European Journal of Education Studies
ISSN: 2501 - 1111
ISSN-L: 2501 - 1111
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/edu

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3880450 Volume 7 | Issue 5 | 2020

PROVISION OF QUALITY EDUCATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS: INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS

Elsabet Gindo[1],
Chombe Anagaw[2],
Solomon Sapo[3i]
[1]Department of Pedagogical Sciences,
School of Pedagogical & Behavioral Sciences,
Arba Minch University,
Ethiopia
[2]PhD, Department of Pedagogical Sciences,
School of Pedagogical & Behavioral Sciences,
Arba Minch University,
Ethiopia
[3]Department of Pedagogical Sciences,
School of Pedagogical & Behavioral Sciences,
Arba Minch University,
Ethiopia

Abstract:
The purpose of this study is to investigate factors hindering the provision of quality education in government secondary schools. The study employed a mixed-method (QUAN+qual) with a descriptive survey design. Probability-simple random and non-probability-available and purposive sampling techniques were used. A study comprised a total of 1913 population, and 483 samples i.e. 6 headteachers, 114 teachers, 324 students, 21 parents, and 18 community representatives using Yemane formula. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected through questionnaires, interviews, observation, and document analysis for triangulation. Descriptive (i.e. percentage, mean & Standard deviation) and inferential statistics (i.e. independent sample t-test) were used as a method of analysis. A test of significance employed as finding showed that except for school environment facility and resource-related factors, other factors had an insignificant effect on the provision of quality education. The findings from the descriptive analysis showed that there was a lack of professionally qualified teachers, lack of instructional resources, low participation of parents and community, low motivation of teachers, low-level implementation of active learning methods, lack of transparency among staff and shortage of administrative staffs. Therefore, the study recommended that the government should facilitate professional skill trainings for teachers, provides adequate

[i] Correspondence: email bulchasapo@gmail.com

instructional resources, and should employ qualified teachers to help the head teachers to adapt lucidity in secondary schools. The local government should also seek out the ways for unemployed citizens and revise ethical courses in an offer to improve the characteristics of students.

Keywords: quality of education, investigation, factors

1. Introduction

Education is a pillar of the development of any country over the entire world. It is also one of the indicators that measure the developmental changes of a particular nation. As Nelson Mandela stated that "*Education is the most powerful weapon we can use to change the world*" (EDA, 2011). Besides, education is a process by which people acquire knowledge, skill, values, and attitude that help people to become useful members of society, develop their cultural heritage, and live more satisfactory lives. Furthermore, it is considered an effective vehicle for national development in less industrialized countries like Ethiopia. According to UNESCO (1990) government, policymakers, and civil society have emphasized that developing countries need to invest more in education; ensure that systems of education are efficiently managed, and the improvement measures are adopted.

However, it is important to give more attention to the provision of quality education. Therefore, UNESCO report revealed that quality education reduces poverty, increase income, make people healthier, boost economic growth, saves children's lives, foster peace, reduce child marriage, reduces fertility rates, prevent disaster-related deaths, reduce maternal deaths, promote gender equality and combats HIV and AIDS (GPE, 2015). Provision of quality education was also clearly pointed in the World Declaration on Education for All that the poor quality of education needed to be improved and recommended that education be made both universally available and more relevant. It also identified quality as a prerequisite for achieving the fundamental goal of equity (UNESCO, 1990)

On the other hand, the provision of quality education at all levels needs the cooperation and commitment of various stakeholders, including government, parents, students, teachers, local community, and schools (UNESCO, 2005). For instance: the responsibility of, governments to ensure quality education is primarily identified: such as education available for all children; avoid any action that would serve to prevent children from accessing education, and take the necessary measures to eliminate the barriers to education posed by individuals or communities (UN, 1998). As a result, ensuring quality education at all levels of education remains to focus on areas of the education sector. Further, Goal 4 of the sustainable development agenda recognizes indicated quality of education as an indispensable factor needed to attain sustainable development. It also states the need to improve literacy, numeracy, problem-solving, cognitive, interpersonal, and social skills at all levels of education (UNESCO, 2014).

Indeed, nations recently strive to provide quality education from lower to higher levels. But it needs all concerned bodies to work together.

Even though, the issue of quality education today is predominant in the international discourse, over the past decade, the focus on international education development has shifted from access to quality. This is because the quality is considered as being at the heart of education (UNESCO, 2000). However, the efforts of integrating quality with access are the main challenge globally since millions of children can go to school but fail to learn the required basic skills because of poor quality of education (UNESCO, 2015). To this end, the Ethiopian Government launched a major national-wide reform program to improve the quality of general education (MOE, 2008). The objectives of the reform are to improve the achievement of boys and girls concerning measured learning outcomes, primary completion rates, and secondary entrance rates. The reform includes revision and upgrading of the national curriculum; development and provision of new textbooks across all grades and subjects based on the new curriculum; improving pre-service teacher education; strengthening CPD for serving teachers, and developing the capacity of headteachers (school principals) to contribute for provision of quality education in school.

