

**PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF SCHOOL BASED INSTRUCTIONAL  
SUPERVISION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF WEST HARARGHE  
ZONE, OROMIA REGIONAL STATE.**

**MA THESIS**

**ABDULJEBAR KASIM**

**NOVEMBER 2017**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**  
**POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**  
**Practices and Challenges of School Based Instructional Supervision**  
**in Secondary Schools of West Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State**

**A Thesis Submitted to the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences**

**Department of Educational Planning and Management**  
**In Partial Fulfillments of the Requirements for the Degree of**  
**MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP**

**Abduljebar Kasim**

**NOVEMBER 2017**  
**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**  
**POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**

As thesis research advisors, we hereby certify that we have read and evaluated this thesis prepared under our guidance, by Abduljebar Kasim, **entitled Practices and Challenges of School based Instructional Supervision in Secondary Schools of West Hararghe Zone Oromia Regional State**. We recommended that it can be submitted as fulfilling the thesis requirement.

Bahar Adam (PhD)

Major Advisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Yilfashawa Seyoum (PhD)

Co Advisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

As member of the Board of Examiners of the MA Thesis Open Defense Examination, we certify that we have read, evaluated the thesis prepared by **Abduljebar Kasim** and examined the candidate. We recommended that the thesis be accepted as fulfilling the thesis requirement for the degree Master of Art.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Final approval and acceptance of the thesis is contingent up to the submission of its final copy to the council of graduate studies (CGS) through the candidates department or school of graduate committee (DGC or SGS).

## DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis manuscript to my wife Keiriya Usman, my brother Taha Kasim, my son and daughter Firomsa and Sefani Abduljebar and others for their great contribution in the success of my work.

## STATEMENT OF AUTHOR

First, I declare that this thesis is my work and that all sources of materials used in this thesis have been acknowledged. Thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for M.A degree at the Haramaya University and is deposited at the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rule of the library. I declare that this thesis is not submitted to any other institution anywhere for the award of any academic degree, diploma or certificate.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of postgraduate program directorate when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the materials in the interest of scholarship. In all other instance, however permission must be obtained from the author.

Name Abduljebar Kasim      Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Place. Haramaya University, Haramaya.

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

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as university advisor.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

The author was born on October 1982 G.C at Arsi Zone Oromia Regional State. He attended his primary education at Bollo elementary school and secondary education at Arboye Senior Secondary School. The author earned his diploma (2002 G.C.) from Adama Teachers College and assigned in West Hararghe Zone. He earned Bachelor Degree of art in 2009 E.C from Haramaya University. The author has 10 years teaching experience and currently he is serving as principal. The author has joined School of Graduate Studies at Haramaya University in July 2015 to study summer program in school leadership, so the researcher has been a student of Haramaya University until 2017.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

I would like to express my deepest thanks to my major advisor Bahar Adam (PhD) and my co-advisor Yilfashawa Seyoum (PhD) for giving me constructive advises and guidance starting from the proposal writing up to the completion of the research work. I would like to thank them because, without their encouragement, suggestion, insights, guidance and professional expertise, the completion of this work would have not been possible.

My particular gratitude and appreciation also goes to my wife Keiriya Usman and my friends Muktar Kaso, Dejene Worku and Aliye Hassan who contributed toward the success in my study through their love, thoughtfulness and encouragement and providing me by supportive idea and materials which is used for this work.

Finally my gratitude goes to Haramaya University that facilitated all situations like student dormitory, internet access, and library and assigning advisors to guide me for completion of my work effectively.

## **ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONOMYS**

<b>ADEA</b>	Association for the Development of Education in Africa
<b>GEQIP</b>	General Education Quality Improving Program
<b>MoE</b>	Ministry of Education
<b>OREB</b>	Oromia Regional Education Bureau
<b>REB</b>	Regional Education Bureau
<b>SBS</b>	School Based Supervision
<b>SRS</b>	Simple Random Sampling
<b>UNESCO</b>	United Nations Educational, scientific and Cultural Organization
<b>WHZ</b>	West Hararghe Zone
<b>ZEO</b>	Zone Education Office

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>DEDICATION</u>	iv
<u>STATEMENT OF AUTHOR</u>	v
<u>BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH</u>	vi
<u>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</u>	vii
<u>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONOMYS</u>	viii
<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	ix
<u>LIST OF TABLES</u>	xii
<u>ABSTRACT</u>	xiii
<u>1. INTRODUCTION</u>	1
<u>1.1. Background of the Study</u>	1
<u>1.2. Statement of the Problem</u>	6
<u>1.3. Research Questions</u>	9
<u>1.4. Objectives of the Study</u>	10
<u>1.4.1. General objective</u>	10
<u>1.4.2. Specific objectives</u>	10
<u>1.5. Significance of the Study</u>	10
<u>1.6. Delimitations of the Study</u>	11
<u>1.7. Limitation of the Study</u>	12
<u>1.8. Operational Definition of Key Terms</u>	12
<u>1.9. Organization of the Study</u>	13
<u>2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</u>	14
<u>2.1. Historical Development of Educational Supervision</u>	14
<u>2.2 The Renewed Interest in Supervision</u>	15
<u>2.3 Principles of Supervision</u>	16
<u>2.4. The Current Practice of Educational Supervision in Ethiopia</u>	17
<u>2.5. School Based Instructional Supervision</u>	19
<u>2.6. The Role of School Based Instructional Supervision</u>	19
<u>2.7. Instructional Leadership Practices in Improving Students' Achievement</u>	20
<u>2.8. Challenges in School Based Supervision</u>	21
<u>2.9. Leadership Capabilities Required to Instructional Supervision</u>	22
<u>2.9.1. Knowledge of Instructional leader</u>	22
<u>2.9.2. Skills of Instructional Leader</u>	23
<u>2.10. The Roles of School Principal in Instructional Supervision</u>	24
<u>2.11. The Roles of Deputy Principals in Instructional Supervision</u>	24
<u>2.12. The Roles of Department Heads in Instructional Supervision</u>	25

<a href="#"><u>2.13. The Roles of Senior Teachers in Instructional Supervision</u></a>	25
<a href="#"><u>2.14. Barriers for Effective Instructional Leadership</u></a>	25
<a href="#"><u>2.14.1. Lack of skills and training</u></a>	26
<a href="#"><u>2.14.2. Lack of cooperation of staffs and other school members</u></a>	26
<a href="#"><u>2.14.3. Lack of time</u></a>	26
<a href="#"><u>2.14.4. Lack of cooperation from supervisor, school board and community</u></a>	27
<a href="#"><u>2.15. Problems of Instructional Supervision</u></a>	28
<a href="#"><u>3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</u></a>	29
<a href="#"><u>3.1. Description of the Study Area</u></a>	29
<a href="#"><u>3.2. Research Design</u></a>	29
<a href="#"><u>3.3. Sources of Data</u></a>	30
<a href="#"><u>3.3.1. Primary Sources of Data</u></a>	30
<a href="#"><u>3.3.2. Secondary Sources of Data</u></a>	30
<a href="#"><u>3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques</u></a>	30
<a href="#"><u>3.5. Data Collection Instruments</u></a>	31
<a href="#"><u>3.5.1. Questionnaire</u></a>	31
<a href="#"><u>3.5.2. Interview guide</u></a>	32
<a href="#"><u>3.5.3. Document analysis</u></a>	33
<a href="#"><u>3.6. Procedures of Data Collection</u></a>	33
<a href="#"><u>3.7. Methods of Data Analysis</u></a>	33
<a href="#"><u>3.8. Ethical Considerations</u></a>	34
<a href="#"><u>4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</u></a>	35
<a href="#"><u>4.1. Background of the Respondents</u></a>	35
<a href="#"><u>4.2. The Main results of the study</u></a>	37
<a href="#"><u>5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u></a>	53
<a href="#"><u>5.1. Summary</u></a>	53
<a href="#"><u>5.2. Conclusions</u></a>	55
<a href="#"><u>5.3. Recommendations</u></a>	56
<a href="#"><u>6. REFERENCES</u></a>	59
<a href="#"><u>7. APPENDICES</u></a>	64

## **LIST OF TABLES**

1. Summary of Population and Sampling Techniques	31
2. Summary of reliability tests	32

3. Characteristics of respondents	36
4. The status of school based instructional supervision	43
5. Roles of school based instructional supervisors	39
6. Teachers perception of school based instructional supervision	46
7. Major challenges of school based instructional supervision	50

**Practices and Challenges of School Based Instructional Supervision in West Hararghe Zone, Oroima Regional State.**

**Abduljebar Kasim**

## **ABSTRACT**

*The purpose of the study was to investigate the practices and challenges of school-based instructional supervision in secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone. Total populations are 300 and among these 116 samples are taken and sampling techniques used here is simple random sampling and availability sampling techniques, the design used descriptive survey design. Questionnaires, interviews and document analysis were used to gather data. The data were tabulated and analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively using percentages, mean and average mean. The findings of the study show that; the supervisors did not play roles expected of them, the teachers role in supervision was negligible, the teachers' and school-based supervisors' perception did not go in line with the intensions and principles of supervision, teachers have negative attitude towards supervision, the major problems that affect supervisory practices in the school were: supervisors' unskilled, lack of participatory approach, shortage of finance, lack of proper training and awareness of supervision, supervisors were inexperienced, uncertified and unspecialized to conduct supervisory practices properly and efficiently, absence of regular classroom observation, supervisors overloaded of work, absence of shared decision making procedure, lack of follow up, did not facilitate school self evaluation and assist need based training at school, pre and post observation conference were not provided and supervisors consider themselves as superior in position and teachers perceive them as fault-finders,. The recommendations are teachers, principals and department heads should well oriented and trained in supervision, the school should provide relevant and sufficient training about supervision and make it more systematic and carefully planned, clear concepts on objectives, principles, functions and consequently on the techniques of school based supervision should be stated in the school for each teachers, supervisors and make agreement on the points which should be observed before class observation.*

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, objectives and significances of the study, delimitations and limitations of the study, operational definition of key terms and organization of the study.

## 1.1. Background of the Study

In the education process the role of teachers cannot be underestimated (Glatthorn cited in Kutsyuruba, 2003). In addition improving teaching is a complex process in which many elements should interact. Teachers are in the center of this improvement process. Hence teachers acceptance and interaction with the supervisory practice, therefore, the techniques, methods, models, or processes used by supervisors at schools, provide the catalyst for any supervisory success. The way teachers gain professional support from instructional supervisors and the way teachers view the instructional supervision that they were undergoing and thought about it was very important in the outcomes of the supervision process. Instructional supervision is an interactive process that depends on the source of supervision the supervisor and the teacher. Therefore, assessing the practices and challenges of instructional supervision is important in implementing successful supervision (Abdulkareem, 2001).

Supervision is “an intervention that is provided by a senior member of a profession to a junior member or members of that same profession”. This relationship is evaluative, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the junior member(s); monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the clients she; he, or they see(s), and serving as a gatekeeper of those who are to enter the particular profession, (Bernard and Goodyear, 1998). Supervision has gone through many changes caused by the political, social, religious and industrial forces. Supervision as a field of educational practice emerged slowly, "did not fall from the sky fully formed" (<http://www.education.Stateuniversity.com/pages/2472/supervision>).

The definition of supervision is different with different literatures and different professional aspects. Particularly, (Surya Govinda and Tapan, 1999:8) defined Educational supervision as; “all those services whose main function is to control and evaluate, and/or advice and support school heads and teachers”. Education inspection was introduced in to the education system in Ethiopia about 35 years after the introduction of modern (western) type of education in the country around 1934 E.C.

According to the literature there are forces that brought about the need for school inspection. Firstly, the fast growth of elementary and secondary schools in the empire, secondly the need for coordination of the curriculum and thirdly, and most important, to help

teachers in the classroom activities. Beginning 1955 E.C the twenty or so year's old inspection was replaced by supervision. Now a days, improving the quality of education has given priority throughout the world. To monitor the quality, the national authorities highly depend on the school supervision, (De Grauwe, 2001a:13). Quality has different meanings depending on the kind of organization and the customers served (Certo, 2006:7). Particularly, education quality, according to (Dittmar, Mendelson and Ward, 2002:30) is; "the provision of good education by well prepared teachers".

However, all teachers are not qualified enough and as a result they need support from supervisors (Giordano, 2008:11). To improve teachers' instructional performance; the instructional Supervisors should also work with teachers in fixable and collaborative style. Thus, in order to bring effective education through the improved teaching-learning process; instructional supervisors should be democratic and cooperative and should get serious attention in the school. Researches by (Beach and Reinhartz, 2000) emphasized that the importance of the collaborative effort of all participants involved in the supervisory process. This would help in improving the way this practice are introduced and avoid any potential conflict. In line with this, Education Sector Development Program IV by the Ministry of Education noted the importance of providing quality based instructional supervision to improve the quality of education (MoE, 2010:10) with forming school clusters. 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.

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 and Starratt, 2007). For about ten years, the field of instructional supervision has been suffering from unfriendly and unstable relations between teachers and supervisors. At school level, how supervisors should professionally support while working with teachers was the discussion about the field of instructional supervision and was a main derive for developing the different supervision models because; different models produced different practices. The aim was to increase for the best method by which supervisors could best improve the teachers' performance; provide them with the needed assistance; for the total school improvement and providing quality education for the learners. Having this, MoE, (2003), mentioned that the main focus of instructional supervision is providing support for teachers and

enhances their role as key professional decision makers in practice of teaching. To achieve this aim supervisors usually employ several supervisory practices. But MoE, (2002) mentioned that, the previous years, the woreda education experts who are assigned to supervision at school level are not able to solve school problems. Sometimes they went to school they do nothing except collecting information from the hands of school principals. Because of this, teachers did not gained support from supervisors for improvement of their instructional limitations.

Alternatively, instructional supervision at school level; the focus of this research, has been conceived a better model for helping teachers; school leaders to expand their knowledge and expertise in many countries. As Dawson, (2002), describe the classroom performance of a teacher as implementing curriculum, planning, classroom management and instructional techniques, instructional supervision is the cycle of activities between a supervisor and a teacher with the objective of improving classroom performance, to improve student achievement. Their liaison role is, however, not only vertical; increasingly supervisors are entrusted with horizontal relations and have a honor role to play in identifying and spreading new ideas and good practices between schools. Particularly when ambitious reform programs are being launched, their role in disseminating the reform and in ensuring smooth implementation at the school level becomes important.

Researches indicated that instructional supervisors greatly responsible to link their schools with the community; NGOs and individuals to solve financial and material scarcities of the school with the aim of achieving the goal of stakeholder participations on the school improvement programs. But currently in the context of WHZ Secondary school supervisory practices, they miss completely this function.

Instructional Supervisors in educational organizations have individual goals for improvement and believe that purpose of instructional supervision is to achieve those specified goals. It is the cycle of activities between a supervisor and a teacher with the objective of improving classroom performance. Instructional supervision is the link between teacher needs and school goals so individuals can improve and work together towards the vision of the school (Glickman, 1990). Most researches on the quality of education focus on the key role of teachers and school leaders in bringing education quality. However, as all teachers and school leaders are not qualified enough, they need support from Instructional supervisors (Giordano, 2008:11). Similarly, education in Ethiopia is passing through a period of transition from the emphasis on quantity to emphasis on quality. According to MoE, (2004), the Ethiopian government has now shifted its attention to improve quality of education. It has started quality

education initiative called 'General Education Quality Improvement Package (2007). Some of its programs were school improvement program and continuous professional development of teachers.

Quality education depends on several issues, among others educational planning, management, teacher's professional competence, and efforts of students, instructional supervision and classroom teaching-learning situation (MoE, 2002). This current movement demands that the process of instructional supervision undergo a movement of reform and renewal. In this movement it seems essential to assess the practices and challenges of instructional supervision.

