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**Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCE</td>
<td>Early Childhood Care and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>Free primary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPE</td>
<td>Universal primary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational Scientific Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>Early Child Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI</td>
<td>School Readiness Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labor Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kg Curriculum</td>
<td>Kindergarten Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Packages for Social Scientists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE

1.1 Background

Education is a key to success in life, facilitating social mobility and personal development (Nkinyangi, 1982). It is critical to the development of human capital as this is seen to be the most important key to rapid economic development and the strongest weapon against poverty. Education is an instrument for individual and national development. No country has succeeded in developing fast enough without placing its ultimate priority on education (Derebsa, 2015). It is the most effective means to eradicate poverty, curb population growth, and ensure democracy, peace and sustainable development.

Harbison (1973) argues that the wealth of nations depend on their capacity to develop human resources and not so much on their physical resources. He further notes that a country which is unable to develop the skills and knowledge of its people and to utilize them effectively in the national economy will be unable to develop anything else. In the views of Shultz (1981) education is considered the route to economic prosperity, the key to scientific and technological advancement, the means to combat unemployment, the foundation of social equality, equal wealth distribution, and the spearhead of political socialization and cultural diversity.

For developing countries like Ethiopia, education is a critical sector whose performance directly affects and even determines the quality and magnitude of development. It is the most important means the country has at its disposal to develop human resources, impart appropriate skills, knowledge, and attitudes (Derebsa, ibid). Education forms the basis for developing innovation, science and technology in order to harness our resources, industrialize, and participate in the global knowledge economy and for Ethiopia to take its rightful place in the global economy.

In view of the preceding statements, all societies have arrangements for education of one kind or the other to nurture and take care of the young children. Arrangements for educating generations of children have evolved over time and have been diverse across
cultures, in keeping with differences in family and community structures, and the social and economic role of men and women (Blumberg, 2006). The efforts made by all societies to educate children also aims to transmit the accumulated knowledge, skills attitudes, and beliefs to the upcoming generation in the context of scientific principles and modern technology, since this can help facilitate the accumulation of human capital and increase labor productivity at all levels (Berhan, entail, 2009).

The statement “Learning begins at birth” (EFA, 2007) indicates that Learning begins before a child walks through the classroom door. The concern for early child care and education (ECCE) is therefore, the first of the six Education for All (EFA) goals, which calls upon countries to expand and improve comprehensive early childhood care and education (ECCE), especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children. The need for a holistic approach to Early Child Care and Education that encompasses health, nutrition, hygiene and children’s cognitive development and socio-emotional well-being has been a point of concern for all nations since Early childhood programs are vital to offset social and economic disadvantage (Ibid).

According to Tata J. Mbugua Recent years have seen a global endeavor to prioritize early childhood care and education as a foundation for later learning and development, as evidenced by the Global Guidelines for Early Childhood Education and Care in the 21st Century (Association for Childhood Education International/World Organization for Early Childhood, 1999). Such efforts are a response to a variety of complex social issues and economic trends. These forces, which are referred to here as "complex family stressors," include, but are not limited to, societal changes due to industrialization, the increased number of women with young children entering the labor force, families with two working parents, a rise in the number of single parents, and the demise of traditional systems of child care and extended family support systems (Driscoll & Nagel, 2002;Graves, Gargiulo, & Sluder, 1996). The influence of these social forces and pedagogical requirements of lifelong learning had long demanded the expansion of pre-primary education centers/schools all over the world.
According to NT (2011), Pre-primary education helps to develop the physical and mental development children, promote their emotional and educational development, and improves their socialization process. Boren and Picket (1954:8) stated that “pre-school education seeks to cultivate proper habit of living, develops social cooperation and individual responsibility, stimulates initiative and resourcefulness and develops the ability to solve the daily problems of group life.” For this reason, planning suitable curriculum, getting the professional services in health, education nutrition etc. and having the participation of parents in all aspects of the program is demanding.

Pre-primary education has crucial role to prevent societal and educational exclusion and foster student’s long-term school success. Cunha and a Nobel prize-winner Heckman in economist suggest that the early childhood period gives the best opportunity for investment in human capital in relation to later opportunities during schooling in primary and secondary level (Cunha et al., 2005, see also OECD Starting Strong II, 2006). This happens because learning in one stage begets learning in the next. Learning in early childhood is for this reason most important. Concerning human capital the authors concluded that the rate of return to a dollar of investment made during early years is higher than investment of the same amount of money later. Positive or negative dispositions towards society and learning absorbed and basic life skills acquired. According to Cunha and Hack man important basic life skills are co-operation with peers and adults, autonomy, meaning making, creativity, problem solving and persistence.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The right to education is one of the basic human rights stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948. In Ethiopia, this right has recently been livened through the launch of the Free Primary Education program (hence FPE) by the Ethiopian government. The FPE program is faced with major challenges that range from lack of facilities, few teachers, over-age children, street children, no books, lack of finances and socio-cultural impediments such as HIV-AIDs. The FPE has been received
with mixed feelings from different sections of the society. While some have expressed feelings of discontentment, failure, betrayal among others, many low income members of the population view it as a God sent opportunity. During the early years of the 1990s, with the vision to bring a rapid socio-economic and political change in the country, the Ethiopian government quickly recognized that “education” is one of the vital instruments for national development. Education then became a focus of attention to solve the age long poverty and illiteracy featuring the country in Africa. Globally, education is widely seen as one of the most promising paths for individuals to realize better, more productive lives and as one of the primary drivers of national economic development (Rachel, et.al, 2011).

The development and adoption of the 1994 Education and Training policy by the Ethiopian Government stemmed from these assertions. Besides, the introduction of education quality improvement packages to all schools in the country was another innovative strategy to provide quality education to citizens and thereby bring the nation to middle income level in 2025.

The commitment that began to expand education in the country was further strengthened by the global launching of the Millennium development goals (Universal Primary Education: UPE) which motivated most countries of the world to reform their existing systems of education (UN, 2000). Ethiopia, too, further intensified the reform by introducing a new curriculum, a new education structure, a new mode of decentralized education management and leadership and a new system of teacher training. Not only was the Ethiopian government committed to providing access to primary and secondary education, but also showed a remarkable effort in motivating the private sector to play its role in the provision of education to children in the nation. In particular, the opening of pre-primary education establishments was left to the private sector at the beginning.

