

## CHAPTER IV

### DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

#### 4.0. Introduction

The current chapter presents the data analysis and data interpretation objective-wise. The analysed data was collected through questionnaires, perception scales, observation schedules, and interviews. The analysis for the first objective was done using frequency and percentages. The analysis for the second objective also has calculations of frequencies and objectives, along with the intensity index of each of the items utilised in the data collection through perception scales. Objectives 3 and 4 were analysed thematically, and frequencies and percentages were calculated. The respondents for the present study were teachers, principals, students, and parents of the post-fundamental schools of Burundi.

#### 4.1. Demographics

**Table 4.1: Demographics of Respondents**

Variables		Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
		Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Gender	Male	34	91.7 %	231	67 %
	Female	3	8.3 %	114	33 %
Teaching Experience	Less than 5 years	13	35.1 %	107	31 %
	5-10 years	9	24.3 %	145	44.6 %
	More than 10 years	14	37.8 %	93	27 %

Table 4.1 shows that 67% of teachers were males and 33% were females. 91.7% of the principals were males, and only 8.3% were females. 30.7% of the teachers had less than 5 years of experience, 42.3% had experience comprised between 5 and 10 years, and 27% had more than ten (10) years of experience in the teaching profession. 36.1% of principals had less than 5 years

of experience, 25% had an experience of 5 to 10 years of experience, and 38.9% had more than 10 years of experience.

Most teachers and principals were males. Most principals had more than ten (10) years of experience, while most teachers had experience comprised between five (5) and ten (10) years.

## 4.2. Analysis and Interpretation of Data Objective-Wise

### 4.2.1. Analysis and Interpretation of Data for Objective 1

To examine the educational practices in the post-fundamental schools of Burundi with respect to:

- 1) Curriculum
- 2) Pedagogy
- 3) Evaluation Procedures
- 4) School Infrastructure
- 5) Administrative Practices
- 6) Human Resources
- 7) Community Participation.

### 4.2.2. Curriculum

**Table 4.2: Streams Offered at Post-Fundamental Schools**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Science	33	89.2 %	156	45.1 %
Arts and Craft	20	54.1 %	134	38.8 %
Technology	24	64.9 %	65	18.8%
Languages	2	5.4 %	5	1.4 %

Table 4.2 shows that 89.2% of principals and 45.1% of teachers stated science, 64.9% of principals and 18.8% of teachers mentioned technology, 54.1% of principals and 38.8% of teachers responded Arts and Crafts, while 5.4% of principals and 1.4% of teachers stated languages as the stream mainly offered at the post-fundamental schools.

Most principals and teachers stated that Science was the mainstream offered at the post-fundamental schools.

**Table 4.3: Number of Streams in which Teachers Teach**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Teachers who teach in only one stream	260	75.5%
Teachers who teach in two streams	62	18.1%
Teachers who teach in three streams	23	6.4%

Table 4.3 shows that 75.5% of the teachers taught in one stream, 18.1% taught in two streams, and 6.4% taught in three streams.

The majority of the teachers were teaching in one stream only.

**Table 4.4: Number of Subjects Taught by Teacher**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Teachers who teach one subject	171	49.6%
Teachers who teach two subjects	160	46.4%
Teachers who teach more than two subjects	14	4.0%

Table 4.4 reveals that 49.6% of the teachers taught only one subject, 46.4% taught two subjects, and 14% taught more than two subjects. The majority of teachers taught only one subject.

**Table 4.5: Subjects taught by Teachers at Post-fundamental Schools**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Geography	18	5.2 %
History	63	18.3 %

Mathematics	68	19.7 %
Physics	29	8.4 %
Chemistry	20	5.8 %
Biology	17	4.9 %
Psychology	30	8.7 %
Sociology	43	12.5 %
Physical education	12	3.5 %
Home Science	8	2.3 %
Economics	112	32.5 %
Logic	15	3.5 %
Art and Craft	45	13.0 %
Geology	33	9.6 %
English	9	2.6 %
French	23	6.7 %
Kiswahili	3	0.9 %
Kirundi	5	1.4 %

Table 4.5 reveals that 32.7% of the teachers stated Economics, 24.1% % were Mathematics teachers, 18.8% taught History, 12.6% mentioned Sociology and Arts and Crafts, 11.3% responded Physics, 10.9% answered Psychology, and 10.7% stated Geology as the subject they teach at the post-fundamental schools. 9.9% mentioned Chemistry, 8.1% taught Geography, 6% taught French, 3.9% taught Physical Education, 2.4 % taught English, 2.1% taught Logic, 1.6% taught Home Science, 1.3 % taught Kirundi, and 0.8% stated that they teach Kiswahili in Burundi's post-fundamental schools. Most teachers taught Economics as a subject.

**Table 4.6: Specialisation of Teachers**

Responses		Teachers N=345	
Stream	Subject	Frequency	Per cent
Science	Biology	17	4.9%

	Chemistry	20	5.8%
	Geology	33	9.6%
	Home Science	8	2.3%
	Logic	15	4.3%
	Mathematics	68	19.7%
	Physics	17	4.9%
	Psychology	30	8.7%
<b>Art and Craft</b>	Economics	126	36.5%
	Geography	24	7.0%
	History	77	22.3%
	Physical Education	23	6.7%
	Sociology	40	11.6%
<b>Technology</b>	Technology Maintenance	6	1.7%
	Technology Management	5	1.4%
<b>Languages</b>	English	9	2.6%
	French	23	6.7%
	Kirundi	5	1.4%
	Kiswahili	3	0.9%

Table 4.6 reveals that teachers' specialisation in post-fundamental Burundi schools was categorised into four streams: Science, Art and Craft, Technology, and Languages. From the Science stream, 19.7% taught Mathematics, 9.6% taught Geology, 8.7% taught Psychology, 5.8% taught Chemistry, 4.9% taught Biology, 4.9% taught Physics, 4.3% taught Logic, and 2.3% taught Home Science. From the Art and Craft stream, 36.5% taught Economics, 22.3% taught History, 11.6% taught Sociology, 7% taught Geography, and 6.7% were physical education trainers. From the Technology stream, 1.7% taught Technology maintenance, and 1.4% taught Technology management. The Languages stream showed that 6.7% taught French, 2.6% taught English, 1.4% taught Kirundi, and 0.9% taught Kiswahili.

The majority of the teachers had a specialisation in Arts and Crafts.

**Table 4.7: Aims of Post-Fundamental School Curriculum**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Percentage
Emotional Development	14	37.8 %	65	18.8 %
Mental Development	32	86.5 %	234	67.8 %
Physical Development	20	54.1 %	78	22.6 %
Spiritual Development	24	64.9 %	107	31.0 %

Table 4.7 reveals that 86.5% of the principals and 67.8% of the teachers opted for mental development as the aim of the post-fundamental school curriculum in Burundi. 64.9% of the principals and 31% opted for spiritual development. 54.1% of principals and 22.6% of teachers responded that physical development was the aim. 37.8% of principals and 18.8% of teachers stated that emotional development was the aim of the post-fundamental school of Burundi.

The majority of principals and teachers mentioned that mental curriculum was the aim of the post-fundamental school.

**Table 4.8: Types of Post-Fundamental School Curriculum**

Responses	N=37 Principals		N=345 Teachers	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Activities-centred curriculum	17	45.9 %	221	64.1 %
Co-related curriculum (Demonstrating relationship across disciplines)	14	37.8 %	130	37.7 %
Subject-centred curriculum	25	67.6 %	144	41.7 %

Table 4.8 shows that 67.6% of principals and 41.7% of teachers stated that the subject-centred curriculum was the post-fundamental school curriculum implemented in Burundi. 45.9% of principals and 64.1% of teachers mentioned the activities-centred curriculum. 37.8% of

principals and 37.7% of teachers responded that the co-related curriculum (demonstrating a relationship across disciplines) was used at the post-fundamental schools.

Most principals and teachers stated that the post-fundamental schools offered activities and a subject-centred curriculum.

**Table 4.9: Learning Experiences Provided**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Educational visits	25	67.6 %	206	59.7 %
Laboratories	6	16.2%	74	21.4 %
Libraries	12	32.4 %	80	23.2 %
None of the above	6	16.2 %	11	3.2 %

Table 4.9 reveals that 67.6% of principals and 59.7% of teachers answered educational visits, 16.2% of principals and 21.4% of teachers responded laboratories, 32.4% of principals and 23.2% of teachers mentioned libraries as the learning experiences provided. 16.2% of principals and 3.2% did not mention any of the above learning experiences in their responses to the learning experiences provided at the post-fundamental schools.

The majority of teachers and principals stated that educational visits were the learning experiences provided at the post-fundamental schools.

**Table 4.10: Process of Updating Curricula Content to Students**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Participate in professional development programs.	14	37.8 %	110	31.9 %
Encourage changes in instructional	11	29.7 %	97	28.1 %

procedures.				
Provide adequate instructional resources and materials.	13	35.1 %	64	18.6 %
Encourage continuous modification of curricular activities.	5	13.5 %	68	19.7 %

Table 4.10 shows that 37.8% of principals and 31.9% of teachers indicated that they participated in professional development programs, 29.7% of principals and 28.1% of teachers stated that they encouraged changes in instructional procedures, 35.1% of principals against 18.6% of teachers responded that they provided adequate instructional resources and materials, and 13.5% of principals and 19.7% of teachers answered that they encouraged continuous modification of curricular activities as a process of updating students curricula content.

Most respondents mentioned participation in professional development programs as a process of updating students' curricula content.

**Table 4.11: Curriculum Motivating Students for Higher Education**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
It provides the required theoretical knowledge.	18	48.6 %	185	53.6 %
It teaches 21st-century skills.	9	24.3 %	81	23.5 %
It provides vocational skills.	24	64.9 %	65	18.8 %

Table 4.11 shows that 64.9% of principals and 18.8% of teachers said that the curriculum provided vocational skills, 48.6% of principals and 53.6% of teachers stated that the curriculum provided the required theoretical knowledge, and 24.3% of principals and 23.5% of teachers responded that the curriculum taught students 21<sup>st</sup>-century skills as a way of motivating students for higher education.

Most teachers and principals stated that the curriculum provided the required theoretical knowledge and vocational skills to motivate students for higher education.

**Table 4.12: Reflection of Country's Needs in Curriculum**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Sustainable development	12	32.4 %	94	27.2 %
Employment needs	21	56.8 %	50	14.5 %
Society needs	6	16.2 %	20	5.8 %
Promotion of science and technology	10	27.0 %	107	31.0 %
Sexual education	8	21.6 %	55	15.9 %
Equity awareness	8	21.6 %	49	14.2 %
Cultural preservation	7	18.9 %	19	5.5 %
Global changes	2	5.4 %	10	2.9 %

Table 4.12 shows that 56.8% of principals and 14.5% of teachers responded that the curriculum reflected employment needs, 32.4% of principals and 27.2% of teachers stated that the curriculum reflected sustainable development, 27% of principals and 31% of teachers, 21.6% of principals indicated that the curriculum reflected sexual education and equity awareness against 15.9% and 14.2% of teachers. 18.9% of principals and 5.5% of teachers revealed that it reflected cultural preservation. 16.2% and 5.4% of principals mentioned society's needs, and 5.8% and 2.9% of teachers stated global change as the country's needs reflected in the curriculum at the post-fundamental schools.

The majority of teachers and principals stated that the country's needs for employment and the promotion of science and technology were reflected in the curriculum at the post-fundamental schools.

**Table 4.13: Congruence of Lesson Content with Students' Needs**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	28	75.7 %	292	84.6 %
No	9	24.3 %	53	15.4 %

Table 4.13 shows that 75.7% of principals and 84.6% of teachers replied positively to the congruence of the content of lessons and students' needs, compared to 24.3% of principals and 15.4% of teachers who responded negatively to the congruence of lessons content with students needs.

Most teachers and principals mentioned the congruence of lesson content with students' needs.

**Table 4.14: Enhancement of Students' Motivation for Higher Education Studies**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	30	81.1 %	271	78.6 %
No	7	18.9 %	74	21.4 %

Table 4.14 shows that 81.1% of principals and 78.6 % of teachers stated that the curriculum enhanced students' motivation for higher education studies. However, 18.9% of principals and 21.4% of teachers responded that the curriculum did not motivate students for higher education studies.

The majority of teachers and principals stated that the curriculum enhanced students' motivation for higher education studies.

**Table 4.15: Curriculum Preparing Students for Higher Education**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
It has scope for laboratory experiences.	3	8.1 %	34	9.9 %
It provides a guiding program on higher education.	14	37.8 %	250	72.5 %
It ensures the continuity of disciplines from one stage to another.	21	56.8 %	89	25.8 %
It is completed on time.	6	16.2 %	71	20.6 %

Table 4.15 indicates that 37.8% of principals and 72.5% of teachers showed that the curriculum provided a guiding program on higher education, 56.8% of principals and 25.8% of teachers answered that the curriculum ensured the continuity of disciplines from one stage to another as a way of preparing students for higher education. 16.2% of principals and 20.6% of teachers mentioned completing the curriculum on time, and 8.1% of principals and 9.9% of teachers mentioned that the curriculum prepared students for higher education through its scope for laboratory experiences.

Most teachers and principals stated that the curriculum provided a guiding program on higher education and ensured the continuity of disciplines from one stage to another to prepare students for higher education.

**Table 4.16: Students' Development of English Language Skills**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Conduction of direct classroom teaching.	22	59.9 %	110	31.9 %
Organisation of public speaking	8	21.6 %	68	19.7 %

competitions.				
Conduction vocabulary sessions.	4	10.8 %	29	8.4 %
Organisation of extra classes in reading skills.	6	16.2 %	26	7.5 %
Organisation of remedial classes.	9	24.3 %	155	44.9 %

Table 4.16 reveals that 59.9% of principals and 31.9% of teachers stated the conduction of direct classroom teaching, 24.3% of principals and 44.9% of teachers highlighted the organisation of remedial classes, 21.6% of principals and 19.7% of teachers mentioned the organisation of public speaking competitions, 16.2% of principals and 7.5% of teachers stated the organisation of extra classes in reading skills as a way of helping students to improve their english language proficiency. 10.8% of principals and 8.4% of teachers stated that conducting vocabulary sessions helps students develop their english language skills.

Most teachers and principals mentioned the conduction of direct classroom teaching and the organisation of remedial classes as means of helping students to develop their english language skills.

**Table 4.17: Curriculum Evaluation Process**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Involvement of teachers in the curriculum evaluation process.	5 (13.5%)	32 86.5%	219 (63.5%)	125 (36.2%)
Curriculum modification from time to time.	14 (37.8%)	23 (62.2%)	141 (40.9%)	203 (58.8%)
Curriculum changes improve the curriculum.	22 (59.5%)	15 (40.5%)	132 (38.3%)	212 (61.4%)

Table 4.17 shows that 86.5% of principals and 36.2% of teachers replied that they were not involved in the curriculum evaluation process, and 13.5% of principals and 63.5% of teachers stated they were involved in the curriculum evaluation process. 62.2% of principals and 58.8%

of teachers responded that the curriculum was changed from time to time, and 37.8% of principals and 40.9% of teachers mentioned that the curriculum was not modified from time to time. 59.5% of principals and 38.3% of teachers indicated that the curriculum changes improved the curriculum, against 40.5% of principals and 61.4% of teachers who responded that the changes had not improved the curriculum.

The majority of teachers stated that teachers were involved in the curriculum evaluation process. However, curriculum modification did not occur occasionally, and the curriculum changes did not improve in the same way.

**Table 4.18: Teachers’ Familiarization with the New Syllabus**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Participation in teachers' periodic meetings to find out appropriate teaching methods.	9	24.3%	197	57.1%
Participation in orientation programs to teach the new syllabus.	4	10.8%	26	7.5%
Discussion on the new syllabus with other subject teachers.	22	59.5%	60	17.4%
Participation in new syllabus-related curricular activities.	15	40.5%	85	24.6%

Table 4.18 indicates that 24.3% of principals and 57.1% of teachers stated their participation in periodicals with staff to find appropriate teaching methods to teach the new syllabus. 59.5% of principals and 17.4% of teachers mentioned their discussion on the latest syllabus with other subject teachers. 40.5% of principals and 24.6% of teachers mentioned participating in new syllabus-related curricular activities, and 10.8% of principals and 7.5% of teachers participated in orientation programs to teach the new syllabus.

Most teachers and principals mentioned that the participation in teachers' periodic meetings to find appropriate teaching methods and the discussion on the new syllabus with other subject teachers were the teachers' familiarisation with the new syllabus.

**Table 4.19: Basis of the Curricular Content**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
The content is based on the country's needs.	26	70.3%	204	59.1%
The content reflects global needs.	17	45.9%	117	33.9%
The content is based on the learners' needs.	8	21.6%	79	22.9%

Table 4.19 indicates that 70.3% of the principals and 59.1% of the teachers stated that the curriculum content in post-fundamental education was based on the country's needs. 45.9% of principals and 33.9% of teachers responded that it reflected global needs and 21.6% of principals and 22.9% of teachers mentioned that it was based on the needs of the learners.

Most teachers and principals mentioned that the curriculum content was based on the country's needs.