Working in supervision reform without having this kind of information is a great deficiency that might misguide the efforts for improvement. Accordingly, this study aims to assess the practices and challenges of instructional supervision in Secondary schools of West Hararge Zone regarding the actual instructional supervisory practices implemented by supervisors at schools. Thus, personal and professional development is the outcome of the effective instructional supervision. Schools are the formal agencies of education where the future citizens are shaped and developed through the process of teaching and learning.

So schools need Instructional supervision to help all students to develop their potentials to the fullest level. This requires the effectiveness and commitment of the stockholders particularly teachers, school leaders and management (Aggarwl, 1985). So schools must improve their basic functions of teaching and learning process that aims at helping and empowering all students to raise their broad outcomes through instructional improvement.

**According** to Trait discussed in the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (1998), supervision was taken as the process in which supervisors visited schools to work with the teachers and school administrators to ascertain the quality of teaching and administration. Thus, adequate support and effective supervisory activities were very crucial for schools to enhance the teaching learning process. The overall objective of effective school based supervision was enabling the individual teacher to become implementer of effective teaching. Regarding the role of supervisors, they were part of the technical level in schools. As such they were concerned primarily with teaching and learning; they were first and foremost teachers-master, not administrators. School based instructional supervision was a basic component of school management. It can play an important role in the improvement of teaching - learning process.

According to Eye and Meltzer (1995) supervision was that phase of school administration which dealt primarily with the achievement of the appropriate selected instructional expectation of

educational service (Newton, 1992 and Ali, 1998). Modern school sited supervision was positively oriented, democratic, objective, creative in nature and systematic in approach; it also promoted the spirit of finding out facts through experimentation and continued evaluation (Govinda and Shahjahan, 1999). To achieve these expected outcomes, we need to have well selected curriculum; and improved instructional situations and professionally motivated and competent teachers. Of all, the one which is the main input and important is the teacher who needs effective instructional support. The relevant and quality education can be provided for the learners by engaging a well trained and professionally developed teachers at all levels of education. It is meaningless to build schools and distributed educational materials without effective and efficient human power that can transmit the educational content to learners.

It is believed that the improvement of schools would not be accomplished without improving Teachers' education. The quality of teachers education is determined by the provision of adequate supervision support from supervisors. The realization of professional competence of teachers and the quality of education remains questionable unless due emphasis is given from different level education officials to implement school based instructional supervision program effectively.

The implementation of the above skills and abilities were that supervisors were expected to play various roles such as, they required to create a conducive atmosphere in the school by coordinating the staff, arranging seminars or workshops within the school system, visited classroom and conducted conferences, gave the necessary solution to teachers in the light of instruction improvement and learners growth, provided professional support for teachers and heads of the school department through demonstrations, facilitations of workshops, helped to adjust a new situation through planned orientation participation in social disciplinary problems, act as effective link agents and to inform schools of decisions made by the center concerning instruction and to inform the center reality in school setting as explained by Haile (2006). The expansion of schools and school system along with shortage of adequately prepared teachers increased the need for the supervision of instruction (present instructional supervision programs). The initial process, the supervisors directly involved in classroom teaching activity. Through this approach, the school based supervisors were able to gain a more reliable view; instructional process was more realistic in proposing change and improvement in the function of the teachers. Also, this made the accountability for the progress of the children and a shared concern among teachers and the supervisions (Govinda and Tapan, 1999). Ministry of Education (2002) stated supervision as the process in which supervisors provided professional support for the school principals and teachers to strengthen the teaching and learning process. In light of this, MoE

(2010) stated that, in its Education Sector Development Program, has stressed the necessity of teacher supervision and support as a strategy to ensure quality of teaching and learning.

On the other hand, school principals, deputy principals, heads of department and senior teachers are categorized under the actors of school based supervision (MoE, 2002). Since these school based supervisors were within the schools, they were responsible to assist teachers closely and continuously for the improvement of the instruction. Because, teaching learning process is a day- to-day activity, which was carried out by teachers in schools.

The problems that teachers encountered while they were teaching can also be solved through instructional supervisors. In order to bring effective education through the improved teaching learning process, school based supervision were democratic and cooperative and get serious attention in the school. According to Hailesilassie (2007), School based supervisions developed and explicated a system of in-class supervision that in competent hands, were proved powerful enough to give supervisor a reasonable hope of accomplishing significant improvements in the teachers classroom instruction and secondly, it had the purpose of helping correct the neglect of class and to establish it as necessary complement to out of class (general supervision).

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

Working for student progress towards the established standards and facilitate the planning of various types of instruction are the main tasks of instructional supervisors. In line with this, supervisors should ensure that teachers are utilizing information from a variety of valid and appropriate sources before they begin planning teaching lessons. Teachers should use different techniques of teaching methodology considering student background, academic levels, and interests, as well as other data from student records to a certain academic needs and to facilitate planning for appropriate initial learning. As different literatures indicated that, instructional supervisors play critical and undeniable role for the success of school organization (Certo, 2006:3). Similarly, it is indicated that, the cluster supervisors were expected to play great role in assuring the quality of education. The provision of quality education needs cooperative and jointed efforts of different stakeholders and communities. It is the concurrent responsibility of federal, regional and Woreda governments; GEQIP Plan (MoE, 2008). Moreover, the researcher has a personal experience as a teacher; and principal of secondary schools and believes that the existence of gap between what was demanded and what they were really doing. In addition, research findings related to the past supervision in schools indicated that there are some problems with its practice. To list some; opportunities that help to improve teaching and learning process were inadequate, training programs were not relevant to real professional

development of teachers, there was no properly designed systematic follow up and support systems (Getachew, 2001 and Chanyalew, 2005).

According to Oliva, ( 2005), the way teachers perceive instructional supervision in schools and classrooms was an important factor that determines the outcomes of supervision process. In addition, previous research and publications revealed that because of its evaluative approaches; less experienced teachers have more negative perceptions on the practice of instructional supervision than more experienced teachers. They consider instructional supervisors as fault finders; they fear that supervisors will report their weaknesses to the school administrator and consider supervision as nothing value to offer to them and controller of their task and punish them with their faults. The research conducted by Gashaw (2008) on the practice of primary school supervisors at national level indicated; ineffectiveness of primary school supervisors in providing support to teachers.

So, research conducted on the practice of instructional supervision of primary schools at national level recommended further investigations regarding the problems that impede supervisory practices (Gashaw, 2008). In light with this, the researcher look into the gaps that affects the improvement of quality education on the side of instructional supervision practices as; education officers and principals did not exert much effort for the success of instructional improvement of teachers with the help of instructional supervisors; instructional supervisors did not design various interventions to assist teachers improve their limitations; instructional supervisors did not provide professional support to teachers to improve their instructional skills; instructional supervisors did not conduct training need assessment from the basis of teachers' pedagogical gaps; beginner teachers did not use student centered /Active learning/ teaching methodology rather simply use lecture methods and instructional supervisors did not link the schools with the local NGOs, communities and other stakeholders to solve and to get financial problems.

According to Adam, (2003), thus the major tool for improving school effectiveness and educational outcomes is school-based supervision In this regard, supervision referred to the action of professional educator that were exercised the purpose of the improving instruction Dull, (1991). According to the REB'S and schools supervision documents, supervision is an activity in the school process where teachers visited in the classroom without prior arrangement or even notification. This was with a few to judge and find faults with teachers.

In addition to that, the researcher has been frequently observing and hearing many high school teachers in the zone talking about their dissatisfaction in supervision and support service being left to them, and they do not seem to have positive attitude to the school

based supervisors. They mostly associate supervisors to evaluate teachers work efficiency it may be for carrier structure only and it is not on the base of enhancing students' achievement. Others still perceive them as intruders who visit school to implement the result oriented evaluation policy. These inappropriate perception of school based supervision make the schools ineffective and inefficient. In addition, any attempts made by external supervisory personnel become meaningless unless school-based supervision strength and shaped to provide effective instruction in the school level. Then, functional supervisory practice has been forgotten and less emphasis was given to it and the school-based supervision did not provide the proper service expected from it. As a result, the result of students was below expected.

In Ethiopia, attention was currently given to the provision and quality of education at all levels. As illustrated by the Ministry of Education (2002), the school principals, vice principals, department heads, and senior teachers should take major responsibility in supervisory practices within their schools. These responsible partners involved themselves in the regular observation of teachers and the organizing of short-term training and experience sharing to maximize the professional competence of teachers, and thus contributed for the quality of education. The findings of different researches conducted by Chanyalew (2005), Atiklt (2008) and Million, (2010:23), there are two approaches of organization of supervision in Ethiopia, that help effective and efficient achievement of the intended objectives. These are, out of school supervision and school based supervision. Out of school supervision is given by the Ministry of Education, Regional Education Bureau, Woreda Education Office and Cluster Resource Centers. Further, Million indicated that, for each cluster center, the Woreda designated one supervisor who should report to Woreda education. on the practice of instructional supervision in secondary schools of different Zones and Regions of our country have shown that, there was lack of awareness on utilizing various supervisory options, lack of relevant continuous trainings for department heads and senior teachers who were supposed to carry out supervisory activities at school level and also there was inadequate classroom observation to monitor teachers' instructional improvement. In addition to this, the researcher look in detail of the challenges faced on instructional supervisors; like that of overburdened by other works; teaches the same credits with other teachers, highly responsible than teachers; not accepted by teachers or that of teachers challenge them to accept comments and did not get support from woreda education officers with lack of enough instructional guidelines.

So, relentless efforts were being made to alleviate the listed problems for the success of instructional supervision. Besides, from the experience of the researcher, a large number of school supervisors seemed to devote most of their time in routine statistical data report activities

rather than systematic identifications of teachers' skill gap and support of teachers on their instructional activities. Besides, the current initiation for quality of education further rationalized the researcher to deal in the area under discussion, as supervision was a quality monitoring tool. Due to this reason, the researcher intended to assess the practices and challenges of instructional supervision by answering the following basic research questions about the practices and challenges of school based instructional supervision in secondary schools.

### **1.3. Research Questions**

1. What are the current practices of school based instructional supervision in secondary schools?
2. What are the roles of school based instructional supervision in enhancing learning teaching process and students' progress?
3. What school based instructional supervisory activities are exercised in the school?
4. What are the challenges that affect the effectiveness of school-based supervision?

### **1.4. Objectives of the Study**

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

The general objective of the study was to investigate the practices and challenges of school based instructional supervision in secondary school of West Hararghe zone, Oromia Regional state.

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

The specific objectives of the study were to:-

1. Assess the current practices of school based instructional supervision in secondary schools.
2. Identify the roles of teachers and school-based supervisory personnel about the function of school based supervision in enhancing learning teaching process and students' progress.
3. Analyses the major problems that limits the role of school-based instructional supervision.
4. Distinguish the major efforts that have been taken to increase effectiveness of school based supervision and show appropriate directions and suggestions to improve school-based instructional supervision.

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

The finding of the study will have significance in various aspects. The result of this study will serve as an input for different levels of educational experts: for secondary schools, woredas and zone education office to know the current practices and challenges of school based instructional supervision in secondary schools and helped them to do their share to improve the practices of school-based supervision in schools; it assisted the school-based supervisors to identify their weaknesses and strengths on supervisory practices and then encouraged them to

give more attention to properly implement supervisory activities in secondary schools; It helped teachers to have positive perception on the school-based instructional supervision and made mutual agreement with school based supervisors in developing their professional competence.

In addition to this, it will assist school principals to know factors affecting school based supervisors and facilitated situation for school based supervisors in order to conduct school based instructional supervision effectively and efficiently in the study areas of secondary schools. It will help students to get effective and efficient learning - teaching process in the schools, it helped as a springboard for other researchers who want to conduct further research in the area of supervision for effective learning – teaching activities. Moreover, any educational research carried out to meet certain values in one way or another. Therefore, the finding of the study will be expected to improve the achievement of students and it hoped that the result was being significant in view of the following facts. It will create awareness about the functional supervision i.e. school-based supervision; it provided additional information to those interested in conducting further investigation in the area of school-based instructional supervision, supervisors to assess their supervisory function that will enabled them to take the necessary measures, informing school based instructional supervisor and other stakeholders about teacher's awareness, expectations and orientation to school-based instructional supervision service and thereby reacted accordingly and helped educational officers at regional, Zonal, woreda and school levels to predict the effect of supervision problems on the deterioration of education and hence, they took a responsive measures. School based instructional supervision focused on the improvement of learning teaching process that revealed excellent students' performance. Therefore, the researcher believes that the result of this study will have a paramount value and might be applicable to the secondary schools, to the communities and other stakeholders in the WHZ.

### **1.6. Delimitations of the Study**

The scope of study was limited geographically to secondary schools of West Hararghe zone Oromia regional state. This was because of the geographically widening location of the area, the manageability of the study in terms of resources, time, cost and other constraints. This zone had fifteen woredas and two town administrations and has 24 secondary schools (grade 9-10) to make the study more manageable, feasible and obtain relevant and sufficient information, it was delimited to only eight secondary schools in the zone. These are; Gelemso, Oda Bultum, Baddesa, Gemachis Boke tiko, Charchar, Asebot and Hardim secondary schools. The subject of study were

principals, vice principals, supervisors, department heads and sampled teachers. This study mainly focused and delimited to practices and challenges of school based instructional supervision in secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone, Oromia regional state.

### **1.7. Limitation of the Study**

It was obvious that research work did not totally free from limitations. One apparent limitation was that most of the secondary school principals, vice principals, unit leaders; teachers and supervisors were busy and had no time to respond to questionnaires and interview. Some of them who have time were also unwilling to fill in and return the questionnaires as per the required time. Another limitation, the researcher was unable to get data from document. Since, there was no much written document by school based supervisors in the study area. And also absence of internet access, review of related literature and other reference materials which helped the researcher during the work.

Again, due to financial and time constraints, the writer failed to compare and contrast school based instructional supervision in the target group with other zones. Secondly, the study did not supplemented by other instruments like observation and group discussion. Yet, practical matters i.e. time and money. However, to overcome these limitations the researcher used different systems those were using extra time when the respondents free from their work, assigning coordinator to collect the questionnaires.

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

**Challenges** –problems that affect school based instructional supervision in secondary school.

**Instructional Supervision-** Supervisory activities and practices related to the improvement of instruction. Such as process of supervising a teacher in an instructional setting often involves direct assistance to improve the strategies of classroom practice through observation and evaluation of teacher performance.

**School-Based Supervision-** the central elements of the school function is what is happens in the classroom, all activities of teaching-learning takes place at school, so that, school-based supervision is important for monitoring the quality of education and its consequences in ensuring the effective and efficient outcome of the school.

**Secondary Schools-** in this context an educational level which includes grades 9-12, that includes the first and second cycle together.

**Supervision-** means to guide and stimulate the activities of teachers with a view to improving them, i.e. teaching as well as instructional and promoting professional growth.

**Practices:** doing well activities in the school through learning teaching process repeatedly in order to improve performance through instructional supervision.

### **1.9. Organization of the Study**

This thesis is organized into seven chapters. The first chapter contained the introduction part which consisted of; background, statement of the problem, objectives, significances, delimitations, limitations, concepts of operational key terms and organization of the Study. The second chapter contained review of related literature pertinent to the research. The third chapter dealt about research methodology that incorporated: research design and method, source of data, population, sample size and sampling technique, instrument and procedures of data collection, methods of data analysis and ethical consideration. The fourth chapter concerned with the results and discussion of important issues. Whereas chapter five presented summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study. Finally, chapter six and seven are the list of reference materials used for conducting the study and questionnaires and interview questions were annexed at the end respectively.