Following the 1998 conference attended by Ministers of Education of African member states (UNESCO, 1998) it has been an urgent task for the Ethiopian government to
formulate culturally appropriate and integrated ECD policy that involve the mainstream ministries. The development of the National Policy Framework and Strategic Guideline can be considered as an outgrowth of this conference despite the delay in time. Later the millennium development goals, and the resolutions of the education for all summit in Dakar Senegal in 2000 (EFA), and as a result of various international resolutions which fueled the motivation for opening pre-primary education, the government embarked on creating access to pre-primary education in government schools.

In Addis Ababa, although pre-primary programs have been run by the respective government schools in the sub cities, the quality of services provided is said not to the standard due to various reasons: Lack of the necessary resources, absence of budget for on job training for teachers and the leadership, absence of learning facilities to enhance the readiness of children for primary schooling and lack of skills on the part of teachers to identify and treat children’s divergent needs.. As a result of this, the city government education bureau had began to work in partnership with some local none government institutions to facilitate the smooth transition of children to primary schools in Addis Ababa. One of these NGOs is the School Readiness Initiative (SRI). This local NGO has been intervening in the school readiness programs of fifty two pre-primary centers in Addis Ababa (all sub cities inclusive) for the last four years. The work of this NGO has been taken by the Education Bureau as the first experimental intervention to facilitate smooth transition of children to primary schools and the outcomes of this experimental program, is said, would serve as a benchmark to replicate the best practices to other pre-school centers in the capital. It is the purpose of this study to assess the impact of the school intervention program provided by SRI.

1.3 Basic Research Questions

This assessment was guided by the following basic questions:

1. What provisions have been made to the pre-primary centers?
2. What was the extent of collaboration between the ECCE centers and stakeholders?
3. What were the impacts of intervention in the pre-primary schools?
4. What were the extents of satisfaction by the stakeholders in the services provided by the pre-primary schools?
5. What should be done for the smooth transition of children to primary grades in Addis Ababa?

1.4 Objectives of the study

The following specific objectives have been set for the study

1. To assess the extent of supports that prevailed in the pre-primary centers;
2. To find out the linkages that existed among the concerned stakeholders for the smooth transition of children from pre-primary to primary grades;
3. To investigate the impact of school readiness interventions on the achievement of children in primary grades; and,
4. To propose strategies that can strengthen the smooth transition of children from pre-primary to elementary schools.

1.5 Significance of the study

The study is expected to be significant in identifying the present status of interventions in the pre-primary education centers in Addis Ababa and in proposing strategies to improve the smooth transition of children to primary grades. It is also believed to serve as a foundation for further similar studies to throw light on the issue and draw the attention of different stakeholders in the capital.

1.6 Delimitation of the study

The study would be more comprehensive if it covered all the program centers in Addis Ababa. However, due to shortage of time and resources, the present study was delimited to ten of the government pre-primary education centers, where five were under the interventions of the School Readiness Initiative local NGO, and the other five which were not included the intervention.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Historical overview

Studies conducted so far indicate that the importance of pre-primary education began as early as the period of Plato (425-347 B.C), and Comenius put the first corner-stone for the pre-primary educational program (in NT, 2011). In support of this, prominent scholars like Rousseau, Locke, Pestalozzi, Piaget, Dewey and others contributed a lot to the emergence of early childhood education. In other words, they were great thinkers whose writings and works had influenced the form and function of the present day early education program (Mitzel, 1982 in Derejie, 1997:18).

Historical evidences show that Froebel (1782-1852) wrote a comprehensive pre-school theory which was specifically directed to the education of the young child. He also coined the name for his pre-school as “Kindergarten” which was meant caring for young children as for young plants (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1974:989). The concept of kindergarten had been driven from the German phrase, that is, “children’s garden” meaning a place where young human plants were cultivated by teachers, using relevant principles, methods and techniques as gardeners where children were considered as young plants (Aggarwal, 1996 in Yemane 2007:11). Since then, the name kindergarten became popular in the education enterprises and has been interchangeably utilized with the name pre-primary.

In 1835, Froebel designed pre-primary education program in Germany. The program aimed at helping children understand the unity of men, God and nature. Froebel developed different manipulative materials to be used by children in
prescribed ways. Moreover, programs like arts, crafts, songs and games were developed and are also currently used by many pre-schools (Bernard, 1986:520). Similarly, pre-primary education program was introduced in America in 1955 by Mrs. Carl Schurz who had studied in Germany under Froebel. The program was initially designed for German immigrants to United States and later developed in many areas of the country (McCarthy, 1980:9). Gradually, the pre-primary education program was introduced throughout the world including Africa by the voluntary organizations as the African governments couldn’t afford to run the program by then (UNESCO, 1991 in Yemane, 2007:13).

According to (EFA, 2007), the industrial revolution in Europe (18th century) resulted in the higher rate of female labor force participation in industrial production and at the same time mothers continued to be the major direct providers of care to children. This was because of the historical fact that fathers and other family members have typically had limited involvement in the care and upbringing of young children. As a response to these new developments in industrial production, maternal and parental leave policies began to be issued to enhance the care and well-being of infants. Laws on maternity leave, initially linked to employment provision for sick leave, were first enacted more than a century ago to protect the health of working women and their babies at the time of childbirth. Supporters of this argued that relieving women of workplace pressure for a brief time before child birth, while protecting their economic situation, would promote the physical wellbeing of both mothers and children. Paid maternity leave was first established in Germany under Bismarck as part of a broad enactment of social insurance policies. By the First World War, thirteen countries had paid maternity leave policies and eight others had legislated unpaid maternal leave (Gauthier, 1996).
The International labor Organization (ILO) was instrumental in promoting maternal leave policies (ILO, 1980, 1985). In 1919, the ILO adopted the first maternity protection convention which was significantly revised in 1952 and 2000. The first convention applied to all women working in industry and commerce and stipulated entitlement to a maternity leave of twelve weeks (six before and six after childbirth, the later being compulsory). Accordingly it was stipulated that while on leave women should receive a cash benefit that would be at least two-third of their wages. The report by the ILO showed that by 1960, women had access to paid maternity leave in fifty nine countries and in more than hundred countries by 1980s [ILO, 1980, 1985].

