

**fCOMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN MATERIAL RESOURCE  
MANAGEMENT IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF SOUTH-WEST SHOWA  
ZONE, OROMIA REGIONAL STATE**

**M.A. THESIS**

**BERHANU ABOMSA**

**JULY, 2017**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA**

**Community Participation in Material Resource Management in Secondary  
Schools of South-West Showa Zone, Oromia Regional State**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Educational Planning and  
Management, College of Education and Behavioral Science**

**Postgraduate Program Directorate**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP**

**Berhanu Abomsa Edosa**

**Major Advisor: Mr. Yirgalem Alemu (Asst. Professor)**

**Co-Advisor: Dr. Justin Sudhakar (Ph.D.)**

**August 2017**

**Haramaya University, Haramaya**

# HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

## POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE

As thesis research advisors, we hereby certify that we have read and evaluated this Thesis prepared, under our guidance, by Berhanu Abomsa Edosa, entitled “Community Participation in School Material Resource Management in Secondary Schools of South-West Showa Zone, Oromia Regional State” and recommended that it should be submitted as fulfilling the MA Thesis requirement.

Mr. Yirgalem Alemu (Ass. Professor)	_____	_____
Name of Major Advisor	Signature	Date

Dr. Justin Sudhakar (Ph.D.)	_____	_____
Name of Co-Advisor	Signature	Date

As members of the Board of Examiners of the MA Thesis open Defense Examination, we certify that we have read and evaluated the thesis prepared by Berhanu Abomsa Edosa and examined the candidate. We recommended that the Thesis should be accepted as fulfilling the Thesis requirement for the degree of Master of Arts 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 final copy of the thesis to council of graduate studies (CGS) through the departmental or school graduate committee (DGC or SGC) of the candidate.

## **Dedication**

This thesis is dedicated to my wife, W/ro Adanech Shelema for her extraordinary sacrifice and dedicated partnership in the success of my life, next to God.

## **STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR**

By my signature below, I declare and affirm that this Thesis is my own work and the materials used for this thesis have been duly acknowledged. This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of masters of art in school leadership at Haramaya University. I declare that this is not submitted to any other institution anywhere for the award of any academic degree, diploma, or certificate.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowed without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Request for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this thesis manuscript in the whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the dean of the school of graduate studies when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instance, however, permission must be obtained from the author of the Thesis.

Name of the author: Berhanu Abomsa Edosa

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date of submission: \_\_\_\_\_

School/Department: \_\_\_\_\_

## **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

The author was born in Oromia Regional State, South-West Showa Zone, Woliso Woreda in the specific place called Dire Durate on September 1, 1975 E.C. He attended his Primary education in Gembela primary school 1-6 and 7-8 at Woliso Liben. Then he attended General Secondary school from 9-12 at Dejasmach Geresu Duki secondary school in Woliso town from 1988-1991 E.C. After sitting to Ethiopian School Leaving Certificate Examination in 1991, he attended Jimma Teachers College from 1992-1993 E.C and graduated with a diploma in teaching English language on June 13, 1993 E.C. and went to West Wolega Zone to teach English language from September 1994 E.C in Oromia region. In 1995 E.C, he started B.ED degree in English language and literature in Addis Ababa University and graduated in 2000 E.C. Then, he was transferred to South-West Showa zone, Dawo Woreda in 2001 E.C and became a Vice-principal of Busa Secondary School in Dawo Woreda, Busa town from September 2002 E.C to September 2009 E.C. He went to Haramaya University in 2007 E.C. to study for Master of Arts in the Department of Educational Planning and Management in School Leadership Program and graduated in 2010 E.C.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

First of all, I am greatly indebted to my almighty God for helping me to complete this research work and for all help throughout my life.

I would like to express my special appreciation to my major advisor, Mr. Yirgalem Alemu (Asst. Professor) for his: encouragement, insightful guidance and professional expertise to the completion of this work. My special appreciation also goes to my co-advisor, Dr. Justin Sudhaka (Ph. D.) for his unreserved support and comments in this thesis work. Also, I would like to thank Ethiopian Ministry of Education for financial support. Furthermore, I would like to acknowledge all my friends those who helped me by giving moral support during my study time and thesis work. Also, my acknowledgment goes to South-West Showa Zone Education office Head, experts and supervisors vice principals, SMC, PTA and teachers who took part in filling the questionnaire and gave their opinions for the interview.

Special thank goes to Haramaya University EDPM department members for continuous support without fed-up always with good feelings and encouragement.

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<b>CP</b>	Community participation
<b>KETB</b>	Kebele Education and Training Board
<b>MoE</b>	Ministry of Education
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organization
<b>PTA</b>	Parent-Teachers –Association
<b>SIC</b>	School Improvement Committee
<b>SIP</b>	School Improvement Program
<b>SMC</b>	School Management Committee
<b>SPSS</b>	Statistical Packages of Social Science
<b>SWSZ</b>	South-West Showa Zone
<b>WEO</b>	Woreda Education Office
<b>WETB</b>	Woreda Education and Training Board
<b>ZEO</b>	Zonal Education Office



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Research Questions	5
1.4. Objectives of the study	5
1.4.1. General objective	5
1.4.2. Specific objectives	5
1.5. Significance of the Study	5
1.6. Delimitation of the Study	6
1.7. Limitations of the Study	7
1.8. Operational Definitions of Key Terms	7
<b>2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1. The Concept of Material Resources Management	8
2.1.1. Material resources	8
2.1.2. Material resources management	8
2.2. Potential Partners in School	9
2.2.1. The government	9
2.2.2. The community	10
2.3. Community Participation in School Affairs	10
2.4. Driving Forces of Community Participation	11
2.5. Roles of Community in Managing School Resource	12

2.6. School Leadership and Management	12
2.7. Rationale for Community Participation in School Resource Management	13
2.8. Practices of Community Participation in School Resource Management	15
2.8.1. Communication	15
2.8.2. Community empowerment	16
2.9. Factors Affecting Community Participation in School Resource Management	16
2.9.1. Community interest	16
2.9.2. Awareness of community	16
2.9.3. Fear	17
2.9.4. Insecurity and intimidation	17
2.9.5. Professional territory	18
2.9.6. Awareness of principals and teachers	18
2.9.7. Communication factors	18
2.10. Strategies of Enhancing Community Participation in School Resource Management	19
2.10.1. Empowering school principals and teachers	19
2.10.2. Creating a school environment conducive for participation	19
2.10.3. Giving orientation and training to community representatives	20
2.10.4. Providing community service	20
<b>3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1. Description of Study Area	21
3.2. Research Design	21
3.3. Sources of Data	22
3.3.1. The primary sources of data	22
3.3.2. The secondary sources of data	22
3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Technique	22
3.5. Instruments of Data Collection	23
3.5.1. Questionnaire	24
3.5.2. Interview	25
3.6. Data Collection Procedures	25
3.7. Method of Data Analysis	26
3.7.1. Quantitative data	26

3.7.2. Qualitative data	26
<b>4. RESULTS AND DICUSSIONS</b>	<b>28</b>
4.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents	29
4.2. How Community Participates in Material Resource Management in secondary schools.	30
4.4. Barriers with Community Participation in School Material Resource Management	42
<b>5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>51</b>
5.1. Summary of the Findings	51
5.2. Conclusions	54
5.3. Recommendations	55
<b>6. REFERENCES</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>7. APPENDICES</b>	<b>64</b>
Appendix A	65
Appendix B	69
Appendix C	71

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Pages</u>
Table 1: Population, Sample Size and Sampling Technique	20
Table 2: Sex, Age, Service Years and Qualification of respondents	26
Table 3: How Community Participates in material Resource Management	29
Table 4: How school leaders motivate Community to participation	34
Table 5: Barriers to Community Participation in Material Resource Management.	38
Table 6: Improving Community Participation in material resource management	42

## **Community Participation in Material Resource Management in Secondary Schools of South-West Showa Zone, Oromia Regional State**

### **ABSTRACT**

*The purpose of this study was to assess Community Participation in Material Resource Management in Secondary Schools of South-West Showa Zone, Oromia Regional State. To accomplish this purpose, the study employed a descriptive survey design, which is supplemented by mixed model approach. Out of twenty-eight government general secondary schools in South-West Showa zone, eight secondary schools were sampled using simple random sampling technique. The subjects of the study were 30.7% (n=121) of teachers, 100% (n=8) Parent-Teacher-Association heads, 100% (n=8) of principals, 100% (n=13) of vice principals, 100% (n=8) supervisors and 100% (n=8) woreda education office-heads from sampled secondary schools. The respondents' selection was carried out using simple random, purposive and available sampling techniques. Simple random sampling technique was used for teachers; purposive sampling technique was used for PTA chair persons, while, available sampling techniques were used for principals, vice-principals, supervisors and woreda education office-heads in each of the sampled secondary schools. The instruments used to collect data were questionnaire, interview. The information obtained from questionnaire was then analyzed by means of statistical tools including frequency, Percentage, mean value and chi-square. The study revealed that community participation in school material resource management was weak in that PTA members haven't participated in the planning, organizing, coordinating, controlling and reporting of school material resources; and also the current status of school leaders in initiating community participation is not in a good direction; there were barriers such as teachers and school leaders unwillingness to welcome PTA members to school and in turn unwillingness of PTA members to come to school. All these are due to PTA members' lack of awareness, enthusiasm, commitment and basic skills, teachers and school leaders professional territory, school leaders' lack of initiation to enhance community participation to work in collaboration from planning to reporting; lack of good communication between the school and PTA members; lack of capacity building training for all teachers, principals and PTA members. So, the study recommended that the school leaders, WEO heads, WETB, ZEO, REB and other educational stakeholders should be aware of the fact that community participation in material resource management in this zone is generally weak and capacity building training should be given to all teachers, school leaders and PTA members to educate them about their role and responsibility in the management.*

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This introductory chapter basically discusses the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, and delimitation of the study, limitations of the study, significance of the study and operational definition of key terms.

## 1.1. Background of the Study

School resource management refers to the capacity of school principal and other education managers to deploy all kinds of resources of school with maximum effectiveness and efficiency and for maximum benefit to students (Dayaram, 2011). However, school principals cannot go it alone because school material resources constitute a very important factor in the functioning of educational system; they need to enlist and harness the active participation and support of numerous other role players including: parents, teachers, students, school management committee, Parent-teacher-association, local leaders and different NGOs. As example, today, greater decentralization of educational decision-making is becoming the common aspiration of many developing countries (De Grauwe, Anton and Candy Ludaz, 2011). In supporting this idea, some researchers argue that the participation of communities and students in the day-to-day activities of the schools (for example, in supervision, monitoring and evaluation) is part of the decentralization of school management (Naidoo and Jordan, 2005). In some Asian countries, like Malaysia, school management has been improved because it involves students and communities in school decision-making (Luck, 2011). The same is true in South Africa where the participation of communities and students in decision-making has played a role in the improved and expanded school-based management (Naidoo, et al, 2005).

Community participation in School resource management is the active involvement of communities in the planning, designing, coordinating, executing, supervising, monitoring and evaluating all school resources for better education delivery. Community participation is very important for school effectiveness and responsiveness to student's needs & management (Tekeu, 2011). Participation of community in school resource management is given different names in different parts of the world like school council, parent teachers' council, parent teachers' association (Mahmood, Majoka, Basharat and Ali, 2011).

Schools are a focal social institution that is intrinsically linked to their community's welfare and growth (Dayaram, 2011). As he stated, strong, sustained community participation in the school resource management can enhance transparency and accountability in the education system and promote a sense of ownership, agency and responsibility for positive change. The school management committee is intended to be the basic unit of a decentralized governance model with active involvement of community in the school's functioning as they are the main stakeholders in the education process.

Community participation in school resource management can take different forms, ranging from parents sending their children to school to active participation in school-related meetings, assisting and managing with school construction and supporting teachers in achieving positive outcomes (Veena and Mahajan, 2005). As such, participation in school resource management constitutes an efficient strategy for achieving objectives such as improved access and quality, voicing community-specific needs and objectives, developing the curriculum collaboratively with school authorities, reaching marginalized groups, creating accountability and ensuring sustainability of programs that are implemented.

In this regard, MoE (2007b) declared that the SIC should comprise of teachers, management personal, students, parents and the community, and principal of each work as a committee chairman. This shows, the collection of SIC in SIP ensures the participation of many stakeholders (parents, community members, teachers, and student) in planning, implementing and monitoring of the program. In the same way, as stated by World Bank (2007), in Oromia region school based management system, responsibility and decision-making authority over school operations are transferred to principals, teachers, and parents and sometimes to students and other school community members; however, the position cannot accept them to participate in decision making.

Therefore, as stated by Tekeu, Dayaram, MoE and World Bank, community participation in school resource management has paramount importance as it can accelerate school effectiveness and responsiveness to students' needs; it can also enhance transparency and accountability between the school and the community that promote a sense of ownership which can share a responsibility for positive change. However, as stated by World Bank, the

community is not welcomed to the school resource management as expected because under the control of school principal, PTAs and community members manage the school resources nominally. Thus, the purpose of this study was to investigate the community participation in school material resource management in South-West Showa Zone, Oromia regional state.

## 1.2. Statement of the Problem

As Morgan (2006) stated, community participation in school material resource management has paramount importance in enhancing transparency and accountability, in promoting a sense of ownership and responsibility, in creating conducive school environment in which smooth communication is experienced between the school and the community to achieve the intended educational goal by using the scarce material resources effectively and efficiently. However, research conducted by Dixon in Molnar (2006) out lined that the barrier to more community participation in school resource management is the lack of support from educators in the case of insecurity and intimidation between community and educators. In some cases, community actually felt that their students might be singled out or treated unfairly in grading by teachers if they participate in all school affairs particularly about their students. On the other hand, community describe their own insecurity at meeting with other adults at home and school association meetings because teachers talk defensively about being verbally attacked by community and the community share discomfort entering schools due to their own level of education or past experience in schools. All these problems create walls between homes and school and limit community participation in school resource management.