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

In order to get an insight in to the problem, to examine the nature of instructional supervision, the student researchers made an attempt to review the literature related to the study. This chapter therefore, treats the following major topics related to instructional supervision:- historical development of supervision, Principle of supervision, the Function of supervision, the role of supervision, nature and characteristics of modern supervision, responsible person and their duties in school based supervisory program, challenges in school-based supervision practice and the role

of supervision in improving quality of education, the effect of instructional leadership practices related school based supervision on student's achievement, role of school based instructional principal in practicing instructional leadership and barriers for effective instructional supervision.

## 2.1. Historical Development of Educational Supervision

The world perspective; supervision is „an intervention that is provided by a senior member of a profession to a junior member or members of that same profession“. This relationship is evaluative, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the junior member(s), monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the clients she, he, or they see(s), and serving as a gatekeeper of those who are to enter the particular profession, (Bernard and Goodyear, 1998).

Supervision has gone through many changes caused by the political, social, religious and industrial forces. Supervision as a field of educational practice emerged slowly, "did not fall from the sky fully formed" (<http://www.education.State.university.com/pages/2472/supervision>). Likewise, Surya indicated the development of supervision through different periods as shown in the following figure Supervision has gone through many metamorphoses and changes have occurred in the field that its practices are affected by political, social, religious, and industrial forces exist at different periods (Oliva, 2005). Accordingly, the following table discusses the major worldwide periods of supervision.

The Development of Supervision through Different Periods: World perspective

Period	Type of Supervision	Purpose	Person Responsible
1620-1850	Inspection	Monitoring rules, looking for deficiencies	Parents, clergy, selectmen
1850-1910	Inspection, instructional improvement	Maintaining rules, helping teachers improve	Superintendents, principal
1910-1930 ,	Scientific, bureaucratic	Improving instruction and efficiency	Supervising principals, supervisors
1950-1975	Bureaucratic, scientific, clinical, human relations, human resource, democratic	Improving instruction	Principals, central office supervisors, school based supervisors
1975-1985	Scientific, clinical, human relations, collaborative, colligial, peercoaching mentor, artistic,	Improving instruction, increasing teacher satisfaction, expanding students' understanding of classroom events	Principals, central office supervisors, school based supervisors, participative, mentor

1985-present	interpretative Scientific, clinical human relations, collaborative, collegial, peer coaching mentor, artistic, interpretative, culturally responsive	Improving instruction, increasing teacher satisfaction, creating learning communities, expanding students' classroom events, analyzing cultural and linguistic patterns in the classroom	School based supervisors, peer coaching mentor, principals, central office supervisors
--------------	---	--	--

---

## 2.2 The Renewed Interest in Supervision

Today, it is symptomatic that most countries do not publish any data or statistics on supervision and support services. Not only do they not publish them they are often simply not available. Even more serious is the fact that most ministries are not able to answer and apparently simple question such as: How much is being spent on the provision of supervision and support services? This is an important question if countries are interested in spotting critical and probably small investments that could have a proportionally important impact on school efficiency.

Nevertheless, since the beginning of the 1990s, there has undoubtedly been renewed worldwide interest in issues of quality and therefore in quality monitoring and supervision. Some countries that had dismantled their supervision services earlier have re-established them such as the Philippines, while others that did not have them in the past have created them such as China and Sweden. More importantly, the number of countries that initiate a process of reorganizing and strengthening supervision services is increasing every year (Bernard and Goodyear, 1998). In most countries, there is a feeling that the rapid expansion, if not mass production, of education has led to the deterioration of quality. Consequently, quality improvement has become a top priority of policy makers, which has in turn reinforced their preoccupation with quality control. This policy interest in quality improvement was endorsed and amplified by the **education for all** world conferences of 1990 and 2000. At the same time, various studies have shown that one important determinant of the deterioration of the quality of schools precisely relates to the weakening of quality monitoring devices, including the professional supervision and support services. This explains why some countries that had dismantled their inspectorate services in the 1970s have reestablished them and also why the general interest in efficient supervision procedures has been increasing.

According to (UNESCO, 2007:6), the work of inspectors, supervisors, advisors, councilors, coordinators, facilitators etc that are located outside the school at local, regional or central level. The common characteristics of all these officers involved in the external supervision are:

(i) explicitly responsible for control and/or support; (ii) located outside the school; and (iii) the regularly visit schools. The school supervision can be both summative and formative. It provide not only summary of the performance of school but also shows the developmental directions for school. Supervisors are indicated as managers that are responsible to oversee what is going on the organization (Certo, 2006:3). Therefore, (MoE, 2012:3) indicated that, supervisors are responsible for monitoring, supporting, evaluating and linking schools, but not part of the line managers. From the above definitions it is clear that supervision include many activities targeted towards achieving educational objectives.

### 2.3 Principles of Supervision

Bar and his Colleagues, (1947) defined principles as "... aggregates of general roles of laws, concepts of fundamental truths, generally accepted tenets (beliefs)". Basic principles of supervision forwarded by scholars like (Haileslassie, 1997, include the following:

**Supervision is Attitudinal:** This principle compare that effectiveness to supervision depends up on the attitude of the supervisor and constructive attitude in the co-owner.

**Supervision is Creative:** This principle suggested that supervision should seek latent talents, provide opportunity for the existence of originality and for the development to unique contributions.

**Supervision is Cooperative:** This principle implies instead of directing attention only to the improvement of individual teachers, the cooperation efforts of the entire staff in the study of educational problems of schools is so important.

**Supervision should be them Ethically Sound:** This principle emphasize sensitivity to ultimate values, aims and polices with specific reference to their adequacy, "Facts" and law, with special emphasis given to accuracy and change and development and methods interims of changing values, clear aims and policies.

**Supervision should be Scientific:** This implies that supervision should use orderly systematic and critical methods of study as well as utilizing more objectives, precise, sufficient, important, and more expertly secured and more systematically organized data and conclusion within its province as well as its own materials and procedures.

**Supervision should be Democratic:** This suggests that supervision should provide full opportunity for cooperation and participation as well as for substation of leadership for authority. In addition to this, according to Haile Selassie, (2002) supervision is established on the following principles and beliefs to achieve the intended educational objectives.

*Supervision provides a mechanism for teachers and supervisors; supervisors must see themselves not as critics of teaching performance, but rather as collaborators with teachers; teachers should not be viewed as consumers of research, but as generators of knowledge about learning and teaching; acquiring an understanding of the learning teaching process demand the collection of many types of data. And supervisor should focus not only on individual teachers but also on groups of teachers.*

#### **2.4. The Current Practice of Educational Supervision in Ethiopia**

Education inspection was introduced into the educational system in Ethiopia about 35 years after the introduction of modern (western) type of education into the country. Although, available sources do not agree on a specific year, there is evidence to believe that school inspection was for the first time introduced in the early thirtieth (Haileselassie, 2007). Hence, supervision has been practiced in this country for long periods. However, its development was not quite sound. Besides, it seemed simply changing the terms supervision and inspection. With this in mind, the history of educational supervision has been passed through four periods. The following table briefly indicated the development of educational supervision in different periods as (Haileselassie, 2007) indicated.

**Development of Educational Supervision in different periods in Ethiopian context:**

<b>Periods</b>	<b>Types of supervision</b>	<b>Purposes</b>	<b>Person</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Period (1934-1954E.C)</b>	Administrative Inspection	-Direct inspection through visits. Collect and compile statistical data on number of students and teachers, number of classroom and class size and finally produce reports to be submitted to the Ministry of Education. -Curriculum related tasks: allocation of suitable textbooks; preparing and developing curricula for all grades. -Staff recruitment: conducting rigorous examinations and interviews to recruit teachers.	Inspector
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> period (1955-1973E.C)</b>	Instructional Supervision	The major preoccupation of supervision had been administrative. Activities such as teachers' placements and transfers, managing and coordinating national examination; assisting education officers at various levels.	Supervisor
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Period (1974-1987E.C)</b>	Administrative Inspection (re instituted)	Staff development through in-service training, establishment and strengthening of model schools and planning instructions were put as duties of inspectors. Inspectors' work was focused on administrative, financial, property and utility management. Professional help were more neglected and attention was given to administrative activities.	Inspector
<b>4<sup>th</sup> period (1986E.C to date)</b>	Democratic Educational Leadership	It is an educational program on supervision and an important aspect of educational management which envisaged as democratic educational leadership. It seeks the participation of all concerned bodies in all spheres of the educational establishment in terms of decision-making, planning and development of objectives and teaching strategies in an effort to serve the beneficiaries (students) through the continuous improvement of the teaching-learning process.	Supervisor

Source Haileselassie, (2007)

## **2.5. School Based Instructional Supervision**

Schools are the mission center where the actual teaching learning process takes place. Hence, making it a continuous responsibility at this level is crucial. Supervision within the school can be delivered by school based supervision team; that is principals, deputy principals, unit leaders' department heads and senior teachers. School based supervision committee is expected to provide support service for teachers to become smart at professional judgments, curriculum pedagogy and student's achievement (OREB, 2007).

The tasks regarding school based supervision may be performed by teachers themselves when opportunities allow them to undertake joint planning, to observe each other's lessons, individual and group meeting, workshops, projects, study groups, coaching and team works are facilitated (Ahmad 1998). Supervisors have to work effectively for effective implementation of school supervision. They need to know how supervision at school level best be implemented, by whom it will be carried out, its purpose and effect on the learning teaching process. Whatever, attempt made at any lever outside school regarding supervision; the attempt will be meaningless unless supervisory activities are strengthened at school level.

Similarly, Hailesellasie (1997) pointed out that the functional and true sense of educational supervision depends on the supervisory operation made at the grass roots level, i.e. school level. Schools are institutions where the actual instruction takes place. As instruction is continuous process, the functional of supervision at school level shall also be a continuous responsibility. In this respect, within the school system, school principals, deputy principals, department heads and school teachers are supposed to be active participants of school based instructional supervision. Hence, the contribution of each and every responsible personnel of the school can make the educational endeavor worthwhile and productive for the successful achievement of educational objectives.

## **2.6. The Role of School Based 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 coordinators, the instructional supervisor should plan with teachers' service programs for teachers in order to promote staff development. Consultant: In this case instructional supervisor serves as specialist in curriculum development, instructional methodology and special help to teachers. Group leader: helps and assists not only individual but in most case s/he helps, guides and assists group for foster group work and to improve their performance in a dynamic way. Evaluator: Instructional supervisor as evaluator

provides assistance to teachers in evaluating instruction and curriculum. This means instructional supervisors help teachers find answer to curriculum and instructional problems and conduct action research. Supervision in instructional leadership that relates perspectives to activities, clarifies purposes, contributes to 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, i.e. developing curriculum, organizing instruction, providing staff, providing facilities, providing materials, arranging for in-service education, orienting staff members, relating special pupil services, developing public relation and evaluating instruction (Beb, 1985). Giving over all instructional leadership to staff members and evaluating lesson plans of teachers and instructions and conducting classroom supervision to ensure the application of the lesson plan and ensuring the curriculum of the school addresses the needs of the local communities. Able to promote, support and create conducive environment for learning teaching process through observing, managing, evaluating Instructional curriculum and activities in the school and giving feedback to the teachers. Monitoring and assessing instructional programs and promote shared decision making and collaborative culture of learning communities. And also work on teachers' promotion and transfer and orienting new and beginner teachers' through tutoring, guiding and educating them. Promote in service teacher training program at school level.

## **2.7. Instructional Leadership Practices in Improving Students' Achievement**

Effective instructional leadership requires a combination of practices that are used together to instruction. Now a day's rapidly changing the world becoming a leader of leaders is achieved through learning and working with teachers, students, parents and school communities to improve instructional quality. Goal setting and problem solving become site-based, collective and cooperative activities. The leadership of the principal is pivotal in ensuring that the process is informed of all school issues, especially those which related to student instruction. Before initiating any practices leaders need to attend first to the context of instructional leadership as defined by school climate, relationships, collaborative structures and goals and expectations. Second, leaders must define the target for the instructional change. Improvement must have a clear agenda and focus.

Accordingly the principals developed a plan at the school level that they shared among the school members to communicate school mission and vision, however, being able to communicate for work, getting the accomplishment of common dreams and above all needs the agreement of all school members (Sergiovanni, 2001). The ultimate goal of schooling is learning on the part of the

students; what they learn, how they learn, however, depends on the teachers performance, which is a product of many factors, such as their commitment, their professional growth, school environment, prevailing culture, teachers innovativeness etc. All these factors have connections directly and indirectly with the principals' action or inaction. Promoting teachers' professional development, according to Sheppard (1996), is the most influential instructional leadership behavior at high school levels. Therefore, to be successful instructional leaders, the principals must give primary attention to the program of staff improvement, which comprises leadership techniques and procedures designed to change the teachers' role performance.

The principal is expected to provide the appropriate leadership which will assist each staff member make a maximum contribution to the school effort to provide the quality and up to date education. He/ she will expect to have experience in this area because according to Sergianni (1996) after all, knowledge about teaching learning and ability to share these insights with teachers is a key factor in any good principal selection process. The rarely specify how these characteristics and action interact, how they shape, enable sustain high performance of teachers and students.

## **2.8. Challenges in School Based Supervision**

Onoyase (1991) and Akpotu (2006) identified the current challenges of affecting effective of school based supervision in education centers are the following: supervisory services are poorly funded by government at all level; the period allocated for supervision is inadequate for effective supervision and supervisors are fault finders. Goals of education can only be 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).

## **2.9. Leadership Capabilities Required to Instructional Supervision**

The skill in the instructional leadership is the major characteristics of effective and successful educational manager. Therefore, to be effective secondary school principals should also be effective instructional leaders who can look outside the school for exemplary practices or new approaches, and use outside experts to build instructional capacity inside the school. According to Cotton (2003), effective instructional leadership exhibits the following characteristics. Create a safe environment for trainers to take risks, experiment and continue learning. This means they build more supportive relationship with trainers and foster an environment that valued the exploration and improvement of the craft of training and emphasizing collaboration and communication. This means, effective instructional leaders focused on strong relationship

engaging staff members. Develop consistent sets of expectations and incentives for trainers that keep the entire staff to focus on meeting college wide goals. That means effective instructional leaders have clear goals with trainers about their expectations. And publically acknowledge trainers efforts to implement new strategies. Participate frequently and meaningfully in classroom and in workshops. Effective and strong instructional leaderships visit workshops and classrooms on a daily or almost daily basis.

Generally, effective instructional leaders allocate regular blocks of time for instructional managerial and political matters. Moreover, they should facilitate development programs for trainers and they involve in all research and learning teaching activities of the college (Brewster and Klump 2005). However the problem continues to exist due to the failure of education officers to monitor schools effectively.

### **2.9.1. Knowledge of Instructional leader**

Inherent in the concept of an instructional leader is the notion that learning should be given top priority while everything else revolves around the enhancement of learning which indisputably characteristics of any educational endeavor. Hence to have credibility as an instructional leader, the principal should also be a practicing teacher. For example in United Kingdom most principals spend an average of 20% of their time in a week on teaching (Weindling 1990). School based Instructional leaders need to know what is going on in the classroom; an opportunity “to walk the factory floor”. Many times principals are not in touch with what is going at the classroom level and are unable to appreciate some of the problems teachers and students encounter. The tendency is to address instructional issues from the perspective when they were teachers.

Principals need to work closely with students, developing teaching techniques and methods as a means for understanding teacher’s perspectives and for establishing a base on which to make curricular decisions. Also, a teaching principal strengthen believes that the sole purpose of the schools is to serve the educational needs of students. (Whitaker 1997) identify four skills essential for instructional leadership. First, they need to be a resource provider. It is not enough for principals to know the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty but also recognize teacher desire to be acknowledged and appreciated for a job well done.

