

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIOURAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OFEDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF SCHOOL BASED SUPERVISION IN GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF LIDETA SUB CITY, ADDIS ABABA.

BY

HAFTU BIRHANU

MAY, 2022

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF SCHOOL-BASED SUPERVISION IN GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF LIDETA SUB CITY.

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF

GRADUATE STUDIES AT ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP.

BY

HAFTU BIRHANU

ADVISOR:

DEJENE NIGUSSIE(PhD)

MAY, 2022

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

This thesis has been summated for examination with my approval as University advisor

Name :-_____

Signature:-_____

Date:- _____

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF SCHOOL-BASED SUPERVISION IN GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF LIDETA SUB CITY.

BY

HAFTU BIRHANU

APPROVAL OF BOARD OF EXAMINATIONS

Department Head	Signature
Dejene Nigussie (PhD)	
Advisor	Signature
Befekadu Zeleke (PhD)	
Internal examiner	Signature
External examiner	Signature

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declared that the thesis on the title, *"Practices and Challenges of School-Based supervision in Government Secondary Schools of Lideta Sub City"* is his work and that all sources that have been referred to and quoted have been dully indicated and acknowledged with complete references.

Name- Hagos Gebremariam

*Sign.*_____

Date 03/11/14

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

Advisor's name: Dejene (PhD)

*Sign.*_____

Date _____

Place: **Addis Ababa University** College of Education and Behavioural Studies Department of Educational Planning and Management.

Date of submission _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this research is a result of so many People's efforts that deserve appreciation. First and foremost I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my advisor DejeneNigussie(Ph.D). I really cannot put into words how incredibly grateful I am for everything he has done for me. For everything, he has taught me and for his professional advice and constructive criticisms in my attempts to make this work a success, I sincerely thank him.

Secondly, I would also like to express my heartfelt thanks to Addis Ababa University for its financial and material support for the completion of this research work.

Thirdly, I have also expressed my sincere love and appreciation for my wife W/roRhaelTewolde, and my beloved children's YostinaHaftu and LiuleHaftu. For their moral support and encouragement, and also their efforts to overcome various challenges in this study. I have to send my heartfelt thanks to my friends Mr.Molla,W/roMekides and Mr.Aschale for their technical support as well as moral support starting from the initial to the completion of this research work. Lastly, but not least, I would like to send my sincere thanks tolidetasubcitysample secondary school principals and teachers, school-based supervisors, and sub-city education office expertise, for their participation to give the necessary information, through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews to finish the study successfully.

TABLE OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i
TABLE OF CONTENTS ii
LIST OF TABLES v
LIST OF ACRONYMS vi
ABSTRACT vii
CHAPTER ONE 1
1. INTRODUCTION 1
1.2. Statement of the Problem 3
1.3. Objective of the Study 4
1.3.1. General Objective 4
1.3.2. Specific Objective 4
1.4. Significance of the Study 5
1.5. Delimitation of the Study 5
1.6. Limitation of the Study 5
1.7. Operational Definition for key Terms 6
1.8. Organization of the study 6
CHAPTER TWO 7
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 7
2.1 The Concept of Supervision 7
2.2 Historical Development of Educational Supervision 8
2.2.1 Global perspective 8
2.2. Historical Development of Educational Supervision in Ethiopia 9
2.3 Principles of Educational Supervision 13
2.4. The Intents of Supervision 13
2.5. Qualities of a Good Supervisor 14
2.6. School based Supervison Options for Teachers 15
2.6.1 Clinical Supervision 15
2.6.1.1. Pre-Observation Conference 16
2.6.1.2. Classroom Observation 16
2.6.1.3. Analysis of the Observations 16

2.6.1.4. Post Observation Conference 16
2.6.1.5. Post Conference Analysis 17
2.6.2. Collegial Supervision 17
2.6.3. Informal and Inquiry-based Supervision 17
2.6.4. Self- Directive Supervision 17
2.7. Tasks of Instructional Supervision 18
2.7.1 Direct Assistance 18
2.7.2 Curriculum Development 18
2.7.3 Group Development 19
2.7.4. Professional Development 19
2.7.5 Action Research 20
2.8. Practices of Educational Supervision in Ethiopia 22
2.8.1. Supervision at School Level 22
2.8.1.1 The Roles of School Principal in Supervision 22
2.8.1.2 The Roles of Deputy Principals in Supervision 22
2.8.1.3. The Roles of School based aupervisiors in Supervision 22
2.8.1.4. The Roles of Senior Teachers in Supervision 23
2.9. Current Educational Supervisory Practice in Addis Ababa City 23
2.9.1. Supervisors' Responsibility 24
2.10. Challenges against School-Based Supervision 24
2.10.1 Perception of Teachers towards Supervision 24
2.10.2. Lack of Adequate Training and Support 24
2.10.3. Excessive Workload 25
2.10.4. Inadequate Educational Resources 25
CHAPTER THREE 27
THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY 27
3.1. The Research Design 27
3.2. The Research Method 27
3.3. Sources of Data 27
3.3.1. Primary Source of Data 27
3.3.2. Secondary Source of Data 28

3.4. The Study Population 28
3.5. Sample and Sampling Techniques 28
3.6. Instruments of Data Collection 29
3.6.1. Questionnaires 29
3.6.2. Interview 30
3.6.3. Document Analysis 30
3.7. Validity and Reliability checks 30
3.8. Data Collection Procedure 31
3.9. Methods of Data Analysis 32
3.10. Ethical consideration 33
3.11. Communicating the result 33
CHAPTER FOUR 34
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION 34
4.1. Characteristics of Respondents 34
4.2. The organazation of School Based Supervision 35
4.3.The Actual Practices of School Based Supervision 38
4.4. Teachers' perception on School based supervision 43
4.5. How supervisors' assess their contribution to the improvement of instruction 46
4.6. Major Challenges that affect School based Supervisors 50
CHAPTER FIVE 55
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 56
5.1. Summary 56
5.2. Conclusion 59
5.3. Recommendations 60
REFERENCES 63
Annexies 67

LIST OF TABLES

Table1: Development of supervision through different periods 9
Table 2: Summary of the five tasks of supervision 21
Table 3: Summary of Sample Size and Sampling Techniques 29
Table 4-Reliability test results with Cronbach's alpha. 31
Table 5: Summary of data analysis 33
Table 6: Characteristics of respondents 34
Table 7: Views on how the Function of School based Supervision is facilitated 36
Table 8: Respondents' View on the actual practices of school based supervision corresponds to the expected standards to assist Teacher's Professional Improvement. 39
Table 9: Teachers Perception on implementing school based suppervision in gvovernment secondary schools. 44
Table 10: Respondents View on the School Based supervisors effort to identify the strengths and limitations of teachers in the classroom. 46
Table 11: Respondents View on the Challenges that affect Secondary School based Supervisors While Implementing Supervisory Practices In lideta sub city. 51

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AACAEB: Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureau

ADEA: Association for the Development of Education in Africa.

CPD: Continuing Professional Development

EFA: Education for All

ESDP: Education Sector Development Program

ETP: Education and Training Policy

LSCAR: Lideta Sub City Annual Report

MOE: Ministry of Education

SCEO: Sub City Education Office

UNESCO: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization

UNICEF: United Nations International Children's Education Fund

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess the practices of school-based supervision in government secondary schools of lideta sub-city. four basic questions were formulated, which emphasized the extent to which teachers understand the school-based supervision in secondary schools of lideta sub-city, the procedures employed in-classroom observation in the secondary schools, the extent to which school-based supervisors discharge their responsibilities, and the challenges existing in the implementation of school-based supervision. To conduct this study, a descriptive survey design was employed. All three government secondary schools found in the sub-city were selected schools. From these sample schools, 38 teachers,45 department heads, and 9 School principals and vice-principals were selected as respondents usingavailable,Quota, and purposive sampling techniques respectively. The questionnaire was used as the main tool of data collection. Interview and document analysis were used to substantiate the data gathered through questionnaires.Percentage,Mean,standard deviation, and t-test were utilized to analyze quantitative data gained through the questionnaires. The qualitative data gathered through interviews and document analysis were by narration. The result of the study indicated that teachers lack awareness and orientation on the activities and significance of school-based supervision, ineffectiveness of the practices of supervisory options matching with the individual teacher's developmental level, and the inability of supervisors to apply the necessary procedures for classroom observation properly. On the other hand, among the factors influencing the school-based supervision, are lack of relevant training programs for supervisors, scarcity of experienced supervisors in school-based supervision activities, lack of supervision manuals in the schools, and shortage of allocated budget for supervisory activities. Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn; The absence of facilitating experience sharing programs among teachers, seldom assisting teachers in developing instructional materials, and absence of expanding best practices of teaching methodology among school and teachers were the problems.Finally, to minimize the problems of school-based supervision in secondary schools, it is recommended to give relevant in-service pieces of training for supervisors to upgrade their supervisory activities, necessary resources such as supervision manuals, and an adequate budget for the success of supervision at the school levelwassuggested.

Key words: Supervision,School based supervision, Practices, Challenges and Secondary school

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, Limitation of the Study, and definition of operational terms.

1.1. Background of the study

As in many other developing countries, in our country- Ethiopia, education has been given great attention for it is the basic way of economic growth and all-rounded development of the society. This requires the effectiveness and commitment of stakeholders particularly teachers, school leaders, and management, (Aggarwl, 1985). So schools must improve their basic functions of teaching and learning process that aim at helping and empowering all students to raise their broad outcomes through instructional improvement, administration, instruction, and supervision are responsible for the highest performance of students in schools. Furthermore, the Ministry of Education (MoE, 2010), in its Education Sector Development Program (ESDP V), has stressed the necessity of teacher supervision and support as a strategy to insure quality of teaching and learning.

Many researchers believe that supervision of instruction has the potential to improve classroom practices, and contribute to student success through the professional growth and improvement of teachers (Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Musaazi, 1985; Sergiovanni&Starratt, 2002; and Sullivan &Glanz, 1999). Supervision is viewed as a co-operative venture in which supervisors and teachers engage in dialogue for the purpose of improving instruction which logically should contribute to student improved learning and success (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986; Sergiovanni&Starratt, 2002; Sullivan &Glanz, 1999).

To achieve the goal of supervision, supervisors of instruction generally advice, assist and support teachers (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986 ;) The International Institute for Educational Planning UNESCO, 2007; Sergiovanni&Starratt, 2002) and also inspect, Control and evaluate teachers UNESCO, 2007). In a related way, (Blasé and Blasé 1999) suggest that teachers do their best work when they are motivated. They note that effective instructional leadership impacts positively on teacher motivation, satisfaction, self-esteem, efficacy, and teachers' sense of security and their feelings of support.

Supervision in the school system mainly focuses on the whole school improvement and quality of education given to the students. In the light of this, (MoE, 2002) stated supervision

as the process in which supervisors provide professional support for the school principals and teachers to strengthen the teaching and learning process. Similarly, according to the Trait discussed in the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA, 1998) supervision is taken as the process in which supervisors visit schools to work with the teachers and school administrators to ascertain the quality of teaching and administration. Thus, adequate support and effective supervisory activities are very crucial for schools to enhance the teaching-learning process.

The overall objective of effective school-based supervision is to enable the individual teacher to become an implementer of effective teaching. Regarding the role of supervisors, they are part of the technical level in schools. As such they are concerned primarily: with teaching and learning; they are first and foremost tobe come experienced in their profession, not administrators. Their area of expertise is curriculum and instruction; their job is to help their colleagues improve the teaching-learning process. They need an organizational structure that allows them to do this in anumber threatening environment unfettered by bureaucratic requirements for control. The supervisory requirement, then of a staff position with earned, informal authority (rather than administrative authority) consistent with a supervisory role defined as part of the technical subsystem. This point is illustrated in Supervision Manual of (MoE, 1994) as follows:

- Ensuring curriculum implementation.
- Providing direct technical support to teachers.
- Providing on- the - job training to teachers.
- Conducting teacher performance evaluation.
- Conducting formative education program evaluation.
- Monitoring and coordination.

In Ethiopia educational inspection which was later replaced by supervision, was started in 1941/42. The shifting of inspection to supervision (in 1962/63) was to improve the teaching learning process through strengthening of supervision by focusing on the curriculum, teaching content and methodology, and provision of professional assistance and guidance to classroom teachers. Again, with the change of the political system in the country a shift from inspection to supervision was made as of 1994 (AACAEB, 2006).

According to (MoE,1994), school-based supervisors and external supervisors are responsible to carry out educational supervision. In this regard, the woreda,sub city/zonal/, Regional and Central supervisory educators are structured under external supervisors. Furthermore, the

supervisors and education experts of the above-mentioned external organizational bodies have been given the responsibility to assist teachers in school.

To bring effective education through the improved teaching-learning process, school-based supervision should be democratic and cooperative and should get serious attention in the school. In light of this, it is quite useful to assess the current practices of school-based supervision in government secondary schools of the Lideta sub-city.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

According to educational literatures indicated that, school based supervisors play critical and undeniable role for the success of school organization (Certo, 2006:3). The provision of quality education needs cooperative and jointed efforts of different stakeholders and communities. It is the concurrent responsibility of federal, regional and local governments.as illustrated by the MoE,(2015), the school principals, vice-principals, department heads, and senior teachers should take major responsibility for School-based supervisory practices within their school. These responsible partners involve themselves in the regular observation of teachers teaching in the classroom, and the organizing of short-term training and experience sharing to maximize the professional competence of teachers, and thus contribute to the quality of education.

The current school based supervision practices has exposed to multiple problems such as; lack of adequate professional support to newly deployed teachers; less frequent classroom visits to enrich teachers instructionally and peer coaching by school based supervisor; focus of supervisors on administrative matters than on academic issues and less mutual professional trust between supervisors and teachers.

In addition, research findings related to the past supervision in schools indicated that there are some problems with its practice. To list some of them are 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).

In line with this, the researcher look in to the gaps that affects the improvement of quality education on the side of school based supervision as; school based supervisors did not design various interventions to assist teachers improve their limitations; school based supervisors did not provide professional support to teachers to improve their instructional skills; school based supervisors did not conduct training need assessment from

the basis ofteachers pedagogical gaps and school based supervisors did not link the schools with the local NGOs, communities and other stakeholders to solve and to get financial problems.

