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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine the current practices and identify challenges of implementation of instructional supervision in public secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. To achieve the purpose of the study a descriptive survey research method was employed. Relevant data were gathered by using primary and secondary sources. Consequently, 119 secondary school teachers, 22 secondary school principals and 6 woreda education office heads were selected as sample respondents using stratified sampling, availability sampling and purposive sampling techniques respectively. A questionnaire, interviews and document analysis were used to gather the necessary data. The questionnaire used as major instrument to collect data from teachers and principals. Mean, standard deviation, t-test and percentages were used to analyze questionnaire data. Moreover, the data collected through interview and the result of document analysis was analyzed qualitatively. The findings of the study indicated that, instructional supervision was perceived negatively; planning of instructional supervision in the study area was inadequate which was non-participatory, not properly scheduled and not timely. Implementation of instructional supervision was not in line with policy direction and failed to contribute for teachers professional growth as a result it lost acceptance from teachers. The instructional supervisory evaluation was judgmental, evaluative and focused on fault-finding rather than focusing on improvement of the teaching learning process. Additionally, absence of cluster centers and lack of continuous support from woreda education officials also characterized the supervision system in the study area. Based on the findings, some conclusions made; the wide spread negative perceptions are affecting the supervisory process, inadequately planned instructional supervision contributing little for teachers’ competence, problematic/ineffective implementation of instructional supervision lacked acceptance and recognition from teachers and contributing little for quality assurance and irrelevant evaluations of instructional supervision caused teachers to categorize it as judgmental, focused on fault-finding and evaluative rather than contributing for teachers’ professional development. Secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone didn’t overcome challenges of instructional supervision and thus the challenges are causing greater influence on quality of education. Tracing on the findings and conclusions, recommendations were made. Accordingly, wide spread mind set activities should be carried out to make teachers stimulate and need supervision service, Kembata Tembaro zone education department and other stakeholder must provide comprehensive training for woreda education officials and principals on cooperative planning of instructional supervision. Short-term capacity building trainings should be provided for supervisors to make them implement appropriate supervision that contribute for knowledge and professional development of teachers. Evaluation of instructional supervision should focus on teaching learning process rather than targeting judgments, reporting and fault findings. Finally, educational tours also should be arranged by school management to share best experiences from model schools regarding instructional supervision.
CHAPTER ONE

The Problem and Its Approach

This chapter begins with the introduction of general background of the study and followed discussion of the statement of the problem. Next, objectives of the study are stated; significance of the study explained; the scope of the study is declared and limitation of the study explained. Lastly, definition of terms and organization of the entire study presented.

1.1. Background of the problem

Instructional supervision is a type of school-based (in-school) supervision carried out by the school staff (principals, department heads, senior teachers, and assigned supervisors) aimed at providing guidance, support, and continuous assessment to teachers improvement in the teaching-learning process (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000; Tyagi, 2010). What is more, “Instructional supervision is a behavior system in school operation with distinct purpose, competences and activities which is employed to directly influence teaching behavior in such away as to facilitate student learning” (Lovell and Wiles, 1983). Supervision is a multifaceted process that focuses on instruction to provide teachers with information to improve their teaching performance (Everhart, 2004).

Numerous ongoing education reforms in many countries indicated the necessity of instructional supervision from the kinder-garden to vocational and higher education (Tony, Arong & Ogbadu, 2002). Hallinger, Wilcox & Gray (1990) state that teachers need the opportunity to explore and update skills in method, curriculum, class management, instruction and behavior. The main purpose of instructional supervision is to build the capacity of the teachers and to facilitate effective teaching learning process. This is due to the fact that it is only through this process that we can improve students result and behavior. If teachers properly supported, facilitated and motivated, they contribute a lot for student’s success. No one is fit/qualified by his/her own. Educational activities need frequent follow up and everybody’s restless effort in today’s world. Hanny (1987) perceives that "effective principals are expected to be effective instructional leaders . . . the principal must be knowledgeable about curriculum development, teacher and instructional effectiveness, clinical supervision, staff development and teacher evaluation." Instructional Supervision is one among the key factors that facilitate the effective running of the teaching learning activities. It also helps to make students learn better and equip teacher to deliver quality education for students. Instructional supervision play an
important role in promoting the learning and professional growth of teachers. Supervision is one of the functions of education that offers opportunities for schools to be effective and for increasing the professional development of teachers as a means of effectively managing the teaching-learning process (Kutsyuruba, 2003; Arong&Ogbadu, 2010). Supervision has existed in all countries for many decades and occupies a pivotal position in the management of education, which can be understood as an expert technical service most importantly concerned with scientific study and improvement of the conditions that surrounds learning and pupil growth (Elias, 2008). According to Elias (2008), supervision is leadership and development of leadership within groups, which cooperatively assess educational product in light of accepted educational objectives, studying the teaching-learning situation to determine the antecedents of satisfactory and unsatisfactory pupil growth and achievement, and improving the teaching learning process.

The concept of instructional supervision differs from school inspection in the sense that the former focuses on guidance, support, and continuous assessment provided to teachers for their professional development and improvement in the teaching-learning process, whereas the latter gives emphasis on controlling and evaluating the improvement of schools based on stated standards set by external agents outside the school system (Tyagi, Arong & Ogadugu 2010).

Instructional supervision is mainly concerned with improving schools by helping teachers to reflect their practices, to learn more about what they do and why, and to develop professionally (Sergiovanni&Starratt, 2007). Various authors stated that instructional supervision has clear connection with professional development (Sergiovanni&Starratt, 2007). Kutsyuruba (2003) defined professional development as follows: “A major component of ongoing teacher education concerned with improving teachers’ instructional methods, their ability to adapt instruction to meet students’ needs, and their classroom management skills; and with establishing a professional culture that relies on shared beliefs about the importance of teaching and learning and that emphasizes teacher collegiality.” The concepts of “supervision” and “inspection” have been changed frequently in Ethiopian education system and the reason was not clearly pedagogical (Haileselassie, 2001). During the Imperial regime (1941-1974) supervision was practiced, the Derg practiced inspection and for the fourth time it shifted to supervision in 1994. Haileselassie stated that “with the name changes made we do not notice any significant changes in either the content or purpose and functions.” From 1994 onwards, in order to effectively and efficiently achieve the intended objectives of educational supervision, in Ethiopia there are two
approaches of organization of supervision: the out-of school (external) supervision and school-based (in-school) supervision in which the former is carried out by external supervisors at federal, regional and lower levels, whereas the later is done by the school personnel (school principals, department heads and senior teachers and Currently, supervision is widely practiced in all schools at all levels (Haileselassie, 2001).

Teachers know how to deliver the content. They are rich in subject knowledge. This by itself is not enough. There are so many internal and external factors that hinder teachers’ effectiveness. As Elias (2008) stated among so many factors that necessitated instructional supervision; the most crucial are:

- the pre-service training by itself is not enough
- to match the complex practice with already set policy directives
- due to the need to update and upgrade the existing work force (teachers) competency to be compatible with dynamism of knowledge and technology
- The need to become successful rather than working for survival and to become proactive in a highly competitive knowledge-based global economic era.

The overall outcome rests on students’ result. This kind of problem should be solved timely since it affects the well being of the school and life of many students. Properly supervised teachers and principals correct their mistakes on time and always become up dated. If all stakeholders and school principals become ignorant of supervision issues, teachers also give less value for class room instruction. Proper build up is necessary and it should be on going not at the end. According to Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007), clinical supervision is helpful for teachers because it involves a face-to-face contract with teachers with the intent of improving instruction and increasing professional growth. It is a sequential, cyclic and systematic supervisory process which involves face-to-face interaction between teachers and supervisors designed to improve the teacher’s classroom instructions (Kutsyuruba, 2003). The purpose of clinical supervision according to Snow-Gerono (2008) is “to provide support to teachers (to assist) and gradually to increase teachers’ abilities to be self-supervising” (p. 1511).

Brookover and Lezotte’s (1982) in their study presents the role of the supervisor as instructional guider as the catalyst for school improvement. However, the knowledge and skills needed to be effective instructional leaders are not innate; they must be learned. Richardson (1989) state that
a systematically designed and implemented training program has a positive effect on practicing principals and the school community. Bamburg and Andrews' (1990) study indicated that school districts and professional associations must develop capacity building programs that will provide on-going training and support for teachers if one needs high achieving school.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Supervision believed to have its origin in the practice of industrial and business enterprises. Among the industrialized countries that started the activity was Britain in 17thC. This was during the period of industrial revolution in Europe. At this period, the need for supervision was crucial in order to control the industrial workers. Later on, the concept of supervision borrowed from the industries and enterprises to educational institution. The main purpose was to control the plant and pupils achievement (Dull 1981).

According to Eye and Netzer (1965) the evolution and development of supervision has gone through the following stages, the first is the period of administrative inspection (1642-1875), which emphasized on observation of the School’s physical plant and the control of the pupils and examination of financial and materials wealth and teaching by laypersons. The next period referred as, the period of efficiency orientation (1876-1936) known for its emphasis on pressurized influence on teaching procedures, by specialists who have efficiency oriented. Inspection during this period remained, generally, a function related to the instructional program of school (Eye and Netzer, 1965).

The third period of development known as cooperative group effort (1937-1959) where they capitalized the system of use of research methods with regard to studying problems related to educational administration. The other purpose of inspection at this time was to assist the school administration in coordinating activities and give advice on what to be done, i.e. to bring about cooperative and coordination in all phases of instruction (Eye and Netzer, 1965).

The last stage was the period of research orientation (1960 up to the present time). The emphasis of the period was the combination of theory and practice to vitalize in the improvement of the teaching learning process. Educational problems solved through study rather than by negotiation and persuasion (Eye and Netzer, 1965).

The national supervision strategy of the FDRE government is to facilitate and support school improvement by building the capacity of school leadership that could be able to implement the
vision and mission set at each level (MoE 2003) The motive behind practicing instructional supervision is to support the learning and growth of young people and adults guided by values such as equity, respect for humanity, diversity, ethical and democratic practices and lifelong learning (MOE 2013). The objective of practicing supervision as stated in MoE document, is to mediate, lead and serve the best interests of the community which resonate through the strategic vision, school culture, tradition and positive ethos.

In addition to the above listed planning, implementation, timing, collaboration and evaluation gaps, instructional supervision practiced in secondary schools of SNNPR as stated in 2005, 2006 and 2007 E.C annual performance evaluation meetings arranged by regional education bureau are exposed to multiple problems such as:

- Limitations in planning and timing of supervisory activities
- Gaps in delegating duties, granting appropriate levels of authority to carry out those duties, and create smooth communication to perform classroom supervision
- The supervisory activities from planning to evaluation phases are not in line with the acceptable supervisory approaches
- Widespread negative perception within teachers regarding the significance and objectives of instructional supervision
- Limited cooperation of the stakeholders in time of supervision
- Gaps in winning the commitment and devotion of teachers
- Limitations regarding the consistency of supervisory duties and following broadened gaps due to it
- Limitations in timing, aim and system of implementation of instructional supervision
- The supervisor’s lacked trust from the stakeholders
- There is factionalism, gaps in planning and job description
- Limitations in internalizing policy directions regarding supervision and adequacy of the practice are listed problems where the researcher personally attended the meetings.

Kembata Tembaro Zone as one of the constituency zone in SNNPR shares the lion share of limitations and weaknesses in the practices and outcomes of educational activity in general and instructional supervision in particular. For example in the year 2006 E.C Kembata Tembaro Zone was sixth in rank with result and educational achievements in the region. Instructional
supervision practices and its outcome in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone is often associated with Sevier challenges. It seem that little attention is given to the context, input, process and outcome that requires worth studying the practices of instructional supervision and identifying problems thereby suggest likely solutions to improve the effectiveness of instructional supervision.

Current trends appear to indicate that there is quality challenge still left unsolved not only in the form of deterioration of students’ achievement but also decline in the quality of teacher and school leader performance. Weakness in the later critical input (school leadership and management) usually manifested in poor supervision, leadership and management process in the school system which in turn will negatively affect the effectiveness of classroom delivery (MOE 20013)

The researcher worked for more than seven years in the area understudy. Within those years the researcher have observed that there was gaps in delegating duties, granting appropriate levels of authority to carry out those duties, and gaps in creating smooth communication to perform classroom supervision. Besides this, supervisory activities from planning to evaluation phases are not in line with the acceptable supervisory approaches and there was limitations regarding the consistency of supervisory duties and following broadened gaps due to timing, aim and system of implementation of instructional supervision. To fill this gap, therefore, the following basic research questions are forwarded.

1. To what extent instructional supervision is positively perceived in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone?
2. How is the adequacy of planning of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone?
3. How is the effectiveness of implementation of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone?
4. To what extent Evaluation of Instructional supervision practice contribute for the success of teaching learning process?
5. What are the major challenges of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone?

1.3. Objectives of the Study
1.3.1. The general objective

The general objective of this research was to:

- examine the practice and challenges of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

This research was aimed to:

- examine the perception of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone
- assess the adequacy of planning of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone
- assess the effectiveness of implementation of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone
- examine the degree of contribution of instructional supervisory evaluation for the success of teaching learning process
- identify the major challenges of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone

1.4. Significance of the Study

The due importance of this research is that it may be used as an input for other researchers, policy makers and concerned stakeholders who have the aim of working in related area. Anyone who wants to conduct educational or some other social research might trace on this study and develop it by improving some aspects of or by criticizing this study.

It shows directions for Federal and Regional Education Bureau experts on how to work for the professional development of teachers. Concerned education bureaus are eager enough to search research results of each region or specific district. This research motivates them to dig out additional problems in the specified area by conducting sophisticated and all-rounded research by using this study as an input.

It could be used as a guide for Kembata Tembaro Zone support workers how to supervise schools by pointing out key challenge areas. The Zonal education bureaus are eager enough to
become competent with other zones of the region. Their effort should not be hindered due to inefficient supervisory tasks of schools. From this research tries to point out real grass-root problems. From this they can take remedial actions by equipping concerned stakeholders by preparing frequent awareness creation programs, meetings, short-term trainings and seminars at the Zonal level.

This research may be used as a guiding document that helps to change attitude of teachers to work for the success of students and change their attitude towards instructional supervision. Finally, it can be used as an input for school principals in their way of supervising instruction. It helps for school principals to give due attention for classroom supervision using the findings of this research.

1.5. Delimitation of the study

The study is bound to include only government secondary schools in Kembata Tembaro Zone. There are eight woredas in the Zone. The researcher has selected only three woredas (Durame town, Kedida Gamela, and Damboya Woreda). The researcher conducted the study side by side with the regular task.

In Kembata Tembaro Zone there are 24 government secondary schools, it is difficult to attempt to study the practice and challenges of instructional supervision of all schools within a given time limit. There are nine secondary schools in three woredas. Particularly two schools are new and opened in the year 2014. These are Shashera secondary school and Hanja Laloamo secondary school in Kedida Gamela and Damboya woredas respectively. Therefore, the study is delimitated to 7 government secondary schools namely Durame secondary and preparatory, Hidase secondary, Hambo Secondary, Damboya Secondary and preparatory, Adilo preparatory and secondary, Roman Dega Kedida secondary, Zatoshodera secondary schools. The first three are in Durame town whereas the next four schools belong to Damboya and Kedida Gamela Woredas respectively two from each.

From the aspects of instructional supervision this study encompasses perception, planning, implementation and evaluation. Regarding the conceptual delimitation, the study has bound to the attitudinal and knowledge gap area in application of instructional supervision. These are skill of designing problem solving plan, skill of cooperation and forming amicable
relations and skill of sustaining supervisory tasks by winning acceptance of the school community.

1.6. Limitation of the Study

The student researcher’s efforts to undertake this study was constrained by different factors, which were beyond the researcher control. One of which was absence of cluster supervisors except Durame town. The researcher also could not get most documents in well organized way. He found in the form of fragmented pieces. He also solved the problem by collecting these pieces and organizing them in meaningful way.

In addition to these above mentioned, it could be said that time, financial constraints and lack of experience from the student researchers’ side played great role in limiting a scope and depth of this study. This gap was filled by the frequent advice and directions given by the dedicated advisor.