Second, they need to be instructional resources. Teachers count on their principals as resources of information on current trends and effective instructional practices. Instructional leaderships are tuned into issues relating to curriculum, effective pedagogical strategies and assessment. Third, they need to be good communicators. Effective instructional leaders need to communicate essential beliefs regarding learning such as the conviction that all children can learn and no child should be left behind. Finally, they need to create a visible presence. Leading the instructional

program of a school means a commitment to living and breathing a vision success in learning and teaching. This includes focusing learning objectives, modeling behaviors of learning and designing programs and activities on instruction.

Generally, principals do not see themselves as instructional leaders and many are of the belief that anything that has to do with learning and teaching is best assigned to teachers. In some cases principal feels inadequate to initiate and develop instructional programs given the assortment of subject areas taught with each having its own pedagogical uniqueness.

### **2.9.2. Skills of Instructional Leader**

Interpersonal skills are essential for the success of being a principal. These are skills that maintain trust, encourage motivation and give collegiality. Relationships are built on trust and tasks are accomplished through motivation and empowerment where teachers are involved in planning, designing and evaluating instructional program. Empowerment leads to ownership and commitment as teachers identify the problems and design strategies themselves. Collegiality promotes sharing, cooperating and collaboration, in which both the principal and the teachers talk about learning and teaching. Planning begins with clear identification of goals or vision to work towards as well as induce commitment and enthusiasm. Observing instruction (supervision) aims' to provide teachers with feedback to consider and reflect upon.

But teachers should make their own judgment and reach their own conclusions. Research and evaluation skills are needed to critically question the success of instructional programmers initiated and one of the useful skills would be action research. The task of being an instructional leader is both complex and multidimensional. If principals believe that growth in students learning is the primary goal of schooling, then it is a task worth learning. If a principal processes these knowledge and skills he or she is likely become an effective leaders sharing, facilitating and guiding decisions about instructional empowerment for the betterment of students' education.

Therefore, practices related to defining the school's mission include overseeing the development of specific school goals and ensuring they are communicated clearly to all members of the school community. The practices central to managing the instructional program are supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum and monitoring students' progress. At the heart of this model, however, is the final category of the practice promoting a positive school learning climate, which includes protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers and providing incentive for learning.

## **2.10. The Roles of School Principal in Instructional Supervision**

The school principal in his/her capacity as instructional leader, his/her responsibilities would be: creating a conducive environment to facilitate supervisory activities in the school by organizing all necessary resources; giving the professional assistance and guidance to teachers to enable them to realize instructional objectives; and supervise classes when and deemed necessary; coordinating evaluation of teaching-learning process and the outcome through initiation of active participation of staff members and local community at large; coordinating of the staff members of the school and other professional educators to review and strengthen supervisory activities and cause the evaluation of the school community relations and on the basis of evaluation results strive to improve and strengthen such relations (MoE,2002).

## **2.11. The Roles of Deputy Principals in Instructional Supervision**

Besides assisting the principal of the school in carrying the above responsibilities, the school vice-principal is expected to handle the following responsibilities: giving over all instructional leadership to staff members; evaluating lesson plans of teachers and conducting classroom supervision to ensure the application of lesson plans and ensuring that the curriculum of the school addresses the needs of the local community (MoE, 2002).

## **2.12. The Roles of Department Heads in Instructional Supervision**

Because of their accumulated knowledge, skills and abilities in the particular subject as well as in the overall educational system acquired through long services/experience; the department heads have the competence to supervise educational activities. Therefore, the supervisory functions to be undertaken by the department heads are: coordinating the supervisory activities their respective departments and evaluating teachers' performance; arranging on the job orientation and socialization programs to newly assigned teachers in the respective departments; initiating and promoting group participation in the planning; implementation and decision making of the instruction and in the evaluation of instructional outcomes; selecting and organizing teaching materials and making them available for use by teachers; encouraging teachers to conduct action research so as to improve and develop subjects they teach and methods of teaching .

They are organizing model teaching programs for inexperienced (junior) teachers, staff members by imitating senior staff members from the departments; coordinating evaluation to the department curriculum and organize workshops, conferences, seminars, etc, to tackle identified problems of the curriculum and; encouraging staff members to conduct meetings

regularly to make periodic evaluations of their activities and to seek solutions for instructional problems (MoE, 2002).

### **2.13. The Roles of Senior Teachers in Instructional Supervision**

According to the career structure developed by Ministry of Education on the basis of Ethiopian Education and Training Policy of 1994, High-ranking teacher, Associate, Head teacher and Head teacher are considered as senior teachers. Thus, such teachers because of their accumulated experience in specific subject area/areas are well positioned to supervise other teachers within their department (MoE, 2002).

### **2.14. Barriers for Effective Instructional Leadership**

Many contextual factors positively affect school performance. However, the type as well as the intensity of the problem is not the same in every school. Shortage of highly educated manpower is found as a critical problem for these advanced countries, while scarcity of resource for more investment in education has created a dividing line between those developed and developing nations in the world (Bush and Bell, 2003). For instance, incompetence in educational leadership, lack of incentive for teachers problem related with teachers transfer or promotion, lack of administrative skills and commitment of these assigned as school leaders, shortage of educational materials or finance are among problems mentioned as factors that hinder effective performance of leaders.

#### **2.14.1. Lack of skills and training**

Beyond the personal traits of a leader, there are specific skills someone must master if they want to be a leader; Effective communication- it's more than just being able to speak and write. A leader's communication must move people to work towards the goal the leader has chosen. Motivation- a leader has to be able to motivate everyone to contribute something. Each of us has different 'buttons'. A leader knows how to push the right buttons on everyone to make them really want to their best to the leader's goal and Planning- the leader has a plan to achieve the goal. He/ she will not get bogged down in the detail, which are what managers are for, but rather uses a high level plan to keep everyone moving together towards the goal. However, lack of knowledge, skills and abilities of instructional leader, what (Sergiovanni, 2001) calls technical human and educational forces are essential properties that instructional leaders have to possess. Because leader without adequate skills and training in educational leadership and teachers without continuous professional development can do little/ has no contribution for the improvement of students' learning.

#### **2.14.2. Lack of cooperation of staffs and other school members**

Teachers' cooperation is mandatory for the effective instructional leadership practices because the cooperation of all school communities such as teachers, students, parents and PTA can be available in the school compound where the leaders exercise demographic leadership. Often, principals seem too busy with all the day-to-day responsibilities of running their schools that they will not seem to have enough time to practice instructional leadership as expected. Many situations and environmental factors other than human, materials and financial assets, can affect the operation of instructional leadership practice of any school. Yet, cooperation of teachers is primary needs servant's leadership (Harries and Muijis, 2005).

#### **2.14.3. Lack of time**

Principals have multiple roles they play, information over loaded, paper work too reports, many non-academic demands and work over load consume much of the principals' time. Hence, only principal's committed to instructional improvement can also choose and use their time for the enhancement of classroom instruction and teachers' development (Chang, 2007).

#### **2.14.4. Lack of cooperation from supervisor, school board and community**

Supervision is conducted by experienced and skilled principal and educational experts in the woreda office in order to assist less advanced teachers to improve learning and teaching process, and to develop the knowledge and skills to be able to practices effectively instructional leadership in secondary schools. But lack of adequate resource of all type and support from central office discourage instructional leaders. Bureaucratic management that hinders timely assessment of the human, materials and financial resources required can restrict the success of the schools and limits the development of the teachers (Bell and Bush, 2003). Therefore, high cooperation and good commitment from the supervisor, schools board and communities for the practices of instructional leadership functions is found to be highly and closely connected with teachers' sense of efficacy, sense of community and professional interest. It validates the use of teachers' affective and attitudinal outcomes as the direct outcomes of instructional leadership.

Further studies of principals' instructional leadership may include teachers, affective and attitudinal outcomes as well as students' academic achievement. The relationship among these three parts may reveal the complicated schooling process and the finding may give hint for administrators to improve school effectiveness. In summary, goal of education can only be 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 and for check and balance by regular and effective supervision or inspection (Ochuba, 2008). Considering education as element for

economic, social and technological development, many countries invest enough and sustainable amount of their national resources for the improvement of their education.

For instance, Association for the Development of Education in Africa (1998) supervision is a developmental approach where a practitioner assists a client to carry out an assignment more easily and more effectively in order to achieve improved results. In the same way, the federal government recognizing the role of education in developing other sectors has given much emphasis for the improvement of the sector by under taking of teachers' continuous professional development program and others (Ministry of education, 2007). So the discussion which will be made in the study have shade light on the conceptual frame work and dimension of instructional leadership focusing on; developing and communicating vision and mission of the school, coordinating curriculum and instruction to improve students' progress, influence of instructional leadership practices on learning and teaching and students' progress, factors that hinder the effective instructional leadership practices in the schools, effort made by principals and concerned bodies to improve instructional practices.

### **2.15. Problems of Instructional Supervision**

According to, Bernard and Goodyear, (1998) stated that a supervisor will not be able to carry out instructional evaluation effectively if he/she is not well qualified and trained in techniques of evaluation; a sound up date knowledge of the subject matter, a good organizing skill, and ready to accept teachers idea and interest. Scholars, (Danielson and McGreal, 2000) cited limited supervisors experience and a lack of skills as being problems in teacher supervision. He also reported that supervisors did not have enough training in providing constructive feedback while maintaining relationships. According to, Cogan, (1973), one of the most important factors that affect supervision effectiveness is the "un clarified, ambivalent relation of teachers to supervisors". He goes on to say that "teachers as a whole saw the supervisor's job as effectively to bar himself from many areas of direct action with the teacher out of fear of arousing resentment and distrust".

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

This chapter deals with methodology and procedures that followed to accomplish the study. So it presents; description of the study area, research design, source of data, sample and sampling techniques, tools of data collection, procedures of data collection and methods of data analysis and interpretation.

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

The study was conducted in selected secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone Oromia Regional State that located in the Eastern part of Ethiopia. West Hararghe zone is bounded in the West by Arsi Zone, in the North Afar Zone, in the East, East Hararghe Zone and in the South Bale Zone. The capital city of the Zone is Chiro and located about 326 km from Addis Ababa to its Eastern direction. West Hararghe is one of the 20 Zones of Oromia Region. Based on the 2007 censuses conducted by the CAS, the total population of the Zone is 1,787,086, within an estimated area of 17,552.23 square kilometers. The Zone has 15 Woredas and 2 administrative towns. Coffee and Chat is the backbone of farmers' income as cash crops with significant agricultural and pastoral areas supporting of livelihood of the majority of the population.

The current Zone education office statistics shows that there were 24 secondary schools with total student population of 13,224 male 6,860 female total 20,084 and 12 preparatory schools with an enrollment of student population 2635 male 790 female total 3425 students. The Zone has also 615 primary schools with total enrollment of 342,825 male 266,507 female total 609,332. There are also three governments owned and eight private owned TVET institutions found in the Zone. (Statistics of Zonal Educational Office 2008).

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

The purpose of this study was assessing the current school based instructional supervision practices and challenges in secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone Oromia Regional State. The researcher used the descriptive survey design, because it was assumed to be an appropriate design to get an exact description of the current practices of school based instructional supervision in the school. Assessment of facts using descriptive survey research method, as

Sharma (2000), allowed the description of the present status of a given phenomenon. According to Dabali (2010) such design was used to generate views and opinion of the respondents and indicated a clear picture of the situations, practices, experiences. It also allowed the collection of quantitative and qualitative data through wide range of questionnaires. Moreover, descriptive method as Best and Kahn (2004), state, it was widely applied in the discipline of social science when gathering detailed data or facts from large population at a particular time. Hence the goal of this study was examined, to what extent and how the principals' instructional supervision behaviors were practiced within the context of school program.

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

The researcher used both primary and secondary sources of data for his study.

#### **3.3.1. Primary Sources of Data**

The primary sources of data were gathered from different resources that might have adequate exposure to school based instructional supervision. This included the selected secondary schools principals, vice principals, supervisors, department heads, secondary school teachers.

#### **3.3.2. Secondary Sources of Data**

Secondary sources of data were gathered from the school documents, different plans, records of school based instructional supervision activities; such as school based supervision plan, checklist, reports, feedbacks and comments were given by school based instructional supervision and other concerned bodies and guidelines. These all files were observed to strengthen the data gathered through questionnaires and interviews.

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

The populations of the present study were secondary school teachers, principals, vice-principals, supervisors and department heads. Out of 24 secondary schools of WHZ, eight of them were selected using simple random sampling technique through numbering system. The selected woredas are as follow:-Boke Tiko, Hardim, Gelemso. Oda Bultum, Bedesa Gemachis, Charcher and Asebot. The principals, vice-principals, department heads and supervisors were selected using purposive sampling techniques and teachers were selected using simple random sampling techniques. Regarding all these, a total population of 300, there would be 88 (35.27%) teachers, 6 (100%) supervisors, 8(100%) principals, 11(100%) vice-principals and 17(50%) department heads were selected from secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone and summarized in table 1 below.

No	School s name	Sup	P	V.P	Dept.H	Teachers	Total
----	------------------	-----	---	-----	--------	----------	-------

		P	S	P	S	P	S	P	S	P	S	Pop	Sa
1	Asebot	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	13	6	19	11
2	Gelemso	1	1	1	1	2	2	4	2	45	15	53	21
3	Hardim	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	14	5	21	10
4	Karra	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	19	8	22	13
5	Boke Tiko	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	25	12	32	17
6	Baddesa	1	1	1	1	2	2	5	2	42	17	51	23
7	Gemachis	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	23	8	30	13
8	Charchar	1	1	1	1	2	2	5	3	63	17	72	24
Total		8	8	8	8	11	11	34	17	244	88	300	132
Percent		100		100		100		58		36		42	
						0				06		27	
Techniques used	Purposive					Purposive	SRS		SRS				

Table 1. Summary of Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques

Sup= supervisors, P= principal, V.P=vice principal, SRS-simple random sampling

P=population, S=sample,

### 3.5. Data Collection Instruments

The relevant data required for the study was collected through questionnaires, interviews and document analysis.

#### 3.5.1. Questionnaire

Based on the review related literature questionnaires were constructed in order to assess school based instructional supervision practices and its challenges in selected secondary schools. It were prepared in order to collect data from principals, vice principals, supervisors, department heads and teachers. The questionnaires contained two parts. The first part concerned about the respondents background and the second part dealt with practices and challenges of school-based instructional supervision. Statements were constructed a five point Likert scale. The five point scale ranged from very strongly agree to strongly disagree, (1 to 5) points. In the scales, agree to very strongly agree represent the effective implementation of the item in the dimension. Similarly disagree to very disagree represents the low level of implementation dimension as a whole. It was recognized that pilot testing was allowed fresh 'eyes' to comment on stability and clarity of questionnaires. For example, Wilkinson and Birmingham (2003) have stated that usually mistakes were quickly spotted through piloting; ambiguous questions can be retested and redeveloped in. Therefore, to ensure the reliability of the instruments the researcher conducted the pilot test on 25 teachers in Gelemso secondary school which were not included in the sample.

Then, the researcher used Cronbach alpha to calculate the reliability of the instruments. Before distributing the questionnaire, all questionnaires critically commented and examined by advisors and expertise of the Education behavioral science department, Haramaya University to check validation of the instruments. But based on the comment given, sequences of the items, vague question and confusing items were modified and restructured to make the questionnaires clear and ready for the final study and in light of the advisor opinion and also the item of the questionnaires were improved in terms of language, format and contents. Based on these, the reliability of the item, status of SBIS is  $\alpha=.949$ , for item roles of SBIS in enhancing learning teaching process is  $\alpha=.884$ , for item teachers' perception of school based supervision is  $\alpha=.920$  and for item challenges of school based supervision is  $\alpha=.838$  and the average  $\alpha=0.897$ .