Molnar (2006) also states that there is an insider-outsider tension that results between school staff and community members. Educators are never quite insiders because they fear that communities are stepping into their professional territory. He also further explained that, at times, teachers consider communities troublesome because they question, challenge, and take time. All these situations will develop a protection of territory between school and community which influence community participation in school resource management negatively. On the other hand, principals and teachers may perceive that communities often have few decision making skills and they degraded the capacities of the community representatives to participate in the educational activities of the school.



Researchers who conducted studies on the area (Getachew, 2001; Matebe, 2006; Melesew, 2005) indicate that while community participation in contributing money and labor were found at medium level, school community relationships, community participation in school management and decision-making, and parent involvement in their children education were all at low levels.

In the earlier studies Gebre Michael (2006) found out that community's efforts and outcomes in school administration was not successful at Kindaya Primary School in Tigray region. His findings showed that Teachers and directors disagree with the interference of community. They accepted the participation of community in the school affairs, but dissatisfied with their participation in the evaluation of teachers. Beside the effort of community participation in alleviating students disciplinary problem was low. The same thing is true as stated in Eyasu (2011) that parent teacher participation in managing their respective schools and observing roles of PTA was not at desired level. As a result, they had weak role on motivating the school communities, improving students' discipline, meetings in convenient time.

Therefore, as stated by Molnar, Barbour, Matebe, Gebre Michael and Eyasu , there were different hindrances of community participation in school material resource management. For instances, the case of insecurity and intimidation between community and educators, schools' fear of questions and challenges from communities, principals and teachers may perceive that communities often have few decision making skills, the schools dissatisfaction with communities participation in the evaluation of teachers were some of the reasons described in this statement of the problems. It could be deduced from the local researches that few researchers have given a due attention to conduct their research on this area recently, focusing on finding out the hindrances. Particularly, in Oromia region, still different deep and exhaustive studies were needed to investigate both the hindrances and strategies to improve community participation in school material resource management. In secondary schools of South-West Showa Zone, Oromia regional state, the main reason why the researcher was motivated to conduct this research was that the same problems prevailed in the zone. So, the researcher, mainly, wanted to conduct the study not only to identify the roadblock between the school and community but also to find out strategies that can improve community participation in school material resource management.

### **1.3. Research Questions**

The study attempts to answer the following research questions.

1. How the community participates in material resource management in Secondary schools of South-West Showa Zone, Oromia regional state?
2. How school leaders motivate the community to participate on the management of material resources in secondary schools of South-West Showa Zone, Oromia regional state?
3. What are the barriers of community participation in material resource management in secondary schools of South West-Showa Zone, Oromia regional state?
4. How can community participation be improved in material resource management in secondary schools of South-West Showa Zone, Oromia regional state?

### **1.4. Objectives of the study**

#### **1.4.1. General objective**

The major objective of this study was to investigate the community participation in school material resource management in South-West Showa Zone, Oromia regional state.

#### **1.4.2. Specific objectives**

1. To assess how the community participates in material resource management in Secondary schools of South-West Showa Zone, Oromia regional state.
2. To examine the current status of school leaders in initiating community participation in material resource management in secondary schools of South-West Showa Zone.
3. To identify the barriers of community participation in material resource management in secondary schools of south-West showa zone, Oromia regional state.
4. To suggest ways of improving community participation in material resource management in secondary schools of South-West Showa Zone, Oromia regional state.

### **1.5. Significance of the Study**

The findings of this study are intended to help different educational stakeholders that are found at various structural levels. Hence, the study is believed: to create awareness about community

participation in school resource management among members of SIC, WETB, PTA and school leaders; to identify the existing problems and to take common responsibility with school leaders and practitioners to correct their weakness about current community participation in school resource management because some hard and soft copy of this research will be distributed to the South-West Showa eleven Woreda and one administrative town and by encouraging them to redistribute its copies to their secondary schools. The other importance of this study is to suggest possible options for the current community participation in this zone as it provides opportunity to share experience from each other.

Moreover, it may initiate school leaders, teachers, students and supportive staff to well-come PTA members to the schools. And also, the study may provide information to high officials of policy makers about the current status of community participation in this zone which may resemble with other Oromia zones to design policies and strategies to alleviate the current problems. Furthermore, it may minimize professional territory which can hinder active community participation in the zone and facilitates the way for PTA members to participate in school material resource management; In addition to that, it provides more information for those who may conduct further study on this area. In general, it provides valuable contribution to enhance community participation in the school resource management.

## **1.6. Delimitation of the Study**

The study was designed to assess community participation in material resource management in Secondary schools, grade 9-10, of South-West Showa Zone, Oromia regional state. The study focused on material resource management as it was difficult to include all the school resources' management in the study due to shortage of time and budget. So, the researcher conducted the study on material resource planning, organizing, coordinating and controlling because today, materials are generally scares unless we use them wisely to achieve the intended school goal. The researcher also focused on one zone as it was difficult to include wider areas due to time and budget constraints. In addition to that, the seriousness of the problem in the intended area initiated the researcher to conduct the study. To collect data from respondents, the researcher used purposive sampling technique, simple random sampling technique and availability sampling technique. The researcher employed questionnaire, document analysis and interview

to collect data from respondents and also used SPSS.V.20 to calculate and analyze data of respondents with frequency, percentage, mean value and chi-square.

### **1.7. Limitations of the Study**

This study was not free from any limitations. The researcher faced shortage of recent and local review of related literatures, unwillingness of few respondents to fill in the questionnaires and return on time, and the shortage of time to collect and analyze the data were the problems which the researcher encountered. However, the researcher managed and ensured the reliability of the study in spite of these limitations.

### **1.8. Operational Definitions of Key Terms**

**Community Representatives** are PTA members who represent the community and who are actively involved in the management of school material resources.

**Community Participation** is the active involvement of the PTA members in the management of schools' material resource management.

**Material** is any equipment and tool with certain physical properties that is used as inputs to production or services. In educational context machines, computers, stationery materials, hand tools, furniture, laboratory equipment and chemicals etc.

**Material Resource Management** encompasses activities such as material requirement planning, purchasing, storing, utilization, inventory control, maintenance and disposal of unused material.

**Government Secondary Schools** are the schools under the direct management of the Ethiopian Government consisting of grade nine to ten

**School Leaders** in this study are the principals, vice principals and supervisors

## **2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This part of the research presented relevant literatures such as published books, journals, policy documents and different school documents concerning to the general concept of community participation in school resource management. In this chapter literature on importance, barriers and objectives of community participation in school resource management were discussed.

### **2.1. The Concept of Material Resources Management**

Material resource management in this study refers to activities such as material requirement planning, purchasing, storing, utilization, inventory control, maintenance and disposal of unused material. Thus, PTA and WETB members are expected to participate actively in school material resource management because school leaders alone cannot do it. Using material resources effectively leads to achieving school goals in the intended way because they are essential inputs in the teaching-learning process.

#### **2.1.1. Material resources**

The term material resources have been defined by various experts in various ways. In connection to educational material resources, Bekuretsion (2005) states that material resources include renewable and immediate use items. They are any inputs or consumable items that are fixed or recurrent objectives used in the process of production. Each item is used for specific objectives and the integration of all items can help to promote the education process. The objectives of any organization can be attainable with great help of material resources. Today, resources are very scares; so, the participation of community in the management of school material resources is very important to distribute them fairly among the users in the school and to minimize their wastage.

#### **2.1.2. Material resources management**

Material resource management directs the flow of materials and services from the supplier, and keeps track of the supplier's delivery and quality commitment, so as to avoid any disruptive surprises. Material resource management activities are frequently handled at the local or office

level and involve regular communication with suppliers concerning requirements, such as order quantity and delivery dates (Leenders *et al.*, 2006). In addition to this, Chunawalla and Patel (2006), material resource management concerned with those management functions such as planning, organizing, purchasing, warehousing, distribution, inventory control and disposal of material resources. So, when communities or PTAs participate in managing school material resources from planning process up to disposal process in every activity of the school, wastage and corruption of school resources will be minimized, quality of materials will be improved which is directly related with the efficiency and effectiveness of school activities.

## **2.2. Potential Partners in School**

The potential partners in education are students, teachers, principals, local educational officials, and parents, leaders of the local community, NGO, community representatives and others. The provision and management of an effective education system cannot be achieved without the deliberate participation of these potential partners. An attempt to exclude these potential partners in any educational issues is likely to be suicidal on the part of the school because by its nature, education is a public commodity. Part of the partnership agreement is that boards, representing communities, are responsible for building part of the staff houses, the school kitchen, and that each parent with a student at the school paid some levy. The potential partners had made remarkable efforts in this regard with some achieving major projects such as the building of school hostels for the boarders and some had raised funds that purchased school vehicles and computers and also take part in managing all the school material resources (Moswela, 2007).

### **2.2.1. The government**

The high officials and policy makers, in collaboration with local leaders, can play a great role to enhance community participation in the schools' material resource management. In order to facilitate community participation, government of Australia initiated community strengthening initiative program. The government in order to address the local problems involves people in identifying local problems and come with positive solutions (Gorinski and Fraser, 2006). Therefore the governments have great contribution for the improvement of school through sustainable local government and community participation towards the school improvement.

So, the government can improve community participation by establishing sustainable initiative programs and policies which will activate PTA members to willingly participate in managing the school material resources.

### **2.2.2. The community**

In a community, people take responsibility for collective activity and are loyal to each other beyond immediate self-interest. They work together on the basis of shared values. They hold each other accountable for commitments (Epstein, 2001). The involvement of community in education system paves the way for their accountability which goes beyond the provision of material requirements for schools. Because it includes assisting, guiding, and extending whatever help to equally share the burden of education of their students with the school. Any school that implements an active program to stimulate community involvement will be rewarded. The rewards can range from voluntary labor to improved school grounds or enhanced pupil study habits, to financial resources and subsidies for school athletic and cultural events (Carino and Vaison 1991).

## **2.3. Community Participation in School Affairs**

The word community participation is a concept with two components. These are community and participation. The word community could have different meanings in different contexts. According to (Bray, 1987) a community can be defined as a group of people who share social, economic and cultural interests. Its members recognize social obligation to each other, hold at least some common values, and share identity (Aynalem, 2012). According to Socio-cultural researchers 'community' as a 'community of practice' – that is, a group of people engaged in an activity driven by common or closely intersecting goals and interests. In pursuit of these goals and interests, they employ common practices, work with the same tools or resources and use specific discourse (Goos, et.al 2003). Miranda (2007) stresses that without community participation; there is obviously no partnership, no development and no program. Hence the lack of community participation in decision making to implement educational development can lead to failure in the community development (Aref, 2010). Particularly, nowadays where and when materials are very scarce, the participation of community in school material resource management is mandatory, because school leaders alone cannot bring the expected goal.

## 2.4. Driving Forces of Community Participation

In any role that community plays, be it substitute, complementary, or critical, the most important driving force is the demand for education from the side of a wider community. Also important are information sharing within the community and between community and school, collaboration and coordination among actors within the community and administrative institutions, critical thinking abilities of community members for analyzing government policy and their own needs to initiate action, attitudes of trust and mutual respect among people over school management, untiring efforts to improve, and a spirit of voluntary contribution (Nishimura, 2014). In Cambodia, for example, it is reported that parents' norm, as being obedient to teachers and community leaders, as well as teachers' perceptions that regard parents as passive, with no interest in the learning environment of schools, jointly led to the limited degree of parental involvement in school management (Shoraku, 2008).

Therefore, access and provision of quality education is realized through the appropriate level of CP (UNESCO, 2006) policymakers, educators and other stakeholders involved in education are seeking ways to utilize the limited resources effectively and effectively to identify and solve problems in the education sector so that quality education can be provided for children. Because quality of education usually related with quality of material resources with their effective management; and without using the limited resources effectively it will be impossible to arrive at the intended goals. Although Participation in school management may include resource mobilization as well, the goals of the education sector development program cannot be achieved within the limited resources of the government (MOE, 2002).

In contrast to the earlier policies the current education and training policy has decided to decentralize the education sector with two major objectives: devolution and decentralization (Yodet et al, 2005). Giving away of responsibility and authority to the local people to enable the community to be involved in managing schools, the devolution of operational planning, budget allocation and control. Decentralization of school management will lessen the burden of responsibility from the government while building capacity at lower levels. Local people are in a better position to guide the integration of the school with the community participation at lower level will spread among the community awareness of their own capacity to solve



problem they face as well as motivate local people towards self-mobilization. In the second place, a decentralized education management system will encourage CP in decision-making and enhance accountability at lower level. Lower level management is also significance to make efficient use of local capacity and resources while increasing relevance by encouraging flexibility. So, community participation is has paramount importance not only in providing necessary resources for their schools but also in participating in managing the resources in the school devotedly.

## **2.5. Roles of Community in Managing School Resource**

In a decentralized education system, the community participates in decision making, planning, monitoring and evaluating the activities of the school improvement program. It has been conclusively stated that community participation in the school resource management has a lot of benefits that include ownership of the school by communities, and ability of the communities to support the school financially and materially, and the school becoming environment where democracy is practiced (Kaunda, 2005). The main reason is that school principal cannot go it alone. They need to enlist and harness the active participation and support of numerous other role players. These reasons and many more made the government to devise that national strategy for community participation in SIP through committees or associations, such as WETB, SIC, PTA (MOE, 2002). So in relation to school management, the communities or their representatives can participate in planning process of all school activities, in decision making, monitoring and evaluating, and in creating conducive school environment.

## **2.6. School Leadership and Management**

Democratic and participatory kind of leadership is mandatory to encourage and well-come the community in material resource management in the schools; unless, if the school leaders are autocratic who take all the responsibility for themselves and keep away the community, it would be difficult to talk about community participation. So, the school principals can play a great role in enhancing community participation in school material resource management if they are democratic leading the school but if they are dictatorial, community cannot get ways

of participating in school activities. Harris and Lambert (2003) claimed that the school improvement strategies can result in changing school culture and that leadership has an important part to play in defining and shaping schools culture. Florez et al, (2001) in Agbo (2007) indicate that the levels of community participation in school decision making are dependent largely on the leadership style of the principal and that it is important that the principal promotes democratic leadership in schools.