More formal arrangements to care for; socialize, and educate young children started in Europe and North American countries in the Nineteenth century. This evolved in response to multiple challenges notably: addressing the needs of abandoned, deprived or neglected children and the children of poor working mothers, providing an enriching pre-school education for middle class children and providing a safe and affordable environment for children of working women (Cameraman & Kahn, 1991).

Pre-primary education programs were gradually introduced throughout the world including Africa by voluntary organizations as the African governments couldn’t afford to run the program by then (UNESCO, 1991 in Yemane, 2007:13). In some post colonial countries in Africa pre-schools retained the structures established by the former colonial powers, supplemented with national elements. In Morocco for example, Kuttabs /kuranic schools survived as a source of early learning for boys aged 4 to 7 (Characters and Geneix, 2006). Health issues related to birth and immunization were considered the traditional responsibility of governments while early childhood provision in all other areas relied upon the
initiative of concerned citizens and/or international organizations such as UNICEF.

2.2 Early Child Hood Care Education in Ethiopia

The history of education in Ethiopia goes as far back as the fourth century, and is closely associated with the introduction of Christianity to the country in the fourth century which marked the founding of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church (Pankhurst, 1955). Since then, the Orthodox Church took the lead in expanding Christianity and the Amharic scriptures’ together with the Geez language which resulted in opening church schools that step by step evolved from the weekend religions teaching programs. While church education programs are currently operational in most of the orthodox churches, they step by step gave rise to village schools for children and these later developed to private schools in the 1930s.

Atse Zara Ya’aqob, who was considered the great local philosopher of the time, became an activist towards traditional church education in the 16th century and embarked on opening various church schools (Demeke, 2007:154-155). However, the first modern pre-primary education was opened in Diredewa before eight years of the establishment of the first public school Menlik II School. The pre-primary school was established to teach children of the Ethio-French railway line workers (Hoot et al., 2004:4). Later, the pre-primary education program was established in Asmara in 1923 by Catholic Missionaries and in Addis Ababa in 1950 by the Welfare and International Organizations (Shewakena, 1997:13). Gradually, a lot of pre-primary schools attached to the then formal educational institutions such as the German school, the British school, Lice Geberemariam and others to serve children from the nobility in Addis Ababa. However, since 1971 few pre-primary schools (pilot projects) were constructed in major towns of the country under the Ministry of National Community Development and Social Affairs for serving children of some families. Since then the program centers were run by Swedish and American Peace Corp Volunteers. When they left the country, the program
was taken over by Women Village Level Workers who were untrained for pre-school program (Demeke, 2007:181).

The socialist movement of the 1974 was the turning point for the growth of pre-primary education in Ethiopian history. The national training institution ‘Mennen Pre-primary schools Teachers Training Center’ was established in Addis Ababa in 1986 with the support of UNICEF. At the same time, departments like curriculum development and text books preparation, teacher education, supervision and evaluation of pre-school program were formed with the assistance of the Ethiopian Ministry of Education to satisfy the growing demand of early child-hood education programs (Demeke, 2007:182-183).

2.3. The Importance of Early Child Hood Care Education

Early child care education is a right in itself. The 1990 declaration on education states that Learning begins at birth and encourages the development and importance of ECCE to reaching basic education goals (EFA, 2000).

Reaching the Millennium Development goods (MDG) and reducing poverty depended on efforts to support young Children’s rights to health, education, protection and equality. Children who participate in ECCE and have positive early learning experiences make a better transition to primary school and are more likely to begin and complete it (EFA goal 2). By reducing dropout, repetition and special education placements, ECCE can improve the internal efficiency of primary education and decreases cost for both governments and households and it is also considered as an important instrument for promoting gender parity (EFA goals) as younger children’s attendance to ECCE programs can impact on older sisters to join schooling and then relieved themselves of care responsibilities and this in turn can create an opportunity to reduce stereotypes about traditional gender roles and to foster gender equality at an age when young children are developing understanding of identity, empathy, tolerance and morality.
Participation in good quality ECCE is linked with achievement at subsequent levels of education and contributes to the quality of the education system as a whole [EFA goal 6]. According to UNICEF (2003) reaching the MDGs and reducing poverty and hunger (MDG1) and child mortality (MDG4) can help combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases [MDG6].

Various studies have shown that pupil who were in quality pre-school programs later in life learned more each month than those who were not. Children, who were in pre-school programs most of the time graduate from high school, own home and have longer marriage and are less likely to get into trouble with the law. Therefore, pre-primary education has an immediate (school transition) and long term benefits in the life of children. (*http;//www Education atlas).

2.4 School Readiness

School Readiness refers to the constellation of factors that help prepare children for school success, including physical health, cognitive and social-emotional readiness to enter kindergarten, the readiness of school systems to address children’s diverse learning needs, and the readiness of family- and provider systems to support children with resources that will help them succeed (Davis Y. Ja, and Associates, 2010). School readiness is currently defined by three interlinked dimensions: a) ready children; b) ready schools; and c) ready families. These three dimensions are meant:

a. Ready Families: Describes children’s family context and home environment.

b. Ready Communities: Describes the community resources and supports available to families with young children.

c. Ready Services: Describes the availability, quality and affordability of proven programs that influence child development and school readiness.

d. Ready Schools: Describes critical elements of schools that influence child development and school success.

This above dimensions of school readiness are expressed by the following formula:
Ready families + Ready communities + Ready Services + Ready schools = Children ready for school. (Davis Y. JA, and Associates, 2010).

Children, schools and families are considered ready when they have gained the competencies and skills required to interface with the other dimensions and support smooth transitions (in UNICEF, Rebello, 2010).

The concept of School Readiness (SR) emerged from the first National Education Summit in the United States of America with the goal “all children start school ready to learn”. It was launched in 2001 in five states and counties namely Imperial County, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Santa Barbara County, and Ventura County (Lokcit). The project was financed by matching funds from participating school districts and local agencies and organizations. These state and local dollars together supported an array of health and early learning services and system enhancements that helped children successfully transition from early childhood to elementary school (Ibid).

The School readiness initiatives support institutions so that young children gain maximum benefits than homes by enhancing the suitability of institutional environment, surroundings, plans and programs that have a paramount importance in achieving the goals of the pre-primary education program (Choudhury and Choudhury, 2002:110).

The benefits obtained from school readiness goes beyond the construction and establishment of pre-primary institutions and staffing them with the required manpower. It refers to the combined architectural work of all staff in the institution and the wider community/parents.
### 2.5 Why School Readinesses?