1.7. Operational Definition of Key Terms

**Instructional supervision**: follow up, support, building, help for progress of the teaching learning process

**Practice**: the actual application or use of instructional supervision

**Challenge**: unsafe condition that hinder implementation of instructional supervision

**Planning**: a detailed arrangement for the application of instructional supervision

**Implementation**: putting in to effect the planned instructional supervisory activities

**Perception**: refers to attitude towards instructional supervision

**Supervisors**: Principals, vice principals and department heads who are in charge of planning, controlling, supporting, and evaluating instructional supervisory activities in the school
1.8. **Organization of the Study**

This study comprises five chapters. The first chapter deals with the problem and the way it is approached. The second chapter reviews the current literature pertaining to the area of instructional supervision, different approaches to supervisory process, and their contribution for students result. The third chapter details the research methodology and design used. Analysis and interpretation of the research findings are presented in the fourth chapter. Lastly, a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations are presented in chapter five.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This part of the study treats analytical review of the contemporary theories regarding the practice and challenges of instructional supervision.

2.1 The Concept and Meaning of Supervision

The concept of educational supervision borrowed from business enterprises where it have evolved and used as controlling mechanism (Lucio and Mc Neil, 1979). Supervision is an expert technical service primarily concerned with studying and bettering the conditions that surround learning. Such service include, the work of both general and special supervisors who are primary engaged in studying the teaching-learning situation and in evaluating the methods and outcomes of supervision (Peckham and Dorthy, 1953).

Supervision is consists of all the activities loading to the improvement of instructional activities related to moral, improving human relations, in-service education and curriculum development (Wiles, 1967). The concept of supervision, therefore, considered as service to interpret to teachers and the public educational policies of the government (Mohanty, 1996). Many Writers have defined the term supervision in different ways. The definitions vary in both content and specificity.

Numerous other definitions of supervision have found in different literatures. Some of the more pertinent definitions include: ‘Co-ordination by someone taking responsibility for the work of others including planning, scheduling, allocating, instructing and monitoring actions’ (Mintzberg, 1979). ‘The supervisor…usually organizes or directs the work of others by giving direct instructions, although subordinate supervisors may be involved as an additional layer between supervisor and worker’ (Weston, Grimshaw & Norton, 1989).

In many developed countries, such as United Kingdom (UK) and United States, much more attention has been given to inspection than school supervision (Lee, Dig & Song, 2008). The Inspectorate of Education had originated from France under Napoleon’s Regime at the end of the 18th century, and other European counties followed the idea in the 19th century (Grauwe, 2007).
For example, in UK, the first two inspectors of schools were appointed in 1883 (Shaw, Newton, Aitkin & Darnell, 2003) and in the Netherlands it was started in 1801 (Dutch Education Inspectorate, 2008). The terms “inspector” and “inspection” are still being used in various developed and developing countries, including United Kingdom (UK), United States, European countries and some African countries such as Lesotho, Senegal, Tanzania and Nigeria (Grawue, 2007). Traditionally, inspection and supervision were used as important tools to ensure efficiency and accountability in the education system. Later adherents of the terminologies of inspection and supervision are used by different countries in different ways. As outlined by Tyagi (2010), inspection is a top-down approach focused on the assessment and evaluation of school improvement based on stated standards, where as supervision focus on providing guidance, support and continuous assessment to teachers for their professional development and improvement in their teaching-learning process. Nevertheless, since the demand of teachers for guidance and support rendered from supervisors has increased from time to time, some countries changed the terminology and preferring the term “supervisor” over that of “inspector”. According to Grawue (2007), some countries have recently developed more specific terminologies: Malawi, uses “education methods advisor”, and Uganda “teacher development advisor”.

The concepts of “supervision” and “inspection” have been changed frequently in Ethiopian education system and the reason was not clearly pedagogical Haileselassie, (2001). In 1942, educational inspection was practiced for the first time, then it was changed to supervision in the late 1960s, again to inspection in mid 1970s and for the fourth time it shifted to supervision in 1994 Haileselassie(2001). Haileselassie stated that the supervisor will supervise work in the workplace, inspect it and maintain discipline in order that the company objectives are being preserved, allocate tasks for his team and in turn be held accountable for work done. The supervisor is the shop-floor face of the organization, the filter or lens through which management messages and attitudes are transmitted to the workforce and views and feedback from the shop-floor passed back up to line management(Lardner & Miles, 1998).

Taken together, the definitions advocate that supervision involves; directing the work of others, allocating workload, planning and scheduling, instructing and monitoring actions, maintaining discipline, taking responsibility and ultimately being held accountable for the work done. The supervisor also generally ‘acts as the interface between management and the workforce’ (Anon, Offshore Research Focus, 1999). Throughout this literature review Supervision is the cycle of
activities between a supervisor and a teacher with the objective of improving classroom performance (Patrick & Dawson, 1985). Patrick and Dawson describe the classroom performance of a teacher as implementing curriculum, planning, classroom management, and instructional techniques. Sergiovanni & Starratt (1993) view supervision as a focus for improving teacher’s knowledge, skills, and abilities to make informal decisions and solve problems effectively. The intent of educational supervision is to assist teachers in improving instruction (Goldhammer et al. 1993; Hoy & Forsyth, 1986; Lovell, 1978). Individual goals of school districts may vary; however, improvement of teacher performance is a common goal of instructional supervisors (Glickman et al., 2001; Zepeda, 2003). Supervisors in educational organizations have individual goals for improvement and Lucio and McNeil (1962) and Sergiovanni and Starratt (1971) believe the purpose of instructional supervision is to achieve those specified goals. Supervision requires the leader to observe, assess, evaluate, and direct employees to ensure an organization is meeting its goals (Glickman, James R. Ogletree, 2001).

Successful supervision promotes a vision to implement change in organizations that facilitate improvement (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993; Collins, 2001). Educational reports from the U.S. government such as A Nation at Risk (1983) and No Child Left Behind (2001) legislation include specific standards for evaluating program effectiveness. This standard based approach structures teaching and learning based on school districts’ performance on high stakes testing and a variety of other administrative criteria.

Other criteria include attendance, teacher quality, technology, and Adequate Yearly Progress toward achievement percentages (US Department of Education, 2001). Public school accountability in the United States takes its form most strongly in the state-level accountability systems that are required by federal education legislation (Gunzenhauser & Hyde, 2007). Evaluation models, though not formative in nature, provide a component of supervision that can be valuable in assessing teacher effectiveness (Glickman, Brycle & Vandeventer 2001).

Bomel’s (2003) report observed that management and supervision were considered to be the most significant organizational factors affecting activities, largely as a result of heavy workloads rather than an overt neglect of responsibility. However, most organizations fail to fully understand the relationship between supervision and healthy working conditions.

Team structures have changed over recent years, largely because of ‘down-sizing’, ‘delayering’ and increased use of contractors (Bomels 2003). This has had a major effect on how supervision
is delivered, with Self Managed Teams, where teams do not have a supervisor, being one of the outcomes. In reality, few organizations have made such fundamental changes, with most teams falling somewhere between the traditional, hierarchical approach and the Self Managed Team approach (Hayde 2007).

The traditional, hierarchical approach to supervision tended to mean that roles were well defined, with clear lines of control and communication. However, the levels of employee involvement in work planning and management were generally very low, which could to have a negative impact on health and safety. Conversely, Self Managed Teams increase the levels of employee involvement, increasing job satisfaction and resulting in better communication, clearer decision making and a more committed workforce. However, the result can be a lack of leadership and poor communication external to the team.

Organizations have to understand how they deliver supervision and the inherent weaknesses of the chosen approach. Management then has to implement the appropriate counter-balances to ensure those weaknesses that do not introduce risk. Other factors, such as multi-skilling and use of contractors must also be considered, as they can also affect how supervision impacts on health and safety. Overall, whatever method schools use to deliver supervision, it is essential that it addresses the need to plan and allocate work, make decisions, monitor performance and compliance, provide leadership, facilitate communication and teamwork and ensure workforce

### 2.2. The purpose of Supervision

The function of supervision classified into three major parts; these are administrative function, educational function and supportive function (Smith, 1996).

#### 2.2.1. Administrative purpose

It is refers to the promotion and maintenance of good standard of work, coordination of practice with policies of administration, the assurance of an efficient and smooth running office. In administrative supervision, the primary problem is concerned with the correct, effective and appropriate implementation of agency policies and procedures. The primary goal is to ensure adherence to policy and procedures. The supervisors have been given authority by the agency to oversee the work of supervises. They carry the responsibility of both to ensure the agency policy that implemented and which implies a controlling function and a parallel responsibility to enable supervises to work to the best of their abilities (Smith, 1996).
2.2.2. Educational purpose

It concerned with the educational development of each individual worker in the staff, in a manner calculated to evoke here to realize the possibilities of usefulness of educational supervision. The primary problem is workers ignorance or ineptitude regarding the knowledge, attitude and skills required to do the job. The primary goal is to dispel ignorance and upgrade skill. Supervises may helped to: understand the client better, become more aware of their own reactions and responses to create understand the dynamics of how they and their client are interacting, look at how they intervened and the consequences of their interventions and explore other ways of working with this another similar client situations (Smith, 2005).

2.2.3. Supportive purpose

This refers to the maintenance of harmonious working relationship and the cultivation of sprite decors. Essentially managerial aspects of managers work is their responsibilities for monitoring and improving the work of other, if managers are not able to make their capacity to improve the work of others, if managers are not able to make this contribution, then what value are they adding? The ultimate justification of managers` existence is the improvement of the work of their subordinates. If managers fail in this way, they fail to be managers.

In their way, managers expected to develop relationships and environments that enable people to work together and respond to changes. Such joint performance, involves having common goals, common values, the right structure and continuing training and development (Ducker, 1988).

In supportive supervision, the primary problem is workers’ moral and job satisfaction. The primary goal is to improve moral and job satisfaction. According to Kadish, cited in smith (1996) workers are seen as facing a variety of job-related stresses that, unless they have to deal with them, could seriously affect their work and lead to provide less satisfactory service. For the worker, there is ultimately the problem of “burn out”. Kadish argues that the other two forms of supervision focus on instrumental needs, where as supportive supervision is concerned with expressive needs (Smith, 1996).

The supervisor seeks mechanism to prevent the development of potentially stressful situations that removes the work from stress, reduces stress on the worker and helps him adjust to stress. The supervisor should be available and approachable, communicates confidence in the worker, provides perspective, excuses failure when appropriate; sanctions and shares responsibility for
different decision, provides opportunities for independent function and for probable success in task achievement (Smith, 1996).

More specifically curriculum development has also become the major function of instructional supervision. According to Harris (1985:10) as cited in Chanyalew (2005) pertains to designing or redesigning what to be taught, by whom, when, where and in what pattern developing curriculum guides, establishing standards, planning instructional units and instituting new courses are examples of this task area. Spears (1995) also pointed out that, improving every phases of educational program like curriculum revision is the major function of supervisor

2.3. Supervision’s effect on the workforce

Supervision is thought to be important when building emotional resilience as, for example, caring for people in the last stages of their life can be stressful, as well as rewarding. In schools faced support workers from education sector and some other politicians spoke of being able to talk about challenging behaviour of their supervision session, and how this then affected their work. They said they felt listened to in supervision and this was important to them in carrying out their role.

The primary functions of supervision are: administrative case management; reflecting on and learning from practice; personal support; professional development; and mediation, in which the supervisor acts as a bridge between the individual staff member and the organisation they work for (Bomel’s 2003). Organisations are likely to succeed by having workers who are skilful, knowledgeable, clear about their roles, and who are assisted in their practice by sound advice and emotional support. This should come from a supervisor with whom they have a good professional relationship (Poole 1994).

Research into what happens within supervision suggests that effective supervision generates good outcomes for workers while experts suggests that “the consequences of absent, inadequate, or negative forms of supervision poses a threat to workforce stability, capacity, confidence, competence and morale” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). When supervising in the educational realm, supervisors seek to help those being supervised realize their possibilities and usefulness. The supervisor must watch the teacher’s work, ask the teacher questions about why the teacher used certain teaching methods and provide information on the best teaching practices, enabling educators to improve (Kutsyuruba, 2003).
Feedback is an important part of the education process (Brawdy & Byra, 1994; Clariana & Koul, 2006; Slavin, 2003). Teachers need to be given a chance to see their progress prior to assessment in order to better their achievement. Clariana and Koul (2006) stated that the use of a multiple feedback method was preferable to both a delayed feedback method as well as single-try knowledge of correct response. Kulik (1988)

Education and teaching are forced to deal with chaos. The initial, and all subsequent conditions are not known to an infinite degree of accuracy with any given student or class. Hence, chaos must ensue. This chaos can be seen in two ways. First, every class session is uncertain until it occurs. Despite the best developed lesson plans and class management techniques, the class will be subject to an infinite number of possible occurrences. Second, it is difficult to see the connection between teaching and learning (Burke & Fessler 1983). How can a teacher know what is taught is best for the student's learning in the short and long terms. Sometimes, good assumptions can be made by studying students. However, all students are subject to a variety of chaos in their lives at school and in the world. Which effect beyond teaching could have effected the result? Educators will always deal with uncertainty in both how and what they should teach. Lampert (1882)

Instructional supervision processes must meet the unique needs of all teachers being supervised. From the beginning teacher to the well experienced teacher, instructional supervision must provide a variety of opportunities for each teacher (Nolan & Hoover, 2005). However, the Standards and procedures expected of the first-year teachers is exactly the same as experienced teachers at the moment the new teachers enter their classroom (Danielson & McGeal, 2000). Nolan and Hoover (2005) identified seven essential effects of classroom-based supervision. These include:

1. Builds trust and positive communication
2. Uncovers espoused platforms and platforms in use
3. Encourage continuous reflection and inquiry into teaching
4. Helps to Collect systematic data
5. Helps to interpret and use the data
6. Facilitate Conference and consultation
7. Foster a school wide climate that values community collaboration and continuous growth.
2.4. Objectives and Principles of Supervision

The provision of efficient and effective instructional supervision requires attainable objective and principles that guide to achieve the intended goal.

2.4.1. Objectives of Supervision

Objectives are always necessary for guiding the formulation of the supervision and it is important for effective supervision. Different scholars regarding the objectives of supervision have put different views. According to (Mohanty, 1996) the main objective of supervision is to evaluate the school program, which the supervisors are expected to assess the growth of the child and the effectiveness of the learning-teaching process, to provide professional leadership to all educational workers under his jurisdiction is an improvement objective of the supervision. Such leadership is essential to improve the teachers’ competence and guide them in the right direction. Identifying the various factors responsible for promoting or hindering the teaching-learning process, takes necessary step to utilize or control these forces. It is a useful task to ascertain the strength and weaknesses of the schools and to set suitable goals or targets for progress of the educational institutions and sharing with public problems and getting support for their solution is an objective of supervision.

Evaluating teacher performance in terms of pupils growth and educational objectives and suggest ways and directions is an aim of supervision. Promoting professional growth of all teachers through provision of some in-service training, staff discussion, writing and reading some materials, undertaking actionresearch and ensuring the participation of other teachers is also component of supervision. This will give to teach good insight in to the different educational problem that helps him to solve those problems (Eye and Netzer, 1965).

Assisting and encouraging the teachers’ participation of instructional materials like hand books, guide books, scheme of lessons plans and like. In brief, supervision intended to improve the quality of instruction by promoting the professional growth of all teachers. Therefore, the main objectives of supervision is to improve instruction by assisting teachers on the basis of positive approach and promote understanding and cooperation between teachers and schools. (Eye and Netzer, 1965).
It is also, supervision intended to improve the quality of instruction by promoting professional
growth by all teachers. Therefore, the whole purpose of supervision is in the development of
better education for youth.

2.4.2. Principles of Supervision

In supervision, principles considered as guide to a supervisory activity. It guides the lives and
attitudes of people with different background, experiences and opinions. The success of
supervisory activities largely depends on the principles of supervision. These principles also
provide a sense of direction and serve a boundary that keep efforts and energies contributed to
relevant issues and activities. Therefore, supervision grounded in the following principles and
beliefs as Carl D. Gilikman stated in Haileslassie (2007) in the following ways.

The primary purpose of supervision is to provide a mechanism for teacher and school personnel
to bring good understanding of learning-teaching process through collaborative inquiry with
other professionals. Supervisors must see themselves not as critics as but they should themselves
as collaborators with teacher in attempting to understand the problem, issues and dilemmas that
are inherent in the process of learning and teaching. On the other hand, teachers should not
viewed as consumers of research but as a generator of knowledge about learning and teaching
and acquiring an understanding of the learning-teaching process that demands the collection of
many types of data, over extended period (Eye and Netzer, 1965).