**Table 4.20: Means of Students' Goal Achievement**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Provision of proper teaching-learning facilities.	13	35.1%	121	35.1%
Provision of adequate human and material resources.	9	24.3%	189	54.8%

Provision of appropriate co-curricular activities.	6	16.2%	21	6.1%
Provision of relevant content material to teach students.	15	40.5%	42	12.2%

Table 4.20 shows that 24.3% of principals and 54.8% of teachers responded that the curriculum provided students with adequate human and material resources, 35.1% of principals and teachers mentioned the provision of proper teaching and learning facilities, 40.5% of principals and 12.2% of teachers stated the provision of relevant content material to teach the students, and 16.2% of principals and 6.1% of teachers responded that the curriculum provided appropriate co-curricular activities as the rule of students' goal achievement.

Most teachers and principals stated that providing adequate human and material resources and relevant content material to teach students were the rules for the students' goal achievement.

**Table 4.21: Aspects Lacking in the Curriculum**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Value education	3	8.1%	77	22.3%
Vocational education	5	13.5%	32	9.3%
Global Education	10	27.0%	158	45.8%
Community Development	20	54.1%	98	28.4%

Table 4.21 reveals that 54.1% of principals and 28.4% of teachers responded that the curriculum lacked aspects of community development, 27% of principals and 45.8% of teachers stated that the curriculum lacked aspects of global education, and 13.5% of principals and 9.3% of teachers responded that the curriculum lacked aspects of vocational education, and 8.1% of principals and 22.3% of teachers responded that the curriculum lacked value education aspects into its content.

Most teachers and principals mentioned that global education and community development were lacking in the post-fundamental schools' curriculum.

**Table 4.22: Types of Co-curricular Activities Provided to Students**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Debates	12	32.4%	141	40.9%
Drama	16	43.2%	25	7.2%
Dance	16	43.2%	96	27.8%
Elocution	11	29.7%	17	4.9%
Music	3	16.2%	98	28.4%
Sport	2	5.4%	1	0.3%
None of them	7	18.9%	0	0.0%

Table 4.22 shows that 32.4% of principals and 40.9% of teachers mentioned debates as a co-curricular activity provided to students. 43.2% of principals and 7.2% of teachers stated drama, 43.2% of principals and 27.8% of teachers mentioned dance, 29.7% of principals and 4.9% of teachers answered elocution, 16.2% of principals and 28.4% of teachers mentioned music, 5.4% of principals and 0.3% of teachers responded sport and 18.9% of principals did not mention any of the activities mentioned above as co-curricular activities provided to students.

Most teachers and principals stated debates, drama, and dance were the co-curricular activities provided to students.

**Table 4.23: Availability of Clubs for Students in School**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	24	64.9%	208	60.3%
No	13	35.1%	63	18.3%

Table 4.23 shows that 64.9% of principals and 60.3% of teachers stated the availability of different clubs for students in classes, and 35.1% of principals and 18.3% of teachers mentioned the non-existence of clubs for students in class.

Most teachers and principals acknowledged the availability of clubs for students in schools.

**Table 4.24: Types of Clubs Available in School**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Art Club	10	27.0%	56	16.2%
Dance Club	12	32.4%	2	0.6%
Debate Club	17	45.9%	218	63.2%
Engineering Club	1	2.7%	33	9.6%
Histography Club	4	10.8%	6	1.7%
Science Club	7	18.9%	34	9.9%

Table 4.24 shows that 24.7% of principals and 16.2% of teachers stated art club, 32.4% of principals and 0.6% of teachers mentioned dance club, 45.9% of principals and 63.2% of teachers mentioned debate club, 2.7% of principals and 9.6% of teachers responded engineering club, 10.8% of principals and 1.7% of teachers answered historiography club, and 18.9% of principals and 9.9% of teachers mentioned science club as the types of clubs available in Schools.

The majority of teachers and principals confirmed debate clubs as the most available in schools.

**Table 4.25: Availability of Pre-Decided Programmes in Clubs**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	21	56.8	189	54.8%
No	16	43.2	156	45.2%

Table 4.25 shows that 56.8% of principals and 54.8% of teachers responded positively, confirming the availability of pre-decided programs being implemented in different school clubs, and 43.2% of principals and 45.2% of teachers answered negatively towards the availability of pre-decided programmes in clubs.

The majority of teachers and principals mentioned that a pre-decided programme in clubs was available.

**Table 4.26: Origin of Themes of Discussion in School Clubs**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Ideas from teachers	28	75.7%	68	19.7%
Choices from literature	4	10.8%	271	78.6%
Ideas of students	8	21.6%	44	12.8%

From Table 4.26, 75.7% of principals and 19.7% of teachers stated that the discussion themes in different clubs originated from teachers' ideas. 10.8% of principals and 78.6% of principals responded that debate themes were choices from literature, and 21.6% of principals and 12.8% of teachers answered that debate discussions were students' ideas.

The majority of teachers and principals stated that ideas from teachers and choices from the literature were the origin of discussion themes in school clubs.

**Table 4.27: Most Popular School Clubs in Schools**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Art Club	4	10.8%	114	33.0%
Dance Club	17	45.9%	160	46.4%
Debate Club	21	56.8%	32	9.3%

Engineering Club	0	0.0%	2	0.6%
Histography Club	2	5.4%	17	4.9%
Science Club	6	16.2%	14	4.1%
None of the above	4	10.8%	28	8.1%

Table 4.27 reveals that Dance Club, Art Club, and Debate Club represented the most popular school clubs according to 45.9% of principals and 46.4% of teachers, 56.8% of principals and 9.3% of teachers, 10.8% of principals and 33% of teachers, respectively. However, 16.2% of principals and 4.1% of teachers stated the Science club, 5.40% of principals and 4.9% of teachers mentioned the histography club, and 0.6% of teachers stated the engineering club. Remarkably, 10.8% of principals and 8.1% of teachers did not mention any of the clubs as the school's most famous. Most teachers and principals stated that debate and dance clubs were the most popular.

### 4.2.3. Pedagogy

**Table 4.28: Teaching Methodology Based on Content's Objectives**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	258	74.8
No	87	25.2

Table 4.28 shows that 74.8% of the teachers stated they implemented a teaching methodology based on the content's objectives, while 25.2% responded negatively to considering the teaching methodology based on the content's objectives.

Most teachers mentioned that the teaching methodology was based on the content's objectives.

**Table 4.29: Use of a Different Teaching Methods for a Different Content**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	191	55.4
No	154	44.6

Table 4.29 shows that 55.4% of the teachers stated that they used different teaching methods for different content, and 44.6% mentioned they did not use various teaching methods while teaching different content. The majority of teachers stated that they used different teaching methods for different content.

**Table 4.30: Teaching Resources used by Teachers**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Charts	152	44.0
Digital-based games	34	9.9
Smartboard	133	38.6
YouTube tutoring videos	28	8.1
Text and audio	2	0.6
Films	24	7.0
Textbooks	1	0.3
Bibliotheque	1	0.3

Table 4.30 reveals that 44% of the teachers used charts, 38.6% mentioned smartboards, 9.9% answered digital-based games, and 8.1% responded YouTube tutoring videos as teaching resources. 7% of the teachers mentioned films, 0.6% mentioned text and audio, and 0.3% used textbooks and Bibliotheque as teaching resources.

Most teachers stated that they used charts as teaching resources.

**Table 4.31: Types of Learning Approaches**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Cooperative learning	44	12.8
Constructive learning	166	48.1
Collaborative learning	61	17.7
ICT-based learning	106	30.7

Table 4.31 reveals that 48.1% of the teachers mentioned constructive learning, 30.7% stated ICT-based learning, 17.7% indicated collaborative learning, and 12.8% stated cooperative learning as a learning approach.

Most teachers implemented a constructive learning approach in their pedagogical practices.

**Table 4.32: Teaching Methodologies Implemented**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per Cent</b>
Discussion method	167	48.4
Project method	23	6.7
Demonstration method	158	45.8
Lecture method	35	10.1
Discovery method	19	5.5
Integration pedagogy	4	1.2

Table 4.32 shows that 48.4% of the teachers stated they used the discussion method in a class, 45.8% stated the demonstration method, 10.1% mentioned the lecture method, and 6.7% responded project method, 5.5% revealed they used the discovery method, 1.2% answered that they employ integration pedagogy.

Most teachers mentioned that the discussion method was the teaching methodology implemented at the post-fundamental schools.

**Table 4.33: Technology Integration**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	194	56.2
No	151	43.8

Table 4.33 shows that 56.2% of the teachers responded that they integrated technology-based facilities in their classes, and 43.8% stated that they didn't incorporate technology-based facilities while teaching.

The majority of teachers responded that they integrated technology-based facilities into their classes.

**Table 4.34: Types of Digital Tools used by Teachers**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Quizizz	22	6.4
Edmodo	112	32.5
Google Classroom	162	47
Class dojo	13	3.8
None of the above	52	15.1

Table 4.34 shows that 47% of the teachers employed Google Classroom as a digital tool, 32.5% stated that they used Edmodo, 6.4% mentioned quizizz, and 3.8% indicated that they used Class Dojo as a digital tool. However, 15.1% of the teachers responded that they use no digital tools in their teaching methodology.

Most teachers stated that they used Google Classroom as a digital tool in classes.

**Table 4.35: Techniques Implemented in Class**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Brainstorming	126	36.5
Questioning	229	66.4
Critiquing	43	12.5
Group Formation	1	0.3
None of the above	2	0.6

Table 4.35 reveals that 66.4% of the teachers implemented questioning as a pedagogical technique in their classes, 36.5% stated brainstorming, 12% mentioned critiquing, and 0.3% responded that they implemented group formation as a technique in their classes. Notably, 0.6% of teachers mentioned they did not implement any technique in their classroom.

The majority of teachers mentioned that they implemented questioning as a pedagogical technique in their classes.

**Table 4.36: Pedagogy Improvement Initiatives**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	200	58.0
No	145	42.0

Table 4.36 shows that 58% of the teachers replied positively to taking initiatives to improve pedagogy, and 42% stated that they didn't take any initiatives to improve pedagogy while teaching.

Most teachers stated that they took the initiative to improve their pedagogical practices.

#### 4.2.4. Evaluation Procedures

**Table 4.37: Availability of Rubric for Assessment Work**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	244	70.7
No	101	29.3

Table 4.37 shows that 70.7% of the teachers responded in favour of the availability of rubrics for assessment work, while 29.3% stated that rubrics for assessment work were not available.

Most teachers stated that rubrics were available for assessment work.

**Table 4.38: Types of Assessments Conducted by Teachers**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Formative evaluation	38	11.0
Summative evaluation	113	32.8
Formative and summative evaluation	204	59.1

Table 4.38 revealed that 59.1% of the teachers conducted formative and summative assessments for evaluating their students, 32.8% stated that they used summative assessment, and 11.0% responded that they implemented formative evaluation to assess their students' work.

Most teachers mentioned that they conducted both formative and summative evaluations.

**Table 4.39: Frequency of Students' Work Assessment**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Daily	91	26.4
Weekly	229	66.4
Yearly	4	1.2
Monthly	28	8.1

Table 4.39 reveals that 66.4% of the teachers assessed the work of students weekly, 26.4% stated that they evaluated the work of students daily, 8.1% admitted that they assessed the work of students monthly, and 1.2% said that they evaluated the work of students yearly. Most teachers stated that they performed the evaluations weekly.

**Table 4.40: Types of Formative Assessment Provided to Students**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Assignments	199	57.7
Group work	45	13.0
Quizzes	99	28.7
Peer Reviews	53	15.4

Table 4.40 shows that 57.7% of teachers mentioned that assignments are formative assessments used to evaluate students, 28.7% stated quizzes, 15.4% responded that they use peer reviews and 13% specifically mentioned using group work as a type of formative assessment provided to students.

The majority of teachers mentioned that assignments were the most formative assessment provided to students.

**Table 4.41: Motivation of Students through Evaluations**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
By grading students' daily written work on time	133	38.6
By providing feedback on assessments to students	70	20.3
By providing students with daily homework	176	51.0

Table 4.41 reveals that 51% of the teachers motivated students by providing them with daily homework, 38.6% of teachers stated that they encouraged students by grading daily their written work, and 20.3% responded that they inspired students by providing feedback after assessments of the student's work.

Most teachers stated that providing students with daily homework was their means to motivate them to work through evaluations.

**Table 4.42: Selection of Topics for Students Assignments**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
On the previously discussed topic	116	33.6
On the current teaching topic	180	52.2
On the following topic to be discussed	85	24.6
On any general topic	34	9.9

Table 4.42 indicates that 52.2% of teachers stated that they gave assignments to students based on the current teaching topic, 33.6% indicated that they gave assignments based on the previously discussed topic, 24.6% answered that they gave assignments based on the following topic to be discussed, and 9.9% mentioned that they gave assignments based on any general topic.

Most teachers stated that students' assignments were chosen from the most current teaching topic.

## 4.2.5. Infrastructure

**Table 4.43: Observation Schedule for Infrastructure Dimension**

Sr. N <sup>o</sup>	Rooms	Availability		Quantity	Adequacy			Remarks
		Yes	No		Less	Adequate	More	
1	Spacious and lightened classes	Yes		131	Less	No		Insufficient
2	Assembly hall	Yes		59	Less	No		Insufficient
3	Auditoriums with ICT Installations	Yes		16	Less	No		Insufficient
4	Well-equipped library	Yes		11	Less	No		Insufficient
5	Well-equipped laboratory	Yes		10	Less	No		Insufficient
6	Stores for storage	Yes		14		No		Insufficient
7	Guidance and Counselling Centre	Yes		3	Less	No		Insufficient

Table 4.43 shows that 131 spacious and lightened classes were available, 59 assembly halls were available, sixteen (16) auditoriums with ICT installations were available, eleven (11) well-equipped libraries were available, ten (10) well-equipped laboratories were available, fourteen (14) stores for storage were available, and three (3) guidance and counselling centres were available. However, all the available rooms were insufficient in size and number and, therefore, were marked as inadequate.

**Table 4.44: Observation Schedule for Infrastructure Dimension**

Sr. N <sup>o</sup>	Furniture	Availability		Quantity	Adequacy			Remarks
		Yes	No		Less	Adequate	More	
1	Teachers rooms	Yes		127		Yes		Sufficient
2	Teachers tables	Yes		134		Yes		Sufficient
3	Teachers chairs	Yes		454		Yes		Sufficient
4	Shelves	Yes		74		Yes		Sufficient

5	Students desks	Yes		2362	Less	No		Insufficient
6	Cupboards	Yes		375	Less	No		Insufficient
7	Writing boards	Yes		170		Yes		Sufficient
8	Notice board	Yes		24	Less			Insufficient

Table 4.44 shows that on one side, 127 teachers' rooms with 134 teachers' tables were available, 454 teacher chairs were available, 74 shelves were available, and 170 writing boards were available. The observation schedule indicated that there were enough teachers' tables in schools, sufficient teacher's chairs, enough shelves and writing boards. All the furniture items mentioned above were found adequate. On the other side, there were 2362 student desks available, 375 cupboards were available, and 24 noticeboards were available. However, students' desks, school cupboards, and notice boards were found insufficient and, therefore, stood inadequate.

**Table 4.45: Observation Schedule for Infrastructure Dimension**

Sr. N°	ICT Facilities	Availability		Quantity	Adequacy			Remarks
		Yes	No		Less	Adequate	More	
1	ICT Laboratory	Yes		10	Less	No		Insufficient
2	Class projector		No	0		No		Not available
3	Digital writing board	Yes		7	Less	No		Insufficient
4	Scanner	Yes		12	Less	No		Insufficient
5	Printer	Yes		24	Less	No		Insufficient
6	Laptops	Yes		16	Less	No		Insufficient
7	Desktop	Yes		53	Less	No		Insufficient
8	Telephone	Yes		11	Less	No		Insufficient
9	Film	Yes		2	Less	No		Insufficient
10	Internet	Yes		Slow	Less	No		Poor Internet

Table 4.45 reveals that ten (10) ICT laboratories were available but insufficient. Schools have internet access, but the connection quality is poor, with a slow speed in some schools and

inexistent in others. There were no class projectors available, seven (7) digital writing boards were available, twelve (12) scanners were available, twenty-four (24) printers were available, 16 laptops were available, 53 desk computers were available, 11 phones were available, and two (2) pieces of film equipment were available. However, none of the ICT equipment was sufficient for the number of schools, and all of them were inadequate.

**Table 4.46: Observation Schedule for Infrastructure Dimension**

Sr. N°	Documents, Recreational & Sanitation Facilities	Availability		Quantity	Adequacy			Remarks
		Yes	No		Less	Adequate	More	
1	Teachers books	Yes		168	Less			Insufficient
2	Students books	Yes		2082	Less			Insufficient
3	Preparation books	Yes		61	Less			Insufficient
4	Curriculum copy	Yes		143	Less			Insufficient
5	School regulations	Yes		47	Less			Insufficient
6	Daily/weekly newspapers		No	0	Less			Inexistent
7	Playgrounds and halls	Yes		26	Less			Insufficient
8	Sports items/facilities	Yes		60	Less			Insufficient
9	Staff Sanitation facility	Yes		85		Yes		Sufficient
10	Students' sanitation facility	Yes		372	Less			Insufficient
11	Drinking Water Facility	Yes		45	Less			Insufficient
12	Files of records	Yes		2	Less			Insufficient

Table 4.46 shows that 168 teacher books were available, 2082 student books were available, 61 preparation books were available, 143 curriculum copies were available, and 47 school regulations were available. It also shows that "daily/weekly newspapers did not exist. It shows that 26 playgrounds were available, 60 sports items/facilities were available, and 85 staff sanitation facilities were available and labelled as adequate. 372 students' sanitary facilities were available, 45 drinking water facilities were available, and two (2) record files were available.