Furthermore, the study by Telem (2003) in Agbo (2007), found that the principal plays a central role in promoting parental involvement and limited parental involvement could be related to the governance structure of the school, the leadership style of the principals' feeling about parent's status and power and school climate. Where school is perceived as authoritarian institution, parents and community members do not feel welcome to participate in their children's education. They are not capable of taking any responsibility in school issues and tend to feel that education is something that should be taken care of by educational professional at school.

According to Mayer, J. (2007), the principal is responsible for encouraging the community representatives in school activities. School principals, therefore, not only welcome and encourage parents to participate in school resource management and other school activities, they need to be responsible for making sure that parents are involved and can have an impact. Furthermore, Mayer, J. (2007) explained that community need to participate to learn about the education process, determine the purpose of the school, implement the school program, and help appraise school program, so as to serve as important two way channels of combination between school and community. The principal, therefore, has to let them share in planning decision-making, development implementation, and evaluation; generally in the management of the school and other school activities.

## **2.7. Rationale for Community Participation in School Resource Management**

Education is a goal oriented activity that requires the participation of community. The community plays a significant role in preparing students to be competent in the changing world. Community participation in the school resource management will contribute to the

development of school policies and practices which could be most effective in improving educational relevancy, quality, access and academic performance of students and above all it increases feeling of ownership and responsiveness of community toward school (Bagin and Donald, 2005). Therefore, there must be active participation on the part of community in school resource management. It is through such participation that the community comes to know the school. It is as a result of such participation that the community will be able to raise questions, obtain information, express ideas, consider proposals and take positions on critical issues. It is also this that helps the community to become part of the decision-making process and assist the school to keep up with social change and bring about educational change.

The impact of community participation in school management is mixed at best in the past literatures. Empirical evidence, mostly from Latin American countries, has highlighted some impacts of community participation on the increased attendance of pupils and teachers and of pupils' learning achievements (Bruns et al., 2011). Taniguchi and Hiraka (2016) recently suggested some indirect positive relationship between community participation and learning achievements of pupils through improved school management in rural Malawi. In Senegal, a recent study that used a randomized control trial method reports that the impact of school grants was seen on French, mathematics, and oral reading test scores of Grade 3 students, especially on girls with high ability levels at baseline (Carneiro et al., 2015). Reviewing a wide range of the past empirical literatures, Bruns et al. (2011), note that a combination of school autonomy, students' learning assessment, and accountability to parents and other stakeholders brought better learning performance by students. Likewise, participation of community in school material resources management is undoubtedly mandatory, because in this era when the resources, without which school goals cannot be achieved, are so scarce, need stake-holders participation to ensure its effective usage to satisfy students' needs.

In more decentralized forms of school management, tension theoretically exists between teachers' professionalism and political legitimacy as represented by community participation (McGinn & Welsh, 1999). In Latin American countries such as Guatemala, where power to hire and dismiss teachers was devolved to community; tensions occurred between teachers and community members over personnel management and school policy (Tamura, 2012). However, most of the existing literature on developing countries does not reveal such tension. Rather, the

degree of participation is fairly limited due to the top-down nature of policy formation and implementation of decentralization and the difficulty of attitudinal and behavioral changes of people. So, community participation in school resource management can be negatively affected by the perceptions of students, teachers, principals, supervisors and other educational officials thinking as if school management is the task of officials from school to ministry of education and as if it were not the role of community as a whole.

## **2.8. Practices of Community Participation in School Resource Management**

In a decentralized education system, the community participates in decision making, planning, monitoring and evaluating the activities of the schools. It has been conclusively stated that community participation in school resource management has a lot of benefits that include ownership of the school by communities, and ability of the communities to support the school financially or materially, and then managing all its activities at which democracy is practiced (Kaunda, 2005). These reasons and many more made the government to devise that national strategy for community participation in school resource management through committees or associations, such as 'Woreda' Education and Training Board (WETB), SIC, PTA (MOE,2002).

### **2.8.1. Communication**

Schools are expected to communicate with communities about school programs and students' progress where school is providing necessary information to home and home is also providing necessary information to school (Pauline, 2010). Communication with all communities or stakeholders enables the school to generate and utilize all available resources. Purposeful and good communication with community enables them to feel more involved with the work of school and its aspiration (UNESCO, 2004). Supporting this, Morgan (2006) suggested that more meetings among school staffs, PTA, parents, community members and expressing their respect and contributions can motivate stakeholders to participate in school affairs and make meaningful communication and understanding each other.

### **2.8.2. Community empowerment**

As Mitrofanaova (2011) explained it community empowerment enables individuals, organizations and community at large to share, ‘power’ to collectively analyze problems, propose solutions, mobilize and manage resources and act effectively to transform their school and environment. By getting opportunity in decision making process through participation on school improvement committee, members of PTA, kebele board, and the like initiates community members for their dedication in managing school resources. This leads the school to the process of organizing community in to unit engagement in exploring school issues and set priorities in planning together, act together and evaluating together for the best development of the school.

## **2.9. Factors Affecting Community Participation in School Resource Management**

A number of factors are associated with the community itself when it comes to decrease its level to participation in school resource management. Some of them are below.

### **2.9.1. Community interest**

Not all community members are willing to participate in school resource management. Some have negative schooling experiences to themselves. Others are illiterate and do not feel comfortable talking to teachers. In their effort to suggest solutions, Cummings and Dall (1995) note that when schools face with reluctance or resistance to their efforts, they have to make their programs transparent and reach the community using several mechanisms such as inviting elders dignitaries, and celebrities to schools.

### **2.9.2. Awareness of community**

Community members need to know that their inputs are important for schools to accomplish the task effectively. In line with the Cummings and Dall (1995) stated that community members should understand that without their support schools face challenges to accomplish their tasks fully in order to achieve their intended objectives. As Jensen et al (1967) state that people have different perceptions about the support they are required to provide. Some look at

financial support of schools program as a burden, while others see it as an imposition. Some others who have no children in schools question their being compelled to support the education of other people. He further claimed that misunderstanding of community members regarding the roles they have in relation to the schools is one of the drawbacks which affect both the school and the community. To avoid this misunderstanding, school should establish strong, public relations as a means for raising levels of understanding interrelationships as well as support.

### **2.9.3. Fear**

One of PTA members is teacher and can either positively or negatively affects community participation in school resource management. He or she can play a great role in enhancing community representatives to participate in school affairs if he or she does not have negative attitude towards them. Fear affects teachers and they may do little to encourage community involvement. When teachers are uncertain or insecure about their own teaching skills, they fear criticism of how they do their job and discourage community participation in their classrooms. When such condition happens communities are made to feel unwelcome in many different ways (Barbour and Barbour, 1997). Such problem is then can also be the basis of distrust among teachers and communities.

### **2.9.4. Insecurity and intimidation**

Research conducted by Dixon in Molnar (2006) out lined that the barrier to more community's participation is not the apathy communities but lack of support from educators in the case of insecurity and intimidation between parents and educators. In some cases, communities actually felt that their students might be singled out or treated unfairly in grading by teachers who deemed parents to be interfering. Teachers talk defensively about being verbally attacked by parents and parents share discomfort entering schools due to their own level of education or past experience in schools. All these problems create walls between homes and school and limit community participation in school resource management.

### **2.9.5. Professional territory**

Molnar (2006) also states that there is an insider outsider tension that results between school staff and community members. Parents are never quite insiders because the minute they go too far they are subtly reminded that they are stepping into professional territory. He also further explained that, at times, teachers consider parents troublesome because they question, challenge, and take time. Educators feel threatened about intrusion into their territory and parents are not safe if they trust teachers or other parents. All these situations will develop a protection territory among all stakeholders which influence parental involvement negatively.

### **2.9.6. Awareness of principals and teachers**

The negative attitude of teachers and principals towards community participation can make the community to participate in school material resource management passively. Some teachers and principals purposely or unknowingly, discourage community participation (Kandasukmy and Lia, 2004). Supporting this, the report of UNESCO (2002) noted that principals and teachers sometimes refuse to encourage the school board and association board members or parents to actively participate for they fear that these community members would get overall control of the pedagogical matters which they have no mastery. On the other hand, principals and teachers may perceive that school board and association members often have few decision making skills and they degraded the capacities of the community representatives to participate in the educational activities of the school. Parents who had unpleasant school experiences are often reluctant to participate in school affairs because they develop negative attitude to the school (Barbours and Barbours, 1997).

### **2.9.7. Communication factors**

Communication barriers arise when the intent of the message and the content as perceived by the receiver differ, when the honesty of the message is questionable, when the language and cultural gap is large, when there is lack of understanding between parties, or the idea is not accurately communicated to the community (Schaffer and Bet, 1992).

## **2.10. Strategies of Enhancing Community Participation in School Resource Management**

Schools should develop strategies to ensure the participation of community in school resource management. The following are from among the strategies.

### **2.10.1. Empowering school principals and teachers**

Principals and teachers play a pivotal role in the success of the school. In successful schools, principals create a strong sense of mission and vision; build a strong culture of collaboration; set appropriate curriculum implementation mechanisms; possess an instructional leadership that takes responsibility for students achievement; develop and communicate plans for effective teaching , and nurture cooperative relationship with community members in general (MOE, 2005).Accomplishing all these requires some degrees of competence and these, in turn, necessitate further and continuous capacity building trainings.

In the same way, teachers also need to undergo similar training for the same purpose of enabling them create a participatory management style by involving the local people in planning, decision making, implementing plans, developing school based budget and monitoring and evaluation (MOE, 2002), UNESCO (2002) also notes that school leaders and teachers need training in how to manage their autonomy and collaborative responsibilities. Lack of training creates problems of communication with community members. Supporting this idea Holliday in Bagin (2001), explains that educators communicate poorly because they have little communication experiences almost no meaningful communication training. Thus, training principals and teachers on how to involve the community in the school program activities is essential.

### **2.10.2. Creating a school environment conducive for participation**

The school has to create an environment suitable for the community to participate in school resource management. It must initiate the community to participate and appreciate its contribution. When members of the community are welcomed and get respected in their participation, they would be more motivated and exert more and better efforts (Morgan 2006). In addition to welcoming the participation of the community, schools have to adjust



appropriate time and place for members of the community to participate on different school activities. Therefore, the school principals, teachers and others should create conducive school environment that invite the communities to participate in school resource management.

### **2.10.3. Giving orientation and training to community representatives**

Community members may attend meeting passively without adding an input. This could be due to lack of confidence or knowledge. It is essential to give orientation and training for building their capacity which could enable them to understand their rights, play expected role, and discharge responsibilities accordingly (UNESCO, 2002). In agreement with this idea, the world bank (1997) states that if communities or their representatives get training, they will maximize their effort and participate actively in school programs.

### **2.10.4. Providing community service**

The Ministry of education (MOE, 2005) states that some of the ways which are used to build community participation are arranging some programs such as bazaar, parents' day, plays and sport festivals. A program must be arranged for parents to come to school physically as a team or individually, to enable them to evaluate and give their suggestions about their students' academic progress. Community members who actively participate in school affairs must be acknowledged or awarded a recognition that gives them value in the society. Therefore, the school has to involve the community in its different programs through the committees or associations elected from the community. In addition to this, the school has to have planned communication mechanisms which enable the community to assist teachers and create a sense of ownership.

### **3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

The research design and methodology part included description of study area, research design, sources of data: primary sources of data and secondary sources of data, population, sample size and sampling technique, instrument of data collection: questionnaire, interview and document analysis, data collection procedures, method of data analysis and ethical considerations.

#### **3.1. Description of Study Area**

The study area was South-West Showa Zone, Oromia regional state. There were eleven woredas and one administrative town in the zone. The geographical areas of the zone are divided into high land and low land. The climatic conditions of South West Showa are temperate, sub-tropical and tropical. The number of population estimated around 1.2 million. Most of the zonal people economic activities are depending on farming; the dominant religion practiced in the zone is Christianity and Afan Oromo is the dominant language in the area. Some people are merchants and a few are government workers. There are a lot of educational institutions in the zone. These are: one branch of Ambo university - Woliso campus, one poly Technique College, and three technical and vocational colleges, eleven preparatory schools, twenty eight secondary schools and four hundred and nine primary schools. (Source: South-west Showa Zone Communication Office of 2016)

#### **3.2. Research Design**

In this study, descriptive survey design with both quantitative and qualitative approaches were used. Quantitative data gathered through questionnaire and it was the major data but the qualitative data that had been obtained from interview was used to support quantitative data. It was used as a means for convergence and integrating qualitative and quantitative data (Creswell, 2009). Descriptive survey design involves acquiring information about one or more groups of people-perhaps about their characteristics, opinions, attitudes or previous experiences. Similarly, Best and Kahan (2003) noted that descriptive research design helps to describe and interpret the current conditions.

### **3.3. Sources of Data**

The data were gathered from primary and secondary sources to accomplish the study, to get reliable and valid information.

#### **3.3.1. The primary sources of data**

The sources of primary data were gathered from school principals, vice principals, teachers, school supervisors, woreda education heads and PTAs using questionnaire and interview.

#### **3.3.2. The secondary sources of data**

The secondary sources of data were gathered from PTA documents and their different minutes of meetings at different time.

### **3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Technique**

The target populations of this study were eight woredas, eight governmental secondary schools, teachers, principals, vice-principals, secondary schools supervisors, parent – teacher association (PTA) and Woreda educational office heads from eight government secondary schools of eight different woredas of South-West Showa Zone, Oromia Regional State. The selection procedures are indicated as follows: this 28.57% (n=8) of secondary schools was selected using simple random sampling technique for the study. In these eight sample secondary schools, the number of teachers varied from school to school. So, the researcher selected teachers using simple random sampling technique from each school to give them equal chance as shown in the table below. Totally, 394 teachers were found in these sampled government secondary schools and 30.7% (n=121) of them were selected as sample for the study using simple random sampling technique.