Similarly, the issue of quality has become critical in many countries that help them to see a better future because it was considered as the base for all developments. On the other hand, in searching for the factors that promote quality education, national programs and literature have increasingly emphasized teachers, schools, and communities as the engines of quality, with special attention to teacher quality identified as a primary focus to improve the poor quality of education (Leu & Price-Rom, 2005). As a result, this study was focused on investigating factors affecting the input aspect of quality education specifically with teachers, school leadership, school environment and facilities, and the school community in the study area. It was attempted to assess factors hindering provision of quality education at the level of secondary education because it is considered as the foundation for promoting middle and high-level skilled manpower and help to feed students to technical and vocational insulation as well as the higher education programs (QEFA, 2014). To these ends, the study was aimed at investigating factors affecting the provision of quality education in secondary schools of three districts namely; Bule, Dilla zuria, and Wonago in Gedeo Zone at South nations nationalities people Region in Ethiopia.

As research results showed, the cycle of poor-quality education and its current effects are looming dangers for Ethiopia. These problems are systemic and intentionally induced (Concerned Educators, 2015). Similarly, another study in Ethiopia indicated that the majority of Government schools have serious problems that mainly lack quality in education during the provision of education (Emmanuel Development Association, 2011). Although the Ethiopian government recently attempts to address the challenges in educational quality, the government has recently devised two major plans, the Education Sector Development Plan (ESDP IV) and the General Education Quality Improvement Programme (GEQIP), anywhere the emphasis is on enhancing student achievement

through better teaching and learning processes. However, this happened at the expense of quality because the quality of education remains poor, student achievement has not adequately improved, particularly at secondary levels (UNESCO, 2015).

In the same way, the data obtained from the Gedeo Zone education office indicated that there was an improvement in enrollment for secondary education, on the other hand, for instance, an average promotion rate of grade ten students to the next grade level by the national examination for the last five years (2013-2017) was 26.2% which was a half percent smaller than expected minimum score point (50%). Therefore, this research was aimed at investigating factors that affect the provision of quality education-related teachers, school leadership, school physical environment facilities, and school community relations in the study area.

1.1 Research Questions

To address the objectives of this research, the following basic research questions were raised.

1) What are the teacher-related factors that affect the provision of quality education?
2) To what extent do school leadership related factors hinder the provision of quality education?
3) To what extent do school physical environment, facility, and resource-related factors affect the provision of quality education?
4) To what extent do school community relationship associated hindrances affect the provision of quality education?
5) Is there statistically a significant difference between views of teachers and students regarding teacher, school leadership, physical environment, and community relationship-related factors on the provision of quality education?

1.2 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study would be vital to identify input level hindrances to strive to provide quality education at secondary schools;

1) To help the local state to implement possibly suggested intervention strategies;
2) To enhance awareness and insight of stakeholders, implementers and community at secondary school level for further improvement with policies, strategies, plans, and actions;
3) To boost teachers' pedagogical skill and career development which in turn help to enhance their knowledge, skills, and attitudes for better services, and
4) To be useful and beneficial for those who are interested to conduct researches on the provision of quality education at process and product level.

1.3 Scope of the Study

The study was delimited to both geographically and conceptually. Conceptually, it was focused on the investigation of factors that affect the input aspect of quality education – specifically concerning teachers, school leadership, school environment and facilities,

and school-community relations. However, it was also geographically delimited to secondary schools of three districts, namely; Bule, Dilla zuria, and Wonago at Gedeo Zone, South Nations Nationalities, and Peoples Region in Ethiopia.

2. Research Design and Methods

According to Patton (1990), a research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims at getting relevant data for the research. Therefore, the researcher used a descriptive survey design at its usefulness to find out information, experiences, opinions, and views from respondents on the provision of quality education. As it is presented in Creswell (2009), a mixed-method paradigm involves collecting and analyzing both qualitative and quantitative data concurrently. Accordingly, this method was used with a high priority of the quantitative approach (QUAN+qual) that guided the study.

2.1 Sources of Data

Both primary and secondary sources of data were used in this study. The primary sources included headteachers, teachers, students, parents, and community members. Whereas, the secondary sources of data were roster, students' class attendance, lesson plans, and teachers' attendance list from secondary schools.

2.2 Target Population, Sample Size, and Sampling Techniques

A total of 1913 target population for this study comprised students, teachers, and headteachers, parent-teacher association members, and community members. As it is stated by Yamane (1967), four hundred eighty-three samples were selected by using his formula. Probability, the simple random technique used to select the samples from teachers, students, and parent-teacher associations because it ensures that each member of the population has an equal and independent chance of being selected (Mertens, 2005). However, non-probability, available sampling technique was used to take school head samples and that of community members was taken using purposively based on the active participation in school activities and literacy level.

Table 1: Sampling frame

Population categories	**Target population**	**Sample size**	**%**	**Sampling techniques**
Head-teachers	6	6	100	Available
Teachers	158	114	72	Simple Random
Students	1689	324	19	Simple Random
Parent	42	21	50	Simple random
Community members	18	18	100	Purposive
Total	**1913**	**483**	**25.2**	**Probability & non-probability**

Summary for sample size determination using Yamane formula:

To determine sample size from teachers:

$$n = \frac{\text{N}}{\text{1+Ne\^{}2}} = \frac{158}{\text{1+158\^{}0.0025}} = 114$$

Similarly, to determine sample size from students:

$$n = \frac{1689}{\text{1+1689\^{}0.0025}} = 324$$

Where, *n* is sample size, *N* is population size, & e is degree of confidence set as 0.05.

