

**OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES IN SCHOOL-COMMUNITY
PARTNERSHIP IN GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF
SOUTH WEST SHOA ZONE OF OROMIA REGIONAL STATE**

MA THESIS

BEDADA GOBU DUGUMA

NOVEMBER 2017

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA

Opportunities and Challenges in School-Community Partnership in
Government Secondary Schools of South West Shoa Zone of Oromia
Regional State

A Thesis submitted to College of Education and Behavioral Sciences,
Department of Educational Planning and Management in the Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Masters of Arts in school
leadership

Bedada Gobu Duguma

November 2017

Haramaya University, Haramaya

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIERCTORATE

As Research thesis Advisor, we hereby certify that we have read and evaluated this Thesis entitled “Opportunities and Challenges in School-Community Partnership in Government Secondary Schools of South West Shoa Zone of Oromia Regional State” prepared under our guidance by Bedada Gobu. We recommended that it has been submitted as fulfilling the thesis requirement.

Tadese Hailu _____

Major Advisor: Signature Date

Yirgalem Alemu _____

Co-advisor Signature Date

As a member of the Board of Examiners of the MA Thesis Open Defense Examination, we certify that we have read and evaluated the Thesis prepared by Bedada Gobu and examined the candidate. We recommended that the Thesis has been accepted as fulfilling the Thesis requirements for the degree of Masters of Art in School Leadership.

Chairperson Signature Date

Internal Examiner Signature Date

External Examiner Signature Date

Final approval and acceptance of the Thesis is contingent upon the submission of its final copy to the council of Graduate (CGS) through the candidates department or school of Graduate Committee (DGC or SGC).

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis manuscript to my wife, W/ro Belaynesh Megersa for her undeserved supports and all rounded encouragements to complete the study, and to my children Bonsitu, Biya, Yona and Girma Bedada for their love.

STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR

By my signature below, I declare and affirm that this Thesis is my own work. I have followed all ethical and technical principles of scholarship in the preparation, data collection, data analysis and compilation of this Thesis. Any scholarly matter that is included in the Thesis has been given recognition through citation.

This Thesis is submitted in the partial fulfillment of the requirements for Masters Arts degree at Haramaya University. The Thesis is deposited in Haramaya University Library and is made available to borrowers under the rules of the library. I solemnly declare that this Thesis has not been submitted to any other institution for the award of any academic degree, diploma or certificate.

Brief quotation from this Thesis may be made without the special permission that accurate and complete acknowledgement of the source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotations from or reproduction of this Thesis in whole or in part may granted by the head of the school or department when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interest of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author of the Thesis.

Name: Bedada Gobu

Signature_____

Place: Haramaya University

Date of submission: November 2017

Department: Educational Planning and management

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would first to all like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my advisors Mr. Tadese Hailu (Assistant Prof.) and Mr. Yirgalem Alemu (Assistant Prof.) who have devoted their precious time and knowledge in giving me valuable and constructive comments, guides and encouragements right since the beginning of the study till the completion of thesis work.

My sincere thanks also goes to South West Shoa Zone teachers, principals and supervisors for their cooperation for filling in the questionnaires, and PTA chairpersons, WEO heads and planners of for giving detailed responses for the interview. I would also like to express my grateful thanks to colleagues in South West Shoa ZEO and Woliso Woreda Education Officials particularly, Seifu Gelan, Teshome Lechisa, Mergea Alemu, Bogale Bekele, and Solomon Girma who supported me by offering internet and printing services.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

The author was born in Oromia Regional State, South West Shoa Zone, Woliso Woreda, Karro Simela Farmers Kebele on June 7, 1972. He attended his First Cycle Primary Education (1-6) at Maru Korme, Second Cycle Primary Education (7-8) at Dilela Primary School, and Secondary School's Education (Grade 9-12) at Dej.Geresu Duki Secondary School. After completing the primary and secondary education, he was trained for one year at Jimma Teachers' Training Institute for primary school teacher, Diploma from 2004-2005 and BA Degree from 2008-2010 at Addis Ababa University.

Besides, the author has taught for 12 years in the primary schools of South West Shoa Zone, and served as a planning and budget expert for 2 years in Woliso Woreda Education Office. Later, he joined the Postgraduate Program Directorate at Haramaya University, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Department of EdPM in 2015 to pursue his MA in School Leadership. Currently, he is serving in Woliso Woreda Dej.Balcha Aba Nebso Government Secondary School as a school principal.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CWA	Common Wealth of Australia
EEC	European Economic Commission
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
EUNEC	Europeans Network of Education Council
HFRP	Harvard Family Research Project
IEL	Institute for Educational Leadership
KETB	Kebele Education and Training Board
MoE	Ministry of Education
NASSP	National Association of Secondary Schools Principals
NEA	National Education Association
PTA	Parent-Teacher Association
SIP	School Improvement Program
WEO	Woreda Education Office
WETB	Woreda Education and Training Board
ZEO	Zone Education Office
ZFEDO	Zone Finance and Economic Development Office

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	vii
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xii
ABSTRACT	xiii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Basic Research Questions	4
1.4. Objectives of the Study	5
1.5. Significance of the Study	5
1.6. Delimitation of the Study	6
1.7. Limitations of the Study	6
1.8. Operational Definitions	7
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1. Definition and Concept of the School-Community Partnership	8
2.2. Rationales of the School-Community Partnership	10
2.3. Models of the School-Community Partnership	12
2.4. Types of the School-Community Partnership	14
2.5. Characteristics of the School-Community Partnership	15
2.6. Opportunities for the School-Community Partnership	16
2.7. Activities of the School-Community Partnership	17
2.8. Challenges of the School-Community Partnership	18

Continues...

2.9. Strategies of the School-Community Partnership	19
2. 10. The School-Community Partnership in Ethiopian Context	20
2.10.1. Activities of the school-community partnership	20
2.10.2. Strategies of the school-community partnership	21
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	22
3.1. Description of the Study Area	22
3.2. Research Design	22
3.3. Sources of Data	23
3.3.1. Primary sources of data	23
3.3.2. Secondary sources of data	23
3.4. Target Population, Samples and Sampling Techniques	23
3.5. Data Collection Instruments	26
3.5.1. Questionnaire	26
3.5.3. Interview guide	28
3.5.4. Document analysis	28
3.6. Data Collection Procedures	28
3.7. Methods of Data Analysis	29
3.7.1. Quantitative data analysis	30
3.7.2. Qualitative data analysis	30
3.8. Ethical Considerations	30
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	32
4.1. Characteristics of the Respondents	32
4.2. Opportunities, Activities, Strategies and Challenges	34
4.2.1. Responses on opportunities of school-community partnership	35
4.2.2. Responses on activities of the school-community partnership	43
4.2.3. Responses on challenges of the school-community partnership	51
4. 2.4. Responses on the strategies of school-community partnership	57

continues...

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	62
5.1. Summary	62
5.2. Conclusions	66
5.3. Recommendations	68
6. REFERENCES	70
7. APPENDICES	73

LIST OF TABLES

Table1. Summary of population, sample size and sampling techniques	25
Table 2. Reliability coefficients	27
Table 3. Chcteristics of the Respondents	33
Table4. Responses on policy related opportunities	35
Table5. Responses on community related opportunities	40
Table6. Responses on community participation in management	44
Table7. Responses on community involvement in supporting students learning	47
Table8. Responses leadership related challenges	51
Table9. Responses on community related challenges	55
Table10. Responses on the strategies of the school-community partnership	58

Opportunities and Challenges in School-Community Partnership in
Government Secondary Schools of South West Shoa Zone of Oromia
Regional State

By Bedada Gobu

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to assess opportunities of the school-community partnership, and challenges that hinder its effectiveness in government secondary schools of South West Shoa Zone., and descriptive survey design was employed to conduct the study. Besides, the target populations of the study were 28 secondary schools teachers, principals, supervisors, PTA and officials. Thus, 8 secondary schools by the simple random and 164 teachers were selected systematic sampling techniques. Then, 8 PTA chairpersons, 8 principals, 8 supervisors and 16 officials were selected by availability sampling technique. Data was collected from both primary and secondary data sources. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to collect data. The data collected through questionnaire was analyzed by using quantitative method (descriptive statistics_ frequency and percentage) and inferential statistical tool (t-test) whereas qualitative data that was obtained through interview, open-ended questions, and document analysis was analyzed qualitatively. Based on the major findings, conclusions had also been drawn. Accordingly, the government secondary schools of South West Shoa could not efficiently utilize the available opportunities of school-community partnership. The failure of employing the opportunities has negative implication for the effectiveness of school-community partnership. In addition, activities of school-community partnership had not been implemented in line with the policy expectation. This also implies that weak community participation in the implementation of the partnership activities have negative impact on the outcomes of partnership. The partnership had also been encountered the prevailing challenges, which in turn negatively affect its effectiveness. Besides, the strategies of school-community partnership implementation were inconsistent with the policy expectation, and this failure hampers its effectiveness. It has also been suggested that the school leadership should investigate the opportunities of school-community partnership intensively and employ consistently to achieve sustainable partnership, conduct need analysis to identify priorities and relevance of the partnership, provide trainings for the practitioners of the partnership to enhance their capacity, and government (supervisors, WEO and Regional Education Bureau) should conduct regular review of the allocation of the school-community partnership, provide trainings for the practitioners, and maintain close follow-up.

1. INTRODUCTION

The introduction part of this research includes background of the study, statement of the problem, basic research questions, and objectives of the study. It also includes significance of the study, delimitation, limitations and definition of key terms.

1.1. Background of the Study

Partnerships are the critical components of 21st century of community learning centers, and community-based organizations are the most common partners because partners perform a number of important roles such as offering programs, provide services, and volunteering. To this effect, a comprehensive school-community partnership has been perceived as an indispensable strategy of seeking community participation to promote and sustain healthy school-climate by providing shared vision, guide principals, and bridge connections between the schools and communities (Harvard Family Research Project, HFRP, 2010). Hence, the school-community partnership has been adapted in to the school system as a key strategy to maintain community participation in the school programs to improve the students learning outcomes.

In addition, a survey report of National Association of Secondary Schools Principals clearly stated that the importance of the school-community relationship in achieving the students' success at the school and in their future lives (Berg, Jacobson and Melville, 2006). In other words, schools lacking such connections result in more likely to perform poorly, and difficulties such as health concerns, lack of motivation, family circumstances, and community problems that the students may encounter.

Likewise, Gary and Witherspoon (2011) reported that high performing schools involve families and community in the school activities through trust building; collaborative relationship, addressing cultural diversity, and embracing the philosophy of partnership in which responsibilities are shared. Roekel (2008) also suggested that the support in educational institutions strongly correlate with higher academic performances of the students and school improvement. This implies that collaboration of the schools with

parents and the community to work together creates transparency and enables to share the responsibility to address the students' needs.

Furthermore, Pullman, Wiggins, and Bruns (2011) suggested that children who are served in the collaborative school-community partnership programs had better learning outcomes, higher ratings of school adjustment, and lower cumulative rates of grade retention. Besides, Obsa (2010) reported that collaboration and partnership in education can lead to increased resource for education, more effective and relevant education, greater equity, demand and acceptability of education. This indicates that the supports and engagement of partners through collaborative work and shared responsibilities between the schools and the partners enhance the effectiveness of the schools.

In Ethiopian context, MoE (2010b) stated that SIP document, community participation domain; the schools are expected to develop partnership with the key stakeholders to bring sustainable improvement in the students learning outcomes. In this regard, the schools can be provided with the necessary inputs such as financial and material resources required to improving the quality education. In that light, the schools are expected to develop collaborative relationship with community in order to gain supports in terms of fulfilling school facilities and maintenance, and engagement of community in the leadership. In contrast, the problem of poor quality of school facilities, less support for schools through government funds, less support for school construction, lack of computers and plasma in secondary schools, weak leadership and management capacity at the school level, and deteriorating trends of students' achievement(MoE, 2010a).

Likewise, the practices of school-community partnership in government secondary schools of South West Shoa Zone can be considered as insignificant in light of the policy expectation because the average promotion rate of grade 10 was declining from 30.62% to 27.17%, the average rate of students' absenteeism had been increasing from 15.1% to 29.4% in the past three consecutive years (ZEO, 2016). Besides, it was understood from the informal discussion conducted by the researcher with some school schools principals and teachers, and PTA members that community participation in the specific zone has been declining with in the specified years, which directly or indirectly hampered the

school-community partnership. Therefore, the primary purpose of the study was to assess the opportunities employed and identify the major challenges that hinder the school-community partnership in government secondary schools, and to suggest the possible solutions.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Research reports revealed different challenges hinder the school-community partnership. In this regard, Bayha and Harrison (2002) reported that the implementation of school-community partnership still is facing hurdles, especially at the local level. Christenson (2002) also reported the major problems in promoting the school-community partnership such as lack of adequate time mainly for community outreach programs, fear for conflict, lack of adequate training, ineffective communication, and narrow conceptions of community roles among the educators (principals, teaching and non-teaching staff). As a result, the practice of the school-community partnership could not be able to become effective in light of the expectation.

Likewise, in Ethiopian context, Tadele (2014) reported the major challenges of community participation in education such as the negative attitude of principals and teachers towards community roles, lack of adequate training, lack of leadership commitment, reluctance of the community to planning, implementation and evaluation of the school plan, lack of regular schedules in dealing with the community, lack of well-developed school-based policies, poor communication system, and lack of good governance. Abera (2015) also identified the major factors that hinder community participation in education were low community awareness to the program and financial constraints in the sides of the community, and lack of leadership skill, poor communication, lack of community services and ineffective roles of the school-community (principals, teachers, PTA and KETB) towards empowering the community.

In addition, a study conducted in Horro Guduru of Oromia regional state by Obsa (2010) also reported the major challenges of community participation in education were lack of transparency from the management (principals, PTA and KETB), poverty and economic fluctuation. In this respect, the strong efforts have been made to discover the major

challenges of community participation in education. However, the school-community partnership, which is the maximum level of community participation, was not touched because the researcher could not get researches conducted on the topic in South West Shoa Zone. In that light, it was mandatory to conduct a research on the school-community partnership and contribute in providing knowledge for understanding and promoting a comprehensive school-community partnership to enhance the students learning outcomes. As a result, the practitioners would be able to develop some skills in dealing with the prevailing challenges of school-community partnership in the target area of the study.

In general, it was understood that there was policy implementation gaps in light of the school improvement programs (SIP) where meaningful school-community partnership were expected. From the researcher's point of view, it should be important that the schools should strive to alleviate the challenges of the school-community partnership. Unless the challenges are resolved, enhancement of the students learning outcomes through active participation of community could not be achieved and the effectiveness of school performance could be impossible. Therefore, the researcher was initiated to conduct the study in order to fill the gap of school-community partnership among the government secondary schools of the specific zone. Accordingly, the researcher carefully designed the basic research questions that guided the research effectively.

1.3. Basic Research Questions

In order to assess the opportunities and challenges of school-community partnership in government secondary schools of South West Shoa Zone, the following basic research questions were designed to guide the study:

1. What opportunities exist to promote the school-community partnership in the government secondary schools of South West Shoa?
2. What school-community partnership activities have been undertaken in the government secondary schools of South West Shoa?
3. What factors hinder the implementation of school-community partnership in government secondary schools of South West Shoa?

4. What strategies have been used to overcome the challenges of school-community partnership in government secondary schools of South West Shoa?

1.4. Objectives of the Study

1.4.1. General objective

The general objective of the study was to assess opportunities of school-community partnership exist and challenges in government secondary schools of South West Shoa, and to recommend the possible solutions that may help to overcome the challenges.

1.4.2. The specific objectives

In light of the general objective, the specific objectives that guided the study were:

- i. To identify the existing opportunities of the school-community partnership in the secondary schools of South West Shoa.
- ii. To examine the school-community partnership activities undertaken in the secondary schools of South West Shoa.
- iii. To pinpoint the major challenges those hinder the school-community partnership.
- iv. To analyze the strategies used to overcome the challenges of school-community partnership.

1.5. Significance of the Study

According to MoE (2010b), significant improvement of the school performance is expected from the school-community partnership as the major goal of the school program implementation. Despite of the strong efforts made to bring about sustainable school-community partnership, it could not bring about significant improvement of school-community partnership in the secondary schools of the specific zone. Therefore, the outcomes of this study may serve to overcome the prevailing challenges of school-community partnership and benefit for the centered beneficiaries (the students, the staff, the school management, parents, and the community as well).