The total number of PTA representatives in the sampled schools was 56 and each school had 7 committee members. But the researcher selected a sample of 100% (n=8) chairpersons from the sampled schools using purposive sampling technique because of their position and it was expected that they were either actual implementer or evaluators of each activity of the school. Regarding officials, each secondary school had one principal, two vice-principals, one high

school supervisor, and total number of eight principals, thirteen vice-principals, eight supervisors and eight woreda education heads were selected using available sampling technique because they were small in numbers and were manageable. In general, 100% (n=8) principals, 100% (n=13) vice-principals, 100% (n=8) supervisors, 100% (n=8) woreda education office heads, 100% (n=8) PTA chair-persons and 121 (30.7%) of teachers were included in the study.

**Table1. Population and sample size of the study**

S.N	Woreda	schools	Total Population						Sample population							
			Principal	Vice Prin/1	Supervisor	Teachers	PTA	WEO head	Total	principal	vice	Supervisor	Teachers	PTA	WEO head	Total
1	Ameya	Gindo	1	2	1	50	7	1	<b>62</b>	1	2	1	18	1	1	<b>24</b>
2	Wonchi	chitu	1	2	1	50	7	1	<b>62</b>	1	2	1	18	1	1	<b>24</b>
3	Goro	Goro	1	1	1	24	7	1	<b>35</b>	1	1	1	8	1	1	<b>13</b>
4	Woliso	Geresu Town Duki	1	1	1	85	7	1	<b>96</b>	1	1	1	25	1	1	<b>30</b>
5	Woliso	Woliso Town	1	1	1	34	7	1	<b>45</b>	1	1	1	10	1	1	<b>17</b>
6	Woliso	Dilala rural	1	2	1	45	7	1	<b>69</b>	1	2	1	12	1	1	<b>16</b>
7	Bacho	Yehibret fire	1	2	1	57	7	1	<b>57</b>	1	2	1	15	1	1	<b>21</b>
8	Ilu	Teji	1	2	1	49	7	1	<b>61</b>	1	2	1	15	1	1	<b>21</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>166</b>

Source: South-West Showa Zone Education Bureau

### 3.5. Instruments of Data Collection

The study employed both quantitative and qualitative data. Both types of data were gathered by using appropriate data collecting tools: questionnaire, interview and document analysis in order to obtain ample information from respondents. Thus, questionnaire were the major data collecting tool which was used in this study and all the questions were answered through it

whereas, interview and document analysis were used to get the view of respondents for further in-depth information to enrich the data obtained from questionnaire.

### **3.5.1. Questionnaire**

The first instrument employed in the study was questionnaire which comprise of both open ended and close ended items. It was convenient to receive real data and adequate information from a large number of respondents with a short period of time. The same kind of questionnaire was prepared for both groups: for teachers and officials (principals, vice-principals and supervisors). The questionnaire had three parts. Part one: personal information of the participant; part two: close-ended questions with the five rating scales and part three included the open ended questions. The type of questionnaire was close ended with five rating scales to get quick responses and also there was open ended not to restrict the respondents' ideas, feeling or opinion if any.

The questionnaire had been reviewed, designed with the help of advisors to check whether they could generate the desired information (validity) and to judge their internal consistency (reliability). Based on these valuable suggestions and recommendations modification was made, retyped and made ready for reliability test. Then the instrument was pilot tested in Kersa secondary school. The school was selected because it was convenient and had common characteristic similar to other schools. Accordingly, questionnaires were distributed to 20 teachers, 1 principal, one vice principals and 1 supervisor.

After respondents had filled the questionnaire, the result of the pilot test was statistically computed by the SPSS V.20 program software. The Cronbach's Alpha Model was used for analysis of the data. Based on the result of this pilot test, the reliability alphas for the awareness of PTA members about community participation in school resource management; the current status of school leaders in initiating school participation in school material resource management; the barriers of community participation and the strategies to improve community participation was calculated. Based on the pilot test, the reliability coefficients for the four items were 0.982, 0.970, 973 and 0.904 respectively. The average reliability coefficient found to be 0.935 (93.5%) and, hence, was taken to be reliable. The instrument was found to be reliable as statistical literature recommend a test result of 0.65 (65% reliability) and

above as reliable (George & Mallery, 2003). Lastly, after reliability test, it was distributed to 121 teachers, 8 principals, 13 vice principals and 8 supervisors for the purpose of the research

### **3.5.2. Interview**

The interview was another instrument which was used by researcher in order to get in depth information and to cross check the information gathered through questionnaire about community participation in school material resource management in south-west Showa zone, Oromia regional state. Leedy and Ormrod (2005) described that interview was a major tool in which a qualitative evaluator seeks to understand the perceptions, feeling and knowledge of people in program through in-depth, intensive interviewing. For this matter, the same kind of interview guide questions was prepared for both woreda education office heads and PTA chair persons by the researcher and then reviewed and redesigned by advisors for its clarity. The questions were prepared with the main focus to get detail information regarding research questions of the study and then face to face communication was made with both groups to get their views. For all woreda education officers the same questions were developed in English as all of them were degree-holders, but the questions were translated to Afan Oromo to eliminate any ambiguity for some PTA Members as they were not degree holders.

### **3.6. Data Collection Procedures**

At the beginning contacts were done through phone and face-to-face with secondary school principals, supervisors and woreda education office-heads to get their permission, build trust and describing the mission and purpose of the study. Next the instruments had been developed for data collection then submitted for evaluation to the advisor in the process, before the actual data was employed on the studies. Finally, based on the appropriate time chosen by respondents given by the schools with help of assistants, the questionnaires which were prepared to concerned teachers was distributed, administered and collected. After the completion of questionnaire, firstly, the researcher interviewed PTA chairpersons then woreda education office heads based on questions on the check list.

### **3.7. Method of Data Analysis**

In order to achieve the objectives, data obtained from the questionnaire were organized, tabulated and described quantitatively using frequency, percentage, mean value and chi-square with the help of SPSS V.20 program software. For the open-ended questions and interview the data was organized logically and narrated accordingly.

#### **3.7.1. Quantitative data**

The quantitative data which had been collected from the two sets of questionnaire were computed and analyzed using SPSS V.20 program software to obtain the frequency, percentage, mean value and chi-square of each item. The responses were categorized and frequencies were tallied. Percentage was used to analyze the characteristics of the population as they help to determine the relative standing of the respondents and the mean was used to analyze the average of the responses, whereas, the chi-square was used to check whether there exist significant difference between the two group of respondents or not.

#### **3.7.2. Qualitative data**

The data which was collected from semi-structured interview and open ended question items were analyzed qualitatively. The written notes of interview was transcribed, categorized and compiled together into theme. The result of open-ended questions was summarized and organized with related category. Qualitative data analysis was employed as a supplementary data analysis technique for triangulation and justification purpose. As a result, the data collected through interview and open ended questions was narrated under the data obtained through questionnaire items related to it.

### **3.8. Ethical Consideration**

The researcher had the necessary ethics when conducting the research to get reliable information. For instance, the researcher was free from abuse like smoking, chewing chat, drinking alcohol; he respected social norms and values of the respondents and was free from plagiarism as it causes harsh punishment. In addition to that, the researcher respected and accepted any kind of comment and correction from advisor and co-advisor. Furthermore, the

researcher was active and consistent to accomplish his work according to the plan and respected the response and suggestions of the respondents.



#### 4. RESULTS AND DICUSSIONS

This chapter presents the description of the sample population, analysis and interpretation of the data based on the information obtained through the questionnaires, interviews and document analysis. It consists of two parts. The first part is concerned with the description of characteristics of the respondents whereas; the second part deals with the analysis and interpretation of the data obtained from questionnaire, interview and document analysis. The purpose of this data was to explore community participation in school material resource management in the secondary schools of South West Shoa Zone, Oromia regional state.

For this purpose, the questionnaire, the interview and document analysis were used to collect data from the respondents. The questionnaire data was collected from 119(98.3%) of teachers as two of them did not filled and returned the questionnaires, 8(100%) principals, 13(100%) vice principals and 8(100%) supervisors. Whereas, 8(100%) secondary school PTA chair persons and 8(100% woreda education officers were interviewed. Schools' PTA documents and reports were also analyzed in this section of the study. Finally, the research analyses were done based on the data obtained from the questionnaires, interview results and document analysis.

Teachers, principals, vice principals and high school supervisors responded to both open and closed-ended questionnaire items. The closed-ended items across sub-categories were computed and analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean scores and chi-square. Percentage was utilized for easy presentation of frequency distribution and for comparison of the degree of the community participation in school material resource management. In addition, items across each category were arranged under the rating scale with five points. These five rating scale range from strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, undecided = 3, disagree = 2 and strongly disagree = 1.

Besides, data from interviews, and document analysis were triangulated to validate the findings. Mean scores and t-test were calculated from the responses. For the purpose of easy analysis and interpretation, the mean values and chi-square of each item were interpreted as follows.

#### 4.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The following parts deal with the characteristics of the respondents who were participated in the study. The details of the characteristics of the respondents are given in table 2 below.

**Table2: Characteristics of Respondents by Sex, Age, Service Years and Qualification.**

Description		Teachers		School Leaders	
		N	%	N	%
<b>Sex</b>	Male	98	82.35	29	100
	Female	21	17.65	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Age</b>	10-20	-	-	-	-
	20-30	50	42	11	38
	31-40	61	51	15	52
	≥41	8	7	3	10
	<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100</b>
	<b>Total years of services</b>	0-5 years	23	19	-
	6-10years	19	19	10	34
	11-15years	61	51	19	66
	16-20	6	4	-	-
	21-25	8	4	-	-
	Above 26years	2	3	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Educational Qualification</b>	Diploma	2	1.7	-	-
	BA/BSC	114	95.8	25	86
	MA/MSC	3	2.5	4	14
	<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>

As shown in table 2 above, out of 148 respondents, 127(85.8%) were males whereas 21(14.2%) were females. Concerning principals and secondary school supervisors all respondents were males. This shows that the essential data was mainly obtained from male respondents. Moreover, one can understand that the number of females in the teaching profession is much lower compared to males in secondary schools of South West Shoa Zone ,Oromia regional state. In the same way all the PTA chairpersons and woreda education officers interviewed were males which could be said that the number of female teachers coming to authority was also very low.

As can be seen from the above table 2, majority 61 (51%) of teachers, 4(50%) of principals, 7(54%) of vice principals and 4(50%) of supervisors were belong to the age group of 31-40. Thus, this implies that all the respondents were experienced and matured enough to express ideas related to the study consistently and with better understanding. Therefore, their judgments and opinions can be taken as more acceptance to the study. With regard to work experience, the majority of respondents 61(51%) teachers, 6(75%) of principals, 9(69) vice principals and 4(50%) of supervisors had 11-15 years of service. This shows that adequate number of respondents can provide better and recent information on the extent of community participation in school material resource management and about its barriers.

Regarding the educational back ground of respondents, 114(95.8%) of teachers, 8(100%) principals, 13(100%) vice principals and 4(50%) of supervisors were first degree holders. This implies that the qualification standards set by MoE were achieved. The standard states that minimum request qualification to teach at secondary schools is first degree (MoE, 2006). From this it can be concluded that all the respondents are experienced and matured enough to give valuable information for this research and can easily understand the purpose of the study. So, all the respondents can simply identify how community participates in school resource management and what hinders them.

#### **4.2. How Community Participates in Material Resource Management in secondary schools.**

This part deals with different items such as knowledge and roles of PTA members, roles of school leaders, inventory control by PTA members, regularly checking of school material resources' storage, protection of school facilities, ensuring fair distribution and accountability for misused school material resources among the users. Each item was analyzed based on the data obtained through questionnaires responded by teachers and officials (principals, vice principals, supervisors) and further backed by the data obtained from interview and document analysis. Therefore, the twelve items were interpreted as indicated in table 3 below.

**Table3: How Community Participates in Material Resource Management in Secondary Schools**

No	Items under no I	Respondents	Rating scales										Mean	X <sup>2</sup>	.Sig
			S.disagre		Disagre		Undeci		Agree		S.Agre				
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
1	PTA members know each of the school material resource in detail	Te	7	5.9	81	68	12	10	9	8	10	9	2.4	14.53	0.007
		offi	6	21	12	41	8	28	2	7	1	4	2.3		
		Tot	13	9	93	63	20	14	11	8	11	7	2.3		
2	PTA members controlled the school material resources with careful inventory	Te	13	11	79	66	10	9	8	7	9	8	2.3	17.170	0.000
		offi	9	31	10	35	6	21	3	10	-	-	2.2		
		Tot	22	15	89	61	16	10	11	8	10	7	2.2		
3	PTA members regularly check how school materials are stored	Te	10	9	83	70	9	8	12	10	5	5	2.3	22.725	0.000
		offi	7	24	9	31	9	31	4	14	-	-	2.4		
		Tot	17	12	92	62	18	12	16	10	5	4	2.3		
4	PTA members regularly check expire date of school material resources	Te	2	1.7	90	76	16	13	6	5	5	4	2.3	13.72	0.014
		offi	5	17	16	55	5	17	2	7	1	3	2.3		
		Tot	7	5	106	72	21	14	8	5	6	4	2.3		
5	PTA members protected the school facilities from danger	Te	5	4.3	61	51	19	16	21	18	13	1	2.8	15.251	0.004
		offi	7	24	9	31	6	21	6	21	1	3	2.5		
		Tot	12	8	70	47	25	17	27	18	14	9	2.6		
6	PTA members know their role and the role of school leaders	Te	11	9.2	87	73	8	7	10	8	3	3	2.3	17.01	0.000
		offi	8	27	10	35	6	21	4	14	1	3	2.2		
		Tot	19	13	97	66	14	10	14	10	4	3	2.2		
7	PTA members have had regular meetings with the school leaders about school material resources	Te	11	9.2	68	57	13	11	10	8	17	1	2.6	12.807	0.007
		offi	8	27	12	41	5	17	4	14	-	-	2.2		
		Tot	19	13	80	54	18	12	14	10	17	1	2.4		
8	The school and PTA members usually work in collaboration to carry out inventory control	Te	16	13	60	50	14	12	21	18	8	7	2.5	4.935	0.236
		offi	6	21	14	48	6	21	3	10	-	-	2.2		
		Tot	22	15	74	50	20	14	24	16	8	5	2.3		
9	PTA ensures the accountability for misused school material resources	Te	13	11	69	58	18	15	11	9	8	7	2.4	6.328	0.95
		offi	8	27	14	48	4	14	2	7	1	3	2		
		Tot	21	14	83	56	22	15	13	9	9	6	2.2		
10	PTA ensures fair distribution of school material resources	Te	17	14	93	78	9	8	-	-	-	-	1.9	15.64	0.000
		offi	11	38	13	45	4	14	1	3	-	-	1.8		
		Tot	28	19	106	72	13	9	1	.7	-	-	1.8		
11	The school and PTA members usually work in collaboration for the maintenance of school material re	Te	15	13	90	76	10	8	3	3	1	.8	2	10.20	0.027
		offi	4	14	15	52	8	27	1	3	1	3	2.4		
		Tot	19	13	105	71	18	12	4	3	2	1	2.2		
12	PTA find alternatives for maintenance with cost minimized	Te	11	9.2	81	68	16	13	7	6	4	3	2.2	2.203	0.757
		offi	3	10	16	55	6	21	2	7	2	7	2.5		
		Tot	14	9.5	97	66	22	15	9	9	6	4	2.3		