2.3 Instruments of Data Collection

Both quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments were used. These include five-point Likert scale format self-developed questionnaires (i.e. open & close-ended for students & teachers), semi-structured interviews for headteachers & community members, non- participant observation – to observe school facilities, and document analysis from mark books, student class attendance, teacher attendance, and lesson plans. A pilot study of the questionnaire was carried out at Chichu secondary school before conducting the actual research. Accordingly, 10 questionnaires to teachers and 20 questionnaires to students were distributed.

Furthermore, all (100%) of questionnaires were returned. Analysis of the pilot indicated that the scale of the questionnaire has good item characteristics. Accordingly, Cronbach Alpha, the reliability coefficient, of improved ranges was averaged as 0.79, which is Acceptable and very good. The face validity of questionnaire items was also cheeked and re-cheeked by two instructors from Dill University who had a related field of specialization with high academic profiles. In this regard, some of the items seem to be vague were modified and some others were replaced by valid items.

2.4 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher collected both forms of data at the same time, concurrently. Data had been collected with an informed say-so of participants by consulted earlier with the cooperation letter written from both the Gedeo zone education department and Arba Minch University, therefore, respondents were rendered cooperation and provide necessary data as needed. Before that, a pre-test to check the consistency of items and validity for the soundness of tools was done before the collection of data immediately after the preparation of tools. Therefore, all the participants were involved willingly to fill the questionnaires and to be interviewed after the orientation given by the researchers. The researchers were planned on how to distribute the questionnaire and get back the adequate numbers of questionnaires. Similarly, the researchers had initial contact with the interviewees to make them clear about the purpose of the study. Then, during the interviews, the researchers have jotted down the main points.

2.5 Method of Data Analysis

The quantitative data collected using questionnaire was filled into SPSS V.20 and analyzed using descriptive statistics-percentage, frequency, mean and standard deviation, and inferential statistics - independent sample t-test was employed to see the differences of the views of teachers and students. Whereas, data collected through interviews, observation, and document analysis were interpreted qualitatively to support quantitative data in the result and discussion section.

3. Result and Discussion

This part presents result analysis, interpretations, and discussions simultaneously after result Tables. The findings of teacher respondents are compared to students and tried to be discussed regarding empirical studies. Moreover, qualitative data collected through interviews, observation, and document analysis are also integrated with result presentations of results of the compared two groups. The result summary of a test of significance, independent sample t-test, are also presented immediately after result discussions of descriptive analysis to see the significant effects of hindering factors by comparing the views or responses of teachers and students in terms of a factor related themes.

3.1 Demographic Information of the Respondents

Table 2: Analysis of sex, age, experience and qualification

Characteristics of respondents	Category	N	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent
Age of students	Age range	15-18	236	92.1	92.1
		19- 21	20	7.81	7.81
	Total		**256**	**100**	**100**
Sex	Female	91	259	26.0	26.0
	Male	259	259	74.0	74.0
	Total	**350**	**350**	**100**	**100**
Qualification of teachers	Diploma	23	23	73.4	73.4
	Degree	69	69	100	100
	Masters	2	2	100	100
	Total	**92**	**94**	**100**	**100**
Experience of teachers	Novice	1-5	39	41.489	42
	Middle	6-10	27	28.723	29
	Teacher	11-15	16	17.0212	17
	Lead	16-20	7	7.4	7.4
	Well experienced	above 21	5	5.3	5.3
	Total	**94**	**94**	**100**	**100**

Regarding the sex of student respondents, as expressed in Table 2, the majority of the students 177(69.14%) is male, and similarly, 82(87.2%) teachers are male. However, all headteachers are male. Therefore, it is revealed that there was no equal participation and representation of students, teachers, and headteachers that indicate a lack of equality and

equity in education which in turn indicates as hindering factor in the provision of quality education. Similarly, concerning the age of these students, the majority of 236 (92%) is in age between 15 and 18 years that indicate inappropriate age maturity level to attain objectives of secondary education. It is referred to in Ethiopian education policy and curriculum that the required qualification of teachers for secondary schools was a master's degree. However, the majority of 69(73.4%) of teachers are degree holders showing that they did not have the required knowledge, skill, and attitude to implement the curriculum of the level to its expectation for the provision of quality education. The experience of these teachers is not also satisfactory, because nearly half (41%) of the teachers are beginners who were without ample experience to provide quality education. This result is in contrast to Kiviti (2004) cited in Mugo (2011) that reveals teachers' experience affects students' performance in national examinations because such teachers have a long experience in teaching and so they know the techniques required for preparing learners adequately for examinations.