Table 2. Summary of Reliability Tests

No	Group of items	No of Items	Alpha Value( $\alpha$ )
1	1	10	0.949
2	2	7	0.884
3	3	8	0.920
4	4	10	0.838
<b>Total</b>		35	0.89775

### 3.5.2. Interview guide

Interviews were used by the researcher in order to get supplementary information to validate the information obtained from the questionnaires. The How instructional supervision monitors, supervises, guide and evaluate and help teachers on the teaching learning activities. researcher used interview questions because of the flexibility and to make clear any time there was ambiguity (Cohan Mnian, 1995), Therefore, the student researcher interviewed 4 supervisors, 5 principals, 7 vice principals, 5 department Heads and 8 teachers one times each of them recording it using tape recording.

### 3.5.3. Document analysis

Document analysis were used to collect appropriate information to investigate the existing school-based instructional supervision practices in each school with reference to principals, vice principals and supervisors that dealt with instructions and teachers' development activities. It served as means of triangulation of data. Interview and document analysis were used together with questionnaires to triangulate the questionnaires responses. The analyzed documents are schools' and supervisors' annual plan, records on the supervision, time table for supervision, guidelines for instructional supervision and checklists.

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

The questionnaires initially developed in view of the basic research questions of the study. Before it was administered to respondents, a pretest was carried out in Gelemso secondary school to ensure its validity, reliability and language clarity. At last, these questionnaires were set in their final forms. In addition, interview guide questions were developed. Convenient time was chosen for the respondents to maximize the quality of the response. Then after giving a short orientation, the questionnaires were distributed to the respective sources by the researcher and collected data in collaboration with the instructional leaders, supervisors and assigned teachers for this purpose in each secondary school. In addition, the interview time was arranged to the selected bodies to be interviewed. While the interpretation the five point rating scales were, (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) agree and (5) strongly agree were used. The qualitative data was collected through open ended questionnaires; interview and documents analysis were directly stated, presented, narrated described and the results was classified and computed to draw conclusion.

### **3.7. Methods of Data Analysis**

In order to generalize collected data, the data were analyzed. In analyzing, both qualitative and quantitative data analysis method were used. Depending on the nature of basic questions and the data collected the following data statistical techniques were employed. In order to know the practices and challenges of school based instructional supervision in secondary schools and in order to attain research objectives quantitative data were coded, tabulated, analyzed, described and interpreted. Closed ended questionnaires data from the respondents were analyzed quantitatively using the stating frequency and percentage of each item and also the rating scales were checked by significance level t-test. The data that were collected through open ended and interview questionnaires were analyzed qualitatively in narrative form. Data analysis in qualitative studies basically involved word argumentations than numerical explanations.

One can be more confident with the result if different methods lead to the same result. The aim of triangulation was used to cross check the data through questionnaire, interview and document analysis. Finally, the result of the analysis and interpretation of data obtained was discussed and summarized to forward recommendations on the bases of the findings. Under this section all items were listed and the response of respondents also indicated by mean and average means scores. In categorizing the rating scales of mean scores were calculated their responses as the following: 1.00–1.49 strongly disagree, 1.50 – 2.49 disagree, 2.50 –3.49 undecided, 3.50 –

4.49 agree and 4.50 –5.00 strongly agree (Aron et al, 2008). Finally, the data obtained from the interview sessions was presented through narration and analyzed qualitatively to substantiate the data collected through the questionnaires to validate the findings of the study.

### **3.8. Ethical Considerations**

To make the research process professional, ethical consideration were made. The researcher informed the respondents about the purpose of the study i.e. it was purely for academic purpose. In addition the purpose of the study was introduced in the introduction part of the questionnaires and interview guide to the respondents and confirms that subjects confidentiality was protected. In addition to this, they were informed that their participation in the study was based on their consent. The research has not personalized any of the respondents' response during data presentations analysis and interpretation. Furthermore, all the materials used for this research have been duly acknowledged.

## **4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter dealt with data analysis and interpretation of findings. The points included in here are: characteristics of the respondents, current status of school based instructional supervision, major roles of school based supervision, teachers' expected roles in supervisory activities, perceptions of teachers about supervisory practices in the school; major challenges that affect supervisory practices and potential efforts made to improve school based supervision. The data was presented in tables that were accompanied by textual discussions.

In this study all the data were gathered through the questionnaires, interviews and document analysis. The necessary data for study were obtained from teachers, school-based supervisors and documents of school based supervision. The questionnaires were distributed to 88 teachers and 44 school based supervisors out of them 79 (92.94%) and 37(84.09%) filled in the questionnaires and returned them respectively.

### **4.1. Background of the Respondents**

This part dealt with personal and professional demographic characteristics of respondents. Accordingly, the respondents were asked to indicate their background information through

questionnaires. Responses on their age, work experience, academic qualification and field of studies were summarized using percentage below in table 3.

**Table 3. Characteristics of respondents in the study.**

No	Variables	Categories respondents	Respondents			
			Teachers		SBIS	
			N	%	N	%
1	Sex	Male	66	83.54%	33	89.18%
		Female	13	16.45%	9	24.32%
2	Age	20-25	13	16.45%	21	56.75%
		26-30	29	36.7%	13	35.13%
		31-35	28	35.44%	8	21.62%
		36-40	9	11.39%	-	-
3	Work experience	1-10 years	37	46.8%	27	72.97%
		11-20	25	59.52%	12	32.42%
		21-30	13	16.45%	5	13.51%
		Above 31	4	5.06%	2	5.4%
4	Academic qualification	First Degree	73	92.4%	35	94.59%
		Second Degree	6	5.59%	7	18.91%
5	Current position	Teachers	79	100%	-	-
		Supervisors	-	-	37	100%

Concerning the work experience of the respondents, the majority (72.97% of school principals, vice-principals, and department heads and 37(46.8%) of teachers have less than 10 years work experience and 59.52% of teachers had above 10 years work experience. However, school

principals had less experience than the rest. This shows that school-based supervisors did not have experience. This might be because they were not well experienced in the field of supervision. Regarding to the educational qualification 35 (94.59%) of the school based supervisors and 73(92.4%) of the teachers had B.A degree. Thus, one concluded that the educational qualifications of the respondents were satisfactory.

## 4.2. The Main results of the study

Table 4 .The current practices of school based instructional supervision in the schools

No	Items	Resp	N	Me a n	Am	P- value	t-val ue
1	Instructional supervision is essential for learning teaching activities and students' progress.	SBIS	37	4.16	3.84	.014	.134
		Trs	79	3.52		.012	.134
2	Classroom observation has been implemented regularly by SBIS.	SBIS	37	2.30	2.43	.290	.143
		Trs	79	2.56		.270	.143
3	SBS focused on issues of teachers teaching competency and instructional improvement	SBIS	37	2.68	2.65	.879	.122
		Trs	79	2.63	5	.873	.122
4	Instructional supervisory teams provide teaching aids for learners.	SBIS	37	2.95	3.1	.241	.261
		Trs	79	3.25		.281	.261
5	SBS follow up the lesson attentively from the beginning to the end and ensuring student learning	SBIS	37	2.73	2.74	.905	.129
		Trs	79	2.76	5	.908	.129
6	SBS assist teachers by giving the latest information on the innovative teaching learning theories and strategies that enhance students better achievement	SBIS	37	2.11	1.94	.013	.493
		Trs	79	1.77		.010	.493
7	SBIS assisting the need based training of teachers	SBIS	37	3.78	3.39	.005	.248
		Trs	79	3.00		.003	.248
8	SBIS preparing a peer to peer supervision	SBIS	37	3.30	2.8	1.543	.121

	program for teachers in the school level.	Tr	79	2.30		1.191	.121
9	SBIS providing an induction program to new teachers and providing short-term training at school level.	SBIS	37	2.54	2.37	.779	.126
		TR	79	2.62		.784	.126
10	SBIS encourages and facilitates school self evaluation on instructional matters	SBIS	37	2.24	2.1	.116	.149
		Trs	79	1.96		.219	.149

---

strongly agree-5, -Agree-4, - undecided -3, - disagree -2 and strongly disagree- 1

SBIS-school based instructional supervisors, T= calculated t-value, Trs- teachers

Regarding to item 1 of table 4, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on the question if Instructional supervision is essential for learning teaching activities and student progress or not? School based instructional supervisors  $m=4.16$  agreed and teachers  $m=3.52$  agreed. The average mean is 3.84 shows that both respondents agreed on the issue. The calculated value of  $t > 0.05$  which shows that there is no significance difference. Thus, it can be concluded that instructional supervision is essential for learning teaching activities and student progress.

With regards to item 2 of table 4, one of the question raised to respondents whether classroom observation had been implemented regularly or not, School based instructional supervisors and teachers with the  $m=2.30$  and  $m=2.56$  were disagree and undecided about the issue respectively. The average mean 2.43 also shows that the majority of respondents undecided with the issue. The calculate value of  $t$  is greater than 0.05) shows that there is no significance difference. Therefore, the implementation of classroom observation was not satisfactory.

Regarding to item 3 of tables 4 respondents were asked the question whether school based instructional supervision focused on issues of teachers teaching competency and instructional improvement or not. Both School based instructional supervisors and teachers with the  $m=2.68$  and  $m=2.63$  were undecided about the issue respectively. The average mean 2.655 shows that both respondents had medium opinion on the issue. The calculated value of  $t$  is greater than 0.05 which shows that there is no significance difference. From this, one can conclude that teachers and school based supervisors in the study areas were unsatisfied on the issue.

Regarding to table 4 item 4, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels whether school based instructional supervisory teams provided constructive teaching aids for learners or not. Both school based supervisors and teachers with  $m=2.95$  and  $m=3.25$  were undecided on the issue respectively. The average mean 3.1 shows that the majority of respondents undecided with

it. The value of  $t$ -is greater than 0.05 shows that there is no significance difference. Therefore, it was concluded that school based instructional supervisory teams provided constructive teaching aids for learners. Considering this, the responses from the interviewee: principal, vice principals, department heads and the supervisors also confirmed that there were no arranged programs that show school based instructional supervisory teams provided constructive teaching aids for learners. Thus, there were no documents that shows school based instructional supervisory teams to provide constructive teaching aids for learners. One of the respondents said that our supervisors did not provide any constructive teaching aids for learners, because they have no such experience of providing instructional resources effectively. During the researcher document analyzed and observed pedagogical center there were no enough teaching aids which organized by school supervisors.

Regarding of item 5 of table 4 respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on the question that whether SBIS follow up the lesson attentively from the beginning to the end and ensuring that the curriculum of the school addresses or not. Both School based supervisors and teachers with the  $m=2.73$  and  $m=2.76$  were disagreed on the issue. The average mean 1.94 shows that majority of the respondents were disagree with the issue respectively. The calculated value of  $t=0.129$ ,  $p=0.905 > 0.05$  shows that there was no significance difference. Thus, it can be concluded that school based supervision did not follow up the lesson attentively from the beginning to the end and ensuring that the curriculum of the school addresses.

Item 6 of table 4, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on the question that whether school based instructional supervisors were assisting teachers by giving the latest information on the innovative teaching learning theories and strategies that enhance students' better achievement or not, School based supervisors and teachers with the  $m=2.11$  and  $m=1.77$  were disagree on the issue respectively. The average mean 1.94 shows that majority of the respondents were disagree with the issue respectively. The calculated value of  $t=0.013$ ,  $p=0.493 > 0.05$  shows that there was no significance difference. Thus, it can be concluded that school based supervision didn't assist teachers by giving the latest information on the innovative teaching learning theories and strategies that enhance students better achievement.

With regards to item 7 of table 4, one of the questions raised to respondents was either the school based supervision assisting the need based training of teachers or not. School based instructional supervisors with  $m=3.78$  agree and teachers with  $m=3.00$  were undecided about the point. The average mean 3.39 shows that the majority of respondents undecided with the issue because of value of  $t=0.339$ ,  $p=0.05 = 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference between the

opinions of the groups on the issue. It can be concluded that school based instructional supervision has problem on assisting school based training. One of the interviewee responded;

*... school based instructional supervisors did not assist school based training for their teachers due to lack of experience, work loaded and absence of interest. In addition to these most of the school teachers were not volunteer to attend the training even the arranged by school leaders attentively.*

With regards to item 8 of table 4, one of the questions raised to respondents was that whether school based instructional supervision teams prepared a peer to peer supervision program for teachers at the school level or not. School based instructional supervisors and teachers with the  $m=3.30$  and  $=2.30$  were agreed and disagreed respectively. The average mean 2.8 shows that the majority of respondents' undecided with the issue. The t value at  $t = .248$ ,  $p = 1.543 > 0.05$  shows that there no is significance.

In addition to this, based on this through interview using open ended questions held with supervisors and teachers that supervisors lack of preparing a peer to peer supervision program for teachers at the school level; means there were no enough and well organized preparation of peer to peer supervision. The data on the other hand revealed that school based instructional supervision teams' negligence of preparing peer to peer supervision program for teachers in the school level due to lack of experience, absence of interest. One of respondents said that;

*... school based instructional supervisors did not arrange peer to peer supervision in the school for teachers to observe each other because of that most of our teachers see supervision as fault finding activities rather than helping them to improve their instructional competence in the school so they refused using peer to peer supervision.*

Item 9 tables 4 respondents were asked whether school based instructional supervisors were providing an induction program to new teachers or not. School based Instructional supervision teams with the  $m=2.54$  and  $m=2.62$  were undecided about the issue respectively. The average mean 2.58 respondents with the issue were undecided. The calculated value of  $t = .778$ ,  $p=0.784 > 0.05$ , shows that there is no significance difference between the opinions of the respondents. From this, one could conclude that teachers and school based instructional supervision team in the study areas were unsatisfied with provision of induction program and short term training.

Furthermore, from the interview with the 1 department heads and 2 selected teachers, it was found that supervisors were not arranging induction training for instructional improvement for beginner teachers. The reason mentioned for this was lack of knowledge and skills of how to arrange induction training.

Bray (1987:136) indicated that, information is important to make good decision. Having this in mind, the respondents were asked whether the instructional supervisors were providing information in the form of training and workshops for teachers and schools management. But there was no good training and workshop for teachers and school managements.

As the responses to item 10 of table 4 judged their opinion on points that whether school-based instructional supervisors encouraged and facilitated school self evaluation on instructional matters or not. Instructional supervision teams and teachers with  $m=2.59$  and  $m=1.96$  disagreed and undecided about the issue respectively. The average mean 2.275 shows that majority of respondents disagreeing. The calculated value of  $t$  at  $t=.007$ ,  $p=0.149 > 0.05$ ) shows that there was no significance difference between the opinions of the groups.

The qualitative data gathered through interview similarly indicated that, instructional supervisors have problem on encouraging and facilitating school self evaluation but sometimes perform it. One of the interviewee answered:

*the woreda education officers scheduled to evaluate the schools and support different ways for effectiveness of their work once per semester for the purpose of ranking the school and filling the efficiency of the principal but not for encouraging and facilitating school self evaluation.*

In addition to this during document analysis there was no enough written materials on the issues of school self evaluation encouraged by instructional supervisors. But there are documented materials on the issues of evaluation scheduled by school supervisors and woreda education officers. These documents were checklists and programs of classroom observation schedules and annual plan of school based instructional supervision.

Table 5 Roles of school based instructional supervision in enhancing learning teaching activities and students' progress.