The focus for supervision need to the extended to include content specific as well as general
issue and question, supervision should focus not only to individual teachers but also to groups of
teachers who are engaged in a going inquiry, concerning common problems issue and questions.

2.5. Steps or Process of Instructional Supervision

Scholars in the field have differences on the procedures of classroom instructional observation,
but all follow the same basic pattern except the differences in naming the process or steps.
Hopkins (1998) organized classroom observation in to planning conference, classroom
observation and feedback conference. On the other hand, UNESCO (2001) and Hailesellassie
(1995) as cited in (Atikilt, 2008), classified classroom observation into pre-classroom
observation conference, classroom observation and post classroom observation conference.
Therefore, instructional supervisors need to know the three phases or procedures of supervisory practice in carrying out classroom instructional observation.

2.5.1. Planning Instructional Supervision

This is the face-to-face talk between supervisor and teacher to discuss and settle about what to do prior to the supervisor’s visit while the teacher is teaching in the classroom (Harris, 1991). It is a very important stage; because it is at this stage that framework of supervisor’s observation is developed and agreement is reached about how to proceed thereafter. In clinical supervision, the visit is made on resettled time; and the observation is made by the supervisor to identify problems and render help as a trained, skilled colleague, supervisors have to facilitate, to collaborate, consult and help; they have to mentor and coach teachers in clinical supervision.

In line with this, Lucio and McNeil (1979:264) described the planning phase as it is the initial stage where the supervisor designs the instructional objectives and techniques of evaluation he or she intends to use in the lesson to observed. Most teachers and appraisers believed that the ideal supervisor is the one who has close contacts with teachers work; whom the teacher regard as creditable and experienced and who assumes management responsibility. Besides a research, evidence has shown that a supervisory process that involves more than one supervisor; that is the principals and delegates peers (West and Bollington, 1990).

To sum up, the main objective of planning phase should focus on devising mechanisms of establishing teachers’ acceptance and agreement. To this end, teachers together with their supervisors have much opportunity in discussing and deciding on the purpose, criteria, frequency, procedures, instruments and follow up activities prior to the actual classroom observation Lucio and McNeil (1979).

2.5.2. Implementation of Instructional Supervision

Classroom observation demands a high level of technical and analytical skills. The supervisors must have the skill of what to look for, how to note, analyze and interpret the data. It involves discovery, verification, explanation, interpretation and evaluation. Each classroom observation is a unique new situation; classroom interactions are never the same. Thus, the supervisors need to be alert to watch events as they are happening Pajak (1989).
In line with this, Pajak (1989) more briefly depicted that observation is the phase in which the supervisor records instances when the intended behaviors are seen to occur. In similar way, Harris (1991) as cited in Chanyalew (2005) noted that classroom observation is a technique to help teachers improve by indentifying specific needs to satisfy their personal and professional career.

In short, the most important aspects of school are the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom. Hence, supervisors should get prepare before classroom observation and list important elements during the classroom observation to improve the teacher proficiency.

### 2.5.3. Evaluation of Instructional Supervision

Post observation or the follow-up conference of the supervisor with teacher is the most difficult and the most important of the entire cycle. The major purpose of the post observation conference is to give feedback to the teacher about her or his performance. Follow up activity involves some kind of re-recording of data analysis, a plan for feedback other teacher and other appropriate activities growing out of observation (Harris, 1991 as cited in Chanyalew, 2005). Some instructional supervisors may hold post observation conference; but since they lack relevant training they do not analyze, synthesized and evaluate in advance the performance data they might have gathered, they simply focus too much on weakness and little on strength of teachers (Pajak, 1989). The most effective way of improving performance is to inform teachers of their strengths and weakness during post observation conference. In general, the post observation conference can see as a vital component of supervisory approach that contributes to the effectiveness and efficiency of the program or the system. Thus, supervisor and teacher can have an opportunity to examine observational data, evaluate findings and make plans for the future in an open supportive and rewarding climate.

There is a clear link among instructional supervision, professional development and teacher evaluation (Zepeda, 2007). Teacher evaluation involves two distinct components: formative evaluation and summative evaluation (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). The writers differentiated formative teacher evaluation as an approach intended to increase the effectiveness of ongoing educational programs and teachers’ professional growth, where as summative teacher evaluation is designed to judge and rate the quality of one’s own teaching and level of professional growth. In this regard, the purposes of instructional supervision are formative- focused on teachers’ ongoing professional development, and the intents of evaluation are summative- assessment of professional performance which leads to a final judgment (Zepeda, 2007). However,
Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) stated that both formative and summative teacher evaluations cannot be separated, for each contains aspects of the other. Summative evaluation, therefore, uses various techniques such as, administrative monitoring, report writing, checklists, and self-assessment tools (Kutsyuruba, 2003).

2.6. Approaches of Supervision

The various approaches of instructional supervision are briefly discussed under this sub-topic.

2.6.1. Clinical Supervision

According to Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007), clinical supervision is a “face-to-face contract with teachers with the intent of improving instruction and increasing professional growth” (p. 23). It is a sequential, cyclic and systematic supervisory process which involves face-to-face interaction between teachers and supervisors designed to improve the teacher’s classroom instructions (Kutsyuruba, 2003). The purpose of clinical supervision according to Snow-Gerono (2008) is “to provide support to teachers (to assist) and gradually to increase teachers’ abilities to be self-supervising.” Clinical supervision is a “specific cycle or pattern of working with teachers” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993,). It is a partnership in inquiry where by the person assuming the role of supervisor functions more as an individual with experience and insight than as an expert who determines what is right and wrong (Harris, 1985). Goldhammer et al, 1980) described the structure of clinical supervision that includes pre-observation conference, classroom observation, analysis and strategy, supervision conference, and post-conference analysis. Clinical supervision is officially applicable with: inexperienced beginning teachers, teachers experiencing difficulties, and experienced teachers who are in need of improving their instructional performance.

Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) stated that clinical supervision is typically formative than summative in its evaluative approach in order to enable beginning teachers “collaborate to research their practices and improve their teaching and learning.” As a result of this, the writers further described that the focus of clinical supervision is not on quality control, rather on the professional improvement of the teacher that guarantees quality of teaching and students’ performance (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007).
2.6.2. Collaborative Supervision

Collaboration and collegially are very important in today’s modern schools. According to Burke and Fessler (1983), teachers are the central focuses of collaborative approach to supervision. Collaborative approaches to supervision are mainly designed to help beginning teachers and those who are new to a school or teaching environment with the appropriate support from more experienced colleagues. Thus, these colleagues have an ethical and professional responsibility of providing the required type of support upon request (Kutsyuruba, 2003). In this regard, a teacher who needs collegial and collaborative support should realize that “needs do not exist for professional growth, that feedback from colleagues and other sources should be solicited in order to move toward improvement” (Burke & Fessler, 1983). The major components of collaborative approaches to supervision which are especially needed for beginner or novice teachers are: peer coaching, cognitive coaching and mentoring (Showers & Joyce, 1996; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007; Sullivan & Glanz, 2003; Kutsyuruba, 2003).

2.6.3. Peer coaching

Peer coaching, according to Sullivan and Glanz (2000), is defined as “teachers helping teachers reflect on and improve teaching practice and/or implement particular teaching skills needed to implement knowledge gained through faculty or curriculum development.” The term coaching is introduced to characterize practice and feedback following staff development sessions. According to Singhal (1996), supervision is more effective if the supervisor follows the team approach. This would mean that the supervisor should have a clear interaction with teachers and group of teachers, provide an open, but supportive atmosphere for efficient communication, and involve them in decision making. The goal of coaching as described by Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007), is to develop communities within which “teachers collaborate to honor a very simple value- when we learn together, we learn more, and when we learn more, we will more effectively serve our students” (p. 251). Thus, peer coaching provides possible opportunities to beginner teachers to refine teaching skills through collaborative relationships, participatory decision making, and immediate feedback (Bowman & McCormick, 2000; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). In this regard, research findings showed that beginning teachers rated experienced teachers who coached than as highly competent and the process itself as very necessary (Kutsyuruba, 2003).
2.6.4. Cognitive coaching

According to Costa and Garmston (1994), cognitive coaching refers to “a nonjudgmental process built around a planning conference, observation, and a reflecting conference” (p. 2). Cognitive coaching differs from peer coaching in that peer coaching focuses on innovations in curriculum and instructions, whereas cognitive coaching is aimed at improving existing practices (Showers & Joyce, 1996). As Beach and Reinhartz (2000) described, cognitive coaching pairs teacher with teacher, teacher with supervisor, or supervisor with supervisor, however, when two educators are in similar roles or positions, the process is referred as peer supervision. The writers further identified three components of cognitive coaching: planning, lesson observation, and reflection.

Costa and Garmston (1994) described three basic purposes of cognitive coaching, namely: (1) developing and maintaining trusting relationship; (2) fostering growth toward both autonomous and independent behavior; and (3) promoting learning. In a cognitive coaching process, teachers learn each other, built mutual trust, and encouraged to reach at a higher level of autonomy- the ability to self-monitor, self-evaluate, and self-analyze (Garmston, Linder & Whitaker, 1993).

2.6.5. Mentoring

Mentoring as defined by Sullivan and Glanz (2000) is “a process that facilitates instructional improvement wherein an experienced educator agrees to provide assistance, support, and recommendations to another staff member” (p. 213). Mentoring is a form of collaborative (peer) supervision focused on helping new teachers or beginning teachers successfully learn their roles, establish their self images as teachers figure out the school and its culture, and understand how teaching unfolds in real class rooms (Sergiovanni&Starratt, 2007).

The mentor can work with a novice or less experienced teacher collaboratively, nonjudgmentally studying and deliberating on ways instruction in the class room may be improved, or the mentor can share expertise in a specific area with other educatorsSullivan and Glanz (2000). Mentors are not judges or critics, but facilitators of instructional improvement. All interactions and recommendations between the mentor and staff members are confidential. (p. 213)

Research projects and publications revealed that mentoring has clear connections with supervision and professional development which serve to augment the succession planning and
professional development of teachers (Reiman & Thies-Sprinthall, 1998). In addition, Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) described that the emphasis of mentoring on helping new or beginner teachers is typically useful for mentors as well. By helping a colleague (beginner teacher), mentors able to see their problems more clearly and learn ways to overcome them. As a result, mentoring is the kind of relationship in which learning benefits everyone involved.

2.6.6. Self-Reflection

As the context of education is ever changing, teachers should have a professional and ethical responsibility to reflect on what is happening in response to changing circumstances. Thus, they can participate in collective reflection practices such as peer coaching, cognitive coaching, or mentoring, as well as self-assessment reflective practices (Kutsyuruba, 2003). According to Glatthorn (1990), self-directed development is a process by which a teacher systematically plans for his or her own professional growth in teaching. Glatthorn further described that self-directed approaches are mostly ideal for teachers who prefer to work alone or who, because of scheduling or other difficulties, are unable to work cooperatively with other teachers. Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) considered this option to be efficient in use of time, less costly, and less demanding in its reliance on others. Thus, the writers indicated that in self-directed supervision “teachers work alone by assuming responsibility for their own professional development” (p. 276).

Furthermore, Glutton (1990) suggested that self-development is “an option provided for teachers that enable them to set their own professional growth goals, find the resources needed to achieve those goals, and undertake the steps needed to accomplish those outcomes” (p. 200). In addition, this approach is particularly suited to competent and experienced teachers who are able to manage their time well (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007).

2.6.7. Portfolios

As teachers want to be actively participated in their own development and supervision, they need to take ownership of the evaluation process (Kutsyuruba, 2003). The best way for teachers to actively involve in such practices is the teaching portfolio (Painter, 2001). A teaching portfolio is defined as a process of supervision with teacher compiled collection of artifacts, reproductions, testimonials, and student work that represents the teachers’ professional growth and abilities (Riggs & Sandlin, 2000). A portfolio, according to Zepeda (2007), is “an individualized, ongoing
record of growth that provides the opportunity for teachers to collect artifacts over an extended period of time” (p. 85). Similarly, Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) stated that the intent of portfolio development is to establish a file or collection of artifacts, records, photo essays, cassettes, and other materials designed to represent some aspect of the classroom program and teaching activities. As Sullivan and Glanz (2000) stated portfolio documents not only innovative and effective practices of teachers, but also it is a central road for teachers professional growth “through self-reflection, analysis, and sharing with colleagues through discussion and writing” (p. 215). The writers further described that portfolio can be used to support and enrich mentoring and coaching relationships.

2.6.8. Professional Growth Plans

Professional growth plans are defined as “individual goal-setting activities, long term projects teachers develop and carry out relating to the teaching” (Brandt, 1996, p. 31). This means that teachers reflect on their instructional and professional goals by setting intended outcomes and plans for achieving these goals. In professional growth plans as part of instructional supervisory approach, teachers select the skills they wish to improve, place their plan in writing including the source of knowledge, the type of workshop to be attended, the books and articles to read, and practice activities to be set. In this regard, Fenwick (2001) stated that professional growth plans “could produce transformative effects in teaching practice, greater staff collaboration, decreased teacher anxiety, and increased focus and commitment to learning” (p. 422).

2.7. Roles and Responsibilities of supervisors at Different Level

The models of supervision demand that every supervisor plays a multi-fold role. Supervisors can no longer remain outsiders to the school or to the community, visiting the school only occasionally and advising or discipline the teachers. They are fully responsible for the quality of functioning of the school. Wiles (1967) indicate that school-based supervision is not limited to any one person or to individual who carry the title supervisor. In fact, supervisory activities require the involvement of all of professional school staff that has different roles in the educational system. There are two supervisory accomplishments in education. They are external and internal supervision.
2.7.1. External Supervision

Include supervision at Federal, Regional, Zonal and Woreda levels. According to Haileselassie (2007) the function of out of school supervision should expected to focus on maintaining the quality and standard of education in the respective level of the educational structure, secondly, it should be to render the necessary professional and technical support to maintain quality and standard. The major supervisory functions expected to undertaken at the various level excluding the school listed as follows.

The Federal Ministry of Education mainly engaged in ensuring the proper implementation Education, Training Policy, and Strategy. It also develop a national master plan curriculum which defines the standard for the whole educational system, causing the preparation of examinations administered at national level, ensuring the quality and standard of educational materials and text books and also ensuring the availability of these materials. Providing professional and technical assistance to promote teaching and learning and determining training levels and qualifications required at the various level of educational structure.

Regional or zonal Level with the exception of the last point listed under the Ministry of Education level, the function of supervision at Regional and Zonal levels similar to those listed at the Federal Ministry of Education level, however, to specify as applicable to the specific and concrete condition of the pertinent levels.

Although the concern of the central, regional and Zonal level supervision is also concern of woreda level supervision, the woreda level supervision expected to perform specific supervisory works because it has a direct contact with schools. Among the tasks, the major ones are to check, follow up, monitor and evaluate schools. This is to maintain quality and standards of teaching learning. This intern ensures educational programs in schools are susceptible to local conditions and community needs, organize and demonstrate appropriate teaching methods and models to senior teachers, organize in renewal and professional development programs. Moreover, woreda education office conduct periodic and planned visits to schools to render support at spot and prepare reports on issues and problems which are beyond the competence of schools.
2.7.2. Internal Supervision

All stakeholder and the investment decision-making bodies on education send children to school to teach to acquire knowledge relevant enough for such children to become useful and active participants in the society. Consequently, there is no much demand on the school administrator to live up to expectations by ensuring an effective educational system that meets these expectations. Here lies the critical role of supervision (Degmawi, 2010). One major tool for improving school effectiveness and educational outcomes is school-based supervision (Adam, 2003).

Proper and regular supervision has the potential to promote school effectiveness leading to the improvement of the quality of education given to the citizens and the proper oriented strategies for improving school supervision to achieve the desired results of promoting quality education (Aghanta, 2006). OECs (2000) supervisory leaders are personnel who perform supervisory tasks. They include supervisors, principals and department heads. Similarly, Thornton (2000) indicated that the complexity of the educational operation combines the crucial importance of supervision necessitate the involvement of nearly all professional school personnel.

Modern educational organizations that hope to maintain their effectiveness as institutions of learning must involve supervisors, principals, teachers and special service personnel in the activities of instructional leadership (Hailesilassie and Girmaw, 2008). According to DeGrauwe (2004), a principal is one of the official leaders at the local school level who is primarily concerned with the overall goals of the school. He or she is a leader of the supervisory team at the local school level.