In this respect, it may help to enhance the commitment of the stakeholders to discharge their roles better than the previous to overcome the prevailing challenges of the school-

community partnership the government secondary schools of the specific zone. Besides, it may initiate the community to share the responsibilities for enhancing the students learning outcomes by developing sense of ownership, strengthening the school-community relationship, reducing the wrong perceptions of the community about their roles in promoting the school-community partnership. It may also help for further studies by providing the necessary in put (data) that might be required to conduct the study.

1.6. Delimitation of the Study

The scope the study was geographically delimited to Oromia Regional State, South West Shoa Zone, 12 woredas, and 28 government secondary schools because there were only government secondary schools in the zone. It was also confined to assess the existing opportunities and challenges of the school-community partnership in government secondary schools, and to suggest the possible solutions. In addition, the research design employed was delimited to descriptive survey design because it enables to gather both quantitative and qualitative data from large group of respondents (Cohen, et al., 2007).

Besides, the method of data collection was also delimited to both quantitative and qualitative methods in order to cross check the truthfulness of data gathered across the tools. Quantitative method of data collection was employed for questionnaire and qualitative method was used for open-ended questionnaire, interview and document analysis, and primary and secondary data sources were employed in the study. Moreover, the data collection instruments were confined to questionnaire, interview (semi-structured) and document analysis.

1.7. Limitations of the Study

While conducting this research, some limitations were encountered specially during the data gathering process. One of the limitations was that some of the officials were occupied by workloads and various meeting programs so that it was not easy to get them easily for interview. Besides, locally written literature on the school-community partnership is scarcely available that might limit the researcher in having sufficient literature reviewed in the current context of the zone.

1.8. Operational Definitions

In order to avoid confusions or ambiguity of ideas, the key terms of the study were operationally defined.

Challenges: refers to the factors that hinder the school-community partnership effectiveness in enhancing the students learning outcomes.

Community: refers to students, staff members, parents, local governance, local community, professionals and volunteers who involve in students learning.

Community Participation: refers to involvement of the community in influencing and decision making roles from identification of needs to evaluation of outcomes.

Effectiveness: refers to the attainment of partnership objectives by the proper implementation of the strategies designed.

Leaders: refers to Secondary School Principals and Supervisors who participate in the study as data sources.

Opportunities: refers to policy guides and school procedures those exist to provide conducive environment for the school-community partnership.

Parent-Teacher Association: voluntary organizations that govern the school whose membership consists of teachers in a school and parents' of children who attend the school they support.

Partnership: refers to the linkage between schools, parents, community, individuals, groups, and institutions to pursue a common purpose.

Secondary School: the current Ethiopian Education System which incorporates grade level of students of 9-10.

Strategies: refers to ways of employing the existing opportunities and resolving the Challenges of school-community partnership encountered.

Woreda: refers to a local name given to district or municipality

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The aim of the chapter was to establish analytical frameworks that serve as the basis for subsequent analysis and discussion of the study. The frameworks were also built around the opportunities and challenges of school-community partnership. Hence, the chapter presents definition and concept of school-community partnership, rationales, models, types, characteristics, and opportunities. It also presents the activities of school-community partnership, strategies, challenges of school-community partnership and the practices of school-community partnership in Ethiopian context. Thus, understanding of the frameworks and practices of school-community partnership has helped to guide the analysis and discussion with reference to the opportunities and challenges in the government secondary schools of South West Shoa Zone.

2.1. Definition and Concept of the School-Community Partnership

Partnership is often used interchangeably with participation or involvement by different individuals. However, it differs from participation as well as involvement. The school-community partnership is defined in different contexts by researchers. Coinciding with this, Sanders (2006) explains the school-community partnership as the means through which the school-community can work collaboratively for the success of students' learning outcomes. This implies that the school-community partnership can be conceived as a collaborative relationship between the school-community based on shared responsibilities for the success of students learning out comes.

Patricia, A (2001) also noticed the term school-community partnership as the social network or relationship within and between the school, and its local community that promote certain actions. In other words, the partnership is built on social interaction, mutual trust and relationships that the school promote with in the community for the development of common goals.

The school-community partnership can also be explained as an agreement based on the shared responsibilities for enhancing the students learning that is negotiated between the school, parents and the local community to work collaboratively for change (Commonwealth of Australia, CWA, 2013). Likewise, Sheridan (2003) also explained that the school-community partnership as ‘a belief’ of sharing responsibilities for educating and socializing the child and the youth. Hence, it can be understood that the school-community partnership is an approach that emphasizes the school-community relationships than roles, and this responsibility should be negotiated between the partners.

The term partnership may be used advisedly and its concept can be interpreted in different ways based on institutional contexts. In the school context, the school-community partnership may be perceived as collaboration of partners which is formally linked with resources to ensure sustainability of participation (Patricia, 2001). This implies that the school-community partnership can be perceived as a means or an approach by which the school-community mobilizes resources and work in collaboration through effective relationship with the stakeholders to improve the students’ learning outcomes.

Coinciding with this, MoE (2010) states that school-community partnership perceived as a prospect for social mobility and a substantial opportunity to improve life chances of their children. In this respect, school-community partnership can be perceived as the process through which the school partners (students, parents, teaching and non-teaching staff, PTA, KETB, local community and other stakeholders) work in collaboration for the enhancement of students learning. For all, school-community partnership can be understood as a collaborative relationship between the school-community and key stakeholders through sharing the responsibilities for the success of students learning outcomes. In other words, school-community partnership can be understood as an approach by which the school-community creates linkage for the betterment of the students learning outcomes.

2.2. Rationales of the School-Community Partnership

Basically, the school and the community are interdependent entities because one cannot exist without the other. The school exists within the community to serve the community and the community also provides the school with resources (inputs) that enable to achieve its goals_ students learning outcomes. Thus, community participation in education is indispensable.

Researchers propose different purposes of the school-community partnership. However, the purposes of the school-community partnership may vary based on the practical situations of the school and community. In relation to this, Valli et al. (2014) reported that the school-community partnership initiates the schools partners to improve students' educational and life prospects through a close-relationship with the community and service organizations to address the students' learning needs. In addition, Blank et al. (2012) argued that the importance of the school-community partnership as:

Many public and private community institutions share the responsibilities for helping children to improve the social, emotional, psychological and academic development of students, become motivated and engaged in the learning-teaching process, and become safer and more economically vibrant.

In other words, the school-community partnership provides with the opportunity to share responsibility among the schools and the schools partners for enhancing the holistic development the students learning outcomes.

Besides, the European Economic Commission (EEC, 2013) reported that some of the benefits of school-community partnership such as high level of students' achievement, increased motivation and self-esteem, school facilities, supports to meet students' needs, reduced dissatisfactions of students, better community services, local career development opportunities, better supervision, promoting community cohesion by reinforcing the relationship between the school and home, improving local availability of arts and other facilities. In other words, the school-community partnership serves to enhance the holistic development of the youth, strengthening relationship between the school and the community.

Likewise, the school-community partnership also provides with the opportunity to encourage any interested community groups to consider the benefits on the major areas of student-centered learning environment, principals' team leadership and provision of external supports (Sanders, 2016). Moreover, the school-community partnership may be required for enhancing the students learning effectiveness, providing a comprehensive, multifaceted and integrated continuum of intervention to support all youth and families, increasing combined capacity to positively influence students' learning outcomes that service as a clear incentive for the school to develop school and community partnership agreement. Thus, it can be considered that the school-community partnership serves to provide with comprehensive advantages for both the students and the families through collaborative efforts that positively influence the students learning.

Similarly, Chrzanowski, et. al. (2009) stated the rationales of the school-community partnership such as:

supporting teachers and students (facilitation of the classroom learning provides opportunities for teachers in the implementation of lesson plan in collaboration with local expertise engagement to improve students learning), maintaining high level of local visibility, establishing institutional legitimacy in politically complex community areas, and perception of the students to improve in valuing their participation in the community activities.

This implies that school-community partnership can also serve the schools to create conducive environment for the class room teaching by providing with local expertise or facilitation of teaching- learning.

In Ethiopian context, the purpose of school-community partnership, as stated in MoE (2010b) declares that creating quality partnership and networking with parents and community enables schools to link their students closer with the community. Thus, it indicates that sustainable school-community partnership helps to link the schools to the community and become more responsive to their expectations. Hence, it provides with safety and healthy learning environment for students learning through establishing collaborative relationship with the community, community based-learning opportunities, social support services and participation in community events.

2.3. Models of the School-Community Partnership

Researchers propose different models of school-community partnership based on the comparative frameworks of purposes, requirements and theories of actions. In this respect, Valli et al. (2014) proposed four models school-community partnership such as family and interagency collaboration model, full-service school model, full-service school-community model and community development model based on the degree of complexity of the partnership and commitment required.

According to the writers, the family and interagency collaboration model is perceived as the most basic and simplest model of partnership with the primary goal of increasing and coordinating the services of family and community involvement in improving students learning outcomes. In other words, it is a model that focuses on providing community services in order to maintain the school-community partnership. On the other hand, the collaboration partnership model is a type of model where partners are motivated by the belief that coordination of delivery of educational, health, and social services as key strategies to strengthening school-community partnership and requires organizational commitment from the partners. This indicates also similar to the family and community interagency models but broader in a scope of the delivery of services.

The Full-service school model is also the other type of model which goes beyond the coordination of delivery of services at near or far-site that attempts to provide a comprehensive set of academic, health, and social services to both the students and the families. The school-community partnership model is significant as it incorporates the provision of academic services to both students and the families in addition to other services.

Besides, the full-service school-community partnership model is a model that requires additional, substantial cultural shift because of the implications for community inputs and decision making processes, which stresses on the importance of changing of the culture of school in addition to organizational changes by democratizing the schools, opening greater involvement and decision making of the community. In other words, the full-service school-community partnership model is more advanced type which promotes the

partnership through cultural transformation and democratization of decision making processes in the schools.

Moreover, community development model is the site-based type of model, and the most comprehensive and inclusive type of model with a broader scope and vision than other types of models. This shows that community development model of school-community partnership goes beyond the accessibility of services that made the school the social service center that provides a broad array of services and seeks to strengthen the community infrastructures (Valli et al., 2014).

Similarly, community development model of school-community partnership enhances the socio-economic and physical development of capital of the community by focusing on economic development emphasizing community organizations, advocacy of leadership development, parents and students through a two-way communication. The other model of the school-community partnership is a model which mainly focuses on the process and outcomes of school-community partnership. It incorporates various stages of development such as allocation the school-community partnership, implementation, and sustaining it (CWA, 2013).

As stated in the research report, the development stage of school-community partnership includes understanding of the context for initiating, level of readiness and capacity of each party, time devoted to conversations and building relationships with key people and their roles, levels of involvement of community and parents, use of external consultants celebrating through a signing ceremony. The implementation stage of school-community partnership also concerns with planning, monitoring, reviewing and refining of school-community partnership action plan, and sustaining through embedding in the school's culture, regular monitoring and review of the plan which serves as a base for the establishment of the sustainable school-community partnership (Ibid).

In Ethiopian context, the school-community partnership model does not match exactly with the four models illustrated. However, it is almost similar with the family and interagency collaboration model. As it's a school-based and the simplest model of

partnership with the primary goal of coordinating services and increasing family and community involvement in enhancing students learning outcomes. Thus, the model slightly differs from the family and interagency collaboration model because it lacks coordination and delivery of services such as health and social services that are not incorporated in such a school-community partnership model.

Besides, MoE (2011b) stated in SIP framework that the school-community partnership model comprises of parents and community involvement in the decision making process and resource contribution to enhance students' achievement. As a result, the school-community partnership model is a divergent type that may not coincide with the global models of school-community partnership. However, the Ethiopian school-community partnership model can be understood as school-based partnership which mainly focuses on enhancing students' achievement, and comprehensive set academic service provisions. In this regard, collaborative effort of the school leadership and the stakeholders should be indispensable to ensure its effectiveness.

2.4. Types of the School-Community Partnership

Researchers propose various types of the school-community partnership established among the school-community. However, those partnership approaches are categorized under the general categories of partnership approaches that exist between schools, parents and communities. Coinciding with this, Davis (2000) recommended the six types of the school-community partnership among the schools such as parenting, communication, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community.

The parenting type of partnership concerns with helping families to establish home environment to support children as learners. Similarly, communication also deals with the use of effective forms of school- to- home and home-to-school communications. The volunteering type of partnership also concerned with the recruitment and organization of the school's volunteers program. In addition, learning at home deals with the families' assistance of their children with homework recognizing other types of learning at home opportunities. Moreover, the decision making and collaborative types emphasize parents,

families and community members' involvement in the school's decision making process through the identification and integration of community resources and services (Ibid).

In Ethiopian context, the type of the school-community partnership is also incorporating the six types. However, the most common types that are employed in the secondary schools are volunteering, decision making, community resource provision, and communication.

2.5. Characteristics of the School-Community Partnership

Creating a successful school-community partnership is a complex, challenging, and time consuming. To be effective, it needs to engage into a thoughtful process to define a vision and clear goals; effective governance and management structure to ensure efficient implementation of the programs, awareness creation, strategies for coordinating and linking of array of supports, mobilization of resources and effective communication (Blank and Langford, 2000).

Sheridan (2003) also stated the characteristics of effective partnership that mutual interest, commitment to working together on the behalf of the child's performance achievement, frequent, positive and bi-directional communication, cultural sensitivity, and perspective taking. Similarly, Blank et al. (2012) also defined the characteristics of effective partnership such as shared vision and high expectations set, establish formal relationship and collaborative engagement of stakeholders, use of appropriate data, and open-dialogue among the partners. On the other hand, the school-community partnership subscribes certain principles that are the basic tents and guidelines that are to be considered to address the barriers and ensure to improve students' learning.

Besides, the school-community partnership to be characterized by a multi-dimensional approach based on certain principles that have to be sustained through shared vision, contractual relationships, mutual benefits, collaborative work among the parties through the use of empirical data, and two-way communication system. Hence, in order to have sustainable partnership, these features of partnership should be indispensable.

2.6. Opportunities for the School-Community Partnership

The school-community partnership approach needs conducive environment that positively influences its effectiveness that provides with opportunity for the establishment of sustainable partnership. With regard to this, research findings revealed a number of factors that provide safety and healthy environment for promoting the school-community partnership. Hence, different opportunity factors are recommended by different writers.

Patrikakou (2008) identified various opportunity factors for the school-community partnership system such as parental involvement in the education child's development, beliefs and expectations, cultural perspectives, teachers and parental perspectives, and policy issues. The child's characteristics can influence the magnitude and the nature of parental involvement in academic, social and emotional development aspects. In other words, it entails that parents' active participation in the child's academic, social and emotional development aspects as the determinant factors to ensure the success in the learning achievement of students.

Likewise, parents and teachers' beliefs and expectations are very crucial to shape the home-school relationship in order to develop a positive, welcoming school climate, and consistent invitations to parents to be involved in the school programs. Besides, the cultural perspective also considers the school environment as if it is full of the diversified needs of the students that the school leadership is required to acknowledge those diversities. On the other hand, it was indicated the factors that contribute to sustain the school-community partnership such as leadership, capacity building, accountability, induction and succession planning (CWA, 2013). In addition, the attendance and engagement by working together with families, parents, and schools to increase their combined capacity the school-community provides opportunities to positively influence the students learning outcomes (Ibid). Hence, the school leadership, capacity building programs, the planning process, and community attendance on school events can be considered as the opportunities of school-community partnership.

In Ethiopian context, MoE (2010b) stated institutional structure and policy guides for promoting the school-community partnership. In that light, roles and responsibility vested

in the policy guides, the integrated community participation in the internal rules of the schools, consistent exchange of information among the school and the community, frequent interaction required between teachers and parents to improve students' performance are some of the factors that influence the school-community partnership. Therefore, the optimal implementation of the opportunities should be indispensable to maximize its effectiveness.

2.7. Activities of the School-Community Partnership

In order to promote of the school-community partnership, different partnership activities are expected to be performed in order to enhance the students learning outcomes. In this respect, researchers suggested different school-community partnership activities those are required to be implemented and sustained among the schools. However, the areas of the partnership activities may vary based on the schools contexts.

Patrikakou (2008) reported parents roles with the areas of activities such as decision making process at the school level, collaboration with the community to offer additional resources and supports, and establishing learning opportunities (interactive assignment and homework activities). Likewise, students are also responsible in sustaining the school-community partnership through discharging roles such as involvement in parent-teacher conference, intervention in planning and evaluation of the school program.