No	Items	R	N	Mean	A.M	p-val	t-v
1	SBIS making rules, regulation, school policy and give training on these items for school members to improve learning process and students' progress.	SBIS	37	3.78	3.555	.896	.274
		Trs	79	3.33		.900	.274
2	SBS observing teachers throughout the time allocated for classroom observation enhancing students' progress	SBIS	37	1.97	1.93	.564	.116
		Trs	79	1.89		.607	.116
3	SBIS providing constructive feedback following classroom observation to support learning process.	SBIS	37	4.27	3.655	.147	.232
		Trs	79	3.03		.144	.232
4	SBIS make agreement with teachers on the objectives to be observed for enhancing good teaching and active learning.	SBIS	37	2.92	3.13	.042	.651
		Trs	79	3.34		.084	.651
5	SBIS evaluating school performance to give feedback for school improvement and students' active learning.	SBIS	37	3.54	3.415	.367	.128
		Trs	79	3.29		.394	.128
6	Instructional supervisors facilitate professional development of teachers through workshops or seminars.	SBIS	37	3.49	3.42	.626	.132
		Trs	79	3.35		.628	.132
7	Instructional supervisors provide induction programs for beginner or new teachers in the school to enhance active learning	SBIS	37	2.14	3.735	.684	.906
		Trs	79	2.04			.859
						.684	

Strongly agree-5, -Agree-4, - undecided -3, - disagree -2 and strongly disagree- 1

R=respondents N=No of respondents Mean A.M=Average mean

SBIS-school based instructional supervisors T= calculated t-value, Trs- teachers.

Regarding to table 5 item 1, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on the idea that whether the supervisors make rules, regulations, school policy and gave training on these items for school members to improve learning teaching process or not. SBIS and teachers with

mean=3.78 and m=3.33 agreed and medium on the issue respectively, The average mean 3.555, shows agreement on the issue and the calculated value of t at  $t = 0.274 >$ ,  $p = 0.896 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference. From this, one can concluded that both groups agreed on the issue that SBIS makes rules, regulation, and school policy and give training on these items for school members to improve learning teaching process. On the other hand from document analysis there was no enough information that shows considerable helps from SBIS buy making rules, regulation, and school policy and gave training on these items for school members to improve learning teaching process.

From table 5 item 2, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on the idea that whether SBIS team observing teachers throughout the time allocated for classroom observation or not. SBIS with mean=1.97 and teachers m=1.89 both of the respondents disagreed on the issue. The average mean 1.93, this means both SBIS and teachers also disagreed and the calculated value of t- at  $t = 0.607 >$  and  $p = 0.564 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance differences. From this the researcher concluded that school supervisors did not observe teachers throughout the time allocated for classroom observation.

Regarding to table 5 item 3, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on the idea that whether SBIS team provided constructive feedback following classroom observation or not. SBIS and teachers with mean=4.27 and m=3.03, agree and undecided on the issue respectively. The average mean 3.655 and the calculated value of t- at  $t = 0.231 >$  and  $p = 0.147 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups on the issue. From this one can concluded that SBIS provided constructive feedback following classroom observation.

In the table 5 item 4, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on the idea that whether SBIS made agreement with teachers on the objectives to be observed in classroom or not. Both SBIS and teachers with mean=2.92 and m=3.33 undecided on the issue. The average mean 3.42 here shows undecided on the issue and the calculated value of t- at  $t = 0.128 >$  and  $p = 0.651 > 0.05$  there is no significance difference. Based on the majority of teachers and school based supervisors; it can be concluded that the school based supervision did not make well agreement with teachers on the objectives to be observed in classroom.

During pre-observation meeting, the supervisor and teacher discuss on the lesson plan by stressing on the lesson objectives, relevance and appropriateness of content, time allocation, the availability of teaching aids, and the evaluation (ADEA,1998). These determinations are made before the actual observation, so that both supervisor and teacher are clear about what would transpire (Glickman et al., 2004).

In the table 5 item 5, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on the idea that whether SBIS evaluated school performance to give feedback for improvement or not. SBIS and teachers with mean=3.54 and m=3.29 shows agreed and undecided on the issue respectively. The average mean 3.41 also shows undecided and the calculated value of t-at  $t = .0.249 >$  and  $p = 0.367 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance differences. From this one can concluded that there was no enough permanent evaluation of school performance and giving feedback for improvement.

Regarding to table 4 item 6, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on the idea that whether school based instructional supervision teams facilitated professional development of teachers towards workshops or seminar or not. Both SBIS and teachers with mean=3.49 and m=3.35, SBSI and teachers undecided on the issue. The average mean 3.42 shows both of the respondents also undecided on the issue and the calculated value of t-at  $t = .0.132 >$  and  $p = 0.626 > 0.05$  there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups. From this one can concluded that there was no enough facilitation toward professional development of teachers through workshops or seminars.

Therefore, it can concluded that the supervisors facilitation of professional development of teachers towards workshops or seminars were unsatisfactory. Thus, as most of the interview participants,(principals, vice principals, department heads and supervisors were agreed), a few number of workshops might not allowed them to judge enough whether school level workshops or seminars organized by school based instructional supervisors enable teachers to bring the expected outcome in professional competence of teachers.

Regarding the reasons why school supervisors neglected organizing workshops were, most of the interview participants agreed upon: supervisors' incompetence in organizing workshops following the appropriate procedures; lack of commitment and interests of supervisors in carrying out their duties and responsibilities, and supervisors' engagement in routine tasks. Supporting this, as noted in the literature, Leu (2004) argued that in service training or workshops at school level is one of the means to achieve professional development of teachers' of the school. Through the training or workshops teachers improved teaching methodologies and curriculum innovations, develop mutual support and stand for common goal. Support of this, Mc Birdge (1996) argued that mentoring or induction is aimed at helping new deployed teachers to develop self confidence and to avoiding unnecessary tension and future malfunction.

Furthermore, the interview held with principal, vice principals and supervisor shows that the reason mentioned for this was lack of knowledge and skills of how to arrange induction

training. Taking this reality in mind, (MoE, 1995G.C) indicated that, supervisors are expected to provide induction training for beginner teachers.

Regarding to item 7 table 5, respondents were also asked to judge their opinions that either school based instructional supervisors support induction programs for beginner teachers in the school or not, teachers and school based supervisors with  $m=2.14$  and  $m=2.04$  that show undecided respectively. The average  $m= 2.09$  also indicated two of them undecided on the point. This implies that the majority of respondents undecided with the idea. The calculated value of t- at  $t = 0.135$ ,  $p=0.111 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference between the respondents response of teachers and school based supervisors. From the result, it is possible to say that supervisors did not support induction programs for beginner teachers in their schools. As the researcher conducted interview with the respondents, one of the interviewee said;

*...teachers had no enough chance of getting induction course or mentoring service while they were beginner or new to the schools which they were assigned to teach due to overloaded work of school supervisors they did not monitor the new or beginner teachers effectively during they were assigned at school.*

Similarly, (MoE, 2002) indicates instructional supervisors are not engaged in solving school problems, because they went to school only to collect information from the hands of school principals. But they do not give necessary support for the school personnel. As Singhal et al. cited in (Gashaw, 2008) pointed one of the most embarrassing explanations for the current poor reputation of schools and the presumed failure of many excellent innovations is that teachers have not had adequate, well informed and direct supervision to help, understand and implement new practice. Therefore, it can concluded that the supervisors facilitated professional development of teachers towards workshops or seminars were unsatisfactory in the study areas.

In general, the compiled result indicates that, instructional supervisors did not design various interventions so as to assist teachers improve their limitations. As a result the teachers had not got enough professional support to improve the day to day classroom instruction and instructional skills. Hence, it might reduce the effectiveness of students, teachers' initiation as well as the schools goal achievement.

Table 6.what is school based instructional supervisory activities exercised in the school?

No	Items	Res	N	Mean	A.M	t-value	p-value
1	Supervision focuses only on weak points of	SBIS	37	4.35	4.29	.692	.490

	teachers.	Trs	79	4.27	5	.712	.479
2	Supervision integrating the curriculum with the co curricular activities.	SBIS	37	2.97	3.24	.360	.067
		Trs	79	3.51		.360	.070
3	Help teachers in the preparation of supportive teaching manuals or materials	SBIS	37	3.30	3.51	.360	.150
		Trs	79	3.72		.360	.149
4	Instructional supervisors facilitate experience sharing programs between teachers	SBIS	37	2.51	3.05	.123	.000
		Trs	79	3.59		.123	.000
5	Do not create smooth relationship between teachers and school-based supervisors for the improvement of Instruction	SBIS	37	3.97	3.65	.365	.027
		Trs	79	3.34	5	.365	.021
6	Teachers perceive supervision as a fault finding than helping activity	SBIS	37	4.32	4.29	.446	.658
		Trs	79	4.27	5	.458	.649
7	Making considerable attempt to help teachers improve by identifying their specific needs during class room observation	SBIS	37	3.43	3.72	.120	.034
		Trs	79	4.01		.120	.050
8	promote shared decision making and a collaborative culture of learning community	SBIS	37	3.78	3.55	.123	.106
		Trs	79	3.33	5	.123	.094

---

Strongly agree-5 -Agree-4, - undecided -3, - disagree -2 and strongly disagree- 1, Trs- teachers

SBIS-school based instructional supervisors T= calculated t-value, 2tailed. = p- value

The aim of the first item in table 6 was to know the answer for the question whether supervision focused only on weak points of teachers or not. In this regard, SBIS and teachers with mean=4.35 and m=4.27, SBSI strongly agreed and teachers agreed on the issue. The average mean 4.31, the calculated value of t at  $t = .692$ ,  $p=0.490 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference. From this, one can concluded that both groups agreed on the issue that school based instructional supervision focused only on weak points of teachers.

The aim of the second item in table 6 was to investigate the answer for the question whether school based instructional supervision integrating the curriculum with the co- curricular activities or not. Regarding to this, SBIS and teachers with mean=2.97 and m=3.51 undecided and agreed on the issue respectively. The average mean 3.24, the calculated value of t at  $t = .360 > p=0.360 > 0.05$ ) shows that there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups on the

issue. From this, one can concluded that both groups undecided on the issue that school based instructional supervision did not integrate the curriculum with the co- curricular activities.

Regarding to third item in table 6 the respondents asked answer for the question whether supervision helps teachers in the preparation of supportive teaching manuals or materials or not. Regarding to this, SBIS and teachers with mean=3.30 and m=3.72 medium and agreed on the issue respectively. The average mean 3.51, the calculated value of t at  $t = 0.360 >$ ,  $p = 0.150 >$  0.05 shows that there is no significance difference. From this, one can concluded that both groups agreed on the issue that school based instructional supervision were help teachers in the preparation of supportive teaching manuals or materials.

On the same table item 6, the respondents requested to express their opinion that whether the instructional supervisors facilitated the experience sharing programs among teachers or not. Both school based instructional supervisors and teachers with mean=2.51 and m=3.59, medium and agree on the issue respectively. The average mean 3.05 indicated both respondents undecided on the issue. The calculated value of t at  $t = .120 >$ ,  $p = 1.32 >$  0.05 shows that there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups on the issue. From this, one concluded that school based instructional supervision did not facilitate the experience sharing programs among teachers.

To strengthen this idea, the researcher made the interview, school based instructional supervisors and they reply that, there was no enough experience sharing programs successfully facilitated at the school level. One of the interviewee said;

*they simply passed though the school rules and policy to the teachers rather than facilitating experience sharing among them, these means even school based instructional supervisors did not give orientation on the school rules, regulations and policy which was designed by ministry of education.*

The other basic function of instructional supervision is promoting teachers' professional development in schools. Therefore, since the competent and skillful teachers are a key component of successful school, staff development is a major function of instructional supervision. In this the role of instructional supervisors are helping teachers to grow and to develop in their understanding of teaching and learning process and improving their teaching skill (Pajak, 2002). As the researcher concluded that, instructional supervisors were not facilitating experience sharing programs among teachers to their pedagogical skill improvement.

Facilitating experience sharing between teachers was the main duties of instructional supervisors because they might have more experience and they develop different instructional skills through

experience and then they should facilitate experience sharing but still the study indicated that there were not done as expected.

On the same table item 5, the respondents requested to express their opinion on the question whether school based instructional supervisors created smooth relationship between teachers and school based supervisors or not, SBIS and teachers with mean=3.97 and m=3.34 agreed and medium on the issue respectively. The average mean 3.655 shows that both groups were agreed. The calculated value of t at  $t = 0.365 >$ ,  $p = 0.027 >$  0.05 shows that there is no significance difference between the opinions of the groups on the issue. From this, one can concluded that both groups agreed on the issue that school based instructional supervision did not create smooth relationship between teachers and school based supervisors.

On the same table item 6, the respondents requested to express their opinion whether teachers' perceived supervision as a fault finding than helping activity or not. In this regard, both SBIS mean=4.32 medium and teachers with m=4.27 agreed on the issue. The average mean 4.295 shows that the agreement of both groups and the calculated value of t at  $t = 0.446 >$ ,  $p = 0.449 >$  0.05 shows that there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups on the issue. From this, the researcher concluded that both groups agreed on the issue that teachers perceived supervision as a fault finding rather than helping activity.

Regarding to table 6 item 7, the respondents requested to express their opinion whether SBIS made considerable attempt to help teachers improve their competence by identifying their specific needs during classroom observation or not. SBIS and teachers with mean=3.43 and m=4.01 medium and agreed on the issue respectively. The average mean 3.72 and the calculated t- value at  $t = 0.120 >$ ,  $p = 0.050 >$  0.05 shows that there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups on the issue. From this, one can concluded that both groups agreed on the issue that SBIS made considerable attempt to help teachers improving by identifying their specific needs during classroom observation. On the other hand from document analysis and from the experience of the researcher there were no enough information that shows considerable helps from SBIS to improve teachers' competence by identifying their specific needs by making pre and post classroom observation due to work load.

The last item 8 on table 6 the respondents requested to express their opinion whether SBIS promoted shared decision making and a collaborative culture of a learning community or not. SBIS with mean=3.78 agreed and teachers m=3.33 medium on the issue. The average mean 3.555, shows agreement of both group on the idea, the calculated value of t-at  $t = 0.123 >$ ,  $p = 0.106 >$  0.05 shows that there is no significance differences. From this, one can concluded that

both groups agreed on the issue that SBIS promoted shared decision making and a collaborative culture of a learning community.

On the other hand from interview made with respondents, whether school based instructional supervision promote shared decision making and a collaborative culture of a learning community.

One of the interviewee said that:

*'...school based instructional supervision made all decision at school level without participating and sharing with school communities as well as concerned bodies. So they may face problems either from school staff members or from others during making the decision.*

No	Items	Resp.	N	Mean	Am	t-value	p-value
1	Lack of qualified persons for supervision	SBIS	37	4.14	4.11	.713	.954
		Trs	79	4.08		.613	.949
2	SBIS do not apply the principles and techniques	SBIS	37	3.38	3.78	.250	.003
		Trs	79	4.18		.250	.008
3	Lack of knowledge of teachers about school based supervision.	SBIS	37	2.92	3.705	.399	.000
		Trs	79	4.49		.399	.252
4	SBIS focusing on administrative area rather than teaching-learning process.	SBIS	37	4.16	4.24	.008	.206
		Trs	79	4.32		.007	.213
5	SBIS are using less participatory approaches	SBIS	37	3.49	4.015	.139	.223
		Trs	79	4.54		.139	.000
6	SBIS are overburdened by many tasks	SBIS	37	3.86	3.82	.123	.696
		Trs	79	3.78		.123	.684

7	Shortage of school finance to support learning teaching activities	SBIS	37	4.11	4.106	.550	.022
		Trs	79	4.01		.584	.035
8	Shortage of skilled manpower on school based supervision	SBIS	37	4.43	4.105	3.73	.006
		Trs	79	3.78		.147	.009
9	Unfair budget allocation for school based supervisory activities	SBIS	37	4.38	4.33	.785	.743
		Trs	79	4.28		.849	.686
10	Supervision helps to improve quality of learning teaching.	SBIS	37	4.51	4.515	.747	.973
		Trs	79	4.52		.747	.974

Table 7. Major challenges that affect school based instructional supervision

SBIS-school based instructional supervisors T= calculated t-value, N= No of Respondents,

Am= average mean, Trs = teachers

Regards to table 7 item 1, the respondents were asked that whether there were lack of qualified persons for supervision or not. Both School based Instructional supervision teams and teachers with the  $m=4.14$  and  $m=4.08$  were agree on the issue. The average mean 4.11 agreement, the value of t at  $t = .007$ ,  $p=0.954 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference between the opinions of the groups on the issue. From this, one can concluded that there was no qualified person for school based instructional supervision.