Except for the staff sanitation facility, which was enough and adequate, all other documents, recreational and sanitation facilities were classified as insufficient and inadequate.

#### 4.2.6. Administrative Practices

**Table 4.47: Assurance of Teachers' Professional Development**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Participate in an induction program for newly recruited teachers	188	54.5
Participate in teachers' orientation programs	66	19.1
Take membership in recognised academic organisations	63	18.3
Conduct self-evaluation regularly	38	11.0

Table 4.47 reveals that 54.5% of the teachers stated that they participated in an induction program when newly recruited for their professional development. 19.1% mentioned that they participated in teachers' orientation programs, 18.3% answered that they joined recognised academic organisations, and 11% responded that they regularly conducted self-evaluation as part of their professional development activity.

The majority of teachers mentioned that they participated in an induction program for newly recruited teachers as their professional development programme.

**Table 4.48: Professional Development Programmes Organised in Schools**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Weekly administrative meeting	136	39.4
Teacher pedagogical meeting	139	40.3
Pedagogical counsellors meeting	70	20.3

Workshops	22	6.4
Seminars	4	1.2

Table 4.48 indicates that 40.3% of the teachers stated teacher pedagogical meetings, 39.4% mentioned the organisation of weekly administrative meetings, 20.3% stated pedagogical counsellors' meetings, 6.4% mentioned the organisation of workshops, and 1.2% mentioned the organisation of seminars as part of professional development activities for teachers organised in their schools.

The majority of teachers stated that teacher pedagogical meetings and weekly administrative meetings were professional development activities organised in schools.

**Table 4.49: Frequency of Participation in Professional Development Activities**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Once	201	58.3
Twice	105	30.4
Thrice	4	1.2
Never	35	10.1

Table 4.49 shows that 58.3% of teachers stated that they participated once a year, 30.4% answered that they participated twice a year, 10.1% responded that they had never participated, and 1.2% said they participated thrice a year in professional development activities.

Most teachers said they participated once in professional development programmes.

**Table 4.50: Provision of Incentives for Professional Development Programmes**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	211	61.2
No	134	38.8

Table 4.50 shows that 61.2% of teachers stated that incentives were provided, and 38.8% mentioned that no incentives were provided for professional development programmes.

The majority of teachers stated that incentives were provided for professional development activities.

**Table 4.51: Types of Incentives Provided to Teachers**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Extra credit points in performance appraisal	107	31.0
Monetary reward	46	13.3
Certificate of merit	142	41.2
None of the Above	40	11.6

Table 4.51 shows that 41.2% of teachers stated that they received certificates of merit, 31.1% responded that they received extra credit points in performance appraisal, and 13.3% answered that they received monetary rewards as an incentive. However, 11.6% said that there were no incentives for teachers.

Most teachers mentioned that a merit certificate was the main incentive type provided to teachers.

**Table 4.52: Teachers' Sanctions Procedures**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
The principal decides based on teacher requirements	177	51.3
The principal fires the concerned teacher with immediate effect	40	11.6
The principal takes expert opinion	85	24.6
The principal consults his principal colleagues before deciding	28	8.1
The principal calls up a meeting with teachers for a joint decision	31	9

Table 4.52 reveals that 51.3% of the teachers stated that the school principal decided based on teacher requirements, 24.6% mentioned that the school principal took the expert opinion, 11.6% said that the principal fired the concerned teacher with immediate effect, 9% revealed that the principal called up a meeting with teachers for a joint decision, and 8.1% indicated that the principal consulted his principal colleagues before deciding as part of the teachers' sanction procedures.

The majority of teachers stated that the principal decided, based on teacher requirements, to sanction teachers under his responsibility.

**Table 4.53: Involvement of Teachers in Decision-Making**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Possession of equal opportunities to participate in decision-making	250	72.5
Involvement in decision-making, but ultimately rely on the principal's decision as final	38	11.0
The principal makes teachers understand his administrative decisions	64	18.6

Table 4.53 indicates that 72.5% of the teachers stated they possessed equal opportunities to participate in decision-making, 18.6% mentioned that principals made teachers understand their administrative decisions, and 11% responded that they were involved in decision-making even though the principal's decision is ultimately final.

The majority of teachers stated that they possessed equal opportunities to participate in decision-making in schools.

**Table 4.54: Availability of Teacher Recruitment Eligibility Criteria**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Yes	111	32.2
No	234	67.8

Table 4.54 reveals that 67.8% of teachers stated that there were no eligibility requirements for recruitment, while 32.2% responded that there was a laydown recruitment eligibility criteria.

Most teachers stated that there were no eligibility requirements for teachers' recruitment.

**Table 4.55: Teachers' Awareness of Recruitment Guidelines**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Yes	267	77.4
No	78	22.6

Table 4.55 shows that 77.4% of the teachers mentioned being aware of the recruitment guidelines, while 22.6% stated that they were not.

Most teachers mentioned being aware of the recruitment guidelines.

**Table 4.56: Teachers Recruitment Criteria**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Qualification	298	86.4
Geographical origin	9	2.6
Experience	51	14.8
Age	8	2.3

Table 4.56 reveals that 86.4% of the teachers stated qualification, 14.8% mentioned experience, 2.6% mentioned geographical origin, and 2.3% stated that age was the recruitment criteria.

Most teachers stated that qualification was the teacher's recruitment criteria.

**Table 4.57: Teacher Recruitment Agency for Schools**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
The Communal Education Bureau	108	31.3
The Central Government	151	43.8
The Provincial Education Bureau	68	19.7
The School Administration Board	26	7.5

Table 4.57 indicates that 43.8% of teachers mentioned the central government, 31.3% stated the communal education bureau, 19.7% stated the provincial education bureau, and 7.5% stated the school administration board as the teachers' school recruitment agency.

Most teachers mentioned the central government as the teachers' school recruitment agency.

**Table 4.58: Timely Response to Teaching Vacancy**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Yes	168	48.7
No	177	51.3

Table 4.58 reveals that 51.3% of teachers answered negatively, stating that recruitment was not held as soon as a teaching vacancy was in schools, and 48.7% of teachers responded positively, stating that recruitment was held timely following a teaching vacancy.

Most teachers stated that recruitment was not held as soon as a teaching vacancy was in school.

**Table 4.59: Required Qualification for a Post-Fundamental Teacher**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Bachelor's degree in a teacher education institution	148	42.9
Hold a teaching experience	42	12.2
Master's degree in a teacher education institution	139	40.3
Any qualification	28	8.1

Table 4.59 states that 42.9% of teachers responded that a post-fundamental teacher should have a bachelor's degree from a teacher education institution, 40.3% said they should have completed their master's degree program from a teacher education institution, 12.2% mentioned that a teacher should have a teaching experience, and 8.1% said there was no specific qualification required for a post-fundamental teacher.

The majority of teachers mentioned that a bachelor's degree in a teacher education institution was required for a post-fundamental teacher.

**Table 4.60: Supervisors of Teachers in Schools**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
External Supervisors	152	44.1
School principal	200	58.0
Senior teachers	29	8.4

Table 4.60 shows that 58% stated that the school's principal supervised teachers' work, 44.1% answered that external supervisors supervised teachers' work, and 8.4% responded that senior teachers supervised teachers' work.

The majority of teachers stated that the school's principal supervised teachers' work in school.

**Table 4.61: Frequency of Supervising Teachers Work**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Daily	154	44.6
Weekly	150	43.5
Monthly	22	6.4
Quarterly	12	3.5
As needed	19	5.5

Table 4.61 indicates that 44.6% of teachers stated that their principals supervise teachers' work every day, 43.5% mentioned that principals supervise teachers' work every week, 6.4% answered that principals supervise teachers' work every month, 5.5% stated that principals supervise teachers' work every time they feel it's necessary, and 3.5% stated that the principals supervise their work every three months.

Most teachers stated that their principals supervised their work on a daily basis.

**Table 4.62: Follow-Up Actions after the Supervision**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
To go through training programs	255	73.9
To go through disciplinary action	101	29.3
To be assigned a mentor	35	10.1

Table 4.62 shows that 73.9% of the teachers stated that principals asked teachers to go through training programs, 29.3% stated that teachers went through disciplinary actions, and 10.1% stated that teachers were assigned mentors for assistance after principals supervised their teaching activities.

The majority of the teachers stated that principals asked them to go through training programs as a follow-up action performed after the supervision was done.

**Table 4.63: Reasons of Teacher Supervision**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Daily reports from colleagues	155	44.9
Principal's duty	122	35.4
Students complaints	29	8.4
Effectiveness of the teaching-learning process	57	16.5

Table 4.63 indicates that 44.9% of teachers stated that principals supervised teaching activities in response to daily reports from colleague teachers, 35.4% mentioned that it was the principal duty to supervise the teaching activities, 16.5% mentioned that supervising teaching activities improved the effectiveness of the teaching-learning process, and 8.4% responded that they supervised teaching activities in response to student complaints.

The majority of teachers stated that principals supervised teaching activities in response to daily reports from colleague teachers.

**Table 4.64: Students Admission Rules and Regulations**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	30	81.1
No	7	18.9

Table 4.64 shows that 81.1% of the principals stated the availability of student admission rules and regulations, while 18.9% replied negatively, stating that rules and regulations regarding admission criteria were available.

Most principals stated the availability of student admission rules and regulations in schools.

**Table 4.65: Student Admission Criteria in Schools**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
Possess the admission documents	31	83.8
Have completed the fundamental school	13	35.1
Meet the age requirement	6	16.2
Meet the disciplinary guidelines	3	8.1

Table 4.65 shows that 83.8% of principals stated that students needed to have their admission documents, 35.1% of teachers stated that students needed to have completed elementary school, 16.2% stated that candidates were required to meet the age requirement, and 8.1% answered that students needed to meet the discipline guidelines in order to get admission in schools.

The majority of principals stated that possessing the admission documents was the main criterion for students' admission to schools.

**Table 4.66: Student Admission Procedures**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Interview	6	16.2%	159	46.1%
Merit	14	37.8%	84	24.3%
Written test	9	24.3%	110	31.9%
None of the Above	0	0.0%	3	0.9%

Table 4.66 reveals that 16.2% of principals and 46.1% of teachers responded that an interview was conducted as part of the admissions process for students, 37.8% of principals and 24.3% of teachers responded that students got admission based on their merit, 24.3% of principals and 31.9% of teachers responded that written tests were part of the admissions process, and 0.9% stated that none of the procedures had been taken into consideration while admitting students.

Most respondents mentioned that interviews and meritocracy were the student's admission procedures in schools.

**Table 4.67: Frequency of Student Admission in Schools**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Once a year.	33	89.2%	204	59.1%
It depends on the field of study.	3	8.1%	152	44.1%
Once a semester.	1	2.7%	19	5.5%

In Table 4.67, 89.2% of the principals and 59.1% of the teachers stated that students were admitted to schools once a year, 8.1% of principals and 44.1% of teachers mentioned that

students got admission depending on the field of study, and 2.7% of principals and 5.5% of teachers answered that students were admitted in schools once a semester.

The majority of teachers and principals stated that students' admission to schools was performed once a year.

**Table 4.68: Overcrowded Classes Management Strategies**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Divide students into learning groups.	195	56.5
Get assistance from co-teachers.	42	12.2
Take daily attendance.	100	29.0
Take no action.	8	2.3

Table 4.68 reveals that 56.5% of teachers indicated that they divided students into learning groups to manage overcrowded classes; 29% said that they had taken students' daily attendance to manage their classes; 12.2% stated that they got assistance from co-teachers to manage their overcrowded classes, and 2.3% indicated that they took no action to manage the overcrowded classes.

Most teachers mentioned that dividing students into learning groups was the strategy to manage overcrowded classes.

**Table 4.69: Students' Discipline Management**

Responses	Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent
Ensure the discipline guidelines are given to students	175	50.7
Give punishment to indisciplined students.	133	38.6
Suspend the indisciplined students from the class.	37	10.7

Table 4.69 shows that 50.7% of the respondents stated that teachers ensured the students' discipline guidelines were given to students, 38.6% indicated that they provided punishment to indisciplined students, and 10.7% responded that they suspended the indisciplined students from the class.

The majority of teachers and principals stated that teachers ensured the students' discipline guidelines were given to students as part of student discipline management.

**Table 4.70: Availability of Fee Regulation in Schools**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	28	75.7
No	9	24.3

Table 4.70 reveals that 75.7% of principals stated that fee regulation was available in schools, while 24.3% of the principals responded that fee regulation was missing.

The majority of principals stated that fee regulation was available in schools.

**Table 4.71: Availability of Government's Funding for Schools**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	19	51.4
No	18	48.6

Table 4.71 reveals that 51.4% of principals mentioned that schools received government funding, while 48.6% disagreed, stating that schools did not receive any funding from the government.

The majority of principals mentioned that schools received government funding.

**Table 4.72: Frequency of School Funding by Government**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
Once a trimester	7	18.9
Once a semester	12	32.4
Once a year	12	32.4
Never	6	16.2

Table 4.72 indicates that 32.4% of the principals stated that the funding to schools was provided once a semester, 32.4% disclosed that the funding to schools was provided once a year, 18.9% responded that the funding to schools was provided once a trimester and 16.2% stated that the government did not provide funding to schools.

The majority of principals mentioned that schools received government funding once a year or once a semester.

**Table 4.73: Government's Funding for Different Dimensions**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
External development programs	18	48.6
Supply of teaching facilities	5	13.5
Infrastructure development	3	8.1
Staff professional development	6	16.2
Staff salary	5	13.5

Table 4.73 shows that 48.6% of the principals stated that their school received government funding for external development programs, 16.2% stated professional development, 13.5% mentioned the supply of teaching facilities, 13.5% stated staff salaries, and 8.1% mentioned that infrastructure development was the dimensions that received funding from the government.

Most principals stated that their schools received government funding for external development programs.

**Table 4.74: Adequacy of Government Funds to Schools**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	5	13.5
No	32	86.5

Table 4.74 shows that 86.5% of the principals disagreed, mentioning that government funding was inadequate to meet all of the needs of schools, while 13.5% agreed to the government funding adequacy.

Most principals mentioned that government funding was inadequate to meet all of the needs of schools.

**Table 4.75: Means of School Funds Mobilisation**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
Contribution of students to development funds	19	51.6
Mobilisation of funds from the school-industry partnership	5	13.5
Organisation of school fund-fair	4	10.8
Mobilisation of funds from charity organisations	10	27.0

Table 4.75 reveals that according to 51.6% of principals, schools require a contribution of students for development funds, 27% stated mobilisation of funds from charity organisations, 13.5% mentioned mobilisation of funds from the school-industry partnership, and 10.8% stated organisation of school fund-fair to generate money for covering their needs.

Most principals stated that schools required students to contribute to mobilising school development funds.

**Table 4.76: Regulations on Use of School Funds**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	18	48.6
No	19	51.6

Table 4.76 shows that 51.6% of principals stated that there was no regulation on the use of school funds, while 48.6% gave a positive response, mentioning that there was a regulation on school funds use.

The majority of principals stated that there was no regulation on the use of school funds.

#### 4.2.7. Human Resource

**Table 4.77: Unqualified Teachers in Schools**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	13	35.1%	172	49.2%
No	24	64.9%	175	50.8%

Table 4.77 shows that 64.9% of principals and 50.8% of teachers stated that schools did not have unqualified teachers. In comparison, 35.1% of principals and 49.2% of teachers responded that unqualified teachers were present in schools.

Most teachers and principals stated that schools did not have unqualified teachers.

**Table 4.78: Recruitment Motive of Unqualified Teachers**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Lack of qualified teachers	24	64.9%	98	28.4%
Possession of teaching inborn skills	11	29.7%	166	48.1%
Replacement of the retired/departed ones	4	10.8%	33	9.6%
Possession of a brief teaching training	5	13.5%	107	31.0%

Table 4.78 reveals that 64.9% of principals and 28.4% of teachers stated that unqualified teachers were hired due to a lack of qualified teachers, 29.7% of principals and 48.1% of teachers stated that unqualified teachers got recruited because they possess inborn teaching skills, 13.5% of principals and 31% of teachers responded that hiring unqualified teachers occurred for those with brief teaching training, and 10.8% of principals and 9.6% of teachers stated that unqualified teachers were hired to replace the retired or departed teachers.

Most teachers and principals stated that unqualified teachers were hired because schools lacked qualified teachers and others because they possessed inborn teaching skills.

