

Instructional Supervision and Practices in Primary Schools

Aster Asrat and Asrat Dagne^{*}

College of Education and Behavioral Science, Department of Teacher Education and Curriculum studies, Bahir Dar University, Post Box No: 79, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

Corresponding Author: Asrat Dagne, College of Education and Behavioral Science, Department of Teacher Education and Curriculum studies, Bahir Dar University, Post Box No: 79, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

Received: 📅 2025 Jan 03

Accepted: 📅 2025 Jan 23

Published: 📅 2025 Feb 01

Abstract

Objective of this study was to practice instructional supervision in primary schools. To accomplish this purpose, the study employed a descriptive survey method. Principals and cluster supervisors were involved in the study of interviewing. One sample t-test were used to analyze the questionnaire. The qualitative data obtained through open ended and interview were analyzed by using narration. The result of the study revealed that the practice of supervisors on the three domain of instructional supervision were unsatisfactory and in effective. The major challenges in school based supervision were lack of knowledge and competences to implement instructional improvement, curriculum development, roles and techniques of supervision, Lack of training in supervision, lack of communication skills of supervisors, shortage of budget, perception of teachers toward instructional supervision were major hindering factor in implementation of the three domain of instructional supervision. Finally, recommendations were drown based on the above findings. Supervisors need specialized training in the area of instructional improvement, curriculum development and staff development.

Keywords: Instructional Supervision, Practices, Primary Schools

1. Introduction

Education provides human beings with behavioral changes by acquiring knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enable them to become active and productive members of society. Therefore, to attain the desired results in the education sector, we should emphasize the improvement of teaching and learning, assist and encourage teachers, and strengthen educational management in general and instructional supervision in particular. The main domains of school improvement programs are; teaching and learning, community participation, school leadership and management, and creating a safe and conducive school environment [1].

Instructional supervision has valuable importance for the improvement of teaching and learning processes, as it facilitates the professional growth of a teacher by giving the teacher, primarily feedback about classroom instructions, and helping the teacher to make use of that feedback in order to make teaching more effective [2]. Instructional supervision is a process that focuses on instruction and provides teachers with information about their teaching to develop instructional skills to improve performance. In this process, supervisors work with teachers to improve class instruction. It is formally provided by the organization for influencing teaching behavior directly in such a way as to improve students' learning and the activities that serve to improve

the quality of teaching and learning. Therefore, supervision plays a key role in the improvement of instruction.

Panigrahi, stated that the concept of supervision with respect to contemporary educational thought is the total process that includes all duties and functions that are of high significance for the operation of a school system [2]. At the same time, supervision supported a system emphasizing the development of teachers and students in the teaching and expert service, which was based on accepted principals and planned programs for the development of instruction. To help teachers perform their teaching tasks effectively, it is necessary to give increased attention to the provision of adequate and effective supervision support to teachers. Everything in the school system is designed to stimulate teachers for the growth of learning. Hence, supervision provides administrative and pedagogical services, primarily concerned with studying and improving the conditions that surround learning and the growth of people.

The theoretical frame-work of this study is based on Oliva and Pawlas's three domains of instructional supervision [3]. These domains of supervision include instructional improvement, curriculum development, and staff development. Each domain includes several specific functions. From this perspective, the four major functions of supervision are coordination, consultant, group leader,

and evaluation, which are performed in the three domains. Instructional supervision is a means by which the school organization can enhance the teaching-learning situation by providing assistance services to teachers based on the above three domains. Therefore, for the success of the school system, particularly in providing a teaching learning process, the effective supervisory support of educationalists to teachers in the areas of instruction, curriculum, and staff development is essential.

The supervisors serve in consulting capacity as specialists in furnishing necessary information and suggestions during instructional improvement; the supervisors plan with teachers arrange, evaluate, and often conduct in-service programs for teachers; and the supervisor also initiates teachers to identify curriculum problems and facilitate the search for solutions, and provide appropriate resources, time, and facilities needed to perform their task of curriculum development. Therefore, supervisors must work continuously with teachers to improve their curriculum, instruction, and professional competence [4].

The educational and training policy ETP of Ethiopia (1994) gives due attention to the relevance, quality, access, and equity issues that have been out-standing problems of the educational system today. Among other priorities, education and training policies have focused on the provision and appropriate usage of educational facilities, technology, and materials to strengthen the teaching learning process and the expansion of education. To affect this, the policy states that the evaluation of decentralization is an, efficient and professionally coordinated participatory system. The management and organization of the educational system as expressed by the new education and training policy (ETP) was to meet the decentralization of authority and, autonomy of instructions ensuring democratic professional, coordinated, efficient, and effective management (MOE,1994). This educational decentralization has also assigned school authorities and responsibilities to make school-based decisions to improve the teaching and learning processes. Thus, they are empowered by exercising supervisory tasks as improving, enhancing the professional competence of teachers, promoting students' learning achievement, and improving their instructional systems and operations. Therefore, instructional supervision should be consistent with these changes.