Key: Te=teacher, Offi= officials, Tot= total, X<sup>2</sup>=Chi-square, Table value = 5.991 at 0.05 alpha

In item 1 of table 3, the respondents were asked to rate the extent of PTA members awareness about school material resources. Accordingly, 81 (68%) teachers and 12(44.4%) officials disagreed with the idea that PTA members know each of the school material resources in detail. In the same way, as we can see from the table the mean score 2.4 for teachers, 2.3 for Officials assured that PTA members didn't know each of the school material resources in detail. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 14.533$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed that PTA members had lack of awareness but only some officials agreed with this idea as they were responsible and it was expected from them to bring the change. So, this result reveals that PTA members had lack of awareness in managing school material resources. Furthermore, an interview held with a school PTA chairperson also supported this. He said:

*We PTA members say that some basic activities are not our concern it should be done by school leaders. Particularly, some few of our members even do not know why the community selects them as PTA members; they don't give their due attention for that and don't care to know the school material resources in detail. But, we love our school and we want its development and change so we will work hard as much as possible being with all stake holders.*

It can be seen from the interview that PTA members generally lacked awareness about their contribution of participating in the school material resource management. In the same way, school leaders lacked raising the awareness of PTA members in school material resources management.

In the same way, the result of document analysis also showed that there were only two minutes of meetings between school and PTA members in 5 schools that have agendas of school material resource usage which shows that the schools, PTA and WETB members almost were not working together. No reports were made in 5(62%) of schools regarding decisions made on school material resource usage: school to PTA and school to WETB.

As indicated in the above table 3 item 2, the respondents were asked to give their view about the extent to which PTA members controlled the school material resources from buying to its disposal. Accordingly, 79 (66.4%) teachers and 10(35%) officials disagreed with the idea that states PTA members controlled school material resource from buying until its disposal with careful inventory. In addition to that, as one can see from the table, the mean score 2.3 for teachers, 2.2 for officials and the average mean value 2.2 help to conclude that the extent to which PTA members controlled the school material resources from buying to its disposal was weak. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 17.171$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items.

This means that compared to officials, more teachers agreed that PTA members didn't control material resources from buying to its disposal carefully but less number of officials agreed with it thinking that blaming themselves as bringing more of the change expected from the officials themselves by mobilizing the community. So, this result reveals that PTA members couldn't control school material resources from buying to its disposal. Furthermore, an interview held with a school PTA chairperson also supported this. He said:

*Secondary schools' PTA members could give no attention to control the school material resources some students' disciplinary problems happen. Since they don't have regular schedule to come and manage the schools' activities and resources how they can control each and every school material resources. So, unless strong strategies employed to enhance their participation, it is impossible to arrive at the desired goals...why not it is possible but it needs commitment and determination.., he added.*

So, it can be said that school PTA members need awareness creation mechanisms to involve them in school material resource management as expected. The document analysis took place showed that there were no agenda, or no minute found with regard to school material resource management. So, from this it can be said that unless on other issues PTA members haven't participated in school material resource management.

In item 3 table of 3, 83 (70%) teachers and 9(31%) officials disagreed and said that PTA members didn't regularly check if the school material resources were stored in adequate spaces. In addition to that, as we can see from the table, the mean score 2.3 for teachers, 2.4 for officials and the average mean value 2.3 approve that PTA members didn't regularly check if the school material resources were stored in adequate spaces. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 22.721$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed that there was lack of regularly checking the storage of material resources in the school. So, this result reveals that PTA members didn't regularly check the storage of school material resources.

In item 4 of table 3, respondents were asked to rate the extent of regularly checking expire date of school material resource. The table shows those 90 (75.6%) teachers and 16(55%) officials responded that PTA members didn't regularly check the expiry date of school material resource. In addition to that, as one can see from the table, the mean score 2.3 for teachers, 2.3 for officials and the average mean value 2.3 ensure that PTA members didn't regularly check the expiry date of school material resource. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 13.718$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed that there was lack of regularly checking expire date of material resources in the school but some officials agreed with it in fear of blaming themselves as they are responsible persons. So, this result reveals that PTA members didn't manage the expiry date of school material resources.

In item 5 of table 3, the respondents were asked to answer the degree to which PTA members protected the school facilities from danger. The table shows those 61 (51.3%) teachers and 9(31 %) officials responded with disagreement saying that the degree to which PTA members protected the school facilities from danger was weak. However, 21 (17.6%) teachers and 6 (21%) officials responded with agreement that the degree to which PTA members protected the school facilities from danger was strong and encouraging. To sum up, as one can see from the table, the mean score 2.8 for teachers, 2.5 for officials and the average mean 2.6 ensure that the degree to which PTA members protected the school facilities from danger was found at

moderate circumstances. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 15.251$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed that the protection of PTA members for school facilities was not as expected. So, this result reveals that the protection that PTA members have done for school was moderate but still hard work is needed.

In item 6 of table 3, the respondents were asked to answer the degree to which PTA members knew their roles and the roles of the school leaders separately. The table shows those 87 (73%) teachers and 10 (35 %) officials disagreed with the idea that states PTA members knew their roles and the roles of the school leaders separately. In addition to the above data, as one can see from the table, the mean score 2.3 for teachers, 2.3 for officials and the average mean value 2.2 ensures that PTA members didn't know their roles and the roles of the school leaders separately. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 17.018$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed with the idea that PTA members didn't know their roles and the roles of the school leaders separately. So, this result reveals that PTA members didn't know their role and the role of school leaders.

In item 7 of table 3, the respondents were asked to answer the degree to which PTA members have had regular meetings with the school concerning school material resources. The table shows those 68 (57%) teachers and 12(41%) officials responded that PTA members have not had regular meetings with the school concerning school material resources. Moreover, as one can see from the table, the average mean value 2.3 shows that PTA members have not had regular meetings with the school concerning school material resources. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 12.807$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that compared to officials, more teachers agreed that PTA members had no regular meetings with the school concerning material resources because officials were responsible and expected to bring the change. So, this result reveals that PTA members have not had regular meetings with the school leaders.



In item 8 of table 3, the respondents were asked to answer the degree to which the school and PTA members work in collaboration in carrying out inventory control of the school material resources. The table shows those 60 (50.4%) teachers and 14 (48 %) officials responded that the school and PTA members didn't work in collaboration in carrying out inventory control of the school material resources. However, as one can see from the table, the mean score 2.5 for teachers expresses that the school and PTA members work in collaboration in carrying out inventory control of the school material resources; whereas the average mean value 2.3 proves that the school and PTA members didn't work in collaboration in carrying out inventory control of the school material resources. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 4.935$ ) which is less than the critical value of  $\chi^2=5.991$ , showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. So, this result reveals that PTA members hadn't carry out inventory control with the schools.

In item 9 of table 3, the respondents were asked to answer the degree to which PTA members ensure the accountability for misused school material resources. The table shows those 69 (58%) teachers and 14 (48 %) officials responded that PTA members didn't ensure the accountability for misused school material resources. Furthermore, the average mean value 2.2 proves that the degree to which PTA members ensure the accountability for misused school material resources was almost not functional. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 6.328$ ) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. So, this result reveals that PTA members didn't ensure the accountability for misused material resources.

In item 10 of table 3, the respondents were asked to answer the degree to which PTA ensures fair distribution of school material resources among the users. The table shows those 93 (78.2%) teachers and 13 (45 %) officials responded that PTA members didn't ensures fair distribution of school material resources among the users. In addition to the above data, as one can see from the table, the mean score is 1.9 for teachers, 1.8 for officials and the average mean value 1.8 witnesses that PTA members didn't ensure fair distribution of school material

resources among the users. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 15.640$ ) which is greater than the critical value  $\chi^2=5.991$ , showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that compared to officials, more teachers agreed that there was no ensured fair distribution of school material resources among the users. So, this result reveals that PTA members didn't ensure fair distribution of material resources. Furthermore, an interview held with a head of woreda education office also supported this. He said:

*Secondary schools' PTA members could not control the school material resources. I hear that when some teachers blame directors about unfair usage of school material resources among them but PTA members do not see it as their concern; because, they don't have regular schedule to come and manage the schools material.*

In item 11 of table 3, the respondents were asked to answer the extent to which the school and PTA members work in collaboration in accomplishing and monitoring maintenance of the school material resources. The table shows those 90 (75.6%) teachers and 15 (42 %) officials responded that the school and PTA members didn't work in collaboration in accomplishing and monitoring maintenance of the school material. In addition to the above data, as one can see from the table, the mean score is 2.0 for teachers, 2.4 for officials and the average mean value 2.2 tell us that the school and PTA members didn't work in collaboration in accomplishing and monitoring maintenance of the school material resources.

Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 10.207$ ) which is greater than the critical value of  $\chi^2= 5.991$ , showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed that there was no collaboration between the schools and officials in monitoring maintenance of the schools. So, this result reveals that PTA members didn't work in collaboration with school in the maintenance of school material resources.

In item 12 of table 3, the respondents were asked to answer the extent to which PTA members find alternatives to accomplish it with cost minimized to save the school budget. The table

shows those 81 (68%) teachers and, 16 (55 %) officials responded with disagreement expressing those PTA members almost didn't find alternatives to accomplish it with cost minimized to save the school budget. In addition to the above data, the average mean value 2.4 indicates that PTA members almost didn't find alternatives to accomplish it with cost minimized to save the school budget. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 2.203$ ) which is less than the critical value of  $\chi^2 = 5.991$ , showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. So, this result reveals that PTA members didn't work in finding alternatives to save the school budget. Furthermore, an interview held with a head of woreda education office also supported this. He said:

*Secondary schools' PTA members could not control the school material resources. They were, of course, present to plan and run particularly school Grant budget as the directory cannot run it but serve as facilitator, in other cases PTA members didn't involve themselves in. PTA members do not see it as their concern; because, they don't have regular schedule to come and manage the schools material.*

So, it can be said that school PTA members only focused on some general activities but they didn't work on all kinds of activities to save the school budget to enhance the availability and quality of school material resources. The document analysis took place also showed that there were no reports made regarding decisions in finding alternatives to save the school budget.

### **4.3. How school leaders motivate Community Participation in material Resource Management.**

This section deals with the items related to the current status of school leaders in initiating community participation in school material resource management. Each item is analyzed based on the data obtained through questionnaires responded by teachers, principals, vice principals and supervisors and then further backed by the data obtained from interview and document analysis. Accordingly, the five items were interpreted as indicated in the table below

Table4: How school leaders motivate Community Participation in material Resource Management.

N o	Items under no II	Respond e	Rating scales										X <sup>2</sup>	Sig	
			S.disagre		Disagre		Undeci		Agree		S.Agre				Mea
			F	%	F	%	F	%			F	%			
1	The school has set annual plan on how to manage school material resources	Te	20	17	70	58	13	11	10	8	6	5	2.3	3.424	0.473
		offi	5	17	13	45	5	17	3	10	3	10	2.4		
		Tot	25	17	83	56	18	12	13	9	9	6	2.3		
2	The school has regular schedule to meet with PTA members on the issues related to community participation	Te	15	13	71	60	14	12	9	8	1	8	2.4	1.258	0.865
		offi	4	14	15	52	3	10	4	14	3	10	2.5		
		Tot	19	13	86	58	17	12	13	9	1	9	2.4		
3	Different meetings take place between school leaders and PTA members about school material resource management	Te	10	8	75	63	16	13	9	8	9	8	2.4	2.841	0.581
		offi	4	14	14	48	5	17	4	14	2	7	2.6		
		Tot	14	10	89	60	21	14	13	9	1	7	2.5		
4	School leaders are empowered to manage school material resources	Te	9	8	77	65	18	15	10	8	5	4	2.4	2.811	0.588
		offi	5	17	13	79	6	21	3	10	2	7	2.5		
		Tot	14	10	90	61	24	16	13	9	7	5	2.4		
5	Generally, the current status of school leaders in initiating community participation is in a good direction	Te	6	5	88	74	16	13	5	4	4	3	2.3	3.168	0.554
		offi	1	3	18	62	17	3	10	2	7	8	2.3		
		Tot	7	5	106	72	21	14	8	5	6	4	2.3		

Key: Key: Te=teacher, Offi= officials, Tot= total, X<sup>2</sup>=Chi-square, Table value = 5.991 at 0.05 alpha  
Officials: (Principals, vice principals and supervisors)

In item 1 of table 4 the respondents were asked to rate whether the school has set annual plan on how to manage school material resources. Accordingly, 70(58.3%) of teachers and 13(45%) of officials disagreed with the idea which shows that the schools were in problem in setting annual plan on how to manage school material resources. There is no significant difference between the two respondent groups. The mean value for teachers (2.3) and for officials (2.4) shows that the schools didn't give attention for this activity. The average mean value of the response 2.3 implies that the schools were weak in setting annual plan on how to manage school material resource management. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $x^2 = 3.442$ ) which is less than the critical value of  $x^2 = 5.991$ , showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that a considerable proportion of both teachers and officials

equally agreed that there was lack of setting annual plan on how to manage material resource management. So, this result showed the weakness of the schools in setting annual plan on how to manage school material resources.