**Table 4.79: Teaching Courses of Specialisation**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	28	75.7%	261	75.7%
No	9	24.3%	84	24.3%

Table 4.79 shows that 75.7% of the principals and teachers answered positively, stating that teachers were teaching their specialisation courses, and 24.3% stated that teachers were not teaching according to their specialisations.

The majority of teachers and principals mentioned that teachers were teaching their specialisation courses.

**Table 4.80: Availability of Co-Teachers in Class**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	6	16.2%	54	15.7%
No	31	83.8%	291	84.3%

Table 4.80 shows that 83.8% of the principals and 84.3 of the teachers responded negatively, stating that teachers didn't have co-teachers to assist them in class, whereas 16.2% of the principals and 15.7% of the teachers responded positively, mentioning that teachers had co-teachers to assist them in class.

Most teachers and principals stated that teachers didn't have co-teachers to assist them in class.

**Table 4.81: Teachers' Professional Development Activities**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
Suggest that teachers take membership in recognised academic organisations.	24	64.9
Conduct an induction program for the new teachers.	11	29.7
Evaluate the teaching staff regularly.	9	24.3
Organise teachers' orientation programs.	4	10.8

Table 4.81 reveals that 64.9% of principals suggested teachers take membership in recognised academic organisations, 29.7% answered that they ran induction programs for new teachers, 24.3% mentioned they regularly assessed their teaching staff, and 10.8% stated they organised

teacher orientation programs to ensure that teachers under their responsibility are developing professionally.

The majority of principals suggested that teachers take membership in recognised academic organisations to ensure that teachers under their responsibility are developing professionally.

**Table 4.82: Categories of Non-Teaching Staff**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
School psychologist	8	21.6
Librarians	26	70.3
Peons	12	32.4
Clerks	11	29.7
Lab technicians	5	13.5

Table 4.82 shows that 70.3% of principals stated librarians, 32.4% mentioned peons, 29.7% mentioned clerks, 21.6% mentioned school psychologists, and 13.5% mentioned lab technicians among other non-teaching staff available in schools.

The majority of principals stated that librarians were the most non-teaching staff available in schools.

**Table 4.83: Responsibilities to Non-Teaching Staff**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	26	70.3
No	11	29.7

Table 4.83 shows that 70.3% of principals stated that non-teaching staff members were given responsibilities, while 29.7% responded negatively, mentioning that non-teaching staff were not given any responsibility in schools.

Most principals stated that non-teaching staff were assigned some activities in schools.

**Table 4.84: Assignments of Non-Teaching Staff**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
Support students' academic initiatives	8	21.6
Assist teachers in applying routine discipline to students	26	70.3
Ensure the cleanliness of the school	12	32.4

Table 4.84 shows that 70.3% of the principals stated that non-teaching staff was assigned to assist teachers in applying routine discipline to students, 32.4% responded that non-teaching staff ensured the cleanness of the school, and 21.6% stated that their role was to support student's academic initiatives.

Most principals mentioned that assisting teachers in applying routine discipline to students was the primary assignment given to school non-teaching staff.

**Table 4.85: Grievances among Teachers**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	32	86.5%	185	53.6%
No	5	13.5%	160	46.4%

Table 4.85 reveals that 86.5% of principals and 53.6% of teachers agreed that teacher grievances existed among teachers, while 13.5% of principals and 46.4% of teachers disagreed on grievances among teachers.

Most teachers and principals stated that grievances existed among teachers in schools.

**Table 4.86: Grievance Redressal Process in Schools**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
The school principal confronts the conflicting parties.	16	43.2%	189	54.8%
The school principal solves them one by one as they are submitted.	14	37.8%	31	9.0%
There is a complaint box.	3	8.1%	20	5.8%
The school principal listens to every complaint from teachers.	33	89.2%	104	30.1%

Table 4.86 shows that 89.2% of principals and 30.1% of teachers mentioned that the principal listened to every teacher's complaint. 43.2% of principals and 54.8% of teachers stated that the school's principal confronted the disputing parties as parties, 37.8% of principals and 9% of teachers responded that the principal solved grievances as they were submitted, and 8.1% of principals and 5.8% of teachers stated that there was a complaint box as grievances redressal process.

The majority of teachers and principals stated that the school principal confronted the conflicting parties, and the school principal listened to every complaint from teachers as a grievance redressal in schools.

**Table 4.87: Effective Grievance Redressal**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	16	43.2%	73	21.2%
No	21	56.8%	272	78.8%

Table 4.87 shows that 56.8% of principals and 78.8% of teachers responded that the grievance redressal among teachers was not effective, and 43.2% of the principals and 21.2% of the teachers stated that the process was grievance redressal among teachers was effective.

Most teachers and principals stated that the grievance redressal among school teachers was ineffective.

**Table 4.88: Consequences of Unaddressed Grievances**

Responses	Principals N=37	
	Frequency	Per cent
Unsolved conflicts are directed to the Parent-Teacher Association Board	4	10.8
Conflicts are left unsolved	20	54.1
Unsolved conflicts directed to the Provincial Bureau of Education	3	8.1
Unsolved conflicts are directed to the Ministry of Education	6	16.2
Unsolved conflicts are directed to the Communal Bureau of Education	3	8.1

Table 4.88 reveals that 54.1% of principals stated that conflicts were left unresolved, 16.2% mentioned that unresolved conflicts were directed to the Ministry of Education, 10.8% answered that unresolved conflicts were directed to the parent-teacher association board, 8.1% responded

that unresolved conflicts were directed to the provincial bureau of education, and 8.1% mentioned that unresolved conflicts were directed to the communal bureau of education.

Most principals stated that as a consequence of unaddressed grievances, conflicts were left unresolved.

**Table 4.89: Payment Agency for Teachers' Salary**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Government	37	100%	382	100%
NGO	0	0%	0	0%
Any other Agency	0	0%	0	0%

Table 4.89 shows that 100% of teachers and principals stated that the government is paying all teachers salaries.

Cent per cent of teachers and principals stated the government was the teachers' salary payment agency.

**Table 4.90: Adequacy of Teachers Salary**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	11	29.7%	118	34.2%
No	26	70.3%	227	65.8%

Table 4.90 shows that 70.3% of principals and 65.8% of teachers stated the inadequacy of their salary, against 29.7% of principals and 34.2% of teachers who stated that the salaries were adequate.

Most teachers and principals mentioned the inadequacy of the teachers' salaries.

**Table 4.91: Salary Increment**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	15	40.5%	259	75.1%
No	22	59.5%	86	24.9%

Table 4.91 shows that 40.5% of the principals and 75.1% of teachers agreed to the increase of teachers' salaries yearly, against 59.5% of principals and 24.9% of teachers who disagreed with the yearly salary increase.

Most teachers and principals stated that the teachers' salaries were increased yearly.

**Table 4.92: Provision of Performance-Based Benefits**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	14	37.8%	53	15.4%
No	23	62.2%	292	84.6%

Table 4.92 shows that 62.2% of principals responded negatively, against 37.8% of principals and 15.4% of teachers who responded positively that their school provided them with performance-based benefits.

Most teachers and principals stated that the schools did not provide them with performance-based benefits.

**Table 4.93: Facilities Provided by School to Teachers**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Canteen fee waiver to all teachers' children.	3	8.1%	47	13.6%
School fee waiver of children of all teaching staff.	29	78.4%	62	18.0%
School fees waiver of extended family members of teachers.	4	10.8%	223	64.6%
None of the Above	0	0.0%	13	3.8%

Table 4.93 shows that 78.4% of principals and 18% of teachers stated that schools waived fees for the children of all teaching staff. 10.8% of principals and 64.6% of teachers stated that schools waived fees for teachers' extended families to facilitate the life of their teachers. 8.1% of principals and 13.6% of teachers responded that the school waived fees for all teachers' children to eat at the canteen, and 3.8% of teachers mentioned that the school does not offer any facilities to teachers.

The majority of teachers and principals mentioned the school fee waiver for children of all teaching staff and the school fee waiver for extended family members of teachers as facilities provided to teachers by schools.

**Table 4.94: Management of Teacher Stress**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Assign leave to teachers as and when required.	11	29.7%	49	14.2%
Direct and accompany teachers to	5	13.5%	151	43.8%

guidance and counselling centres.				
Relieve the stressed teachers on stressful days.	26	70.3%	139	40.3%

Table 4.94 shows that 70.3% of the principals and 40.3% of the teachers stated that the schools relieved stressed teachers on stressful days, 13.5% of principals and 43.8% of teachers stated that the schools directed and accompanied the teachers to guidance and counselling centres, 29.7% of the teachers and 14.2% of the teachers mentioned that schools assigned leave to teachers required to manage the stress of teachers.

The majority of teachers and principals stated that the school directed and accompanied teachers to guidance and counselling centres and relieved the stressed teachers on stressful days as their stress management strategy.

**Table 4.95: School's Contribution to Life Insurance for Teachers**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	15	40.5%	172	49.9%
No	22	59.5%	173	50.1%

Table 4.95 shows that 59.5% of the principals and 50.1% of the teachers stated that the school did not contribute to teachers' life insurance, and 40.5% of the principals and 49.9% of the teachers stated that the school did contribute to teachers' life insurance.

Most teachers and principals stated that the school did not contribute to teachers' life insurance.

**Table 4.96: Means of Job Security Assurance**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent

Provide a determined job contract.	6	16.2%	196	56.8%
Provide an undetermined job contract.	30	81.1%	66	19.1%
Renew the job contract on time.	2	5.4%	64	18.6%
None of the Above	2	5.4%	15	4.3%

Table 4.96 indicates that 81.1% of principals and 19.1% of teachers responded that the schools provided an undetermined job contract to ensure the teachers' job security. 16.2% of principals and 56.8% of teachers stated that the schools offered a determined job contract. 5.4% of principals and 18.6% of teachers stated that the school renewed the teachers' job contracts on time, and 5.4% of principals and 4.3% of teachers mentioned that schools did nothing to ensure the teachers' job security.

Most teachers and principals mentioned providing determined and undetermined job contracts to ensure teachers' job security.

#### 4.2.8. Community Participation

**Table 4.97: Parents' Involvement in School Activities**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	22	59.5%	183	53.0%
No	15	40.5%	162	47.0%

Table 4.97 shows that 59.5% of principals and 53.7% of teachers agreed with the involvement of parents in school activities, against 40.5% of principals and 47% of teachers who disagreed that there was parental involvement in school activities. Most teachers and principals stated the involvement of parents in school activities.

**Table 4.98: Level of Parents' Involvement in School Activities**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
High involvement	14	37.8%	30	8.7%
Regular involvement	17	45.9%	157	45.5%
It is not needed	1	2.7%	24	7.0%
Less involvement	7	18.9%	136	39.4%

Table 4.98 reveals that 45.9% of principals and 45.5% of teachers stated that parents were regularly involved in school activities, 19.8% of principals and 39.4% of teachers stated that parents were less involved in school activities, 37.8% of principals and 8.7% of teachers mentioned that parents were highly involved in school activities, and 2.7% of principals and 7% of teachers stated that parents' involvement in school activities was not needed.

The majority of teachers and principals stated that parents were regularly involved in school activities.

**Table 4.99: Activities Performed by Parents in School**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Contribute to paying hostel fees for homeless students.	3	8.1%	72	20.9%
Contribute to the food supply in the school canteen.	8	21.6%	179	51.9%
Participate in school material supply.	14	37.8%	35	10.1%
Participate in the construction of school buildings.	0	0.0%	4	1.2%
Pay school fees for financially weak	17	45.9%	21	6.1%

students.				
None of the Above.	0	0.0%	24	7.0%

Table 4.99 shows that 21.6% of the principals and 51.9% of teachers responded that parents contributed to the food supply in the school canteen, 45.9% of the principals and 6.1% of teachers mentioned that parents contributed to paying school hostel fees for financially weak students, 37.8% of the principals and 10.1% of teachers stated that parents participated in school material supply, 8.1% of the principals and 20.9% of teachers answered that parents paid hostel fees for homeless students, 7% of the teachers stated that parents did not perform any activity in schools, and 1.2% of the teachers stated that parents participated in the construction of schools' buildings.

Most teachers mentioned that parents' central involvement in school activities was contributing to the school canteen's food supply and paying school fees for financially weak students.

**Table 4.100: School Contribution to Community Development**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	22	59.5%	211	61.2%
No	15	40.5%	134	38.8%

Table 4.100 reveals that 59.5% of the principals and 61.2% of the teachers agreed that schools contributed to community development. In comparison, 40.5% of principals and 38.8% of teachers disagreed with the school's contribution to community development.

Most teachers and principals stated that schools contributed to community development.

**Table 4.101: Schools' Contribution to Community Development**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Principals N=37</b>		<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Organise awareness campaigns on social issues.	9	24.3%	132	38.3%
Teach unprivileged children.	17	45.9%	153	44.3%
Provide adult education.	13	35.1%	51	14.8%
None of the Above.	0	0.0%	18	5.2%

Table 4.101 shows that 45.9% of the principals and 44.3% of teachers responded that the schools taught unprivileged children, 24.3% of the principals and 38.3% of the teachers stated that schools organised awareness campaigns on social issues, 35.1% of the principals and 14.8% of the teachers mentioned that the schools provided adult education, and 5.2% of the teachers stated that the schools didn't contribute to community development.

Most teachers and principals stated that schools taught unprivileged children as their contribution to community development.

**Table 4.102: Existence of Parent-Teacher Associations**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Principals N=37</b>		<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Yes	9	24.3%	165	47.8%
No	28	75.7%	180	52.2%

Table 4.102 reveals that 75.7% of the principals and 52.2% of the teachers answered negatively about the existence of parent-teacher associations. In comparison, 24.3% of principals and 47.8% of teachers replied positively, stating that parent-teacher associations existed.

Most respondents answered that the parent-teacher association did not exist in schools.

**Table 4.103: Organisation of Regular PTA Meetings**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	22	59.5%	135	39.1%
No	15	40.5%	210	60.9%

Table 4.103 shows that 40.5% of principals and 60.9% of teachers stated that parent-teacher associations did not conduct meetings regularly, and 59.9% of the principals and 39.1% of the teachers responded that the PTA meetings were being organised regularly.

Most teachers and principals mentioned that parent-teacher associations did not conduct meetings regularly.

**Table 4.104: PTA Activities in Schools**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Participate in school project decisions	21	56.8%	114	33.0%
Raise money for school supplies.	6	16.2%	196	56.8%
Volunteer to take classes.	11	29.7%	24	7.0%
None of the Above.	0	0.0%	21	6.1%

Table 4.104 shows that 56.8% of the principals and 33% of teachers stated that the parent-teacher association participated in school project management, 16.2% of principals and 56.8% of teachers mentioned that the parent-teacher association raised money for school supplies, 29.7% of the principals and 7% of the teachers responded that the parent-teacher association volunteered to take classes, and 6.1% of teachers stated that the parent-teacher association did not perform any of the mentioned activities in school.

Most teachers and principals stated that participating in school project management and raising money for school supplies were the main activities of the teacher-parent association in the schools.

**Table 4.105: PTA Involvement in School Social Programmes**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	17	45.9%	138	40.0%
No	20	54.1%	207	60.0%

Table 4.105 shows that 54.1% of principals and 60% of teachers responded negatively, stating that parent-teacher associations were not involved in school social programmes. In comparison, 45.9% of the principals and 40% of the teachers replied positively, mentioning that parent-teacher associations were involved in school social programmes.

Most teachers and principals mentioned that parent-teacher associations were not involved in school social programmes.

**Table 4.106: Social Activities by School PTA**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Campaign for community's cleanliness.	21	56.8%	186	53.9%
Campaign for HIV education.	4	10.8%	89	25.8%
Spread of human values.	21	56.8%	52	15.1%
None of the Above.	0	0.0%	33	9.6%

Table 4.106 discloses that 56.8% of the principals and 53.9% of the teachers responded that the parent-teacher associations campaigned for community cleanliness, 56.8% of the principals and 15.1% of the teachers stated that the parent-teacher associations spread human values, 10.8% of

principals and 25.8% of teachers campaigned for HIV education. However, 9.6% of the teachers stated that the parent-teacher associations performed none of the above social activities in school.

The majority of teachers and principals stated that they campaigned for the community's cleanliness and the spread of human values as the social activities performed by parent-teacher associations in schools.

**Table 4.107: Existence of School Industry Interface**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Yes	7	18.9%	128	37.1%
No	30	81.1%	217	62.9%

Table 4.107 shows that 81.1% of the principals and 62.9% of the teachers stated that the school industry interface did not exist, and 18.9% of the principals against 37.1% of the teachers mentioned that the school industry interface existed.

The majority of teachers and principals stated that the school industry interface did not exist.

**Table 4.108: School Industry Interface Initiators**

Responses	Principals N=37		Teachers N=345	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
The government initiates it.	5	13.5%	65	18.8%
The organisation approaches the school.	14	37.8%	154	44.6%
The school approaches the organisation.	21	56.8%	56	16.2%
The students initiate it.	7	18.9%	21	6.1%
None of the Above.	2	5.4%	54	15.7%

Table 4.108 reveals that 37.8% of the principals and 44.6% of the teachers responded that the organisation approached the school to initiate the industry interface. 56.8% of the principals and 16.2% of the teachers stated that the school approached the organisation to initiate the industry interface. 13.5% of principals and 18.8% of teachers mentioned the government initiated the school industry interface. 18.9% of the principals and 6.1% of the teachers responded that students initiated the school industry interface. However, 5.4% of principals and 15.7% of teachers stated that the school industry interface was not initiated.