In addition, MoE (2010b) states that the school-community partnership activities, as indicated in the SIP framework, such as decision making process (planning, implementation and evaluation), resource mobilization (material, finance, physical labor), involvement in the students' academic affairs, creating healthy working environment based on mutual trust and collegiality, setting internal rules and regulations for partnership, maintaining effective communication with all stakeholders in the sense of ownership. Therefore, various activities of the school-community partnership are required to be implemented among the secondary schools based on the school contexts.

2.8. Challenges of the School-Community Partnership

Currently, the school-community partnership is facing critical challenges. In this concern, research revealed various sorts of challenges the school-community partnership. Coinciding with this, researches indicated that the school-community partnership faces a number of challenges that inhibit the effectiveness of the school-community partnership (Virginian Department of Education, 2002).

Bayha and Harrison (2002) stated the factors that challenge the effectiveness of the school-community partnership such as lack of adequate financial resource, lack of incentives, lack of technical supports, lack of sufficient time, lack of relevant information, and insufficient school facilities. In addition, Patrikakou (2008) also identified the major challenges that hinder the success of school-community partnership such as lack of knowledge, lack of adequate resources, mistrust, negative perceptions, poor communication system, diversity of needs and parents' demography (education, marital status and others).

In addition, Roekel(2008) has also reported the challenges of school-community partnership that are related to parental involvement such as lack of know-how, lack of extra-time to attend school activities, cultural difference (language and others), school's bureaucracy policy, and lack of information (communication). Besides, Christenson (2002) also identified major challenges to establish collaborative school- community relationship under the major categories of family related challenges, educators related, and partnership related challenges. The family related challenges include feeling of inadequacy, adopting a passive role by leaving education to schools, economic, emotional, and time constraints, lack of responsive to parental needs, and lack of confidence or mistrust.

Educators related challenges also concern with less commitment of parental involvement, underestimation of community roles, poor communication systems, lack of adequate time, lack of know-how, and fear of conflict. In addition, partnership related barriers consists of poor understanding of the constraints, limited time for communication, poor

school-community relation, limited skills and knowledge of collaborative, psychological and cultural difference, and misunderstanding of differences in parent education (Ibid).

MoE (2010a) states the main challenges of community participation which in turn decline the school-community partnership such as lack of clearly articulated policies for community participation, absence of adequate information about community contribution, and weak leadership capacity at the school level. Likewise, Tadele (2014) reported the challenges of community participation such as lack of community exposure to recent information, passivity of the community, inconsistent community mobilization, inadequate resource, and poor communication. Thus, it can be regarded that there are a great deal of challenges that adversely affect the effectiveness of the school-community partnership.

2.9. Strategies of the School-Community Partnership

The school-community partnership implementation needs consistent strategies. Research findings reveal that schools employ different strategies that suite better for the successful achievement of the students learning based on their contexts. In this concern, Blank et al. (2012) proposed how the schools can build effective partnership stating key strategies such as sharing a common vision, establishing a formal relationship and collaborative structure for the stakeholders engagement, encouraging open-dialogue regarding the challenges, utilization of the appropriate data, empowering the community, and leveraging community resources. It implies that the partnership approach needs to have the shared vision and common values among the schools and partners, and set of expectations for the schools to ensure sustainable partnership.

More specifically, in order to promote effective partnership, it needs to encourage the schools' self-efficacy, and encourage the stakeholders to clearly define the roles of the stakeholders in achieving the stated goals of the school-community partnership (improving students learning outcomes). Therefore, it needs to develop accountability and sense of ownership among the partners through collective trust and effective communication mechanisms.

Likewise, Henderson (2011) also identified ten major strategies that state the directions of school-community partnership such as:

“agreeing on the core values of the school, listening to the community, providing professional development, building collaboration with the community, focusing on priority of the needs of the community, and building a one-to-one relationship between families and educators that are linked to the students learning.”

Thus, it indicates that in order to be effective partnership, identifying needs, creating shared vision, and providing capacity building program, communication and collaborative relationship are key strategies to be applied.

On the other hand, Berg, et. al. (2006) proposed the six keys of community engagement in the school affairs such as knowing where to go, sharing leadership, the reach out program, considering the elephant in the room, telling the school’s history, and stay on the course. In other words, it implies setting vision, participatory leadership approach, visible presence of the leadership, acknowledging diversity and honest discussion to develop trust and sense of ownership as strategies required for the successful partnership.

2. 10. The School-Community Partnership in Ethiopian Context

2.10.1. Activities of the school-community partnership

As indicated in the Education and training policy of Ethiopia, MoE(2008) states that ESDP was prepared to serve as a framework to enable all the stakeholders and development sectors to rally for the implementation of educational programs through interventions and mobilization in order to sustain the minimum standards, contributions of the necessary resources imposed on the community to ensure both the safety and acceptable quality learning environment. In this regard, construction of new schools, maintenance and expansion of schools are considered as areas where the communities are expected to share the responsibility to ensure the stated goals of education.

In addition, creating quality partnership and networking with parents and community shall be indispensable because it enables the schools to link their students closer with the community, and provides with information for the community to more become

responsive to expectations. To this effect, partnership with the community focuses on activities such as setting school policies that support parents' participation, provision of comments from parents on reviewing their children's home works, participation of parents in information exchange activities of the school program, financial contribution, engagement in school-based research, curriculum designing, and increasing the enrolment of female students, and providing social services for teachers and students (MoE, 2010b).

2.10.2. Strategies of the school-community partnership

As stated in SIP framework, MoE (2010a) and ESDP-IV, it's mandatory to improve the standards of educational leadership (principals, teacher and supervisors) in order to ensure the national education quality. Besides, effective strategies of the school-community partnership shall be employed such as provision of training programs that enable to create awareness, develop new skills, roles and values among the community, sharing practical experience to provide with all rounded supports for the learning teaching, communicating the level of performance through the use of effective media (school newsletter, flyers, meeting program) to bring about satisfaction of its beneficiaries, and acknowledging community participation consistently.

In order to increase community participation in the school management and decision making, two strategies shall be employed: *first*, a media-based campaign_ Radio, Television, and printed media shall be used, which focus on promoting education, community engagement in leading schools, and the values of education to the society at large. *Second*, providing face-to-face information and engagement to households and community members shall be implemented to engage with education (MoE, 2010b).

On the other hand, resources and conditions of work shall be made available to all organizations (schools) to the minimum level of standards. In this respect, it was stated that the school environment should be accessible, safe and healthy, which includes monitoring and enforcement of code conduct, reducing gender-based violence, ensuring that all schools have a supply of adequate portable drinking water, adequate gender-specific sanitation, and basic set of accessibility of facilities.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The main purpose of this chapter is to present the road map and how the research work has to be carried out. It has been accompanied by the conceptual frameworks and methods employed in the research work. Therefore, the chapter presents description of the study area, the research design, sources of data, the target population, samples and sampling techniques, data collection instruments, data collection procedures, methods of data analysis and ethical considerations.

3.1. Description of the Study Area

The research on opportunities and challenges in the school-community partnership were conducted in South West Shoa Zone of Oromia Regional State, 28 government secondary schools. South West Shoa Zone has a total surface area of 5813km² which is about 1.6 % of the region. South West Shoa Zone has 12 woredas with the total population of 1,125,606 (567,485 males and 558, 121 females).

It has also 28 government secondary schools (Grade 9-10), 730 teachers (614 males and 116 females), students with the total enrolment of 19,589 (10, 856 males and 8,733 females), 409 primary schools (1-8), 11 preparatory schools, one Poly Technical College, 11 Technical Vocational Colleges, Ambo University Wolisso Campus, and one Private University College (ZEO, 2016).

3.2. Research Design

The research design employed in this study was descriptive survey because it enables to obtain quantitative data from the data sources through the data gathering tool (questionnaires). In addition, qualitative data were also obtained through interview and document analysis to supplement the quantitative data that were obtained through questionnaire. In relation to this, Cohen et al. (2007) reported that survey studies are more useful for gathering factual information from the respondents on preferences, predictions, and experiences of the past and present; and survey study relies on large scale data that are to be collected by the tools such as questionnaires, attendance, and test

scores. Hence, the primary purpose of the survey study of this research was to obtain factual information from the data sources on the current status of school-community partnership practices to reflect their views, experiences, and preferences of the school-community partnership implementation in the secondary schools of the specific zone.

3.3. Sources of Data

3.3.1. Primary sources of data

The primary data sources employed in the study were teachers, principals, PTA chairpersons, supervisors, WEO heads and planning experts.

3.3.2. Secondary sources of data

The secondary data sources were the annual and quarterly reports and records of the sample schools and WEO on the school-community partnership in the past three years, which is from 2014 to 2016.

3.4. Target Population, Samples and Sampling Techniques

According to the information obtained from South West Shoa ZEO of 2016, South West Shoa Zone has 12 woredas, and 28 government secondary schools. There are also 12 supervisors (all males), 28 principals (all males), 730 teachers (614 males and 116 females) in the government secondary schools. In addition, there were 12 WEO heads and 12 planners who facilitate the schools programs.

In order to take the appropriate samples from the target population, South West Shoa Zone was sub-divided to 4 clusters (sub-zones) by cluster sampling technique based on their geographical contiguity and homogeneity of climatic, socio-economic conditions because it enables to obtain the sample each unit from a wider geographic location. Then, 8 woredas were selected from each cluster woreda by the simple random 'Lottery-method' because it gives each woreda equal probability of being included in the sample. In addition, 8 WEO heads, 8 planners of WEO, and 8 supervisors were selected by availability sampling technique due to their responsibilities for the topic under study.

Cohen, et al (2007) suggested that for the statistical analysis of small size population, a researcher has to use the sample size of a minimum of 30% and above as the sample population. In that light, two secondary schools were selected from each woreda and a total of 8 (27.6%) secondary schools by the simple random 'lottery' technique because it gives equal chance of being included in the sample. Then, 8 principals were selected by availability sampling technique due to their responsibilities for the topic under study.

Similarly, 8 chairpersons of PTA were selected by sampling one PTA respondent from each sample school by using availability sampling technique due to their responsibilities for the topic under study. Then, 8 PTA chairpersons were selected from sample schools. Besides, 164(59%) of teachers (139 males and 17 females) were selected from the total of 277 (248 males and 29 females) by systematic random sampling technique because the method gives equal probability for the respondents to be included in the sample.

Table-1 Summary of population, sample size and sampling techniques

Cluster	Woreda		Officials						Supervisor			School			Teachers			Principals			PTA		
			WEO heads			Planners																	
	population	Sample	Po	Sa	%	Po	Sa	%	Po	Sa	%	Po	Sa	%	Po	Sa	%	Po	Sa	%	Po	Sa	%
1	Ameya	Goro	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	2	1	50	24	14	59	1	1	100	1	1	100
	Goro	Wonchi	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	3	1	33	49	29	59	1	1	100	1	1	100
	Wonchi		1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	3	1	33	49	29	59	1	1	100	1	1	100
2	Becho	Becho	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	2	1	50	37	22	59	1	1	100	1	1	100
	Woliso	Wolliso	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	3	1	33	44	26	59	1	1	100	1	1	100
	W/town		1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	3	1	33	44	26	59	1	1	100	1	1	100
3	Dawo	Dawo	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	2	1	50	16	10	59	1	1	100	1	1	100
	Elu	Tole	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	2	1	50	43	25	59	1	1	100	1	1	100
	Tole		1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	2	1	50	43	25	59	1	1	100	1	1	100
4	Kersa	Kersa	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	2	1	50	34	20	59	1	1	100	1	1	100
	S/Sodo	S/Sodo	1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	3	1	33	30	18	59	1	1	100	1	1	100
	S/Dechi		1	1	100	1	1	100	1	1	100	3	1	33	30	18	59	1	1	100	1	1	100
Total	12	8	8	8	100	8	8	100	8	8	100	19	8	42	277	164	59	8	8	100	8	8	100
Sampling techniques	Cluster sampling Technique	Simple random sampling	Availability Sampling			Availability Sampling			Availability Sampling			Simple random Sampling			systematic sampling			Availability Sampling			Availability Sampling		

3.5. Data Collection Instruments

The data collection instruments employed for the study were questionnaire, face-to-face interview (semi-structured) and document analysis.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed as both closed-ended and open-ended, and was distributed to collect quantitative data from teachers, principals and supervisors because it is manageable by the respondents. Therefore, one set of questionnaire with the same type of items was designed for teachers, principals and supervisors by the researcher to address all basic research questions. Then, 45 items were prepared in the form of rating scales with a 5-point scale of answers such as strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree to identify the extent that the respondents agree or disagree with the items. Besides, open-ended questions were also included at the end of close-ended questions in line with each basic research question to obtain adequate information required.

Before distributing the questionnaires to the respondents, pilot test was conducted by the researcher to check clarity of the questionnaire, to gain feedback, and avoid ambiguity and difficulties in wording. In that light, Wolliso Town was selected from Ameya, Ilu and Soddo Dechi woreda, which were not included in the main study by the simple random 'Lottery-sampling' technique. Then, Geresu Duki secondary school was selected for the pilot test, and 30 teachers were by the simple random 'Lottery-sampling' technique.

Besides, WEO head, a planner, a school supervisor and a principal were selected by using the same techniques as to the main study to test the appropriateness of the data collection instrument. Further, cronbach's alpha was used to test the reliability of the tool (questionnaire) to ensure the internal consistency of the items, and the result of alpha value has been indicated in Table-2.

Table-2 Reliability Coefficients

Major Categories	No of items	Reliability coefficients
Opportunities	14	0.94
Activities	12	0.88
Strategies	8	0.91
Challenges	11	0.95
Average coefficient(α)	45	0.92

In relation to this, Cohen, et al. (2007) reported that the alpha value or reliability coefficient as very high for ' α ' > 0.9, highly reliable for α 0.8_0.9, reliable for α 0.7_0.79, minimally reliable for α 0.6_0.69, and unacceptable for α < 0.6. Accordingly, the reliability of the instruments was calculated by SPSS version 20, and the results were 0.94, 0.88, 0.91, and 0.95 for teachers, leaders and supervisors. Hence, the instrument was found reliable for the test result of alpha value, $\alpha = 0.92$, which is $\alpha > 0.70$. In addition, semi-structured interview guides were used with the same format and sequence of words and questions for each respondent. Then, modifications of some terminologies and edition of items in wording were made in order to avoid the ambiguity and difficulties of ideas based on the feedback obtained.

On the other hand, in order to ensure the content validity of the items, the researcher applied the guides and comments given by the advisors and items found to be vague were modified appropriately. The researcher also tested to determine the internal consistency of items was calculated by SPSS software version-20, and checked the reliability of the tools. In that light, the researcher validated the coherence between the items of questionnaire and basic research questions. Then, the printed questionnaires were distributed to all respondents by the researcher, and were collected by the assistant data collectors assigned by the researcher at each sample school.

3.5.3. Interview guide

Semi-structured interview was conducted to collect qualitative data from 8 PTA chairpersons, 16 officials (8 WEO heads and 8 planners) because it enables to get in depth information from the respondents. Coinciding with this, Abera (2015:49) reported that interview can be employed by investigators to understand the perceptions, feelings and knowledge of the people qualitatively through in depth and intensive interview as well as to triangulate the reliability of the evidences obtained through questionnaires. Then, the researcher conducted face-to-face interview for 30 to 40 minutes with each respondent in line with the basic research questions based on the interview guides.

Consequently, one set of interview guides were prepared by the researcher in line with the basic research questions. Then, interview was conducted with the PTA chairpersons and officials, which incorporated personal information, and guiding questions that enabled to address all the research questions and the responses were narrated manually with a pen by the researcher.

3.5.4. Document analysis

The document analysis was conducted by the researcher to collect qualitative data from the sample schools and WEO through the direct observation and review of records and the annual reports on the practices of school-community partnership because it enabled to obtain the necessary information for the study to ensure the truthfulness of data obtained through other tools (questionnaire and interview). Therefore, the annual reports and records of the sample schools and WEO were carefully reviewed and narrated qualitatively (in words) in line with the basic research questions.

3.6. Data Collection Procedures

In order to collect the necessary data from the sources, the following sequential procedures were employed. *First*, the set of questionnaire and interview guides were prepared in detail by the researcher under the guidance of advisors. Then, the prepared interview guides were translated in to local language (Afan Oromo) for PTA

chairpersons, WEO heads and planning experts to make the communication more relevant for the interaction with the interviewees.