In item 2 of table 4, the respondents were asked to rate that whether the schools have regular schedule to meet with PTA members on the issues related to community participation in school material resource management. As we can see from the responses, from the respondents 71(60%) teachers and 15(52%) officials disagreed with the idea which implies that the schools have no regular schedule to meet with PTA members on the issues related to community participation in school material resource management. The mean value for teachers (2.4), for officials (2.5) and the average mean value is 2.4 imply that the activity was not functional. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 1.258$ ) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that a considerable proportion of both teachers and officials equally agreed that the school didn't have regular meetings with PTA members.

An interview held with a woreda education officer also revealed this. He said:

*The schools didn't meet with PTA members on a regular base as expected and not encouraging which still needs active work to bring a change. The schools alone have planned some activities that the PTA members can do. But a lot of support system was not formed to increase community participation. All schools tend to only include the community participation in their plan but they only want other bodies, for example, the woreda education office and REB to give them whatever they want.*

It can be seen from the interview that the school leaders have no regular schedule or very few efforts to involve PTA members regularly in the school material resource management. And also the document analysis made showed that there were only 4 meetings conducted in 4(50%) and only 3 meeting in other 4(50%) of the sample schools throughout the year which revealed that there were no regular meeting between the school and PTA members.

In item 3 of table 4, the respondents were asked to give their opinion if there was different meetings takes place between school leaders and the community about school material resource management. Accordingly, 75 (63%) teachers and 14(48%) officials expressed their disagreement in responding that school leaders and the community have not carried out different meetings together; in the same way, as indicated in the table, the mean score 2.4 teachers expressed that the activity was in the negative condition. However, the mean score 2.6 for Officials and the average mean value 2.5 indicates that the activity was in the moderate circumstances. Thus it can be concluded that the different meetings that took place between school leaders and the community was rare which cannot bring an expected change. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $x^2 = 2.841$ ) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items.

Moreover, an interview of a woreda education officer and PTA chairperson confirmed this. Both said that:

*Most of the school leaders called the community particularly when serious students' misbehavior occurs but there was no regular meeting on different issues. The school leaders usually meet with teachers on regular base for any activities with regard to school but not with PTA members.*

So, it can be said that school leaders haven't welcomed PTA members at different times for different school activities. This means that they haven't invite these bodies to school activities as their part takers. In the same manner, the document analysis showed that there were a few minutes that made between school principals and PTA members about School Grant budget plan in each of eight sample schools because school grant budget cannot be implemented without PTA members and there were a few decisions made by school principals in collaboration with PTA members particularly about teachers and students disciplinary problems; however, there were no deep discussion made about School material resource management among school leaders, PTA and WETB members.

In item 4 of table 4, the respondents were asked to give their suggestion on the power of school leaders to manage school material resources. In this regard, 77 (64.8%) teachers and 13(79%) officials responded with disagreement that the power of school leaders to manage school material resources was weak. The mean value for teachers (2.4), for officials (2.5) and the average mean value 2.4 showed that the power of school leaders to manage school material resources was weak. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 2.811$ ) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that a considerable proportion of both teachers and officials equally agreed on the idea. So, this result revealed that the power of school leaders to manage school material resources was weak.

In item 5 of table 4, the respondents were asked to give their idea whether the current status of school leaders in managing school material resources was weak or strong. In this regard, 88 (74%) teachers and 18(62%) officials responded that the current status of school leaders is not encouraging in initiating community participation to manage school material resources. In the same way, as indicated in the table, all the mean score: 2.3 for teachers, 2.3 for officials and the average mean value is 2.3 indicate that the current status of school leaders is not functional in the school in initiating community participation to manage school material resources. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 3.168$ ) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that a considerable proportion of both teachers and officials equally agreed on that it was not encouraging. Generally, it can be said that the school leaders were not found in good direction in initiating the community to participate in setting annual plan, in putting regular schedule and in sharing responsibility to manage material resources actively.

#### **4.4. Barriers with Community Participation in School Material Resource Management**

This part deals with the items related to the teachers' and the school leaders' feeling that whether they want the coming of community to school; and also the feeling of community members in coming to school. Moreover, it deals with the time allotted for school activities by

PTA and the strong relationships between the school and community. Each item is analyzed based on the data obtained through questionnaires responded by teachers and officials (principals, vice principals and supervisors); and further backed by the data obtained from interview and document analysis. Therefore, the eight items are interpreted as indicated in the table below.

Table5: Barriers to Community Participation in School Material Resource Management

N o	Items under no III	Responde	Rating scales										X <sup>2</sup>	Sig	
			S.disagre		Disagre		Undeci		Agree		S.Agre				Me an
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
1	Teachers do not want the PTA members come to school	Te	-	-	6	5	91	77	10	8	12	10	3.2	32.11	0.000
		offi	2	7	4	14	9	31	11	38	3	10	3.3		
		Tot	2	1.4	10	7	10	68	21	14	15	10	3.2		
2	The school leaders do not want PTA members come to school	Te	6	5	3	2.5	70	47	30	25	10	8	3.3	12.57	0.014
		offi	4	14	3	10	8	28	9	31	8	28	3.2		
		Tot	10	7	6	4	78	53	39	26	18	12	3.2		
3	PTA members do not feel good about coming to school	Te	10	8	8	7	80	67	12	10	9	8	3	15.841	0.003
		offi	2	7	4	14	10	8	8	28	5	17	3.2		
		Tot	12	8	12	8	90	61	2	14	14	9	3.1		
4	PTA members feel that they do not have enough skill to participate in managing school material resources	Te	4	3	2	1.7	82	69	11	9	20	25	3.3	27.226	0.000
		offi	1	3.4	3	10	8	28	12	41	5	17	3.5		
		Tot	5	3.4	5	3.4	90	61	23	16	25	17	3.4		
5	PTA members do not have enough time	Te	5	4	5	4	86	72	9	8	14		3.2	24.29	0.000
		offi	3	10	3	10	8	28	10	8	5	17	3.3		
		Tot	8	5	8	5	94	64	19	13	19	13	3.2		
6	PTA members feel that managing school material resource regularly is a burden	Te	2	1.7	4	3.	31	26	69	58	13	11	3.7	10.380	0.041
		offi	1	3.4	2	7	10	8	8	28	8	27	3.7		
		Tot	3	2	6	4	41	28	77	52	21	14	3.7		
7	There is weak relation between the school and PTA members	Te	2	1.7	9	8	16	13	83	70	9	8	3.7	12.11	0.016
		offi	-	-	2	7	11	38	12	41	4	14	3.6		
		Tot	2	1.4	11	7	27	18	95	64	13	9	3.6		
8	PTA members feel that participating in school material resource management is not their role and responsibility.	Te	2	1.7	8	7	10	8	92	77	7	6	3.8	14.835	0.000
		offi	2	6.8	2	7	8	28	13	45	4	1.	3.5		
		Tot	4	2.7	10	7	18	12	10	70	11	7.	3.6		

Key: Key: Te=teacher, Offi= officials, Tot= total, X<sup>2</sup>=Chi-square, Table value = 5.991 at 0.05 alpha  
Officials: (Principals, vice principals and supervisors)



In item 1 of table 5, the respondents were asked to answer whether teachers blocked the coming of community members to the schools or not. The table shows those 91 (76.5%) teachers want to keep silent or didn't want to decide; however, 11 (38 %) officials responded that teachers do not the coming of community members to school. To sum it up, as one can see from the table, the mean score is 3.2 for teachers, 3.3 for officials and the average mean value 3.2 all are above average and shows that teachers do not have good feeling for the coming of PTA members to the school although it was not a direct resistance. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $x^2 = 32.118$ ) which is greater than the critical value of  $x^2=5.991$ , showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers didn't want to decide because it was not encouraging. So, this result reveals that teachers do not have good feeling for the coming of PTA members to the school.

In item 2 of table 5, the respondents were asked to answer whether school leaders blocked the coming of community members to the schools. The table shows those 70 (47.3%) teachers kept themselves under undecided; 9 (31 %) officials responded that the school leaders became blockage to the community. Generally, as one can see from the table, the mean score is 3.3 for teachers, 3.2 for Officials and the average mean value 3.2 all are above average mean and show that the school leaders do not have good feeling for the coming of community members to the school although it was not a direct resistance like teachers. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $x^2 = 12.578$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers kept themselves under undecided because they thought not to blame the officials and some officials agreed with the idea.

In item 3 of table 5, the respondents were asked to answer whether PTA members did not feel good in coming to school. The table shows those 80 (67.2%) teachers and, 10 (8.4 %) officials did not want to decide about the idea that states community members do not feel good in coming to school. In the same way, as one can see from the table, the mean score 3 for teachers, 3.2 for officials and the average mean value 3.1 show that PTA members did not feel good in coming to school. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $x^2 = 15.841$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the

two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed that PTA members didn't feel good in coming to the schools. So, this result revealed that PTA members didn't feel good in coming to school.

In item 4 of table 5, the respondents were asked to answer whether PTA members felt that they did not have enough skill to participate in managing school material resources. The table shows those 82 (68.9%) teachers did not want to decide about the idea that states PTA members feel that they do not have enough skill to participate in managing school material resources; however, 12 (41 %) officials agreed with the idea that PTA members feel that they do not have enough skill to participate in managing school material resources. In line with this, the mean score 3.3 for teachers, 3.5 for officials and the average mean value 3.4 proves that PTA members did not have full confidence on their skill to participate in managing school material resources. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 27.226$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that compared to officials, more teachers agreed that PTA members felt they did not have enough skill to participate in managing school material.

In item 5 of table 5, the respondents were asked to answer whether PTA members did not have enough time to participate in school material resource management. The table shows those 86 (72.3%) teachers did not want to decide whether they have enough time or not to participate in school material resource management. However, 10(34 %) officials responded that PTA members did not have enough time to participate in school material resource management. In the same way, the mean score is 3.2 for teachers, 3.3 for officials and the average mean value is 3.2 indicates that PTA members did not participate in school material resource management as expected due to shortage of time. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 24.293$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed that PTA members did not have enough time to participate in school material resource management.

The interview made with a head of woreda education office supported the idea. He stated that:

*PTA members are interested to participate in school material resource management but they usually are not present at the time they are needed. They consider school activities as secondary one that is why they usually procrastinate any meetings belong to the school searching for free time.*

As can be seen from the interview, PTA members haven't participated in school material resource management as expected. Even though they love their school, they considered that only school principals and woreda education officers are responsible for school. In the same manner, PTA document analysis shows that there were very few minutes have been recorded in 6 (75%) schools; which can be said that almost there was no collaboration between the schools and PTA members in managing school material resources.

In item 6 of table 5, the respondents were asked to answer whether PTA members feel burden in managing school material resources regularly. The table shows those 69 (57.9%) teachers agreed with the idea that PTA members feel burden in managing school material resources regularly. However, 10 (34 %) officials did not want to decide whether PTA members feel burden or not in managing school material resources regularly. In the same way, the mean score 3.7 for teachers, 3.7 for officials and the average mean value 3.7 provide information that PTA members feel burden in managing school material resources regularly. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 10.380$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed that there PTA members feel burden in managing school material resources regularly. So, this result reveals that PTA members didn't have enough time to participate in school material resource management.

In item 7 of table 5, the respondents were asked to answer if there was weak relationship between the school and community. The table shows those 83 (69.7%) teachers and 12 (41%) officials responded that there was weak relationship between the school and community was. Similarly, the mean score 3.7 for teachers, 3.6 for officials and the average mean value 3.6 proves that there was weak relationship between the school and PTA members. Additionally,

the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 12.118$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed that there was weak relationship between the school and community. So, this result reveals that there was weak relationship between the school and PTA members.

In item 8 of table 5, the respondents were asked to answer whether PTA members feel that participating in school material resource management is not their role and responsibility. The table shows those 92 (77.3%) teachers and 13 (45 %) officials agreed with the idea that states PTA members feel as if participating in school material resource management is not their role and responsibility. Additionally, the mean score 3.8 for teachers, 3.5 for officials and the average mean value 3.6 approves that PTA members felt as if participating in school material resource management was not their role and responsibility. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 14.835$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed that participating in school material resource management is not their role and responsibility

#### **4.5. Strategies to Improve Community Participation in School Material Resource Management**

This part deals with the items related to community capacity building program to educate the community about their role in managing school material resources; and also about a need of designing strategy to sustain community participation; and finally about school leaders to initiate involving PTA members in the school material resource management. Therefore, the three items are interpreted as indicated in the table below.