In addition to this, the researcher look in detail of the challenges faced on school based 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 sub city education officers with lack of enough instructional guidelines. So, less efforts were being made to alleviate the listed problems for the success of school based supervision. 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. Indeed, these circumstances initiated the researcher to conduct study on the issue. Due to this reason, the researcher was motivated to assess the practices and challenges of School-based school supervision in lideta sub-city Government Secondary Schools. In this case, and it is selected from other subcites due to its low achivements of studenetsacadmeic performance. the research raised the following basic research questions.Thus, this study intends to answer the following basic questions:

1. To what extent do teachers understand the school-based supervision in secondarySchools of lideta sub city?
2. To what extent do school-based supervisors employ the procedure of classroom observationin Secondary schools?
3. To what extent did school-based supervisors discharge their responsibilities?
4. What are the challenges existing in the implementation of school-based supervision?

1.3. Objective of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective

To assess the practices and challenges of school-based supervision in government secondary schools of idea sub-city.

1.3.2. Specific Objective

The research wasconducted to attain the following specific objectives;

1.To investigate the understanding of teachers about school-based supervision.

2.To explore the procedures employed in-classroom observation in secondary schools.

3.To discover the extent to which school-based supervisors discharge their responsibilities.

4. To examine the challenges and prospects of school-based supervision in secondary schools.

1.4. Significance of the Study

The purpose of supervision is to improve instruction, strengthen classroom management, and ensure that the curriculum is implemented. Supervision aims at helping teachers ensure effective teaching, and that all the ministry policies, rules, and regulations are implemented (MoE, 1994). In the light of this, the study wasbelieved to have the following contributions:

1. It may serve as an input for different levels of educational experts i.e. SCEO, and AACAEB to know the current practice of school-based supervision in secondary schools.
2. It may assist the external and school-based supervisors to know their weaknesses and strengths on supervisory practices and then encourage them to give more attention to implementing supervisory activities in secondary schools.
3. This study may help as a springboard for other researchers who want to conduct further research in the area of supervision for effective learning and teaching.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

This study was delimited to assess the practices and challenges of school-based supervision in government secondary schools of lideta sub-city, it gives due emphasis on how teachers internalize the school-based supervision, the various supervisory options mostly applied by the supervisors in the school, the procedures of classroom observation implemented in the school, the school-based supervisors discharge their responsibilities and the challenges of school-based supervision.this study was delimited to the 3government secondary schools of the specific sub-city.becausethere are only three governmental secondary schools as well as the problem is severe at those three governmental schools.

1.6. Limitation of the Study

Research work can notbefree from limitations. Hence, some limitations may also be observed in this study. One apparent limitation was that most of the secondary school principals,department heads, and senior leaderswasbusy and may not have enough time to respond to questionnaires and interview. Some of them who have enough time may also be used to fill in and return the questionnaire as per the required time. Despite these shortcomings, however, it was challenging to make the study as complete as possible.these challenges were being solved through the following strategies; i.e, building a strong

relationship with participants and creating awareness for participants on the essentiality of conducting this research to improve teaching and learning.

1.7. Operational Definition for key Terms

Challenges: factors that hinder the function of school-based supervision.

Supervision:-is a process of offering professional support for the improvement of instruction to enhance the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom.

External supervision: refers to professional support for teachers provided by experts, sub-cityCluster supervisor experts, and Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureaufromoutside of the school.

School-based supervision: the supervision that is conducted in schools and that is carried out by principals, vice-principals, heads of department, and senior teachers.

School-Based Supervisor:anybody in the school who has been assigned to conductsupervisory practices at the school level.

1.8. Organization of the study

This study is organized into five chapters. The first chapter contains the introduction part which consists of, the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, the delimitation of the study, and definition of operational terms or concepts. The second chapter contains a review of related literature pertinent to the research. The third chapter deals with research methodology that incorporates, research design, research method, source of data, Population, sample size and sampling technique, Instrument of data collection, procedures of data collection, methods of data analysis, and ethical consideration. The fourth chapter is concerned with the analysis and interpretation of data and discussion of important issues. Whereas chapter five presents a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study. Finally, a list of reference materials used for conducting the study, questionnaire, and interview questions are annexed at the end.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of the literature related to the study of school based supervision. It begins withabriefing on the concept of supervision, the historical development of supervision, tasks of supervision and practices of supervision in Ethiopia and the City Administration of Addis Ababa.

2.1 The Concept of Supervision

Researchers have assigned several definitions and interpretations to supervision but almost all of them centred on one common aim or objective. The main objective of supervision is to improve teachers' instructional practices which may in term improve students' performance.The concept of supervision with respect to the contemporary educational thought is the total processes that include all duties and functions that are of high significance for the operation of a school system. Supervision is a service provided to teachers, both individually and in groups, for the purpose of improving instruction, with the student as the ultimate beneficiary (Oliva&Pawlas, 1997). It is a means of offering to teachersspecialisedhelpin improving instruction.

Supervision is a multipart process that involves working with teachers and other educators in a collegial, collaborative relationship to enhance the quality of teaching and learning within the schools and that promotes the career-long development of teachers (Beach &Reinhartz, 2000). Similarly, Glickman et al. (2004) shared the above idea as supervision denotes a common vision of what teaching and learning can and should be, developed collaboratively by formally designated supervisors, teachers, and other members of the school community. It focuses on teaching and learning by emphasising the subject matter content, the principles of learning, and the teaching process.

Acording to (Benjamin,2003), asserts that, School based supervision in the modern era centers on the improvement of the teaching-learning situation to the benefits of both the teachers and learners, helps in the identification of areas of strength and weaknesses of teachers, follow-up activities that should be directed at the improvement of identified areas of teachers weaknesses and give recognition to the teachers and create a pleasant working atmosphere based on good human relations.Thepurpose of supervision of instruction is not to

judge the competencies of teachers, nor it isto control them but rather to work co-operatively with them.

Instructional supervision is a process that focuses on instruction and provides teachers with information about their teaching to develop instructional skills to improve performance (Beach &Reinhartz, 2000). On the other hand, Igwe (cited in Enaigbe, 2009) indicated that to supervise means to direct, oversee; guide to make sure that expected standards are met. Similarly the term supervision is derived from the word "super video" meaning to oversee as well as it is an interaction between at least two persons for the improvement of an activity.i.e. instructional supervision is seen as a set of activities designed toimprove the teaching and learning process.

(Bernard and Goodyear, 1992), defined supervision as: A relationship between senior and junior members of a profession that (a) is evaluative (b) extend over time (c) serves to enhance the skills of the junior person, (d) monitor the quality of service offered by the junior person and (e) act as gate keeping to the profession. In effect, it is managing others throughleadership and personal influence.

2.2 Historical Development of Educational Supervision

2.2.1 Global perspective

Supervision has gone through many transforms and changes have happened in the field that its practices are affected by political, social, religious, and industrial forces that exist in different periods (Oliva, 2001). The development of instructional supervision is manifest throughout history as a reflection of learning theory and social and political influences (Fine,1997). In colonial New England the process of instructional supervision was external inspection conducted by appointed citizens who would inspect teachers and students in schools (Glanz,1977). This "inspection" process of school supervision made judgments about the management of the school and the teacher rather than the teaching or student learning (Burnham, 1976). This theory of school supervision at this time is known as Administrative Inspection (Lucio&McNeil, 1962). Instructional supervision processes and periods were evolving through the years as the United States population grew and federal and state governments began funding school systems and standardizing the practices of public education (Glanz, 1991). Allowing to Oliva (2001), the main worldwide phases of supervision are discussed below.

Table1: Development of supervision through different periods

Period	Type of supervision	Purpose	Person Responsible
1620-1810	Inspection	Monitoring rules looking for deficiencies	Parents, clergy/selectmen , citizens committees
1850-1910	Inspection, instructional improvement	Monitoring rules, helping teachers improve	Superintendents, principals
1910-1930	Scientific, bureaucratic	Improving instruction and efficiency	Supervising principals, general and central office supervisors' superintendent
1930-1950	Human relations, democratic	Improving instruction	Principals, central office supervisors
1950-1975	Bureaucratic, scientific, clinical, human relations, human resources, democratic	Improving instruction	Principals, central office supervisors, school-based supervisors
1975-1985	Scientific, clinical, human relations, human resources, collaborative/collegial	Improving instruction, increasing teacher satisfaction, expanding students' understanding of classroom events	Principals, central office supervisors, school-based supervisors, peer/coach mentor
1985-Present	Scientific, clinical, human resources, collaborative/collegial/mentor	Improving instruction, increasing teacher satisfaction, creating learning communities, expanding students' classroom events	School-based supervisors, peer/coach/mentor, principals, central office supervisors

Source: Surya, 2002

The history of supervision as a formal activity exercised by educational administrators within a system of schools did not begin until the formation of the common school in the late 1830s. During the first half of the nineteenth century, population growth in the major cities of the United States necessitated the formation of city school systems. While superintendents initially inspected schools to see that teachers were following the prescribed curriculum and that students were able to recite their lessons, the multiplication of schools soon made this an impossible task for superintendents and the job was delegated to the school principal. In the early decades of the twentieth century, the movement toward scientific management in both industrial and public administration had an influence on schools.

At much the same time, child-centered and experienced-based curriculum theories of European educators such as Friedrich Froebel, Johann Pestalozzi, and Johann Herbart, as well as the prominent American philosopher John Dewey, were also affecting the schools. Thus, school supervisors often found themselves caught between the demand to evaluate teachers scientifically and the simultaneous need to transform teaching from a mechanistic repetition of teaching protocols to a diverse repertory of instructional responses to students' natural curiosity and diverse levels of readiness. This tension between supervision as a uniform, scientific approach to teaching and supervision as a flexible, dialogic process between teacher and supervisor involving the shared, professional discretion of both was to continue throughout the century (Surya, 2002).

In the second half of the century the field of supervision became closely identified with various forms of clinical supervision. Initially developed by Harvard professors Morris Cogan and Robert Anderson and their graduate students, many of whom subsequently became professors of supervision in other universities, clinical supervision blended elements of "objective" and "scientific" classroom observation with aspects of collegial coaching, rational planning, and a flexible, inquiry-based concern with student learning.

In 1969, Robert Goldhammer proposed the following five-stage process in clinical supervision: (1) a pre-observation conference between supervisor and teacher concerning elements of the lesson to be observed; (2) classroom observation; (3) a supervisors analysis of notes from the observation, and planning for the post-observation conference;(4) a post-observation conference between supervisor and teacher; and (5) a supervisors analysis of the post-observation conference.

For many practitioners, these stages were reduced to three: the pre-observation conference, the observation, and the post-observation conference. Cogan insisted on a collegial relationship focused on the teachers" interest in improving student learning, and on a nonjudgmental observation and inquiry process.

The initial practice of clinical supervision, however, soon had to accommodate perspectives coming out of the post-Sputnik curriculum reforms of the 1960s that focused on the structures of the academic disciplines. Shortly thereafter, perspectives generated by research on effective schools and effective classrooms that purported to have discovered the basic steps to effective teaching colonized the clinical supervision process.

Nevertheless, in many academic circles the original dialogic and reflective process of Cogan and Goldhammer continued as the preferred process of supervision. This original process of supervision has been subsequently embraced by advocates of peer supervision and collegial-teacher leadership through action research in classrooms. Despite the obvious appeal of clinical supervision in its various forms, it is time-consuming and labor-intensive, rendering it impossible to use on any regular basis given the large number of teachers that supervisors are expected to supervise (in addition to their other administrative responsibilities).

Recognizing the time restraints of practicing supervisors, and wanting to honor the need to promote the growth of teachers, Thomas Sergiovanni and Robert Starratt suggested, in 1998, the creation of a supervisory system with multiple processes of supervision, including summative evaluation.

Such a system would not require the direct involvement of a formal supervisor for every teacher every year. The supervisory system might cycle teachers with professional status through a three-to five-year period, during which they would receive a formal evaluation once and a variety of other evaluative processes during the other years (e.g., self- evaluation, peer supervision, curriculum development, action research on new teaching strategies, involvement in a school renewal project).

2.2. Historical Development of Educational Supervision in Ethiopia

The educational inspection was introduced into the educational system of Ethiopia nearly 35 years afterwards the introduction of the modern (Western) type of education into the country. As it is specified in the Ministry of Education supervision manual (MoE, 1994), for the first time, the inspection wasinitiated in Ethiopia in 1941/42. Among the forces that brought about

the need for school inspection was the increasing number of schools and teachers in the country.

Starting from 1944/45, the office of the inspectorate was recognized centrally, i.e. at the Ministry's head office wascontrolled by a British national named Lt. Commander John Miller. He was appointed as Inspector General assisted by two Ethiopians. The major responsibilities of the inspectors wereto collect and compile statistical data on the number of students and teachers, the number of classrooms available and classsize, conduct school visits in the capital and the province, and finally, produce reports to be submitted to the Ministry of Education as well as the emperor who at that time assumed the Ministry of Education portfolio (AACEB, 2006).

As more and more schools were opened, the number of teachers increased and the student population grew up, the educational activities became more complicated and so it became necessary to train a certain number of inspectors. Thus, in 1950/51 for the first time, the training program was started in the Addis Ababa Teacher Training School with the intake of 13 selected trainees. The number of graduates of inspectors reached 124 in 1961/62. However, an inspection was replaced by supervision in 1962/63. The replacement of inspection with supervision was found necessary to improve the teaching-learning process more efficiently and effectively by strengthening supervision (MoE, 1994).

Under the socialist principles, with the changes in the political system in the country, the management of education needed strict control over the educational policies, plans, and programs. Thus, a shift from supervision to inspection was made in 1980/1 (MoE, 1994).

Again, following the change in the political system in the country a shift from inspection to supervision was made in 1994. According to the Education and Training Policy of 1994, educational administration is decentralized. In this respect, what is envisaged is democraticsupervision, which would seek the participation of all concerned in all spheres of the educational establishment in terms of decision-making, planning and development of objectives and teaching strategies in an effort to improve teaching learning process (MoE, 1994).

During the preceding political systems, the establishment of supervision in Ethiopian education system was limited to national, regional and Zonal level. For that matter, supervisory activities could not able to provide close and sustainable support for school

principals and teachers. The responsibility of the supervisors was not clearly justified, so that they was less effective in implementing their activities. Moreover, the past trend of supervision was focused on administrative tasks than supporting teaching and learning processes. Supervisors was incompetent to support teachers and principals. To this end, supervision has contributed less to sustaining quality education and the professional growth of principals. Therefore, alleviating the old age supervisory problems in schools by establishing supportive school environment is inevitable to improve principals' and teachers' professional growth, and ultimately to maximize learning achievement (MoE, 2002).