In line with this policy and to address the goals of education, an educational supervisor is expected to have a considerable influence on the instructional program. As indicated in the Educational Management, Organization, Community Participation, and Finance guide (EMOCPF), the roles and responsibilities of supervisors are; involvement in the school systems or school efforts to identify what good instruction, knowledge, skills, and attitudes are related to higher instructional performance and what standards or goals should be adopted and respected within the school. As Lucio, and McNeil, indicate, supervision today is not the responsibility of an individual or a particular position; rather, it is the responsibility of the worker and is part of

the human organization [5]. Supervision in modern school systems is a cooperative endeavor. Hence, more attention should direct to the functions, operations, and contributions of all staff members.

Currently, the main actors in instructional supervision are school supervision committees, principals, department heads, vice principals, and cluster supervisors. The role of supervision is to ensure curriculum implementation, providing direct technical support to teachers, providing job training to teachers, conducting formative evaluation programs, providing classroom observation to help teachers with professional competences, giving feedback, evaluation, monitoring, and coordinating, and creating a conducive teaching learning environment [6]. Moreover, one purpose of instructional supervision is to ensure that very good teachers continue to be very good and above. Hence, instructional supervisors must discuss with teachers the great things they are doing already and to encourage them not only to keep up with the good work but also to encourage them to share their expertise with fellow professionals.

However, other researchers in the Amhara Region have indicated that the necessary supervision services related to instructional improvement, curriculum development, and staff development were not expected, supervisory activities did not focus on facilitating teachers' participation in continuous professional development programs, there were no different capacity building strategies to build the staff members, professional mentors were assigned for the matter of assigning, but they were not assisting teachers effectively , the school supervision did not encourage teachers, no participation in research activities related to staff development, and no strong relationships among staff members in the schools [7].

1.1. Literature Review

Instructional supervision is the work of ensuring the implementation of the educational mission of the school overseeing, equipping, and empowering teachers to provide meaning full learning experiences for students. It is a professional continuous and cooperative process for the improvement of instruction. Instructional supervision aims to help teachers reflect on their practice, learn more about what they do and why and develop professionally [8]. It also provides objective feedback to teachers, diagnoses and solves teaching problems, helps teachers develop their strategies and skills, evaluate teachers for promotions or appointments, and help teachers maintain positive attitude.

Instructional supervision is concerned with classroom observations as in clinical supervision, peer coaching, and other technologies that allow teachers to examine their own classroom practices with and through the assistance of others. Instructional supervision aims to promote growth, development, interaction, fault-free problem solving, and a commitment to build capacity in teachers. Cogan and Goldhammer, the early framers of clinical supervision, envisioned practices that would position the teacher as an active learner [9,10]. Moreover, Cogan asserted that teachers

were able to be professionally responsible and more than able to be “analytical of their own performance, open to help from others, and self-directing” (p. 12). Instructional supervision is an important tool for schools as it helps them in ensuring that their vision and mission are achieved by supervising, training, and empowering teachers so that they can create valuable experiences for their students.

1.2. Supervision as a Service Activity

The main purpose of educational supervision is to help teachers do better job. Initially, educational supervision was looked at as an inspection to check the teachers were doing their job satisfactorily or not. But, now its basic function is to improve the teaching-learning situation with the focus on achieving goals of education. This is a very comprehensive activity which means doing everything that contributes to teaching-learning effectiveness.

In the area of the study, there was inadequate supervisory service in the areas of instructional implementation, curriculum development, and staff development. Supervisors did not fulfill their roles within the domains of the instructional supervision service. Related to this idea, Aggarwal, reported that the limitation practice in that year, continuous and problem-solving instructional supervision support in primary school was not as intended, the development of teachers' profession on teaching learning process with the service of supervision was not as intended, the supervisors did not fulfill their role in instructional supervision, and students' results did not improve as much [12]. The best way to improve teacher's teaching competence is through instructional supervision which is the process of assisting teachers to develop and improve the quality of the teaching and learning process and environment, with the ultimate goal of improving student learning outcomes

Generally, it is arguable that schools cannot improve without improving their teacher competence. The quality of teachers' education and training in pre-service program is determined by the provision of adequate supervision and support. The development of teachers' professional competence and quality of education partially depends, on the development and implementation of effective instructional supervision programs in schools.

1.3. Supervision as Processes

Modern supervision is based on social, psychological and educational process [12]. Teaching-learning cannot be improved until the teacher's quality improves. For developing teachers interaction between the supervisor and the teacher is necessary. The supervisor is required to stimulate, nurture and appraise the professional growth of teachers. Desirable knowledge, skills and attitudes have to be developed in them. This happens in a social context and through a social process. This kind of learning of the teachers is a social process which is influenced by the kind of people around them, the way they are treated by their supervisors, the way they are rewarded by the institution, the role they are required to play by the society in the institution.

When instructional supervision is well planned, organized, and based on the interests of teachers, students, and parents, it will be useful for the development of individual teachers, development of the school, and fulfillment of societal demands. In line with this, West and Gratton, explained that the proper implementation of instructional supervision is believed to have a positive consequence in the development of teachers' professional competence, in up grading the content of curriculum, and in the improvement of instruction [13]. Furthermore, Sturges, expressed that teachers on the job require service training and professional support, either to remedy deficiencies that they have discovered in their professional skills or to develop their potential competence in their specialized fields [14].