In Ethiopia, principals, vice principals, department heads and senior teachers are expected to play major roles in supervision at the school level (Degmawi, 2010). Hence, the contribution of each responsible personnel of the school can make the educational endeavor worthwhile and productive for the successful achievement of educational objectives (MOE, 2007).

As teaching-learning activity is day-to-day and continuous process, the function of supervision at the school level should also be a continuous responsibility. In this respect, school must provide its own supervisors from within the school (Reta, 2008). Within each school system, supervisors are principals, vice-principals, department heads and the senior teachers with relevant training in supervision, will undoubtedly have the competence, to supervise the educational activities of their colleague teachers (MOE, 1995).
2.7.3. The Role of Supervisors In Instructional Supervision

The service oriented supervisors expected to play the role of coordination, a consultant, a group leaders and an evaluator (Haileselassie, 2007).

Coordination: The supervisors serve as coordinator of programs, groups, materials and reports. As coordinator: The supervisor should plan with teachers’ service programs for teachers in order to promote staff development. Consultant: In this case, supervisor serves as specialist in curriculum development, instructional methodology and special help to teacher. Group leader: The supervisor help and assist not only individual but in most case he helps, guides and assists group for foster group work research and to improve their performance in a dynamic way. Evaluator: Supervisor as evaluator assists teacher in evaluating instruction and curriculum. This means the supervisor help teachers find answer to curriculum and instructional problems and conduct action research.

Hughes also (1971) remarked that the role of the supervisor of instruction is very demanding. The implementers if educational changes are classroom teachers; the facilitator of the change is supervisor of the instruction. He acts as a coordinator, curriculum director, and instructional leader, helping teachers, an agent for a better teaching; he supposed to create conducive climate for the teaching process. Supervisors have always expected to encourage improved instruction through new and well-refined methodology and techniques. As Cawelt has suggested it, (1980) there are four major instructional improvement processes employed by supervisors to provide instructional supervisory services to teachers as follows: Curriculum development: Assessing needs setting, goals and objective, selecting and organization contents and learning activities and evaluating curriculum.

Clinical supervision: Hold sessions for planning with teachers before classroom visits. Staff development: providing in-service education based on teachers and learners needs and on knowledge of how adults learn. Teacher evaluation: Process of determining the professional adequacy of individual teacher.

He further stated that teachers tend to teach what they are; the way they perceive themselves to be interacting with the reality. Therefore, helping teachers improve professionally is tantamount to advance school instruction that in turn results in teachers’ job satisfaction. In another instance, Bradfield (1964) closely observed with an all-out effort to have a clear view that instructional
leadership role of supervisor would give teachers a sense of freedom to plan their work, the educational program and the opportunities to participate in curriculum construction helps teachers to promote their satisfaction with supervision.

Supervision is instructional leadership that relates perspectives to behavior, clarifies purposes, and supports organizational actions, coordinates interactions provide for maintenance and improvement of the instructional programs and assesses goal achievement (Robert and Peter, 1989). Harris enumerated ten tasks of school based supervision, that is developing curriculum, organizing instruction, providing staff development, providing facilities, providing materials, arranging for in-service education, orienting staff members, relating special pupil services, developing public relation and evaluating instruction (Ben, 1985).

2.7.4. The Role of principals in Instructional Supervision

Van Deventer and Kruger (2003) stated that the five basic elements of instructional supervisory roles of principals are: defining the school mission, managing the curriculum and instruction, supervising teaching, monitoring learner progress and promoting instructional climate. Budhal (2000), Van Deventer and Kruger (2003) definitions of instructional supervision imply that the Principal provides direction, resources and support the teachers as an instructional leader. The Principal has a direct and determining effect on teacher attitudes towards teaching and on his/her instruction. The Principal supervises the heads of departments by checking their scheme of work and lesson notes, making sure they go to classes regularly, checking absenteeism, rewarding hardworking teachers, and punishing the indolent ones, assigning administrative duties to them and encouraging them to do the right things at the right time. He provides the materials for effective discharge of assigned duties and he encourages experimentation. All these are also inputs into the standard of education. Quinn (2002) points out that Principals are responsible for informing teachers about new educational strategies, technologies and tools that apply to effective instruction. Therefore, it is evident that pre-eminent in the Principal’s role as an instructional supervisor is his/her ability to motivate and inspire teachers with the end goal of exerting a positive influence on instructional practice and ultimately learners’ achievement.

MohdKassimJaafar (1998) explained that teaching supervision has been an important aspect in school management and administration. Its purpose is to improve teaching and
learning quality among teachers and thus improving the overall quality of teaching in schools. Nevertheless, the principals faced some hindrances. These problems stemmed up not only from the teachers side but also from the principals themselves. Some of the principals were reluctant to observe on the pretext that they did not receive any instruction from the Regional Education Bureau or Ministry of Education. The MoE’s opinions that principals are professionals, therefore they have the ability to carried out their duty and are not supposed to be observed and guided all the time.

Mohd Salleh Lebar (2000), stated that normally principals are very busy due to tight schedule for attending meeting and briefing at department, district and national levels. Some principals delegated the supervision responsibility to senior assistants. Hence, many problems crops up and much of the problems surrounding the area of study are still unexplained.

As a supervisor, the principal is directly involved in matter related to learning and teaching processes in the school (Dull, 1981). According to Sweeney (1982), there are six characteristics that a principal should have related to leadership in the school, namely stressing on the students academic achievement, developing teaching strategies, maintaining conducive atmosphere in the school, evaluating the students achievement regularly, coordinating teaching programs and helping to boost teachers moral on the job.

Mohd Salleh Lebar (2002) stated that to be a successful teacher, a principal should have the credibility and authority in making decision even though he is practicing democracy. Teachers’ supervision covers all kinds of activities delegated to the principal with the aim of helping and improving the quality of their teaching (Dull, 1981).

Studies conducted by (Dull, 1981) involving 279 teachers found that the supervision carried out by the principal was not only might achieve the school goal but might also give an impact to everyone in the organization. That shows teachers satisfaction is high towards certain leadership function but low on other things. This discussion of the literature now turns to view the principal's position today in this continuum of role change and includes the perceived directions that this role will take in tomorrow's schools.

In today's world, Hanny (1987) perceives that "effective principals are expected to be effective instructional leaders . . . the principal must be knowledgeable about curriculum development, teacher and instructional effectiveness, clinical supervision, staff development and teacher evaluation" (p. 209). Bryce (1983) and Fullan (1991) agree with this holistic view of the
principal's role. However, Fullan expands this holistic definition of leadership and management to be: an active, collaborative form of leadership where the principal works "with teachers to shape the school as a workplace in relation to shared goals, teachers collaboration, teacher learning opportunities, teacher certainty, teacher commitment, and student learning" (p. 161).

This collaborative nature of leadership is often stressed in the literature. Bernd (1992) states that "increased teacher involvement in school decisions are (sic) effective tools for focusing the staff on students outcomes" (p. 68). Hallinger (1989) speaks of leadership teams at the secondary level to help carry out the critical functions of curriculum and instructional coordination and supervision. Cooper (1989) states that schools need to create models of shared leadership which incorporate the talents and energy of principals, teachers, students, and parents.

This mode of instructional leadership provides for learning and working with others - teachers, students and parents - to improve instructional quality. . . . It is their responsibility to create a strong school culture, enabling teachers to collaborate with them in redesigning the instructional program so that all students can learn. (p. 16)

Fullan (1991) perceives the role of the principal, in models of the future, will be to encourage collaborative groupings of teachers to play a more central role in the instructional leadership of the school. This, however, will require active participation of the principal to facilitate change by motivating the staff and students, by reaching out to the community, and by continually improving the school. The assumption inherent, here, is that effective leaders manage and lead (Fullan, 1991; Moorthy, 1992). (Dull, (1981) appear to disagree with the above statements by stating that "school management and instructional leadership are two separate tasks that cannot be performed by a single individual." But they strongly agree with the idea of teacher empowerment where teachers have significant input into decisions concerning instruction, arguing that well managed schools "enable real instructional leaders to empower teachers who can create the effective schools reformers are seeking" (p. 304).

Of interest, the role of women as instructional leaders is highlighted in the research of Hughes, M. (1991) who found that, "as a group, women are more likely to evidence behavior associated with effective leadership." The results of their study showed that women spend more time on educational program improvement activities than do males. They are more attuned to curriculum issues, instructional leadership, teachers concerns, parent involvement, staff development,
collaborative planning strategies, and community building. Hughes, M. (1991) concurs with their findings: "women are more likely to possess characteristics associated with effective leadership and effective schooling" (cited in Fullan, 1991, p. 163). Ironically, the research of Smith (1991) reveals that "although about 60% of Canadian teachers are women . . . about 16% of school principals are women" (p. 198). It is apparent that further changes need to be made by both men and women.

2.8. General Perceptions towards Instructional supervision

According to Blasé and Blasé (1998), although many supervisory approaches are collaborative in nature, for long time, supervision of instruction has been viewed exclusively as an inspection issue. Sergiovanni (1992) described supervision as a “ritual they (supervisors and teachers) participate according to well established scripts without much consequence” (p. 203). This author continued that “today, supervision as inspection can be regarded as an artifact of the past, a function that is no longer tenable or prevalent in contemporary education” (p. 204). He explained that though functioned for a considerable span of time, this type of supervision caused negative stereotypes among teachers, where they viewed as subordinates whose professional performance was controlled. Supporting this idea, Anderson and Snyder (1993) stated, “because of this, teachers are unaccustomed to the sort of mutual dialogue for which terms like mentoring, peer coaching collegial assistance are coming in to use” (p.1).

It should be clear, however, that traditional supervisory approaches should not be removed completely because supervisory authority and control are essential for professional development. (Mitchell and Sackney ,2000) explained this as “much of past practice is educationally sound and should not be discarded” (p. 37). Having said this, it is important to differentiate instructional supervision from evaluation. Authors described the former as a formative approach and the later as a summative approach (Poole, 1994; Zepeda, 2007). Poole (1994) stated that “instructional supervision is a formative process that emphasizes collegial examination of teaching and learning” (p. 305). In this regard, participants in the supervision process plan and implement a range of professional growth opportunities designed to meet teacher’s professional growth and educational goals and objectives at different levels. Teacher evaluation, on the other hand, is “a summative process that focus on assessing the competence of teachers, which involves a formal, written appraisal or judgment of an individual’s professional competence at specific time” (Poole, 1994, p. 305). The supervisory (formative) and evaluative (summative) processes should
go hand in hand (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). While supervision is essential for teachers’ professional growth, evaluation is essential to determine this growth and teacher effectiveness (Kutsyuruba, 2003; Wareing, 1990).

2.8.1. Teachers’ Perception of Supervisory Processes

Teacher perceptions of clinical or traditional methods of supervision have been one of resentfulness and caution (Gullatt, & Ballard, 1998; Townsend, 1987). When there is a perceived discrepancy between the stated purposes and emerging practices, teachers are less inclined to make a full commitment to the process (Townsend, 1987). In fact, teachers tend to believe that a traditional supervisor in their classroom indicates they are being evaluated, rather than being offered support (Roberts & Pruitt, 2003). Supervision has often been a one-size-fits-all approach. Diaz-Maggioli (2004) insisted that most supervisory practices include evaluation, whether implicitly or explicitly. From laypersons conducting school inspection in the 18th century, up to the practice of neo-scientific management, instructional supervision in most schools of the world has focused on inspection and control of teachers (Alemayehu, 2008). According to Sullivan and Glanz (2000) “Historically the evaluation function of supervision was rooted in bureaucratic inspectional type supervision” (p. 22). The writers further described that teachers view supervision for the sake of evaluation as often being anything other than uplifting.

In a study of supervision and teacher satisfaction, Fraser (1980) stated that “the improvement of the teaching learning process was dependent upon teacher attitudes toward supervision” (p. 224). The writer noted that unless teachers perceive supervision as a process of promoting professional growth and student learning, the supervisory practice will not bring the desired effect.

Kapfunde (1990) stated that teachers usually associate instructional supervision with appraisal, rating, and controlling them. In Ethiopia, many teachers resent or even fear being supervised because of the history of supervision, which has always been biased towards evaluation or inspection (Haileselassie, 1997). Regarding the challenges of teachers, it is stated in various literatures that beginning teachers face more challenges than more experienced teachers. “Teaching has been a career in which the greatest challenge and most difficult responsibilities are faced by those with the least experience” (Glickman, 1998). At least 30 percent of beginning teachers leave the profession during the first two years (Casey & Mitchell, 1996).
For many less experienced teachers, supervision is viewed as a meaningless exercise that has little value than completion of the required evaluation form (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). The writers further described that “no matter how capable are designated supervisors, as long as supervision is viewed as doing something to teachers and for teachers, its potential to improve schools will not be fully realized” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007, p. 5).

2.9. Factors Affecting Effective Instructional Supervision Practice

Several potential difficulties impede the effectiveness of instructional supervision. These include various skills (conceptual, technical and humanistic), obstacles related staff moral, staff turnover and staff diversity (Caruso and Faweet, 1986). Staff moral refers to the moral supervisor towards the job: when the moral of the supervisor is high, they are motivated to excitedly in an innovation and growth oriented work. Conversely, when the morale is low, they do their work in a hopeless and routine fashion. Staff turnover may lead to lack of continuity in different supervisory program that in turn exposes supervisor to the task of continually orienting and training new personnel. More the staff diversified in age, culture and language the more challenging will be the process of supervisory communications. In line with this court line, contend that, “no supervisor can succeed in the improvement of instruction where the teaching staff is in different, where there are antagonisms to supervision” (Fekadu, 1992).

Goals of education can only achieved with a well-organized school system that would ensure that all aspects of school life are well articulated and effectively coordinated. There is need for check and balance by regular and effective supervision or inspection (Ochuba, 2008). Researchers like Amberber (1975) and Fekadu (1992) pinpoint that Ethiopian supervisory practices face many constraints. Some of these are, teachers have negative attitudes towards the supervisory program, supervisors do not apply the principles and techniques they taught, supervisors lack skills in human relation while working with teachers and lack of the necessary facilities for supervisors. These are contributory factors for the existing problems of instructional supervision.

In supporting this idea, the manual of Inspection Department of the Ministry of Education (1984 E.C.) explains that problems of supervision in relation to our context: the shortage of time, ineffective transport system, insufficient fund and lack of supervisory personnel or shortage of qualified human power who are eligible in facilitating the teaching-learning process are considered as the major factors.
CHAPTER THREE

Research Methodology

This chapter deals with the research design, data source, and sample and sampling techniques, data collection instruments, data collection procedures and tools of data analysis.

3.1. Research method

Descriptive survey research method was employed in this study because it is the appropriate method to examine the current practice of implementation of instructional supervision and identify those challenges in public secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. This approach is employed because it is helpful to collect relevant data from different groups. It also helps to collect data from large number of respondents within short period of time that enable to come up with generalizations of a phenomenon.

3.2. Description of the Study Area

The study was conducted in selected government secondary schools in Kembata Tembaro Zone particularly in Durame town, Damboya Woreda and Kedida Gamela. Durame Town is the Zonal town of Kembata Tembaro Zone that is found in southern nations nationalities and peoples Region (SSNPR) with a total population of 35417 out of which the male population is about 15934 and the female population holds 19383. Durame town is located 119 km from Hawassa the regional capital and 340 km away from Addis Ababa in between Hadiya and Wolayita Zones and 12km from Asphalt road that connects Shashemene and Wolayita Sodo. Its Astronomical location is 7.170° 7.44’N and 37.840° 38.07’E.

Kedida Gamella Woreda is one among the woredas of Kembata Tembaro Zone which encircled the durame town. It is bordered by Kachabira and Damboya woredas in the west and in north respectively. In the east and in the south it is bordered by Badewacho woreda.

The Damboya Woreda is located in Kembata Tembaro zone, SNNPR having a total area of about 17,754.3 hectares and inhabited by 126,678people. It is bordered by Alaba Special woreda to the East by Angacha woreda to the West, by Kedida Gamela Woreda to the South and to the
North by Bonosha woreda of Hadiya zone. Astronomical location of the woreda is between 07°07' N-7°59'N latitude and E 37°29'-38°13'E longitude.