2.3 Principles of Educational Supervision

Supervision is worried with the total development of teaching and learning situation. In line with this, Sumaiya (2010) stated that supervision has the following principles:

- There should be short-term, medium-term and long-term planning for supervision.
- Supervision is a sub-system of school organization.
- All teachers have a right and the need for supervision.
- Supervision should be conducted regularly to meet the individual needs of the teachers and other personnel.
- Supervision should help to clarify educational objectives and goals for the principal and the teachers.
- Supervision should assist in the organization and implementation of curriculum programs for the learners.

Supervision from within and outside the school complements each other and are both necessary.

2.4. The Intents of Supervision

Instructional supervision aims to endorse growth, interaction, fault-free problem solving, and a commitment to build capacity in teachers. (Cogan,1973) envisioned practices that would position the teacher as an active learner. Moreover, Cogan asserted that teacherswerenot only able to be professionally responsible but also more than able to be "analytic of their performance, open to help from others and self-directing". (Unruh and Turner,1970) saw supervision as a social process of stimulating, nurturing, and appraising the professional growth of teachers and the supervision as the prime mover in the development of optimum conditions for learning for adults, when teachers learn from examining their practices with

the assistance of others, whether peers or supervisors, their learning is more personalized and therefore more powerful.

The intents of instructional supervision are formative, concerned with ongoing, developmental, and differentiated approaches that enable teachers to learn from analysing and reflecting on their classroom practices with the assistance of another professional (Glatthorn, 1984; Glickman, 1990).

To sum, the intents of instructional supervision revolves around helping teachers for their practical competencies and increasing students learning through the improvement of the teachers' instruction.

2.5. Qualities of a Good Supervisor

The most important indicator for the quality of education is the quality of the teaching and learning taking place in the classroom. However, this cannot be materialized without having regular supervision of teachers' activities (MoE, 2006). The supervisor needs to have some qualities to handle well his/her responsibility. (Claude,1992) indicates that supervising people, teachers, in particular, is both a skill and an art. It is a skill because the basic theories about motivation, communication, conflict resolution, performance counseling, and so on can be learned. On the other hand, its view as an art is, that the supervisor adopts and adapts this knowledge and puts it into practice in his/ her unique way. In general, school-based supervisors ought to be skilled and knowledgeable about the task elements of their school work.

A successful supervisor has a positive attitude. When the supervisors' attitude towards work and their school is positive, the teachers are more likely to be satisfied with and interested in their work. Furthermore, the heads of the school and staff members alike prefer working with someone who has a positive attitude (Samuel, 2006).

According to (Stadan,2000) a good school-based supervisor should be approachable, good listener, very patient, and should be a strong leader. Moreover, supervisors also should have ability to motivate people as well as create a feeling of trust in others. The qualities mentioned above are used as a mechanism for achieving harmonious relationships between supervisors and those for whom they are responsible and for providing adequate communication systems between supervisors and teachers and between school departments and functions.

2.6. School based Supervison Options for Teachers

The problems and issues of teaching and learning that teachers find in their practice differ, also teacher needs and interests differ (Sergiovanni&Starratt, 2002). School based supervision processes must meet the unique needs of all teachers being supervised. Because, matching supervisory approaches to individual needs has great potential for increasing the motivation and commitment of teachers at work (Benjamin, 2003). By supporting the necessity of alternative supervisory options for teachers, (Sullivan & Glanz,2000), revealed that the proper use of various approaches to supervision can enhance teachers, professional development and improve instructional efficiency. As (Sergiovanni and Starratt,2002) mentioned, there are at least five supervisory options: clinical, collegial, self-directed, informal, and inquiry-based supervision.

2.6.1 Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision can be described as instructional supervision that has beenperfected that is a more structured and more analytical supervision that works deeply into teachers' practice and behaviour in the classroom conducted in a closed and helping relationship (Bernard, 2015). According to Acheson ad Gall, 1980, clinical supervision model is to bring about face –to –face interaction between the Head teacher and the teachers with the sole aim of improving instruction and increasing teachers' professional growth. The head teacher should always aim at assisting the teachers to improve their instruction.

Acheson and Gall (1987) defined clinical supervision as "supervision focused upon the improvement of that instruction by means of systematic cycles of planning, observation and intensive intellectual analysis of actual teaching performance in the interest of rational modification". Clinical supervision refers to face- to- face contact with teachers with the intent of improving instruction and increasing professional growth, Sergiovanni and Starratt, 2002). Although the original developers of clinical supervision (Cogan &Goldhammer, proposed eight phases, other authors have proposed different numbers of faces usually three to five.

The focus of clinical supervision is on formative evaluation, which is intended to increase the effectiveness of ongoing educational programs. (Goldhammer,1969) proposed the following five-stage process in clinical supervision.

2.6.1.1. Pre-Observation Conference

Accordingly, the pre-observation conference (behavior system) provides an opportunity for the supervisor and the teacher to establish a relationship of mutual trust and respect. So that it is essential to the establishment of the foundation for the observation and analysis of teaching. This approach is most suitable because the expertise, confidence, and credibility of the supervisor outweigh information, experience, and capabilities as cited by (Glickman et .al, 1998). To sum up, the main objective of the pre-observation conference should focus on establishing teachers' acceptance and high ment. To this end, teachers together with their supervisors have many opportunities in discussing and deciding on the purpose, criteria, frequency, procedures, instruments, and follow-up activities before the actual classroom observation.

2.6.1.2. Classroom Observation

In this stage, the supervisors observe the teacher at work during the formal lesson. Observation creates opportunities for the supervisor to help her/his test reality, the reality of his/her perceptions and judgments about teaching. To this end, (Acheson and Gall, 1997) high that the selection of an observation instrument was help sharpen the teacher's thinking about instruction. Indeed (Goldhammer, 1980) proposes, "If supervisors was to spend more of their energy in the classroom visits followed by helpful conference, we believe that teacher would probably have more friendly attitudes toward supervision". There is no other equally important choice than classroom visits for the betterment of instructions.

2.6.1.3. Analysis of the Observations

As soon as the observation has been conducted, the supervisor organizes their observation data into clear discipline for feedback to the teacher. Collect, analyze, and present data gathered during classroom observations for post observation conferences, with the goal of strengthening instruction to improve student achievement (Glickman, 2000 & Zepeda, 2007).

2.6.1.4. Post Observation Conference

In this stage the major purpose of supervisor is to give feedback to the teacher about the teacher's performance. Research demonstrates that teachers are likely to change their instructional behaviors on their own after their classroom has been described to them by a supervisor. Whether or not any positive change occurs depends on the quality of feedback that is provided. So, from the researchers' point of view, supervisors should tip out the main gaps from what have been observed and conduct further study on the improvement of specified gaps.

2.6.1.5. Post Conference Analysis

The final phase in the clinical model is an evaluation of the process and outcome. It is a means of self improvement for the supervisor. It is the time when the supervisor assesses the nature of communication during conference, the effectiveness of the strategies used, the role of the teacher during the conference, and the extent to which progress was made on the issue that was discussed. In supporting this stage, the supervisor must see his role as trying to help teachers achieve purpose more effectively and efficiently. Many instructional supervisors do not use this as a means of input for themselves for the next stage of clinical supervision and did not valuate the all processes that have been conducted before.

2.6.2. Collegial Supervision

SergiovanniandStarratt(1993), refers collegial supervision to "the existence of high levels collaboration among teachers and between teachers and principals and is characterized by mutual respect,shared walk values, co-operation, and specific conversations' about teaching and learning."They describe cooperative professional development as a process of fostering teacher growth through systematic collaboration with peers and includes a variety of approaches such as professional dialogue, curriculum development, peer observations and feedback, and action research projects. Supervisors help to coordinate the collegial teams and monitor the process and goal attainment.

2.6.3. Informal and Inquiry-based Supervision

Inquiry based supervision in the form of action research is an option that canrepresent an individual initiative or a collaborative effort as pairs or teams of teacherswork together to solve problems. In-query based supervision is an action research as itsprocess aimed at discovering new ideas and practices as well as testing old ones,establishing and exploring relationships between cause and effects, of the nature of aparticular problem (Sergiovanni&Starratt, 2002).

2.6.4. Self-Directive Supervision

In self-directed supervision, teachers work alone by assuming responsibility for their own professional development. This approach of supervision is appropriate for teacherswho prefer to work alone or who, because of scheduling or other difficulties, are unable to work cooperatively with other teachers. Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) stated, this supervisory option as it is efficient in use of time, less costly, and less demanding in its reliance on others than in the case of other options.

2.7. Tasks of Instructional Supervision

Supervision for successful schools attempts to remove the obstacles in the work environment so that teachers can see each other at work, receive feedback from others, engage in professional dialogue, and have the chance to make decisions about collective instruction actions (Glickman, 1985).These interrelated supervision tasks can purposefully planned to increase teacher thought. It is impossible for one person to do all these supervisory tasks, but many persons such as principals, department heads, peer teachers, master/mentor teachers, central office personnel, and consultants can carry out the tasks (Glickman, 1985). In genral here are five essential tasks of supervision. These are;

2.7.1 Direct Assistance

Direct assistance to teachers is one of the crucial elements of a successful school. Supervision provides direct assistance to teachers as it continuously focuses on the improvement of classroom instruction. Direct assistance occurs when the supervisor effectively providefeedback for individual teacher. It is necessary for instructional improvement by providing feedback to teachers, and making sure, they are not feeling isolated, but is essential part of a team oriented staff (Glickman et al., 2004).

Direct assistance can be carried out effectively by conducting clinical supervision in a way that is goal oriented and provides support and a commitment to improvement. Thus, supervisors must be able to provide teachers with a pre-conference, observation and postconference as well as study the effectiveness of this method (Jacklyn, 2008).

2.7.2 Curriculum Development

As (Glickman et al.,2004) state, curriculum development involves the supervisor providing opportunities for changes in curriculum and materials to improve instruction and learning. It is necessary for instructional improvement due to the need for enhancing collective thinking about instruction.

Curriculum development has become the major function of instructional supervision in the school. As Harris (cited in Million, 2010), designing or redesigning that which is to be taught, by whom, when, where, and in what pattern developing curriculum guides, establishing standards, and planning instructional units are the components of school-based supervision.

According to McNeil and Dull (cited in Chanyalew, 2005), the major responsibilities of supervisors in the curriculum development process are:

- Assist individual teachers in determining more appropriate instructional objectives for the pupils in a specific classroom to improve the curriculum;
- Plan and implement a well-established in-service training program;
- Aid in goal definitions and selections at local, state, and federal levels;
- Work closely with administrators to establish roles that are expected of the consultant who is outside the school.

2.7.3 Group Development

According to little's study described (cited in Glickman et al., 2004);Teachers engage in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete and precise talk about teaching practices. By such talk, teachers build up a shared language adequate to the complexity of teaching, capable of distinguishing one practice and its virtues from another, and capable of integrating large bodies of practice into distinct and sensible perspective on the business of teaching.

Group work enhances the knowledge of teachers at different developmental levels by the collaboration of ideas, regardless of experience or accomplishments, which initiates cohesiveness and creates a team amongst educators. According to Pike et al. (cited in Jacklyn, 2008), group activity evokes different efforts from teachers at different levels. This allows for more successful teachers whose practices is may not be aligned with state standards.

2.7.4. Professional Development

Professional development is part of improving the instruction of teachers.(Harris,1998) views professional development as it is promoting effective teaching practices, providing for continuous personal and professional growth as well as changing the character of the school and teaching.Professional development programs for teachers can be carried out in the school.

As Lawrence (cited in Glickman et al., 2004) concluded the following are characteristics of successful professional development:

- Linkage of activities to the general professional development program
- Difference training experiences for different teachers;
- Appointment of the teacher in an active role
- Emphasis on demonstrations, supervised trials and feedback, teacher experience sharing, and Mutual assistance;

- Involvement of administrators and supervisors in planning and delivering the program
- Teacher self-initiated and self-directed training activities.

Appropriate activities in the continuing professional development of teachers can include; improving teachers' general education background, as well as their knowledge and understanding of the subjects they teach, instruction on how children learn different subjects, developing practical skills and competencies, learning new teaching strategies and how to use new technologies, improved professionalism and ethics, in addition to providing knowledge and skills linked to the ever-changing needs of a dynamic society. for the sake of teachers' professional development the schools should have schedules for workshops, staff meetings, and visiting other schools.

2.7.5 Action Research

Action research aims at improving instructional activities. As (Glickman,1985) suggested, basically action research is when teachers meet to identify common instructional problems, determine what current evidence they have about meeting the instructional needs of their students, propose change that might be more successful, improvement of changes, and finally judge the success of their endeavours.

The purpose of action research is to bring about improvement in a given situation such as improving students performance, teacher performance, school administrations, school and community relationship (ADEA,1998). To sum up, Ministry of Education (MoE, 2002) also clearly puts that teachers are expected to conduct action research in order to enhance teaching learning process. To this end, school-based supervision is crucial processwhich needs to be strengthened in the school and practiced continuously based on the prepared plan for school improvement program.

Table 2: Summary of the five tasks of supervision

Prerequisites	Function	Tasks Unification		Product
Conceptual skills	Supervision as Development	Direct Assistance	Organizational goals	Student Achievement
Human skills		Group Development		
Technical skills		Professional Development	Teacher need	
		curriculumDevelopment		
		Action Research		

Based on the above table, (Glickman et al.,2004) summarizes the following ideas. To facilitate instructional improvement, those responsible for supervision must have certain prerequisites of the following skills:

1. Conceptual skills: supervisors need to understand what teachers and schools can be and what teachers and schools are?

2. Human skills: supervisors must know how their own interpersonal behaviors affect individuals as well as groups of teachers and then study ranges of interpersonal behaviors that might be used to promote more positive and change-oriented relationships.

3. Technical skills: supervisors must have technical skills in observing, planning, assessing and evaluating instructional improvement. Supervisors have certain educational tasks at their disposal that enable teachers to evaluate and modify their instruction.