1.4. Supervision as Functions

Modern supervision can be described and explained in terms of functions also as it was done in term of processes involved in it. Wiles, (1967) have considered it as services to teachers to help them do better job. AS stated by Unruh and Turner, supervision is seen to provide a technical service related to learning and pupil growth. Looking from this point of view modern supervision has several functions to perform [12]. A few more functions of modern supervision are coordinating instructional services over schools of several towns, districts and the state, upgrading evaluation, study of problems, decisions successfully implemented, facilitating co-operation and interaction among faculty and staff.

Research on the practice of instructional supervisory in primary schools has not been exhaustively conducted. Therefore, the main purpose of this study was to evaluate instructional supervision practices and fill the gap in these problems in primary schools. Hence, the following basic research questions were formulated to guide this study:

- To what extent do school supervisors assess practices of the three major domains of instructional supervision?
- To what extent do supervisors play their role within the major domains of instructional supervision?
- What are the major challenges to monitor the practices of the three domains of instructional supervision?

To examine the major domains of instructional supervision practices in primary schools, the following specific objectives were designed:

- To assess the level of instructional supervision exercised in terms of instructional improvement, curriculum development, and staff development.
- To identify the role of supervisors in the three domains of instructional supervision in improving the teacher profession and student achievement.
- To identify the major problems that may affect the practices of instructional supervision.
- To suggest practical solution for the problems identified in this study.

2. Materials and Methods

The research design that was used to conduct this study was descriptive survey. A descriptive survey method was selected because the nature of the problem requires wide description

and investigation. In other words, it helps describe and interpret the trend of events that exist now, existing in the past, and that have influenced the present.

2.1. Sources of Data

The data sources in this study were both primary and secondary. Therefore, primary school teachers, principals, cluster supervisors, and department heads were used as primary sources. Books, Thesis papers, Journals, and Internet were used as secondary sources of the data. Respondents were categorized as supervisees and supervisors. Supervisees were teachers and supervisors were cluster supervisors, principals, vice principals, and department heads.

2.2. Samplings and Sampling Techniques

The study area had 25 primary schools. There were 358 teachers, seven cluster supervisors, and 28 principals (including vice principals) during the study period. For this study, five (20%) primary schools were selected. These schools were selected using simple random sampling techniques, in particular the lottery method. This method provides equal chances for all members of the target population. After selecting the sample schools, supervisors, department heads, principals, and teachers were identified. The selected primary schools had five principals, 32 department heads, 138 teachers, and five cluster supervisors. Of the 138 teachers, 32 were department heads. In the sample study area, there were, 10(31.25%), department heads, 56 (40.57%), teachers, 5 (100%) cluster supervisors, and 5 (100%) principals.

The selection of principals and cluster supervisors was done using comprehensive sampling because those professionals

were participating in instructional supervision in primary schools, and they were experienced in relation to supervisory issues in their respective schools. In addition, the selection of teachers and department heads, in each sample school was based on probability-sampling techniques.

2.3. Instruments of Data Collection

For this study, questionnaires and interviews were used as the data-gathering instruments. Qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed. The questionnaire contained both closed and open-ended items. The close-ended items have a five-point Likert scale. This is because scaled items are relatively objective, and help respondents choose one option that best fits their opinions. A total of 36 questions were used to assess the three domains of instructional supervision. The questionnaire was organized in to five sections. Section one focused on teachers and supervisors' demographic, personal, and contextual data. The second section sought data on the domains of instructional supervision. This section consisted of 14 questions. Section 3, which consists of nine question items, focuses on the role of supervisors in three domains. Section four sought data on instructional supervision techniques, which contained 13 questions. Section five sought data on the major problems of instructional supervision. This section contained only open-ended questions. This could be used to enhance the presentation of the data and complement the discussion of the findings.

2.4. Interview

For further clarification to gather information and supplement the questionnaires, semi-structured and unstructured interviews were designed to gather information from principals, and cluster supervisors.

NO	Item	Calculated reliability value
1	The 3 domain of instructional supervision	
1.1	Instructional improvement	0.802
1.2	Curriculum development	0.78
1.3	Staff development	0.799
2	The roles of supervisors within each domains of supervision	0.757
3	The techniques of instructional supervision	0.807

Table 1: The Calculated Reliability Values Using Cronbach Alpha Method of Reliability Test

2.5. Data Collection Procedure

Before the distribution and administration of the questionnaires and interviews, the researcher contacted the selected school principals, cluster supervisors, and teachers to clarify the nature and purpose of the questionnaire in a meeting organized by the district education office. This was also a very important opportunity to distribute the questionnaires in an organized way. The district education office experts who led the meetings helped the researcher to distribute and collect the questionnaire.

2.6. Data Analysis Techniques

As previously mentioned, the purpose of this study was to assess instructional supervision practices. Hence, descriptive statistics were used to analyze the quantitative data. The characteristics of the sample were analyzed by using, frequency counts and percentages. One-sample t-test was used to analyze the data collected from close-ended questionnaires using the statistical package for social science (SPSS) software. In addition, qualitative data obtained from interviews and open-ended questionnaires were analyzed qualitatively using the narration of words.