3.2 Teacher Related Factors

Table 3: Frequency, percentage, mean, and SD values of teacher related factors (N=94)

S/N	Items	SA		A		U		DA		SDA		X	SD
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	Teachers is no sufficient number of teachers in your school	15	16	31	33	4	43	35	37.2	9	9.6	2.9	1.3
2	Most teachers do not prepare lesson plans	35	35.1	45	47.9	1	1.1	11	11.7	4	4.3	2.0	1.1
3	Most teachers have low educational qualification	28	29.8	48	51.1	7	7.4	9	9.6	2	2.1	2.0	1.0
4	The way teachers answer the questions do not help students to understand	25	26.6	36	28.3	16	17	14	14.5	3	3.2	2.3	1.1
5	Teachers do not have adequate pedagogical trainings	12	12.8	28	29.8	20	21.5	24	25.5	10	10.5	2.9	1.2
6	Teachers have high work loads	5	5.3	32	34	4	4.3	42	44.7	11	11.7	3.2	1.2
7	Teachers do not implement active learning methods and various materials	18	19.1	28	29.1	7	7.4	32	34	9	9.6	3.4	1.4
8	Teachers lack motivation due to low salary	15	16	15	16	3	3.2	34	36.2	27	25	3.4	1.4
9	Teachers have low expectation for their students	25	26.6	3	40.4	6	6,4	21	22.3	4	4.3	2.4	1.2
10	Tests are not given regularly to assess students' learning	28	29.8	42	44.7	8	8.5	11	11.7	5	5.3	2.2	1.4
11	Teachers do not affirm and encourage their students	27	28.7	47	50	4	4.4	12	12.8	4	4.3	2.2	1.4

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree (SDA) 2=Disagree (D) 3=Undecided (U) 4=Agree (A) 5=Strongly Agree (SA) X=Mean SD=Standard Deviation, N=No of Respondents, F=Frequency %=Percentage

As it is indicated in Table 3, the mean value (X=2.9) which is approximate to 3 implies that teacher respondents rated as undecided (3) regarding the number of teachers. But, the standard deviation (SD=1.3) points a sufficient number of teachers that are opposite to the interviewed responses of headteachers. The mean values (X=2) for question item 2 refers that they are strongly disagreed or disagreed which implies that most of the teachers were preparing lesson plans. This result is in favor of students' responses and reviewed lesson plans from documents. Another study by Gilbert (2007), says that lesson plans give a teacher a bird's eye view of the things to be taught and learned every day. Therefore, the lesson plans are vital in teaching; it is a guide a teacher needs to pull through the lesson that is aimed towards learning outcomes.

Regarding educational qualification, half of the respondents (51.1%) disagreed, and about 29.8% of them strongly disagreed in implying that they had expected level of qualification as it is supported by the mean value (X=2.0) and standard deviation (SD=1.3). However, this result contradicts with students' point of view, interviewed data, and demographic information of teachers. Quality of education depends largely on the qualifications and skill of the teaching profession, generally on human, pedagogic and technical qualities of the individual teacher.

Concerning the last question item (4), the mean value (X=2.3, SD=1.1) reveals that the way some teachers answer the question for students was not helpful. This result is contrary to more than half (64.9%) of teachers agree that the way they respond to questions is important to the students' understanding. This result is also strengthened in the study conducted by UNESCO (2004) that asserts the role of the teacher in the classroom has been identified as a crucial variable for improving learning outcomes. Therefore, the way teachers teach is a critical concern in any reform designed to improve the quality of education in general, and the teaching-learning process in particular.

Concerning pedagogical training, teachers' view refers to mean value (X=2.9), which approximates to 3 indicates that some teachers are adequately trained and some of them are not trained as referred with a value of (SD=1.22). The study result revealed in Darling-Hammond (2000), indicate that the effects of well-prepared, that is, trained or qualified teachers on student achievement were stronger than the influence of student background factors.

Concerning teachers' view to their high workload, the mean value (X=3.2) which approximates to 3 and nearly half (56%) of their agreed responses implied that teachers are scarce, and as a result, some teachers are overloaded that forces them to the deterioration and compromisation of quality education.

Regarding the implementation of active learning methods, the study found that about 43.6% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that teachers are implementing active learning methods and various materials in the classroom which was also supported by students' view and classroom observation. This result is also revealed in a study conducted by Santiago and McKenzie (2006) indicated a new paradigm to enhance the quality of teaching, teachers are aware of the implications of applying active learning in the classroom.

Regarding teachers' motivation due to low salary, as indicated in Table 3, the mean value (X=3.8, SD=1.3) approximates to 4 is strengthened by the response of more than half (61.2%) of teachers that implies they lacked motivation due to low salary. However, the result was contrary to the view of students which indicates they might not know how much the teachers earn.

As expressed in Table 3, more than (67.0%) of the teachers strongly disagreed or disagreed to imply high their level expectation for students which was also revealed by mean & SD value (X=2.4, SD=1.21). Similarly, three forth (74.5%) of teachers strongly disagree or disagree with the point that tests were not given regularly to assess students learning. Students' views and analyzed documents such as student mark list strengthened this finding.

Related to the teachers' affirmation and encouragement, more than three fourth of teachers' views (78.7%) strongly disagreed or disagreed which is similar to mean value (X=2.1) was an indicator of teachers' affirmation and encouragement to their students.