To sum, for those responsible bodies in supervisory roles in the activity of improving student learning, applying the conceptual skills, human skills, and technical skills to the tasks of direct assistance, group development, curriculum development, professional development, and action research that enabled teachers to teach in a collective, purposeful manner insuccesorganizational goals and teacher needs is very fundamental.

2.8. Practices of Educational Supervision in Ethiopia

2.8.1. Supervision at School Level

As the teaching-learning process is a day-to-day and continuous process, the function of the supervision at the school level should also be a continuous responsibility. Within the school system, the supervisors are the school principal & vice-principal, department heads,and the senior teachers. The educational programs supervision manual of the Ministry of Education (MOE, 1994) has sufficiently listed the roles of supervision at the school level as follows:

2.8.1.1 The Roles of School Principal in Supervision

The school principal responsibilities would be:

- Organizing of the staff members of the school and other professional educators to review and strengthen supervisory activities;
- Coordinating evaluation of teaching-learning process and the outcome through the initiation of active participation of staff members and the local community at large;
- Making a conducive environment to facilitate supervisory activities in the school by organizing all necessary resources;
- Root the evaluation of the school community relations and on the basis of evaluation results strive to improve and strengthen such relationsand;
- Giving the professional assistance and guidance to teachers to enable them to realize instructional objectives, and supervise classes when and deemed necessary;

2.8.1.2 The Roles of Deputy Principals in Supervision

Also assisting the principal of the school in carrying out the above responsibilities, the school vice-principal is expected to handle the following responsibilities:

- Safeguarding that the curriculum of the school addresses the needs of the local community;
- Conducting the classroom supervision to ensure the application of lesson plans
- Evaluating lesson plans of teachers and;
- Giving over all instructional leadership to staff members

2.8.1.3. The Roles of School based aupervisiorsin Supervision

School based supervisiorsdue to their accumulated knowledge, skills and abilities in the particular subject as well as in the overall educational system acquired through long services experience; theyhave the competence to supervise educational activities. Therefore, the scholl based supervisory responsibilities would be:

- Forming model teaching programs for inexperienced (junior) teachers and staff members by imitating senior staff members from the departments;
- Selecting and organizing teaching materials and making them available for use by teachers;
- Directing the supervisory activities in their respective departments and evaluating teachers' performance;
- Arranging on the job orientation and socialization programs to newly assigned teachers in the respective departments;
- Introducing and promoting group participation in the planning, implementation, and decision making of the instruction and the evaluation of instructional outcomes;
- Boosting teachers to conduct action research to improve and develop subjects they teach and methods of teaching such subjects;
- Directing evaluation of the department curriculum and organizing workshops, conferences, seminars, etc., to tackle identified problems of the curriculum and;
- Inspiring staff members to conduct meetings regularly to make periodic evaluations of their activities and to seek solutions to instructional problems.

2.8.1.4. The Roles of Senior Teachers in Supervision

According to the career structure developed by the Ministry of Education based ontheEthiopian Education and Training Policy of 1994, High-ranking teachers, Associate Headteachers, and Headteachers are considered senior teachers. Thus, such teachers because of their accumulated experience in specific subject areas/areas are well-positioned to supervise other teachers within their department (MoE, 1994). Experience makes a different in success of certaion set of goles.

2.9. Current Educational Supervisory Practice in Addis Ababa City

Instructional supervision is a service that was be given to teachers, and it is the strategy that helps to implement and improve the teaching-learning process, and an activity that is performed for the advantage of students learning achievement. As Addis Ababa cityAdministrationEducation Bureau (2006) states, the mission of the supervisor is to implement and strengthen the teaching-learning process through providing professional support, and also creating conducive situation for the improvement of students' learning.

2.9.1. Supervisors' Responsibility

A supervisor is an expert who supports teachers and other educational experts for the improvement of teaching learning activities and also who motivates teachers for their professional growth. Moreover, a supervisor is responsible to act as a coordinator and expected to work intimately with teachers and school community for the school improvement programme. Based on this, a supervisor monitors the curriculum development, facilitates inservice training, and provides professional support for teachers particularly on the basis of school improvement programme and quality education (MoE,2006). theAddis Ababa city AdminstrationEducation Bureau (AACAEB,2006)has commended additional responsibilities to the sub city supervisors. In order to strengthen the school based supervisory activity, Sub city supervisor is would be:

- Provide professional support for school based supervisiors
- Collect and compile necessary data of the whole schools found in the Sub-city.
- Organize discussion programs with instructional supervisors.
- Leveling schools intermes of final student performance
- Identifay and disminating good practices from one to other schools
- Conducting seminars between members of school based suprvisors
- Conducting CPD and action researches

2.10. Challenges against School-Based Supervision

Several factors tend to influence against effective supervision of instruction in schools. among the challenges, the following can be mentioned;

2.10.1 Perception of Teachers towards Supervision

School-based supervision aims at improving the quality of children's education by improving the teacher's effectiveness. As Fraser (cited in Lilian,2007),noted the improvement of the teacher learning process is dependent upon teacher attitudes towards supervision. Unless teachers perceive supervision as a process of promoting professional growth and student learning.The way and manner that teachers react to supervision of instruction is anotherconcern to supervisory practices.Some teachers see supervision as a tool used by administrators to control and intimidate them. This nation makes teachers feel unsafe and form of supervision. If teachers, who are the direct beneficiariesofinstructional supervision, have a negative attitude towards the practice, the whole processwill not yield the desired results.

2.10.2. Lack of Adequate Training and Support

Another issue of concern as far as challenges to school based supervision are concerned is whether supervisors are given enough training to function properly in theirpractice. Supervisors need continuous and sufficient training to carry out their responsibility effectively. Training programs for supervisors are aimed at providing necessary skills for supervisors and making them better equipped at doing their job. As it is summarized in Alhammad's study (cited in Rashid, 2001), lack of training for supervisors, a weak relationship between teachers and supervisors, and lack of support for supervisors from higher offices affect the supervisory practice in the school. In line with this, (Merga, 2007) pointed out, that the lack of a continuous training system for supervisors to update their educational knowledge and skills is an obstacle to the practice of supervision.

2.10.3. Excessive Workload

The major challenge facing head teachers as instructional supervisors is lack of time for instructional supervision as a result of overload of work caused by many other responsibilities that head teachers carry out in schools. Combining supervision with other duties is a situation where head teachers by virtue of their position, are administrators, co-curicularactivity leaders and instructional supervisors.

The school-level supervisors are responsible to carry out the in-built supervision in addition to their classes and routine administrative tasks. Ogunu (cited in Enrage, 2009) revealed that secondary school principals are so weighed down by routine administrative burdens that they hardly find time to visit classrooms and observe how the teachers are teaching. Supporting the above idea, Alhammad (cited in Rashid, 2001) in his study showed that, the supervisor's high workload and lack of cooperation from principals negatively affect the practice of supervision.In such situations, school based supervisors may not be able to sufficiently supervise instruction.

2.10.4. Inadequate Educational Resources

Without adequate instructional materials,there can be no effective supervision of instruction will be conducted.(Enaigbe, 2009). Materials like supervision guides and manuals have their impact on supervision work. As it is indicated in (UNESCO, 2007), these materials are unquestionably helpful to the supervisors themselves and the schools, they can turn the inspection visit into a more objective exercise by informing schools and teachers of the issues on which supervisors focus leading to a more transparent process.

On the other hand, the absence of a specific budget for supervision and support is another critical problem that negatively affects the quality of supervision. Lack of enough budget results from the incapability to run supervisory activities effectively such as in-service training programs for teachers and visiting other schools for experience sharing (Merga, 2007; UNICEF, 2007). To sum up, if one of from the above mentioned resources is absence or nglect there would be achallenge on the improvement of school based suprvisior.

CHAPTER THREE
THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. The Research Design

The research design used for this study was descriptive survey design. This design helped the researcher to describe the current situation regarding the practice of School based supervision in the school. Moreover, descriptive research design makes possible the prediction of the future based on findings on prevailing conditions. It also helped to draw valid general conclusions.

3.2. The Research Method

In this study, the research methods used both quantitative and qualitative approaches with more focus on quantitative one. Quantitative research consists of research in which the data can be analyzed in terms of numbers. Research can also be qualitative; that is, it can describe events and persons scientifically without the use of numerical data. A survey, according to Kothari (2004), is a method of securing information concerning an existing phenomenon from all or selected number of respondents of the concerned universe. The qualitative approach was incorporated in the study to validate and triangulate the quantitative data.it is also relevant to gather detailed information concerning the current status of the practices and challenges of school-based supervision.

3.3. Sources of Data

To strengthen the findings of the research the relevant data for the study were collected from both primary and secondary sources. These were:-

3.3.1. Primary Source of Data

In this study, primary data sources were employed to obtain reliable information about the School-based supervisory practices. The major sources of primary data were teachers, School-based supervisors (principals and heads of department) of government secondary schools because they were the implementers of the School-based supervision at secondary schools of lideta sub-city.

3.3.2. Secondary Source of Data

The secondary sources of data were the schools' documented records of School based supervision. These files were observed to strengthen the data obtained through questionnaires and interviews.

3.4. The Study Population

The study population of this studywas government secondary school teachers and principals. There are 3 government secondary schools organized under one cluster center. These Secondary schools are DejazmachBalcha Aba Nefso,Hidase, and Africa Hibert. Hence, the participants of this study wereschool-based supervisors (Principals, deputyprincipals, school-based supervision,and teachers. This group of participants would be appropriate for this study, because, they are among the front line for school-based supervision and help the researcher to get reliable and first-hand information about the issue in focus.

3.5. Sample and Sampling Techniques

To obtain reliable data for the study, various sampling techniques were employed. Accordingly, due to their responsibility to provide supervised activities for teachers and a direct and close relationship within the schools. Consequently, from the government secondary schools found in the sub-city, three (100%) are selected by random sampling technique. Then, Ninety-three school-based supervisors (3principals,6 vice-principals) for the interviewee, and (45 heads of department and 38senior teachers) for Questionnairethrough,quota,Jujmental, and available sampling techniquesrespectively,due to their responsibility to follow up the overall activities of the school and to provide supervision service for teachers.

Since school-based supervisors are responsible to carry out supervisory activities in their school, all school-based supervisors of the three schools were taken through the following sampling technique.

Table 3: Summary of Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

NO	Cluster /School/	Sample	Population	Sample size		Sampling technique	Remark
				No	%		
1	Balacha ,AfricaHibret ,HidasseLideta .	School principals	3	3	100	Available sampling	
2		School vice principals	9	6	66.6	Purposive sampling (Jujmental)	3 of them are member of internal inspection team
3		Deprtment heads	60	45	75	Quota sampling	15 of them aremember of internal inspection team
4		Senior teachers	38	38	100	Available sampling	
Total			110	92	83.6		

Source: Sample Schools Human Resource Rreport 2020/21

3.6. Instruments of Data Collection

To conduct this research effectively, three instruments were used. These were questionnaires, interviews, and document analyses. In addition, the researcher refers to relevant reference books, internet sources, and supervision manuals to support the study. The purpose and rationale to use these instruments are presented below.

3.6.1. Questionnaires

The researcher used questionnaires to collect data from school based supervisiors. Questionnaires were believed better to get a large amount of data from a large number of respondents in a relatively shorter time with minimum cost. Hence, questionnaires were prepared in the English language and administrated to all school-based supervisors and teacher participants with the assumption that they easily understand the language.

In this study, two sets of questionnaire items were used. The first set of items dealt with the general background of the respondents. The second set of questionnaires, which is prepared in English, was administered to teachers, department heads. In terms of content, there were two sets of questionnaires that had different items. The first section would have certain items on the background information of the respondents and the second section on issues related to the practices and challenges of School-based supervision consists of different parts with a

focus on the identification of teachers' instructional strengths and limitations, design of various intervention to assist teachers professional improvement, professional support to assist teachers, link schools with the school community group to assure quality education and major challenges of School-based that affect School-based supervisors. Therefore, for structured question items, the Likert scale is going to be employed, because the Likert scale is the simplest way to describe the opinion, suggestions, and frequency of respondents and also provides more freedom to respondents. The scale consists of five scales. These are 5 = Very High , 4 =High , 3 = Avarege, 2 = low , and 1 = Very low to which school-based supervision is being implemented.

3.6.2. Interview

The semi-structured interview was designed to gather data from school principals and vice-principals involved in the interview question. This is because the semi-structured interview was used to get more information by asking them repeatedly and it helped the researcher to ask the interviewee more and more questions regarding the basic questions as well as provided the interviewee with full of freedom to express their idea. The interview was conducted for an hour on each school in English and the selection was based on its position to effectively describe the reality in the study area and it had detailed information about the practices and challenges of School-based supervision.

3.6.3. Document Analysis

The analysis of School-based supervision records of sample schools, supervision plans, portfolio documents of the supervision practice, written reports on supervision, and feedback was taken as better to get relevant information because it was so difficult to conduct Focal Group Discussions with those participants at all place.

3.7. Validity and Reliability checks

checking the validity and reliability of data collecting instruments before providing them to the actual study subject was the core to assure the quality of the data (Yalew, 1998).To ensure the validity of instruments, initially, the instrument was prepared by the researcher and developed under the close guidance of advisors, who were involved in providing their inputs for the validity of the instruments. The English version questionnaires were checked and corrected by English subject specialistsfrom sub-city supervisors. Moreover, the questionnaires were pilot tested at DejazmachBalcha Aba Nefso secondary school teachers (15) and cluster supervisors (4).The respondents of the pilot test are not included in the main

study. Based on the respondent's response additional, omissions and modifications of the question were undertaken.

A reliability test was performed to check the consistency and accuracy of the measurement scales. As Table 4 shows the results of Cronbach's coefficient alpha are satisfactory (between 0.71 and 0.93), indicating questions in each construct are measuring a similar concept. As suggested by Cronbach (cited by Tech-Hong &Waheed, 2011), the reliability coefficients between 0.70–0.90 are generally found to be internally consistent.

Table 4-Reliability test results with Cronbach's alpha.