It is found at 382 Km away from Addis Ababa and 165km from Hawassa the center SNNPR (Elias, 2008). The altitudes of the study area range from 900m – 3028m above sea level. Topographically the study area is characterized by mostly mountainous in the north and at the center and low land in southern parts. Its areas is usually divided in to 25% Dega, 32% Woyena Dega and 43% Kola (Elias 2008).

3.3. Sources of Data

This study used two main sources of data. These are primary and secondary sources of data.

**Primary source of data:** The primary sources of data were secondary school teachers, secondary school principals, vice principals, Woreda Education Office Heads and woreda education quality assurance core process. From these individuals the student researcher got reliable data for his findings. These individuals have provided first hand information of eyewitness on the problem under study because they are currently working at directly related positions to the topic under investigation.

**Secondary source of data:** secondary sources of data for this study were the data collected through document analysis from school annual plan, school minute, students result in EGSLE, school reports and supervision documents as well as written supervisory feed backs in order to check frequent application of instructional supervision

3.4. Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques

Outcome of the study is generalizable to secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. There are eight woredas(Durame town, KedidaGamela and Damboya, Kachabira, Hadero Tunto, Tembaro, Angacha & Doyogena) Out of this, three woredas selected as a sample. These are Durame Town, KedidaGamela and Damboyaworedas.

There are nine secondary schools in three woredas. Particularly two schools are new and opened in the year 2014. These are Shashera secondary school and Hanja Laloamo secondary school in KedidaGamela and Damboyaworedas respectively. Therefore, the study is delimited to 7 government secondary schools namely Durame secondary and preparatory, Hidase secondary, Hambo Secondary, Adilosecondary and preparatory, RomanDegaKedida secondary school,
Zatoshodera secondary school and Damboya Secondary and preparatory schools. The first three are in Durame town where as the next three schools belongs to KedidaGamela Woreda and the last school belongs to Damboya woreda. There are 54 Education sector officials, 22 principals and 281 teachers in the sample woredas. Durametown consists of 141 teachers, Damboya 71 teachers and KedidaGamela there are 69 teachers. Total of 281 teaches (216 male and 65 female), 6 woreda education sector officials were selected as a sample using purposive sampling technique. These are the three woredas’ the sector coordinators and education quality assurance core process which are selected purposely. These people have direct contact with supervisory tasks. 22 principals were selected using availability sampling technique.

Based on precision rate and confidence level, the researcher used formula employed by Kothari,(1985) in order to determine sample size of teacher respondents which is used to get sample size of finite data: 
\[ n_i = n(N_i/N) \] or \[ n_i = nP_i \] in which, \( P_i \) represents the proportion of population included in stratum \( i \), and \( n \) represents the total sample size, the number of elements selected from stratum \( i \) is \( nP_i \). \( N_1 = 141 \), \( N_2 = 71 \) and \( N_3 = 69 \). The confidence level 95% and error 0.5%. Accordingly the sample size of teacher respondents was determined that Durame town \( n_1 = 60 \), KedidaGamela woreda \( n_2 = 30 \) and Damboya Woreda \( n_3 = 29 \) with total sample of 119 teachers. The target population, sample size, percentages and sampling techniques employed are presented in summarized form in the following table.

**Table 1: Population, sample and sampling techniques**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Woreda</th>
<th>Woreda Education Officers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>S.Tech</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Durame Town</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Damboya</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KedidaGamela</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5. Instruments of Data Collection

To gather the relevant data, questionnaires, interview and document analysis used.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

For this study, questionnaire was used as an instrument to collect relevant and adequate information. A total of 30 items were used to seek the current practice and challenge of instructional supervision, which focused on perceptions, planning, implementation, evaluation and current challenges of implementation of instructional supervision. Close-ended questions were prepared because qualitative data was collected from interview and document analysis. All the questions were prepared in English language. This is due to the fact that all the respondents are educated and have the ability to read and write English. Besides this, the similar questionnaire were distributed for all categories of the respondents as all of them are in the same line of position that related to the study it was believed that it was possible and having similar objective.

The questionnaire was organized in to five sections. In each section, respondents were asked to rate their level of argument on the items. Section one focused on the perception towards the supervisory process and consisted of 6 questions. The second section sought data on effectiveness of planning of instructional supervision. 5 items are forwarded under this category.

Section three, which consisted of 7 items, focused on data related to effectiveness of implementation of instructional supervision which consists of 7 items, and section four sought data on the effectiveness of evaluation of the supervisory process. This section contained 6 items. The fifth section focused on challenges of the supervisory process and consists of 5 items.

3.5.2. Interview

A semi-structured interview was employed in this study. In qualitative study, interview can be one of the major tools used for data collection because it permits to collect greater depth of response, which is not possible through any other means. Woreda education officers, principals and teachers were interviewed. In this study interview was under taken in the form of person-to-person to encounter respondents to address matters in their own terms and words. Therefore, in this study, in order to get view and opinion about practice and challenges of instructional supervision, interview was prepared and distributed for three Education Office.
Heads, *three* woreda education quality assurance core process officers, *three* principals and *six* teachers who are selected from each Woreda and each sample school. They were selected for interview due to their manageable size purposely by the researcher. Semi-structured interview items were prepared for the purpose of cross checking and to substantiate the result of the questionnaire and document analysis.

**3.5.3. Document Analysis**

In order to find out the facts in the study area the researcher has also analyzed documents related to the topic under investigation. In this study, supervision checklists, result of students in EGSEC, annual plans, school minutes, school reports and other related documents were analyzed.

**3.6. Procedure of Data Collection**

The researcher developed instruments depending on the review of related literature first; in the next step in order to check validity and reliability, pilot testing was conducted at shishicho secondary and preparatory school by using Cronback Alpha and the result of items under perception; the lowest value was 0.67 and the highest was 0.85. Regarding the values of items under planning the lowest value was 0.70 and the highest was 0.86. For items under implementation the lowest value was 0.77 and the highest value it is 0.87. The values of items under evaluation ranges from 0.68 to 0.84 and the values of items under challenges of instructional supervision ranges from 0.79 to 0.87 which is reliable.

To ensure validity of the study, the results from the sample must be generalized to the accessible population from which the sample is selected. Then the accessible population must be generalized to the sample population. To achieve content validity, the specific phenomenon being studied must be related to the original purpose of the study (Yin, 2003). Yin indicated that survey research relies on statistical generalization. The inferential leap from the sample to the accessible population can be achieved if a stratified sample of the accessible population is obtained (Gall, 2003).

All the teachers and in-school administrators within the selected school division used in this study had an equal opportunity to participate in the study. The inferential leap from the accessible population to the sample population is made by gathering the data collected to determine the degree of similarity between the populations.
While considering the validity of the survey used in the study three areas will be considered, face validity, content validity, and construct validity. Face validity according to (Gall, 2003) it is “the extent to which a casual, subjective inspection of a test’s items indicates that they cover the content that the test is claimed to measure.” In this particular study, the survey instrument in discussion time was piloted to a group of individuals that had experience with instructional supervision and regular practices in schools were not connected to the school division that was selected for the study. Content validity in the study was addressed by selecting the qualities used in the survey from the literature that was reviewed. Finally, in addressing construct validity, the survey was used by the instruments (questionnaire & interview guide) developed for such kind of studies using the literature reviewed. The actual use of the survey in the study was to taste the assumption that the survey accurately reflecting the construct that the survey was measuring.

Instrument revision or adjustment was also carried out in which grammatical and sentence coherences problems are edited and corrected. All the items critically commented and examined by the researcher’s advisor throughout all the process.

As a pre-requisite in order to make the data collection process more effective and to have maximum rate of return, firstly, the research advisor contacted the researcher in order to give general orientation regarding the research process.

Respondents were asked to respond to questions on a five point Likert scale to indicate their level of agreement on each item. The opportunity for oral responses was provided in the interview part in which suggestions were recorded and used to enhance the presentation of data and to complement the discussion of the findings.

Then the questionnaire was distributed to 119 teachers and 22 principals in order to collect the required research data. It was dully filled and completed. The items filled out on face-to-face base that is in the presence of student researcher on the site. All 119 teachers filled and returned the items which is (100%) and 22 principals filled in the questionnaire and returned them.
3.7. Tools of Data Analysis

In analyzing the data, both qualitative and quantitative methods employed. As it is common, data analysis in qualitative studies involves word argumentations than numerical explanations. Qualitative data particularly interview and document analysis was analyzed by using narrative summarized statements of the subject of the study.

In order to attain research objectives quantitative data (collected through questionnaire from teachers and principals) was analyzed by using frequency, percentages, mean standard deviation and t-test and p-value. The purpose while using t-test was to compare the significance level of the two variables. The \textit{p-value} was used to know the likelihood or probability that the randomness in the sampling would lead to difference in sample means as large as observed meaning it measures how much evidence we have against the null hypothesis. The significance threshold of p-value was set at 0.05. Respondents characteristics was analyzed by using tabulated and percentage form.
CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter deals with analysis and interpretation of data gathered from principals, teachers and woreda education officials.

The analysis of responses is presented in five sections in relation to basic questions. The first section deals with the analysis of perceptions of respondents towards instructional supervision. The second section deals with adequacy of planning of instructional supervision. The third section deals with effectiveness of implementation of instructional supervision. The fourth section focuses on evaluation of instructional supervision and the last section focused on major challenges of instructional supervision.

4.1. Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 2: Characteristics of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Characteristic Category</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Above 46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Academic qualification</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA/MSC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work experience on current position</td>
<td>1-5 year</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding the sex ratio, 77.4% of teachers are male and 22.6% of them are female. This is indicating that the teaching force is dominated by the male population. In order to encourage female students to the teaching position and to balance the sex ratio, encouraging the female teachers is necessary.

Almost more than 90% of the principals are male. Female principals constitute only nine percent. This shows that still females are playing scant role in school leadership. There is gap in equipping female leaders. Affirmative action should be put in practice. Woreda education offices are also dominated by male leaders (5 male ad one female).

This shows that still it needs effort to equip, support and encourage females to the leadership position. Due attention has not given for females to bring them to the required level of authority.

Regarding the age category, 70.5% of teachers fall under the age range of 26-30 years. This shows that the greater majority of the teachers are inexperienced, lack maturity and with limited emotional ability. Particularly teachers within this age are exposed to multiple difficulties. They need frequent support and tight mentoring. Experienced mentors are necessary for them but the problem is that the principals themselves need mentoring according to age, experience an academic qualification statistics. So that, proper instructional supervision is necessary.

Out of 22 principals 10(45.4%) are within the age range of 26-30 years. The rest 12(54.5%) are also in the age range of 31-40 years. Although it is productive age range, almost half of the principals lacked sufficient experience.

The Woreda education office is led by inexperienced officials. 4(66.6%) are within the age range of 26-30 and 2(33.3%) are within the age range of 31-35). The woreda education offices are led by inexperienced leaders.

This shows that there no large gap with respect to agelevel between of teachers, principals and WEO. Thus, one can conclude that the age level of the respondents is not satisfactory for the position. This implies that unless properly supervised and properly supported, their age appears likely affects them in carrying out their professional tasks effectively and efficiently.
Regarding the academic qualification 114(95.7%) of the teachers are degree holders and only 5(4.2%) are MA/MSC holders. According to MOE standard, secondary school teachers should possess MA/MSC/PGDT. Majority of secondary school teachers in Kembata Tembaro Zone are below expected quality standard again with low teaching experience. In order to maintain quality of education not only instructional supervision should be effectively conducted but also in-service training to update and upgrade teachers qualification should be given due emphasis.

Out of the 22 principals 19(83.3%) are degree holders and only 3(13.6%) are MA/MSC holders. This shows that majority of them found to be below qualification set and having less experience in their principal position. This condition seriously damages quality of instructional leadership and supervision. This implies that the concerned bodies should devise an alternative strategies to augment fill gap through on-job and in-service training programs.

All the WEO have first degree. This shows that less experienced WEO, principals and in experienced teachers are working in Kembata Tembaro Zone secondary schools. This implies that it is below the already set standard and its effect on quality of education is serious. It is better to qualify the teachers, principals and Woreda officials. All, teachers, principals and WEO are at the same level of qualification. According to MOE standard, secondary school teachers should be MA/MSC holders. Additionally, secondary school principals should be MA/MSC and should take PGDSL training. The WEO leading MA/MSC holder principal and teachers should be above the rank/qualification of the work force under their rule.

So, there is huge gap with respect to educational qualification between teachers, principals and WEOs. Thus, one can conclude that the educational qualification of the respondents is not satisfactory and still it needs improvements. It is difficult to believe that the woreda education office with insufficient qualification support and supervise principals properly. Similarly challenging for the principals to lead and supervise teachers with the same level of academic qualification. The respect, reasoning, convincing and capacity building becomes challenging issue for the leaders. Equipping the man power by giving education opportunity is desirable.

Concerning the work experience of the respondents, the majority 85(71.4%) of teachers have worked less than or equal to 5 years on their current working position. 20(16.8%) of them worked 6-10 years and less than 10% worked more than 10 years in the teaching profession. This indicates that their less experience has adverse effect on the quality of education and students result. Instructional supervision is necessary for such king of working force. They need support
in handling students, continuous assessment strategies, different in-school study organizations and the like.

Similarly, majority 17(77.2%) of principals worked less than 5 years in the current position and 5(22.7%) of them worked 6-15 years. Most of them are still with limited experience. In order to improve students result and behavior among other things, work experience and academic qualification of principals has its own effect.

It is possible to conclude that their lack of experience affect their efforts as instructional leaders in supporting teachers. MoE set standard for secondary schools that in order to become school principal, one should work more than five years in teaching position and work as vice principal, department head and leader of different co-curricular activities. But due attention has not given for this criteria in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Secondary schools.

4.2. Analysis of Perceptions towards Instructional Supervision Process

The objective of this part is to examine the perception of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. In this part teachers and principals responses are reflected.

Table 3: Respondents’ responses on Perceptions towards Instructional Supervision Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St Deviation</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teachers perceive being offered support rather than being inspected</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instructional supervision improves students results at a greater rate</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instructional supervision increases teachers’ competence</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supervision is carried out in the school to improve instruction</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instructional supervision motivates teachers to do more</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Providing supervision continuously benefits teachers at a greater rate</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregate mean</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1-1.49=SD 1.5-2.49=D 2.5-3.49=U 3.5-4.45=A 4.5-5.00=SA

In table 3, the responses of the three groups of respondents on their perception towards instructional supervisory practices comparatively seen.
The first item of table 3 focuses on the perception of teachers and principals on the statement teachers perceive being offered support rather than being inspected. Accordingly, the mean value of teachers is 2.2 (disagree). In contrary, the mean value of principals is 3.2 which is under the range of undecided on this statement and t-value of both groups is 0.94 and p-value is 0.043. This indicates that the statistical data is significant and tell that there is substantial evidence to say teachers do not constructively view instructional supervision because they responded undecided on the given item because p-value is less than 0.05 which is already set significance threshold for the study. If properly benefited, no doubt they respond positively. Besides this, principals are also in a confused state and do not have a firm stand. This implies that there is huge gap in understanding the role of instructional supervision and attitudinal change is not widely made in the secondary schools of specified zone.

Attitude plays a great role in achievement of any goal. People in the schools have no positive attitude. When there is a perceived discrepancy between the stated purposes and emerging practices, teachers are less inclined to make a full commitment to the process (Townsend, 1987). Concerned people (principals and WEO) are not properly discharging their responsibility of shaping wrong attitudes.

In item 2 of table 3 respondents asked to express their feelings regarding the role of instructional supervision in improving students’ results. Regarding this item the mean value of teachers (1.84) disagrees, principals (3.55) agree. The two categories responded differently as well as the t-value is 0.38 and p-value 0.048 which was statistically significant since it is within the set threshold. This indicates that there is no common understanding and agreed goal. The administrative body is not in a position to win the commitment and devotion of the employees (teachers). The overall indication is that principals, who are in the forefront of students’ result and behavior and the first responsible organ, are not internalizing the problem rather indicating it to the higher hierarchies. The service oriented supervisors expected to play the role of coordination, a consultant, a group leaders and an evaluator (Haileselassie, 2007). If they rate on disagree, one can blame them. So, their response is to escape from this blame. The policy direction, general truth and believable facts are not well communicated within the key stakeholders. Attitudinal gaps are widely reflected. Additionally, document analysis of ESCLCE result indicated the deterioration of students’ result. This is additional manifestation of existence of huge gaps in attitudinal change. Principals and WEOs has to do more to change attitude of teachers.
In the third item of table 3, the target groups were asked to rate their level of agreement to the notion that supervision process increases teachers’ competence. Accordingly, the mean value of teachers 2.02 (disagree) and principals 3.57 (agree). An indication principal’s agreed, teachers disagreed manifested that teachers have not benefited from the service of supervision. The comparative t-value is 0.48 and p-value 0.045. This shows that it is statistically significant because p-value is less than 0.05. Supervises may help to understand the client better, become more aware of their own reactions and responses to create understand the dynamics of how they and their client are interacting, look at how they intervened and the consequences of their interventions and explore other ways of working with this another similar client situations (Smith, 2005).