NO	variable	Characteristics	Teachers N=56		Supervisors N=20	
			Frequency	%	Frequency	%
A	Sex	M	35	62.5	13	65
		F	21	37.5	7	35
		Total	56	100	20	100
B	Age	20-30	23	41	5	25
		31-40	20	35	7	35
		41 and above	13	24	8	40
		Total	56	100	20	100
C	Qualification	Certificate	5	8.92	1	5
		Diploma	48	85.7	17	85
		First degree	3	5.35	2	10
		Total	56	100	20	100
D	Experience	1-2 years	24	42.85	3	15
		3-5 years	21	37.6	10	50
		6 and above	11	19.64	7	35
		Total	56	100	20	100

Table 2: Characteristics of Respondents

Table 2.2., indicated that the total participants in the study were 76. The respondents were categorized as teachers and supervisors. The number of males was greater than females i.e. 35(62.5 %) and 21(37.5 %) of male and female teacher were participated in the study area respectively. 13 (65 %) and 7 (35%) of male and female were involved in supervision activities respectively. This indicated that the number of female teachers and supervisors were low in the study area.

In terms of the Ages of the respondents, 23(41 %) and 5(25 %) of teachers and supervisors respectively were between the Age of 20-30, whereas 20(35 %) 7(35 %) teachers and supervisors respectively were between the Age of 31-40. Only 13 (24%) and 8 (40%) of teachers and supervisors respectively were within the Age of 41 and above.

In the same table variable C, 5(8.92%) and 1(5 %) of teachers and supervisors respectively were certificate holders . 48(85.5 %)and 17 (85 %) teachers and supervisors respectively were diploma holder and only 3(5.3%)and 2(10 %)of teachers and supervisors respectively First Degree

holder. This result indicated that a large number of teachers and supervisors were diploma holders.

Concerning the current working experience of teachers and supervisors in the same table variable D, showed that 24(42.8 %) and 15%) of teachers and supervisors respectively had work experience of 1-2 years. 22(37.6 %) and10 (50 %) of teachers and supervisors respectively had work experience 3-5 years. Generally the above table depicted that the great number of teachers and supervisors were less experienced.

3. Results of the Study

3.1. The Practice of Supervisors on the Three Domains of Instructional Supervision

3.1.1. Instructional Improvement

Instructional improvement is major domain of instruction supervision. This involves what teachers perform in the instructional process and the leadership role that supervisors should exercise to help teachers perform their teaching tasks effectively.

Variable	N	Observed Mean	SD	test-value	t- value	Df	Sig(two-tailed)	Md
Instructional improvement	76	10.7895	1.68377	12	-6.268	75	0.000	-1.21053
P < 0.05								

Table 3: One Sample t- Test Value on the Practice of Supervisors in Instructional Improvement

Table 3.1, indicated that the value of one sample test for the practice of supervisors in instructional improvement observed mean is significantly lower than the mean test value-(t= -6.268,df=75, P=0.000). This shows that supervisors practice in instructional improvement was insufficient. For items indicated to test the practice of instructional supervision, that is, the extent to which supervisors provide professional support that helps teachers improve their lesson

planning skills, present their lessons, facilitate materials, and stimulate teachers to improve instruction, helping teachers in the system of classroom management was not effectively practiced. This indicates that supervisors might have lacked knowledge and training related to instructional improvement.

In addition, the data collected through open-ended interviews and interviews were used to describe the practice of instructional supervision on institutional improvement. Supervisors' practices in planning, presenting, evaluating, and classroom management were not satisfactory. Supervisors and principals said that, they supported teachers by checking lesson plans, comparing daily and weekly lesson plans with annual lesson plans, and conducting classroom observations at a minimum level. During the process of classroom observation, the practice was not as interesting; however, during these activities, the supervisors tried to check the performance of teachers in elaborating the content clearly, in revising the past lesson, on the clarity of objectives and suitability teaching method, time usage, her or his hand writing readable or not, in teaching learning and instructional usage, in teacher readiness to the topic, and in developing active learning methods, check the one to five group interaction, and check how teachers evaluate their students in the classroom.

From the above open-ended questionnaires and interviews, it was possible to identify the considerable failure of the sampled schools regarding their supervisory services concerning the area of instructional improvement.

Hallinger conceptualized the instructional development process as one that fundamentally focuses on the roles of coordinating, supervising, and developing curricula and

instruction through actions taken to influence what happens in the school and classroom [15]. West and Bollington support instructional development activities as the main focus of instructional supervisors. However, the schools under this study with respect to this issue could be viewed as having insufficient performance, and this was a bit far from the ambitions stated in the literature [16].

Holding the same idea, Admas and Dicky revealed that supervisors should aim to stimulate, coordinate, and guide teachers' efforts both individually and collectively to make their performance more effective [17]. Similarly, Mbamba, Nwagwu, and Joof, asserted that the instructional supervisor emphasizes the development and improvement of professional techniques and procedures, while Adams and Dickey, pointed out that the supervisor is concerned with facilitating appropriate instructional materials and stimulating teachers to improve instruction [17,18]. Respondents were asked whether school-based supervision helped teachers create a cooperative spirit.