Thompson argues that the first five years of life are critical to a child’s lifelong development. Young children’s earliest experiences and environments set the stage for future development and success in school and life (Spring/Summer 2001). As is usually advised by medical professionals, early experiences actually influence brain development, establishing the neural connections that provide the foundation for language, reasoning, problem solving, social skills, behavior and emotional health (Lock cite). Families and communities play critical roles in helping children get ready for school. Children from families that are economically secure and have healthy relationships are more likely to succeed in school. Infants and young children thrive when parents and families are able to surround them with love and support and opportunities to learn and explore their world Ready Schools. (S.R, 1998). Communities are vibrant when they provide social support for parents, learning opportunities for children, and services for families in need.

Schools can improve the readiness of young children by making connections with local child care providers and preschools and by creating policies that ensure smooth transitions to kindergarten. Children entering kindergarten vary in their early experiences, skills, knowledge, language, culture and family background. Schools must be ready to address the diverse needs of these children and families in their community and be committed to the success of every child (Shonkoff, et.al, 2002).

In the words of Ladd, et.al (1999) when children lack access to quality early childhood programs, they enter primary schools inadequately prepared to participate in individual learning and classroom activities. This adversely affects their learning achievement and school completion and is linked with behavioral problems. Failure to provide ECCD often results in children entering school late or dropping out, thereby setting a downward economic and social trajectory in adulthood (Nonoyama, et.al, 2007).
According to Grantham, et al, (2007) lack of access to quality ECCD programs stand out – Only about 50 per cent of developing countries have any formal system for the care and development of children aged 3 years old and younger. Due to minimal, low-quality provisions of ECD and high poverty contexts, children often come to school malnourished and stunted. Without the crucial elements for early childhood– antenatal care, good nutrition, health care and routine immunizations – children will experience poorer school outcomes and performance than children who have access to the building blocks of development (Grantham, et al, 1995). Overcrowded classrooms, inconvenient locations, lack of learning materials, and inadequately prepared or absent teachers exacerbate the situation (Pence, et.al, 2008).

In many parts of the world, there is a strong national system of early care and development until children are approximately 3 years old. Then they receive minimal attention until they enter primary school, leaving a gap in services for children between ages 3 and 6. The early intervention programs from birth to 3 years set the children on an upward path. Without continuity of services, these children may ‘fall through the cracks’, lose their early gains and enter school unprepared. The burden of navigating the transition then falls on children and families. Such lack of continuity in services may lead to school failure and dropout because families and children are unprepared for the school system (UNICEF, 2011).

According to UNESCO (2007) an analysis of primary school enrolment rates suggests that, while overall increases are being made, rates of enrolment remain low for children from marginalized communities. Cultural, social and linguistic differences between families and the mainstream school culture may be implicated in these low enrolment and attendance rates, thereby creating inequities (Auerbach, 1989). Without the skills and competencies necessary to smooth the transition for children from minority they drop out. Inaction at the primary school level translates into a high cost for society, which misses out on the potential talents and contributions of a portion of its citizenry communities, schools and Grade 1 teachers are ill-prepared to receive them. Because the schools are not responsive to their needs, children and families make it to the
school door but do not remain. They feel uncomfortable they drop out. Inaction at the primary school level translates into a high cost for society, which misses out on the potential talents and contributions of a portion of its citizenry.

Costs of inaction for society include economic ramifications. Data supporting the connection between malnutrition and learning and development, proxy indicators of early childhood learning, suggest a 22 per cent loss in adult income due to early childhood deprivation (Ibid). On the whole, when children and families are prepared for school and schools are prepared for them, children are more likely to enroll in school on time and stay until they complete primary schooling.

2.6 School Readiness in Addis Ababa

At present there are 950 private pre-primary centers in Addis Ababa (Plan, 2015). To enroll in these private centers, the parents of children are required to pay a considerable amount of money to the owners of these establishments. Thus, only those children whose parents are able to pay the monthly school fee can attend these schools. However, children of the poor and the disadvantaged sections of the residents in Addis Ababa have no choice but send their children to government pre-school centers.

158 pre-primary centers are open in government primary schools in Addis Ababa now (Ibid) and each is attached to an existing public primary school, and yet no pre-primary centers have been opened in 58 of the primary schools in the capital and this indicates that children from the disadvantaged families living around these primary schools join primary grades inadequately prepared.

Although, the opening of pre-primary centers in government primary schools is commendable, it is often said that the centers are not to the standard as resources are in short supply, prevalence of large classrooms as these centers are attached to primary grades and expansion works are difficult to accommodate the yearly influx of children from the disadvantaged families, and lack of teaching and learning resources to facilitate the ready transition of children to primary grades. This, coupled with lack of
awareness on the part of parents to participate in their children’s learning has made the ready transition of children difficult. Cognizant of this, the City Government Education Bureau works in partnership with the School Readiness Initiative NGO to facilitate the readiness of children for primary schools, the impact of which is identified by this assessment deliberation.
CHAPTER THREE

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Design of the Study

In this impact assessment, mixed methods research design, which comprises both quantitative and qualitative approaches, has been used. Mixed methods research approach provides more comprehensive evidence for studying a research problem than either quantitative or qualitative research alone; because it helps answer questions that cannot be answered by either of them alone (Creswell, 2007). Mixed methods research is a design linked to the pragmatic knowledge claim, which strives to find solutions to existing problems.

3.2 Sampling

With the use of simple random sampling, five pre-primary schools under the SRI intervention and five government pre-primary centers which were not under any intervention were selected for assessment. Thus, ten pre-primary centers represented the ten sub cities. From each pre-primary center, the pre-primary center head, two teachers, and two parents each from the pre-primary centers were randomly selected as data sources. Thus a total of 50 stakeholders were considered to generate data.

3.3 Data Collection

Pre-primary center heads, teachers, and parents were made to respond to self constructed validated structured questionnaire tagged children’s data, supports accrued to the centers, parent’s role on participation in the education of children, teachers’ capacity enhancement and support mechanisms. The questionnaire were prepared and administered for the three data sources separately and sought to find out the actual interventions and the results achieved. In addition, two separate check lists were prepared and utilized to document students achievement data in 2007 (both for those who passed through the intervention and those who did not). The data collection tools
were validated using a team of 10 data collectors recruited from the sub cities. The data collectors were trained to secure the necessary information from the pre-primaries using the questionnaires as per the sample.