Anyone who benefited from certain crevice cannot respond negatively. The school principals have been using instructional supervision simply for administrative purpose than for professional development of teachess and improving of students results. They believe that supervision process undertaken in the study area is more of problematic lacking due contribution for teachers competence. The mismatch of both groups of respondents is an indication of this.

In table 3 item 4, teachers mean value 1.94, principals with the mean value 4.70 for the item stating that supervision is carried out in the school to improve instruction. Principals strongly agreed and teachers disagreed and with t-value 0.81. According to Harris (1985:10) as cited in Chanyalew (2005) pertains to designing or redesigning what to be taught, by whom, when, where and in what pattern developing curriculum guides, establishing standards, planning instructional units and instituting new courses are examples of this task area. Spears (1995) also pointed out that, improving every phases of educational program like curriculum revision, scaling up teachers effectiveness and culming the climate is the major function of supervisor.

This shows that teachers are not confident enough and ignorant of the importance of supervision. According to their view supervision is not significant due to the improper usage of it. Implementation problem has reflected. Principals should be honest, logical and should make data-based decision. Its indication is that they are not conducting action research on school problems. If they do that they find out the problem and try to shape those wrong attitudes. The overall implication is instructional supervision conducted in the schools lacked its core objective but simply to fulfill the minimum requirements.
In the fifth item of table 3, the target groups asked to rate, their perception to the notion instructional supervision motivates teachers to do more. Accordingly the mean value of principals 3.85 (agree) and teachers mean 2.16 (disagree). The t-value is 0.79 and p-value is 0.038. More importantly supervisory process should provide teachers with constructive feedback leading to increase teacher motivation (Komosski, 1997)

This means principals are saying that it motivates teachers whereas teachers are saying that it is not motivating them. Fraser (1980) stated that “the improvement of the teaching learning process was dependent upon teacher attitu des toward supervision.” The writer noted that unless teachers perceive supervision as a process of promoting professional growth and student learning, the supervisory practice will not bring the desired effect. This has an indication of two dimensions: the first is that widespread attitudinal changes are not made in the schools. The second is that principals are not properly implementing instructional supervision and as a result they are attempting to hide it by compiling false report. Document analysis also assured that instructional supervision has conducted twice a year. This is a time in which teachers’ performance appraisal (efficiency) is to be conducted. Hence, it concluded that supervision done in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone is mainly for the purpose of performance appraisal. Here it is clear that clinical supervision is neglected. Holland (2002) highlight that the right supervision supports teaching and professional development ensures “personal and collaborative enquiry promotes critique and contributes to evolving pedagogy.

Item 6 of table 3 mainly focused on understanding the perception of teachers about the statement that says providing supervision continuously benefits teachers at a greater rate. Accordingly, mean value of principals 3.85 (agreed on the statement). The mean value of teachers is 2.16 (disagreed on the statement). Principals have positive perception regarding the statement and teachers have negative perception. The t-value is 0.76 and p-value 0.013. Chanyalew (2005) stated that instructional supervisors are important in promoting teachers’ professional development as they frequently assigned to identify and exemplify various effective classroom instructional techniques and teacher skill to promote better teaching and learning. The negative perception is due to the problem of shaping the attitude of teachers and lack of awareness creation programs on the significance of instructional supervision as well as its improper implementation. In most cases, teachers view instructional supervision as part of inspection and examining them. Principals are aware of its significance but they haven’t transferred this awareness to the large mass of the teaching force. As a result teachers feel that the supervision
process is more of evaluative rather than beneficial. If teaches gained sound benefit from instructional supervision, they cannot disagree on it.

Finally, the aggregate mean of table 3 indicated that principals agreed (mean 3.78), teachers disagreed (mean 2.05). This indicates that according to principals’ view instructional supervision in the school has positively perceived. On the other hand teachers’ perception is completely negative and categorized that the instructional supervision process of the study area is more of judgmental. MOE (1995) mentioned that supervisions’ major focus should become providing support for teachers and enhances their role as key professional decision makers in practice of teaching. It believed that the improvement of schools would not accomplish without improving teachers’ education. This analysis clearly indicated that the responses of both group of respondents contradict each other. It is possible to conclude that it still needs effort and time to change attitude of teachers capacitating principals.

Feedback from interview and document analysis sessions also corroborated findings from the study. The interview session with teachers, principals and woreda Education Office Heads revealed that the whole supervision process was rather conventional in schools. Among six Education Office Heads interviewed, five of them pointed out that teachers have negative attitude towards their supervisors. They also consider them as faultfinders rather than of being supportive. They also emphasized that the whole process of supervision is evaluative rather than supportive. This shows that there is attitudinal gap within teachers towards supervision and supervisor.

Interviewed teachers responded that traditional methods of supervision have been in practice which has nothing of value for them. They do not know their strong and weak sides from the supervision. When there is a perceived discrepancy between the stated purposes and emerging practices, teachers are less inclined to make a full commitment to the process (Townsend, 1987). According to the interview result, teachers believe that they are being evaluated, rather than being offered support. Supervision has often been conducted in top-to-bottom approach which failed to consult and deal with them on the process and objectives. Diaz-Maggioli (2004) insisted that most supervisory practices include evaluation, whether implicitly or explicitly. In order to minimize such negative perceptions, respective woreda education officials and school principals should change the methods of instructional supervision and take time to change attitude of teachers by arranging attitude change meetings.
4.3. **Analysis of Adequacy of planning of instructional supervision**

The objective of this part is to assess the adequacy of planning of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. In this part teachers and principals responses are reflected. Its scope is limited to the areas like participatory planning, timing, cooperation, properly scheduled and cooperation of key potential stakeholders.

Table 4: Respondents’ responses on adequacy of Planning of instructional supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>St.dev</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning of instructional supervision in the school is participatory</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td><strong>0.028</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Planning of instructional supervision in the school is timely</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td><strong>0.021</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The supervisory plan is properly scheduled</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td><strong>0.042</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Before planning supervisors consult the potential stakeholders to get valuable information about teaching learning</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td><strong>0.036</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supervisors are designing a problem-solving Plan</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td><strong>0.023</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aggregate mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>St.dev</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td><strong>0.023</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1-1.49=SD 1.5-2.49=D 2.5-3.49=U 3.5-4.45=A 4.5-5.00=SA

As indicated in table 4, item 1, respondents are asked whether or not planning of instructional supervision in the school is participatory. In this respect all principals and teachers were asked to rate the frequency with which they apply the stated supervisory roles. Haileselassie (1995:28-31) stated that the pre-classroom observation conference, classroom observation and post classroom observation conference should be properly planned by making key stakeholders involved. Therefore, instructional supervisors need to know the three phases or procedures of supervisory practice in planning classroom instructional observation and make key stakeholders to have their say in the planning phase.
Accordingly, teachers with the mean value 2.49 responded disagree, principals with the mean value of 3.00, responded undecided. This shows that cooperative planning process in the study area was rarely practiced. The t-value is 0.94 and p-value is 0.028. This shows that it is against the null hypothesis and statistically significant because p is less than 0.05. This shows that the likelihood of existence of error is less than 5%. There is a positive relationship between what the principals responded and what the teachers witness about the cooperative planning process in the schools. Such relation was created because the principals might have become silent/not comfortable on their duty. Thus, what the teachers said appears sounding. This shows that stakeholders have no balanced sound/say in the planning process. The resulting failure in the implementation phase is due to failure of cooperation in the planning phase. Thus, it argued that the participative planning process plays key role in helping the implementation. But in this regard the analysis revealed that in Kembata Tembaro Zone secondary schools cooperative planning process was poorly practiced.

In table 4 item 2, teachers and principals are asked to rate whether planning of instructional supervision in the school is timely or not. To this end, with the mean value 2.57 principals rated undecided and with the mean value 2.41 teachers disagree and the t-value is 0.92 and p-value is 0.021. This implies that the planning process of instructional supervision is not conducted timely in Kembata Tembaro Zone secondary schools because the p-value is showing that the data is significant as well as the mean value indicated that principals undecided and teachers disagreed on the statement planning of instructional supervision in the school is timely. Quinn (2002) points out that Principals are responsible for timely organizing planned supervisory activities by giving emphasis on new educational strategies, technologies and tools that apply to effective instruction. Therefore, it is evident that pre-eminent in the Principal’s role as an instructional supervisor is his/her ability to prepare timely plan and inspire teachers with the end goal of exerting a positive influence on instructional practice and ultimately learners’ achievement. As revealed from the respondents, such kind of organized timely planning activities are poor in Kembata Tembaro Zone secondary schools. So, it needs tight support and capacity building trainings for principals and woreda education officials.

In table 4, the third item deals about identifying whether the supervisory plan is properly scheduled or not. Accordingly, principals with the mean value 3.14 undecided on the issue. Teachers with the mean value 2.21 disagreed on it. The t-value is 0.97 and p-value is 0.042. The implication of this statistical data is that instructional supervision was rarely scheduled. Thus,
there was a gap between what the teachers view and what the principals think about their role even more than half of key stakeholders (teachers). This difference of view between the groups probably emanated from supervisors inefficiency and improper implementation of the process. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that supervisors are not identifying the necessary preconditions and prerequisites for effective supervisory process.

In table 4, the fourth item aims at knowing whether supervisors consult the potential stakeholders to get valuable information about teaching learning before deciding supervision plan. Accordingly, with mean value of 2.21 teachers disagreed, with mean value 3.14 principals undecided. That means teachers disagreed and principals undecided. The p-value is 0.046 which is statistically significant meaning the value is less than 0.05 or probably closer to 0.001. This indicates that there is no idea unity, coherence and commonly agreed goal. Stakeholders rarely take part in the pre-planning phase of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. It needs creating awareness for concerned individuals on the importance of consulting stakeholders in the planning phase of instructional supervision.

This shows that there is difference between what the principals assume they do and what the teachers perceives. Concerning this, new Education and Training Policy emphasizes on decentralization of the education system. The policy statement mainly aimed at the need of the participation of all stakeholders to solve the problems of education. Principals have great responsibilities to consult stakeholders at grass root level to ensure problem solving teaching learning process.

The fifth item in table 4, aims at investigating as to how the supervisory plan is problem solving. With this regard, mean of teachers 2.63 undecided and principals 4.00 is agree. The t-value is 0.93 and p-value is 0.049. The indication of this is that there is poor, non problem-solving and inefficient planning system. Chanyalew (2005) reveal that supervisory planning should focus on solving problems particularly targeting techniques, procedures and skill that foster quality of teachers and the achievement of learners. Furthermore, supervisors should plan properly in order to put the necessary effort in providing in-service training to enhance teachers’ effectiveness. It is not difficult to conclude that the problematic planning is contributing little for the result and behavior of students.

Regarding the interview conducted on the effectiveness of supervision planning, most of the respondents replied that concerned school instructional supervisors were not played their roles
properly as expected/stated in the Education and Training Policy. They emphasized that supervisors are not skilled enough to support teachers; conduct need assessment before planning, identify problems in implementation of curriculum and integrating curriculum with co-curricular activities.

Thus, from the aggregate mean values it argued that supervisors do not seem to play their role in proper manner. This has proved by the interviewers’ response, regardless of the stated target sample’s reaction. Their work experience and specialization tend to testify that they are unlikely to play their expected roles in designating scientific and problem solving plan.

Many authors regarding the above issue asserted that instructional supervisors have irreplaceable role in curriculum development, improving instruction and facilitating development of teachers’ competence. According to Haileselassie (2007), supervisors service as, specialist in planning for curriculum development, instructional methodology and special help to teacher. Sears (1995:9) also pointed out that improving every phases of educational program like instructional supervision is major function of supervisor. As the responses reveal, huge responsibility is rested on woreda education officials in establishing systems in which all stakeholders collaborate in the development of supervisory planning process. Creating an atmosphere where those stakeholders fell sense of ownership in the school issues matters a lot for the success of preparing a sophisticated supervisory plan.

As the referred documents in sample schools described, the supervisory plans included who is going to be evaluated when. What done by whom is not listed properly. Properly planned supervision plan is a plan where the supervisor designs the instructional objectives and techniques of evaluation he or she intends to use in the lesson to be observed. Most teachers and appraisers believed that the ideal supervisor is the one who has close contacts with teachers work; whom the teacher regard as creditable and experienced and who assumes management responsibility. Besides a research, evidence has shown that a supervisory process that involves more than one supervisor; that is the principals and delegates peers (Bollington, 1990).

As concluded from the referred documents, the main objective of planning phase should focus on devising mechanisms of establishing teachers’ acceptance and agreement. This is not properly done in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone.
4.4. Analysis of Effectiveness of Implementation of Instructional supervision

The objective of this part is to assess the effectiveness of implementation of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. In this part teachers and principals responses are reflected.

Table 5: Respondents’ responses on effectiveness of Implementation of Instructional supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Implementation of instructional supervision in the school follow stated policy directions</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supervisors build emphatic skills and relationships</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supervisors of the school are skillful in identifying obstacles to successful completion of tasks and processes</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.0381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supervision is being consistently practiced in schools</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supervisors are collaborative and friendly with teachers in time of supervision</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The supervision practiced in the school motivates teachers to do more</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Appropriate method of supervision is being used in the school</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregate mean</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1-1.49=SD 1.5-2.49=D 2.5-3.49=U 3.5-4.45=A 4.5-5.00=SA

Table 5 discusses whether the implementation of instructional supervision in the school is properly done or not. Different questions posed to get information about this issue.

The first item in this table is concerned with whether the implementation of instructional supervision in the school follow stated policy directions or not. Regarding this, teachers disagreed (mean 2.36) principals agreed, (mean 4.50). The t-value is 0.94 and p-value is 0.043 which is statistically significant because p-value is nearer to 0.05 meaning there is less than 5% chance of getting the observed difference by chance. The indication of this is that the respondents have mixed attitude that means it is only in some occasions that schools follow the proper policy
directions. According to Haileselassie (2007), supervisors serve as coordinator of programs, groups, materials and reports. As coordinator: The supervisor should plan with teachers’ service programs for teachers in order to promote staff development. Consultant: In this case, supervisor serves as specialist in curriculum development, instructional methodology and special help to teacher. Group leader: The supervisor help and assist not only individual but in most case he helps, guides and assists group for foster group work research and to improve their performance in a dynamic way. Evaluator: Supervisor as evaluator assists teacher in evaluating instruction and curriculum. This means the supervisor help teachers find answer to curriculum and instructional problems and conduct action research.

People who are in the line of implementing the policy issue are saying it is proper where as those teachers who are beneficiaries of the process are stating that it is not in line with policy directions. Two problems reflected here: the first is existence of huge attitudinal gap within teachers and the second is the woreda and school leading bodies are not implementing clinical supervision and other supervisory approaches appropriate for the teachers and for the system at all. Kutsyuruba, (2003) stated that the purpose of clinical supervision is to provide support to teachers (to assist) and gradually to increase teachers’ abilities to be self-supervising.

Flath (1989) outlines what most researchers have to say concerning the dilemma of policy direction and real practice. Mention is made of the lack of skill, training, and time for the instructional leadership role; of leadership activities being set aside for more immediate problems; and of the increasing volume of paper work. Also, public expectations for the principal's role are mainly managerial and, to a principal, this is a safe and comfortable role. MoE expect educational leaders to provide instructional supervision but what is actually practical is investing more time on managerial duties. Providing capacity building training and equipping concerned personnel eases this problem.