The majority of teachers and principals mentioned that the organisation approached the school, or the school approached the organisation to initiate the few school industry interfaces.

**Table 4.109: Contribution of Industry for Students**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Principals N=37</b>		<b>Teachers N=345</b>	
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Prepare the students for future endeavours.	9	24.3%	205	59.4%
Provide a short-term skill training program for students.	1	2.7%	34	9.9%
Provide internships to school students.	27	73.0%	58	16.8%
None of the Above.	0	0.0%	33	9.6%

Table 4.109 shows that 73% of the principals and 16.8% of the teachers responded that the industry provided internships to school students, 24.3% of the principals and 59.4% of the teachers stated that the industry prepared the students for future endeavours, and 2.7% of the principals and 9.9% of the teachers stated that the industry offered short-term skill training programs for students. However, 9.6% of the teachers stated that the industry did not bring any contribution to students.

Most teachers and principals stated that industry prepared the students for future endeavours and provided internships to school students as their primary contribution.

The present study contained a set of qualitative data, which was analysed thematically, and the results are presented in the following lines. Apart from principals and teachers who responded to the questionnaire, the researcher also interviewed the provincial directors of education (PDE) of the sampled provinces to determine the current status of the educational practices in the post-fundamental schools of Burundi.

### **Curriculum**

All four (4) provincial directors of education stated that the curriculum met the country's needs. Three (3) mentioned that the training content was adapted to the country's realities, and two (2) stated that the curriculum concentrated on students' holistic development.

### **Pedagogy**

All four (4) provincial directors of education stated that the post-fundamental schools in Burundi implemented the integration pedagogy as, according to them, it reflected ordinary life events in the sense that the various integration scenarios are consistent with everyday life. They stated that the pedagogy implemented stimulated the learners to be active and interactive. It enabled students to address everyday difficulties independently. It would also allow students to tackle comparable challenges in their professional, daily, and/or entrepreneurial lives without hindsight. It allowed teachers to inculcate life scenarios in teaching-learning sessions that mirror their daily experiences, particularly in the entrepreneurial field.

### **Evaluation Procedures**

Three out of four provincial directors stated that the evaluation procedures were carried out in two stages: learning about the resources results in a constant formative or regulatory evaluation on the one hand and a summative evaluation provided at the end of the level on the other hand. The learners' learning focused on the integration week when they designed their integration scenarios. They mentioned that evaluation in post-fundamental schools established learners' learning by demonstrating the students' previous paths to mastering the skill of the level or year, readjustment of their work, and remediation by the teacher.

## **Infrastructure**

All four provincial education directors stated that the government has invested in infrastructure development, and its impact on school success/failure was evident. Success or failure was strongly related to various elements, but infrastructure could not be underestimated. The PDE 3 stated that Burundian schools rely heavily on infrastructure. The local communities (municipalities) created the infrastructure for post-fundamental schools.

## **Administrative Practices**

The four provincial directors stated that administrative visits were conducted regularly in the schools to solve possible problems. Both administrative and educational meetings were periodically organised in addition to the annual action plans. Educational and financial management meetings for school officials were organised. They mentioned they tried to have a somewhat balanced distribution of students during the orientation of post-fundamental students so that all schools receive approximately equal numbers. The ministerial order stating that certain schools with minimal numbers should be merged within the rational management of the human resources framework was implemented. They mentioned contributing to permanent solutions and improving administrative practices through coaching given to communal directors of education (DCEs) and school principals.

## **Human Resources**

All four provincial education directors (PDE) stated that the post-fundamental teachers were domain-wise qualified at all levels, including the general and technical post-fundamental schools—however, two out of the four mentioned that some teachers were competent, and others were not.

## **Community Participation**

Three provincial education directors stated that parents supported the municipalities in maintaining a healthy school environment. They subsidised schools in times of insufficient contributions. The benefits of community participation were observed in motivating the teachers

(volunteers) and constructing classrooms because most classrooms were built with parental funds. Other benefits included being aware of school life and contributing to developing and improving teaching-learning by making material, opinions, and financial contributions to support school activities. Two out of four stated that community participation in educational activities made it possible to meet parents' expectations. The parents-teachers boards monitored the evaluation procedures and frequency. Community participation in school activities has positively impacted the student's motivation towards school activities.

### **4.3. Analysis and Interpretation of Data for Objective 2**

To measure the perceptions of teachers, students, principals, and parents regarding educational practices in Burundi's post-fundamental schools.

Each aspect under study had five statements, and each statement had five alternatives as mentioned in the perception scale, respectively, including Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (UD), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). The scores corresponding to the alternatives were Strongly Agree (**5**), Agree (**4**), Undecided (**3**), Disagree (**2**), and Strongly Disagree (**1**).

The below formula was used to calculate the intensity index of each statement.

For each Statement, Intensity Index (SII) =  $(F_1*5)+(F_2*4)+(F_3*3)+(F_4*2)+(F_5*1)/N$ .

For each aspect, an Average Intensity Index was calculated using the following formula:

$(SII_1+SII_2+SII_3+SII_4+SII_5)/n$

Whereas:

**SII:** Statement Intensity Index

**F1:** Frequency of Strongly Agree

**F2:** Frequency of Agree

**F3:** Frequency of Undecided

**F4:** Frequency of Disagree

**F5:** Frequency of Strongly Disagree

**N:** Number of Respondents

**n:** Number of Statements per Aspect and 5,4,3,2,1 are assigned scale points to SA, A, UD, D, and SD.

### 4.3.1. Perception of Teachers

**Table 4.110: Perception of Teachers on Curriculum**

Statement	N=345	SA (%)	A (%)	UD (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Intensity Index	Average Index
The stakeholders understand the curriculum's aims and objectives clearly		49 (14.2%)	259 (75.1%)	1 (0.3%)	30 (8.7%)	6 (1.7%)	3.91	3.90
The objectives of the curriculum are not based on societal needs.		56 (16.2%)	10 (2.9%)	16 (4.6%)	63 (18.3%)	200 (58.0%)	3.99	
The curriculum is interesting to students.		75 (21.7%)	197 (57.1)	13 (3.8%)	54 (15.7%)	6 (1.7%)	3.81	
The curriculum does not ensure the continuity of subjects from one stage to another.		65 (18.8%)	12 (3.5%)	12 (3.5%)	94 (27.2%)	162 (47.0%)	3.80	
Teachers encourage students to participate actively in co-curricular activities		123 (35.7%)	158 (45.8%)	18 (5.2%)	30 (8.7%)	16 (4.6%)	3.99	

**SA= Strongly Agree; A= Agree; UD= Undecided; D= Disagree; SD= Strongly Disagree**

Table 4.110 shows that 14.2% of the teachers strongly agreed, 75.1% agreed, 0.3% undecided, 8.7% disagreed, and 1.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that stakeholders clearly understood the curriculum's aims and objectives. The intensity index of 3.91 indicated that teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement. 18.3% of the teachers strongly agreed, 58.0% agreed, 4.6% were undecided, 16.2% disagreed, and 2.9% strongly disagreed with the statement that the objectives of the curriculum were not based on societal needs. The intensity index of 3.99 indicated that the teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement. 21.7% of the teachers strongly agreed, 57.1% agreed, 3.8% were undecided, 15.7% disagreed, and 1.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that the curriculum interests students. The intensity index of 3.81 indicated that teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement. 27.2% of the teachers strongly agreed, 47.0% agreed, 3.5% were undecided, 18.8% disagreed, and 3.5% strongly disagreed with the statement that the curriculum does not ensure the continuity of subjects from one stage to another. The intensity index of 3.84 showed that the

teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement. 35.7% of the teachers strongly agreed, 45.8% agreed, 18 (5.2%) were undecided, 8.7% disagreed, and 4.6% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers encourage students to participate actively in co-curricular activities. The intensity index of 3.99 showed that the teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement.

**Table 4.111: Perception of Teachers on Pedagogy**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>N=345</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
The pedagogy implemented ensures that essential content is covered systematically.		71 (20.6%)	145 (42.0%)	29 (8.4%)	79 (22.9%)	21 (6.1%)	3.04	3.47
The teaching methodology prepares students for real-world challenges.		94 (27.2%)	177 (51.3%)	15 (4.3%)	46 (13.3%)	13 (3.8%)	3.36	
The pedagogy implemented is appropriate.		71 (20.6%)	171 (49.6%)	26 (7.5%)	63 (18.3%)	14 (4.1%)	3.18	
Teachers lack ICT-integrated pedagogy to make the learning situations joyful.		23 (6.7%)	15 (4.3%)	25 (7.2%)	127 (36.8%)	155 (44.9%)	4.09	
The teaching methods do not meet the requirements of the latest pedagogy.		59 (17.1%)	32 (9.3%)	21 (6.1%)	76 (22.9%)	157 (45.5%)	3.70	

Table 4.111 shows that 20.6% of the teachers strongly agreed, 42.0% agreed, 8.4% were undecided, 22.9% disagreed, and 6.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that the pedagogy implemented ensures that essential content is covered systematically. The intensity index of 3.04 indicated that the teachers had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 27.2% of the teachers strongly agreed, 51.3% agreed, 4.3% were undecided, 13.3% disagreed, and 3.8% strongly disagreed with the statement that the teaching methodology prepares students for real-world challenges. The intensity index of 3.36 indicated that the teachers had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 20.6% of the teachers strongly agreed, 49.6% agreed, 7.5% were undecided, 18.3% disagreed, and 4.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that the

pedagogy implemented was appropriate. The intensity index of 3.18 indicated that the teachers had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 36.8% of the teachers strongly agreed, 44.9% agreed, 7.2% were undecided, 6.7% disagreed, and 4.3% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers lack ICT-integrated pedagogy to make the learning situation joyful. The intensity index of 4.09 indicated that teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement. 22.0% of the teachers strongly agreed, 45.5% agreed, 6.1% were undecided, 17.1% disagreed, and 9.3% strongly disagreed with the statement that the teaching methods do not meet the requirements of the latest pedagogy. The intensity index of 3.70 indicated that the teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement.

**Table 4.112: Perception of Teachers on Evaluation Procedures**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>N=345</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
The student's assessment is fair and just.		75 (21.7%)	176 (51.0%)	14 (4.1%)	66 (19.1%)	14 (4.1%)	3.67	3.68
Formative assessment in the school is conducted regularly.		48 (13.9%)	191 (55.4%)	10 (2.9%)	75 (21.7%)	21 (6.1%)	3.49	
Teachers encourage students to focus on their studies by grading their assignments.		79 (22.9%)	188 (54.5%)	11 (3.2%)	52 (15.1%)	15 (4.3%)	3.77	
Teachers modify their teaching methods based on students' assessment results.		116 (33.6%)	147 (42.65)	7 (2.0%)	65 (18.8%)	10 (2.9%)	3.85	
The assessment style adopted informs educators about the effectiveness of their teaching methods.		90 (26.1%)	154 (44.6%)	9 (2.6%)	65 (18.8%)	27 (7.8%)	3.62	

Table 4.112 shows that 21.7% of the teachers strongly agreed, 51.0% agreed, 4.1% were undecided, 19.1% disagreed, and 4.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that the student's assessment was fair and just. The intensity index of 3.67 indicated that teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement. 13.9% of the teachers strongly agreed with the statement,

55.4% agreed with the statement, 2.9% were undecided, 21.7% disagreed, and 6.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that formative assessment in the school is conducted regularly. The intensity index of 3.49 showed that the teachers had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 22.9% of the teachers strongly agreed, 54.5% agreed, 3.2% were undecided, 15.1% disagreed, and 4.3% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers encourage students to focus on their studies by grading their assignments. The intensity index of 3.77 showed that teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement. 33.6% of the teachers strongly agreed, 42.65% agreed, 2.0% were undecided, 18.8% disagreed, and 2.9% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers modify their teaching method based on student's assessment results. The intensity index of 3.85 indicated that teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement. 26.1% of the teachers strongly agreed, 44.6% agreed, 2.6% were undecided, 18.8% disagreed, and 7.8% strongly disagreed with the statement that the adopted assessment style informs educators about their teaching methods' effectiveness. The intensity index of 3.62 showed that the teachers had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement.

**Table 4.113: Perception of Teachers on School Infrastructure**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>N=345</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
Students well utilise the library facility.		14 (13.3%)	154 (44.6%)	29 (8.4%)	77 (22.3%)	39 (11.3%)	2.80	2.94
Guidance and counselling centres are not effectively working in my school.		27 (7.8%)	165 (47.8%)	28 (8.1%)	79 (22.9%)	46 (13.3%)	2.86	
The quality of the mid-day meal given to students is good.		51 (14.8%)	149 (43.2%)	11 (3.2%)	87 (25.2%)	47 (13.6%)	3.20	
My school has more students than it can accommodate.		65 (18.8%)	129 (37.4%)	19 (5.5%)	72 (20.9%)	60 (17.4%)	3.19	
School infrastructure is lacking, which is the primary aspect of an effective learning environment.		48 (13.9%)	164 (47.5%)	28 (8.1%)	67 (19.4%)	38 (11.0%)	2.66	

The analysis in Table 4.113 shows that 13.3% of the teachers strongly agreed, 44.6% agreed, 8.4% were undecided, 22.3% disagreed, and 11.3% strongly disagreed with the statement that students utilise the library facility well. The intensity index of 2.80 showed that the teachers had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 7.8% of the respondents strongly agreed, 47.8% agreed, 8.1% were undecided, 22.9% disagreed, and 13.3% strongly disagreed with the statement that guidance and counselling centres are not effectively working in their schools. The intensity index of 2.86 indicated that the teachers had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 14.8% of the teachers strongly agreed, 43.2% agreed, 3.2% were undecided, 25.2% disagreed, and 13.6% strongly disagreed with the statement that the quality of the mid-day meal given to students is good. The intensity index of 3.20 showed that the teachers had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 18.8% of the teachers strongly agreed, 37.4% agreed, 5.5% were undecided, 20.9% disagreed, and 17.4% strongly disagreed with the statement that their school has more students than it can accommodate. The intensity index of 3.19 indicated that the teachers had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 13.9% of the teachers strongly agreed, 47.5% agreed, 8.1% were undecided, 19.4% disagreed, and 11.0% strongly disagreed with the statement that there is a lack of school infrastructure, which is the primary aspect of an effective learning environment. The intensity index of 2.66 indicated that the teachers had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement.

**Table 4.114: Perception of Teachers on Administrative Practices**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>N=345</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
Recruitment is done regularly whenever a post-vacancy is announced.	67	19.4%	51.3%	4.6%	15.9%	8.7%	3.57	
Teachers are appreciated from time to time for their excellent performance.	73	21.3%	49.3%	4.3%	17.1%	8.1%	3.58	

Teachers do not actively participate in professional development programs.	69 (20.0%)	143 (41.4%)	32 (9.3%)	70 (20.3%)	31 (9.0%)	2.57	3.40
Non-teaching staff get due recognition in the school.	85 (24.6%)	140 (40.6%)	14 (4.1%)	81 (32.5%)	25 (7.2%)	3.52	
Teachers are not satisfied with their salaries.	19 (5.5%)	68 (19.7%)	18 (5.2%)	109 (31.6%)	131 (38.0%)	3.77	

Table 4.114 shows that 19.4% of the teachers strongly agreed, 51.3% agreed, 4.6% were undecided, 15.9% disagreed, and 8.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that recruitment is done regularly whenever a post-vacancy is announced. The intensity index of 3.57 showed that teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement. 21.3% of the teachers strongly agreed, 49.3% agreed, 4.3% were undecided, 17.1% disagreed, and 8.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers are appreciated from time to time for their excellent performance. The intensity index of 3.58 indicated that teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement. 20.0% of the teachers strongly agreed, 41.4% agreed, 9.3% were undecided, 20.3% disagreed, and 9.0% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers do not actively participate in professional development programs. The intensity index of 2.57 showed that the teachers had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 24.6% of the teachers strongly agreed, 40.6% agreed, 4.1% were undecided, 32.5% disagreed, and 7.2% strongly disagreed with the statement that non-teaching staff get due recognition in the school. The intensity index of 3.52 showed that teachers favourably perceived the statement. 31.6% strongly agreed, 38.0% agreed, 5.2% were undecided, 19.7% disagreed, and 5.5% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers are unsatisfied with their salaries. The intensity index of 3.77 showed that the teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement.