3.4 Methods of Analysis:

A computer software system known as SPSS was utilized for coding, design, entry, and organization/tabulation of data. The data collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics/frequency counts and percentage, t-tests and other tests of relationships. Qualitative data collected through the structured interview from center heads, parents and teachers were analyzed using narrative approaches to triangulate the evidence. This complements the statement that: When evidence is collected from three different sources over time, trends and patterns can become apparent. This process has a history of use in the social sciences and is called triangulation (Lincoln and Guba 1984).
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This section presents the major findings on the impact of school readiness programs on teachers, parents, the school leadership and learners’ in terms of learning outcomes and transitioning to primary education, and impacts on communities and teachers. These findings are the main basis for the recommendations made at the end of this report.

4.1 Respondents’ Characteristics

The respondents surveyed included the school leadership, teachers and parents; apart from students whose 2015 grade one score reports in languages, mathematics, and science were documented for comparison.

Table 1: Sub City and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub City</th>
<th>Arada</th>
<th>Ad. Ketema</th>
<th>Gulele</th>
<th>Kolfe</th>
<th>Yeka</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that majority of respondents were female (76%) while a sizable number were males (24%). The lowest numbers of male respondents were from Arada and Addis Ketema sub cities (8.3%) while the highest female respondents were also from the same area. This could imply that females are more prone to respond to the
care and education of their children. As shown in table 2, the educational qualification of the respondents varied across the category of the data sources.

Table 2: Respondents Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Qualification</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>19 (95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>15 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 (68%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Large number of the principals had Degrees (80%) and only two principals were diploma holders. However, the highest percentages of teachers were certificate holders while only one teacher was reported to hold a degree. Regarding parents, the majority of them were certificate holders (75%), but 20% were said of masters degrees holders. Such variations in educational qualification have implications to the quality of school readiness programs in the pre-primary centers. For example, other than the formal training, teachers who hold certificates require adequate on job training to effectively nurture and prepare children for transition to grade one. In addition, literate parents are more prone to send, care and educate their children than the illiterate parents. On the whole, the majorities of the data sources were literates and had understanding about the importance of preparing children for primary grades and could also provide the necessary data regarding school readiness programs.

4.2 Analysis of Data

Under this part of the impact assessment the data collected from field work would be analyzed. Both quantitative and qualitative information were treated simultaneously.
One crucial research question was directed to the school leadership regarding the supports provided to facilitate the school readiness program in the pre-primary centers (table 3). The responses of both school leaders were displayed side by side.

Table 3: Supports being received by the school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Has your school been getting supports?</th>
<th>N=10</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5(100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1(20)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6(60%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the data in table three shows overall variation in the responses of both the schools under intervention and the non intervention once. All the schools under the school readiness intervention are reported to receive supports in terms of training, material, and counseling (100%) from the School Readiness Initiative. More specifically, the data from the qualitative responses indicated that intervention schools were getting training supports like: parental education, special needs education, child care and child psychology, skills in using the Kg Curriculum, and techniques of supervising pre-primary programs in the school readiness centers. Besides, the school leaders unanimously reported that considerable material supports were provided to their centers by the school readiness initiative NGO that included: Child toys, TVs, DVDs, Reference materials, musical instruments, teaching aids, white boards, water tankers, and may other materials that supported them in their work.

On the other hand, the majority of the principals in the non intervention centers indicated that they were neither getting adequate material nor training support from any (80%) entity except children’s books, tables and chairs provided by the government.
(20%). The principals’ perceptions were sought about to establish whether the resources in their centers were sufficient to facilitate the effective transition of children to primary schools. A t-test statistic was utilized to compare the perceptions of the principals of the intervention and the non intervention centers at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table 4: Principals’ perceptions of the sufficiency of learning resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t-tabulated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
<td>1.34164</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1.270</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4000</td>
<td>1.14018</td>
<td>7.797</td>
<td>-1.270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<0.05

The results indicate that (table 4), the t-calculated was less than the t-tabulated (1.96) implying that there was a significant difference between the principals perceptions regarding the sufficiency of learning resources in the pre-primary centers. It appears that the mean value is greater for the intervention schools than the non intervention once. Thus, resources are sufficiently available in the intervention schools than the non intervention schools. It would be easy to imagine how difficult it was for these non intervention ECCEs to provide quality preparatory programs in the absence of these supportive resources. In this context, children would be forced to experience poorer school outcomes and performance than children who have access to the resourceful ECCE centers in later learning.

The knowledge and skills of the teachers in the pre-primary centers are crucial ingredients to bring the required ready transition of children to the primary grades. In this regard, the need for continuous in-service training for teachers is underlined. With regards to this, teachers’ responses obtained from the questionnaires indicate that 80%
of the none intervention ECCE centers reported that capacity building for teachers did not exist while 20% have confirmed that it is limited. On the other hand, teachers from the experimental centers indicated that capacities building training programs like instructional planning (80%), the preparation and utilization of teaching aids (70%), continuous assessment (20%), child psychology (80%), special needs education (60%), parental education (20%), child play (20%), active learning (20%) and managing children have been organized to capacitate them. Teachers in the intervention schools further explained that the knowledge and skills acquired from these training sessions have capacitated them in the early identification of children’s needs and difficulties for immediate actions, monitoring children’s progress continuously, managing children’s behavior easily, adapting instruction in the ECCE centers to the needs of children and facilitate the readiness of children to the primary grades. Thus, teachers seemed to confirm that the training was useful for their work as indicated by their responses when that concern was put to them. However, teachers in the non intervention centers
appear to lack these opportunities to facilitate the ready child transition activities in their centers. It is easy to imagine that there were no arrangements made to support them, and this can pose a threat to the continuity and sustainability of school readiness programs in the capital that were accepted very positively by the communities in Addis Ababa in general.

Teachers perceptions of capacity building provisions were compared using the

Table 5: Teachers’ perceptions of capacity building provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>t tabulated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Pre-primaries</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.8000</td>
<td>1.60918</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None intervention pre-primaries</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.45883</td>
<td>22.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(p<0.05\)

independent samples t-test. The results (table 5) indicated that the value of the significance level was 0.039 which is less than 0.05 alpha levels showing the existence of evidence that indicate differences in the perceptions of teachers from the two categories of schools. The values of the mean for the intervention and non intervention ECCEs also vary and greater for the intervention ECCEs. Thus there is a significant difference between teachers’ perceptions regarding the provision of training workshop opportunities in the ECCEs, and intervention schools were by far better off to get capacity building programs as well.