No	Detail description of the title of the questions	Reliability coefficient
1	Views on how the Function of School-based Supervision is facilitated	0.78
2	Views on the actual practices of school-based supervision corresponds to the expected standards to assist Teacher's Professional Improvement	0.85
3	Teachers' perception of implementing School based supervision in government secondary schools	0.79
4	View on the School-Based supervisors' efforts to identify the strengths and limitations of teachers in the classroom.	0.9
5	View on the Challenges that affect Secondary School based Supervisors While Implementing Supervisory Practices In lideta sub-city.	0.88
	Reliability coefficient	0.82

3.8. Data Collection Procedure

To answer the basic research questions through a series of data gathering procedures, the expected relevant data were gathered by using a questionnaire, interview, and document analysis. Those procedures helped the researcher to get accurate and relevant data from the sample units. In doing so, after having letters of authorization from Addis Ababa University and the sub-city Education Office for ethical clearance, the researcher directly went to DejazmachBalcha Aba Nefso secondary school to pre-test the data-gathering instruments. At the end of all aspects related to the pilot test, the researcher has contacted the principals of respective schools for consent. After high ing with the concerned participants, the researcher

introduced his objectives and purposes. Then, the final questionnaires were administered to sample teachers and school-based supervision in the selected schools. The participants were allowed to give their answers to each item independently and the data closely assisted and supervised them to solve any confusion regarding the instrument. Finally, the questionnaires were collected and made ready for data analysis.

3.9. Methods of Data Analysis

The data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The analysis of the data was based on the responses collected through questionnaires, interviews, and document analysis. The data collected through closed-ended questions were tallied, tabulated, and filled into SPSS version 24, and interpretation was made with help of percentage, mean, standard deviation, and independent-sample t-test. Because, the percentage was used to analyze the background information of the respondent, whereas, the mean and standard deviation are derived from the data as it served as the basis for interpretation of the data as well as to summarize the data simply and understandably (Aron et al., 2008). The interpretations were made for all five-point scale measurements based on the following mean score results:

1 OR 1.00 – 1.49 = Very low , **2** OR 1.50 – 2.49 = low ,**3** OR 2.50 – 3.49 = avarege, **4** OR 3.50 – 4.49 = High ,**5** OR 4.50 – 5.00 = Very high

Apart from this, a t-test was used to test for statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the two independent variables (school-based supervisors and teachers). The existing response differences were tested at a 0.05 level of significance.

On the other hand, the data obtained from the document analysis, and the unstructured interview was analyzed qualitatively. The qualitative analysis was done as follows. First, organizing and noting down the different categories were made to assess what types of themes may come through the instruments to collect data concerning the research questions. Then, transcribing and coding the data to make the analysis easy. Also, the results were triangulated with the quantitative findings. Finally, the findings were concluded and suggested recommendations were forwardedin line with the data obtained from the questionnaire.

Table 5: Summary of data analysis

Types of data	Statistical tool techniques	Purpose
Quantitative	Percentage	To state data of respondents' characteristics and other collected data.
	Mean,Standard deviation	To express some of the data gathered from teachers and department heads
	T-test	To observe the statistically significant difference between the opinions of the two respondents
Qualitative	Narration	To analyze the collected data related to the practice of school-based supervision

3.10. Ethical consideration

To make the research process professional, ethical considerations were made. The researcher informed the respondents about the purpose of the study i.e. purely for academics; the purpose of the study was also introduced in the introduction part of the questionnaires and interview guide to the respondents: and confirmed that subject's 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 respondent's response during data presentations analysis and interpretation. Furthermore, all the materials used for this research have been acknowledged. This study was be reported by incorporating its genuine findings without distortion and addition.

3.11. Communicating the result

The researcher communicate or disseminate his finding by using conference/meeting with College and sub-city officials. And furthermores disseminate on Web pages.

CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION

The purpose of this research was to investigate the practices of school-based supervision and the challenges encountered during the implementation of supervision in government secondary schools of lideta sub-city of the city administration of Addis Ababa. Subsequently, this chapter deals with the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of data collected on the practices of school-based supervision as well as its challenges while implementation. It contains two major parts; the first part presents the characteristics of respondents. The second part deals with the results of findings from the data gathered through the questionnaire, interview, and document analysis.

4.1 Characteristics of Respondents

Table 6: Characteristics of respondents

No	Items	Category	Respondents							
			Teachers		School based supervisior					
					Department heads		principals		v/principals	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	sex	male	26	68.42	38	84.4	3	100	6	100
		famle	12	31.57	7	15.5	-	-	-	-
		total	38	99.99	45	99.9	3	100	6	100
2	age	20-24	-	-	-		-	-	--	-
		25-29	-	-	6	13.3	-	--	-	-
		30-34	8	21.05	18	40	-	-	2	33.3
		35-39	8	21.05	12	26.6	1	33.3	1	16.6
		>40	22	57.8	9	20	2	66.6	3	50
		total	38	99.9	45	99.9	3	100	6	99.9
3	service year	11-15	5	13.15	4	8.8	1	33.3	3	50
		16-20	2	5.26	8	17.7	1	33.3	2	33.3
		21-25	6	15.78	5	11.1	-	-	-	-
		26-30	7	18.42	12	26.6	-	-	-	-
		31 and above	18	47.36	16	35.5	1	33.3	1	16.6
		total	38	99.9	45	99.8	3	99.9	6	99.9
4	level of education	1st degree	10	26.3	12	26.6	-	-	-	-
		2nd degree	28	73.68	33	73.3	3	100	6	100
Total			38	99.9	45	99.9	3	100	6	100

Resource: Research servey, 2022

From the above table the experience of teachers, the majority 18(47.36 %) and 7(18.42%) of teachers had work experience between 31 and above years and between 26-30 years respectively, and also 6(15.26%) of teacher respondents had between 21-25years experience and 5(13.15%) of them had work experience between 11-15years experience. The remaining 3(5.26%) of teachers had work experience of 16-20 years. In addition, 16(35.5%) of department heads/school-based supervisorshad work experience of 31 and aboveyears.The remaining 12(26.6%) and 8(17.7) department heads/school-based supervisorshad work experience between 26-30 and 16-20 years respectively. Among the interviewee, the majority 4(44.4 %) and 3(33.3%) of principals and vice-principals together had work experience between 11-15and 16-20, and also 2 (22.2%) of intervieweeshad 31 and above years of experience.This implies that in most schools, most school-based supervisors were not assigned based on their work experience as they can give professional support to the teachers. As a result, the practice of School-Based supervision was not properly implemented which indirectly affected the student's achievement. Regarding the educational background of the respondents, there were, 10(26.3 %) of teachers' heads were first-degree holders and the remaining 28(73.6%) of teachers were MA holders. In the case of department heads, 12(26.6%)were first-degree holders while 33(73.3%) second degree holders. all 9(100%) principals and vice-principals had second-degree holders. From this, it is possible to understand that almost all respondents in the sample principals had the same qualification.

4.2. The organization of School-Based Supervision

Teachers and school-based supervisors were asked to indicate their level of high mentor Low on how the functions of school-based supervision are organized to promote teachers' professional competence for the betterment of students learning. The data collected concerning the stated issue was shown in table 7 below.

Table 7: Views on how the Function of School based Supervision is facilitated

No	Items	Respondents	N0	X-	SD	Over all X	P-value
1	How SBS organize capacity building programs to teachers	Senior teacher	38	3.11	1.45	3.32	0.28
		department heads	45	3.52	1.44		
2	How SBS hold conferences before and after classroom observations.	Senior teacher	38	2.3	1. 5	3.05	0.38
		department heads	45	3.81	1.80		
3	How SBS organize peer coaching and experience sharing programs	Senior teacher	38	2.50	1.44	2.65	3.32
		department heads	45	2.80	1.54		
4	How SBS conduct unplanned and occasional supervisory act	Senior teacher	38	2.75	1.50	2. 83	0.57
		department heads	45	2.9	1.6		
5	How SBS encourage teachers to plan their own professional development.	Senior teacher	38	2.29	1.33	2.41	0.2
		department heads	45	2.53	1.47		
6	How SBS support teachers to conduct action research.	Senior teacher	38	2.95	1.35	2.89	0.69
		department heads	45	2.83	1.41		

X= mean,SD=standared division, and p-value at α=0.05

As shown in item 1 of Table 7, respondents were asked to rate their high levels on the orientation of teachers towards how the Function of School based Supervision is facilitated. Accordingly, teachers with the (X=3.11, SD=1.45) were not sure about the issue, and supervisors with the(X=3.52, SD=1.44) high data that the orientation of teachers toward school-based supervision organization. The overall mean of 3.32 shows the avarege of the majority of respondents with the issue. Thus, it can be said that teachers were not satisfied with supervisors' response regarding the orientation of teachers toward school-based supervision facilitation, it is possible to conclude that the orientation of teachers toward school-based supervision was not implemented properly in the schools. The significance value (p-value) is 0.28 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significant difference between the two groups. To confirm this Oliva and Pawlas (1997:55) stated that as a one-time training could not be sufficient in an ever-changing social situation, teachers should get continuous on-the-job pieces of training throughout their carrier to cope with the changing world.

As indicated in item 2 of the same table, both senior teachers and school-based supervisors were asked whether or not supervisors make pre-observation conferences with teachers before observing classes, conduct classroomobservations after the conference and give

teachers constructive feedback towards improved practices after the observation. In light of this, (x =2.3, SD=1.5) and (x= 3.81 SD= 1.08 of the teachers and leaders showed their Low respectively. The mean score analysis of both groups which is 3.05implies that they were not using their skills of pedagogy and personal relations in the teaching-learning process, and the supervisors in the sampled secondary schools were not practiced to hold pre-observation conferences, observing the teaching, diagnosing, and analyze difficulties during the observation of teaching, discuss with the teachers on the gaps observed and give constructive and timely feedback during the post-observation conference. From this, it can be deduced that the supervisors were not in a position inpracticing clinical supervision as an option for promoting teachers' competence for better classroom practices.

Both teachers and leaders were asked to show their level of highon the issue of whether or not school-based supervisors organize collegially or peer coaching programs among teachers to make them share experiences in item 3 of table 7. To this end (x =2.51, SD=1.44) and (x= 2.80 SD= 1.54) of both teachers and leaders showed their Low and Very low respectively to the statement with a mean value of 3.32. The mean score analysis of both groups reveals that collegial or peer supervision was not practiced by the school-based supervisors to make teachers share experiences and learn from one another. However, it should be noted that collegial supervision was also an option of supervision by which two or more teachers high to work together for their professional growth, usually by observing each other's classroom, giving each other feedback about the observation, and discussing shared professional concerns.

Table 7 of item 4 depicts the views of respondents on the extent to which unplanned and occasional supervisory acts were conducted by the school-based supervisors to see how the teaching and learning process was going on. In this regard, (x=2.75, SD=1.5) and (x= 2.9 SD= 1.6) of the teachers and the leaders asserted their low ment and Very lowrespectively with a mean score of 2.9. The mean score analysis of the two groups implies that informal supervision was rarely practiced by school-based supervisors. However, both groups should know that informal supervision was also an option of supervision in which supervisors make classroom visits to check how the teaching and learning go on without announcing and arranging appointments with teachers.

In item 5 of Table 7, respondents were asked to rate their high levels on whether or not Encourage teachers to plan their professional development. Accordingly, Teachers with the

(X=2.29, SD=1.33) have lowd that classroom observation enabled teachers to use a variety of teaching techniques and supervisors with the (X=2.53, SD=1.47) were not sure about the issue. The overall mean of 2.41 shows the Low of the majority of respondents with the issue. From this,it can be concluded that classroom observations were not enabled teachers to use a variety of teaching techniques. The significance value (p-value) is 0.20 is greater than 0.05 showing there is no significant difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding Encourage teachers to plan their professional development.

Concerning the extent to which supervisors support teachers to become systematic problem solvers of their practices by conducting the action, research was asked in item 6 of the same table. Accordingly, (x=2.95, SD=1.35) and (x= 2.83 SD= 1.41) of the teachers and the leaders asserted their low. The mean score analysis of the two groups of respondents indicated that the groups did not have the same awareness of the issue. The calculated weighted mean of the two groups was 2.89 which indicates the rare practice of the stated activity by the supervisors. However, both groups should know that inquiry-based supervision was also an option for promoting teachers' professional competence in which teachers are supported to conduct action research either alone or with others, to solve the instructional problems they face systematically. The significance value (p-value) is 0.69 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significant difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding Support teachers to conduct action research.

4.3. The Actual Practices of School-Based Supervision

This part deals with the discussion of the data gathered from respondents with regards to the actual practices of school-based supervision corresponding to the expected standards to achieve professional improvement. The extent to which school-based supervisors assist teachers to ensure professional improvement was presented to respondents through questionnaires.

Table 8: Respondents' Views on the actual practices of school-based supervision corresponds to the expected standards to assist Teacher's Professional Improvement.

No	Items	Respondents	N0	X-	SD	Over all mean	P-value
1	The extent to which School-based supervisors are arranging induction training for beginner teachers	Senior teacher	38	2.43	1.2	2.44	0.32
		department heads	45	2.45	1.34		
2	The extent to which School-based supervisors in the school assist teachers in lesson planning	Senior teacher	38	2.4	1.4	2.45	0.24
		department heads	45	2.5	1.5		
3	The extent to which School based supervisors facilitate experience sharing programs	Senior teacher	38	2.35	0.93	2.22	0.38
		department heads	45	2.1	0.82		
4	The extent to which School based supervisors assist teachers in developing/selecting instructional materials	Senior teacher	38	2.34	1.4	2.38	0.21
		department heads	45	2.42	1.18		
5	The extent to which School-based supervisors spread best practices & teaching methodologies among schools and teachers.	Senior teacher	38	2.2	0.7	2.15	0.45
		department heads	45	2.1	1.08		
6	To what degree School-based supervisors are facilitating the professional growth of teachers through short-term training, workshops, and seminars?	Senior teacher	38	2.42	1.2	2.32	0.34
		department heads	45	2.22	0.92		
7	To what extent do supervisors support teachers to do action research?	Senior teacher	38	2.42	2.29	1.76	0.42
		department heads	45	1.1	0.9		

X= mean ,SD=standareddevesion and p-value at α=0.05

Item 1 of Table 8 above indicated that the respondents asked to what extent school-based supervisors arrange induction training for beginner teachers to improve their profession. Accordingly, teachers and education leaders with (x= 2.43, S.D=1.2) and (= 2.45, S.D= 1.34) mean scores respectively revealed that the extent to which School-based supervisors arrange induction training for beginner teachers was low. The overall mean of 2.41 revealed that the

extent to which School-based supervisors arrange induction training for beginner teachers was low. In addition to this, the interview with the school principals found that supervisors were not arranging induction training for instructional improvement for beginner teachers, and no document was found that supports the existence of training for teachers. This was due to a lack of knowledge and skills in how to arrange induction training. Taking this reality in mind, (MoE, 2015 E.C) indicated that supervisors are expected to provide enough induction training for beginner teachers; however, they didn't implement it yet in this study area. The significance value (p-value) is 0.32 is greater than 0.05 shows there is no significant difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding supervisors arranging induction training for beginner teachers to improve their profession.