The second item in table 5, tried to investigate whether supervisors build emphatic skills and relationships or not. Accordingly, principals agreed that such skills are highly applicable in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone (mean3.71) and teacher respondents responded undecided (mean2.36). The t-value is 0.89 and p-value is 0.031. Hence, the data is statistically significant and it deduced that this skill is not applied as expected because teachers are not happy or comfortable to say that there is emphatic skill and relationship. In light of this, Gunter and others (2001) recommended that, in order to bring change, leaders need to help their
colleagues and students to cope with changes. In this regard, it is leader, who promotes the necessary communication and collegiality skill in time of implementation of instructional supervision to promote efficient implementation of the curriculum and to meet the needs of their students better.

The third item in table 5, aims at identifying whether instructional supervisors of the schools (in this case principals and teachers) are skillful in identifying obstacles to successful completion of tasks and processes or not. Accordingly, teachers disagreed and principals’ undecided. This shows that there is no organized need assessment before implementation of the supervisory process. Skill gap has also reflected because principals themselves are not comfortable to express about their duty. So, it needs providing capacity building training for teachers, principals and woreda education officials in order to make them informed and rational in identifying obstacles to successful completion of tasks. It is concluded that supervisors in this regard principals are not playing their role properly. The rationale might be similar to the reasons discussed in the first and second items.

The fourth item is about whether supervision is being consistently practiced in schools or not. If consistently and properly implemented, instructional supervision builds the capacity the teachers. Bomel’s (2003) stated that management and supervision were considered to be the most significant organizational factors affecting activities, largely as a result of heavy workloads rather than an overt neglect of responsibility. However, most organizations fail to fully understand the relationship between supervision and healthy working conditions. Accordingly, principals are saying that it is consistently practiced where as teachers refused the idea. The document analysis indicated that supervision has conducted twice a year; at the end of first semester and at the end of the academic year. Teacher respondents in the interview session also responded that their class duty has checked twice a year this is even not to shape or comment them but simply to fulfill administrative requirements. (reporting) reports are This has reflected in their responses of teachers and principals with the mean values (1.90, & 3.00 respectively). One can conclude from this that there is huge gap regarding consistent implementation of instructional supervision in the specified study area.

The fifth item in table 5, aims at getting information about whether supervisors are collaborative and friendly with teachers in time of supervision. Accordingly, principals replied that they perform it collaboratively and friendly. In the contrary teacher respondents also proved that it
practiced in such manner rarely. This is deduced from the response of teachers with mean 1.97 and principals with mean 4.42. The t-value is 0.93 and p-value is 0.041 which is statistically significant. McNeil (1979) discussed importance collaboration by stating that teachers and appraisers believed that the ideal supervisor is the one who has close contacts with teachers work; whom the teacher regard as creditable and experienced and who assumes management responsibility. (Kutsyuruba, 2003) stated that a teacher who needs collegial and collaborative support should realize that for professional growth, feedback from colleagues and other sources should be solicited in order to move toward improvement. The major components of collaborative approaches to supervision which are especially needed for beginner or novice teachers are: peer-coaching, cognitive coaching and mentoring (Showers & Joyce, 1996).

Thus, it is concluded that there is no sufficient and frequent collaboration and friendship with teachers in time of supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. Besides this, the supervisors are not performing their role in relation to the policy direction set by the professional competency standard of Ethiopian school supervisors.

The sixth item focused on gathering information on whether supervision practiced in the school motivates teachers to do more or not. Accordingly, principals, undecided and teachers disagreed. This shows that something is not going right in this regard. This shows that supervision in the schools is conducted not to equip teachers rather it is for report purpose and for organizing portfolios. Any service should be measured by the level of satisfaction of its clients. From this it is not difficult to conclude that supervisory service in the schools needs modification.

In table 5, the seventh item discusses about the appropriateness of methods of supervision being used in the school. The principals and woreda officials gave varied responses. Here principals are confident enough to say that they are implementing appropriate way of supervision. Whereas teachers undecided. From both groups of respondents it is not difficult to conclude that proper approaches of supervision were not applied. Clinical supervision if properly applied improves instruction and develops teachers’ competence.

According to the responses, instructional supervision was not properly implemented in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. It is evident that capacity building training, equipping principals and showing the right directions of instructional supervision is necessary.
Due to their focus on complicated administrative tasks, instructional supervision has rejected and teachers are not benefiting from the program. Thus, it has concluded from the analysis result of the above table 5 that principals do not seem to discharge their supervisory responsibilities properly.

The aggregate value of the implementation phase witnessed improper, managerial-oriented, non consistent and superficial type of instructional supervision. It is expressed in such manner from the final results of what has discussed under each question because the mean values of teachers in this regard fall under the range of disagree.

Since supervisors are leaders of instruction, they must work for the improvement of their followers or teachers because; the effectiveness of an organization to achieve its goal is largely depending up on competence willingness of the people in the organization (Wilcox, 2000).

4.5. Analysis of contribution of Evaluation of Instructional supervision for teaching learning process

The objective of this part is to examine the degree of contribution of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. In this part teachers and principals responses are reflected.

Table 6: Respondents’ responses on Effectiveness of Evaluation of Instructional supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation of instructional supervision focused on reviewing assumptions and realities about teaching and learning</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The evaluation process gives due attention on reviewing progress and performance</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluation of supervision stresses on skills development and abilities</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The evaluation feedbacks promote further learning</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supervisors provide data-based decision making</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supervisors are using both formative and summative evaluations</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate mean</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.0489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 item one contains the respondents’ suggestion that would help to reduce the problems of evaluation of instructional supervision in the area reviewing assumptions and realities about teaching and learning. With this regard, teachers disagreed on the statement (with mean 1.57) and the mean value of principals was indicating that they fail to give decision (with mean 3.14 undecided). The t-value is 0.96 and p-value is 0.034 which fall within the set statistical significance threshold of the study. Some instructional supervisors may hold post observation conference; but since they lack relevant training they do not analyze, synthesized and evaluate in advance the performance data they might have gathered, they simply focus too much on weakness and little on strength of teachers (Pajak, 1989:229). This is indicating that the three groups of respondents are not comfortable enough to agree that the already practical supervisory evaluation focused on the real assumptions. From this, it is concluded that whether the supervisors are inefficient in convincing and winning the attention of teachers or their limited know how if affecting them.

Regarding the potential efforts to improve the problem of evaluation of instructional supervision, the responses of interviews and document analysis sited up additional solutions. More importantly, majority of the respondents emphasized that the school-site supervision although currently problematic should be strengthened and cluster centers must be organized. As the respondents added its contribution for the teaching learning is still scant. Administrators conduct it periodically for the sake of organizing semester or annual reports.

The second item in table 6, aims at getting information about the focus of evaluation process on reviewing progress and performance. Accordingly, with the mean value 3.71, principals agreed. In the contrary, teachers with mean value 1.73 disagreed. The t-value is 0.98 and p-value 0.039 which is significant. In this case only teacher respondents responded that the evaluation process poorly focused on reviving performance of teachers that means it is rarely done in this manner.

Pajak, (1989) stated that most effective way of improving performance is to inform teachers of their strengths and weakness during post observation conference. The analysis of referred documents in schools under this study related to teacher performance appraisal such as portfolios also assured that appraisal technique in 2014/15 in Kembata Tembaro Zone secondary schools is nil. The principal solely plays dominant role in the performance appraisal system. Poor
comments given, individual signed under each person’s supervision report file is only one principal. This is also another indicator of the inefficient implementation and evaluation of the supervisory process. Building the capacity of principals through in-service and short-term trainings solves this problem.

The third item was concerned with identifying whether evaluation of instructional supervision stresses on skills development and abilities. Regarding this, principals gave their response that the evaluation process concerned with fostering skill development. The t-value 0.94 and p-value 0.043 was statistically significant. From the teachers’ side the majority of them responded disagree. This shows that the supervisory system is not winning the potential acceptance and recognition of the direct beneficiaries (teachers). The manifestation of this is existence of poor communication and inefficient leadership channel from woreda to school level. The result of this means it is poor kind of instructional supervision which need to be changed.

Document analysis revealed that only four teachers rewarded in the last three consecutive years in some of sample secondary schools. These schools are Durame, Adilo and Damboya Secondary Schools. The result of the analysis of document supports what teachers witness on provision of reward for teachers. This indicates that supervision and inspection was not properly conducted as a result recognizing competent teachers in their profession has not properly implemented. This highly affects teachers’ motivation towards their work.

The fourth item of table 6, aimed at investigating whether evaluation feedbacks promote further learning or not. Accordingly, as the statistical values indicated, principals have not decided on the item( t-value 0.86 and p-value 0.038). Principals’ respondents disagree on the statement. Adequately implemented supervision harmonizes the provision of information, instruction and training to ensure that the teaching and learning activities of an organization is effectively implemented and developed. It also makes the observation that, ‘supervisors, by example and discipline, are uniquely placed to influence how well organizations achieve teaching and learning objectives and what standards of performance are maintained (Elias 2008). In this regard the responses are indicating that still the schools lacked properly managed scientific supervisory process. Unless its result shape teachers content delivery, lesson planning, classroom management, application of student-centered learning, its application has nothing of value for the teacher.
In the fifth item of table 6 respondents asked about whether supervisors provide data-based decision making. Regarding this, principals are saying that they are making data-based decision because the mean value of their responses fall into 4.00. Teachers refused this idea. Therefore, according to responses of the two groups, there appears inadequate provision of supervision and inadequate decision making in the supervisory process. This is indicating that sort of fault-finding, false judgment, sectarianism, counting mistakes; back-bite and evil tasks are being applicable. These hard words are used not simply but in time of interview teachers responded that people from either woreda level or school leaders wants to attack them and enter to class in order to find faults. As the teachers responded they become happy to register if they got mistakes. The most irritating issue raised is that in most cases they register faults and expose to peers rather than giving comments for the teacher face to face.

In the last item of table 6, the respondents are asked if the supervisors are using both formative and summative evaluations. Accordingly, principals responded undecided. Teachers responded on disagree. The t-value is 0.88 and p-value is 0.48 which is significant. Hence, as the responses indicated it is not confusing to conclude that the inefficient way of supervision is being practiced in the schools. As interviewed stakeholders pointed continuous support and indicating directions is rarely practiced. The researcher has asked whether new entran teachers properly mentored or not. In this regard even more than 90% of the interviewed respondents reflected that new teachers are learning from trial and error. No one is caring about them rather teasing and laughing at the in time of their frustration has reflected. Additionally, the researcher faced shortage of manuals, policy documents, reports, feedbacks and portfolios indicating formative assessment in the document analysis period.

The aggregate mean value is indicating that evaluation result has nothing of value for students’ success and professional development of the teacher rather it born personal hatred and ignorance of the supervisor and his/her work has reflected through it.

In general, both interview and questionnaire respondents stated that proper supervisory techniques not applied by instructional supervisors. Moreover, lack of human relation skills and manuals for supervision, weakening of school site supervision and absence of cluster centers are additional problems that prevalent in supervisory practices of stated secondary schools. By supporting researchers like, Amberber (1975), Fekadu (1992) explained that Ethiopian supervisory service faces many constraints. Some of these are teachers have negative attitude
towards supervisory program; supervisors do not apply principles and techniques of supervision, lack skills in human relation and necessary facilities for supervision.

### 4.6. Analysis of Items of Major Challenges of Instructional Supervision

The objective of this part is to identify the major challenges of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. In this part teachers and principals responses are reflected.

Table 7: Respondents’ responses on Major Challenges of Instructional Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There is gap in cooperation in time of instructional supervision</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Importance of instructional supervision is not properly understood within the school community</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High attention given for administrative tasks affects timely implementation of formative assessment</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supervisors are not free from prejudice, fault finding and control</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teachers are not willing to accept comments given by their supervisors</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregate mean</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1-1.49=SD 1.5-2.49=D 2.5-3.49=U 3.5-4.45=A 4.5-5.00=SA

Table 7 summarizes the analysis of major challenges of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. According to the manual of Inspection Department of Ministry of Education (1994) the Ethiopian instructional supervisory activities faced problems like shortage of time, ineffective transport system, inefficient and inadequate fund and shortage of quailed man power that are eligible in facilitating teaching learning process are considered as major problems. In the following tables, the researcher tried to identify five major problems for this research purpose.

The first item in table 7 concerned with the perceived gaps in cooperation in time of instructional supervision. Accordingly, teachers remain undecided (mean 3.09) and principals with the mean value 3.57 agreed that there is cooperation gap in time of instructional supervision. The t-value is
0.92 and p-value 0.026 which is significant (less than 0.05 which is already set significance threshold of the study). This shows that there is fragmented activity lacking common stand. If such kind of activities lacks recognition from stakeholders, it means its final result become failure. This shows that supervisors/principals/ and teachers failed to make mutual cooperation on time of observation, class visit, decision making and planning process of the school. All stakeholders should cooperate and discuss in detail to minimize this problem.

The second item of table 7 was to check whether there is challenge in understanding the importance of instructional supervision within the school community or not. Accordingly, principals are saying that it is not properly understood where as teachers are saying that the problem is not understanding its importance but the problem is its application and its objective starting from planning phase to evaluation. This is reflected in their responses. Therefore, from the view of the respondents’ one can understand that its significance is not properly understood. Although stated in MOE document, Educational Development programmes and other policy toolkits, schools in Kembata Tembaro Zone are not in a position to change the attitude of stakeholders regarding the significance of instructional supervision.

Related to class observation, Lucio and McNeil (1979) stated that class observation is the improvement cycle where the teacher presents to the supervisors the instructional objectives, methods and techniques of evaluation he or she intended to use in lesson to observe. Hence, the main objective of class observation should focus on establishing teachers’ acceptance and agreement. To this end, teachers together with supervisors must have an opportunity in discussing and deciding on the purpose, criteria, frequency, procedures instruments and follow up activities prior to the actual classroom observation. However, these accounts less considered by the school supervisors as they were confirmed by the data analysis in above table. This is because supervisors lacked due acceptance and lack adequate experience as it is indicated in table 1. This condition may hinder supervisors to such very important technical role, which expected of them during class observation of instruction.

In the third question respondents are asked to rate their response on one challenge area if there were high attention given for administrative tasks are affecting timely implementation of formative assessment. Accordingly, principals argue that those huge administrative tasks are one challenge areas affecting implementation of instructional supervision. Only teacher respondents remain undecided. In today’s world, Hanny (1987) perceives that "effective principals are
expected to be effective instructional leaders . . . the principal must be knowledgeable about curriculum development, teacher and instructional effectiveness, clinical supervision, staff development and teacher evaluation.” From this analysis, one can conclude that there is no due focus on the supervisory activities due to routine over- dozen administrative activates. Routine tasks are consuming large amount of time of the school administrators.

MohdSallehLebar (2000), stated that normally principals are very busy due to tight schedule for attending meeting and briefing at department, district and national levels. Some principals delegated the supervision responsibility to senior assistants. Referring to classroom observation process Pajak(1989) reported that classroom observation is the phase in which the supervisor record instances when the intended behaviors are seen to occur. Thus, classroom observation demands a high level of technical and analytical skills. The supervisors must have the skill of what to look, how to note, analyze and interpret the data. But this research question and its findings are indicating that schools in Kembata Tembaro Zone face deficiency of this skill.

With regard to fourth question which discusses about whether supervisors are free from prejudice, fault finding and control or not. The t-value is 0.89 and the p-value 0.048 is statistically significant and against the null hypothesis because it is within the set threshold of the study. Unfortunately the mean value of principals (2.00) indicating that they are free from prejudices. But teachers are replying that they are not free from such duties. The responses of both groups contradict each other. However, what teachers said became sounding because frequent complaints, disregards, misconceptions and deep hatred are indicators of this. The nick-name given for supervisors in many schools under focus is ‘super viruses’. Something which is valuable cannot be hated by teachers.

The interviewed respondents also confirm that supervisors leave the class at the middle of the lesson before the lesson is completed for some teachers and they missed relevant information.

For some teachers who have no good relation with the stay until the end of the period. They added that classroom observation held once in a semester for the sake
of performance appraisal and focused on newly deployed teachers. They also stressed that those classroom observational activities are not done in continuous manner. Pre-determined results are posted. Personal relations and intimacy/closeness matters a lot.

When we move to the last question of the challenge part, it discusses about teachers willingness to accept comments given by their supervisors. Accordingly, all group of respondents agreed that teachers are not eager/keen to accept the given comments to improve their knowledge and classroom instruction.. This shows that teachers are not happy with the already practical supervisory process. It depends on whether supervisors ability or problem in changing attitude of teachers regarding the importance of instructional supervision for both teachers and students.