Literature suggested that (SCALAR) a broad range of family support and parent education programs that teach parents how to promote learning and early literacy within the home, foster positive parent-child interactions, and encourages the use of effective parenting practices (2010). This reach of services could be achieved, in large part, through strong school-community collaborations involving parents. In this regard, principals and teachers were asked to reflect on the extent of the linkages with parents in children’s learning (table 6).
Table 6: Parent Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Center type</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10(100%)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20(100%)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses obtained from both teachers and principals in the intervention programs indicated that parent’s intervention in the school readiness programs were the highest (80% and 100% respectively). On the other end of the spectrum, 60% and 70% of the teachers and principals in the non intervention centers respectively reported that the involvement of parents in the ECCE centers were the lowest, except the very few principals and teachers who said that there were a modest involvement of parents (20% and 10% respectively).

The areas of parent’s involvement in the experimental groups, as explained by the teachers and the principals, included: Helping children to do their home works, Child care & health at home, playing with their children, material and labor support to the pre-primary centers, helping to clean classrooms, and participation in decision making as members of committees in the early child care education centers. However these areas of participation were reported missing in the non intervention centers. The school personnel (teachers and principals) reported that they used communication Medias such as: communication books, phone call for emergency cases, regular monthly meetings, physical communication by conducting home visits, formal letters and semester and annual parent’s conferences. The means of communication with parents are multifaceted and, thus, teachers and principals had a wide range of communication channels to create linkages with parents of children in the centers.
In connection with parent-school-child-readiness dimensions, parents were asked to reflect on the kind of support accrued to them from the school readiness centers. With regards to this, the data in table 7 reveals that a wide range of supports were provided to parents that included school meals (50%), stationary (10%), clothing for children (10%), medical treatment like deworming (20%), and counseling (10%). Some parents have also indicated that they get livelihood training and support to sustain themselves and their children. Nevertheless, the non intervention pre-primary centers receive a limited support in terms of school meal (20%), counseling (60%), and other supports for economic strengthening.

When asked if they had home support visits, 80% of the parents in the intervention groups confirmed being supported at home by the school personnel, particularly by teachers on how to handle children and follow-up their development, how to care for the health and wellness of their children, how to support the child develop literacy, numeracy and language skills. Parents from the non intervention ECCE centers reported that home support visits were very rare except when the child is sick and or injured. At the outset, the views of the parents regarding the supports provided to them complement the views suggested by the principals and the teachers.

Parental expectations and satisfaction on service delivery provided by the pre-primary centers are partly dependent on the extent to which these centers achieved their bridging role. Whether or not ECCE centers have achieved the mission of transiting the preschool child to the formal school system depends on the child’s mastery of basic skills to facilitate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>N=20</th>
<th>What supports do you get from the ECCEs centers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School meal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under intervention</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not under intervention</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2(20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7(70%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the upcoming task. In view of this, parents were asked to indicate their satisfaction with the services they enjoyed by enrolling their children in the ECCE centers.

Table 8: Parents expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECCEs</th>
<th>N=20</th>
<th>Were your expectations fulfilled by ECCEs?</th>
<th>N=20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not under intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses of parents in the intervention schools (table 8) were very positive to the satisfaction of them with 70% reporting that their expectations have been fulfilled. However there were some who seemed to be unsatisfied (30%). On the other hand, a total of 80% of the parents from the comparison group reported that their expectations from the ECCE centers were not fulfilled and this could be due to absence of supports/and or resources to facilitate the ready transition of children to primary grades. It is a common belief that Parents require Safe and hygienic environment and basic knowledge and skills for later learning and development for their children. If these are not met parents would be disappointed, and similar situations may prevail in the non intervention centers, a fact which calls for sustainable school readiness intervention in the government pre-primary centers in Addis Ababa.

4.3 Achievement Scores in grade one

There is a general consensus that literacy, numeracy, and language development during the early years in pre-primary grades are the foundations for success in primary grades. In particular, skills in reading, writing and arithmetic are the prerequisite knowledge to begin formal learning in grade one. In view of this, the 2007/2015 grade one scores of 210 students from the intervention and non intervention ECCE centers in the subjects Amharic,
English, Mathematics, and Environmental science were documented for comparison. With the use of the SPSS software, the mean, the standard deviation and similar parameters were calculated and presented as follows (table 9).

Table 9: 2007 Grade one Mean Score report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Amharic</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Environmental Sc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>83.8182</td>
<td>76.0818</td>
<td>78.5818</td>
<td>77.8727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>11.30331</td>
<td>12.51797</td>
<td>12.93766</td>
<td>12.94810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>85.5000</td>
<td>75.0000</td>
<td>80.0000</td>
<td>80.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      | Mean               | 67.2591 | 63.4273 | 66.3273     | 65.0364           |
|                      | Std. Deviation     | 23.24340| 21.22119| 20.01151    | 22.12306          |
|                      | Minimum            | 17.00   | 16.00   | 22.00       | 24.00             |
|                      | Maximum            | 100.00  | 99.00   | 98.00       | 100.00            |
|                      | Range              | 83.00   | 83.00   | 76.00       | 76.00             |
|                      | Median             | 69.5000 | 63.5000 | 70.0000     | 65.0000           |

When the student achievement scores of the academic year 2007/2015 are further compared, significant variations across all the subjects were observed between the two groups of ECCEs (Experimental & comparison). Considering the experimental group, the mean scores were above 75 across all the subjects with the maximum scores ranging from 100 to 99, which is the highest in all the cases. The minimum scores were, on the average, more than 40 which is by far greater than that of the comparison groups (15.54), showing the differences that exist between the two groups of school. When it comes to the comparison groups, the aggregate mean score was 65, which is by far less than the scores
of the experimental students. The minimum score was, on the aggregate, 15.54, showing the real gap in achievement between children from the intervention and the non intervention per-primaries. The standard deviations of the scores also vary between the two school types and the scores from the experimental group more cluster around the mean than the comparison groups. It is important to note that Children who passed through the school readiness initiative by far showed best achievements than the non intervention children in grade one. The differences in achievements can be more revealed by the proceeding chart.