Item 2 of the same table revealed that respondents were asked about the extent to which School-based supervisors in the school assist teachers in lesson planning. Accordingly, the overall mean of the respondents was 2.32 indicating that the extent to which School-based supervisors provide support to teachers in lesson planning was low. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p-0.24) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in responses and the document analysis also showed that few teachers' lesson plans were prepared full of problems. Therefore, can conclude that there was a great problem for teachers on how to prepare their annual and lesson plans.The result from the open-ended question indicated that only a few teachers rarely support teachers in how to prepare a lesson plan. As a result of this, teachers'lesson plans were full of mistakes when they implement the instructional process.

In the above table 8 item 3, teachers and school-based supervision with (x= 2.35, S.D= 0.93) and (x= 2.1, S.D= 0.82) mean scores respectively indicated that School-based supervisors insufficiently facilitate experience sharing programs among teachers. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p-0.38) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in responses. As we can conclude, high experience sharing from teachers to teachers and schools can improve the performance of the school as well as the performance of individual teachers. Instructional skills, assessment skills, evaluation skills, and the way to give and receive feedback skills teachers can be improved when School-based supervisors and more experienced teachers carryout experience sharing programs. The mean scores (2.1) calculated from both respondents indicated that the practice was done inefficiently but there were trying to facilitate experience sharing programs. High experience sharing between teachers helps to identify their limitations and strength their good work, so, it is very important to minimize the teachers' instructional limitations. Moreover, highly

experienced teachers should volunteer to share their work and instructional skills with less experienced teachers, and also less experienced teachers should be encouraged and motivated to receive and obtain their good experience. For this purpose, the MoE planned Continuous Professional Development (CPD) program for two important purposes which are updating and upgrading teachers. However, during the interview, the School-based supervisors informed that, even though they repeatedly asked the sub-city education office to arrange experience sharing, there was a very low experience sharing program held. However, facilitating the experience sharing at Woreda, Zone, and region level was written in the primary and secondary schools' instructional organization document (MOE, 1994 E.C).

As shown in the same table item 4, the respondents were asked to what extent school-based supervisors assist teachers in developing/selecting instructional materials. Accordingly, teachers and education leaders with (X= 2.34, S.D= 1.4) and (X= 2.42, S.D= 1.18)) mean scores respectively indicated that there was a low degree of assisting teachers in developing /selecting instructional materials. The overall mean of 2.38 shows the low of the majority of respondents with the issue.The significance value (p-value) is 0.21 is greater than 0.05 showing there is no significant difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding classroom observation enabled teachers to use a variety of teaching techniques.The qualitative data obtained from interviews support the idea that almost no School-based supervisors assist teachers in developing /selecting instructional materials in the teaching-learning process. However,MoE,(2000), forwarded that:-

"Teachers should develop and select instructional materials for proper teaching-learning process. This can improve teachers' performance of instruction and at the same time, the students achieve and score high results because of those well-learned and well-prepared teachers. Instructional skills, assessment skills, student management skills, and subject matter knowledge can be improved when teachers develop/select instructional materials. At the same time, students with different abilities to learn can be motivated and then try to grasp what they easily learn from the instructional materials."

According to table 8item 5 above, the respondents were asked about the degree to which School-based supervisors spread best practices on teaching methodologies among teachers and schools. Accordingly, teachers and school-based supervisors with (X= 2.2, S.D=0.7) and (X= 2.1, S.D= 1.08) mean scores respectively indicated that School-based supervisors inadequately expanded best practices on teaching methodologies among teachers and schools. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.45) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in responses. Similarly, during the interview, the

respondents informed that low School-based supervisors spread best practices on teaching methodologies among teachers and schools. This concluded, as best practices on teaching methodologies (how to teach) especially student-centered methods were highly preferable that teachers should use and School-based supervisors should encourage teachers to use active learning methods in their day to the day teaching-learning process, but it was not implemented as it was expected to be done.

In addition to this, the documents available in each of the sample schools showed that no best practice helps teachers to learn from each other.

In the same table item 6, the respondents asked to what extent School-based supervisors facilitate the professional growth of teachers through short-term training, workshops, and seminars. Accordingly, teachers and school-based supervisors with (X=2.42, S.D=1.2) and (X= 2.22, S.D= 0.92) and mean scores respectively reported that School-based school supervisors inefficiently facilitate the professional growth of teachers' through short term training, workshops and seminars. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.34) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in responses. the overall mean of 2.32 shows low of the majority of respondents with the issue. Similarly, during the interview, the respondents informed that School-based supervisors didn't highly facilitate the professional growth of teachers through short-term training, workshops, and seminars.

The data gathered through document analysis similarly indicated that there were low seminars and workshops arranged to facilitate teachers' professional growth. Bray (1987:136) indicated that information is important to make a good decision. Having this in mind, the respondents were asked whether the school-based supervisors were providing information in the form of training and workshops for teachers or not. So, still, with the lack of budget allocated by the woreda education office and the school management, school-based supervisors did not perform short-term training, seminars, and workshops for teachers' professional growth.

In the same table item 7 above, the respondents asked whether the School-based supervisors are supporting teachers in doing action research and supporting teachers in providing solutions for the identified problems in the teaching-learning process. Thus, teachers and school-based supervisors with (x=2.42, S.D=2.29) and (X= 1.1, S.D=0.9) mean scores respectively reported that School-based supervisors insufficiently support teachers in doing action research and set appropriate solutions. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.42) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference

in responses. the overall mean of 1.76 shows low of the majority of respondents with the issue. Similarly, during the interview, the respondents informed that school-based supervisors inadequately support teachers in doing action research and support them to solve instructional problems.

The information obtained from school principals through interviews reveals that these activities were being implemented at the department level, not at an individual teacher basis. In addition, the interview assured that School-based supervisors are not capable enough to shoulder their responsibilities in assisting the day-to-day instructional activities of teachers in the schools. This is due to time constraints and a large number of teachers in the schools, 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 best practice. In general, the compiled result indicates that school-based supervisors didn't design various interventions to assist teachers to improve their limitations. As a result, the teachers had not got enough professional support to improve their day-to-day classroom instruction and instructional skills. Hence, it might reduce the effectiveness of students, teachers' initiation as well as the school's goal achievement.

4.4. Teachers' perception on School based supervision

This part deals with the discussion of the data gathered from respondents with regards to the teachers'perception of implementing School-based supervision while implementing the supervisory activity.

Table 9: Teachers' perception of implementing School based supervision in government secondary schools

No	Items	Respondents	N0	X-	SD	Over all mean	P-value
1	Teachers think that School-Based supervisors are incompetent enough in their professional knowledge & skills.	Senior teacher	38	3.71	1.675	4	0.351
		department heads	45	4.29	1.325		
2	How they perceive supervisors as they have no high experience in the practice of school-based supervision	Senior teacher	38	2.45	2.5	1.73	0.3
		department heads	45	1.01	1.28		
3	How teachers are resistant against the supervisory activities.	Senior teacher	38	4.42	1.004	4.5	0.319
		department heads	45	4.58	.812		
4	How teachers perceive supervisors as fault finders rather than assisting them.	Senior teacher	38	3.82	1.486	4.13	0.324
		department heads	45	4.44	.990		
5	How they neglect the activities of School based supervisors for what they are the same in their qualification	Senior teacher	38	3.61	1.346	3.925	0.31
		department heads	45	4.24	1.246		

X= mean,SD=standared division, and p-value at α=0.05

According to item 1 of Table 9, respondents were asked their perception of whether their school supervisors are incompetent enough to help other teachers. the calculated mean with (x = 3.71, SD=1.675and x=4.29, SD= 1.325) respectively showed the respondents highto the target issue. The overall mean 4 also shows high of the total respondents with the point. The significance level (p=0.351) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors.

As depicted in item 2 of table 9 respondents were asked to express their degree of high on the idea that school supervisors have high experience in the practice of School-based supervision to carry out their responsibility effectively. With this idea teachers and leaders respondents of the mean score (x=2.45, SD=1.01, and x=2.5,SD=1.28) respectively revealed that they low with the idea. the overall x=1.73, Shows low of the total respondents with the point. Therefore, based on the overall score value, teachers consider their School-based supervisors as they have no high experience in the practice of School-based supervision to carry out their

responsibility effectively. The significance level (p=0.3) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors.

Concerning item 3 of the same table above, respondents were asked their opinion on the idea of teachers against the supervisory practices. Based on this issue, teacher respondents with the mean score(x= 4.42,and SD=1.004) and school-based supervisors with (x= 4.58,SD=.812) respectively and the overall x=4.5 shows high of the total respondents with the point. Based on the overall score value, teachers were against the supervisory activities. The significance level (p=0.319) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors.

According to item 4 from the above table, respondents were asked whether teachers perceived school-based supervisory as afault finder or not with (X= 3.82, SD=1.486 and X= 4.44, SD=0.99) respectively. The overall X=4.13 Shows high of the total respondents with the point. Based on the overall score value teachers perceived School-based supervisors as fault finders. The significance level (p=0.324) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors.

In the same way, the data gained from the interviewee confirmed the above idea. One of the participants said that some teachers showed resistance to the supervisory activities. They missed their regular teaching classes during a classroom observation. Because they suspect supervisors as they find out the poor performance of teachers. Thus, the findings revealed that the negative perception of teachers toward School-based supervision adversely affects the practice of supervision in secondary schools inlideta sub-city.

In the same table of item 5, respondents were asked to express their rate of high on teachers neglecting the supervisory activity in following up the activities of teachers.the mean score(x= 3.61, SD=1.346 and X=4.24, SD=1.246) respectively and the overall x= 3.925 shows the highof the total respondents with the point. The significance level (p=0.31) is greater than 0.05, this indicates that there is no significant difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors. thisindicated that most teachers neglect the school-based supervisors' activity for what they were the same in their education quality.

4.5. How supervisors assess their contribution to the improvement of instruction in Secondary Schools of lideta sub-city

This part deals with the discussion of the data gathered from respondents with regards to how supervisors assess their contribution to the improvement of instruction in secondary schools of lideta sub-city. The respondents' opinion on the idea of School-Based supervisors assessing their contribution to the improvement of instruction in the classroom to design appropriate interventions was presented to respondents through questionnaires.

Table 10: Respondents' View on the School-Based supervisors' efforts to identify the strengths and limitations of teachers in the classroom.

No	Items	Respondents	N0	X-	SD	OV mean	P-value
1	How School-based Supervisors regularly identify any instructional limitations of teachers in the classroom.	Senior teacher	38	2.39	0.917	2.42	0.083
		department heads	45	2.45	1.139		
2	How School based Supervisors identify teachers ability to manage class.	Senior teacher	38	2.53	0.986	2.42	0.100
		department heads	45	2.31	1.245		
3	How School based Supervisors can identify teachers' skill gaps.	Senior teacher	38	2.45	1.08	2.42	0.15
		department heads	45	2.39	1.163		
4	How School based Supervisors encourage and facilitate teachers self evaluation on instructional matters.	Senior teacher	38	2.47	0.986	2.35	0.57
		department heads	45	2.34	1.101		
5	How School based Supervisors facilitate the availability of instructional materials and encourage teachers to use them appropriately	Senior teacher	38	2.55	0.962	2.47	0.91
		department heads	45	2.39	1.163		
6	How School based Supervisors support teachers in setting instructional goals and objectives.	Senior teacher	38	2.55	0.992	2.39	0.029
		department heads	45	2.23	1.191		
7	How School-based Supervisor advice teachers to use active learning in the classroom.	Senior teacher	38	2.51	0.963	2.48	0.28
		department heads	45	2.45	1.097		
8	How School-based Supervisors design appropriate interventions to minimize the identified limitations of teachers in the classrooms.	Senior teacher	38	2.49	1.024	2.38	0.016
		department heads	45	2.28	0.806		

X= mean ,SD=standareddevesion and p-value at α=0.05

As indicated in item 1 of Table 10, the respondents were asked whether the School-Based supervisors regularly identify any instructional limitations of teachers in the classrooms and provide appropriate intervention. Accordingly, teachers and school-based supervisors with (X=2.39, SD=0.917) and (X= 2.45 SD= 1.139) mean scores respectively responded that School-Based supervisors were insufficiently identifying instructional limitations of teachers in the classrooms and did not regularly provide immediate solutions. The overall mean of 2.42 shows low of the majority of respondents with the issue. Therefore it can be concluded that the School-based supervisors did not identify any instructional limitations of teachers' in the classroom. In this regard, the t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.083) is greater than 0.05 this shows there is no significant difference between the two respondent groups regarding the 1st item.

On the other hand, the data collected from school principals through interviews revealed that the majority of School-based supervisors did not regularly identify any instructional limitations of teachers in the classrooms. They simply conduct the clinical supervision per semester but did not regularly identify teachers' strengths and limitations on instructional matters. This implication showed that School-based supervisors had an opportunity to identify the instructional limitations of teachers in the classroom, but they did not regularly identify the limitations of teachers and did not indicate appropriate solutions. The document analysis supports this issue as School-based supervisors tried to identify instructional limitations of teachers per semester once but did not regularly identify the limitations of teachers and they did not indicate proper solutions on how teachers could improve their limitations. Therefore, the findings implied that School-based supervisors insufficiently identify the strengths and limitations of teachers by conducting classroom observation.

About item 2 of the same table, both groups of respondents were asked to express their degree of highon the idea that School-based supervisors identify teachers' abilities to manage students in the classroom or not. Accordingly, teachers with (X=2.53, SD=0.906) and school-based supervisors with (X=2.31, SD=1.245) mean scores respectively indicated that School-based supervisors inadequately identify teachers' abilities to manage students in the classroom during teaching-learning processes and a total mean score (X= 2.42) indicate that teachers and education leaders responded that School-based supervisors insufficiently identify teachers ability to manage students in the classrooms while teaching-learning process. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=.100) is greater than 0.05. This shows that there is no significant difference between the two respondent groups. Generally,

the findings implied that School-based supervisors insufficiently identify teachers' ability to manage students in the classroom.