**Table 4.115: Perception of Teachers on Community Participation**

Statement	N=345	SA (%)	A (%)	UD (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Intensity Index	Average Index
The school is inactive in interfacing with the	62 (18.0%)	168 (48.7%)	20 (5.8%)	74 (21.4%)	21 (6.1%)	2.49		

community.							
Community participation in schools actively contributes to decision-making processes.	116 (33.6%)	130 (37.7%)	23 (6.7%)	63 (18.3%)	13 (3.8%)	3.79	3.43
The parents actively involve themselves in school activities.	81 (23.5%)	160 (46.4%)	13 (3.8%)	77 (22.3%)	14 (4.1%)	3.63	
The parent-teacher association meetings are conducted regularly.	94 (27.2%)	136 (39.4%)	18 (5.2%)	60 (17.4%)	37 (10.7%)	3.55	
Parental school involvement significantly contributes to a child's development and academic success.	96 (27.8%)	149 (43.2%)	20 (5.8%)	57 (16.5%)	23 (6.7%)	3.69	

Table 4.115 shows that 18.0% of the teachers strongly agreed, 48.7% agreed, 5.8% were undecided, 21.4% disagreed, and 6.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that the school is inactive in interfacing with the community. The intensity index of 2.49 showed that teachers had an unfavourable perception towards the statement. 33.6% of the teachers strongly agreed, 37.7% agreed, 6.7% were undecided, 18.3% disagreed, and 3.8% strongly disagreed with the statement that community participation in schools actively contributes to decision-making processes. The intensity index of 3.79 showed that the teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement. 23.5% strongly agreed, 46.4% agreed, 3.8% were undecided, 22.3% disagreed, and 4.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that parents actively involve themselves in school activities. The intensity index of 3.63 showed that teachers were neutral in perceiving the statement. 27.2% of the teachers strongly agreed, 39.4% agreed, 5.2% were undecided, 17.4% disagreed, and 10.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that parent-teacher association meetings are conducted regularly. The intensity index of 3.55 showed that teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement. 27.8% of the teachers strongly agreed, 43.2% agreed, 5.8% were undecided, 16.5% disagreed, and 6.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that parental school involvement significantly contributes to a child's development and academic success. The intensity index of 3.69 showed that teachers had a favourable perception towards the statement.

### 4.3.2. Perception of Students

**Table 4.116: Perception of Students on Curriculum**

Statement	N=405	SA (%)	A (%)	UD (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Intensity Index	Average Index
The subject content is not relevant to societal needs.		90 (22.2%)	29 (7.2%)	22 (5.4%)	131 (32.3)	133 (32.8)	3.46	3.65
Various learning experiences offered in our school are adequate.		71 (17.5%)	162 (40.0%)	32 (7.9%)	101 (24.9%)	39 (9.6%)	3.31	
The content taught develops our thinking skills effectively.		135 (33.3%)	154 (38.0%)	50 (12.3%)	49 (12.1%)	17 (4.2%)	3.84	
Teachers actively develop our English skills.		103 (25.4%)	174 (43.0%)	46 (11.4%)	56 (13.8%)	26 (6.4%)	3.67	
Some teachers lack enough knowledge of the subject that they teach.		46 (11.4%)	8 (2.0%)	49 (12.1%)	113 (27.9)	189 (46.7%)	3.97	

Table 4.116 shows that 32.3% of the students strongly agreed, 32.8% agreed, 5.4% were undecided, 22.2% disagreed, and 7.2% strongly disagreed with the statement that the subject content is irrelevant to societal needs. The intensity index of 3.46 showed that students had neither an unfavourable nor a favourable perception; they were undecided about the statement. 17.5% of the students strongly agreed, 40.0% agreed, 7.9% were undecided, 24.9% disagreed, and 9.6% strongly disagreed with the statement that various learning experiences offered in their school are adequate. The intensity index of 3.31 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 33.3% of the students strongly agreed, 38.0% agreed, 12.3% were undecided, 12.1% disagreed, and 4.2% strongly disagreed with the statement that the content taught develops their thinking skills effectively. The intensity index of 3.84 showed that students had a favourable perception towards the statement.. 25.4% of the students strongly agreed, 43.0% agreed, 11.4% were undecided, 13.8% disagreed, and 6.4% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers actively develop students' English skills. The intensity index of 3.67 showed that students favourably perceived the statement.. 27.9% strongly agreed, 46.7% agreed, 12.1% were undecided, 11.4% disagreed,

and 2.0% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers lack enough knowledge of their subject. The intensity index of 3.97 showed that students favourably perceived the statement.

**Table 4.117: Perception of Students on Pedagogy**

<b>N=405</b> <b>Statement</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
Collaborative learning in the class is interesting.	88 (21.7%)	144 (35.6%)	53 (13.1%)	86 (21.2%)	34 (8.4%)	3.41	3.62
Teachers involve us effectively in content-related activities in class.	158 (39.0%)	124 (30.6%)	42 (10.4%)	66 (16.3%)	15 (3.7%)	3.85	
The teachers encourage us to participate in co-curricular activities.	96 (23.7%)	177 (43.7%)	47 (11.6%)	59 (14.6%)	26 (6.4%)	3.64	
We can approach our teachers anytime to solve our problems.	120 (29.6%)	148 (36.5%)	46 (11.4%)	71 (17.5%)	20 (4.9%)	3.68	
The teaching methodology used in the classes is interesting.	106 (26.2%)	124 (30.6%)	81 (20.0%)	60 (14.8%)	34 (8.4%)	3.51	

Table 4.117 shows that 21.7% of the students strongly agreed, 35.6% agreed, 13.1% were undecided, 21.2% disagreed, and 8.4% strongly disagreed with the statement that collaborative learning in the class is interesting. The intensity index of 3.41 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 39.0% of the students strongly agreed, 30.6% agreed, 10.4% were undecided, 16.3% disagreed, and 3.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers effectively involve students in class content-related activities. The intensity index of 3.85 showed that students had a favourable perception towards the statement.. 23.7% of the students strongly agreed, 43.7% agreed, 11.6% were undecided, 14.6% disagreed, and 6.4% strongly disagreed with the statement that the teachers encourage us to participate in co-curricular activities. The intensity index of 3.64 showed that the students had a favourable perception towards the statement.. 29.6% of the students strongly agreed, 36.5% agreed, 11.4% were undecided, 17.5% disagreed, and 4.9% strongly disagreed with the statement that students could approach their teachers anytime to

solve their problems. The intensity index of 3.68 showed that students favourably perceived the statement.. 26.2% of the students strongly agreed, 30.6% agreed, 20.0% were undecided, 14.8% disagreed, and 8.4% strongly disagreed with the statement that the teaching methodology used in the classes was interesting. The intensity index of 3.51 showed they had a favourable perception of the statement.

**Table 4.118: Perception of Students on Evaluation Procedures**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
Teachers do not assess our work on time.	62 (15.3%)	163 (40.2%)	61 (15.1%)	75 (18.5%)	44 (10.9%)	2.69	3.35
The assessment done by the teachers is fair.	77 (19.0%)	136 (33.3%)	41 (10.1%)	100 (24.7)	52 (12.8%)	3.22	
Teachers provide us with regular formative assessments.	126 (31.1%)	151 (37.3%)	46 (11.4%)	57 (14.1%)	25 (6.2%)	3.73	
Our teachers encourage us to focus more on language skills development.	118 (29.1%)	163 (40.2%)	45 (11.1%)	51 (12.6%)	28 (6.9%)	3.72	
Teachers change their teaching style after assessing our assignments.	81 (20.0%)	152 (37.5)	60 (14.8%)	59 (14.6%)	53 (13.1%)	3.37	

Table 4.118 shows that 15.3% of the students strongly agreed, 40.2% agreed, 15.1% were undecided, 18.5% disagreed, and 10.9% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers do not assess students' work on time. The intensity index of 2.69 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 19.0% of the students strongly agreed, 33.3% agreed, 10.1% were undecided, 24.7 disagreed, and 12.8% strongly disagreed with the statement that the teacher assessment was fair. The intensity index of 3.22 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 31.1% of the students strongly agreed, 37.3% agreed, 11.4% were undecided, 14.1% disagreed, and 6.2% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers provide students with regular formative assessments. The intensity index of 3.73 showed that the students had a favourable perception towards the statement. 29.1% of

the students strongly agreed, 40.2% agreed, 11.1% were undecided, 12.6% disagreed, and 6.9% strongly disagreed with the statement that our teachers encourage students to focus more on language skills development. The intensity index of 3.72 showed that students favourably perceived the statement. 20.0% of the students strongly agreed, 37.5% agreed, 14.8% were undecided, 14.6% disagreed, and 13.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers change their teaching style after assessing their students' assignments. The intensity index of 3.37 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement.

**Table 4.119: Perception of Students on School Infrastructure**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>N=405</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
Our school laboratories are well utilised.		70 (17.3%)	136 (33.6%)	51 (12.6%)	69 (17.0%)	79 (19.5%)	3.12	2.90
Teachers do not use ICT facilities in the class effectively.		91 (22.5%)	133 (32.8%)	43 (10.6%)	83 (20.5%)	55 (13.6%)	2.70	
The quality of food that we get is good.		58 (14.3%)	130 (32.1%)	74 (18.3%)	73 (18.0%)	70 (17.3%)	3.08	
The guidance and counselling centre is not actively functioning.		77 (19.0%)	124 (30.6%)	82 (20.2%)	85 (21.0%)	37 (9.1%)	2.71	
Our classrooms are overcrowded.		36 (8.9%)	141 (34.8%)	48 (11.9%)	95 (23.5%)	85 (21.0%)	2.87	

Table 4.119 shows that 17.3% of the students strongly agreed, 33.6% agreed, 12.6% were undecided, 69 (17.0%) disagreed, and 19.5% strongly disagreed with the statement that their school laboratories are well utilised. The intensity index of 3.12 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 22.5% of the students strongly agreed, 32.8% agreed, 10.6% were undecided, 20.5% disagreed, and 13.6% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers do not use ICT facilities in the class effectively. The intensity index of 2.70 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 14.3% of the

students strongly agreed, 32.1% agreed, 18.3% were undecided, 18.0% disagreed, and 17.3% strongly disagreed with the statement that the food quality that students get is good. The intensity index of 3.08 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 19.0% of the students strongly agreed, 30.6% agreed, 20.2% were undecided, 21.0% disagreed, and 9.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that the guidance and counselling centre is not actively functioning. The intensity index of 2.71 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 8.9% of the students strongly agreed, 34.8% agreed, 11.9% were undecided, 23.5% disagreed, and 21.0% strongly disagreed with the statement that classrooms are overcrowded. The intensity index of 2.87 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement.

**Table 4.120: Perception of Students on Community Participation**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>N=405</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
There is a shortage of teachers in our school.	68 (16.8%)	130 (32.1%)	74 (18.3%)	83 (20.5%)	50 (12.3%)	3.20	3.10	
The teacher is not partial to some students.	71 (17.5%)	134 (33.1%)	70 (17.3%)	73 (18.0%)	57 (14.1%)	2.78		
Parents' participation in our school activities is enough.	100 (24.7%)	146 (36.0%)	54 (13.3%)	69 (17.0%)	36 (8.9%)	3.51		
The school-industry interface is inactive in our school.	85 (21.0%)	121 (29.9%)	82 (20.2%)	76 (18.8%)	41 (10.1%)	2.67		
The involvement of parents contributes to our development and academic success.	89 (22.0%)	132 (32.6%)	70 (17.3%)	55 (13.6%)	59 (14.6%)	3.34		

Table 4.120 shows that 16.8% of the students strongly agreed, 32.1% agreed, 18.3% were undecided, 20.5% disagreed, and 12.3% strongly disagreed with the statement that there is a shortage of teachers in their school. The intensity index of 3.20 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 17.5% of the students strongly agreed, 33.1% agreed, 17.3% were undecided, 18.0% disagreed, and 14.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that the teacher is not partial to some students.

The intensity index of 2.78 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 24.7% strongly agreed, 36.0% agreed, 13.3% were undecided, 17.0% disagreed, and 8.9% strongly disagreed with the statement that parents' participation in students' school activities was enough. The intensity index of 3.51 showed that the students had a favourable perception towards the statement. 21.0% of the students strongly agreed, 29.9% agreed, 20.2% were undecided, 18.8% disagreed, and 10.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that the school-industry interface is inactive in school. The intensity index of 2.67 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 22.0% strongly agreed, 32.6% agreed, 17.3% were undecided, 13.6% disagreed, and 14.6% strongly disagreed with the statement that the involvement of parents contributes to students' development and academic success. The intensity index of 3.34 showed that the students had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement.

### 4.3.3. Perception of Principals

**Table 4.121: Perception of Principals on Curriculum**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>N=37</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>			
The curriculum is interesting to students.	10	27.0%	22	59.5%	4	10.8%	1	2.7%	0	4.11	3.77
The curriculum ensures the continuity of subjects from one stage to another.	14	37.8%	13	35.1%	3	8.1%	7	18.9%	0	3.92	
The objectives of the curriculum are not based on societal needs.	3	8.1%	4	10.8%	3	8.1%	27	73.0%	0	3.46	
The stakeholders understand the curriculum's aims and objectives clearly.	2	5.4%	14	37.8%	11	29.7%	10	27.0%	0	3.22	
The participation of students in co-curricular activities leads to their holistic development.	12	32.4%	21	56.8%	1	2.7%	3	8.1%	0	4.14	

Table 4.121 shows that 27.0% of the principals strongly agreed, 59.5% agreed, 10.8% were undecided, and 2.7% disagreed with the statement that the curriculum interests students. The intensity index of 4.11 showed that the principals had a favourable perception towards the statement. 37.8% of the principals strongly agreed, 35.1% agreed, 8.1% were undecided, and 18.9% disagreed with the statement that the curriculum ensures the continuity of subjects from one stage to another. The intensity index of 3.92 showed that the principals had a favourable perception towards the statement. 8.1% of the principals strongly agreed, 73.0% agreed, 8.1% were undecided, and 10.8% disagreed with the statement that the objectives of the curriculum are as per societal needs. The intensity index of 2.22 showed that the principals had an unfavourable perception towards the statement. 5.4% of the principals strongly agreed, 37.8% agreed, 29.7% were undecided, and 27.0% disagreed with the statement that the stakeholders clearly understood the curriculum's aims and objectives. The intensity index of 3.22 showed that the principals had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 32.4% strongly agreed, 56.8% agreed, 2.7% were undecided, and 8.1% disagreed with the statement that the participation of students in co-curricular activities leads to their holistic development. The intensity index of 4.14 showed that the principals favourably perceived the statement.

**Table 4.122: Perception of Principals on Pedagogy**

Statement	N=37	SA (%)	A (%)	UD (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Intensity Index	Average Index
The pedagogy implemented at the post-fundamental school is appropriate.		3 (8.1%)	25 (67.6%)	5 (13.5%)	4 (10.8%)	0	3.73	3.43
The teaching methodology adopted by teachers is innovative.		1 (2.7%)	23 (62.2%)	5 (13.5%)	4 (10.8%)	4 (10.8%)	3.35	
Teachers lack ICT-integrated pedagogy to make the learning situations joyful.		3 (8.1%)	26 (70.3%)	1 (2.7%)	5 (13.5%)	2 (5.4%)	3.62	
The teaching methods meet the requirements of the latest		5 (13.5%)	10 (27.0%)	7 (18.9%)	12 (32.4%)	3 (8.1%)	3.05	

pedagogy.							
The teaching methodology prepares students for real-world challenges.	5 (13.5%)	19 (51.4%)	6 (16.2%)	0	7 (18.9%)	3.41	

Table 4.122 shows that 8.1% of the principals strongly agreed, 67.6% agreed, 13.5% were undecided, and 10.8% disagreed with the statement that the pedagogy implemented at the post-fundamental school was appropriate. The intensity index of 3.73 showed that the principals had a favourable perception of the statement. 2.7% of the principals strongly agreed, 62.2% agreed, 13.5% were undecided, 10.8% disagreed, and 10.8% strongly disagreed with the statement that the teaching methodology adopted by teachers was innovative. The intensity index of 3.35 showed that the principals had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 8.1% strongly agreed, 70.3% agreed, 2.7% were undecided, 13.5% disagreed, and 5.4% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers lack ICT-integrated pedagogy to make the learning situation joyful. The intensity index of 3.62 showed that the principals had a favourable perception towards the statement. 13.5% strongly agreed, 27.0% agreed, 18.9% were undecided, 32.4% disagreed, and 8.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that the teaching methods meet the requirements of the latest pedagogy. The intensity index of 3.05 showed that the principals had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 13.5% strongly agreed, 51.4% agreed, 16.2% were undecided, and 18.9% strongly disagreed with the statement that the teaching methodology prepares students for real-world challenges. The intensity index of 3.41 showed that the principals had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement.