Table 4: Independent samples t-test of teacher related factors between the views of teachers and students

Teacher related factors on provision of quality education		**T-test for equality of means**						
		T	**df**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**Mean difference**	**Std. error difference**	**95% Confidence interval of the difference**	
							Lower	**Upper**
Teacher factor	Equal variances not assumed	-.583	172.143	0.560	-.46759	.80143	-2.04949	1.11431

As indicated in Table 4, an independent sample t-test analysis is conducted to see if there is a significant difference between the responses of two groups at a significance level of 0.05. So that the result of the t-test showed as t (.583) sig = .560 > 0.05 confirms that there is no significant difference between the response of two groups. This result implies that teacher-related factors do not have an effect on the provision of quality.

3.3 School Leadership Related Factors

As it is expressed in Table 5 above, the mean value (X=3.1) approximates 3 indicates that teachers are not decided concerning approaches of headteachers. However, about 58.5% of teachers are strongly agreed or agreed and, this is also revealed with SD=1.4 in implying that the headteacher is easy to approach. This result is also strengthened by the result of a study conducted by McLean (2010) that assures an effective school is one where the headteacher is seen as trustworthy and approachable. Regard to headteachers' respect to students and teachers, the mean value (X=3.1) which approximates to 3 indicates undecided, meant some school leaders highly respect students and teachers in their work. However, some are not, as revealed by SD =1.2 that this result was similar to the students' view. The mean value (X=3.1) implies that some school leaders has a good relationship with their staff, students, parents, and community members but some of them are not as it can be seen from SD=1.1. A similar study conducted revealed that the

school leader has to create an avenue of trust competency, a collaborative spirit, attitude, and teamwork among teachers, students, parents, and community members (Hargreaves, 1995).

Table 5: Frequency, percentage, mean, and SD values of leadership related factors (N=94)

S/N	Items	SA		A		U		DA		SDA		X	SD
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	The head teacher is easy to approach	19	20.2	19	20.2	1	1.1	43	45.7	12	2.8	3.1	1.4
2	The school leader highly respects students and teachers in their work	7	7.4	32	34	7	7.4	40	42.6	8	5.5	3.1	1.2
3	The school leader has a good relationship with staff, students, parents and community members	6	6.4	29	30.9	14	14.9	37	39.4	8	8.5	3.1	1.1
4	In school issues, decision making is done in group	20	21.3	11	11.7	11	11.7	29	30.9	5	5.3	2.1	2.1
5	Head teacher delegates responsibility or work	13	13.8	41	43.6	8	8.5	26	27.7	5	5.3	2.6	1.2
6	Head teacher responds to expressed feelings by staff/students	30	11.8	81	31.8	22	8.6	110	43.1	12	4.7	3.0	1.2
7	Head teacher has a high expectation of their staffs and students in terms of academic, social and emotional efforts	30	11.7	72	28.1	19	7.4	124	48.4	11	4.5	3.1	1.2
8	Head teacher is flexible and open to other peoples' views	26	10.2	79	30.9	8	3.1	132	51.6	`11	4.3	2.7	1.2
9	Head teacher communicates and clear to staff and students	22	8.6	82	32	3	1.2	128	50	21	8.2	2.7	1.2

Note: 1=strongly Disagree (SDA) 2=Disagree (D) 3=Undecided (U) 4=Agree (A) 5=Strongly Agree (SA) X=Mean SD=Standard Deviation, N=No of Respondents, F=Frequency %=Percentage

The mean value (X=2.1) which is approximated to 2 indicates that in school issues, decision making is not participatory. Similarly, the mean value (X=2.6) & (SD=1.2) which mean that some school leaders delegate their responsibility and this result is also agreed with students' views. This result is stressed in the study by McLean (2010), giving staff at all levels responsibilities following their skills and remit fosters a culture of leadership where staff feels they share power with management and have some autonomy within their areas of responsibility. But, the mean value (X=3.0) indicates that some school leaders are responsive, and some are not responsive to others feeling with Std. Deviation of 1.18. It was also similar to the students' view. According to mean value (X=3.0851), in the Table above, similarly, some headteachers has a high expectation of staff and students in academic, social, and emotional efforts, and some of them do not have a similar

expectation with SD of 1.2. Question item no 8 has supportive findings to the study conducted by Brook (2011) to ascertain that a language of acceptance in school opens up and makes staff or students feel more comfort. So, when the leader communicates in an accepting way, he or she is using a tool that facilitates positive effects in students. A similar finding was revealed in a study conducted by Harris (1999), who adds that people are important; their views, opinions, feelings, and values must be respected, and every student must get a fair academic chance.

Regarding headteachers' clear communication, the mean value (X=2.7) which is approximated to 3 refers to undecided views. This result is also agreed with the students' view with SD of 1.2. Covey (1990), in favor of this finding, says that in a school, a leader should first seek to understand, then to be understood. Covey and many others also believe that to interact effectively with any group for example, teachers, students, community members, even family members, a school the administrator needs first to understand where the person is coming from.