As the qualitative data obtained from school principals indicated that supervisors did not continuously identify teachers that have skill gaps in classroom management and they did not consult them on how they can manage the classroom during the ongoing teaching-learning process. This indicated that School-based supervisors insufficiently consult and advise teachers on how they can manage their students in the classroom and how can they control and handle the misbehaving students in the classroom. This can affect the stable teaching-learning process in the classrooms.

In item number 3 of table 10, respondents were asked to indicate their high with the idea of School-based supervisors can identify teachers' skill gaps. Thus, teachers and school-based supervisors gave a quick response to the problem encountered in the identification of teachers, and skill gaps during the teaching-learning process in the classroom. The mean score of (X=2.45, SD=1.08) and (X= 2.39, SD=1.163) respectively indicated that School-Based school supervisors insufficiently identify the teachers' skill gaps in the classroom teaching-learning process, and the idea which was narrated by the participants also supported that School-based supervisors insufficiently work to strengthen teacher skill of teaching and learning. Still, it is insufficient and the researcher concluded that there is a gap among supervisors and identifications of teachers' skill gaps in the sample schools. In this regard, the t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.28) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no significant difference in responses.

The school principals during the interview informed that School-based supervisors ineffectively identify teachers' skill gaps.

In item 4 of the same table, the respondents were asked to forward their degree of high on School-based supervisors encouraging and facilitating school self-evaluation on instructional matters. In this case, teachers and school-based supervisors with (X=2.47, SD= 0.986) and (X=, 2.34, SD=1.101) mean scores respectively indicated that School-based supervisors inadequately encourage and facilitate school self-evaluation as was expected to be done. In this view, the t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.57) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in responses. The qualitative data gathered through an interview on this issue similarly indicated that School-based supervisors

did not continuously encourage and facilitate School self-evaluation but sometimes perform the activities.

In item 5 of the same table, the respondents were asked to reflect on their high on the issue of School-based supervisors facilitating the availability of instructional materials and encouraging teachers to use them appropriately in the teaching-learning process. In this case, teachers and school-based supervisors with (X=2.55, SD=0.962) and (X=2.39 SD=1.163) mean scores respectively indicated that School-based supervisors insufficiently facilitate the availability of instructional materials and do not encourage teachers to use it appropriately. Most of the teachers were using the instructional materials sometimes to get certain points in their annual or semester appraisal, but not for their instructional improvement. The qualitative data gathered from the interview also indicated that School-Based supervisors insufficiently facilitated the availability of instructional materials. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.91) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in responses.

According to item 6 of the same table, both groups of respondents rated their idea concerning the degree to which surveys were conducted on School-based supervisors to support teachers in developing instructional goals and objectives. In this case, teachers and school-based supervisors with (X=2.55, SD=0.992) and (X=2.23, SD=1.191) mean scores respectively indicated that School-based supervisors inefficiently support teachers in developing instructional goals and objectives. The overall mean of 2.29 low with the idea and it can be said that they did not support teachers in setting instructional goals and objectives. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.029) is less than 0.05. This indicated that there is a statistically significant difference in responses that may be due to different mechanisms that some of the school-based supervisors used sometimes. The qualitative data gathered through interviews also indicated that School-based supervisors do not support teachers in developing instructional goals and objectives satisfactorily.

In item 7 of Table 10, the respondents asked whether School-based Supervisors advise teachers to use active learning in the classroom and indicate the mechanisms that can motivate students or not. In this case, teachers and school-based supervisors with (X =2.51, SD=0.963) and (X=2.45, SD=1.097) mean scores respectively indicated that School-based supervisors inefficiently advised teachers to use active learning and did not indicate the mechanisms how can they motivate students. The t-test revealed that the significance level

(p=0.28) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in responses.

The qualitative data gathered by semi-structured interviews also indicated that School-based supervisors expected to advise teachers to use active learning and indicate the mechanisms that can motivate students as it was expected but still, they inefficiently advise teachers to use active learning in the classroom. This indicated that School-based supervisors were not well done on the advice services of teachers on the teaching-learning process.

In item 8 of the same table, the respondents were asked whether School-based supervisors design appropriate interventions to minimize the identified limitations of teachers in the class rooms or not. In this case, teachers and school-based supervisors with (X=2.49, SD=1.024) and (X=2.28, SD= 0.806) mean scores respectively indicated that School-based supervisors did not efficiently design appropriate interventions to minimize the identified limitations of teachers in the classrooms. In this regard, the t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.016) is less than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in responses.

The qualitative data gathered by interview also indicated that School-based supervisors inefficiently design appropriate interventions to minimize the identified limitations of teachers in the classrooms because of a lack of budget and experience. The semi-structured close-ended questions indicated that the majority of the respondents high d on the absence of specific mechanisms to identify the instructional limitations of teachers in the classroom because those School-based supervisors did not have specific and tangible plans to specify and identify the limitations of teachers.

In general, the compiled result indicated that School-based supervisors were insufficiently identifying teachers' instructional limitations regularly. As a result, the teachers did not get enough support to be competent enough in improving the day-to-day classroom instruction as well as enhance their professional growth. Thus, this might reduce the effectiveness of students' and teachers' initiation as well as the schools' goal achievement.

4.6. Major Challenges that affect School-based Supervisors

This part deals with the discussion of the data gathered from respondents with regards to the challenges that affect secondary school internal supervisors while implementing supervisory activity was presented to respondents through questionnaires that they were required to rate

the level of effects based on a five-point Likert scale. For ease of analysis, the mean value range from 1.00 to 2.49 was insufficient from 2.50 to 3.49 were moderate, and greater than 3.50 were rated as high.

Table 11: Respondents' View on the Challenges that affect Secondary School based Supervisors While Implementing Supervisory Practices In lideta sub-city.

No	Items	Respondents	N0	X-	SD	Over all X	P-value
1	How SBS have Lack of strategic and short-term plan to implement School based supervision.	Senior teacher	38	3.85	1.01	3.735	0.108
		department heads	45	3.62	1.02		
2	How the supervisors are overloaded with classroom activities	Senior teacher	38	3.85	1.19	3.84	0.055
		department heads	45	3.83	1.071		
3	How School-based supervisors teach the same credit like ordinary teachers	Senior teacher	38	3.57	1.3	3.65	0.082
		department heads	45	3.73	0.962		
4	How SBS haveLack of adequate training system on the practices of School based supervision.	Senior teacher	38	3.85	0.976	3.87	0.725
		department heads	45	3.89	0.854		
5	How SBS have inadequate pre-service and in service training	Senior teacher	38	3.76	0.973	3.79	0.12
		department heads	45	3.83	0.978		
6	How the attitudeof SBS towards supervision work.	Senior teacher	38	3.72	0.78	3.825	0.26
		department heads	45	3.93	0.83		
7	How SBS have the ability to conflict resolution and performance counseling	Senior teacher	38	3.66	1.016	3.59	0.32
		department heads	45	3.52	0.878		
8	How SBS give Inadequate attention given to supervision service	Senior teacher	38	3.72	0.871	3.805	0.085
		department heads	45	3.89	0.944		
9	How SBS have lack of clear direction from sub city Education experts	Senior teacher	38	3.74	1.107	3.785	0.163
		department heads	45	3.83	0.687		
10	How SBS have lack of cooperative, honest, friendly and collegial relationship	Senior teacher	38	3.65	1.032	3.715	0.424
		department heads	45	3.78	0.789		

X= mean ,SD=standared division and p-value at α=0.05

As it can be observed from item 1, of table 11, teachers and school-based supervisorswith (X= 3.85, SD=1.01) and (X=3.62, SD=1.02) mean scores and standard deviation respectively high d that a lack of strategic and short term plan to implement School-based school supervision was a challenge to supervisors in School-based supervision.

According to an interview conducted withschool principals, whatever pattern of supervision procedures, supervisors, need regular planning but they seldom plan for School-based supervision. The overall mean X=3.735 high d with the idea. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.109) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in responses.

In table 11 above item 2, teachers and school-based supervisors with (X=3.85, SD=1.19) and (X=3.83, SD= 1.071) mean scores and standard deviation respectively indicated that School-based supervisors were overburdened with many tasks. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.055) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in responses. Similarly, during an interview, the participants indicated that School-based supervisors were currently overburdened with many tasks. Therefore, almost all of the informants who participated in the interview expressed that having work load was the major problem of School-based supervision. One of the interviewees said;

"Since most of our school-based supervisors were having a teaching load of more than 22 periods a week, it is impossible to provide School-based supervision service to teachers effectively. Besides, due to the big workload of teachers, the school is forced to assign a very small number of supervisors that are not adequate to provide supervisory service to all teachers."

Therefore, based on the response of the majority, it is possible to conclude that having a big workload hindered school-based supervisors to implement the School-based supervision activities effectively and efficiently.

As can be described in item 3 of the same table above, respondents were inquired to indicate their level of high regarding supervisors teaching the same credit as other ordinary teachers. Teachers and school-based supervisionwith (X= 3.57, SD=1.3) and (**X**=3.73, SD=0.962) mean scores and standard deviation respectively high data that School-based supervisors have been teaching the same credit as other ordinary teachers.

The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.082) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in responses. Furthermore, the result obtained from the interview confirmed that most School-based supervisors taught 18 periods on average per week and MoE (1994) confirmed that the big workload of members of School-based supervisors affects the practice of School-based supervision because of the shortage of time hinders the provision of adequate supervision. Therefore, from the result obtained it is possible to suggest that School-based supervisor teaches the same credit like other teachers. So, they were not support teachers as possibly by using their maximum efforts.

Although, MoE,(1994:6) indicated that the education and training helps in bringing-up human power to play a great role and take countrywide responsibility having developed the necessary productive, creative and appreciative capacity in order to participate fruitfully in development and the utilization of resources and the environment at large, senior teachers and school based supervisiors from above table with (X= 3.85, SD=0.976) and (X =3.89, SD=0.854) mean scores respectively high data that School based supervisors had lack of adequate training system concerning internal supervision. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.725 is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significance difference of response. The qualitative data obtained from interview also supported the idea that School based supervisors had no adequate training system in the school. They said that most of the time, training given was for cluster supervisors at subcity level but not for School based supervisors.

As the same table item 5, teachers and school based supervisiorswith (X= 3.76, SD=0.973) and (X=3.83), SD=0.978) mean scores and standard deviation respectively indicated (high data) that the absence of pre-service and in-service training was a challenge to supervisors in School based supervision. This confirms the views of Carron and De Grauwe (1997) that advisers, supervisors and other such staff need regular training, but they seldom receive it. They believe that whatever pattern of recruitment and promotion procedures, supervisors need regular training but they were seldom provided with pre-service or in-service training. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.12) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significance difference of responses.

As responses to item 6 in the same table, all the teachers and school based supervisiors with (X = 3.72, SD=0.78), (X=3.93, SD=0.83) mean scores and standard deviation respectively indicated (high data) that the attitude of supervisors towards supervision work was a challenge to School based supervision. This supports Oliva and Pawlas's (1997) perception

that some School based supervisors as they are called in other countries, continue to fulfill their tasks with an authoritarian approach. Some respondents in Rous (2004) study expressed feelings of fear and disappointment, which were associated with the use of criticism by School based supervisors. The supervisors' criticisms were reported to have stifled the teachers' use of innovative practices. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.26) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significance difference of responses. Similarly during interview the participants indicated that, (high data) the attitude of supervisors towards supervision work was a challenge to educational supervision.

As the same table item 7, all the teachers, School based supervisors and the interviewee with (X= 3.66, SD=1.016) and (X=3.52, SD=0.878) mean scores and standard deviation respectively high data that lack of ability to conflict resolution and performance counseling towards supervision work was a challenge to School based supervision. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.0.32) is greater than 0.05. This indicates that there is no statistically significance difference of responses. Similarly, during interview the respondents informed that lack of ability to conflict resolution and performance counseling towards supervision work was a challenge to internal supervision.

Regarding to item 8 above table, the teachers and school based supervisiorswith (X= 3.72, SD=0.87), (X=3.89, SD=0.944) mean scores and standard deviation respectively high that in adequate attention given towards supervision service was a challenge to School based supervision. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.085) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significance difference of responses. Similarly, during interview the respondents informed that in adequate attention given to towards supervision service was a challenge to School based supervision.

In table 11 item 9, the teachers, School based supervisors with (X= 3.74, SD=1.017) and (X=3.83, SD=0.687) mean scores and standard deviation respectively high data that lack of clear direction from subcity education expert was a challenge to School based supervision. The t-test revealed that the significance level (p=0.163) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significance difference of responses. In the same way, during interview the respondents informed that lack of clear direction from subcity education expert was a challenge to School based supervision.

Regarding to item 10 of table 11 (X=3.65, SD=1.032) and (X =3.78, SD=0.789) mean scores and standard deviation respectively indicated that lack of cooperative, honest, friendly and lack of collegial relationships with and among teachers was a challenge to school-based supervision. Pajak (2010) pointed out that good supervisors are those who are capable of

communicating with teachers to bring professional improvement. Hence, it can be said that a lack of cooperative, honest, friendly, and collegial relationship is a problem related to supervisors that affect School-based supervisory practices in the study area. The t-test revealed that the significance level ($p=0.425$) is greater than 0.05. This indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in responses.

CHAPTER FIVE
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This part of the study deals with the summary of the major findings, a general conclusion drawn on the bases of the findings, and recommendations that are assumed to be useful to enhance the practices of school-based supervision in the government secondary schools of lideta sub-city are forwarded for all concerned academic staffs.

5.1. Summary

School-Based supervision is a means for achieving effectiveness in the professional development of teachers, and curriculum development, and ultimately signifies students learning through teachers' improvement of classroom teaching-learning activities. Thus, the supervision at the school level helps teachers to be competent in their teaching-learning activities; it encourages them to find suitable strategies for better student learning. Therefore, the central purpose of this study was to assess the status of the practices and challenges of School-Based supervision in the government secondary schools of lideta sub-city. To address this purpose, the following basic research questions were raised:

1. To what extent do teachers understand the school-based supervision in secondary Schools of lideta sub city?
2. To what extent do school-based supervisors employ the procedure of classroom observation in Secondary schools of lideta sub-city?
3. To what extent did school-based supervisors discharge their responsibilities in secondary Schools of lideta sub city?
4. What are the challenges existing in the implementation of school-based supervision in secondary Schools of lideta sub-city?