Second, after preparing the questionnaire and interview guides, a pilot test was conducted with the similar groups of respondents outside the sample population before distributing the questionnaires because it enables to identify the clarity of questions, items, instructions, and to get feedback that helped to modify the unclear questions, eliminate duplications and avoid ambiguity in wording. Then, the questions were revised and modified by the researcher. *Third*, the researcher communicated with ZEO and WEO to get permission and cooperation from the respondents. Then, the researcher visited the selected schools, and communicated with principals and supervisors to get the necessary support and cooperation required throughout the research work, and set the schedule for the distribution and collection of the questionnaires.

Finally, the printed set of questionnaires (a total of 180 copies) was distributed to 164 teachers, 8 principals and 8 supervisors by the researcher, and was collected after 3 days of distribution by the assistance of data collectors assigned by the researcher. In addition, the researcher also communicated with principals of the sample schools through cell-phone to minimize the late responses. Then, the questionnaire were filled and collected from 156 teachers, 8 principals and 8 supervisors, and the return rate was 95.12%, 100%, and 100% for teachers, principals and supervisors receptively. On the other hand, face-to-face interview was conducted with 8 PTA chairpersons and 16 officials and their responses were recorded annually with pen by the researcher. Besides, document analysis was also conducted by the researcher among 8 sample schools and 8 wordas.

3.7. Methods of Data Analysis

In order to accomplish the desired objectives of the study, the raw data collected from different sources were manually recorded, categorized, coded, and systematically analyzed. Thus, both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis were employed based on the type of data obtained.

3.7.1. Quantitative data analysis

The quantitative data obtained from the respondents were manually recorded, categorized, coded, tallied, tabulated and systematically organized. Then, the quantitative data obtained from teachers, principals and supervisors by the closed questions were analyzed by using average mean values for each group of respondents rather than treating each mean because the researcher preferred the average (weighted) mean value as it helps to obtain the aggregate ones. In addition, the analysis was performed by the SPSS (statistical package for social science) software version 20.

Cohen, et al. (2007) reported that t-test enables to discover whether there are statistically significant differences between the means of the two groups. Hence, inferential statistic, t-test was used because it enables to identify whether there were statistically significant differences between the means of the two groups of respondents, and to conclude over the target population (28 secondary schools of South West Shoa) based on the major findings.

3.7.2. Qualitative data analysis

Qualitative method of data analysis was also employed to analyze the data obtained through the semi-structured interview from 8 PTA chairpersons, 16 officials, and the document analysis. Then, the data were systematically organized and analyzed qualitatively (in words), categorized in line with the basic research questions, and narrated logically under the quantitative data in line with the related items.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

Cohen et al. (2007) stated several ethical issues that constitute a set of initial considerations that the researcher should address in conducting researches such as the ethics of informed consent, non-maleficence, beneficence, human dignity, absolutism, and relativism that need to be respected and other problems that a researcher should avoid. Therefore, ethical issues that should be taken to consideration while conducting social researches were considered in this research work too.

Likewise, before engaging into this research work, the researcher acquired a support letter from HU and delivered to South West Shoa ZEO to get permission. Then, the researcher communicated with the sample woreda officials, supervisors, school principals, and negotiated by providing them full information about the research to be conducted.

In addition, the researcher promised that the information provided by the participants should be coded by using letters and symbols (anonymity) to protect their identity, and convinced the respondents that their responses and views would be confidential and for academic purpose only. Besides, the researcher promised to be free from misconduct behaviors that are unethical in the research work and to be free from imposing any opinion of the researcher on the audience's needs or influencing the respondents by imposing the interest of the researcher on the respondents.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of data obtained through questionnaire, interview, and document analysis to search for the appropriate answers for the intended basic questions. The chapter consists of two major parts. The first part presents demography and characteristics of the participants, and the second part deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of data gathered on opportunities and challenges of the school-community partnership in government secondary schools of South West Shoa Zone of Oromia Regional State.

The questionnaires (a total of 180 copies) were distributed to 164 teachers, 8 principals and 8 supervisors to obtain the required data. Then, the data were filled out and returned from 156 teachers, 8 principals and 8 supervisors with the return rate of 156(95.12%) for teachers, 8(100%) for principals and 8(100%) for supervisors. On the other hand, interview was conducted with 8 PTA chairpersons and 16 officials in order to triangulate the data gathered through questionnaires. Besides, document analysis was also employed as supplementary data gathering tool. Based on the gathered data, presentation, analysis and interpretation of data were made, and the average (weighted) mean value was used to analyze the responses of both groups in order to achieve the intended results.

4.1. Characteristics of the Respondents

In order to have the background information about the respondents, descriptive statistics was employed to provide summary of their characteristics rather than to generalize over the population. Thus, the general characteristics (sex, age, educational qualification, and work experience on the current position) of the respondents who were involved in the study have been presented in Table 3.

Table-3 Responses on Characteristics of the Respondents

No	Variable	Categories	Respondents							
			Teachers		Leaders		PTA		Officials	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Sex	Male	139	89.1	16	100	8	100	16	100
		Female	17	10.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	156	100	16	100	8	100	16	100
2	Age	21-25 years	35	22.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
		26-30 years	74	47.4	4	25	3	37.5	4	25.0
		31-35years	27	17.3	6	37.5	5	62.5	9	56.3
		36-40 years	7	4.5	3	18.75	-	-	-	-
		41 ⁺ years	13	8.3	3	18.75	1	4.2	3	18.8
3	Education Level	Below	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Grade10/12	-	-	-	-	2	25	-	-
		Grade 10/12 complete	4	2.56	-	-	6	75	-	-
		Diploma	146	93.6	11	68.5	-	-	16	100
		1 st Degree	6	3.8	5	31.25	-	-	-	-
4	Work Experience	1-5 years	49	31.4	1	6.25	8	100	10	62.5
		6-10 years	59	37.8	6	37.5	-	-	3	18.8
		11-15 years	32	20.5	4	25	-	-	3	18.8
		16-20 years	3	1.9	3	18.75	-	-	-	-
		21 ⁺ years	13	8.3	2	12.5	-	-	-	-

Key: N=frequency, % = percentage

As indicated in Table 3, of the total population in the sample woredas (277), 156 teachers, 139 (89.1%) were males and 17 (10.9%) were females. In addition, 16 (100%) leaders and 16 (100%) officials were all males, all PTA chairpersons were males. This indicates that both male and female respondents were involved in providing the responses.

In addition, the age analysis indicated that 35(22.4%) of teachers were in the age ranges of 21-25 years, 74(47.4%) of teachers, 4(25%) of leaders, 3(37.5%) of PTA chairpersons, and 4 (25%) of the officials were in the age ranges of 26-30 years respectively. Besides, 27(17.3%) of teachers, 6(37.5%) of leaders, 5(62.5%) of PTA chairpersons, and 9(56.3%)

of officials were in the age ranges of 31-35 years, 7(4.5%) of teachers, and 3(18.75%) of leaders were in the age ranges of 36-40. It was also identified that 13 (8.3%) of teachers, 3(18.75%) of leaders, and 3(18.8%) of officials were in the age ranges of 41 and above. Similarly, 74(47.4%) were in the age ranges of 26-30 years, 6 (37.5%) of leaders, 9 (56.3%) of officials were in the age ranges of 31-35 years.

It was revealed that 2(25%) of PTA chairpersons had educational qualification of grade 10/12 complete, 4(2.56%) of teachers, and 6 (75%) of PTA had Diploma, 146 (93.6%) of teachers, 11(68.5%) of leaders, all officials, 16(100%) had first degree whereas 6(3.8%) of teachers and 5(31.25%) of leaders had the second degree. Moreover, 146 (93.6%) teachers, 11(68.5%) of leaders and all, 16(100%) of the officials had the first degree respectively. Therefore, it reveals that the respondents had varied educational background that may affect the quality of evidence to be obtained.

Furthermore, 49(31.4%) of teachers, 1(6.25%) of leaders, all PTA, 8(100%) and 10 (62.5%) of the officials had 1-5 service years, 59(37.8%) of teachers, 6 (37.5%) of leaders, and 3(18.75%) of officials had 6-10 service years. In addition, 32(20.5%) of teachers, 2(18.75%) of leaders, and 3(18.75%) of officials had 11-15 service years. Besides, 3(1.9%) of teachers and 3(18.75%) of leaders had work experience of 16-20 years, and 13(8.3%) of teachers, 2(12.5%) of leaders had work experience of 21 years and above. Therefore, it can be considered that the majority of teachers, 59(37.8%), 4(25%) of leaders, all of PTA, 8(100%), and the majority of the officials, 10(62.5%) had work experience of 1-5 years.

4.2. Opportunities, Activities, Strategies and Challenges of School-Community Partnership

In order to analysis the data obtained through questionnaire, the average mean value (Av) was preferred to be used instead of analyzing each variable because the average mean is more adequately represents the dispersion of values than the simple average. Thus, the two groups of respondents (teachers and leaders) participated, and t-test was

used to measure the difference between the groups and means using the parametric data, and generalize the findings over the population by comparing the average mean values.

4.2.1. Responses on opportunities of school-community partnership

Table -4 Responses on policy related opportunities

No	I-Policy related items	Respondents		Response		t-test for equality of means	
		Groups	N	M	Av	t-value	p-value
1	The local community has been delegated authority to the decision making roles in the school programs.	Teachers	156	2.67	2.59	0.56	0.581
		Leaders	16	2.50			
2	Participatory leadership has been practiced in the schools.	Teachers	156	2.57	2.69	-0.87	0.396
		Leaders	16	2.81			
3	Greater parental involvement has been done in the academic development of the students.	Teachers	156	2.35	2.21	1.07	0.298
		Leaders	16	2.06			
4	Community participation has been integrated in the internal rules of the school.	Teachers	156	2.47	2.52	-0.39	0.701
		Leaders	16	2.56			
5	Effective communication of the school performance has been used among the community.	Teachers	156	2.40	2.48	-0.62	0.541
		Leaders	16	2.56			
6	The strategic plan has been developed through community participation.	Teachers	156	2.26	2.66	-2.47	0.24
		Leaders	16	3.06			
7	Strong relationship has been built between the school-community to improve the students learning outcomes.	Teachers	156	2.55	2.34	1.63	0.120
		Leaders	16	2.12			
8	Collaborative work of the school-community has been sustained to address the diversified of needs of the students.	Teachers	154	2.43	2.22	1.47	0.158
		Leaders	16	2.00			

Key: N= frequency, M= simple mean, Av= Average mean, p= probability of sampling error, $\alpha=0.05$ (1-1.49=SD, 1.5-2.49=D, 2.5-3.45=Un, 3.50-4.45=A and 4.5-5.0=SA, A= agree, SA=strongly agree, Un= undecided, D=disagree and SD=strongly disagree)

As indicated in Table 4 of item 1 which states delegation of authority to the local community in the decision making roles in the school programs revealed that the mean scores M=2.67 for the teachers and M=2.50 for the leaders and Av 2.59, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was found that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item1 at t-value = 0.56 and $\alpha=0.581$, which is $p > 0.05$. This implies that both groups perceive in a similar way.

On the other hand, most officials and PTA chairpersons suggested that there was delegation of authority to the local community particularly in the decision making processes such as planning, implementation and evaluation of the school plans, conflict resolution and disciplinary cases. Others also suggested related views. In contrast, three PTA respondents denied saying that the community involve mostly in the evaluation process usually at the end of the budget year. Besides, review of school documents revealed that there were school plans, and management roles to which the community was delegated. Coinciding with this, MoE (2010) states that delegation of authority to the local community through regular structure enables to the school create alliance for the school-community partnership. Therefore, it indicates that delegation of authority to the local community in the leadership activities has been undertaken in the secondary schools.

Regarding Table 4 of item 2 which states the practices of participatory leadership among the secondary schools indicated that the mean scores $M=2.57$ for the teachers and $M=2.81$ for the leaders with $Av\ 2.69$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was found that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 2 at $t\text{-value} = -0.87$ and $\alpha = 0.40$, which is $p > 0.05$. This implies that both groups did not perceive differently. Besides, the eight officials and five PTA chairpersons replied that there was relatively participatory leadership among the secondary schools such as parents, student union, local administrates. One school PTA chairperson suggested that'' in our school, members of PTA are involved in the decision making processes such as planning, implementation and evaluation if only requested by the principal but do not regular involvement scheduled.''

On the other hand, the result of document analysis of the schools indicated that the community was undertaking as PTA, student union and Kebele Education and Training Board have been taking part in the leadership at the schools such as designing school plans by PTA, Kebele Education and Training Boards in its approval. Confirming this, Berg, et.al (2006) suggested that sharing leadership provides greater opportunities for the school-community partnership. Hence, it can be considered that there was participatory

leadership in the secondary schools based on the data obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records.

As indicated in Table 4 of item3 which states parental responsibility of involvement in the academic development of the students, the mean scores, $M=2.37$ for the teachers and $M=2.06$ for the leaders revealed the Av 2.21, which is approximately=2 (disagree). In addition, it was found that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item3 at t - value = 1.069, $\alpha=0.298$ which is $p > 0.05$. This implies that both groups perceive in a similar way.

On the other hand, three PTA chairpersons replied that parents' involvement in providing supports in the academic activities such as homework and assignments of the children was very limited rather than providing materials. Other PTA respondents also suggested similar ideas. Therefore, this reveals that there was less parental involvement in the academic development of the students. However, it contradicts with the review of literature as Patrikakou (2008) reported that active parental involvement in the students' academic development provides the opportunity for the success of the students learning outcomes.

Concerning Table 4 of item 4, the analysis of integration of community participation in the internal rules of the schools revealed the mean scores, $M=2.47$ for the teachers and $M=2.56$ for the leaders and the Av 2.52 which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was found that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 4 at t - value = 0.39, $\alpha = 0.701$ which is $p > 0.05$. This asserts that the respondents did not perceive the variable differently. On the other hand, most officials & eight PTA chairpersons suggested that community participation has been integrated in most of the secondary schools such as SIP and strategic plan with all procedures of implementation.

Besides, the result of document analysis of the sample schools indicated that there were rules for PTA members for their engagement in the activities documents signed by the community members to contribute resources as observed by the researcher. Confirming this, MoE (2010b) stated that integration of community participation in the schools

internal rules provides greater opportunity for community participation. Therefore, it can be regarded that there was integration of community participation in the schools internal rules in the secondary based on the data obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records.

Regarding item 5 of Table 4 which states that communication of the school performance with the community through the use of effective media, the mean scores, $M=2.40$ for the teachers and $M=2.56$ for the leaders, and $Av\ 2.48$, which is approximately=2 (disagree). In addition, it was found that there was no statistically significant difference between the means two groups on item 5 at $t\text{-value} = 0.62$, $\alpha = 0.541$ which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, five PTA chairpersons replied that there were limited communication mechanisms of the school performance such as report, forum and discussions per-semester or at the end of the budget year.

Similarly, some officials and three chairpersons of PTA also accepted that there was limited communication among the schools. Besides, the results of document analysis six schools and eight WEO indicated that there were documents of meetings and annual reports of the schools performance as observed by the researcher. Therefore, it can be perceived that there was limited means of communication of the school performance in the secondary schools and the community which contradicts with the review of literature that consistent exchange information regarding the school performance creates opportunity for the partnership (Patrikakou, 2008).

Concerning Table 4 of item 6, Involvement of PTA in designing the strategic planning revealed the mean scores, $M=2.26$ for the teachers and $M=3.06$ for the leaders with $Av\ 2.62$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). However, it was detected that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 6 at $t\text{-value} = -2.47$, $\alpha = 0.24$ which is $p > 0.05$.

On the other hand, the majority of officials and four PTA chairpersons replied that there has been community participation in the strategic plan designing, implementation and evaluation particularly while conducting need analysis, designing drafts of the plan, approval, and implementation and monitoring activities. In contrast, few of officials and

two PTA chairpersons suggested that in most cases, principals and senior teachers prepare the school plan because of the limited involvement of PTA and community members. Besides, the document analysis indicated that there were principals, teachers and PTA and community representative engagements that were supported by signature. Consequently, there was involvement of PTA in designing the strategic planning in the secondary schools. This asserts that there was community participation in the strategic plans designing in the secondary schools based on the data obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records. Confirming this, MoE(2010b) stated that the strategic plan design should involve community participation.