Chart 2: Grade one achievement-mean scores/2007/2015

As shown in chart two, the mean Amharic scores for children who joined grade one from the intervention centers was 84 while that of those who were not from the intervention centers was 67. Similarly, the mean score for English was 76 for the experimental group but 61 for the comparison group. The mean scores for both types of schools followed similar patterns. It is important to note that the mean scores do not show a sharp difference between students but between school types.
An independent samples t-test was carried out to confirm the significance of the differences in achievement scores of students from the two groups (table 10).

Table 10: Tests of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholl type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sig (2 tailed)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amharic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimental</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>83.8182</td>
<td>11.30331</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>16.55909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>67.2591</td>
<td>23.24340</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.55909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimental</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>76.0818</td>
<td>12.51797</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>12.65455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>63.4273</td>
<td>21.22119</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.65455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimental</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>78.5818</td>
<td>12.93766</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>12.65455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>66.3273</td>
<td>20.01151</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.65455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalscince</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimental</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>77.8727</td>
<td>12.94810</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>12.65455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>65.0364</td>
<td>22.12306</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.65455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that the significance values were less than $\alpha = 0.05$ ($p=0.00$) this shows that there is a significant difference between the achievement scores of children from the experimental and comparison groups. As the mean scores were the highest for the experimental group, children who joined grade one from the SRI ECCEs became the highest achievers. This was found to be true for all the subjects considered for comparison. Thus, children from the intervention groups have registered higher incremental gains in achievement than the non-intervention groups of students.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Conclusion

The purpose of this impact assessment was to examine the impact of an evolving program that makes interventions in the pre-primary education provisions to facilitate the ready transition of children to primary grades and to strengthen the school readiness intervention across Addis Ababa and replicate the experience to the rest of the regions. At the time of the impact assessment, there were 52 intervention schools in Addis Ababa where all were widespread across the sub cities. The impact evaluation heavily relied on a survey that was completed by teachers, parents, and the school principals. Additionally, the children’s classroom achievement in grade one (2007/2015) supplemented the data collection.

Finally, the evaluation benefitted extensively from the review of program documentation records secured from the School Readiness Initiative NGO, and from both the intervention and non intervention schools. The conclusions made in this section were based on the basic questions stated in the introductory part of this impact evaluation in the proceeding section.

Basic question 1: What provisions have been made to the pre-primary centers?

Conclusion: The findings of this impact assessment established that a wide range of provisions have been made to intervention schools in the form of training for teachers and principals in the areas of: Kg Curriculum, special needs education, parental education, child care and child psychology, active learning, and techniques of supervising pre-primary programs. Further, material supports like Child toys, TVs, DVDs, Reference materials, musical instruments, teaching aids, white boards, and
water tankers were among the list. However, the findings established that no arrangements existed for the comparison groups.

Basic question 2: What was the extent of collaboration between the ECCE centers and stakes?

Conclusion: The study established that parent’s intervention in the school readiness programs were the highest (80%). Teachers, parents, the school leadership, school supervisors, and the Sub cities/Woredas and at the corporate level: the Education Bureau is knowledgeable about the school readiness initiative and work in collaboration with the school readiness Initiative.

Conclusion: The findings indicate that communication was significantly boosted by using communication books, phone call for emergency cases, regular monthly meetings, physical communication by conducting home visits, formal letters and semester and annual parents’ conferences to create linkages and collaboration among the stakeholders.

Basic question 3: What were the impacts of the school readiness intervention in the pre-primary schools?

Conclusion: Support mechanisms for the ECCE centers were in place all through the experimental groups. A wide variety of capacity enhancement programs made available and implemented for teachers, parents, and the school leadership (training, material support, counseling and mentoring support).

Conclusion: The school Readiness Intervention and the ready transition of children to primary grades have resulted in higher academic achievement of students. The 2007/2015 academic year final student’s row scores for the experimental group were the highest. The mean scores were greater than 75 in all the cases (table 10).
Basic question 4: What were the extents of satisfaction by the stakeholders in the services provided by the pre-primary schools?

Conclusion: Parents in the intervention schools were very positive to the school readiness program with 70% reporting that their expectations were fulfilled. This was so because, as explained by them, they got school readiness services freely in compensation for what they were unable to pay for the private ECCEs, they deserved Safe and hygienic environment and basic knowledge and skills for later learning and development of their children, and they secured training and material support, organized themselves in livelihood programs that involved them in productive activities to sustain themselves, which if otherwise could be a bottleneck to send their children to schools. The school community was satisfied because the school readiness program empowered them through training and material support.

Overall Conclusion

The School Readiness Initiative program has had both direct and indirect benefits to the individual children as well as to the parents and the community and the researcher strongly recommends the same be extended to other government pre-primaries and communities so that deprived pre-primary centers become engaged in the intervention program to benefit from the productive undertakings in the process of making the ready transition of children to primary grades possible.

5.2 Recommendations

1. Several studies have shown that early childhood education has significant impact on the academic performance of pupils. Besides, ECCE has been observed to impact and influence the pupils’ performance in spoken and written English, Mathematics, Integrated Science, & Social Studies (Barnard 2001; Miedel and Reynolds 1999). However, with the present state of economic strength in the City Government of Addis Ababa, it could be difficult to avail Early Childhood Care and education proper for all children in the city. Hence, as a pioneer in intervening in ECCE programs in the capital,
the School Readiness Initiative NGO should replicate its experiences by scaling up its services, step by step, to the rest of the pre-primary establishments in the City of Addis Ababa.

2. The City Government should encouraged early childhood education by providing pre-primary educational facilities and resources: classrooms, instructional materials, and equipments, need based training and capacity building programs for teachers and the school leadership and parents for the success of the program.

3. There should be proper enlightenment campaign on the importance of early childhood education and Parents should be encouraged to involve in their children’s early education experience by providing the necessary services and materials.

4. The City Government Education Bureau should open ECCE centers in those government primary schools that did not yet open pre-primary centers in attachment to their schools (they are 58 in number now) and provide adequate budget, programs, policies and curriculum for early childhood education in Addis Ababa.

5. Marginalized and poor parents of children in the ECCEs should be further organized in livelihood programs so that they can sustain themselves to support the early transition of children to primary grades.