The second item in table 7, tried to investigate whether School supervisors team did not apply the principles and techniques in the school or not, supervisors and teachers with the  $m=3.38$  and  $m=4.18$  undecided and agree on the issue respectively. The average mean 3.78, shows that all of respondents agreed with it. The value of  $t = .250$ ,  $p=0.006 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference. From this, one can conclude that teachers and school based instructional supervision team in the study areas were agree that principles and techniques of supervision did not applied in the school regularly.

The third item in table 7, tried to investigate the answer for the question that there was lack of knowledge of teachers about school based supervision in the school or not, school based instructional supervision teams and teachers with the  $m=2.94$  and  $m=4.49$ , thus SBIS and teachers medium and high opinion on the issue respectively. The average mean 3.705 and value of  $t = .399$ ,  $p=0.0067 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference. From this, one concluded that there was lack of knowledge of teachers about school based supervision.

The fourth item in table 7, aims to get information about SBIS team whether they focus on administrative area rather than teaching-learning process or not. Accordingly, school based instructional supervision teams with the  $m=4.16$  have medium opinion and teachers'  $m=4.32$ , have high opinion on the issue. The average mean 4.24. The value of t-test at  $t = .399$ ,  $p=0.0067 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference. From this, one concluded that SBIS gave more attention for administrative area rather than learning teaching activity.

The fifth item in table 7, aims to investigate the answer for the idea that whether supervisors use less participatory approaches on learning teaching activity or not. Regarding to this, SBIS and teachers with mean= $3.49$  and  $m=4.54$ , agreed and strongly agreed on the issue respectively. The average mean 4.015. Shows agreement and the calculated value of t at  $t = .139$ ,  $p=0.07 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference. From this, one concluded that supervisors used less participatory approaches on learning teaching activity.

The sixth item in table 7 aims to investigate the answer for the idea lacks of instructional supervisors were currently overburdened with many tasks. Regard to this, both SBIS and teachers with mean= $3.86$  and  $m=3.78$  agreed on the issue. The average means 3.78 also shows they agreed. The calculated value of t at  $t = .696$ ,  $p=0.392 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference. From this, Similarly during interview and focus group discussion the participants indicated that, almost all of the informants who participated in the interview express that having workload was the major problem of school based supervision. One of the interviewee said that;

*...Since most of our school based instructional supervisors were having a teaching load more than 20 periods a week, it is impossible to provide school based instructional supervision service to teachers. Besides, due to big workload of teachers the school forced to assign very small number of supervisors that are not adequate to provide supervisory service to all teachers.*

Therefore, based on the response of majority, it was possible to conclude that having big workload and lack of budget diminished the school based supervisors capacity of supervision.

The seven item in table 7, aims to investigate the answer for the idea that if there was shortage of school finance to support teaching learning process or not. Regarding to this, SBIS and teachers with mean= $4.11$  and  $m=4.01$  both of them agreed on the issue. The average means 4.06. The calculated value of t at  $t = .023$ ,  $p=0.022 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference. From this, the researcher concluded that both groups agreed on the issue that there were shortage of school finance to support teaching learning process at the school level.

The eighth item in table 7, aims to get the answer for the idea that if there was shortage of skilled manpower on school-based instructional supervision or not. Regarding to this, both SBI and

teachers with mean=4.43 and m=3.78 agree respectively on the issue. The averages mean 4.105. The calculated value of t at  $t = 149$ ,  $p = 0.06 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference. From this, the researcher concluded that both groups agreed on the issue that there were shortage of skilled manpower on school-based instructional supervision at the school level.

The ninth item in table 7 aims to get the answer for the idea that if there was unfair budget allocation for school based instructional supervisory activities. Regarding to this, both School supervisors and teachers with mean=4.32 and m4.39 agreed on the issue. The average means 4.355. The calculated value of at  $t = 006$ ,  $p = 0.686 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference between on the issue. From this, the researcher concluded that there were unfair budget allocations for school based instructional supervisory activities.

The tenth item in table 7 aimed to investigate the answer for the question whether school based instructional Supervision helps to improve quality of teaching and learning activity or not. Regarding to this, both SBIS and teachers with mean=4.51 and m4.52 strongly agreed on the issue. The average mean 4.515. The calculated value of t at  $t = .0747$ ,  $p = 0.973 > 0.05$  shows that there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups on the issue. From this, one could conclude that both groups strongly agreed on the issue that school based instructional supervision helped to improve quality of teaching and learning activity.

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

In this chapter, the major findings of the study which were presented and analyzed in chapter four were summarized, concluded and recommended as follow.

### **5.1. Summary**

The aim of the study was to analyze practices and challenges of school based instructional supervision in secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone, Oromia regional state. In achieving these objectives, four research questions had been raised. Practices of instructional supervision was important to provide pedagogical and professional support to teachers by bringing in-school based instructional supervision. Thus, school based instructional supervisors were responsible to provide support, control, guide .supervise and evaluate. So the study tried to answer the following basic research questions; those were:

1. What are the current practices of school based instructional supervision in secondary schools of West Hararghe zone Oromia regional state?
2. What are the roles of SBIS in enhancing learning teaching process and students' progress?
3. What school based instructional supervisory activities are exercised in the school?
4. What are the challenges that affect the effectiveness of school-based supervision service?

In order to address the questions specified above, the descriptive survey research design was used in eight selected secondary schools; namely: Gelemso, Oda Bultum, Gemmachis, Beddesa, Boke Tiko, Charchar, Asebot and Hardim. Consequently, 88 teachers and 44 school based instructional supervisions were selected as a sample by using simple random and available or purposive sampling techniques respectively. Most of the respondents are first degree holders and most of them have more than ten years work experience. Questionnaires comprising both the open and close items were distributed to the target groups and the interview and document analysis were used. The data collected through interviews, questionnaires and documents were analyzed qualitatively using the direct and summarized words of the subjects accompanied by the result of the questionnaires, interviews and documents. The data collected through questionnaires from each sample schools were analyzed quantitatively using percentage, mean and average mean. The findings of the study were summarized as follows;-

#### **Major findings related with the current practices of SBIS in secondary schools.**

The majority of school based instructional supervisors and teachers agreed on the issue that if instructional supervision is essential for learning teaching activities and student progress or not. Both respondents agreed that classroom observation had not been implemented regularly and also supervision did not focus on issues of teachers teaching competency and instructional improvement and follow the lesson attentively from beginning to end.

Regarding to provision of constructive teaching aids for learners, provision of induction program to the new teachers and training at school level by school supervisors and preparing well organized peer to peer supervision program for teachers at the school level, encouraging and facilitating school self evaluation on instructional matters, all were not satisfactory.

#### **Major findings related with roles of school based instructional supervision in enhancing learning teaching process and students' progress.**

School supervisors have problems on making rules, regulation and school policy and giving training on these issues for school members to improve learning teaching process and school supervisors not observe teachers throughout the time allocated for classroom observation and the interview made with department heads and selected teachers and also from analyzed documents there was no sufficient information on the issue regular classroom observation, lack of provision of constructive feedback following classroom observation, making good agreement with teachers on the objectives to be observed. In addition to these, supervisors have not; -follow up and evaluate school performance and give immediate feedback for improvement, lack of

facilitating professional development of teachers through workshops or seminar and lack of supporting induction programs for beginner teachers in their schools.

### **Major findings related with what are school based instructional supervisory activities exercised in the school?**

School based supervision focused only on weak points of teachers, did not integrate the curriculum with the co curricular activities, lack of provision of much help for teachers in the preparation of supportive teaching manuals or materials, facilitating experience sharing programs and creating smooth relationship between teachers and school-based supervisors for the improvement of instruction program. However, during the interview, one of the respondents replied that supervisors lack of motivating and facilitating experience sharing programs between teachers. Teachers perceived supervision as a fault finding rather than helping activity and lack of promoting shared decision making and a collaborative culture of a learning community.

### **Findings related with major challenges of school based instructional supervision in secondary Schools.**

There was lack of qualified person for school based instructional supervision and lack of knowledge of teachers about school based supervision, the principles and techniques of the supervision did not also applied in the school effectively. Supervisors gave more attention for administrative area rather than learning teaching activities and using less participatory approaches, overburdened with many tasks, shortage of school finance, shortage of skilled manpower, unfair budget allocation for school. So due to these, school based instructional supervision has lack of supporting instruction and applying it smoothly in the school. Finally the respondents agreed that supervision helps to improve quality of teaching - learning activity.

## **5.2. Conclusions**

### **Based on the findings the following conclusions were drawn:**

1. Instructional supervision is essential for learning teaching activities and student progress, supervisors have no sufficient time to observe classroom instruction, lack of providing constructive teaching aids for learners, did not assess teachers by giving the latest information on the teaching learning theories and strategies that enhance students better achievement, lack of assisting much on the issue of school based training, negligence of preparing peer to peer supervision program, lack of providing any program and short term school based training .
2. Conclusion related with roles of school based instructional supervision in enhancing learning teaching process and students' progress. School supervisors lack of making school rules, regulation, and school policy and gave training on these items for school members, lack of

observing teachers throughout the time allocated for classroom observation, lack of providing constructive feedback following classroom observation, no continuous evaluation of school performance and giving feedback for improvement, rarely support induction programs for new or beginner teachers in the school.

**3. Conclusion related with what are school based instructional supervisory activities exercised in the school?** Supervisors focused only on weak points of teachers, lack of integrating the curriculum with the co-curricular activities, lack of providing much help for teachers in the preparation of supportive teaching manuals or materials, no experience sharing activity successfully facilitated, lack of create smooth relationship between teachers and school-supervisors for the improvement of instruction program, teachers perceived supervision as a fault finding rather than helping activity, lack of supporting teachers to improve their competence by identifying their specific needs during pre- and post classroom observation, lack of promote shared decision making and a collaborative culture of a learning community.

4. Conclusions on challenges of school based instructional supervision in secondary schools, were drawn as follow:- lack of qualified person for school based supervision, principles and techniques of the supervision have on applying in the school, lack of knowledge of teachers about school based supervision, supervisors gave more attention for administrative area rather than learning teaching process, use less participatory approaches on learning teaching activities, absence of enough and well organized school-based short term training on learning teaching activities, overburden of work, shortage of school finance, shortage of skilled manpower, unfair budget allocation and finally, supervision helps to improve quality of teaching and learning activity.

### **5.3. Recommendations**

Based on the summary of the findings obtained and the conclusions drawn, the following possible recommendations are forwarded.

1.As findings indicated that current practices of instructional supervision is inadequate and it is not regularly implemented, did not assist teachers by giving latest information and did not arrange peer to peer supervision program and also did not provide induction program for new teachers and did not encourage and facilitate school self evaluation on instructional matters. Due to these, the researcher recommended that school based supervisors, woreda and Zone Education office supervisors and experts should follow the implementation of teaching learning activities by increasing the frequency of school based and external supervision.

The selected woredas education office and WHZ education office should facilitate possible condition on the issues of: procedures and frequency of classroom observation, giving sufficient time to observe classroom instruction in the school, giving constructive feedback for teachers, assessing teachers by giving the latest information on the innovative teaching learning theories and strategies that enhance students better achievement, assisting on the issue of school based training of teachers and facilitating good opportunity of peer to peer supervision program for teachers in the school level and arranging instructional program and short term school based training at school level as well as at woreda education office.

2. The findings have shown that school based supervision did not help schools by making school rules, regulation, and policy, observing teachers throughout allocated time, providing constructive feedback following classroom observation and making agreement with teachers on the objectives to be observed and did not make regular evaluation of school performance and give feedback for improvement. So the researcher recommended that woreda, ZEO and school based Supervisors should help schools by making school rules, regulation, and school policy and gave training on these items for school members to improve learning teaching process, observe teachers regularly, provide constructive feedback following classroom observation, make continuous evaluation of school performance and giving feedback for improvement, facilitate and assist induction programs for new or beginner teachers

3. As findings indicates that school supervisors focus only on weak points of teachers, did not integrate curriculum with co-curricular activities, did not facilitate experience sharing program, did not create smooth relationship among school members due to teachers perceive supervision as fault finding activities and also did not promote shared decision making and a collaborative culture of a learning community. So the researcher recommended that school based instructional supervision should focus on all points concerned teachers, instructions, guide teachers in the preparation of supportive teaching manuals or materials and facilitate all opportunities of experience sharing activity successfully among teachers, schools, create smooth relationship between teachers school-based supervisors and other supportive staffs as well as the community, persuade teachers that supervision is helping activity, improve teachers and supportive staff competence by identifying their specific needs and give training, promote shared decision making and a collaborative culture of a learning community,

4. The findings have shown that the major challenges those affect school based instructional supervision were:-lack of qualified and skilled manpower, unfair budget, shortage of school finance, supervisors overloaded with many tasks, did not provide teaching aids, focus on administrative areas, less participatory approaches, so the researcher recommended that MoE,

REB, woreda education office and school supervisors should facilitate training program for supervision, as well as should assign qualified and skilled manpower, fair budget should be allocated, supervisors should apply procedures and principles of supervision and use variety of participatory approaches and should focus on the whole school activities, encourage and facilitate school self evaluation on instructional matters and give school based short training. And adequate budget should allocate for supervision program.

5. Finally, the findings indicated that, instructional supervisors are overburdened with many tasks. Therefore, school based instructional supervisions were not effectively well organized and implemented. They must effectively support teachers and had high responsibility than teachers to support instruction. Teachers expected a lot of professional support from them; as they had great experience and better skill; they must be committed to help and support teachers rather reasoning out many challenges as they mentions. Of course, the woreda education office took parts the problems faced to instructional supervisors and trying to solve and create conducive working situations and environment.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Abdulkareem. (2001). *the Importance of Instructional Supervision for Primary School Teachers*  
un published Master's Thesis, Addis Ababa University
- Abraha.2011.Principals'Instuctional Leadership practice of Effective and Ineffective.  
Primary Schools in Eastern Zone of Tigray.Bahir Dar University. (MA Thesis unpublished.)
- Adam E. N., 2003. The impact of school based management instructors' professional consideration.  
School of education. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. *International Journal of educational management*, volume 17.
- ADEA.1998. Resource material for school inspectors. London, Chameleon Press Ltd,
- Aggarwal J. (1985). *Theory and Principles of Education: Philosophical and Sociological Bases of Education*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd
- Ahmed M. 1998.*Trends in school supervision for Teacher Development: a proposal for*  
Pakistan.Paris:UNESCO.RtrrievedonNovember28/2009<http://unecdoc.unesco.org/images.dj>
- Akpotu.N.E 2006 *Problems of Financing Education in Nigeria in Itedjere P.O(Ed) current Issues in Nigeria Educational System*. Nairobi, Delsu Printing Press, Kenya.
- Atiklt Desta, .2008. The Status of School in Built Instructional Supervision in Governmen  
Secondary Schools of Mekele Zone. MA thesis, AAU, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Bar A.S. W.H. Burton and Leo, Bruckner, (1947) *Supervision Democratic Leadership*. (2nded.).  
New York: Application Cralts, Inc.
- Beach, D. M., and Reinhartz,J. 2000. *Supervisory leadership: focus on instruction* Boston Allyn and  
Bacon.
- Bernard and Goodyer, (1998). *The Definitions of Supervision and Relationship with Monitoring Quality*. London: Oxford University.
- Benjamin,K. 2003. *Instructional Supervision: Perceptions of Canadian and Ukraine beginning high school teachers*. MA thesis, Saskatchewan University at Saskatoon, UK.
- Best W. and J.V. Kahn, 2004.*Research in education*, (6<sup>th</sup>ed). New Delhi: Prentice Hall.
- Bluma, A.G.2012. *Elementary Statistics: A step by Step Approach 8<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New York,  
McGraw-Hill publishers Inc.
- Bray, M. (1987). *School Clusters in the Third World: Making Them Work* [Electronic version]:  
UNESCO/UNICEF Cooperative program.
- Breads. A.2006. *Better instructional leadership can implements learners centered -Education (LCE)*, from <http://www.google.com/search?q>

[Brewster, C and J. Klump, 2005. \*Leadership practice of successful principals\*. Port Land, Oregon North West Regional Educational Laboratory.](#)

Bush T. and Bell, 2003. *The principal practices of Educational management*, Landon: Paul Chapman polishing.