Regarding Table 4 of item7 which states the school-community relationship to improve the students' learning outcomes indicated the mean scores, $M=2.55$ for the teachers and $M=2.13$ for the leaders with $Av\ 2.34$, which is approximately=2 (disagree). In addition, it was found that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item7 at $t\text{-value} = 1.63$, $\alpha = 0.118$ which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, seven PTA chairpersons suggested that there was weak school-community relationship. In contrast, three officials and one school PTA chairperson replied that there was strong school-community relationship in the schools. This indicates that there was weak the school-community relationship in the secondary schools, which contradicts with review of literature as Henderson (2011) recommended that building one-to-one relationship between parents and educators provides climate for enhancing the students learning.

As indicated in Table 4 of item 8 which states collaborative work with the school-community to address the diversified needs of the students mean scores, $M=2.41$ for the teachers and $M=2.00$ for the leaders with $Av\ 2.22$, which is approximately=2 (disagree). In addition, it was detected that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item8 at $t\text{-value} = 1.47$, $\alpha = 0.158$ which is $p > 0.05$.

On the other hand, seven officials & six PTA chairpersons suggested that there was less collaborative work among the secondary schools and the local community to implement the school plan. Besides, review of records and reports of four secondary schools three WEO revealed that there was limited involvement of the community in the schools

programs occasions like meetings and project design program. Thus, it reveals that there was less collaborative work in the secondary schools in order to enhance the students learning outcomes, which contradicts with review of literature that building collaboration with the community is very crucial to maintain sustainable school-community partnership (Henderson, 2011).

Table 5 Responses on community related opportunities

No	II	Community related items	Respondents		Response		t-test for equality of means	
			Groups	N	M	Av	t-value	p-value
1		The community discharged their roles in shaping the delinquent behavior of students.	Teachers	156	2.53	2.71	-0.86	0.403
			Leaders	16	2.88			
2		Frequent observation of school performance has been done by the community.	Teachers	156	2.60	2.49	0.78	0.480
			Leaders	16	2.38			
3		Continuous training program has been given for the community.	Teachers	156	2.73	2.49	1.75	0.095
			Leaders	16	2.25			
4		Orientation has been given for the community towards the values of education.	Teachers	156	2.62	2.56	0.42	0.680
			Leaders	16	2.50			
5		Community perception of their roles to enhance the students' academic achievement has been improved.	Teachers	156	2.62	2.47	0.38	0.71
			Leaders	16	2.31			
6		The welcoming of school-climate has been established to attract the community.	Teachers	156	2.44	2.19	1.59	0.128
			Leaders	16	1.94			

Key: N= frequency, M= simple mean, Av= Average mean, p= probability of sampling error, $\alpha=0.05$ (1-1.49=SD, 1.5-2.49=D, 2.5-3.45=Un, 3.45-4.45=A and 4.5-5.0=SA, where A= agree, SA=strongly agree, Un= undecided, D=disagree and SD=strongly disagree)

In Table 5 of item 1 which states the mean scores of the variable role of community in shaping the delinquent behavior of the students, the mean scores, M=2.53 for the teachers and M=2.88 for the leaders with Av 2.71 which is approximately=3(undecided). In addition, it was found that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 1 at t-value- 0.86, $\alpha = 0.403$ which is $p > 0.05$.

On the other hand, two officials & five PTA chairpersons agreed up on that there was moderate PTA involvement in shaping the delinquent behavior of students in the secondary schools. This shows that there was community involvement in shaping the

delinquent behavior of students in the secondary schools based on the data obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records, which coincides with SIP framework in MoE (2010b) that the schools leadership in collaboration with the community should provide all rounded support to minimize educational wastage.

In Table 5 of item 2 which states frequent observation of the school performance by the community indicated the mean scores, $M=2.60$ for the teachers and $M=2.38$ for the leaders $Av\ 2.49$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was found that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 2 at $t\text{-value} = 0.78$, $\alpha = 0.447$, which is $p > 0.05$.

On the other hand, six PTA chairpersons replied that the community engagement in observation of school performance was less, and usually the communities come to school with the pressure of the school administrative (PTA, KETB or principals) in case of disciplinary problems or at the opening and closing days. This indicates that there was less community engagement in observation of the school performance to provide feedback based on the data obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records. However, it contradicts with MoE (2010b) which states that the schools should be able to conduct frequent interaction with the community on the school performance in order to ensure the effectiveness of the school-community partnership.

Item 3 of Table 5 which states that continuous provision of training programs for PTA revealed the mean scores, $M=2.73$ for the teachers and $M=2.25$ for the leaders and the $Av\ 2.49$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 3 at $t\text{-value}=1.75$, $\alpha =0.095$, which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, 12 (75%) of officials and two PTA chairpersons replied that provision of training programs for the community were limited, inconsistent due to inadequate financial resource, lack of coordination and close follow-up.

Similarly, review of schools and WEO records indicated that there were few training programs provided for PTA members and principals at woreda level on SIP, Continuous Professional Development (CPD) and financial management. This illustrates that there

was less provision trainings for the community based on the data obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records, which contradicts with review of literature as indicated in MoE (2010b) and Common Wealth of Australia (2013) stated that providing capacity building program for the practitioners provides the opportunity to positively influence the students learning outcomes through school-community partnership approach.

Regarding Table 5 of item4, provision of awareness creation programs for the communities on the values of education revealed the mean scores, $M=2.63$ for the teachers and $M=2.50$ for the leaders with $Av\ 2.56$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was detected that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 4 at $t\text{-value} = 0.42$, $\alpha = 0.680$, which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, most officials and PTA chairpersons replied that there were certain mechanisms of promoting the values of education to enhance community participation such as provisions of orientation and awareness creation program the schools or local level.

In addition, the result of document analysis of two schools indicated that there were training manuals and checklists in the schools. This asserts that there was providing awareness for the community regarding the values of education based on the data obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records. Confirming this, MoE(2010a) also states that provision of training programs that enable to create awareness, develop new skills, roles and values among the community, sharing practical experience to provide with all rounded supports for the learning teaching.

Concerning Table 5 of item 5, the mean scores on community perception of their roles to enhance the students' academic achievement revealed, $M=2.62$ for the teachers and $M=2.34$ for the leaders with $Av\ 2.47$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was detected that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 5 at $t\text{-value} = 0.38$, $\alpha = 0.71$ which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, one school's PTA chairperson replied that: "There is underestimation of community about their roles because of the expectation that the government should do all things for the

schools, and some community members lack awareness about the schools affairs,” whereas other PTA chairpersons perceived differently.

In addition, four officials argued that the communities have better understanding and good perception of their roles. As a result, they are being engaged in discharging their roles. This asserts that there was wrong perception of community roles in promoting the school-community partnership based on the data obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records, which diverges from the policy expectation as indicated in MoE(2010b) which states that provisions of training programs create awareness, develop new skills, roles, values for the community enables to minimize the wrong perception of community roles.

As indicated in Table 5 of item 6 which states the school-climate that has been established to attract the community indicated the mean scores, $M=2.44$ for the teachers and $M=1.99$ for the leaders with $Av\ 2.19$, and was rated which is approximately=2 (disagree). In addition, it was detected that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 6 at $t(170) = 1.59$, $\alpha = 0.128$, which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, nine officials & five PTA chairpersons suggested in unrelated ways that most of the secondary schools settings in the zone were different and below the standards.

Besides, review of reports and records of three schools revealed that there were inadequate facilities. This indicates that there was no welcoming of school-climate established to attract the community was low, which contradicts with MoE (2010b) that it was stated in the policy document that creating healthy working environment based on mutual trust and collegiality, and maintaining effective communication with the stakeholders to minimize the wrong perception of the community about their roles.

4.2.2. Responses on activities of the school-community partnership

As indicated in Table 6 of item 1 which states participation of PTA in developing the school-based policy indicated the mean scores, $M=3.43$ for the teachers and $M=2.94$ for the leaders with $Av\ 3.19$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was

detected that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 1 at t-value = -2.04, $\alpha = 0.060$ which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, five PTA chairpersons replied that there was active participation of PTA in developing the school-based policy illustrating the cases such as setting school rules, strategies for managing conflict at school level, schedule for meeting with the community, designing procedures of community contribution for resources. Two members of the officials also suggested in similar way as the PTA chairpersons. Besides, the document analysis asserted that there were rules for managing problems related with the students' disciplinary cases, financial procedures and records were available at the schools. This shows that there was PTA involvement in designing the school-based policy. Confirming this, MoE (2010b) stated that there should be engagement of PTA in designing the school-based policy-setting internal rules to manage the school program.

Table 6 Responses on participation PTA in the school management

No	I-Items related with community participation in the school management activities	Respondents		Response		t-test for equality of means	
		Groups	N	M	Av	t-value	p-value
1	PTA has been actively participated in developing school-based policy.	Teachers	156	3.43			
		Leaders	16	2.94	3.19	-2.04	0.06
2	PTA has been actively involved in designing the school plan.	Teachers	156	3.38			
		Leaders	16	2.62	3.00	2.49	0.020
3	PTA has been actively engaged in the implementation of school plan.	Teachers	156	2.37			
		Leaders	16	2.69	2.53	-0.10	0.440
4	PTA has been actively involved in monitoring the implementation of school plan.	Teachers	156	2.49			
		Leaders	16	2.94	2.72	-1.50	0.150
5	PTA has been actively participated in providing feedback on school performance.	Teachers	156	2.41			
		Leaders	16	2.12	2.27	1.31	0.205
6	PTA has been actively involved in mobilizing community resources.	Teachers	156	2.33			
		Leaders	16	2.31	2.32	0.049	0.962

Key: N= frequency, M= simple mean, Av= Average mean, p= probability of sampling error, $\alpha=0.05$ (1-1.49=SD, 1.5-2.49=D, 2.5-3.45=Un, 3.45-4.45=A and 4.5-5.0=SA, where A= agree, SA=strongly agree, Un= undecided, D=disagree and SD=strongly disagree)

Concerning item 2 of Table 6 which states PTA participation in designing the school plan the mean scores, $M=3.38$ for the teachers and $M=2.62$ for leaders indicated the Av 3.00, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In contrast, it could be concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item2 at t-value = 2.49, $\alpha = 0.020$, which is $p < 0.05$, which implies that the two groups of respondents perceived the variable in different ways.

On the other hand, most officials & PTA chairpersons told that there was active involvement of PTA members in designing the school plan through conducting need analysis. Besides, review of the school plan indicated that the secondary schools had long-term and short-term plan. Despite the mean difference between the groups, there was PTA participation in designing the school plan based on the responses obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records. Confirming this, Patrikakou (2008) suggested similar activities such as planning, implementation and evaluation that require active involvement of PTA.

Regarding item 3 of Table 6, participation of PTA in the implementation of the school plan revealed the mean scores $M= 2.37$ for teachers and $M=2.69$ for leaders with Av 2.53, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 3 at t-value = -0.10, $\alpha = 0.44$, which is $p > 0.05$.

With regard to item 3 one school PTA chairperson replied that: “there is active participation of PTA in the implementation of the school plan in the secondary schools in collaboration with the staff.” other PTA chair persons and the officials did not respond differently. Besides, review of records for the implementation of the school plan and reports of the schools indicated that there was the engagement of PTA in the implementation of school plans in the secondary schools. This indicates that there was participation of PTA in the implementation of the school plans in the secondary schools based on the interview responses and document analysis results based on the responses obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records.

In Table 6 of item 4 which states involvement of PTA in monitoring the implementation of school plan revealed the mean scores $M= 2.49$ for the teachers and $M=2.94$ for the leaders by $Av 2.72$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was found that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 4 at $t\text{-value} = -1.50$, $\alpha = 0.150$, which is $p > 0.05$.

Likewise, most officials & PTA chairpersons responded that there was active involvement of PTA in monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of school plan in the secondary schools. On the other hand, document analysis of school records (check lists of quarterly and annual reports) indicated active PTA involvement in monitoring and evaluation of school plan. This implies that there was involvement of PTA in monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of school plan based on the interview responses and document analysis results based on the responses obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records.

Regarding item 5 of Table 6 which states community participation in providing feedback on school performance revealed the mean scores $M= 2.41$ for the teachers and $M=2.12$ for leaders by $Av 2.27$, which is approximately = 2 (disagree). In addition, it was found that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 5 at $t\text{-value}= 1.31$, $\alpha = 0.205$, which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, one PTA chairperson responded that:

“Community participation in providing feedback on school performance is relatively less because there was less community attendance of the school events such as meeting, forum and discussions, evaluation of school plan and provision of feedback among the secondary schools.”

Other PTA chairpersons and majority of the officials also suggested similar views. Besides, the document analysis of the secondary schools asserted limited records and reports of community participation such as school meetings and discussions. This asserts that there was less community participation in providing feedback on the school performance, which contradicts with MoE(2010b) that consistent exchange of information among the school-community was suggested that it provides relevant evidence to enhance the school-community partnership.

Concerning item 6 of Table 6 which states PTA involvement in mobilizing community resources indicated the mean score $M=2.33$ for the teachers and $M=2.31$ for leaders with $Av\ 2.32$, which is approximately=2 (disagree). In addition, it was found that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 6 at t -value = 0.05, $\alpha = 0.96$, $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, the majority of officials & PTA respondents explained that involvement of PTA in mobilizing the community resources was less because in most of the schools the community was contributing finance only. Besides, the review of records of most secondary schools asserted that the predominant community resource was finance. This indicates that there was low involvement of PTA in mobilizing community resources.

Table 7 Responses on community participation in supporting students learning

No	II Items related with community involvement in supporting the students learning	Respondents		Response		t-test for equality of means	
		Groups	N	M	Av	t-value	p-value
1	The community has been actively participated in sharing experiences to support learning-teaching process.	Teachers	156	2.45			
		Leaders	16	2.38	2.42	0.285	0.78
2	Parents have been consistently commented on their children's home-work performance.	Teachers	156	2.34			
		Leaders	16	2.13	2.24	0.92	0.37
3	The community has been involved in solving problems that related to students' learning.	Teachers	156	2.44			
		Leaders	16	2.44	2.44	0.02	0.99
4	Parents have been actively participated in shaping the students' misbehavior.	Teachers	155	2.50			
		Leaders	16	2.19	2.35	1.15	0.27
5	PTA has been actively involved in reducing dropout.	Teachers	156	2.46			
		Leaders	16	2.06	2.26	1.98	0.06
6	The community has been actively participated in the contribution of financial resources.	Teachers	156	2.54			
		Leaders	16	2.69	2.62	-0.51	0.62

Key: N= frequency, M= simple mean, Av= Average mean, p= probability of sampling error, $\alpha=0.05$ (1-1.49=SD, 1.5-2.49=D, 2.5-3.45=Un, 3.45-4.45=A and 4.5-5.0=SA, where A= agree, SA=strongly agree, Un= undecided, D=disagree and SD=strongly disagree)

As indicated in table 7 of item1, community participation in sharing experiences to support the learning-teaching process revealed the mean scores $M= 2.45$ for the teachers $M=2.38$ of leaders with $Av 2.42$, which is approximately=2 (disagree). Besides, it was found that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 1 at $t\text{-value}= 0.29$, $\alpha = 0.78$, $p > 0.05$.

In this respect, one respondent of the officials replied that: “community participation in sharing experiences to support the learning-teaching process has been less practiced in the secondary schools.” Likewise, other officials and PTA chairpersons did not respond differently. Review of the documents of some schools revealed that there were also limited records of experience sharing conducted to support the teaching-learning. This shows that there was less community participation in sharing experiences to support the learning-teaching process, which contradicts with the review of literature as reported in Blank et.al. (2012) and MoE (2010b) that review and provision of comment on students home-work and activities, solving problems related with the students learning, leveraging community resources and experience sharing to support the learning-teaching is required to enhance the school-community partnership through active community involvement.

Regarding item 2 of Table7, the mean scores parents provision of comment on their children’s home-work performances revealed mean scores $M= 2.34$ for the teachers and $M=2.13$ for the leaders with $Av 2.24$, which is approximately=2 (disagree). In addition, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 2 at $t\text{-value} = 0.92$, $\alpha = 0.37$, which is $p > 0.05$. Similarly, majority of PTA chairpersons and officials replied that there was less involvement of parents in the provision of comments on their children’s home-work performances. This illustrates that there was limited involvement of parents in the provision of comment on their children’s home-work performances which contradicts with MoE (2010b) which states the school should clearly set the tools (meeting, newsletters and flyers) to communicate the school pan, its implementation and evaluation.

Concerning item 3 of Table 7, the mean scores community involvement in solving the school problems that related to students learning revealed $M= 2.44$ for the teachers and

M=2.44 for leaders with Av 2.44, which is approximately=2 (disagree). Likewise, it was detected that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 3 at $t= 0.02$, $\alpha = 0.99$, which is $p > 0.05$.