Table 6: Independent sample t- test of factors related with school leadership between the views of teachers and students

School leadership related factors		T	df	Sig. (2 tailed)	Mean difference	Std. error difference	95% Confidence interval of the difference	
							Lower	Upper
Sum_S2	Equal variances assumed	.671	348	.503	.50490	.75227	-.97466	1.98447
	Equal variances not assumed	.584	131.786	.560	.50490	.86434	-1.20486	2.21467

Teachers and students responded on overall questions related to school leadership and as a result, their views were analyzed based on the given scale. It is mainly confirmed by many interviewed respondents' view and analyzed documents. Independent sample t-test analysis was conducted to see if there is a significant difference between the views of respondent two groups. So that it was tasted at the 0.05 significance level. A test showed that t (584) sig = 0.560 > 0.05, is no significant difference between the respondents of two groups. This implies that those factors related to school leadership do not have a great effect on the provision of quality education.

3.4 School Physical Environment, Facility and Resource Related Factors

Concerning instructional materials 78.8% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that there are inadequate instructional materials in the school. However, no one chosen undecided on the issue. The mean value (3.9) approximated to 4 shows a lack of instructional materials for the learning and teaching process. An interview with headteachers and observation conducted was found to be supportive of this result implying that a great shortage of textbooks, teacher guides, and reference books. For instance, a student-text

book ratio is below standard (1:1) that was observed as 1: 8 during classroom visit and document analysis. This result was also strengthened by the standard deviation of 1.21. Likoko (2013), also noted in his finding that learning experiences are fruitful when there are adequate quantity and quality of physical resources; and that unattractive school building, crowded classrooms, non-availability of playing ground and surroundings that have no aesthetic beauty can contribute to poor academic performance as one of hindering factors for the provision of quality education.

Table 7: Frequency, percentage, mean, and SD values of school physical environment related factors (N=94)

S/N	Items	SA		A		U		DA		SDA		X	SD
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	There are inadequate instructional materials (e.g., books, teacher guides, teaching aids)	7	7.4	13	13.8	0	0	40	42.6	34	36.2	3.9	1.3
2	Poor physical facilities (e.g., classrooms, desks, seats) affect quality of education	7	7.4	28	29.8	3	3.2	36	38.3	20	21.2	3.4	1.3
3	The school has small space (overcrowded classes, field).	11	11.7	25	26.6	0	0	30	39.1	28	29.8	3.4	1.4
4	Our school is not safe, clean, and well-maintained	6	6.4	17	18.1	2	2.1	45	47.9	24	25.5	3.7	1.2
5	There is no suitable and separate toilet to male and female students	22	23.4	22	23.4	1	1.1	30	31.9	17	18.1	3.3	3.4
6	There is inadequate computer to learning	10	10.8	15	16.1	1	1.1	42	45.2	25	26.9	3.6	1.3
7	There is insufficient laboratory in our school	7	7.4	14	14.9	2	2.1	44	46.8	27	28.7	3.7	1.2
8	Our school does not have enough clean water	7	7.4	20	21.3	0	0	39	41.5	28	29.8	3.6	1.3
9	Our school does not have well equipped library	9	9.6	24	25.5	1	1.1	41	43.6	19	20.2	3.4	1.3

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree (SDA) 2=Disagree (D) 3=Undecided (U) 4=Agree (A) 5=Strongly Agree (SA) X=Mean SD=Standard Deviation, N=No of Respondents, F=Frequency %=Percentage

Regarding physical facilities, the mean value (X=3.4) indicates that some schools have physical facilities like classrooms, desks, and seats; however, some do not have these facilities. This result is agreed with students' views and school observations. This also indicated that this case was one of the factors that affect the provision of quality education. Pennycuik (1993) found a similar study result that is; on-site availability of laboratories and clean water supply, classroom maintenance, space, and furniture availability all have an impact on critical learning.

As it is expressed in the Table above, the majority of schools; are crowded, not safe and clean, has no separate toilet by sex, no sufficient computers, not well-equipped

laboratories and libraries, clean water…., etc. These results are revealed in studies like Musau (2004), that found out lack of library facilities is one of the most serious problems standing in the way of achieving high education. Likoko et al. (2013) also noted that better facilities in a school lead to better performance in examinations. Besides, observation of the school physical environment confirmed that most schools had libraries and laboratories without sufficient equipment and materials reading materials.

Table 8: Independent sample t- test on school physical environment, facilities and resources between the views of teachers and students

School physical environment related factors		**T-test for equality of means**								
		F	**Sig.**	**t**	**df**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**Mean difference**	**Std. Err difference**	**95% Confidence interval of the difference**	
									Lower	**Upper**
Sum_S2	Equal variances assumed	3.882	.050	2.839	348	.005	2.10397	.74121	.64616	3.56179
	Equal variances not assumed			2.576	140 .201	.011	2.10397	.81662	.48948	3.71846

Teachers and students responded to overall questions related to the school environment and analyzed their views based on a given scale. It was confirmed by interview and document analysis. Besides, an Independent sample t-test analysis is conducted to see if there is a significant difference between the responses of two groups. This test of significance level was set at 0.05% confidence interval. Therefore, the test result, t (2.576) sig = 0.011< 0.05 shows that there is a significant difference between the responses of two groups. This finding implies that; factors related to school physical environment, facilities, and resources has some extent of the effect on the provision of quality education.