Table6: Strategies to Improve Community Participation in School Material Resource Management

N	o	Items under no IV	Responde	Rating scales										Mean	X <sup>2</sup>	Sig.
				S.disa		Disagre		Undeci		Agree		S.Agre				
				F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%			
1		There is a need to initiate community capacity building program to educate PTA members about their role in managing school material resources.	Te	-	-	4	3.4	15	13	90	76	10	8.	3.9	15.934	0.000
	offi		-	-	1	3.4	13	45	13	45	2	7	3.5			
	Tot		-	-	5	3.4	28	19	10	70	12	8	3.6			
2		There is a need for designing strategy to sustain community participation in school material resource management	Te	-	-	1	0.8	19	16	87	73	12	10	3.9	11.923	0.000
	offi		-	-	3	10.3	8	28	14	48	4	14	3.7			
	Tot		-	-	4	2.7	27	18	10	68	16	11	3.8			
3		There is a need for school leaders to initiate involving PTA members in the school material resource management	Te	-	-	-	-	17	14	92	77	10	8	3.9	22.947	0.000
	offi		-	-	4	13.8	9	31	14	48	2	7	3.5			
	Tot		-	-	4	2.7	26	18	10	72	12	8	3.7			

Key: Key: Key: Te=teacher, Offi= officials, Tot= total, X<sup>2</sup>=Chi-square, Table value = 5.991 at 0.05 alpha  
Officials: (Principals, vice principals and supervisors)

In item 1 of table 6, the respondents were asked to answer if there is a need to initiate community capacity building program to educate PTA members about their role in managing school material resources. The table shows those 90 (75.6%) teachers and 13 (45%) Officials responded that there is a need to initiate community capacity building program to educate PTA members about their role in managing school material resources. Similarly, the mean score 3.9 for teachers, 3.5 for officials and the average mean value 3.6 indicate that there is a need to initiate community capacity building program to educate PTA members about their role in managing school material resources. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $x^2 = 15.934$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed that there was a need to initiate community capacity building program to

educate PTA members about their role in managing school material resources. So, this result reveals that there was a need of intensive capacity building trainings for PTA members to equip them with skills of school material resource management.

This idea was supported by interview made with a PTA chairman. He said:

*The school directors call us whenever there is critical problem particularly about conflict among students or among teachers which couldn't be resolved by the school. They call us when our children disobeyed the school otherwise we didn't get any occasions on what we can do for schools. And we need training on what and how to do something...*

This shows that there was no training conducted to build capacity of PTA members to take part in school material resource management recently. As a result, the benefits that should have gained from the community, that is sustaining community participation for meaningful results, (Pratt and Earle, 2004) are likely that they are ignored in the sample schools. Moreover, the PTA documents of the schools showed that there was no minute recorded and no report was done with regard to training given for PTA members which ensured that there were no trainings given for them.

In item 2 of table 6, the respondents were asked to answer if there is a need to design strategy to sustain community participation in school material resource management. The table shows those 87 (73%) teachers and 14 (48.3 %) officials responded that there is a need to design strategy to sustain community participation in school material resource management was high at school level. Additionally, the mean score 3.9 for teachers, 3.7 for Officials and the average mean value 3.8 ensure that there is a need to design strategy to sustain community participation in school material resource management. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 11.923$ ) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed the idea than officials. So, this result reveals that there was a high need to design strategy to sustain community participation in school material resource.

Lastly, in item 3 of table 6, the respondents were asked to answer if there is a need that school leaders to initiate involving PTA members in the school material resource management. The table shows those 92 (77.3%) teachers and 14 (48.3 %) officials responded that there is a need that school leaders to initiate involving PTA members in the school material resource management. Similarly, as one can see from the table, the mean score 3.9 for teachers, 3.5 for Officials and the average mean value 3.7 indicate that there is a high need for school leaders to initiate involving PTA members in the school material resource management. Additionally, the calculated chi-square value under  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of significance ( $\chi^2 = 22.947$ ) which is greater than the critical value of  $\chi^2=5.991$ , showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents in rating the items. This means that more teachers agreed that there was there is a need that school leaders to initiate involving PTA members in the school material resource management.

## **5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Chapter five deals with the summary of the major findings, the conclusions drawn based on the findings and recommendations that are assumed to improve the community participation in material resource management in government secondary schools of South-West Showa zone, Oromia regional state.

### **5.1. Summary of the Findings**

The Objective of this study was to assess community participation in school material resource management in government Secondary schools of South-West Showa zone, Oromia regional state. The research focused on four basic questions: the awareness of PTA members about community participation; the current status of school leaders in initiating community participation; the barriers of community participation, and the measures to be taken to improve community participation in these schools. In order to answer these four basic research questions, the researcher employed descriptive survey method.

Out of twenty-eight government general secondary schools in South-West Showa zone, eight secondary schools were sampled using simple random sampling technique. The subjects of the study were 30.7% (n=121) of teachers, 100% (n=8) PTA chairpersons, 100% (n=8) principals, 100% (n=13) vice principals, 100% (n=8) supervisors and 100% (n=8) woreda education office heads from sampled secondary schools. The respondents' selection was carried out using simple random, purposive and available sampling techniques. Simple random sampling technique was used for teachers; purposive sampling technique was used for PTA chair persons, while, available sampling techniques were used for principals, vice-principals, supervisors and woreda education office heads in each of sampled secondary schools. The information obtained from questionnaire was then analyzed by means of statistical tools including frequency, Percentage, mean value and independent sample t-test.

According to the result of the study, the summary of the key findings are categorized under the following thematic areas: characteristics of respondents, the awareness of PTA



members about community participation, and the current status of school leaders in initiating community participation, the barriers of community participation and measures to improve community participation.

Firstly, regarding the characteristics of respondents, out of 148 respondents, 127(85.8%) were males whereas 21(14.2%) were females. Concerning principals and secondary school supervisors all respondents were males. The data shows that in the sampled schools, the number of female teachers is less than those of male teachers, and also concerning positions all officials in the schools are males. The majority 61(51%) of teachers, 4(50%) of principals, 7(54%) of vice principals and 4(50%) of supervisors were belong to the age group of 31-40. Thus, this implies that all the respondents were experienced and matured enough to express ideas related to the study consistently and with better understanding, and 114(95.8%) of teachers, 8(100%) principals, 13(100%) vice principals and 4(50%) of supervisors were first degree holder. Therefore, their judgments and opinions can be taken as more acceptable to the study.

Secondly, based on the analysis and interpretation of the data, the study found out that community participation in material resource management in the zone was found to be weak and passive. The result of the findings showed that PTA members didn't know each of the school materials in detail; they didn't know their roles and the roles of school leaders separately; they had no regular meetings with the schools; they didn't work in collaboration with the schools; and they didn't ensure fair distribution of material resources among the users. The study also found out that there was a need of intensive capacity building training that can create awareness for PTA members to identify their roles and responsibilities in managing school material resources. Concerning the two groups of respondents, the result of chi-square showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents in rating the items. This means compared to 60 % of teachers, only 43 % of officials agreed with the idea that states PTA members participated in school material resource management passively.

Thirdly, with regard to school leaders the study found out that about 60% of the respondents agreed that there was lack of school leaders' commitment to involve PTA

and WETB members in major school activities such as planning, organizing, coordinating and controlling and there was the fact that the school had lack of fixed time schedule to deal with the PTA and WETB members. The study also showed that there were no regularly planned meetings, conferences or discussions between the school and PTA members. Principals that were the first body in this issue and expected to play pivotal role as external catalyst in creating smooth communication among stakeholders were not committed in carrying out their priority tasks; and generally the current status of school leaders in initiating community participation is not in a good direction. Concerning the two groups of respondents, the calculated chi-square showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents in rating the items. This means that a considerable proportion of both teachers and officials equally agreed on the idea.

Fourthly, the study distinguished the presence of barriers to community participation in material resource management. They were unwillingness of school leaders and teachers towards the coming of PTA members to school and in turn unwillingness of PTA members to come to school; PTA members shortage of time, lack of skills, PTA members wrong perceptions in thinking that managing schools was burden and not their roles and responsibilities and lack of good communication between the school and PTA members. Concerning the two groups of respondents, the result of chi-square showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents in rating the items.

Lastly, the study found out that there was a need of intensive capacity building programs to educate school leaders, teachers, and PTA and WETB members so as to create awareness about the importance of community participation in school resource management. Concerning the two groups of respondents, the calculated chi-square showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents in rating the items. For instance, 75% of teachers agreed on the necessity of the capacity building programs and only about 47% officials agreed with it; others about 35 % officials keep themselves under undecided.

## 5.2. Conclusions

Relying on the findings presented above, the researcher drew the following conclusions: PTA members participation in school material resource management was passive. This was mainly due to: lack of awareness, lack of knowledge, lack of time and reluctance and lack of commitment that caused them to participate in school material resource management passively. Unwillingness of the PTA members to participate in identification of the need assessment, planning, implementation and evaluation process was due to lack of adequate awareness about their roles and responsibilities as they were not equipped with basic skills and knowledge to be initiated and act on managing school material resources. Moreover, absence of initiating PTA members by the school to participate in school material resource management drew them back not to participate in the management. Particularly, creating awareness for PTA members on first hand is expected from school leaders themselves that was why some of them kept themselves under undecided in rating the items and only few of them agreed that awareness creation is needed for PTA members to enhance their participation in material resource management.

On the other hand, the major problem for the weakness of community participation in school material resource management was that the school leaders particularly principals didn't make PTA members participate in major school activities such as in planning, organizing, coordinating and controlling due to lack of commitment to bring about a difference; the school had lack of fixed-time schedule to deal with the PTA members to participate in school material resource management; as a result, there was no smooth communication between the school and PTA members, because there were no regularly planned meetings, conferences or discussions between them. Moreover, inadequate knowledge of school principals in planning strategic and operation plan with regard to school material resource management through community participation. So, it can be said that the concerned principals who were expected to play pivotal role as external catalyst in creating smooth communication among stakeholders were not committed in carrying out these priority tasks. The result of chi-square showed that a considerable proportion of both teachers and officials equally agreed on the idea because it was obviously known

and indisputable that the school leaders had shortcomings in initiating PTA members to participate in material resource management in the schools.

In addition to these, the communication gap between the school staff and PTA members has resulted in misperception, particularly, to PTA members as if their involvement was not important for school material resource management. This gap could have been filled by WETB, in connection with the school principals, by providing necessary capacity building trainings for school staff and PTA members to avoid misperception in general, because this could have led to coordination and integration of stake-holders and would have enabled them to implement the policy, as it was designed to achieve the intended educational goals.

Finally, it can be said that there was no adequate designed strategy to build capacity of the School leaders, teachers and PTA members to sustain community participation in school material resource management. So, the provision of training, addressing clear roles and responsibilities, and creating conducive environment were some of the major possible measures suggested to be taken to improve community participation in school material resource management in the Government secondary schools of the zone. However, the success of these measures strongly relies on the collaborative effort of all educational personnel beginning from school to regional level. The result of chi-square showed that, compared to officials, more teachers agreed that intensive capacity building is needed to bring about a change because designing strategy to build the capacity of stake holders can start from the school itself.

### **5.3. Recommendations**

Depending on the findings and conclusion of the study, the researcher has recommended the following points: The result of the study revealed that community participation in school material resource management is weak in government secondary schools of South-West Showa zone, Oromia regional state. Therefore, the school leaders in connection with WETB should spread communication channels to use public meetings, discussions with school staff and PTA members to create awareness; and to inform them

about their roles and responsibilities and also to enhance awareness about the importance of community participation in school material resources management.

The result of the study showed that community participation in school material resource management was weak because the school principals were not committed to initiate the issue. School principals are policy implementers and are expected to share responsibility with PTA members to improve the management of school material resources like setting goals, planning, organizing, directing and controlling from buying to disposal, because it is impossible to arrive at desired educational goals without community participation particularly in this dynamic world.

Regarding communication, the study showed there was lack of co-ordination and smooth communication between stake-holders. There fore, WETB and school leaders should strengthen cooperation with educational actors and other social service sectors, NGOs, individuals and institutions to build the capacity of school leaders and PTA members through training. WETB should find ways and means with school leaders, PTA, SIC, & other stakeholders to enhance community participation in school material resource management in discussion through meetings, conferences and workshops.

Lastly, the study showed that the other main reason for the passiveness of community participation in school material resource management was lack of intensive capacity building programs. There for, REB should give intensive capacity building trainings and forums for school leaders and WETB on how to create awareness for PTA members and teachers about the importance of community participation in school material resource management, because capacity building training and forums will avoid misconceptions and pave the way for experience sharing among different model secondary schools and individuals. REB should establish supporting, monitoring, controlling and evaluating strategies and structures from region to school level that enhance community participation in school material resource management.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Agbo,S.A. 2007.*Addressing school–community relations in cross-cultural context; A Collaborative action to Bridge the Gap Between nations and the school.* Journal of research in Rural education.
- Aref,A. 2010.*Community Participation for Educational Planning and Development.* Department of Social Science, Tehran Education, Ministry of Education, Iran, *Journal of Nature and Science.*
- Aynalem Aboye. 2012. *The Status of Community Participation in the Management of School Improvement.* The case of urban governmental primary school, Dire-Dawa administration. M.Sc. thesis, Haremaya University, Haremaya, Ethiopia.
- Begin, Donald, R. 2005.*The School and Community Relations (7<sup>th</sup>ed)*, London; Alyn and Bacon.
- Bekuretsion Haileselassie.2005.*Utilization of material Resources in implementing the curriculum in skill development centers of Tigray.* A.A.U: MA Thesis.
- Best, J.W.Andkahn, J.W.2003. Research in education .New Delhi: prentice hall PLC.
- Botha, R.J. 2004. Excellence in Leadership; Demands on the Professional School Principal. South African Journal of Education.
- Bray, Mark 1996. Decentralization of Education: Community Financing .Washington, Dc: world Bank.
- Bruns, B., Filmer, D., & Patrinos, A. 2011. *Making schools work: New evidence on accountability Reforms.* Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Carino, I. and Vaison, M. 1991. *The parent learning support system: A school and community collaboration for raising pupil achievement.* In Sheldon Shaffer (ed), collaborating for education change. The role of teachers, parents, and the

community in school improvement. Paris. International Institute for Educational Planning.

Carneiro, P., Koussihouèdé, O. K., Lahire, N., Meghir, C., & Mommaerts, C. 2015. *Decentralizing education resources: School grants in Senegal*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Chunawalla, S. A. and Patel, D. R. 2006. *Productions and Operations Management*. (6<sup>th</sup> ed). Himalaya Publishing House. Mumbai.

Creswell, J.W 2009. *Research design; Qualitative, Quantities and mixed methods Approaches*(3r ed.). Los Angeles: SAG Publication, Inc

Cummings, w and Dall, F.1995. *Implementing Quality Primary Education for Countries in Transition*. New York; Jordan press foundation Al Rai

Dayaram 2011. *School Management Committees and the Right to Education Act 200, Resource Material for SMC Training*. American, India Foundation.