Regarding item 3, the majority of PTA chairpersons and officials answered that community involvement in solving the school problems that related to students' learning was very less. Besides, review of some schools and WEO records asserted that there were few cases in which the communities have involved to support the students' learning such as resource contribution (financial) and disciplinary cases. This indicates that there was less community involvement in solving the school problems that related to students' learning. In contrast, MoE, (2010a) states in ESDP-IV that effective strategies of the school-community partnership shall be employed through the provision of trainings that enable to create awareness, develop new skills, roles and values for the community, sharing practical experience to provide with all rounded supports for the learning teaching.

As indicated in item 4 of Table 7 which states involvement of parents in shaping the students' misbehavior in collaboration with teachers asserted mean scores, M= 2.50 for the teachers and M=2.19 for the leaders with Av 2.35, which is approximately=2 (disagree). In addition, it was detected that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 4 at $t\text{-value} = 1.15$, $\alpha = 0.27$, which is $p > 0.05$. Besides, most PTA chairpersons and officials suggested that involvement of parents in shaping the students behavior was limited. This shows that there was less involvement of parents in shaping the students' misbehavior in the secondary schools.

In Table 5 of item 5, PTA involvement in reducing the students' dropout indicated the mean scores M= 2.46 for teachers and M=2.06 for leaders with Av 2.26, which is approximately=2 (disagree). In addition, it was detected that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 5 at $t\text{-value} = 1.50$, $\alpha = 0.150$, which is $p > 0.05$.

On the other hand, one PTA chairperson suggested that:

“Community experienced less involvement in the need assessment of the schools, less attendance of the school programs such as meetings and forums and discussions, and even less engagement of parents in solving schools’ problems related to the students learning such as academic and disciplinary cases, dropout.”

Other interview respondents also did not respond differently. Besides, review of the statistical data of the sample schools asserted that fewer community members and parents attend the schools’ programs such as meetings, celebration of parents’ days, forums and discussions. This reveals that there was less PTA involvement in reducing dropout as dropout rate of the schools was increasing.

Regarding item 6 of Table 7 which states community participation in the contribution of financial resource has indicated the mean scores, $M= 2.54$ for teachers leaders $M=2.69$ with $Av\ 2.62$, which is approximately=2 (disagree). In addition, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 6 at $t\text{-value}= -0.51$, $\alpha = 0.62$, which is $p > 0.05$.

On the other hand, most officials & PTA chairpersons replied that the local community has been actively participated in the contribution of financial resources to supplement the budget allocation from the government to cover miscellaneous, administrative and other costs required in the schools. Besides, review of records and reports of the sample schools and WEO revealed that there was financial contribution from the community that serves for different purposes based on the schools contexts. This implies that there was community participation in the contribution of financial resource to the schools.

As indicated in Table 8 of item 1 which states lack of leadership skills of leaders to participate the community indicated the mean scores $M=3.12$ for the teachers and $M=2.19$ for the leaders with $Av\ 2.66$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In contrast, it could be concluded that there was statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item1 at $t\text{-value} = 2.91$, $\alpha = 0.004$, which is $p < 0.05$. This indicates the two groups perceived the variable differently. Similarly, majority of officials suggested that there was lack of leadership skills of schools leaders to participate the community in the school affairs because of lack of commitment. This implies that there was lack of

leadership skills based on the interview responses obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records. Confirming this, Roekel (2008) reported the challenges related to educators such as lack of know-how, fear for conflict, lack of extra-time, underestimation of community roles and poor communication system.

4.2.3. Responses on challenges of the school-community partnership

Table 8 Responses on leadership related challenges of school-community partnership

No	I-Leadership related challenges	Respondents		Response		t-test for equality of means	
		Groups	N	M	Av	t-value	p-value
1	Lack of leadership skills of leaders to promote community participation	Teachers	156	3.12			
		Leaders	16	2.19	2.66	2.91	0.004
2	Under estimation of community roles in the school affairs.	Teachers	156	2.98			
		Leaders	16	2.63	2.80	1.18	0.254
3	Lack of transparency on the school-community partnership.	Teachers	156	2.71			
		Leaders	16	2.69	2.70	0.06	0.953
4	Less commitment from the leadership to mobilize community.	Teachers	156	2.40			
		Leaders	16	2.69	2.54	-1.03	0.318
5	Fear for conflict from the school leadership.	Teachers	156	2.71			
		Leaders	16	2.69	2.70	0.06	0.952
6	Lack of adequate financial resource	Teachers	156	2.62			
		Leaders	16	3.13	2.89	-1.42	0.173
7	Lack of extra-time for the leaders	Teachers	156	2.63			
		Leaders	16	2.38	2.51	0.99	0.333

Key: N= frequency, M= simple mean, Av= Average mean, p= probability of sampling error, $\alpha=0.05$ (1-1.49=SD, 1.5-2.49=D, 2.5-3.45=Un, 3.45-4.45=A and 4.5-5.0=SA, where A= agree, SA=strongly agree, Un= undecided, D=disagree and SD=strongly disagree)

Regarding item 2 of Table 8 which states underestimation of community roles in the school affairs from principals and teachers revealed the mean scores $M=2.98$ for the teachers and $M=2.06$ for the leaders with $Av\ 2.80$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item2 at $t\text{-value} = 1.18$, $\alpha = 0.254$, which is $p > 0.05$.

Likewise, one PTA chairperson replied that:

“Underestimation of community roles in the school affairs from principals and teachers is practical among the secondary schools because there are different issues such as participation in need analysis (designing the school plan), implementation and provision of feedback on the school performance are areas that require active community participation but the involvement was less due to lack of motivation and initiation from the leaders.”

Others respondents of officials and PTA chair persons also supported the view in similar way. Thus implies that there was underestimation of community roles in the school affairs from principals and teachers in the secondary schools based on the interview responses and document analysis results based on the responses obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records.

Concerning item 3 of Table 6, the mean scores for lack of transparency on the school-community partnership implementation revealed $M=2.69$ for the leaders and $M=2.71$ for the teachers with $Av\ 2.70$, and rated as significant challenge of the school-community partnership which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was detected that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 3 at $t\text{-value} = 0.06$, $\alpha = 0.95$, which is $p > 0.05$.

Likewise, the majority of officials told that the school-community partnership program at the schools lacks transparency for issues budget utilization, and opportunities for incentives among the employees and students whereas some PTA chairpersons denied saying that there was transparency of school performance as the school promotes participatory planning. This asserts that there was lack of transparency from the

leadership on the school-community partnership in the secondary schools based on the responses obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records.

As indicated in Table 8 of item 4 which states less commitment from the leadership to mobilize the community asserted the mean scores $M=2.69$ for the leaders and $M=2.40$ with $Av\ 2.62$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 4 at $t\text{-value} = -1.03$, $\alpha = 0.318$, which is $p > 0.05$. Likewise, one of the officials explained that: “Commitment from principals and teachers can be judged as less in light of their roles and responsibilities due to absence of motivation and workloads with principals and teachers.” Other respondents of officials and PTA chairpersons supported the view in a similar way.

On the other hand, review of annual reports of WEO indicated that there was withdraw of PTA members, supervisors, principals and teachers’ turnover. This indicates that there was less commitment from the leadership to mobilize the community to actively engage in the school affairs based on the interview responses obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records.

Regarding item 5 of Table 8, the mean scores for fear for conflict from the school leadership revealed $M=2.71$ for the teachers and $M=2.69$ for the leaders, with $Av\ 2.70$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 5 at $t\text{-value} = 0.06$, $\alpha = 0.95$, which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, one of the officials suggested that:

“Fear for conflict from the school leadership, particularly from principals and PTA are the significant challenges that have been considered in secondary schools with regard to delegation of employees to perform duties, administering disciplinary measures, creating transparency in school performance etc.”

Other officials did not also respond differently. In contrast, some of the denied was saying that the school leadership was not suffering from fear of conflict rather than working with confidence as intended. This reveals that there was fear for conflict from the school leadership in the secondary schools based on the interview responses obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records.

As indicated in Table 8 of item 6 which states the mean scores for inadequate financial resource revealed the mean scores $M=3.13$ for the leaders and $M=2.62$ for the teachers with $Av\ 2.89$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). Besides, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 6 at $t\text{-value} = -1.42$, $\alpha = 0.173$, which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, most officials & all PTA chairpersons replied that inadequate budget (finance) was the critical problem that limited the schools performance because the budget allocated per the physical year could not enable to implement all the programs.

In addition, the reports and review of records of most schools and WEO indicated that there was lack of adequate budget allocation so that the schools program implementation was facing problems such as purchase of facilities, stationery, and construction and maintenance purposes. This shows that there was inadequate financial resource in the secondary schools based on data obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records. Confirming this, MoE (2010a) reported that the problems of poor quality facilities is a serious problem, and the absence of supports for the schools from government funds forces the community to invest in inputs.

Regarding item 7 of Table 8, which states lack of extra-time for the leaders to participate in the community outreach programs indicated the mean scores $M=2.38$ for the leaders and $M=2.63$ for the teachers , with $Av\ 2.51$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). Likewise, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 7 at $t\text{-value}= 0.99$ $\alpha = 0.333$, which is $p > 0.05$.

On the other hand, most PTA chairpersons and officials suggested that the schools leaders have no extra- time to be engaged in community events due to work load and unplanned meetings. In contrast, few officials and PTA argued that educators were not interested in their engagement in community events. This implies that there was lack of extra-time for leaders to be engaged in community outreach programs based on data obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records. Supporting the view, Harrison (2002) suggested that lack of extra-time for the leaders to be engaged in the community outreach programs as the challenges of school- community partnership.

Table 9 Responses on community related challenges

No	II-Community related challenges	Respondents		Response		t-test for equality of means	
		Groups	N	M	Av	t-value	p-value
1	Lack of relevant information of the community about their roles on the school-community partnership.	Teachers	156	2.83	2.48	2.89	0.009
		Leaders	16	2.12			
2	Resistance from the community to participate in the school activities.	Teachers	156	3.06	2.75	2.14	0.045
		Leaders	16	2.44			
3	Lack of adequate trainings for the community.	Teachers	156	2.95	2.51	3.30	0.004
		Leaders	16	2.06			
4	Absence of well-developed school-based policy to promote community participation.	Teachers	156	2.86	2.68	1.10	0.288
		Leaders	16	2.50			

Key: N= frequency, M= simple mean, Av= Average mean, p= probability of sampling error, $\alpha=0.05$ (1-1.49=SD, 1.5-2.49=D, 2.5-3.45=Un, 3.45-4.45=A and 4.5-5.0=SA, where A= agree, SA=strongly agree, Un= undecided, D=disagree and SD=strongly disagree)

As indicated in Table 9 of item 1, the mean scores for lack of adequate information from the community about their roles on the school-community partnership revealed M=2.12 for the leaders and M=2.83 for the teachers with Av 2.48, which is approximately=2 (disagree). In contrast, it was identified that there was statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 8 at t-value = 2.89, $\alpha = 0.01$, which is $p < 0.05$, which implies that the two groups have different perception of the item. On the other hand, one of the officials replied that:

“Lack of information from the community about their roles on the school-community partnership is one of the challenges in the secondary schools due to information gap to get relevant access of information about the schools performance timely to discharge their roles effectively.”

Others also shared similar view as to the official. This indicates that there was lack of adequate information from the community about their roles to discharge the roles expected in the secondary schools based on data obtained from interview respondents and

review of reports and records. Confirming this, Bayha and Harrison (2002) reported that lack of relevant information, lack of technical skills and poor communication as some of the challenges of the school-community partnership.

Regarding item 2 of Table 9 which states resistance from the community to participate in the school activities asserted the mean scores $M=3.06$ for the teachers and $M=2.44$ for the leaders with $Av\ 2.75$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was found that there was statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 9 at $t\text{-value} = 2.14$ $\alpha = 0.045$, which is $p < 0.05$, which shows that there was different perception of the respondents on the variable.

On the other hand, one of the officials told that: “there is resistance from the community to participate in the school activities because of lack of transparency, lack of incentives, socio-economic, problems, lack of awareness and inadequate information.” Other interview respondents did not also respond differently from the official. This asserts that there was as significant challenge of the community to participate in the school activities based on data obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records. Confirming this, Roekel (2008) suggested that resistance from the community to participate in the school activities can be the challenge of the school-community partnership as a result of feeling of inadequacy, adopting passive role by leaving education to schools, economic, emotional, and time constraints, lack of responsive to parental needs, and lack of confidence or mistrust.

Concerning item 3 of Table 9, the mean scores for lack of adequate trainings program for the community asserted the mean scores $M=2.06$ for the leaders and $M=2.95$ for the teachers with $Av\ 2.51$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In contrast, it was detected that there was statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 3 at $t\text{-value} = 3.3$, $\alpha = 0.004$, which is $p < 0.05$.

On the other hand, most officials and PTA chairpersons replied that adequate trainings were not given for the community to create awareness and capacity building because of lack of conducting need analysis, poor coordination, and inadequate resources. In contrast, few officials and PTA chairpersons suggested that training had been given but

were inadequate. This shows that there was lack of the provision of adequate training for the community based on data obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records. Coinciding with this, MoE (2010) stated that the school leadership and management capacity at school level remains weak.

As indicated in Table 9 of item 4 which states absence of well-developed school-based policies to participate the community asserted mean scores $M=2.86$ for the teachers and $M=2.50$ for the leaders with $Av\ 2.68$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 11 at $t\text{-value} = 1.1$ $\alpha = 0.290$, which is $p > 0.05$.

On the other hand, most officials and PTA chairpersons explained that there were ground rules that govern community participation in some of the secondary schools in the specific zone but the implementation was not satisfactory as such. This it asserted that there was absence of well-developed school-based policies to participate the community based on data obtained from interview respondents and review of reports and records, which confirms with SIP framework, MoE (2010) states that the school leadership is required to clearly set the rules and regulations, mobilize community resource to promote the school program and maintain effective communication with all the stakeholders.

4. 2.4. Responses on the strategies of school-community partnership

As indicated in Table 10 of item 1 which states developing the shared vision of the school among the school-community to promote effective school-community partnership revealed the mean scores $M=2.42$ for the teachers and $M=2.19$ for the leaders, with $Av\ 2.29$, which is approximately=2 (disagree). In addition, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 1 at $t\text{-value} = 0.92$, $\alpha = 0.372$, which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, most officials and PTA chairpersons replied that schools shared vision could not have been developed on the core values. This implies that there were less attempts of developing the schools shared vision in promoting the school-community partnership. In contrast, it was recommended that the school leadership should make the school visions alive and engage all the stakeholders, and convince to share what they can do (Berg, et.al. 2006).

Table 10 Responses on the strategies of school-community partnership

No	Items	Respondents		Responses		t-test for equality of means	
		Groups	N	M	Av	t-value	p-value
1	The shared vision has been developed to promote school-community partnership.	Teachers	156	2.42	2.29	0.916	0.372
		Leaders	16	2.19			
2	Community has been empowerment to share the responsibilities in promoting the partnership.	Teachers	156	2.54	2.58	-0.29	0.779
		Leaders	16	2.62			
3	The partnership programs have been appropriately located.	Teachers	156	2.33	2.51	-0.91	0.376
		Leaders	16	2.69			
4	Adequate training programs have been given for PTA to operate as part of the school program facilitators.	Teachers	156	2.43	2.40	0.25	0.805
		Leaders	16	2.38			
5	Diversity has been acknowledged to develop the sense of ownership.	Teachers	156	2.46	2.58	-0.80	0.345
		Leaders	16	2.69			
6	Community participations have been consistently acknowledged.	Teachers	156	2.34	2.33	0.113	0.911
		Leaders	16	2.31			
7	Continuous discussions have been conducted on the school performance.	Teachers	156	2.44	2.41	0.267	0.79
		Leaders	16	2.38			
8	Effective communication systems have been established to get relevant information on the school-community partnership.	Teachers	156	2.31	2.22	0.817	0.425
		Leaders	16	2.13			

Key: N= frequency, M= simple mean, Av= Average mean, p= probability of sampling error, $\alpha=0.05$ (1-1.49=SD, 1.5-2.49=D, 2.5-3.45=Un, 3.45-4.45=A and 4.5-5.0=SA, where A= agree, SA=strongly agree, Un= undecided, D=disagree and SD=strongly disagree)

Concerning item2 of Table 10, the degree of community empowerment to share responsibilities in promoting the school-community partnership indicated the mean scores $M=2.54$ for teachers and $M=2.62$ for the leaders with Av 2.58, which is approximately=3 (undecided). Besides, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 2 at $t\text{-value} = -0.29$, $\alpha = 0.78$, which is $p > 0.05$.