6. Further research investigations should be carried out in order to clearly show the real impact of the school readiness programs (academic, individual, social) on the performance of children in primary grade.
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Appendix 1: Addis Ababa City Government Education Bureau
Structured Questionnaire for the School Leadership

Dear Data collector:

School Readiness has been a program launched in Addis Ababa since the last few years to ease the readiness and smooth transition of children to primary education. This structured Interview Questionnaire has been designed to collect information from the School leadership to assess the Impact of the program in Addis Ababa pre-primary schools. Therefore, you are requested to carefully listen to the respondents’ reactions and document the information. We request your honest response for the success of the assessment. We thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Instruction: Write down the information requested or put a tick mark (✓) on the space provided as required.

1. School leaders Profile:

1.1 Sub City----------------------, KG Name-------------------------------------

1.2 Sex:  
a. Male---------- b. Female------------------

1.3 Education level:  
a. Certificate----- b. Diploma------------------

 c. BA/BSc--------d. MA/MSc------------------

1.4 Year of Service  
a. < 5yrs----- b.5-10yrs------c.10-15yrs------

d) >15yrs-----------------------------------
2. School Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005 E.C</th>
<th>2006 E.C</th>
<th>2007 E.C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop outs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeaters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Has your school ever received support in terms of training, material or finance from any entity different from the government to aid the school readiness program?
   a) Yes ..............................................  b) No----------------------------------------

4. If your answer to question 3 is yes, list the type of supports received in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Training support</th>
<th>Material support</th>
<th>Financial support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Other types of support not included in the above list:

6. Indicate your agreement or disagreement regarding the role of the above support mechanisms in enhancing the ready children dimension (learning & development) in the transition to primary grades?
   a) Strongly agree------b) Agree------c) Undecided------d) Disagree------
   e) Strongly disagree

7. What is the extent of parental involvement in the activities of the ECCE center?
   a) Very high----b) High-----c) Undecided ------d) Low------Very low

8. In what areas do they participate?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

9. How sufficient are learning resources in the center?
   a) Very sufficient------ b) sufficient------c) undecided------d) Insufficient------
   e) Extremely insufficient

10. Any further information/comments you may provide:

We appreciate your cooperation
Appendix 2: Addis Ababa City government Education Bureau

Structured Questionnaire for Teachers

Dear Data collector:

School Readiness has been a program launched in Addis Ababa since the last few years to ease the readiness and smooth transition of children to primary education. This structured Interview Questionnaire has been designed to collect information from the teachers/care givers to assess the Impact of the program in Addis Ababa pre-primary schools. Therefore, you are requested to carefully listen to the respondents’ reactions and document the information. We request your honest cooperation to secure pertinent data.

Instruction: Write down the information requested or put a tick mark (✓) on the space provided as requested.

1. Teachers’ Profile:

1.1 Sub City---------------------------------------------------------------

1.2 KG Name---------------------------------------------------------------

1.3 Sex:    a. Male-------------------b. Female---------------------

                       c. BA/BSc---------------d. MA/MSc-------------

1.5 Year of Service    a. < 5yrs--------------b. 5-10yrs-------------
                       C.10-15yrs----------d. >15yrs--------------

2. How frequently did you involve in capacity building workshops?
   a) Very frequently--------b) frequently-----------------c) Undecided--------
d) limited-----------------e) Not at all----------------

3. List down the areas of training you attended & the benefits obtained;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Training Areas</th>
<th>In what ways has the training helped you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. List down the materials/guidelines you might have been provided to help you facilitate school readiness activities in the center?

4.1  ---------------------------------------------  4.3  ---------------------------------------------

4.2  ---------------------------------------------  4.4  ---------------------------------------------

5. Indicate your agreement or disagreement regarding the role of the above support materials in enhancing the ready children dimension (learning & development) in the transition to primary grades?

a. Strongly agree-------b) Agree------c) Undecided-------

d) Disagree------- e) Strongly disagree-----------------
5. What other special teaching skills have you received from the training workshops?

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

6. How do you communicate with parents?

6.1

6.2

6.3

6.4

7. What is the extent of your linkage with parents for the learning of children?

a) Very high------ b) High------c) Undecided------d) Low------

e) Very low------------------

8. In what instructional areas do parents assist you in the learning and development of their children?

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

9. Any information/comments you may provide

__________________________________________________________________
Dear Data collector:

School Readiness has been a program launched in Addis Ababa since the last few years to ease the readiness and smooth transition of children to primary education. This structured Interview Questionnaire has been designed to collect information from the Parents to assess the Impact of the program in Addis Ababa pre-primary schools. Therefore, you are requested to carefully listen to the respondents’ reactions and document the views. We request your honest cooperation for the success of the assessment. We thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Instruction: Write down the information requested or put a tick mark (✓) on the space provided as requested.

1. Respondents’ Profile:

1.1 Sub City---------------- KG Name-----------------------------

1.2 Sex: a. Male---------- b. Female-----------------------------

1.3 Education level: a. Certificate------ b. Diploma------------------
Degree--------d. Above degree-------- e. Not educated----------------

2. Number of parents (those unable to pay for private schools) benefitting from the school readiness program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005 E.C</th>
<th>2006 E.C</th>
<th>2007 E.C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. As a parent, what supports have you been getting from the school readiness centers? List them in the table that follows;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports</th>
<th>How the support did help you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Other than the instruction and care support, what other benefits does your child get from the school readiness program (more than one answer is possible)?

a. School meal-------

b. Stationary materials-------------------

c. Clothing-------------

d. Medical treatment---------------------

e. Counseling---------

f. Others if any
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

5. Have you ever received home support visits from the Kgs. or from other entities about the education and care of your child?

a) Yes----------------

b) No---------------------------------

6. Are you encouraged to involve in the learning and development of your child?

a. Yes__________________

b. No_______________________

7. Can you tell me how you are encouraged?
8. What did you expect from the school readiness centers?

________________________________________________________________________

9. Have school readiness centers been fulfilling your expectations?
   a. Yes_________________________ b. No ____________________________

10. As a parent; state your level of agreement to the Statement that: If school readiness program was not available, I couldn’t have been able to educate my child:
    a. Strongly agree -----b. Agree----c. Undecided----- d) disagr-----
    e. Strongly disagree -------------------------------------

11. Any Further comments that you may provide:

________________________________________________________________________

We appreciate your cooperation