**Table 4.123: Perception of Principals on Evaluation Procedures**

Statement	N=37	SA (%)	A (%)	UD (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Intensity Index	Average Index
The student's assessment is fair and just.		4 (10.8%)	23 (62.2%)	2 (5.4%)	5 (13.5%)	3 (8.1%)	3.54	

Formative assessments are held in the school regularly.	17 (45.9%)	14 (37.8%)	3 (8.1%)	2 (5.4%)	1 (2.7%)	4.19	3.92
Teachers encourage students to focus on their studies by grading their assignments.	9 (24.3%)	20 (54.1%)	1 (2.7%)	6 (16.2%)	1 (2.7%)	3.81	
Teachers modify their teaching methods based on students' assessment results.	10 (27.0%)	24 (64.9%)	0	3 (8.1%)	0	4.11	
The assessment style adopted informs educators about the effectiveness of their teaching methods.	12 (32.4%)	17 (45.9%)	2 (5.4%)	6 (16.2%)	0	3.95	

Table 4.123 shows that 10.8% strongly of the principals agreed, 62.2% agreed, 5.4% were undecided, 13.5% disagreed, and 8.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that the student's assessment was fair and just. The intensity index of 3.54 showed that the principals had a favourable perception towards the statement. 45.9% of the principals strongly agreed, 37.8% agreed, 8.1% were undecided, 5.4% disagreed, and 2.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that formative assessments are held in the school regularly. The intensity index of 4.19 showed that the principals had a favourable perception towards the statement. 24.3% of the principals strongly agreed, 54.1% agreed, 2.7% were undecided, 16.2% disagreed, and 2.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers encourage students to focus on their studies by timely grading their assignments. The intensity index of 3.81 showed that the principals had a favourable perception of the statement. 27.0% of the principals strongly agreed, 64.9% agreed, and 8.1% disagreed with the statement that teachers modify their teaching method based on students' assessment results. The intensity index of 4.11 showed that the principals favourably perceived the statement. 32.4% of the principals strongly agreed, 45.9% agreed, 5.4% were undecided, and 16.2% disagreed with the statement that the adopted assessment style informs educators about their teaching methods' effectiveness. The intensity index of 3.95 showed that the principals favourably perceived the statement.

**Table 4.124: Perception of Principals on School Infrastructure**

<b>N=37</b> <b>Statement</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
The library facility is well utilised by students.	7 (18.9%)	19 (51.4%)	4 (10.8%)	4 (10.8%)	3 (8.1%)	3.62	2.85
The school infrastructure is inadequate.	13 (35.1%)	12 (32.4%)	6 (16.2%)	5 (13.5%)	1 (2.7%)	2.16	
Guidance and counselling centres are not effectively working in my school.	8 (21.6%)	10 (27.0%)	7 (18.9%)	8 (21.6%)	4 (10.8%)	2.73	
The quality of the mid-day meal given to students is good.	3 (8.1%)	15 (40.5%)	8 (21.6%)	3 (8.1%)	8 (21.6%)	3.05	
My school has more students than it can accommodate.	2 (5.4%)	14 (37.8%)	3 (8.1%)	6 (16.2%)	12 (32.4%)	2.68	

Table 4.124 shows that 18.9% of the principals strongly agreed, 51.4% agreed, 10.8% were undecided, 10.8% disagreed, and 8.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that students' library facility is well-utilised. The intensity index of 3.62 showed that the principals had a favourable perception of the statement. 35.1% of the principals strongly agreed, 32.4% agreed, 16.2% were undecided, 13.5% disagreed, and 2.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that the school infrastructure is inadequate. The intensity index of 2.16 showed that the principals had an unfavourable perception towards the statement. 21.6% of the principals strongly agreed, 27.0% agreed, 18.9% were undecided, 21.6% disagreed, and 10.8% strongly disagreed with the statement that guidance and counselling centres are not effectively working in the school. The intensity index of 3.27 showed that the principals had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 8.1% of the principals strongly agreed, 40.5% agreed, 21.6% were undecided, 8.1% disagreed, and 21.6% strongly disagreed with the statement that the quality of the mid-day meal given to students is good. The intensity index of 3.05 showed that the principals had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 5.4% of the principals strongly agreed, 37.8% agreed, 8.1% were undecided, 16.2% disagreed, and 32.4% strongly disagreed with the statement that the school has more students than it can accommodate. The intensity index of 2.68 showed that the

principals had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement.

**Table 4.125: Perception of Principals on Administrative Practices**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
Teachers are appreciated from time to time for their excellent performance.	7 (18.9%)	10 (27.0%)	5 (13.5%)	10 (27.0%)	5 (13.5%)	3.11	2.97
Teachers do not actively participate in professional development programs.	8 (21.6%)	16 (43.2%)	6 (16.2%)	6 (16.2%)	1 (2.7%)	2.35	
The teachers at the post-fundamental school are effective.	5 (13.5%)	21 (56.8%)	5 (13.5%)	3 (8.1%)	3 (8.1%)	3.59	
Non-teaching staff get due recognition in school.	6 (16.2%)	19 (51.4%)	8 (21.6%)	4 (10.8%)	0	3.73	
Teachers are not satisfied with their salaries.	10 (27.0%)	19 (51.4%)	4 (10.8%)	3 (8.1%)	1 (2.7%)	2.08	

Table 4.125 shows that 18.9% of the principals strongly agreed, 27.0% agreed, 13.5% were undecided, 27.0% disagreed, and 13.5% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers are appreciated from time to time for their excellent performance. The intensity index of 3.11 showed that the principals had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 21.6% of the principals strongly agreed, 43.2% agreed, 16.2% were undecided, 16.2% disagreed, and 2.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers do not actively participate in professional development programs. The intensity index of 2.35 showed that the principals had an unfavourable perception towards the statement. 13.5% of the principals strongly agreed, 56.8% agreed, 13.5% were undecided, 8.1% disagreed, and 8.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that the teachers at the post-fundamental school were effective. The intensity index of 3.59 showed that the principals had a favourable perception towards the statement. 16.2% strongly agreed, 51.4% agreed, 21.6% were undecided, and 10.8% disagreed with the statement that non-teaching staff get due recognition in school. The intensity

index of 3.73 showed that the principals had a favourable perception towards the statement. 27.0% of the principals strongly agreed, 51.4% agreed, 10.8% were undecided, 8.1% disagreed, and 2.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers are unsatisfied with their salaries. The index of 2.08 showed that the principals had an unfavourable perception towards the statement.

**Table 4.126: Perception of Principals on Community Participation**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>N=37</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
The school is actively involved in interfacing with the community.	2	5.4%	9 (24.3%)	5 (13.5%)	12 (32.4%)	9 (24.3%)	2.54	3.43
Community participation in schools does not actively contribute to decision-making processes.	9	24.3%	13 (35.1%)	2 (5.4%)	12 (32.4%)	1 (2.7%)	2.54	
Parents involve themselves in school activities actively.	11	29.7%	21 (56.8%)	2 (5.4%)	2 (5.4%)	1 (2.7%)	4.05	
Parents-teacher association meetings are conducted regularly.	12	32.4%	14 (37.8%)	10 (27.0%)	0	1 (2.7%)	3.97	
Parental school involvement significantly contributes to a child's development and academic success.	14	37.8%	14 (37.8%)	7 (18.9%)	1 (2.7%)	1 (2.7%)	4.05	

Table 4.126 shows that 5.4% of the principals strongly agreed, 24.3% agreed, 13.5% were undecided, 32.4% disagreed, and 24.3% strongly disagreed with the statement that the school is actively interfacing with the community. The intensity index of 2.54 showed that the principals had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 24.3% of the principals strongly agreed, 35.1% agreed, 5.4% were undecided, 32.4% disagreed, and 2.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that community school participation does not actively contribute to decision-making processes. The intensity index of 2.54 showed that the principals had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided

towards the statement. 29.7% of the principals strongly agreed, 56.8% agreed, 5.4% were undecided, 5.4% disagreed, and 2.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that parents actively involve themselves in school activities. 32.4% of the principals strongly agreed, 37.8% agreed, 27.0% were undecided, and 2.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that parent-teacher association meetings are conducted regularly. 37.8% strongly agreed, 37.8% agreed, 18.9% were undecided, 2.7% disagreed, and 2.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that parental school involvement significantly contributes to a child's development and academic success. The respective intensity indexes of 4.05, 4.05, and 3.97 showed the principals' favourable perceptions towards the statements.

#### 4.3.4. Perception of Parents

**Table 4.127: Perception of Parents on Curriculum**

<b>N=395</b> <b>Statement</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
There is inadequacy in the learning experiences provided to the students.	146 (37.0%)	107 (27.1%)	57 (14.4%)	55 (13.9%)	30 (7.6%)	2.28	3.08
Teachers actively help students develop their English skills.	95 (24.1%)	170 (43.0%)	47 (11.9%)	47 (11.9%)	36 (9.1%)	3.61	
Teachers have enough knowledge of the course they teach.	21 (5.3%)	77 (19.5%)	57 (14.4%)	121 (30.6%)	119 (30.1%)	2.39	
Teachers encourage students to participate in co-curricular activities.	96 (24.3%)	137 (34.7%)	86 (21.8%)	42 (10.6%)	34 (8.6%)	3.55	
The syllabus changes as required.	90 (22.8%)	159 (40.3%)	68 (17.2%)	47 (11.9%)	31 (7.8%)	3.58	

Table 4.127 shows that 37.0% of the parents strongly agreed, 27.1% agreed, 14.4% were undecided, 13.9% disagreed, and 7.6% strongly disagreed with the statement that there is inadequacy in the learning experiences provided to the students. The intensity index of 2.28 showed that the parents had an unfavourable perception towards the statement. 24.1% of the parents strongly agreed, 43.0% agreed, 11.9% were undecided, 11.9% disagreed, and 9.1%

strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers actively help students develop their english skills. The intensity index of 3.61 showed that the parents had a favourable perception towards the statement. 56.8% of the parents strongly agreed, 19.5% agreed, 14.4% were undecided, 30.6% disagreed, and 30.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers have enough knowledge of their course. The intensity index of 2.39 showed that the parents had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 24.3% of the parents strongly agreed, 34.7% agreed, 21.8% were undecided, 10.6% disagreed, and 8.6% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers encourage students to participate in co-curricular activities. The intensity index of 3.55 showed that parents had a favourable perception towards the statement. 22.8% of the parents strongly agreed, 40.3% agreed, 17.2% were undecided, 11.9% disagreed, and 7.8% strongly disagreed with the statement that the syllabus changes as required. The intensity index of 3.58 showed that parents had a favourable perception towards the statement.

**Table 4.128: Perception of Parents on Pedagogy**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
The teaching methodology is interesting to the students.	86 (21.8%)	110 (27.9%)	44 (11.1%)	108 (27.3%)	47 (11.9%)	3.20	2.99
The home assignments do not differ from the content taught.	152 (38.5%)	80 (20.3%)	18 (4.6%)	70 (17.8%)	75 (19.0%)	2.58	
Interschool competitions are organised regularly.	104 (26.3%)	93 (23.6%)	64 (16.2%)	51 (12.9%)	83 (21.0%)	3.21	
The student's assessment procedure is fair.	130 (32.9%)	90 (22.8%)	100 (25.3%)	52 (13.2%)	23 (5.8%)	3.64	
Technology is not integrated into classroom teaching.	129 (32.7%)	111 (28.1%)	88 (22.3%)	25 (6.3%)	42 (10.6%)	2.34	

Table 4.128 shows that 21.8% of the parents strongly agreed, 27.9% agreed, 11.1% were undecided, 27.3% disagreed, and 11.9% strongly disagreed with the statement that the teaching methodology interests the students. The intensity index of 3.20 showed the parents had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 38.5% of the parents strongly agreed, 20.3% agreed, 4.6% were undecided, 17.8% disagreed, and 19.0%

strongly disagreed with the statement that the homework assigned to students does not differ from the content taught. The intensity index of 2.58 showed that the parents had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 26.3% of the parents strongly agreed, 23.6% agreed, 16.2% were undecided, 12.9% disagreed, and 21.0% strongly disagreed with the statement that interschool competitions are organised regularly. The intensity index of 3.21 showed that the parents had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 32.9% of the parents strongly agreed, 22.8% agreed, 25.3% were undecided, 13.2% disagreed, and 5.8% strongly disagreed with the statement that the students' assessment procedure is fair. The intensity index of 3.64 showed that the parents had a favourable perception towards the statement. 32.7% of the parents strongly agreed, 28.1% agreed, 22.3% were undecided, 6.3% disagreed, and 10.6% strongly disagreed with the statement that technology is integrated into classroom teaching. The intensity index of 2.34 showed that the parents had an unfavourable perception towards the statement.

**Table 4.129: Perception of Parents on School Infrastructure**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>N=395</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
The school library is well utilised.	119 (30.1%)	110 (27.8%)	29 (7.3%)	87 (22.0%)	50 (12.7%)	3.41	3.11	
The school laboratories are well utilised.	101 (25.6%)	86 (21.8%)	73 (18.5%)	79 (20.0%)	56 (14.2%)	3.25		
The school has an inactive functioning guidance and counselling centre.	105 (26.6%)	90 (22.8%)	81 (20.5%)	56 (14.2%)	63 (15.9%)	2.70		
Classes are overcrowded.	186 (47.1%)	144 (36.5%)	44 (11.1%)	13 (3.3%)	8 (2.0%)	4.23		
The school does not have spacious and enlightening classrooms.	140 (35.4%)	187 (47.3%)	27 (6.8%)	24 (6.8%)	17 (4.3%)	1.96		

Table 4.129 shows that 30.1% of the parents strongly agreed, 27.8% agreed, 7.3% were undecided, 22.0% disagreed, and 12.7% strongly disagreed with the statement that the school library is well-utilised. The intensity index of 3.41 showed that the parents had neither a

favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 25.6% of the parents strongly agreed, 21.8% agreed, 18.5% were undecided, 20.0% disagreed, and 14.2% strongly disagreed with the statement that the school laboratories are well utilised. The intensity index of 3.25 showed that the parents had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 26.6% of the parents strongly agreed, 22.8% agreed, 20.5% were undecided, 14.2% disagreed, and 15.9% strongly disagreed with the statement that the school has inactively functioning guidance and counselling centres. The intensity index of 2.70 showed that the parents had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 47.1% of the parents strongly agreed, 36.5% agreed, 11.1% were undecided, 3.3% disagreed, and 2.0% strongly disagreed with the statement that classes are overcrowded. The intensity index of 4.23 showed that the parents had a favourable perception towards the statement. 35.4% of the parents strongly agreed, 47.3% agreed, 6.8% were undecided, 6.8% disagreed, and 4.3% strongly disagreed with the statement that the school does not have spacious and enlightening classrooms. The intensity index of 1.96 showed that the parents had an unfavourable perception towards the statement.

**Table 4.130: Perception of Parents on Administrative Practices**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>N=395</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
Teachers apply impartiality in solving issues among students.	103 (26.1%)	112 (28.4%)	70 (17.7%)	49 (12.4%)	61 (15.4%)	3.37	3.47	
The school teachers are approachable to all parents.	185 (46.8%)	136 (34.4%)	43 (10.9%)	19 (4.8%)	12 (3.0%)	4.17		
The school principal reserves time for our children's daily concerns.	197 (49.9%)	97 (24.6%)	40 (10.1%)	33 (8.4%)	28 (7.1%)	4.02		
Co-teachers assist teachers in dealing with overcrowded classes effectively.	99 (25.1%)	90 (22.8%)	62 (15.7%)	67 (17.0%)	77 (19.5%)	3.17		
Teachers do not have knowledge of the material they teach.	82 (20.8%)	133 (33.7%)	82 (20.8%)	54 (13.7%)	44 (11.1%)	2.61		

Table 4.130 shows that 26.1% of the parents strongly agreed, 28.4% agreed, 17.7% were undecided, 12.4% disagreed, and 15.4% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers apply impartiality in solving issues among students. The intensity index of 3.37 showed that the parents had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 46.8% of the parents strongly agreed, 34.4% agreed, 10.9% were undecided, 4.8% disagreed, and 3.0% strongly disagreed with the statement that the school teachers are approachable to all parents. The intensity index of 4.17 showed that the parents had a favourable perception towards the statement. 49.9% of the parents strongly agreed, 24.6% agreed, 10.1% were undecided, 8.4% disagreed, and 7.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that the school principal reserves time for children's daily concerns. The intensity index of 4.02 showed that the parents had a favourable perception towards the statement. 25.1% of the parents strongly agreed, 22.8% agreed, 15.7% were undecided, 17.0% disagreed, and 19.5% strongly disagreed with the statement that co-teachers assist teachers in dealing with overcrowded classes effectively. The intensity index of 3.17 showed that the parents had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 20.8% strongly agreed, 33.7% agreed, 20.8% were undecided, 13.7% disagreed, and 11.1% strongly disagreed with the statement that teachers do not have knowledge of the material they teach. The intensity index of 2.61 showed that the parents had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement.