3.1.2. Curriculum Development

Curriculum development is major domain of instructional supervision. The focus in this domain is to help teachers and students realize effective and meaningful teaching and learning. In this respect, curriculum development in the school system may involve curriculum planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Variable	N	Observed Mean	SD	test-value	t- value	Df	Sig(two-tailed)	Md
curriculum development	76	13.6974	1.72835	15	-6.570	75	0.000	-1.30263
P < 0.05								

Table 4: One Sample t- Test Value on the Practice of Supervisors in Curriculum Development

As shown in Table 3.2, the result of one sample test indicated that the practice of supervisors in curriculum development observed mean was significantly lower than the mean test value ($t = -6.570$, $df = 75$, $P = 0.000$). This indicates that the practice of curriculum development performed by supervisors is insufficient.

The results of the open-ended questions and interviews indicated that supervisors' performance in curriculum development was not effective and had a low level of implementation in the school. Supervisors and teachers had little information about curriculum planning, implementation, and evaluation systems. Therefore, supervisors are not skilled in curriculum development.

The results of the interview gained from all principals and supervisors showed that how you help teachers in curriculum development helps teachers in the text book evaluation, help teachers develop action research skills, and help teachers in curriculum materials. However, this activity was unsatisfactory because the skills of supervisors in curriculum development were low.

Supervisors must focus on developing teachers' knowledge of their fields, creating opportunities for teachers in curriculum

evaluation, supporting teachers to engage in research activities, providing recent and revenue information to teachers, and helping teachers in the preparation, evaluation, and utilization of instructional materials. As tested in the study, the results revealed that none of these activities were performed well. This indicated that the performance of supervisors in curriculum development was not effective in the sample primary schools.

In line with this result, research finding conducted by Hallinger stated that curriculum development supervision was poorly practiced [15]. The supervisory activities on teachers' development of knowledge in their field were low and, did not enable teachers to evaluate the teaching learning process, it failed to assist teachers with the necessary curriculum material. Lucio and McNeil also affirmed that instructional supervision in a curriculum development system supports participatory learning in which the classroom is structured so that students can easily work cooperatively and teachers can make available diverse experiences [5]. Regarding this, Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon, stated that supervisors must have sufficient knowledge of content and purpose of school curriculum to help teachers [19]. They suggested that the primary purpose of supervision is to improve teaching and learning by helping

teachers acquire a deeper understanding of the learning-teaching process. Knowledge generation can be achieved when supervision becomes a process of action research in which the supervisor and teacher use classroom learning and teaching activities as a vehicle to test their own ideas and practices of colleagues and findings in which the teacher and supervisors function.

3.1.3. Staff Development

Staff development is another domain of instruction supervision. According to Oliva and Pawla, staff development develops and facilitates meaningful opportunities for professional growth [3]. Teachers may undergo staff development during instructional and curriculum development.

Variable	N	Observed Mean	SD	test-value	t- value	Df	Sig(two-tailed)	Md
Staff development	76	14.3026	1.74371	15	-3.487	75	.001	-.69737
P < 0.05								

Table 5: One Sample t-Test Value for the Practice of Supervisors in Staff Development

As indicated in Table 3.3, the result of one sample depicted that the practice of supervisors in staff development observed mean is significantly lower than the taste value ($t=3.487$, $df=75$, $P=0.001$). This shows that the practice of supervisors in staff development is insufficient.

The results of the open-ended questions and interviews showed that the implementation of staff development in the school was low. The supervisors did not conduct a survey to identify the gaps between teachers or fill their identified gaps. The principals and supervisors interviewed how you helped the teachers and what your support was. They said that, they did not have sufficient knowledge and skills to implement staff development. They helped teachers by providing orientation to new teachers, short-term training in action research, continuous professional development, and continuous assessment and observation of classroom lessons.

In supporting this, the research finding conducted by West and Burlington, stated that teachers were not encouraged to improve their professional development by supervision program and staff development supervisory practices was not implemented successfully [16]. Similarly, Hallinger found that, teachers were not encouraged to improve professional development through supervision programs and staff development supervisory practices were not implemented successfully [15]. Staff, curriculum, and instructional development are the three interrelated domains of supervision. These interrelated domains have their own importance in improving teaching and learning processes. To develop school staff, supervision must focus on training teachers in line with improving their instructional skills.

3.2. The Practice of Supervisors on Their Expected Roles with in the Three Domains of Instructional Supervision

No	Variable	N	Observed Mean	SD	test-value	t- value	Df	Sig(two-tailed)	md
1	Coordinator	76	8.23	1.397	9	-1.970	75	0.021	-0.31579
2	Consultant	76	5.907	0.926	6	-0.867	75	0.011	-0.09211
3	Group leader	76	5.806	1.222	6	-1.301	75	0.000	-0.00000
3	Evaluator	76	5.828	1.1001	6	-1.355	75	0.017	-0.17105
P < 0.05									

Table 6: One Sample t-Test Value for the Role of Supervisors within the Three Domains of Supervisors

Table 3.4, revealed one sample value of supervisors' practice of supervisors on their expected roles in the three domains of instructional supervision.