3.5 School Community Relations Related Factors

Regarding teachers' help and support for parents/communities, nearly more than half (59.6%) respondents strongly agreed or agreed to this issue. However, the mean value (X=3.3) is approximated to 3 indicate that undecided responses from teachers as it is already revealed by student respondents. Nearly, three forth (70.2%) of teachers strongly disagreed or disagreed concerning the staff-parent work relationship which is already confirmed by the mean value (X=2.4) to mean that there is no good staff-parent work relationship (SD= 1.2).

Table 9: Frequency, percentage, mean, and SD values of school community relations (N=94)

S/N	Items	SA		A		U		DA		SDA		X	SD
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	Parents and community members usually involve in school activities	22	23.4	42	44.7	3	3.2	25	26.6	2	2.1	2.4	1.2
2	Teachers always ask help and support parents/community members to improve students' behavior	10	10.6	18	19.1	10	10.6	44	46.8	12	12.8	3.3	1.2
3	In school, there is a good staff- parents work relationship	20	21.3	46	48.9	4	4.3	18	19.1	6	6.4	2.4	1.2
4	In school issues, parents and community members always discuss	21	22.3	41	43.6	11	11.7	20	21.3	1	1.1	2.4	1.1
5	Apart from school fees, parents and communities contribute to school in any form for extra expenses	44	46.8	32	34	8	8.5	9	9.6	1	1.1	1.8	1.0
6	Parents are involved in school decision making process	19	20.2	44	46.8	12	12.8	17	18.1	2	2.1	2.4	1.1
7	Parents visit our school as needed	19	20.2	48	51.1	10	10.6	13	13.8	4	4.3	2.3	1.1
8	Parents and community members monitor school to bring students 'learning	13	13.8	32	34	7	7.4	40	42.6	2	2.1	2.9	1.2

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree (SDA) 2=Disagree (D) 3=Undecided (U) 4=Agree (A) 5=Strongly Agree (SA) X=Mean SD=Standard Deviation, N=No of Respondents, F=Frequency %=Percentage.

Regarding discussion and consultation of parents and community on the issue of school, only 43.6% of teacher respondents disagreed meant they do not engage in this regard which is almost similar to the mean value (X=2.3) with SD=1.08. Since more than three fourth (80.9%) of teacher respondents point that apart from school fees, parents and community do not contribute sufficiently in any other form for extra expenses. This result is also revealed by mean value (X=80.9, SD=1.008). But the majority of interviewed parents assured a limited financial contribution as it is also agreed by students.

Concerning parents' involvement in the school decision-making process, 77% of teacher respondents strongly agree or agree that parents do not take an active part in decision making. The mean value (X=2.3511) also asserts this finding as one of the factors that hinder the provision of quality education. However, about 71.3% of teachers' response is strongly disagreed or disagreed that points out parents do not visit the school as needed. The mean value (X=2.3) & (SD=1.1) also ascertain this result. However, interviewed parents' response is opposite to this finding to say it is one of the factors because they argued that they sometimes visit when the school invites them to attend in the arranged conferences and meetings.

Regarding teachers' help and support for parents/communities, nearly more than half (59.6%) respondents strongly agreed or agreed to this issue. However, the mean value (X=3.3) is approximated to 3 indicate that undecided responses from teachers as it is already revealed by student respondents. Nearly, three forth (70.2%) of teachers strongly disagreed or disagreed concerning the staff-parent work relationship which is already confirmed by the mean value (X=2.4) to mean that there is no good staff-parent work relationship (SD= 1.2).

Regarding discussion and consultation of parents and community on the issue of school, only 43.6% of teacher respondents disagreed meant they do not engage in this regard which is almost similar to the mean value (X=2.3) with SD=1.08. Since more than three fourth (80.9%) of teacher respondents point that apart from school fees, parents and community do not contribute sufficiently in any other form for extra expenses. This result is also revealed by mean value (X=80.9, SD=1.008). But the majority of interviewed parents assured a limited financial contribution as it is also agreed by students.

Concerning parents' involvement in the school decision-making process, 77% of teacher respondents strongly agree or agree that parents do not take an active part in decision making. The mean value (X=2.3511) also asserts this finding as one of the factors that hinder the provision of quality education. However, about 71.3% of teachers' response is strongly disagreed or disagreed that points out parents do not visit the school as needed. The mean value (X=2.3) & (SD=1.1) also ascertain this result. However, interviewed parents' response is opposite to this finding to say it is one of the factors because they argued that they sometimes visit when the school invites them to attend in the arranged conferences and meetings.

Table 10: Independent samples test-test of community relationship between the views of teachers and students

Community relationship related factors on the provision of quality education		**T-test for equality of means**						
		t	**df**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**Mean difference**	**Std. error difference**	**95% Confidence interval of the difference**	
							Lower	**Upper**
S -M 4	Equal variances assumed	1.782	348	.076	1.18085	.66258	-.12231	2.48401
	Equal variances not assumed	1.898	188.402	.059	1.18085	.62208	-.04628	2.40798

Teachers and students responded to overall questions related to parents and community involvement in schools, and their views are analyzed based on the given scale. It is confirmed by the interview and document analysis. Besides, an independent sample t-test analysis is conducted to see if there is a significant difference between the responses of two groups. The test is set at a significance level of 0.05. The independent sample t-test

showed that t(1.898) sig = .059 > 0.05 which is not significantly different than implies that these factors do not have an effect on the provision of quality education.