On the other hand, one of the officials suggested that:

“Community empowerment to share responsibilities in promoting the school-community partnership has been practiced through the delegation of different committee such as PTA, student union and KETB as decision making bodies among the secondary schools in line with the education policy.”

Other officials and most PTA chairpersons also shared similar views as to the official. This shows that there was community empowerment in the school affairs. In contrast, Blank, et.al.(2012) reported that community empowerment is a key strategy used to develop sense of ownership in order to build effective school-community partnership.

Regarding item3 of Table 10, allocation of the partnership programs among the schools asserted the mean scores, $M=2.33$ for the teachers and $M=2.69$ for the leaders with $A_v=2.51$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). In addition, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item3 at $t\text{-value} = -0.91$ $\alpha = 0.38$, which is $p > 0.05$.

On the other hand, majority of the officials and PTA chairpersons replied that the allocation of school-community partnership program was compatible with the socio-economic conditions of the community. This reveals that there was allocation of the school-community partnership in the secondary schools.

In Table 10 of item 4 which states provision of training programs for PTA to operate as part of the school program facilitators indicated the mean scores $M=2.43$ for the teachers and $M=2.38$ for the leaders, with A value 2.40, which is approximately=2 (disagree). Besides, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 4 at $t\text{-value}= 0.25$ $\alpha = 0.805$, which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, the majority of officials and PTA chairpersons suggested that there were limited provisions of short-term trainings such as awareness creation on SIP implementation, and financial management (School Grant) at the school and woreda level for school leaders (PTA and principals) but were unsatisfactory and were inconsistent.

In contrast, some of the officials and PTA chairpersons denied saying that there was schedule training provision program at the school as well as at woreda level to enhance

capacity of the school-community. In addition, review of the schools and WEO reports and records asserted that there were few cases on which trainings were provided for PTA such as SIP implementation and financial management. This entails that there was less training provisions for PTA as part of the school-community partnership facilitators. Contradicting with this, MoE (2010) stated in ESDP IV that the provision of training programs should be given to improve the capacity of leadership and management at the school levels.

As indicated in Table 10 of item 5, the mean scores for acknowledging diversity among the community to develop sense of ownership revealed mean scores $M=2.46$ for the teachers and $M=2.69$ for the leaders with $Av\ 2.58$, which is approximately=3 (undecided). Besides, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 5 at $t\text{-value} = - 0.80$, $\alpha = 0.44$, which is $p > 0.05$. Likewise, the majority of officials and PTA chairpersons replied that there was fair treatment and equal service provisions for the students regardless of the differences in gender, color, race, impairment, socio-economic and geography. However, it remains insufficient to address all the diversified needs at the school in light of the expectation. This implies that there was the acknowledgement of diversity to develop the sense of ownership among the community.

In Table 10 of item 6 which states the acknowledgement of community participation indicated the mean scores $M=2.34$ for the teachers and $M=2.31$, with $Ave\ 2.32$, which is approximately=2 (disagree). In addition, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 6 at $t\text{-value} = 0.11$, $\alpha = 0.91$ which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, one of the officials replied that: “there are fewer acknowledgements of key stakeholders who have great contributions for the success of the schools at the school and woreda level, however; lack consistency and insufficient.” Others also supported the official’s view. This shows that there was less acknowledgement of community participation in the secondary schools. In contrast, MoE (2010) in ESDP-IV noticed that acknowledging community participation shall be a key strategy in promoting the school-community partnership on order to maximize the degree of participation.

Concerning item 7 of Table 10, the mean scores for continuous discussions that have been held with the school-community on the school performance revealed $M=2.44$ for teachers and $M=2.38$, with $Av\ 2.41$, which is approximately=2 (disagree). In addition, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 7 at $t\text{-value} = 0.27$, $\alpha = 0.792$, which is $p > 0.05$. On the other hand, one PTA chairperson explained that:

“The schools usually invite the local community in the school meetings during the opening and closing days of the schools. Even so, most of the community members do not attend the meetings. As a result, the secondary schools are facing difficulty to openly discuss with the community on the school issues as required.”

Similarly, seven PTA chairpersons and most of the officials did not respond differently from the official. In addition, analysis of the schools records indicated that there were limited evidences such as forum and discussions held at the schools. This reveals that there were limited discussions programs held with the community on the school performance in the secondary schools. Contradicting with this, Blank.et al. (2012) recommended that stakeholders’ engagement, open-dialogue and exchange of appropriate information shall be indispensable in promoting the school-community partnership.

Regarding item 8 of Table 10 which states communication systems established to get relevant information on the school-community partnership revealed the mean score $M=2.31$ for the teachers and $M=2.13$ for the leaders with $Av\ 2.22$, which is disagree. Besides, it was identified that there was no statistically significant mean difference between the two groups on item 1 at $t\text{-value} = 0.82$ $\alpha = 0.43$, which is $p > 0.05$.

Likewise, most officials & eight PTA chairpersons suggested that letter, report, meeting and discussions were communication tools used to communicate the school plan, implementation provision of feedback. This indicates that there was limited communication system with limited means were established to get relevant information regarding the school-community partnership. Coinciding with this, MoE, (2010b) states that the leadership is expected to promote the partnership program through the use of effective media (school newsletters, meetings, and flyers) to improve the awareness of the community.

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with summary of the major findings, conclusions that have been drawn based on the findings, and recommendations suggested that may help to solve the challenges of the school-community partnership in the government secondary schools of South West Shoa Zone of Oromia Regional State.

5.1. Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess the opportunities of school-community partnership and challenges that hinder the effectiveness of school-community partnership in government secondary schools of South West Shoa zone of Oromia Regional State, and to recommend the possible solutions that may help to overcome the prevailing challenges. In order to guide the study, the following basic questions were asked and answered in the course of study:

1. What opportunities exist to promote the school-community partnership in the government secondary schools of South West Shoa?
2. What school-community partnership activities have been undertaken in the government secondary schools of South West Shoa?
3. What factors hinder the implementation of school-community partnership in government secondary schools of South West Shoa?
4. What strategies have been used to overcome the challenges of school-community partnership in government secondary schools of South West Shoa?

In order to achieve the desired goals, descriptive survey design was employed to obtain both quantitative and qualitative data. Accordingly, 28 government secondary schools were divided on to 4 clusters by cluster sampling technique. Then, 8(28.6%) secondary schools were selected from the total of 28 secondary schools by simple random 'Lottery' technique, 164(59%) of teachers were selected from the sample schools 277 by the simple random sampling technique. In addition, 8 principals, 8 supervisors and 16 officials, and 8 (100%) of PTA chairpersons were selected by availability sampling. Data was collected from both primary and secondary sources through questionnaires,

interviews and document analysis. The primary data was obtained from teachers, principals and supervisors through questionnaire, and from officials and PTA through semi-structured interview whereas secondary data was obtained from reports and review of schools and WEO records.

Besides, both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to analyze data. The data collected through questionnaire (closed-ended) was analyzed by using quantitative methods such as descriptive (frequency and percentage) and inferential statistical tool (t-test) whereas qualitative data was obtained through semi-structured interview, open-ended questions and document analysis was analyzed qualitatively.

Based on the discussion and interpretation of data, the following major findings have been summarized in line with the basic research questions:

Concerning opportunities of school-community partnership, delegation of authority to the local community in the decision making roles in the school programs indicates the average rate 2.59 that there was delegation of authority to the local community in the leadership activities. The practices of participatory leadership among the secondary schools was also rated average 2.69, and was regarded as participatory leadership practiced in the secondary schools. In addition, integration of community participation in the internal rules of the schools revealed the average rate 2.52 and was considered that there was integration of community participation in the schools internal rules in the secondary. Besides, involvement of PTA in designing the strategic planning revealed the average rate 2.62, and there was community participation in the strategic plan designing in the secondary schools.

In contrast, parental involvement in the academic development of the students revealed the average rate 2.21, which revealed that there was less parental involvement in the academic development of the students. In contrast, communication of the school performance with the community through the use of effective media indicated the average rated 2.48, and perceived that there was limited means of communication of the school performance in the secondary schools. The school-community relationship to improve the students' learning outcomes also asserted the average rate 2.34, which

indicated that there was weak the school-community relationship in the secondary schools. Likewise, the extent of collaborative work with the school-community to address the diversified needs of the students revealed the average rate 2.22, and considered that there was less collaboration of the school-community in the secondary schools to enhance the students learning outcomes.

The role of community in shaping the delinquent behavior of the students revealed the average rate 2.71, and was understood that there was community involvement in shaping the delinquent behavior of students in the secondary schools. In contrast, the degree of frequent observation of the school performance by the community indicated the average rate 2.49, indicates that there was less community engagement in observation of the school performance to provide feedback, provision of training for PTA revealed the average rate 2.49, and was considered that there were less provision trainings for the community.

Regarding provision of awareness creation or orientation programs for the communities on the values of education, it indicated the average rate 2.56, and asserted that there was providing awareness for the community regarding the values of education. In addition, community perception of their roles to enhance the students' academic achievement revealed the average rate 2.47, asserts that there was underestimation of community roles in promoting the school-community partnership. The school-climate that has been established to attract the community indicated the average rate 2.19, also revealed that there was no welcoming of school-climate established to attract the community.

Regarding the activities of the school-community partnership, participation of PTA in developing the school-based policy, designing the school plan, implementation and monitoring indicated the average rates 3.19 & 3.00 2.53 & 2.72 respectively, and asserted that there was active PTA involvement. It was also indicated that community participation in the contribution of financial resource was rated the average rate 2.62, which indicated that there was active community participation in the contribution of financial resource to the schools.

In contrast, community participation in providing feedback on school performance revealed the average rate 2.27 asserts that there was less community participation in provision of feedback on the school performance. PTA involvement in mobilizing community resources also indicated the average rate 2.32, which was lower. Besides, community participation in support the learning-teaching process, parents' engagement in the provision of comment on their children's home-work performances revealed the average rates 2.42 & 2.24 respectively, which implied that there were less community participation in sharing experiences and limited involvement of parents in the provision of comment on their children's home-work performances were considered. In addition, involvement of parents in shaping the students' misbehavior in collaboration with teachers, and involvement in reducing the students' dropout revealed the average rates 2.44, 2.35 & 2.26 respectively which implied that there was less community involvement.

With regard to the challenges of the school-community partnership, it was indicated that lack of leadership skills of leaders to participate the community, underestimation of community roles in the school affairs from principals and teachers, and lack of transparency on the school-community partnership implementation indicated the average rates 2.66, 2.80 & 2.70 respectively in the secondary schools which implies that there were of lack of leadership skills, underestimation of community roles, and lack of transparency from the leadership on the school-community partnership.

In addition, lack of commitment from the leadership to mobilize the community, fear for conflict from the school leadership and inadequate financial resource asserted the average rates 2.62, 2.70 & 2.89 respectively indicated that there were less commitment from the leadership, fear for conflict from the school leadership and inadequate financial resource in the secondary schools. Besides, lack of extra-time for the leaders to participate in the community outreach programs indicated the average rate 2.51, which was a challenge.

As it was indicated, lack of adequate information, resistance from the community, and lack of adequate trainings for the community indicated the average rates 2.48, 2.75 & 2.51 respectively which implied that there were significant challenges of the community to participate in the school activities. It was also indicated that absence of well-developed

school-based policies to participate the community asserted the average rate 2.68 asserted that there was absence of well-developed school-based policies to participate the community.

Concerning the strategies of school-community partnership, it was indicated that the degree of community empowerment to share responsibilities in promoting the school-community partnership indicated the average rate 2.58, and was considered that there was community empowerment in the school affairs. Similarly, the partnership programs among the schools asserted, it revealed the average rate 2.51, which revealed that there was proper allocation of the school-community partnership in the secondary schools.

The provision of training programs for PTA to operate as part of the school program facilitator, and indicated the average rate 2.40, and validated that there was less training provisions for PTA as part of the school-community partnership facilitators. Likewise, the attempts of acknowledging diversity among the community to develop sense of ownership revealed the average rate 2.58, and it implied that there was less acknowledgement of community participation in the secondary schools.

Concerning continuous discussions that have been held with the school-community on the school performance revealed the average rate 2.41, which revealed that there were limited discussion programs held with the community on the school performance, and communication systems established to get relevant information on the school-community partnership revealed the average rate 2.22, which indicated that there was limited communication system with limited means were established to get relevant information regarding the school-community partnership.

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the major findings of data analysis and interpretation, the following conclusions have been drawn:

Concerning the opportunities of the school-community partnership, every school is expected to utilize the available opportunities at the optimal level in order to sustain

effective school-community partnership. In contrast, it was detected that there were less parental involvement in the academic development of the students, weak school-community relationship, less collaboration of the school-community, limited communication systems, underestimation of community roles from educators, less provision of training and less attractiveness of school-climate. Therefore, the government secondary schools in South West Shoa Zone could not efficiently utilize the available opportunities of school-community partnership. The failure of employing those opportunities will have negative implication for the effectiveness school-community partnership. This implies that if efforts are made to hold intensive utilization, it will be possible to enhance the partnership.

Besides, in order to promote sustainable school-community partnership, a comprehensive implementation of the partnership activities should be indispensable. In contrast, it was indicated that less parental involvement in providing comments on their children's academic performance and community mobilization, limited participation to support the learning-teaching process, less community engagement in reducing students' dropout, and provision of feedback on the school performance. Consequently, the activities of school-community partnership in government of secondary schools of South West Shoa had not been implemented in line with the policy expectation. This implies that weak community participation in the implementation of the partnership activities have negative impact on the outcomes of school-community partnership. Thus, if strong efforts have been made, it will be possible to achieve active community participation for the effectiveness of school-community partnership.

Regarding the challenges of school-community partnership, the results of the analysis revealed that lack of leadership skills, underestimation of community roles from principals and teachers, lack of transparency, lack of extra-time and less commitment from the leaders, resistance from the community, inadequate training, absence of well-developed school-based policies for community participation, fear for conflict and lack of adequate finance were the major challenges. Therefore, this implies that the school-community partnership in the government secondary schools of South West Shoa has been encountered the prevailing challenges of partnership. This in turn negatively affects

the effectiveness of the school-community partnership. The implication is that if strong commitment and efforts have been made from the stakeholders, it will be possible to overcome the challenges.

Concerning with the strategies of the school-community partnership, every school is expected to design effective implementation strategies of the partnership. In contrast, the result of the study asserted that there were less attempts of developing the shared vision on the core values of the school, less acknowledgement of community participation, less provision of trainings, and poor communication. As a result, the strategies of school-community partnership implementation in the secondary schools of South West Shoa zone were inconsistent with the policy expectation. The failure of employing the strategy of school-community partnership hampers its effectiveness. This implies that if efforts have been made in aspects of school-community partnership, it will be possible to implement the strategies consistently.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the conclusions of the study, the following recommendations have been forwarded:

1. The school leadership should employ the opportunities of school-community partnership intensively and consistently to achieve sustainable partnership.
2. The school leadership should also work in collaboration with the community by:
Promoting participatory school planning, setting internal rules and regulations of community participation, conducting regular review of school performance, and maintain effective communication of the school performance.
3. The school leadership should conduct need analysis, identify the gaps, and provide school-based trainings for the practitioners of the partnership to enhance their capacity. As a result, limitations and challenges will be minimized.
4. The supervisors, WEO and Regional Education Bureau should conduct regular review of the allocation of the partnership, provide trainings for the practitioners of School-community partnership, and maintain close follow-up.

5. The school leadership in collaboration with supervisors and WEO should arrange continuous orientation programs for the community to create awareness on the roles of the community and benefits of the school-community partnership.
6. The school leadership should create strong relationship with parents and the local community, and they should also discharge their roles in line with the policy expectation in order to ensure sustainable school-community partnership.