3.3. Coordinator

As indicated in Table 3.4, the results of a one-sample t-test indicated that the practice of supervisors inn their role of coordinating to achieve the three domains of instructional supervision mean score was significantly lower than the mean tested value ($t= -1.970$ df 75, $P=0.021$). This shows that the practice of supervisors inn their role as coordinators was not sufficient and at a low level.

This indicates that the supervisors had a low level of knowledge about their role in coordinating and did not play their role in the school. They also lack knowledge organizing in service training, organizing sharing experience programs, and assisting teachers in relating their work with the recent school curriculum program. Supporting this finding, Seid

stated that instructional supervisors did not play their role as coordinators [20]. They lacked the knowledge and skills to help teachers or coordinate and organize the three domains as coordinators. As coordinators of staff development, supervisors' plans with teachers range, evaluate, and often conduct service programs for teachers.

3.2.1. Consultant

Table 3.4, showed the result of a one-sample t-test, which revealed that the practice of supervisors on their role of consulting to achieve the three domains of instructional supervision mean score is significantly lower than the mean tested value ($t= -0.867$, df 75, $P= 0.011$), indicating that the practice of supervisors on their role of coordinating was not sufficient and at a low level.

This indicates an incompetent and low level of knowledge of supervisors about their roles in consulting. They did not apply their roles of consulting teachers about various

aspects, such as identifying problems of instruction, method of teaching learning process, identification of instructional materials, planning, and other activities. Supporting this finding, Seid stated that instructional supervisors did not play their role as consultants in promoting the three domains [20]. As a result, these supervisors did not support teachers in improving their teaching skills, to help them develop different competences and prepare materials. This has a negative impact on ensuring quality supervision in schools. If supervision does not act as a consultant in promoting instructional development, curriculum development, and staff development activities, this indicates that the quality of supervision is below expectations or poor.

3.2.2. Group Leader

According to the same table above, the result of one sample t-test indicated that the practice of supervisors on their role in the group leading mean score was significantly lower than the mean tested value ($t = -1.301$, $df = 75$, $P = 0.000$). This showed that the practice of supervisors in their role in group leading was insufficient.

This revealed the ineffective practice of group leadership in the sample schools. The supervisors were competent in supporting teachers in moving toward group goals and incompetent in supporting teachers in conflict resolution. Research finding conducted by Seid, found that, supervisors were not involved as group leaders in promoting these three domains [20]. They did not facilitate teachers in augmenting their performance. Similarly, Oliva and Pawlas stated that group difficulties may arise from poor interpersonal relationships among groups of teachers and supervisors, and poor management [3]. Interpersonal relationships may be improved through group deliberation or group processes, and through group encounter techniques such as sensitivity training. In particular, improvement in the development of healthy interpersonal relationships involves the reduction or elimination of conflicts. Okumbe, stated that the most important function of supervisors is to serve as resource leaders [21]. They are expected to provide relevant information, practical guidance, and academic assistance to the committee. It is also expected that a supervisor will play a leadership role in assisting teachers to maintain and augment their professional abilities.

3.2.3. Evaluator

Table 3.4, showed the result of a one-sample t-test indicating that the practice of supervisors on their role of evaluating to achieve the three domains of instructional supervision mean score is significantly lower than the mean tested value ($t = -1.355$, $df = 75$, $P = 0.017$). This showed that the practice of supervisors regarding their role in evaluation was not sufficient.

This revealed that the supervisors did not support teachers as evaluators in developing their skills in selecting appropriate evaluation types or evaluating their student performance and identifying their instructional problems. Supporting this, a research finding conducted by Seid stated that the supervisors did not act as evaluators in facilitated

and assisted teachers for developing or selecting proper evaluation types and for evaluating text-books as well as students' performance [20]. Olive and Pawlas stated that supervisors should provide assistance to teachers in evaluating instruction and curricula as evaluators to support these findings [3]. For instance, supervisors help teachers find answers to curricular and instructional problems, identify research studies that may have bearing on their problems, and conduct limited research projects.

Generally, supervisors within the three domains of supervision are coordinators, consultants, group leaders, and evaluators. As we have seen, in particular supervisors did not apply their role as expected. Supporting this, a research finding conducted by Seid stated that instructional supervisors did not play the roles of consulting, coordinating, group leading, and evaluating [20].

3.3. The Major Challenges in the Practice of the Three Domains of Instructional Supervision

Data on the major challenges of instructional supervision were gathered from all teacher and supervisor respondents using open-ended items.