Hence, it is concluded that the supervisors are not playing properly the role expected of them from the post observation conference to the feedback phase. According to the responses of interviewed Woreda Education Office Heads, supervisors and teachers were not conducting post observation conference consistently. They also explained that post observation conference not done properly in a way that contributes to the improvement of the instructional process.

In light to the above analysis, Harris (1991) as cited in Chanyalew (2005) revealed that the major purpose of class observation is to give feedback to the teacher about his or her performance. Follow up activity involves some kind of re-recording of data analysis, a plan for feedback other teacher and other appropriate activities growing out of observation.

Some instructional supervisors may conduct class observation; but since they lackrelevant training and do not analyze, synthesized and evaluate in advance the performance data they might have gathered, they simply focus too much on weakness and little on strength of teachers (Pajak 1989).

**4.7. Analysis of Interview Data**
The researcher forwarded similar questions for all category of respondents in the interview part. The first question forwarded was “As you are a concerned stakeholder how are the techniques, roles and efforts of supervisors in the school? How it is being carried out?” for the question woreda education secor officials, principals and teacher respondents gave their justifications. Many of them tried to give the number of teachers and large class size as a reason for limited frequent implementation of instructional supervisory activities. All of them assured that instructional supervision is not consistently practiced in the study area.

The second question was asked to check perceptions. In this regard all respondents responded that the is still attitudinal gap but differences observed regarding additional question asked for further clarification since it is a kind of semi-structured interview. The researcher asked why it was perceived negatively. In this case WEO responded that it was not properly introduced for them by school supervisors where as principals reflected teachers disregard the program itself and majority teachers also replied that school supervisors are practicing it in order to attack teachers and to reduce their efficiency result. This shows that wide spread attitudinal changes have not been made regarding the importance of instructional supervision.

The other question says “What are the major problems that may hinder the effectiveness of supervision activity?” In this regard more than 95% of WEO and teachers stated that principals are busy in routine daily managerial tasks. Some of them also replied that the principal him/her self need support from other professionals and that no one accepts them. That means there is belittling the principal due to decline in performance. Principals’ also stated that teachers are fearful and not ready to accept the process itself. Some few principals stated that it is challenging for them to follow all teachers in organized and consistent manner. Due to this as they replied, they are conducting some times. This indicated that the process was affected by lack of skill, underestimation of the process and giving large time for other tasks, problem of consistency, lack of acceptance and coordination within the school actors.

Respondents are asked to give their comments for further improvement of the process. In this regard majority of them commented that the process of instructional supervision should be participatory in which teachers and principals should discuss together and plan together. The schedule should be pre-prepared posted in a clear place that every teacher may become ready for that. As the respondents replied, principals should be free from back-bite, personal attacks, and
registering faults. The result of the process also should be communicated with the individual teacher after supervising in class.

In general, in the interview part, the researcher stressed more on the respondents’ suggestion that would help to reduce the problems of instructional supervision. With this regard, most of WEO, principals and teachers suggested that equipping supervisors with relevant in-service and pre-service training, providing sufficient awareness about supervision, allocating sufficient budget for supervision, develop culture of teamwork, and providing educational inputs and balancing the workload of principals as well as sharing best experiences from model schools regarding appropriate ways of implementing instructional supervisory activities are major solutions forwarded by interviewed respondents to solve instructional supervisory problems.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, the major findings of the study summarized, concluded and recommendations made in relation to the research objectives that was perception, adequacy of planning, effectiveness of implementation, contribution of supervisory evaluations for the success of teaching learning process and major challenges of instructional supervision.

5.1. Summary

Finding related to background information of respondents.

- Majority of the principals, woreda education officers and the majority of teachers are relatively inexperienced in supervision and teaching respectively. It is possible to conclude that their insufficient year of experience affected their implementation of instructional supervision.
- Most of the principals and the majority (95.7%) of teachers are first-degree holders. It indicates that the human resource available is below the set standard of MOE.
• More than half of the principals, teachers and WEO are within the age range of 26-30 rears. This age limit is not satisfactory to say that they provide proper supervisory service for their clients/followers.
• More than 90% of the categories of the respondents are male. An indication of this reflects the improper implementation of affirmative action and contradicts the policy direction in equipping women for leadership and teaching positions

Findings related to perceptions towards supervisory process:

• Majority of teachers perceived that supervision process is hierarchical, authoritarian, punitive and judgmental. Moreover, they also believe that it mainly focused on administrative affairs whose purpose is not focused on teachers’ performance appraisal.
• Majority of principals, perceive supervision process that it is collaborative, interactive, democratic, supportive and descriptive. Moreover, they perceived that it mainly focused on developmental affairs.
• The interviewed Woreda Education Office Heads also assured that the supervision process is mainly evaluative rather than supportive.
• Many of teachers disagree on the point that supervision increases teachers’ competence
• There is no uniform stand on the issue that supervision is carried out to improve instruction

Findings related to the adequacy of planning of instructional supervision.

• Many gaps observed between what principals think they do in planning of instructional supervision and what the teachers witness about them.
• Large number of the principals and teachers expressed that the supervisors rarely practice their role in cooperative and participative planning activities.
• The majority of teachers assured that supervisors do not seem to play their roles properly in consulting potential stakeholders before planning.
• Many of the principals and of teachers as well as WEO expressed that pre, while and post-observational activities done some times.
• The majority of the respondents strongly believed that there is limitation in timely planning of instructional supervision.
Findings related to major problems that affect the practice of instructional supervision:

- Majority of teachers and WEO respondents believed that implementation of instructional supervision rarely follow the stated policy directions.
- More than 81% of principals and the majority of teachers assured that supervisors rarely developed the emphatic skills and relationships.
- The majority principals and the majority of teachers also assured that supervisors lacked skill in identifying to successful implementation of instructional supervision.
- The vast majority of respondents proved that the supervisory activities in secondary schools of the zone understudy lacked consistency of application.
- One of the major principles of modern supervision is that supervision should be democratic, collaborative and participatory. However, in contrary the findings of this study revealed that supervisory activities are not participatory, collaborative and democratic rather it is one directional.
- The majority of principals, WEO and teachers assured that supervision being conducted has scant value in motivating teachers to do more.
- The majority of all group of respondents assured that the supervisory methods applied lacked appropriateness.

Findings related to the effectiveness of evaluation of instructional supervision.

- As the findings revealed, huge gaps observed in the evaluation phase regarding reviewing assumptions and realities.
- Large number of teachers disregard the concept that the evaluation process gives due attention on reviewing progress and performance.
- The majority of teachers assured that the evaluative feed backs of supervision do not seem to play their roles in promoting further learning.
- Idea difference observed regarding the effect of supervision in improving classroom instruction.
- The majority of teachers strongly believed that there is limitation in data-based decision making.
- Most of the respondents witnessed that supervisors are not conducting both formative and summative evaluation in a balanced manner.
Findings related to the major challenges of instructional supervision.

- More than half of principals, teachers and woreda officials agreed that there is limitation in cooperation in time of instructional supervision.
- The majority of the principals and teachers as well as WEO expressed that the importance of instructional supervision is not properly understood.
- All of the respondents agreed that high attention given for administrative tasks is affecting the implementation of instructional supervision.
- More than half of all group of respondents agreed that supervisors are not free from prejudice, fault finding and control.
- The majority of principals, WEO and teachers agreed that teachers are not willing to accept comments given by the supervisor.

Moreover, majority of the interviewed respondents confirmed that no strong attempts made to improve instructional supervisory practices in the study area. Principals and teachers also asked to indicate directions and suggestions to improve the existing supervisory practice. To this end, the absolute majority of principals and teachers suggested that, facilitating relevant in-service training, providing sufficient awareness about instructional supervision for both teachers and supervision personnel, allocating sufficient training budget, developing culture of team work; providing educational inputs sufficiently and balancing work load of principals are major solutions to improve instructional supervision.

Additionally, the responses of interviews and analyzed documents also capitalized in necessity of strengthening of school site supervision and organizing cluster center to improve instructional supervision practice. As the finding of interviews indicated, experience-sharing program for principals and teachers is non-existent and no budget allocations made for such program. As the MoE stated in professional competence standards of supervisors in the year 2013, quality challenges still left unsolved in general education sub-sector not only in the form of deterioration of students achievement but also in the form of decline in quality of teacher and leader professional performance. This has manifested in poor supervision, leadership and management process in the school which in turn negatively affect efficient delivery of classroom lesson.

### 5.2. Conclusions

Based on the above major findings of the study, the following conclusions made:
• Instructional supervision is negatively perceived in Secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. An indication of this is that teachers perceived instructional supervisions objective as something inclined to inspection, fault finding and judgmental rather than being offered support that facilitates their professional development. Woreda education officials and principals also failed to shape attitudinal problems in the study area. As a result, the already implemented instructional supervision is not contributing for staff professional development, curriculum development and teacher performance appraisal as desired in sample secondary schools Kembata Tembaro Zone.

• Instructional supervision is inadequately planned in Secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. Due to this, instructional supervision is contributing little for teachers’ competence and improvement of the teaching learning process as well as students result. This has manifested in students’ low performance in EGSCE. For example as document analysis indicates in Durame secondary and preparatory school from grade ten students who have taken national exam in the year 2003 E.C 51%, in 2004 E.C 44%, in 2005E.C 21% and in 2006 E.C 33% passed the national exam.

• Implementation of instructional supervision is not effective in Secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. As such the ineffective implementation of instructional supervision lacked acceptance and recognition from teachers, conducted for administrative purpose and contributing little for assurance of quality of education.

• Evaluation of instructional supervision in Secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone is not contributing for the success of the teaching learning process. Irrelevant evaluations of instructional supervision causing teachers to categorize it as judgmental, focused on fault-finding and evaluative rather than contributing for teachers’ professional development, students’ result improvement and creating conducive academic environment.

• Lack of cooperation, misunderstanding of its importance, giving due attention for administrative tasks, teachers disregard of supervisory comments and its prejudiced/fault finding nature are key challenges of instructional supervision secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. In Secondary schools in Kembata Tembaro Zone influential stakeholders are not effectively taking part in the overall instructional supervisory process, school administrators are investing most of their time in routine activities and conducting instructional supervision periodically in order to fulfill administrative requirements. Teachers give less value for instructional supervision by categorizing it as
biased and fault-finding task. As a result, supervision is not contributing for improvement of quality of education, improving teachers’ competence and students’ results.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following possible recommendations forwarded

1. The findings of this study clearly indicated that supervisors were not qualified in the field having less than five years of experience. That means they were inexperienced in their current supervisory position. As a result, supervisors became less skillful in providing instructional leadership. So that to capacitate them to properly function their expected roles in planning, implementation and evaluation of instructional supervision, Kembata Tembaro Zone Education Department in collaboration with Woreda Education Offices should prepare in-service training for principals/supervisors. Moreover, teacher-training institutions must provide common courses more relevant to instructional supervision for their candidates who are future teachers. This avoids confusion on supervision for newly assigned supervisors because supervisors are selected among teachers.

2. Kembata Tembaro Zone Education Department and respective woreda education offices should create and promote mindset that all teachers irrespective of extent and type of their experience do need supervision service. Educational tours also should be arranged by school management to share best experiences with other schools regarding the practice of instructional supervision.

3. As the findings revealed, there is gap in cooperation, timing, data-based decision making and designing sophisticated problem solving plan in the planning stage of instructional supervision. To avoid this problem, WEO should establish systems in which all stakeholders collaborate and show commitment in supervisory planning process. Additionally, short-term refreshment trainings through seminars and discussion forums should be organized and implemented for principals and teachers in schools as well as at woreda level on ways preparing effective instructional supervision plan.

4. The study revealed that the implementation of instructional supervisory service faced many problems in the area understudy. Therefore, to solve these problems all concerned bodies, the Zone Education Department, Woreda Education Office and school officials in collaboration with NGOs are recommended to provide comprehensive trainings through seminars, discussion forums for principals and teachers in schools as well as at woreda level on ways of
conducting effective instructional supervision. Additionally, Woreda Education office should allocate sufficient budget to support supervisory service at school and schools should raise internal income to support instructional supervisory activities.

5. Instructional supervisors conduct classroom observation to see the improvement of teaching and the progress of teachers and students. As the finding of this study indicated, the supervisory evaluation process is biased, fault-finding based, punitive and judgmental. It also indicated that the overall process is administrative affairs focused. To harvest the required result from supervisory practices, supervisors should focus on Administrative tasks (requirements, policies and procedures, accountability), Educational (Linkage of tasks to classroom theory, applying theory to practice) and Personal Development (attention to growth of insight, judgment, self-awareness, etc) rather than solely dealing with administrative affairs.

6. As the study reveals, level of school visit by woreda education Quality office in Kembata Tembaro Zone secondary schools is generally very low, which could have a negative impact on results of students. Conversely, highly and effectively supervised schools increase the level of employee involvement, increasing job satisfaction and resulting in better students’ success, clearer decision making and a more committed workforce. As a result Woreda Education Offices should assign cluster supervisors for secondary schools.

7. As the study pointed out the major challenges of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro zone are limited cooperation in time of supervision, misunderstanding of the importance of instructional supervision, wasting time on administrative tasks, prejudiced and fault-finding nature of supervisors and limitations in teachers’ willingness to accept comments given by the supervisor. To solve this problems, Kembata Tembaro Zone Education department in cooperation with woreda education officials should prepare capacity building training and workshops for principals and teachers in order to minimize these challenges regularly.

8. Educational tours also should be arranged by school management to share best experiences from model schools regarding instructional supervision.
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APPENDIX A

HAWASSA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

Research questionnaire intended to collect data on the practice and challenges of instructional supervision which is used as Partial Fulfillment for MA Degree in School Leadership in the Department of Educational Leadership and Management. The information obtained from you is believed to be valuable source for my study. I would like to thank in advance for your kind and honest responses.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

Part I: Personal Informations

i. Name of the school____________________

ii. Position____________________________

iii. Sex   Male ☐ Female ☐

iv. Age   21-30 ☐ 31-40 ☐
Directions: For each of the following four parts, please use “√” mark in front of the number that indicates your level of agreement based on your own experience.

Strongly disagree (SD)=1, Disagree (Dg)=2, Undecided (Ud)=3, Agree (Ag)=4, Strongly Agree (SA)=5

Part I: Items related to perception of Instructional Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teachers perceive being offered support rather than being inspected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instructional supervision improves students' results at a greater rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instructional supervision increases teachers' competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supervision is carried out in the school to improve instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The instructional supervision motivates teachers to do more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Providing supervision continuously benefits teachers at a greater rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The supervision provided in the school is aimed at improving instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part II: Items related to Adequacy of planning Instructional Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning of instructional supervision in the school is participatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Planning of instructional supervision in the school is timely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The supervisory plan is properly scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The instructional supervision plan is supported by budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supervisors are designing a problem solving Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part III: Items related to Effectiveness of Implementation of Instructional Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Implementation of instructional supervision in the school follow stated policy directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supervisors build emphatic skills and relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supervisors of the school are skillful in identifying obstacles to successful completion of tasks and processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supervision is being consistently practiced in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supervisors are collaborative and friendly with teachers in time of supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The supervision practiced in the school motivates teachers to do more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Appropriate method of supervision is being used in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part IV: Items related to Evaluation of Instructional Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The evaluation of instructional supervision focused on reviewing assumptions and realities about teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The evaluation process gives due attention on reviewing progress and performance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluation of supervision stresses on skills development and abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The evaluation feedbacks promote further learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supervisors provide data-based decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supervisors are using both formative and summative evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part V: Items related to major Challenges of Instructional Supervision
APPENDIX   B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interview Guide for principals, Woreda Education Officers and Teachers

1. As you are a concerned stakeholder how are the techniques, roles and efforts of supervisors in the school? How it is being carried out?
2. How do teachers and supervisors view the supervision process?
3. Are the supervisors competent enough? To what extent instructional supervisors assist and guide teachers?
4. Who are responsible persons for conducting and managing supervisory activities in the schools?
5. What are the major problems that may hinder the effectiveness of supervision activity?
6. What do you suggest to alleviate the existing instructional supervisory problems?
7. What are some of the obstacles that hinder implementation of instructional supervision in your school?
8. Do you think effective instructional supervision is being carried out in schools? Why?
9. Are there any observed drawbacks in the current supervisory practices? What are they?