4. Conclusion

Teacher related factors found based on analysis using descriptive statistics like percentage, mean and standard deviation were shortage of highly qualified teachers, lack of motivation in teachers, lack of proper implementation of active learning methods, and low efforts of teachers to enhance students' understanding. By the same method of analysis as to teacher-related factors, school leadership related factors are found to be lack of participatory decision making, transparency, and smooth communication. Regard to school's physical environment, facilities, and resources, findings indicated that most schools are hindered by the lack of attractiveness, scarcity of facilities, and resources. However, the t-test of significance confirmed that there is a significant difference between the responses of teachers and students. Concerning school community relationships; the low participation of parents and community members in decision making, school improvement, and consultancy are identified as hindering factors. But, an independent t-test analysis shows that there is no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that except for school environment facility and resource-related factors, other factors had an insignificant effect on the provision of quality education in secondary schools. However, these all factors are the key factors that affect the provision of quality education in Gedeo zone secondary schools.

Therefore, the study recommends that the government should facilitate professional skill training for teachers, provides adequate instructional resources, and employ qualified teachers to help the head teachers to adapt lucidity in secondary schools. The local government should also seek out the ways for unemployed citizens and revise ethical courses in an offer to improve the characteristics of students.

Acknowledgement

The researchers would like to thank all the participants and collaborators of the present study as well as the editors and reviewers of this research work. Our gratitude also goes to the Dilla University for providing the opportunity, and School of Pedagogical and Behavioral Sciences of Arba Minch University for research funding.

References

Brook, M. (2011). *Head teacher address.* London: University of Nottingham. Retrieved on 23rd /1/2012 from http://www.thisisnottingham.co.uk.

Concerned Educators (2015). The Root Cause of Poor Quality of Education in Ethiopia: An Elephant in the Room. Mekele University. Posted on June 28, 2015,

http://www.satenaw.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/The-Root-Cause-of-Poor-Quality-of-Education-in-Ethiopia.pdf.

Covey, S. (1990). *Principle centered leadership*. New York: Fireside Books, Simon and Schuster.

Creswell J. (2009) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approach*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles: Sage.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis.* Retrieved on February 20, 2009 from http://www.epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1.

EDA (2011). Education Quality in Ethiopia. Emanuel Development Association. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. (Unpublished)

Gilbert, N. (2007). Life Skills Lesson Plans. Retrieved on 12th June, 2011 from http://emilgen2011.hubpages.com/hub/The-Importance-of-Lesson-Plan.

GPE (2015). Global Partnership for Education: USA, Washington DC. www.globalpartnesrship.org.

Hargreaves, A. (1995). *Rethinking educational change*. Invited keynote address to the international conference. Sydney, 1st July 1995.

Harris, A. (1999). *Leading schools in times of change.* Paper presented at the European conference on educational research. Lahti: Finland.

Leu, E. & Price-Rom, A. (2005). *Quality of education and teacher learning: A review of the literature*. Chicago: American Institutes for Research.

Likoko, S., Mutsotso, S. and Nasongo, J. (2013). The Adequacy of Instructional

McLean, A. (2010). *The Motivates school: David Brent factor.* Scotland: UK. Retrieved on 13th November, 2013 from http://www.themotivatedschool.com/docs/13_TessArticles.pdf

Mertens, D. M. (2005). Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

MOE (2008). Ministry of education General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP). Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Mugo, R. W. (2011). The role of parents in promoting effective learning in public secondary schools in Teso South District, Busia County, Kenya. Unpublished Thesis. Nairobi: Catholic University of Eastern Africa.

Musau, S. M. (2004). Factors Influencing Pupils Performance in K.C.P.E in Central Division, Machakos District. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2 nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pennycuick, D. (1993). *School effectiveness in developing countries: A summary of the research evidence.* London: Department for International Development Education Division.

Santiago, P. & McKenzie, P. (2006). Teacher policy review: Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers. *Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American educational research association.* San Francisco: USA.

UN (1998). Convention on the Human Rights of the Child; UNCRC.

UNESCO (1990). World declaration on education for all: Framework for action to meet basic learning needs. Jomtien, Thailand.

UNESCO (2000). *The Dakar Framework for Action: Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments*: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2004). Teacher's pay and conditions: An assessment of recent trend in Africa. EFA, Global monitoring report.

UNESCO (2005). Global monitoring report: The Quality Imperative. Teaching and Learning: Achieving Quality for all, Geneva.

UNESCO (2014). *Sustainable Development Begins with Education. How education can Contribute to the Proposed Post-2015 Goals*. UNESCO.

UNESCO (2015). *Education for All 2000-2015: Achievements and Challenges Education for* All Global Monitoring Report 2015: UNESCO.