3.3.1. Lack of Combining Supervision with Other Duties

Respondents revealed the following points about the problems of supervision related to combining supervision with other duties; 27 teacher respondents revealed that, the supervisors were not inclined toward instructional supervision; they were given more attention to other office duties. The school principals were too busy with the day-to-day operation of the schools, and they had matched power over administrative decisions. School instructional supervisors were only inclined toward their own work, rather than developing the professional development of unproductive teachers. The other 28 teachers revealed that, their supervisors had little time to assist them. They did not pay attention to instructional and pedagogical activities and did not work with unproductive teachers. Moreover, 20 supervisors revealed that, the school-based supervisors did not consider the practice of instructional supervision with the main function of function of their job and they left this practice only for assigned supervisors. The supervisors were too busy with other administrative duties and a shortage of time to assist unproductive teachers.

It was possible to conclude that school supervisors lacked attention to the practices of instructional supervision and lack commitment to work supervision by coordinating with other duties. Oliva and Pawlas stated that supervisors have responsibilities for the curriculum and instruction of schools, and supervision of those aspects is one of their many tasks [3].

3.3.2. Lack of Knowledge and Competences of Supervisors

For the open-ended questionnaires, 27 respondents revealed that, the supervisors lacked knowledge and competencies in the areas of instructional, curricular, and staff development, lack of competence to identify the problems of teachers, and solve them effectively. The supervisors lacked technical

skills to support unproductive teachers. The other 28 teachers stated that their supervisors were incompetent to support teachers, teaching skills, lack of research skills, and lack of educational experience to participate in supervision. Supervisors were capable of accepting and fulfilling new responsibilities arising from technological and other changes. They lacked technical skills and direction to solve the problems, and they had not provided continuous feedback or created computation to the teachers.

Moreover, 20 supervisors revealed the problem of knowledge and competence of supervisors as follows: supervisors and supervisees were almost the same; supervisors were not trained in supervising school except their field of subject matter as teaching, they lacked confidence to practice instructional supervision, the supervisors lacked knowledge related to instructional improvement, curriculum development, and staff development, and the supervisors did not support teachers through materials, facilities, and other educational support. It was possible to conclude that supervisors did not have enough knowledge and competencies to support teachers through instructional improvement, curriculum development, and staff development. In supporting this, a research finding conducted by Okumbe, stated that the supervisors had lack of competence through curricular, instructional and staff development and teachers were not encouraged to improve their professional development through supervision [21].

3.3.3. Lack of Communication Skills

Lack of communication is one of the factors that may limit supervisory practices in schools. Hence, supervisors must build effective communication channels to provide effective instructional supervision. According to the open-ended questionnaire results, lack of communication skills of supervisors, 27 teacher respondents revealed that the communication skills of supervisors to support teachers' teaching skills were not effective, lack of smooth relationship between teachers and themselves for improvement of instruction, and lack of motivation for teachers to feel free to express their problem concerns.

The other 28 teachers, respondents stated communication skills of supervisors, such as, lack of advising techniques for creating and maintaining classroom discipline, lack of constructive criticism in a friendly, firm, and positive manner; the supervisors and teachers lacked a smooth relationship and friendly communication, and there was feeling anxiety during classroom observation.

In addition, 20 supervisors forwarded problems related to their communication skills. For example, supervisors' competence to communicate freely with teachers was not effective, lack of smooth relation between teachers, lack of motivation to feel free to express problem concerns, a lack of friendly communicated with unproductive teachers, and the teachers did not express their problems freely for supervisors.

Generally, it was possible to conclude that supervisors lacked

the skills, knowledge, and ability to supervise others, lack of individual and group supervisory services, lack of training, and loss of self-awareness among themselves. Supporting this, Lucio and Mc Neil forwarded some importance and necessities of communication, as; communication makes social life possible and social organizations cannot exist without effective communication [5]. When communication among individuals fails, their capacity for effective cooperation and productive efforts also fails. Moreover, in connection with this, Pajak pointed out that a good supervisor is capable of communicating with his subordinate to provide necessary guidelines and assistance for professional improvement [22]. Hence, supervisors have to in opposition to create smooth communication with teachers by organizing intensive staff training in supporting and helping teachers. Teacher and supervisor respondents were asked to give their views on whether supervisors would assist teachers to feel free to express problems of concern to them.

3.3.4. Major Findings of the Study and its Implication

Based on the analysis, the following are the main findings of this study:

- Regarding instructional improvement, the results showed that the practice of instructional supervisors in instructional improvement was ineffective. This indicates that supervisors might have lacked knowledge and training related to instructional improvement.
- Related to curriculum development, the study revealed that supervisors did not help teachers in curriculum evaluation, planning and implementation, lack of research skills, and low levels of helping teachers in the preparation, evaluation, and utilization of instructional materials. This shows that supervisors' performance in curriculum development was ineffective.
- Concerning staff development activity, the practice of staff development in the sample area was not effective. Hence, low levels of in-service training, poor conducting of surveys to identify the service needs of the teacher, lack of evaluation in service training, lack of arranging specialization and orientation programs for newly assigned teachers, and organized model teaching programs for experienced staff members and instructional supervisors were competent in developing the ability and productivity of teachers. This shows that the practice of staff development performed by the supervisor was not sufficient.
- Regarding the role of supervisors within the domains, the supervisors lacked knowledge about their role as coordinator, preparation of various programs in the school, knowledge about their role as consultants, and applied roles of consultants through advising teachers through the teaching learning process. Supervisors were incompetent in supporting teachers as group leaders. The supervisors did not support teachers as evaluators in developing their skills in the selection of appropriate evaluation types and in identifying their instructional and curricular problems.
- Regarding the major challenges of instructional supervision, the respondents revealed supervisors' problems related to combining supervision with other duties. Such as, lack of commitment to work supervision by coordinated with other duties, the supervisors had little time for supervision of

instruction, the supervisors didn't consider the practice of instructional supervision with the main function of their job and they left this practice only for assigned supervisors.