Carron, G., DeGrauwe, A. and Govinda, R. (1998a). *Supervision and Support Services in Asia*. Volume I: *A Comparative Analysis* Paris: UNESCO/International Institute for Educational Planning.

Certo, S.C. (2006). *Supervision: Concepts and Skill Building* (5<sup>th</sup>ed), McGraw-Hill /Irwin, United States

Chanyalew Woldegebriel, (2005). *The Practice and Problems of Instructional Supervision in Secondary Schools of Hadya zone*: Unpublished Master's thesis, AAU, Addis Ababa.

Cohn, L and Mariom, 2007. *Research method in education* (6<sup>th</sup>ed) Landon: Routledge.

Corron, H. E. (1998). *Development of Educational Supervision: A conceptual introduction*. New York, NY: Longman.

Cotton, K., 2003. *Principal and student achievement*: Alexandria, Ua: Association for Supervision and curriculum development.

Danielson, C. and McGreal, T.L., 2000. *Teachers Evaluation to enhance Professional Practice Alexandria, Av: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Retrieved May 18, 2010, from <http://www.ascd.org/index.cfm?theviewID=348>*

Dawson, C. (2002). *Practical Research Method*. Magdalena Road, Oxford OX4 1RE. United Kingdom

De Grauwe, A. (2001a). *School Supervision in Four African Countries*: Volume I: Challenges and Reforms. Paris: UNESCO/International Institute for Educational Planning.

Demoze, 2007. *The current practices of instructional leadership in enhancing the quality of education in the government primary schools of a City administration*, unpublished Thesis paper: Addis Ababa University.

Dittmar, F; Mendelsohn . J; Ward. V, (2002). *School Cluster System in Namibia*. Windhoek: Research and Information Service of Namibia (RAISON).

Downey, Carolyn, L. E., Frase and J.J. Peters. 1994. *The quality education challenge*. Thousand Oaks, Calif Corwin Press.

Enaigbe, A.P. 2009. *Strategies for improving supervisory skills for effective: the practice and Challenges school based supervision Primary education in Nigeria*. Edo Journal of Counseling, 2(2) 236-241. England

Eye, Glen G. and Netzer Canone A. Netzer (1965). *Supervision of Instruction* New York: Harper and Row, Inc.

Fikadu Atra. 1992. *The State of Educational Inspection with reverence to some selected Senior Secondary Schools in Ilibabor Administrational Region* .MA Thesis, AAU, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Fullan, M.G., 1991. *The new meaning of educational change* .New York: Teachers College press.

Gashw Debassu. (2008). *Supervisory Practice of Cluster Primary School Supervisors in Promoting Teachers Professional Competences in West Gojjam Administrati Zone*: Unpublished

- Masters of Arts“ Thesis, at AAU. Glanz, J. (2000). *Paradigm Debates in Curriculum and Supervision: Modern and Postmodern Perspectives*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Getachew Gezahegn. (2001). *School-based instructional supervision in selected secondary schools of Addis Ababa*: Unpublished Masters of Arts“ Thesis, at AAU.
- Giordano, E.A. (2008). *School Clusters and Teacher Resource Center*. Paris: UNESCO/International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Glickman, C. D. (1990). *Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach* (2<sup>nd</sup>ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Govinda, R. and T. Shahjahan, 1999. *Quality education through school-based supervision and support*: International Institute of Educational Planning/UNESCO, 7-rue Eugene-Delacroix, 75116 Paris
- Haile Abbay, 2006. Practices and Problem of School based Supervision in selected Secondary Schools of central Zone of Tigray. MA Thesis. AAU, Addis Ababa Ethiopia.
- Hailesilasse Fassha. (2002, 2004). “*The status of professional development program for secondary school teachers in Addis Ababa city administration* A.A.U MA thesis (unpublished)
- Haileselassie Woldegerima, 1997. *Educational Supervision Teaching Material*. Addis Ababa University. Faculty of Education, A.A..
- Haileselassie Woldegerima, 2007. *Educational Supervision*. A.A.U.
- Hammer G, R.H., Robert, Anderson and R.J. Krojew, 1980. *Clinical Supervision: A special Method for Supervision of Teachers* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). New York: Ranchart and Winston
- Harris, B. M., 1975. *Supervisory Behavior in education*. Engle Wood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall
- Lash way, L., 2002. *Development Instructional leaders* ERIC Digest 160(July), clearing House on educational management University of Oregon.
- Leithwood, K. and C. Riehl, 2003. *What we know about successful school leadership*. American Education research association.
- Lilian, C. M. (2007). *Perception of classroom supervision by secondary school teachers in the Harare region*: Unpublished Masters of Arts“ Thesis, Tshwane University of Technology.
- Lue, E. (2004). *School and cluster-based teacher professional development: bringing Teacher learning to the school*. Retrieved from <http://www.equip123.net/docs/EQlworkingpaper/pdf>.
- Lyons, B. 2010. *Principal instructional leadership Behavior as perceived by Teachers and Principals, at New York state recognized and None Recognized middle schools*.
- Mengesha Amberber, 1975. *The Application of Supervision in Ethiopian Schools*.
- Million Morki. (2010). *An assessment of the status of school based instructional supervision in secondary schools of west Arisi zone of Oromia region*. Unpublished Master“s Thesis, Addis Ababa
- MoE. (2002). *Educational supervision manual*. Addis Ababa.
- MoE (2002). *The new education and training policy: Policy Document of the Ethiopian Ministry of Education*. Addis Ababa.
- MoE. (2003). *Teachers“ education system overhaul: Final Document*. Addis Ababa
- MoE (2005). *A presentation of the Ethiopian education sector development program: A policy*

- document for education sector review (ESDP): ESDP III (2005/6 to 2010/11).* Addis Ababa. Ministry of education, 2007. *School improvement blue print* A.A.11p. and *framework* A.A.2p. MoE. (2010). *Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP IV): Program Action Plan*, Federal Ministry of Education, Addis Ababa
- Newstrom, J. W. and Bittel, L. R. (2002). *Supervision: Managing for Results (8th ed)*. New York Columbus: Glencoe McGraw-Hill
- O'Donnell and White, 2005. *Student achievement and principal quality: Principal practices to improve student achievement*.
- Ochuba, V.O., 2008. "Improving the Quality Education in Nigeria through effective inspection of schools" Education. Find Articles.com.
- Oliva, Peter. F.(1997) *Supervision for Today's Schools 5<sup>th</sup> ed*. New York; Addison WesleyLongman.Inc.
- Oliva, P.F. (2005). *Supervision for today schools (7<sup>th</sup>ed)*. Georgia: John Willy and Sons.inc.Retrieved from <http://media.Wely.Com/product-dota/excerpt/pdf>.
- Onoyase, D.1991. *Theroy and Practice of Educational Administration*. Warri, Okienriet Publishers, USA.
- OREB, 2007, *Manwaalii Adeemsa Hojii Kennaa Deeggarsa Ogummaa fi Hordoffii Barnootaa*. Garee JABAH BBO, Finfinnee, Itoophiyaa.
- Pajak, Edward .1989. *The Central Office Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction: Setting the Stage for Success*. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Pama.R.2006.The behaviors and practices in successful at Risk-middle Schools. <http://www.google.com/serct?hl=en> and q.Publishing Company
- Ryan, J.1998Critical leadership for education in postmodern world: Emancipation, Resistance and Communal action International journal of Leadership in education.
- Robert, D.K. and P.J. Burke, 1989.A design for Instructional supervision. Spring field III : Charles c. Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.
- Sergiovanni, T., 2000. *The life world of leadership: Crating culture, community and personal meaning in our schools*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J., and Starratt, R. J. (2007). *Supervision: A redefinition (8<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.

Sharma, R.A., 2002. *Fundamentals of educational research*, Meerut: New Agrawal offset Printing Press.

Surya Govinda and Tapan, (1999). *The definitions of supervision in different profession*. McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.

Tarrant, T and Newton, 1992. *Managing Change in Schools: A Practical Hand Book*

Togneri, W. and S.Anderson, 2003. *Beyond Islands of excellence. What districts can do to Improve instruction and achievement in all schools. Learning first Alliance. .*

UNESCO,2007. *Reforming school supervision for quality improvement*. Retrieve from [www.iiep.unesco.org/fileadmin/.../Supervision/SUP\\_Mod8.pdf](http://www.iiep.unesco.org/fileadmin/.../Supervision/SUP_Mod8.pdf) October 16, 2006

Weber, J., 1989. *Learning the Instruction program*. In the school Leadership hand book for excellence, (2<sup>nd</sup>ed). Clearinghouse in Educational Management University of Oregon.

Weindling, D., 1990. *The secondary school head teacher's new principals in the United Kingdom*.

Whitaker, B, .1997. *Instructional leadership and Principal visibility*. The Clearing house.

Wilcox, B., 2000. *Making School Inspection visits more effective: The English Experience*. Paris: UNESCO \International Institution for Educational Planning.

## 7. APPENDICES

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY  
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire to be filled by teachers and school based supervisors

Dear respondents;

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect relevant data to the study “entitled **Practices and Challenges of School Based Instructional Supervision in Secondary Schools of West Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State**”. Your responses are vital for the success of the study. So you are kindly requested to read all questions and fill the questionnaires with genuine response. Be sure that your responses will not be used for other purpose rather than academic purpose. **General direction**

1. Do not need to write your name;
2. There is no need to consult others to fill the questionnaires;



6	SBIS assisting teachers by giving the latest information on the innovative teaching learning theories and strategies that enhance students better achievement.					
7	SBIS assisting the need based training of teachers					
8	SBIS preparing a peer to peer supervision program for teachers in the school level.					
9	SBIS providing an induction program to new teachers and Providing short-term training at school level					
10	Instructional Supervisors encourage and facilitate school self evaluation on instructional matters					

**2. What are the roles of school based instructional supervision in enhancing learning teaching process and students' progress?**

Please provide appropriate response by using the tick mark for 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree,

3= undecided, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree in the table below.

No	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	SBIS making rules, regulation, school policy and give training on these items for school members to improve learning process and students' progress.					
2	SBS observing teachers throughout the time allocated for classroom observation enhancing students' progress					
3	SBIS providing constructive feedback following classroom observation to support learning process.					
4	SBIS make agreement with teachers on the objectives to be observed for enhancing good teaching and active learning.					

5	SBIS evaluating school performance to give feedback for school improvement and students' active learning.					
6	Supervisors facilitate professional development of teachers through workshops or seminars					
7	Instructional supervisors provide induction programs for beginner or new teachers in the school to enhance active learning					

### 3. What are school based instructional supervisory activities exercised in the school?

**Direction:** provide appropriate response by using the tick mark for 1= strongly disagree,

2=disagree, 3= undecided, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree in the table below.

No.	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	Supervision focuses only on weak points of teachers					
2	Instructional supervision integrating the curriculum with the co curricular activities.					
3	SBIS help teachers in the preparation of supportive teaching manuals or materials					
4	SBIS facilitate experience sharing programs among teachers					
5	SBIS do not create smooth relationship between teachers and school-based supervisors for the improvement of Instruction					
6	Teachers perceive supervision as a fault finding than helping activity					
7	SBIS making considerable attempt to help teachers improve by identifying their specific needs during class room observation					

8	SBIS promote shared decision making and a collaborative culture of a learning community					
---	---	--	--	--	--	--

9. In your view, what are the major challenges that affect the practices of school based instructional supervision? Please write your answer on the space provided.

---



---

10. What will be the solutions for the above mentioned problems? Please write your answer on the space provided

---



---

**4. Major challenges of school based instructional supervision in secondary schools**

Please provide appropriate response by using the tick mark for 1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3= undecided, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree in the table below.

No	Items	5	4	3	2	1
o o o						
1	Lack of qualified persons for supervision					
2	They do not apply the principles and techniques					
3	Lack of knowledge of teachers about school based supervision					
4	Focusing on administrative area rather than teaching-learning process.					
5	Using less participatory approaches					
6	Instructional supervisors are overburdened with many tasks					
7	Shortage of school finance to support teaching learning process.					

8	Shortage of skilled manpower on school-based supervision					
9	Unfair budget allocation for school based instructional supervisory activities					
10	Supervision helps to improve quality of teaching and learning					

## APPENDIX B

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY  
 POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE  
 College of Education and Behavioral Sciences  
 Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interview guides conducted with principals, vice principals and Supervisors

Dear respondents;

The main purpose of this interview is to collect relevant data regarding the study “**entitled Practices and Challenges of School Based Instructional Supervision in Secondary Schools of West Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State**”. The data obtained will be used for academic research purpose only. Therefore, your sincerity in responding to the questions is of great importance, and your responses to the interview would be kept confidential.

**Part I: General Information about Personal Data**

1. Sex \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Age \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Qualification \_\_\_\_\_
4. Experience: As a teacher \_\_\_\_\_ as a principal and/or vice principal \_\_\_\_\_
5. Present position \_\_\_\_\_

**Part II: Give your response to the questions in short and be precise.**

1. What is your understanding about school based instructional supervision?
2. What supervision practices procedures and techniques do the school based instructional supervisors should follow in conducting classroom visits? How often you have visited classes?
3. What major roles do you think supervision has to the development of curriculum, staff and instruction?
4. Do school based supervisors qualified and skilled full?

5. Do Supervisors' provide induction programs for beginner or new teachers in the school level?

6. What are the problems encountered during the implementation of school based instructional supervision in you school?

---



---

\_\_\_\_\_?

7. What do you suggest as solution for \_\_\_\_\_ problems?

---



---

## **II. Interview questions for school based instructional supervisors and teachers:**

1. How often do the supervisors observe or visit your classroom?

2. What kinds of feedback /suggestions do the instructional supervisors give to help you improve your instruction?

3. What role does your principal and other supervisors play in guiding and supporting your work on the learning teaching process and making rules, school policy and the like?

4. How do you recognize the importance of supervision in instructional leadership for student learning?

5. How appropriate it is the way school based instructional supervision allocate instructional resource?

6. What is your observation about the coordination of instructional programs in the school?

7. Does the instructional leadership (supervision) provide in your school satisfactory to improve student learning result & the quality learning? (Time spent for instructional supervision, inputs for instructions, process of class observation, feedback)

8. Do instructional supervisors have overloaded work to supervise the teachers effectively?

9. What the solutions do you give for encountered and existing problems \_\_\_\_\_

---



---

\_\_\_\_\_?