6. REFERENCES

- Abera, B.2015. The Current Practice of School Community Participation in School Improvement Program: The Case of Gurage Zone. MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Bayha, J. and Harrison, T. 2002. School-Community Partnership: A Policy Brief. Department of Special Needs Education, San Francisco.
www.doe.virginia.gov. Accessed on September20, 2016
- Berg, A. Melaville, A. and Blank, M. 2006. Community and Family Engagement: Principals Share what works? IEL, Washington D.C.
www.communityschools.org. Accessed on September29, 2016
- Blank, M, Jacobson, R. and Melville, A.2012.Achieving Results through School-Community Partnership: Building Effective, Sustainable Relationships. IEL, Washington D.C www.americanprogress.org.Accessed on September 18, 2016
- Blank, M and Langford, B.(2000).School-Community Partnership.
[http:// www.communityschools.org](http://www.communityschools.org). Accessed on October7, 2017
- Christenson, S. 2002.Collaborative Family-School Relationships for Children’s learning: Beliefs and Practices. Department of Special needs Education, Virginia.
www.doe.virginia.gov. Accessed on October1, 2016
- Chrzanowski, D. Rans, S. and Thompson, R.2009.Building Mutually-Beneficial Relationships between Schools and Communities: The Role of a Connector. Asset-Based Community Development Institute, Chicago.
WWW.abcdnstitute.org. Accessed on August 18, 2016
- Cohen, L. Manion, L. and Morrison, K.2007.Research Methods in Education, 6th Edition. Rout ledge, London.
- Corbetta, P.2003.Social Research: Theory, Methods and Techniques. SAGE publications, London
- CWA(Common Wealth of Australia). 2013. Sustainable School and Community Partnership: A Research Study, 1st Edition. CWA, Abbotsford, Australia
www.whatworks.edu. Accessed on September 29, 2016

- Davis, D. 2000. Supporting Parents, Family and Community Involvement in Your School: Major Types of Partnership. North West Regional Education Laboratory, Portland. www.pacer.org/.../supporting. Accessed on September 14, 2016
- EEC (European Economic Commission).2013.Community in Wales: Seminar on Community Schools. EEC, Brussels, Europe. www.eunec.ed. Accessed on September 20, 2016
- Gary, W and Witherspoon, R.2011.The Power of Family-School-Community Partnership. NEA, Washington D C.www2.nea.org. OnSeptember30, 2016
- Harvard Family Research Project.(2010). School-Community Learning Partnerships: Essential to expand learning success. Browse -us-publications, Harvard [http//expandinglearning.org](http://expandinglearning.org). Accessed on November7, 2017
- Henderson, A.2011.Family-School-Community Partnership: Collaborative Strategies to advance students learning. National Education Association, Chicago. rhatgan@nea.org. Accessed onSeptember13, 2016
- MoE.2001.School Leadership, Community Participation and Financial guides Manual. EMPDA, Addis Ababa.
- _____. 2008. Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia. MoE, Addis Ababa.
- _____. 2010a. Education Sector Development Program (ESDP-IV). MoE, Addis Ababa
- _____. 2010b. School Improvement Program: Manual. EMPDA, Addis Ababa.
- Obsa, T. 2010. Decentralization and Community Participation in Education in Ethiopia: A case of three woredas in Horro Gudduru Zone of Oromia Regional State. MA Thesis Oslo University, Oslo, Norway www.1881.no/persno/oslo/ullevaa.Accessedon December25, 2016
- Patrica, A (2001) School-Community Partnership in Rural Schools: Leadership, Renewal and sense of Place. Lawrence Erlbaum Associations, Inc. *Journal of Education*, vol.76 (2), 204-221 <https://digitalcommons>.Accessed on November 4, 2017
- Patrikakou,E. 2008. The Power of Parent Involvement: Evidence for the Students' success. Academic Development Institute, USA www.proguesummerschools.org. Accessed on October1, 2016

- Pullman, M. Wiggins, E. and Bruns, E. 2011. Theory, Programs, and Research on School Based-Family Support: Department of Psychology, Washington DC. www.uwhelpingfamilies.org. Accessed on September 30, 2016
- Roekel, D. 2008. Parent-Family Community Involvement in Education. NEA, Washington DC www.nea.org. Accessed on October 1, 2016
- Sanders, M. 2016. Building School-Community Partnership: Harvard Educational review. Harvard Education Publishing groups, Harvard. www.hepg.org/her-home/issues... Accessed on September 15, 2016
- Sheridan, S. 2003. Families and Schools in Partnerships: Creating Connections for the students' success, Nebraska University, Lincoln. www.CHEs. Accessed on September 20, 2016
- Tadele, B. 2014. An assessment on Community Participation in Education: The case of Lideta Sub-City. MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Valli, L. Stefanski, A. and Jacobson, R. 2014. School-Community Partnership: A Typology for guiding Systematic Educational Reform. College of Education, Maryland. www.mdequity.org. Accessed on September 13, 2016
- Valli, L. Stefanski, A. and Jacobson, R. 2014. Typologizing School-Community Partnership: A Framework for analysis and action. *Urban Education Journal*, Vol 29:4-7. www.tandf. Accessed on September 5, 2017

7. APPENDICES

APPENDIX-A

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

Postgraduate Program Directorate

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaires to be filed by teachers, principals and Supervisors

Dear teachers, principals and Supervisors, the main purpose of this questionnaire is to analyze opportunities and challenges in the school-community partnership in government secondary schools of South West Shoa, and to propose the possible recommendations to strengthen the school-community partnership. So, your engagement in providing the necessary information is mandatory and has a greater impact to acquire the desired outcomes. Hence, you are kindly requested to respond each item accurately and thoroughly as much as possible, and the researcher would like to assure that your responses are strictly confidential.

Thank you in advance for taking time to complete this questionnaire!

General Information

- Respondent's name is not required to be written.
- Please mark (√) to indicate your responses for each item of the close-ended questions.
- Write the responses of the open-ended questions in words precisely on the space provided.

Section- One: Personal Information

1.1. Woreda_____ Name of school _____ Level: (9-10)

1.2. Sex: Male Female

1.3. Age: 21-25 26-30 31-35 36-40 41and above

1.4. Educational qualification: Diploma BA /BED MA/MSC Others

1.5. Responsibility: Teacher Principal Supervisor

1.6. Service year in current position: 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21 and above

Section-Two: Items Related with the Opportunities and Challenges in Creating the School-Community Partnership

Direction: The following items are related to opportunities of the school-community partnership. In your opinion, to what extent the opportunities of school-community partnership have been employed in your school? Please, mark (√) in the box provided to indicate your responses for each item. (Key: 1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3 undecided, 4= agree, 5=strongly agree)

1. Items related to opportunities employed to promote the school-community partnership

No	Items	Rating scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The local community has been delegated authority to the decision making roles in the school programs.					
2	Participatory leadership has been practiced in the school.					
3	Greater parental involvement has been done in the academic development of the students.					
4	Community participation has been integrated in the internal rules of the school.					
5	Effective communication of the school performance has been used among the community.					
6	The community discharged their roles in shaping the delinquent behavior of students.					
7	Frequent observation of school performance has been done by the community.					
8	Continuous training program has been given for the community.					
9	Orientation has been given for the community towards the values of education.					
10	Community perception of their roles to enhance the students' academic achievement has been improved.					
11	The welcoming of school-climate has been established to attract the community.					
12	The strategic planning has been developed through community participation.					
13	Strong relationship has been built between the school-community to improve the success of students.					
14	Collaborative work of the school-community has been sustained to address the diversified of needs of the students.					

15. What other opportunities are implemented to promote the school-community partnership?

2. Questions Related with Activities of the School-Community Partnership

In your opinion, to what extent the following issues are addressed in your school? Please, use a (√) in the box provided to indicate your responses for each item. (Key: 1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3= undecided, 4= agree, 5=strongly agree)

No	Items	Rating scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	PTA has been actively participated in developing the school-based policy.					
2	PTA has been actively participated in designing the school plan.					
3	The community has been actively participated in contributing financial resources to the school.					
4	PTA has been actively participated in the implementation of school plan.					
5	PTA has been actively participated in monitoring implementation of school plan.					
6	The community has been involved in solving the school problems that related to students' learning.					
7	Parents have been consistently commented on their children's home-work performances.					
8	The community has been actively engaged in sharing practical experiences with the students to support the learning-teaching.					
9	The community has been participated in shaping the students' behavior collaboration with the teachers.					
10	PTA has been actively involved in reducing dropout rate.					
11	The active involvement of PTA in mobilizing the community to participate in the school activities has been achieved.					
12	The community has been actively participated in providing feedback on school performance.					

13. What other tasks are implemented in promoting the school-community partnership?

3. Questions related with the challenges of school-community partnership

No	Items	Rating scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Lack of leadership skills of leaders to participate the community.					
2	Under estimation of community roles in the school affairs from principals and teachers.					
3	Lack of transparency on the school-community partnership implementation.					
4	Less commitment from the leadership to mobilize the community.					
5	Inadequate financial resource.					
6	Fear for conflict from the school leadership.					
7	Lack of extra-time of leaders for the community outreach program.					
8	Lack of information of the community about their roles on the school-community partnership.					
9	Resistance from the community to participate in the school activities.					
10	Lack of knowledge of school-community partnership.					
11	Lack of adequate trainings for the community.					
12	Absence of well-developed school based policies to participate the community.					

13. What other factors do you think are the challenges not so far stated?

4. Questions related with the strategies of school-community partnership

(Key: 1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3= undecided, 4= agree, 5=strongly agree)

No	Items	Rating scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The shared vision has been developed among the school-community to promote effective school-community partnership.					
2	The sense of ownership has been developed among the school-community to share the responsibilities in promoting the school-community partnership.					
3	The partnership programs have been appropriately located.					
4	Adequate training programs have been given for PTA to operate as part of the school program facilitators.					
5	The leadership has been acknowledging diversity among the community to develop sense of ownership.					
6	Community participations have been consistently acknowledged.					
7	Continuous discussions have been conducted with the school-community to exchange relevant information on the school performance.					
8	Effective communication system has been established to get relevant information on the school-community partnership.					

9. What other strategies do you think are being employed?

The end!

APPENDIX-B

Interview Guides for PTA

Part-I Personal Information

Gender__ Age_ education__ position__ service year in the current position_

Part-II Questions related with opportunities, activities, challenges and strategies of
School-community partnership

1. Questions related with the opportunities of school-community partnership

- ✓ delegation of decision making roles to the community at the school level?
- ✓ leadership practices implemented in the school?
- ✓ Roles and responsibility of the community
- ✓ parental involvement in the students' learning?
- ✓ Integration of community participation in the school's internal rules?
- ✓ Communication of the school performance?
- ✓ school-community relationship to promote the school-community partnership?
- ✓ training and capacity building mechanisms
- ✓ school-community partnership?
- ✓ What other opportunities do you think are to be employed to promote the school- community partnership program in your school context?

2. Questions related with the major activities of school-community partnership

- ✓ developing the school-based policy?
- ✓ designing school planning, implementation and evaluation program and provision of feedback ?
- ✓ community mobilization to participate in the school programs?
- ✓ experience sharing programs to support the students learning
- ✓ commenting on their children's home-work performances
- ✓ extracting the school resources (finance, material, labor, information, others)
- ✓ attendance of school's meeting programs
- ✓ engagement in reducing educational wastage, others if any?

3. Items related to the challenges of school-community partnership in your school context?

School leadership related factors

- Leadership skills
- Commitment, transparency,
- Perception of community roles
- Motivation/incentive
- Training provision program
- Communication system
- Others if any-----?

Community related factors

- Access to information
- Attitudes to participate in the school activities
- Training provision programs
- Development of school-based policy for community participation

If any other challenges? What should be done to overcome the challenges?

4. Questions related with the strategies of school-community partnership

- Developing the *shared vision* among the community
- Empowering the community
- Creating *strong relationship* between the school and the community
- Proper allocation of partnership program
- Acknowledging diversity of the community
- Provision of adequate training programs
- Acknowledgement of community participation
- Communication systems. Do you think other strategies of school-community partnerships that have been used so far in your school context?

The End!

Interview Guide for PTA (Afaan Oromoo)

Kutaa-Tokko: Ragaa dhuunfaa namtoota yaada isaanii kennanii

Koorniyaa: __ Umrii: __ sadarkaa barnoota: __ ga'ee hojii: __ tajaajila __

Kutaa-Lama: Gaaffilee Carraawwan hawaasaafi manni barumsaa waliin hojjachuuf

Qabaniinfi rakkoolee mudataniin kan walqabatan

1. Carraawwan hawaasaafi manni barumsaa waliin hojjachuuf qaban kan walqabatan

1.1. Carraawwan waliin hojjachuu jiran maalfa'i?

1.2. Hawaasichi carraawwan kana ammam kutannoon hojiitti hiikuuf socho'aa jira?

2. Gaaffilee hojiiwwan hawaasniifi manni barumsaa waliin hojjachuuf qabaniin

2.1. Hojiiwwan gurguddoo hirmaannaa ummataa maal maaltu gaggeeffamaa jira?

2.2. Hojiiwwan kun ammam hirmaachisoodha?

2.3. Hirmaattonni addadurootni eenyufa'i?

2.4. Raawwiin jiru akka hubannoo keetiitti akkamitti madaalta?

3. Tarsiimoowwan hawaasniifi manni barumsaa waliin hojjachuuf bocaman

3.1. Tarsiimoowwan bocaman maal fa'i?

3.2. Milkaa'inni isaanii haala kamiin ibsama?

3.3. Hanqinootni kana keessatti jiran maalfa'i?

4. Hudhaalee milkaa'ina hojiiwwan hawaasniifi manni barumsaa waliin hojjachuuf

qabaniin:

4.1. Mana barumsaan kan walqabatan

4.2. Ummataan kan walqabatan

4.3. Furmaatni isaa maalta'uu qaba jettu?

xumura

Hirmaannaa taasistaniif guddaa galatoomaa!

Interview Guide for Officials (WEO heads & Planners)

Part-I Personal Information

Gender: ___ Age: ___ education: _____ position: _____ service _____

Part-II Questions related with opportunities, activities, challenges and strategies of
School-community partnership

1. Questions related with the opportunities of school-community partnership

- ✓ delegation of decision making roles to the community at the school level?
- ✓ leadership practices implemented in the school?
- ✓ Roles and responsibility of the community
- ✓ parental involvement in the students' learning?
- ✓ Integration of community participation in the school's internal rules?
- ✓ Communication of the school performance?
- ✓ school-community relationship to promote the school-community partnership?
- ✓ training and capacity building mechanisms
- ✓ school-community partnership?
- ✓ What other opportunities do you think are to be employed to promote the school- community partnership program in your school context?

2. Questions related with the major activities of school-community partnership

- ✓ developing the school-based policy?
- ✓ designing school planning, implementation and evaluation program and provision of feedback ?
- ✓ community mobilization to participate in the school programs?
- ✓ experience sharing programs to support the students learning
- ✓ commenting on their children's home-work performances
- ✓ extracting the school resources (finance, material, labor, information, others)
- ✓ attendance of school's meeting programs
- ✓ engagement in reducing educational wastage, others if any?

3. Items related to the challenges of school-community partnership in your school context?

Leadership related factors

- Leadership skills
- Commitment, transparency,
- Perception of community roles
- Motivation/incentive
- Training provision program
- Communication system
- Others if any-----?

Community related factors

- Access to information
- Attitudes to participate in the school activities
- Training provision programs
- Development of school-based policy for community participation

If any other challenge? What should be done to overcome the challenges?

4. Questions related with the strategies of school-community partnership

- Developing the *shared vision* among the community
- Empowering the community
- Creating *strong relationship* between the school and the community
- Proper allocation of partnership program
- Acknowledging diversity of the community
- Provision of adequate training programs
- Acknowledgement of community participation
- Communication systems. Do you think other strategies of school-community partnerships that have been used so far in your school context?

The End!

APPENDIX- C Documentation Check list

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIERCTORATE

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Department of Educational Planning and Management

The main purpose of the study is to analyze opportunities and challenges in school-community partnership in government secondary schools of South West Shoa zone, and to propose the possible recommendations to strengthen the school-community partnership. This check list is prepared to collect the observed data for the study topic filled by the researcher himself through direct investigation of documents in the selected secondary schools and WEO. Its purpose is to ensure the truthfulness of the information gathered through other tools. The main points to be investigated are based on the existing situations of the selected schools and WEO:

1. School policies and procedures:
 - Policy guides and frameworks of school-community partnership?
 - SIP frameworks, community participation,
 - financial guides, school-based rules,
 - Strategic and Action plan, others if any?
2. School activities undertaken
 - Plan designing, implementation, monitoring and evaluation
 - Resource contribution (finance, material, physical labor, information etc.)
 - Experience sharing programs, provision of social services to teachers, community participation in solving school problem, others if any?
3. Strategies of school-community partnership
 - Developing shared school's vision, mission and values, Community empowerment, school-community relationship, Communication mechanisms: Reports, forum-discussions, meetings, others if any?