- Regarding problems related to the knowledge and competencies of supervisors, the respondents stated a lack of knowledge and competencies of supervisors in the area of instructional, curricular, and staff development.
- Problems related to communication skills, the supervisors lacking a smooth relation between teachers and themselves for improvement of instruction, and lack of motivation to feel free to express problems concerned with them.

4. Conclusion

Instructional supervision, as one of the essential components of the education system, is broad and vast. In order to make it manageable, the study was confined mainly to the following issues of instructional supervision : the practice of supervisors in the three major domains of supervision, the roles of supervisors in the three domains of instructional supervision, the individual and group techniques of instructional supervision, and the major challenges in the practice of the three domains of instructional supervision. Supervision is a major function in school instructional operations, and it is the best instrument for the contribution of each teaching personnel to the quality of education. In general, instructional supervision is an ongoing process that enables teachers to develop professionally, and different supervisory options should be provided for different teachers based on their experience and level.

Recommendations

- Supervisors should emphasize assisting teachers in planning, implementing, and evaluating curriculum materials, arranging effective orientation programs for newly assigned teachers, and conducting surveys to identify in-service training.
- Instructional supervisors played roles that could be performed in the three domains of instructional supervision. The cluster supervisors and school principals should provide short-term training and awareness of the department head by focusing on the role of the coordinator, consultant, group leader, and evaluator.
- Supervisors should facilitate and organize opportunities to discuss and decide on the purpose and procedures of each phase of class-room observation prior to actual class room observation.
- Principles should assign experienced supervisors to guide and support teachers and learners. Supervisors are also supposed to perform supervisory activities willingly, carefully, with commitment and devotion.
- Supervisors must create special sessions in which teachers and those involved in supervision can discuss how to conduct class room observations and for what purpose it could be conducted by providing timely feedback and discuss on future alternatives.

References

1. UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2006). *Teachers and educational quality: Monitoring global needs for 2015* (Vol. 253). United Nations Educational, Scientific & Cultural Organization.

2. Panigrahi, M. R. (2012). Implementation of instructional supervision in secondary school: Approaches, prospects and problems. *Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal*, 1(3), 59-67.
3. Olivia, P. F., & Pawlas, G. E. (1997). *Supervision for Today's Schools*, New York. NY.: Longman.
4. Enaigbe, P. A. (2009). Strategies for improving supervisory skills for effective primary education in Nigeria. *Edo Journal of counselling*, 2(2), 235-244.
5. Lucio, W. H., & McNeil, J. D. (1979). *Supervision in thought and action. (No Title)*.
6. Ali, M. A. (1998). *Supervision for teacher development: A proposal for Pakistan*. Unesco, International Institute for Educational Planning.
7. ASEGU, D. A. (2012). Practices and Challenges of Instructional Supervision in Enebsie Sar Midir Woreda Primary Schools.
8. Sergiovanni, T. J. (2007). *Rethinking leadership: A collection of articles*. Corwin Press.
9. Cogan, M. (1973). *Clinical supervision*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
10. Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers*.
11. Aggarwal, (1985). *Theory and Principles of Education: Philosophical and Sociological Base of Education*. New Delhi: Vikas publishing House pvt. Ltd
12. Unruh, A. (1970). *Supervision for change and innovation*.
13. Gratton, R. (2004). Teacher appraisal: A lesson on confusion over purpose. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(5), 292-296.
14. Sturges, A. W. (1979). Instructional supervisors: A dichotomy. *Educational Leadership*, 36(8), 586-588.
15. Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of education*, 33(3), 329-352.
16. West, M., & Bollington, R. (1990). *Teacher appraisal: A practical guide for schools. (No Title)*.
17. Adams, H. P., & Dickey, F. G. (1953). *Basic principles of supervision. (No Title)*.
18. Mbamba, A. M., Nwagwu, N. A., & Joof, M. B. (1992). *Book of readings in educational management*.
19. Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2001). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach*. Allyn & Bacon/Longman Publishing, a Pearson Education Company, 1760 Gould Street, Needham Heights, MA 02494.
20. Seid, B. (2016). *The quality of instructional supervision in secondary schools of wagy himra zone as perceived by teachers* (Doctoral dissertation).
21. Okumbe, J. A. O. (1998). *Educational Management: Theory and Practice*. African Books Collective Ltd., The Jam Factory, 27 Park End Street, Oxford OX1 1HU, United Kingdom (paperback: ISBN-9966-846-42-5, \$18).
22. Pajak, E. (1989). *The central office supervisor of curriculum and instruction: Setting the stage for success. (No Title)*.