De Grauwe, Anton and Candy Lugaz with Tiberius Barasa, Pulane J. Lefoka, MathaboTsepa, Samuel Kayabwe and Wilson Asimwe 2011 *Strengthening Local Actors: The Path to Decentralizing Education, Kenya, Uganda, and Lesotho*, Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning and UNESCO

Dodd, Ann Westcott and Konnzal, Jean. L.2002. *How communities build stronger schools, Stories, strategies*

Epstein, J. L. 2001. *School, Family and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Ethiopian Ministry of Education.2002: *Guideline for organization of educational management, community participation and educational finance*. AddisAbaba Unpublished

- Eyasu Debash, 2011. *The Status and Challenges of Parent-Teacher Association Role in Leadership of the Selected Secondary Schools in Southern Zone of Tigray*. M.A. Thesis, AAU, Addis Ababa.
- George, D. and Malley, P. (2003). *Calculating, interpreting, and Reporting Cronbatch''s Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert Scales*. *Middle West Research to Practice Conference*. In *Adult, continuing, and Community Education*, p. 87-88
- G/Michael Berihu. 2006. *Parent Teacher Involvement in Schools in Southern Zone of Tigray*. M.A Thesis, AAU.
- Goos, M., Lowrie,T. and Jolly, L. 2003. *Home, School and Community Partnerships in Numeracy Education: School of Education*. Australian Educational Researcher. University of Queensland, Australian.
- Gorinski, R., & Fraser, C., 2006. *Literature Review on the Effective Engagement of Pasifika Parents and communities in Education*. Tauranga, NZ: Pacific Coast Applied Research Centre, Bay of Plenty Polytechnic.
- Grandvaux, Y., Welmond, M. and Wolf, J. 2002. *A Literature Review of Community School Africa Support for Analysis and Research in Africa*. SARA. Project, Washington DC: USAID
- Harris A. and Lambert, L.2003. *Building leadership capacity for school improvement*. Philadelphia: open University press.
- Jenberu Erco. 2011. *The Status and Challenges of Parent Teacher Association Participation in Government Secondary School Leadership of Addis Ababa*. M.A Thesis, AAU,
- Jensen. J .T. et.al 1967.*Elementary school Administration 2nd ed*. Boston. Allyn& Bacon.
- Kandsumy, M. and Lia, B. 2004.*School principals: core actors in educational improvement ,An analysis of Asian countries*. Paris: UNESCO.



- Kaunda, Z. 2005. *Influencing national policy making in education through best practices: civic involvement in primary education.*
- Leedy.P.d...and armrod, J. E.2005. *practical Research Planning and Design* (8th ed.).New Jersey: Pearson prentice Hall
- Leenders, M. R., Johnson, P., F., Flynn, A. E. and Fear son, H. E. 2006. *Purchasing and Supply Management*. 13<sup>th</sup> edition. McGraw-Hill. Singapore.
- Luck, Tan Lee 2011. *School Principals' Effectiveness and Leadership Quality in Educational Management*, Johor: MARA University of Technology
- McGinn, N., & Welsh, T. 1999. *Decentralisation of education: Why, when, what, and how? Fundamentals of educational planning*. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Mahmood., Z., Majoka., M., Basharat., M., and Ali., M, 2011. *Role of PTAs for Promoting Quality of Education in Islamabad Language in Indi*
- Marsh, C. 1998. *Spot light on school Improvement. Australia: Allen and Unwind Inc.*
- Matebe Tefere 2006.*The status of community participation in the management of primary school: the case of Bahir Darzone: MA Thesis: Adiss Ababa university.*
- Mayer,J. 2007. *Creating a safe and welcoming school*. UNESCO/IEA
- Miranda, E. 2007. *Gang Injunctions and Community Participation, Faculty of the School of Policy Planning and Development*. University of Southern California.
- Mitrofanaova, Y. 2011. *School relations building community*. University of Nebraska, Lincoln: Nebraska University press.
- MoE. 2002. *Guideline for Organization of Education Management, Community, Participation and Educational Finance*. Unpublished. Addis Ababa.

- \_\_\_\_. 2005. *Education Sector Development Program III (ESDP-III) 2005/2006 – 2010/2011 Program Action Plan (PAP)*, Ethiopia, Addis Ababa.
- \_\_\_\_. 2007. *School improvement; Blue print*; Addis Ababa
- \_\_\_\_. 2007a. *General Education Quality Improvement Package*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA
- MOE. 2007b. *School Improvement Program Frame Work*. Addis Ababa :EMPDA
- Molnar, Carole. 2006. *Parent and teacher views of parent involvement in local school .Governance*. A summary Research center Report.
- Morgan, J.S.2006. What community participation in schooling means: insights from southern Ethiopia.Harvard educational review
- Moswela, B.2007. *From Decentralization to Centralization of Community Secondary Schools in Botswana: A community disenfranchisement in education*. International Education Journal. University of Botswana.
- Naidoo, Jordan P. 2005 *Educational Decentralization and School Governance in South Africa: From Policy to Practice*, Paris: International Institute for Education Planning, UNESCO
- New Delhi Agbo,S.A. 2007. *Addressing school –community relations in cross-cultural context*;A Collaborative action to Bridge the Gap Between nations and the school Journal of research in Rural education.
- Nishimura, M. 2014. An analysis of “governance” to improve quality of education in the post-MDGs era: The case of household learning assessment in Kajiado Country, Kenya. *Africa Educational Research Journal*

- Pauline, R.2010. *Community, gender and education: Evidence from Sub-Sahara Africa*. University of Sussex, England: Sussex University Press..
- Pratt, B. and L. Earle, 2004.*Study on Effective Empowerment of Citizens in Ethiopia: Overview Paper*; International NGO training and research centre.
- Schaffer .j and Bet Z. 1992. *Effective parent involvement in secondary school of Texas*. As East Texas as School Study Council Commerce.
- Shoraku. A. 2008. A case study of parental participation in primary school education in Kampong, Chhnang Province, Cambodia. *Comparative Education*
- Tamura, N. 2012. An analysis of factors that caused the expansion and decline of community-managed schools in Guatemala. *Comparative Education*
- Taniguchi, K., & Hirakawa, Y. 2016. Dynamics of community participation, student achievement, and school management: The case of primary schools in a rural area of Malawi.
- Tekeu, R. F. 2011.*Uganda Broad Community Engagement Critical to Education Success*. The Independent 7th April.
- UNESCO. 2002. *Educational Governance at Local Levels: Towards Achieving Education All*.
- UNESCO.2004. Adopting technology for school improvement: A global perspective. UNESCO, Paris: IIEP printing shop.
- UNESCO (2006).Community participation. Paris: IIEP printing shop.

Veena, K.P., Mahajan V. 2005. Janshala in Jharkhand: *An experiment with community involvement in education*. International Education Journal.

World Bank. 1997. *Primary Education in India*. Development in Practice Series. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

World Bank. 2007. *What is school based management system?* Washington, D.C., USA: The World Bank.

## **7. APPENDICES**

## Appendix A

### Questionnaire Filled by Teachers, School Principals, Vice Principals and School Supervisors

I would like to express my appreciation in advance for taking your time to fill the following questionnaire. I am a student of Haramaya University, school of Graduate Studies, enrolled for master of School Leadership. Currently I am conducting a research entitled “**Community Participation in School Material Resource Management in South-West Showa Zone, Oromia Regional State**” The quality of my work depends on the information gained from you. Therefore, you are kindly requested to fill in the questionnaire with the necessary information. Your honest responses will have great benefit to the research work. You do not need to write your name. Your identity will be kept strictly confidential.

#### Section 1.personal information

Please fill in with your personal information. (Put a tick mark [X] in the box provided)

**Qualification:** Diploma  B.A/B.Sc /B.Ed  M.A/M.Sc  Others

**Sex:** Male  Female

**Position/job in the school:** Teacher  School principal   
 Vice principal  School supervisor

**Service in the current position** \_\_\_\_\_

## Section 2: General direction

All questionnaires focus on community participation in school material resource storage, utilization and maintenance/repairing. **School material resources include such material as computers, desks, chairs, blackboard, textbooks, reference books, laboratory equipment and chemicals, sport materials, teaching materials and pedagogical materials (models such as glob).**

Tick [X] marks in one of the boxes to show your degree of agreement with the items in the boxes.

5=strongly agree    4=agree    3=undecided    2=disagree    1= strongly disagree

No	I. How community participates in school material resource management.	5	4	3	2	1
1	The school has set annual plan on how to manage school material resources					
2	The school has regular schedule to meet with PTA members on the issues related to community participation in school material resource management					
3	There are different (formal and informal meetings) take place between school leaders and the community about school material resource management					
4	School leaders are empowered to manage school material resources					
5	Generally, I would say that the current status of school leaders in initiating community participation is a good direction					
<b>II. The extent of community participation in school material resource management</b>						
6	PTA members know each of the school material resource in detail					
7	The PTA members controlled the school material resources from buying until its disposal with careful inventory					
8	PTA members regularly check if the school material resources are stored in adequate spaces					
9	PTA members regularly check the expiry date of the school material resources					
10	The PTA members protected the school facilities form danger, theft and corruption with continuous follow-up					
11	The PTA members know their roles and the roles of the school leaders separately					
12	The PTA members have had regular meetings with the school concerning school material					

	resource issues						
13	The school and PTA members usually work in collaboration in carrying out inventory control of the school material resources						
14	PTA ensures the accountability for misused school material resources						
15	PTA ensures fair distribution of school material resources among the users						
16	The school and PTA members usually work in collaboration in accomplishing and monitoring maintenance of the school material resources						
17	PTA find alternatives to accomplish it with cost minimized to save the school budget						
<b>III. Barriers with community participation in school material resource management</b>							
18	Teachers do not want the coming of PTA members to school						
19	The school leaders do not want the coming of PTA members to school						
20	PTA members do not feel good in coming to school						
21	PTA members feel that they do not have enough skill to participate in managing school material resources						
22	PTA members do not have enough time						
23	PTA members feel that managing school material resource regularly is burden						
24	There is weak relation between the school and PTA members						
25	PTA members feel that participating in school material resource management is not their role and responsibility.						
<b>IV. Strategies to improve community participation in school material resource management.</b>							
26	There is a need to initiate community capacity building program to educate the community about their role in managing school material resources.						
27	There is a need of designing strategy to sustain community participation in school material resource management						
28	There is a need that school leaders to initiate involving PTA members in the school resource management						



**Section 3: Open ended question, give your short and brief answers for the following.**

1. To what extent does the school encourage community participation in the annual planning, particularly, on how to manage school material resources?

---

---

2. What other contributions are made by the PTA members in managing school material resources? Please mention them

---

---

3. What do you think are the challenges that the school face while working with PTA members? Please mention

---

---

4. What do you think are the challenges that the PTA members face while working with the school? Please mention

---

---

5. What do you think are the strategies should be used to strengthen school community relation in managing school material resources?

---

---

6. What means of communication should be used to attract PTA members to school material resource management? Please mention.

---

---

## Appendix B

### Interview questions for Woreda education office heads and for PTA chair persons

Greetings

My name is Berhanu Abomsa and let me explain why I am here. I am a student of Haramaya University, School of Graduate studies, enrolled for Master of school leadership. Currently I am conducting a research entitled “Community participation in school material resource management in South-West Showa zone, Oromia regional state.” There for, I would like you to give me some information about your school. Of course the questions I will ask you are those related to my research title, and the quality of my work depends on the information gained from you. Your identity will be kept confidential. I will not write down your name so that no one will know what you will tell me. The idea will be used only for the research purpose.

Would you be willing to participate in this study?

Yes

No

Thank You

#### Interviewee’s general information

**Qualification:** Diploma  B.A/B.Sc/B.Ed  MA/MS/cd  Others

**Sex:** Male  Female

**Position:** PTA Chairman  Woreda Education Head

**Total year of service in the current position:** \_\_\_\_\_ years

1. To what extent does the school encourage PTA members’ participation in the annual planning, particularly, on how to manage school material resources?
2. How often does the school meet with PTA members to discuss about the usage of school material resources?
  - a. Formally
  - b. Informally

3. What other contributions are made by the PTA members in managing school material resources? Please mention them
4. What do you think are the challenges that you face while working with school leaders in school material resource management? Please mention
5. What do you think are the challenges that PTA members face while working with the school regarding school material resource management? Please mention
6. What do you think are the structure and strategies should be used to strengthen school community relation in managing school material resources?
7. What actions do you think are taken by the school leaders to enhance community participation to take part in school material resource management?
  - a. The effort of school leaders in encouraging PTA members to continually control the usage of school material resources from buying up to its disposal
  - b. The status of PTA in decision making about how to use school material resources.
  - c. Ways of developing communication between school and PTA members using different means
8. Is there any community mobilization workshop/seminar/training given for teachers, School principals, supervisors and PTA members to create awareness on how to manage school material resources?
  - a. If so, how often?
  - b. What are the indicators?
  - c. When was it?
  - d. How important was it?

## Appendix C

### Document Analysis Check List

Time of observation: Date \_\_\_\_\_ Name of school \_\_\_\_\_

Name of observer \_\_\_\_\_

Type of the document observed

<b>I. Minutes of meetings having the agendas of school material resource management</b>		Yes	No	Frequency of minute making
1	Parent teacher association (PTA)			
2	School management committee (SMC)			
3	Woreda Education Board (WED)			
4	Other meetings _____ _____			

<b>II. Letter communications made regarding community participation in school material resource usage</b>		Yes	No	Frequency of minute making
1	School to parent teacher association (PTA)			
2	School to woreda education board (WED)			
3	Parent teacher association to school			
4	Woreda education board to school			
4	School to others _____ _____			
5	Others to school _____ _____			

<b>III. Plans prepared regarding school material resources by PTA</b>		Yes	No	Remarks
1	The school and PTA jointly has			

<b>IV. Reports are made regarding decisions made on school material resource usage</b>		Yes	No	
1	School to parent teacher association (PTA)			
2	School to woreda education board (WED)			
3	School to others _____ _____			