**Table 4.131: Perception of Parents on Community Participation**

<b>N=395</b> <b>Statement</b>	<b>SA (%)</b>	<b>A (%)</b>	<b>UD (%)</b>	<b>D (%)</b>	<b>SD (%)</b>	<b>Intensity Index</b>	<b>Average Index</b>
Parents are not actively involved in school activities.	41 (10.4%)	78 (19.7%)	61 (15.4%)	102 (25.8%)	113 (28.6%)	3.43	3.20
The parent's participation in the school is not enough.	62 (15.7%)	61 (15.4%)	76 (19.2%)	94 (23.8%)	102 (25.8%)	3.29	
Parents-teacher associations are actively functioning in the school.	81 (20.5%)	95 (24.1%)	77 (19.5%)	71 (18.0%)	71 (18.0%)	3.11	
Parents-teacher association meetings are held at regular	141 (35.7%)	132 (33.4%)	43 (10.9%)	49 (12.4%)	30 (7.6%)	3.77	

intervals.							
The school-industry interface is effective.	49 (12.4%)	36 (9.1%)	50 (12.7%)	140 (35.4%)	120 (30.4%)	2.38	

Table 4.131 shows that 10.4% of the parents strongly agreed, 19.7% agreed, 15.4% were undecided, 25.8% disagreed, and 28.6% strongly disagreed with the statement that parents are not actively involved in school activities. The intensity index of 3.43 showed that the parents had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 15.7% of the parents strongly agreed, 15.4% agreed, 19.2% were undecided, 23.8% disagreed, and 25.8% strongly disagreed with the statement that the parent's participation in the school was insufficient. The intensity index of 3.29 showed that the parents had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 20.5% of the parents strongly agreed, 24.1% agreed, 19.5% were undecided, 18.0% disagreed, and 18.0% strongly disagreed with the statement that parent-teacher associations are actively functioning in the school. The intensity index of 3.11 showed that the parents had neither a favourable nor an unfavourable perception; they were undecided towards the statement. 35.7% strongly agreed, 33.4% agreed, 10.9% were undecided, 12.4% disagreed, and 7.6% strongly disagreed with the statement that parent-teacher association meetings are held regularly. The intensity index of 3.77 showed that the parents had a favourable perception towards the statement. 12.4% of the parents strongly agreed, 9.1% agreed, 12.7% were undecided, 35.4% disagreed, and 30.4% strongly disagreed with the statement that the school-industry interface is effective. The intensity index of 2.38 showed that the parents had an unfavourable perception towards the statement.

## **4.4. Analysis and Interpretation of Data for Objectives 3 & 4**

### **Objective 3**

To study the problems encountered in the educational practices of the post-fundamental schools of Burundi

### **Objective 4**

To suggest measures for improvement of educational practices by the stakeholders in the post-fundamental schools of Burundi.

#### **a) Curriculum**

##### **Problems**

The analysis showed that 54.1% of principals and 34.8% of teachers stated insufficient content taught to the students as the major problem. 54.1% of principals and 3.8% of teachers mentioned errors in the existing text books, 51.4% of principals and 31% of teachers stated that the curriculum content does not relate to the student's level of understanding, 37.8% of principals and 4.3% of teachers stated irrelevant programmes, 32.4% of principals and 4.1% of teachers mentioned that the post-fundamental education system itself was problematic, 29.7% of principals and 22.6% of teachers said that teachers are not consulted in curriculum decision-making, 27% of principals and 18.8% of teachers stated lack of teaching materials, 27% of principals and 4.1% of teachers stated inappropriate curriculum transaction, 21.6 and 2.9 stated the plenteous content in curriculum, 18.9% of principals and 25.8% of teachers indicated difficulty in applying content to real-life situations, 13.5% of principals and 16.8% of teachers noted a lot of crucial parts are not covered, 13.5% of principals and 2.3% of teachers stated technical programmes are in the experimental stage, 5.4% of principals and 2% of teachers stude the poor curriculum content, and 1.2% of teachers said that the curriculum did not meet the needs of students.

All 4 PDEs stated the lack of textbooks and teaching professionals, and many errors in teacher guides and student manuals were detected. They stated that students could not apply basic ICT skills with computers or mobile phones in daily activities. ICT provisions in the curriculum were

outdated and could not instil into students the appropriate ICT knowledge and skills needed in the current digital world.

## **Suggestions**

The respondents stated some suggestions to improve the curriculum in the post-fundamental schools. The results showed that 67.6% of principals and 44.9% of teachers mentioned that curriculum content should be designed in such a way that it can be applied to real-life situations. 45.9% of principals and 40.6% of teachers suggested a revision of the existing textbooks, 32.4% of principals and 27.8% of teachers suggested an introduction of relevant programmes, 29.7% of principals and 31.3% of teachers suggested involving teachers in curriculum decision-making, 21.6% of principals and 10.7% of teachers suggested to improve the curriculum, 18.9% of principals and 4.9 of teachers suggested the provision of teaching materials, 16.2% of principals and 7.8% of teachers suggested to create a programme that meets the learners' needs and updated to their level of understanding.

The provincial directors of education (PDE) stated that the curriculum could be more applicable to real-life situations of students and provide schools with appropriate and enough textbooks to support teaching and learning situations. They mentioned a revision of existing textbooks, which could assist in conveying relevant information to learners. There was a need to revise the ICT content in the curriculum. The curriculum should be applicable when appropriate, and adequate textbooks, teacher guides and student manuals are available in schools. ICT provisions in the curriculum should cater for the critical and analytical thinking of the students.

## **b) Pedagogy**

### **Problems**

The respondents revealed that 56.8% of principals and 36.2% of teachers mentioned difficulties in implementing the integration pedagogy as a pedagogical problem encountered in post-fundamental schools. 45.9% of principals and 29.6% of teachers stated difficulties in applying the latest pedagogy, 32.4% of principals and 16.2% of teachers mentioned inappropriate teaching methods, 24.3% of principals and 24.6% of teachers said that the pedagogical practices in

implementation did not allow students to grow intellectually, 24.3% of principals and 10.1% of teachers said that the pedagogical problem was the teachers' resistance to adopting the latest pedagogy. 21.6% of principals and 19.4% of teachers stated that certain teachers were violating pedagogical rules, 13.5% of principals and 12.2% of teachers noted that the integration pedagogy was not adapted to the intellectual level of the pupils, 13.6% of teachers said that the teaching method did not prepare students to face 21st-century needs, and according to 2.7% of principals and 7.2% of teachers, the teaching methods were not interesting to students.

From the interviews, all four provincial directors of education stated that teachers were using outdated and poor teaching approaches; they mentioned that the plethoric numbers in classes could not favour group work retards the implementation of the new technique to implement the latest methods and that teachers were hesitant to embrace the integration pedagogy due to lack adequate skills.

### **Suggestions**

The respondents stated that 86.5% of principals and 35.1% of teachers suggested teaching/learning activities should relate to students' previous knowledge. 73% of principals and 25.5% of teachers suggested teachers professional development intending to equip them with the latest pedagogy, 51.4% of principals and 7.4% of teachers suggested applying suitable teaching methods at the proper levels, 45.9% of principals and 17.4% of teachers suggested inculcating proper attitudes in teachers towards adopting modern pedagogy, 24.3% of principals and 15.7% of teachers suggested to adopt appropriate methods of teaching.

The provincial directors of education (PDE) suggested the improvement of pedagogical practices by instructing educational institutes, including universities, to develop the expertise to train future teachers to apply the integration pedagogy appropriately and incorporate the integration pedagogy into technical education. Teachers, local supervisors, and newly recruited teachers should continuously be trained in integration pedagogy. They mentioned that teacher professional development programmes should be organised to enhance the implementation of the latest teaching methodologies.

## **c) Evaluation Procedures**

### **Problems**

The respondents revealed that 59.5% of principals and 56.8% of teachers stated that less assessment (homework, tests, projects, etc.) was the major problem in post-fundamental schools. 21.6% of principals and 10.4% of teachers mentioned the poor evaluation favouring the strong ignoring the weak, 16.2% of principals and 17.7% of teachers stated a lack of tools to give practical exams, 13.5% of principals and 18% of teachers suspected difficulty in conducting assessments due to the high number of students in class, and 10.8% of principals and 55.7% of teachers stated that the assessments conducted did not have a clear purpose.

The provincial directors of education (PDE) mentioned that teachers lacked the knowledge and abilities to implement evaluation methods in teaching-learning circumstances. Teachers could not use evaluation tools due to a lack of knowledge and skill in applying them to improve learning. Teachers did not have the necessary skills and expertise to implement the evaluation methods in the classroom effectively.

### **Suggestions**

32.4% of principals and 58.3% of teachers suggested that assessment should relate to teaching/learning objectives. 27% of principals and 55.7% of teachers suggested adopting evaluation procedures that cater to a high number of students in the class, 24.3% of principals and 40% of teachers proposed the provision of sufficient tools/materials for practical exams, 24.3% of principals and 8.7% of teachers suggested applying impartial assessment methods, and 8.1% of principals and 28.7% of teachers suggested to regularly give students enough class assignments, homework, tests, projects.

The provincial directors of education (PDE) jointly suggested that adequate training should be organised to up-skill teachers on the effective use of evaluation procedures in the classroom for possible improvement. Evaluation procedures employed by teachers should comply with the evaluation criteria. Therefore, allowing teachers to undergo professional development programmes will update their knowledge and skills in effectively handling the evaluation

procedures. There should be an improvement in in-service training for practising teachers on the effective application of evaluation procedures required to improve student learning. Teachers' knowledge and skills in delivering evaluation methods should also be improved. Teachers should adjust their teaching strategies based on the student's evaluation results.

## **d) Infrastructure**

### **Problems**

Regarding infrastructure, it was found that 78.4% of principals and 74.5% of teachers mentioned inadequate IT equipment as the major problem. 35.1% of principals and 5.5% of teachers stated non-spacious classrooms, 29.7% of principals and 28.4% of teachers mentioned insufficient school desks, 27% of principals and 33.6% of teachers stated dilapidated classrooms, 24.3% of principals and 4.1% of teachers mentioned a lack of enough classrooms, 18.9% of principals and 4.9% of teachers stated a lack of teachers' books (guide, syllabus, lesson notebook, etc.), 16.2% of principals and 20.3% of teachers highlighted a lack of electricity in classrooms, 13.5% of principals and 8.1% of teachers stated a lack of sports infrastructure, 8.1% of principals and 4.6% of teachers mentioned a lack of students' textbooks, 5.4% of principals and 2.3% of teachers stated a lack of financial means for rehabilitation and a lack of libraries.

The provincial directors of education (PDE) stated that the post-fundamental schools' infrastructure was challenged with various problems, including minimal infrastructure, particularly classrooms and desks. A few schools have good infrastructure, whereas many have poor infrastructure. The quality of facilities in post-fundamental schools did not bode well for effective teaching and learning. They stated that because the means by which they have been invested were small, their condition was not particularly appreciable, and practically every school felt the need to close.

### **Suggestions**

It was found that 78.3% of principals and 78.9% of teachers suggested the provision of sufficient school furniture and IT equipment. 54.1% of principals and 53.9% of teachers suggested the provision of teachers' and students' manuals, including guides, syllabi, textbooks, and lesson

notebooks. 51.4% of principals and 2% of teachers suggested providing enough classrooms, 48.7% of principals and 22.9% of teachers proposed the provision of spacious classrooms, and 35.1% of principals and 24.1% of teachers suggested the provision of electricity in classrooms. 29.7% of principals and 9.3% of teachers suggested the repair of dilapidated classroom structures, 27% of principals and 26.1% of teachers suggested the provision of libraries in schools, 16.2% of principals and 16.8% of teachers suggested the provision of sports infrastructure, and 13.5% of principals and 20.9% of teachers proposed providing financial support for school minor maintenance.

The provincial directors of education (PDE) stated that the infrastructure of post-fundamental schools in Burundi could be improved if Burundi's post-fundamental infrastructure was built according to appropriate requirements. Some community-built structures might require minor improvements to meet standard standards. All Burundian and foreign educational partners should work together to improve school infrastructure. The previously worn-out (ancient) infrastructure should be renovated to enhance students' learning environments. The municipality and/or the state might establish a maintenance fund for the schools that they have built.

## **e) Administrative Practices**

### **Problems**

Regarding administrative problems, 81.1% of principals and 21.2% of teachers stated that progressing students who do not have 50% in classes to the post-fundamental only just because they passed the national test was an administrative problem encountered in the schools. 62.2% of principals and 7.2% of teachers stated a lack of regular and strict supervision, 56.8% of principals and 4.6% of teachers stated that admissions were not based on the intellectual capacities of students, 54.1% of principals and 5.2% of teachers stated financial weaknesses in schools activities, 48.6% of principals and 83.8% of teachers stated unfair teacher transfers and reassignment practices, 37.8% of principals and 43.2% of teachers mentioned a lack of teaching staff, and 32.4% of principals and 10.1% of teachers stated a lack of teachers' input in admission procedures.

During interviews, the provincial education directors stated challenges linked to insufficient human resources, a lack of training to ensure local supervision, ignorance from certain school principals, a lack of ICT equipment, and inadequate infrastructure, obliging principals to stay far from their workplace. They also mentioned a shortage of funds to cover the school expenses.

## **Suggestions**

The respondents stated that 54.1% of principals and 48.4% of teachers encouraged fair teacher transfers and reassignment practices, 56.8% of principals and 39.4% of teachers encouraged the merit-based promotion of students to improve school administrative practices, 48.6% of principals and 28.1% of teachers mentioned regular and strict supervision, 32.4% of principals and 7.2% of teachers proposed to practise merit-based admissions, 29.7% of principals and 21.2% of teachers suggested the provision of enough administrative and teaching staff, 21.6% of principals and 24.1% of teachers proposed providing enough financial support for administrative activities coverage.

The provincial directors of education mentioned the organisation of both administrative and educational meetings regularly in addition to the annual action plans. They also proposed the organization of administrative, educational and financial management meetings for school officials. There should be an implementation of the ministerial order stating the merging of certain schools with minimal numbers within the framework for a rational management of human resources. Professional coaching should be provided to communal directors of education (CDE) and provincial directors of education (PDE) to contribute to permanent solutions and improvement of administrative practices.

## **f) Human Resources**

### **Problems**

Regarding human resources, it was found that 86.5% of principals and 57.4% of teachers stated inadequate professional development programmes. 54.1% of principals and 47% of teachers stated a lack of induction for newly recruited teachers, 45.9% of principals and 6.4% of teachers mentioned recruitment of unqualified teaching staff, 32.4% of principals and 8.4% of teachers

mentioned an abnormal rate of teacher absenteeism, 18.9% of principals and 64.9% of teachers mentioned an inequitable distribution of teachers in schools, and 13.5% of principals and 43.5% of teachers mentioned a poor teacher welfare system.

The provincial directors of education mentioned challenges linked to insufficient human resources, the non-qualification of particular teachers, the reluctance of certain teachers who did not want to embrace change, certain teachers who did not prepare for the subject to teach, lack of recruitment of sufficient and qualified staff, lack of funds for the employment of volunteers and temporary teachers, heavy workload, teachers whose initial training included neither integration pedagogy nor teaching methodologies.

### **Suggestions**

While suggesting, 48.6% of principals and 60.3% of teachers mentioned the organisation of adequate professional development programmes. 37.8% of principals and 26.7% of teachers stated equitable distribution of teachers in schools, 16.2% of principals and 13% of teachers mentioned the establishment of a proper teacher welfare system, 10.8% of principals and 18.6% of teachers proposed the establishment of appropriate and impartial disciplinary measures to curb teacher absenteeism, 8.1% of principals and 16.2% of teachers stated organising an orientation for newly recruited teachers, and 5.4% of principals and 9.3% of teachers proposed to recruit qualified teaching staff.

The provincial directors stated that municipalities should abide by assisting volunteer teachers and continuing training to allow educators to adapt to all the educational reforms in vogue, as well as organise in-service teachers and administrative staff training to overcome these human resources challenges. They also proposed recruiting sufficient post-fundamental staff or recognizing and supporting volunteer teachers who gave themselves body and soul, day and night, to the country's interest. They mentioned the incorporation of the integration pedagogy into the higher education curriculum, increasing the recruitment quota for post-fundamental teachers, and organising permanent professional programmes, among other significant suggestions for improving the school's administrative practices.

## **g) Community Participation**

### **Problems**

Regarding community participation in school activities, 54.1% of principals and 29.6% of teachers stated that the community was uninterested in school activities, which constitutes a problem for community involvement. 35.1% of principals and 27.8% of teachers stated a lack of courage to demand accountability, 29.7% of principals and 27.2% of teachers stated a lack of financial support for the school development projects, 27% of principals and 27.5% of teachers mentioned the ineffectiveness of parent-teacher association boards, 27% of principals and 4.1% of teachers stated a poor school-community relationship, 21.6% of principals and 28.4% of teachers mentioned a lack of public awareness of the good of the school, and 16.2% of principals and 8.1% of teachers stated that parents didn't participate in their children's education, and no parent-teacher associations existed.

The provincial directors of education (PDE) responded that the post-fundamental schools experienced a lack of industry interface. They stated that they did not have any partnerships with industries. Others mentioned that there were no partnerships between industries and schools in their district yet.

### **Suggestions**

To intensify community participation in school activities, 73% of principals and 32.8% of teachers stated the enhancement of parent-teacher association boards. 59.5% of principals and 31.3% of teachers mentioned initiating public awareness programmes on the benefits of post-fundamental schools in the community. 37.8% of principals and 29.3% of teachers mentioned the establishment of a proper school-community relationship, 32.4% of principals and 12.5% of teachers responded that the community should be encouraged to demand accountability, and 21.6% of principals and 24.3% of teachers stated encouraging parents to participate in their children's education.

The provincial directors of education suggested that parents should take ownership of education to strengthen community participation in schools.

They stated that parents should follow the children's education, whether at home or school; parents should raise awareness among the entire community, and there should be awareness sessions for the community to contribute actively to the development of schools. They mentioned there should be an increment of meetings between school management and parents' boards, and schools should involve parents' committees in planning school activities.