To this effect, the study was conducted in 3 government secondary schools. Consequently, 38 teachers, 45department heads,and 9 principals were selected as respondents using available,Quota, available, and purposive sampling techniques respectively. techniques respectively. For the study, primary and secondary data sources were employed.

The data was gathered through both quantitative and qualitative tools. Accordingly, 38 copies of a questionnaire were prepared and distributed for teachers and 45 copies of questionnaires for department heads, and all of the questionnaires were returned. On the other hand, to obtain qualitative data, interview sessions were conducted with the school principals and vice-principals.

The quantitative data gathered through questionnaires were analyzed in mean, and standard deviation. The t-test was also utilized to check the statistical significance of whether there is a difference or not between the opinions of the respondents assisted by a computer SPSS program version 24. Whereas, the qualitative data gathered through the open-ended questionnaire, interview, and document were analyzed by narration.

According to the result of the data analysis, the following findings were identified. Therefore, based on the analysis of data, the findings of the study were summarized as follows.With regard to the organization of the functions of school-based supervision, the finding revealed that short training, seminars, workshops, and other capacity-building programs were not arranged for teachers to build their capacity. Besides among the options of supervision to be practiced only clinical supervision was used by the supervisors. Both respondents approved that collegial, informal, self-directed, and inquiry-based supervisions were not practiced by the school-based supervisors.

Concerning the actual practices of school-based supervision that corresponds to the expected standards to assist Teacher's professional improvement, the result of the findings revealed that School-Based supervisors insufficiently arrange induction training for beginner teachers, they insufficiently assist teachers in lesson planning and they facilitate experience sharing programs among teachers. In addition to this, there was a low degree of assisting teachers in developing/selecting instructional materials. Not only this but also, the findings revealed that school-based supervisors insufficiently support teachers to do action research and set appropriate solutions for the identified problems.

School-based supervisors were insufficiently facilitating short-term training to teachers, they insufficiently advised teachers to use effective teaching methods and they did not encourage them to motivate students while they teach in the classroom. Teachers' respondents also revealed that school-based supervisors did not support them in how to conduct action research to set solutions for the existing problems in the teaching-learning process. As a result of this, teachers did not consider action research as it can help them to minimize /overcome different challenges intheteaching and learning process.

Concerning teachers' perception of instructional supervision, the way and manner that teachers react to the supervision of instruction is one concern of supervisory practices. Most teachers who are the direct beneficiaries of instructional supervision have a negative perception of the practices.Due to this, the whole process did not yield to bring the desired

results. Teachers perceive the practices of School-Based supervision as a way of fault-finding rather than supporting them in the instructional process.

Regarding how supervisors assess their contribution to the improvement of instruction, the compiled result indicated that School-based supervisors did not identify teachers' instructional limitations regularly. As a result, the teachers had not got enough support to be competent enough to improve the day-to-day classroom instruction as well as enhance their professional growth. The majority of respondents indicated that among the different opinions –such as clinical, collegial, and self-directed supervision were rarely practiced in their school. They asserted that most School-Based supervisors did not facilitate the availability of instructional materials and encourage teachers to use them appropriately. In addition to this, the result of teachers' respondents revealed that teachers were not properly advised to use active learning in the classroom. Thus, this might reduce the effectiveness of students, teachers' initiation as well as the schools' goal achievement.

Regarding the challenges faced School-Based supervisors while implementing School-Based supervision, the respondents said that school-based supervisors did not prepare strategically and short term to implement it accordingly. Therefore, the practice of School-Based supervision was not given special attention to be done effectively and efficiently. On the other hand, the result of the study indicated that the incapability of school-based supervisors for effective supervisory activities, lack of relevant training programs to update the supervisors; the scarcity of experienced supervisors in school-based supervision activity, the shortage of allocated budget to facilitate supervisory activities, the supervisors was overburdened with multiple tasks, they teach the same credits like other teachers, they had lack of adequate training system, inadequate pre-service and in-service training, lack of a positive attitude towards supervision work, incapability of conflict resolution and performance counseling, inadequate attention given to supervision service from a different angle, miss understanding of direction given from sub-city education experts and lack of cooperative, honest, friendly and collegial relationships, the negative perception of teachers towards supervision, the absence of any supervision manual in the school, lack of competent professional knowledge and skill, supervisors' low experience on the practice of school-based supervision are challenges to implement School-Based supervision. Not only this but also, teachers' resistance to the practice of School-Based supervision, perceptions of teachers to school-based supervision, and lack of follow up of the activities of teachers by the

supervisors are presumed factors that could hamper the activities of effective School-Based supervision in secondary schools of the study area.

5.2. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn: Teachers, who are the main actors in the process of teaching and learning, have individual differences in their competence, need, temperament, action, and the likes. Thus, while organizing the functions of supervision in schools, it is difficult to get better supervisory results without considering the individual difference among them.

Based on the findings, practices of school-based supervision corresponding to the expected standards to assist Teachers to reduce their limitations were insufficient and they didn't arrange induction training for beginner teachers. The absence of facilitating experience sharing programs among teachers, seldom assisting teachers in developing instructional materials, and absence of expanding best practices of teaching methodology among school and teachers were the problems. Accordingly, from the above findings, one may conclude that teachers were not properly assisted and supported by school-based supervisors. So, school-based supervisors did not arrange induction training for beginner teachers and did not properly design various interventions to assist teachers to reduce their instructional limitations. As a result, in our secondary schools, there were a lot of problems that hinders the provision of quality education. Unless this problem is taken into account and solved soon, it is impossible to ensure the quality of education and develop students' achievement.

Based on the findings of the study, the extent to which teachers gained professional support from school-based supervisors to improve their instructional skills was inadequate. They insufficiently support teachers to prepare different instructional materials for teaching-learning effectiveness, insufficiently support teachers to conduct action research on pedagogical skill improvement of teachers, unsuccessfully facilitate short term training for teachers, didn't advise teachers to use model effective teaching methods, and didn't encourage them to motivate students, they ineffectively create competition among teachers by designing different evaluation programs on pedagogical skill improvement. From the above findings, one may conclude that teachers did not gain proper professional support from supervisors to improve their instructional skills, so teachers' instructional skills remain unchanged. As a result, the quality of Education provided for the student is becoming decreasing and decreasing from time to time and if this problem is continued in line with the current situation, it brought the students' poor performance in the future.

Depending on the pieces of evidence from the data analyzed the researcher concluded that school-based supervisors did not identify any instructional limitations of teachers in the classroom and few school-based supervisorsindicatedasolution. From the result of this finding, we can say that the teachers did not get enough support to be competent enough in improving the day-to-day classroom instruction as well as enhance their professional growth. Therefore, from the above results, we can conclude that teachers' instructional skills in the classroom were stagnant although they are working in this dynamic environment. Thus, school-based supervisors did not continuously encourage teachers by identifying teachers' instructional strengths and limitations. Continued follow-up of teachers by the school-based supervisors helps them to reduce their instructional limitations in the classroom and to provide the students with effective classroom instruction. Unless this problem is handled soon, it may reduce the effectiveness of students' achievement, teachers' initiation as well as the schools' goal achievement.

One may conclude that there were a lot of tasks that we expect from school-based supervisors as they had a great experience and better skills. They commit to helping and supporting teachers. However, school-based supervisors have had many challenges in properly practicing school-based supervision in the school. So, it can be concluded that the respondents were still lacking clarity on the goals, objectives, and advantages of school-based supervision at the school level. This leads to additional efforts to exert on communicate the rationales and benefits of school-based supervision to the people who are likely to be affected.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were drawn to minimize and solve the problems that hold up the practice of school-based supervision in lideta sub-citySecondary Schools:

The functions of school-based supervision should be organized in a way that embraces various opportunities to develop teachers' professional competence and bring instructional improvement. Accordingly, organizing professional pieces of training, workshops, seminars, teachers' study groups, experience sharing programs, etc. at the school level is recommended. The supervisors better know that supervision is not merely classroom observation and are advised not to rely on a single option of supervision i.e. clinical supervision to develop teachers' professional competence. As a result, using different options of supervision demand a change of role of both the teachers and the supervisors in such a way that teachers choose

the option that they believe makes sense to them and take the responsibility of making it operational. Therefore, supervisors are advised to encourage teachers to be supervisors of their own, and their colleagues and engage themselves in action research (either alone or with colleagues), and make them systematic problem-solvers oftheir practices.

The finding of the study revealed that the school-based supervisory practice of assisting teachers to reduce their limitations in secondary schools inlideta sub-city was impeded by many problems. Therefore, it is recommended that school-based supervisors in lideta sub-city must arrange induction training for beginner teachers, assist teachers in lesson planning preparation, facilitate experience sharing among teachers, assist teachers in developing/selecting instructional materials, creating a conducive climate for sharing the best practices among teachers, facilitating the professional growth of teachers through short term training, workshops and support teachers to do action research on the specified pedagogical/instructional limitations of teachers.

The findings revealed that teachers did not gain effective and constructive professional support from the supervisors to improve their instructional skills due to the negative perception of teachers toward school based supervisors. Therefore, it can be suggested that school based supervisors and the teachers should have positive relationship among them and they must support teachers to improve their instructional skills for teaching learning effectiveness and advise them at nearby. There should be cooperative and collaborative team sprit to avoid this misleading perception of teachers on school based supervisory practices.

The findings of the study revealed that school based supervisors did not regularly identify the strength and limitations of teachers in the classroom in order to design appropriate intervention strategies. To this end, lidetasubcityeducation office in collaboration with schools and other voluntary organizations must provide training for School based supervisors on how to identify the strength and limitations of teachers in the classroom and how to design appropriate intervention strategies like on the abilities to manage students in the classroom, student evaluation skills, school self evaluation techniques, developing and using of instructional materials and on conducting action research to solve the day to day instructional problems and effectively implement the curriculum.

Finally, the findings of the study pointed out that the practice of school-based supervision was adversely influenced by various factors. Hence, to overcome these particular challenges, the following recommendations are forwarded:-

Providing Training Programs:

Appropriate and continuous training programs need to be organized and given to school-based supervisors and teachers on the significance of supervision and how it can be designed and implemented at the school level. Thus, it is advisable for the school-based supervisor,andsub-city Education office in cooperation with each other facilitate the training programs for the effectiveness of supervision at the school level. its responsible body are CAAAEB, LSCEO and sample study schools.

Reducing the Workload of Supervisors:

The result of the study revealed that the supervisors' heavy workload was among the factors that hindered school-based supervisors to implement school-based supervision. It is fact that school-based supervisors have double responsibilities: eg. Conducting routine tasks and assisting other teachers. Thus, it is better to reduce the teaching credit loads of school-based supervisors in comparison to other teachers.

To overcome these challenges, the sub-city education office takes part in the problems faced by school-based supervisors and try to solve and create conducive working situations and environment for the practices.its responsible body are LSCEO and sample study schools.

Selection of school-based Supervisors:

The appropriate selection of school-based supervisors needs to be given special attention. This is because the findings revealed that most principals, vice-principals, and school-based supervisors were selected not based on their work experience and their qualification rather they were selected because they can achieve the objectives of political affairs. Therefore, it is fact that most of them had no competent knowledge to implement the supervisory practices. So, the school, sub-city Education Office, as well as concerned bodies, should give special attention to the selection of those school-based supervisors depending on the principles of our country's education policy.its responsible body is sample study schools.

REFERENCES

Abongo, J. (1998). Educational management. Nairobi: Nairobi University Press.

Acheson K. A. & Gall, M. D. (1987).Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers: Longman Publisher.

ADEA (1998).Resource materials for school inspectors. London: Chameleon Press Ltd.

Aggarwl, (1985).Theory and principles of Education: philosophical and sociological base of Education New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd

Audrey, F. A. (2004). Enhancing learning through a differentiated approach to teaching and learning. Journal of Research in Special Education Needs, 4(2), 91-97.

Beach, D. M., &Reinhartz, J. (2000).Supervisory leadership: Focus on instruction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (1992). Fundamental of clinical supervision.

Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Ben, T, Sally, H., & Penny, C. (1997).Stuart and Sundeen's mental health nursing: Elsevier publisher.

Benjamin, K. (2003). Instructional supervision: Perceptions of Canadian and Ukraine beginning high school teachers. Unpublished Master of Arts thesis, Saskatchewan University at Saskatoon.

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (1993).Education research. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall

BGREB (2006).Responsibilities of Sub-city and school cluster supervisors. Unpublished training Document, Assosa

Blasé, J. R. & Blasé, J. (1998).Handbook of instructional leadership: How good.

Chanyalew, Woldegebriel. (2005). The practice and problems of instructional supervision in 4secondary schools of Hadya Zone. Unpublished Masters of Arts thesis, Addis Ababa University, at Addis Ababa.

Chiovere, B. R. (1995). Educational administration and management. Harare: Mazongororo Paper converters Ltd.

Cohen, L. (1994). Research methods in education (4th ed). New York: Routledge.

Claude, S. (1992). Supervision in action (3rd ed.). Sydney: Chapel Hill.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). Clinical supervision. Boston: Houghton- Miffin.

Enaigbe, A. P. (2009). Strategies for improving supervisory skills for effectivePrimary education in Nigeria. Edo Journal of Counselling, 2(2), 236-241.

Getachew, Gezahegn. (2001). School-based instructional supervision in selected secondary Schools of Addis Ababa. Unpublished Masters of Arts' thesis, at Addis Ababa.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1984). Differentiated supervision. Alexandria: ASCD.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1990). Supervisory leadership: Introduction to instructional supervision. Glenview, IC: Scott, Foresman, Brown Higher Education.

Glickman, C. D. (1985). Development as the aim of instructional supervision. Retrieved from www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno=ED263655, November, 20/2006

Glickman, C. D. (1990). Supervision of instruction: (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Glickman, C. D. (1993). Renewing America's schools. San Francisco: Jossy- Bass.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2004).Supervision and instructional Leadership: A developmental approach. USA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Goble, N., & Porter, J. (1977).The changing role of the teacher. Paris: NFER Publishing Co. Ltd.

Gurnam, K. S., & Chan, Y. F. (2010).Formative supervision of teaching and learning: Issues and concerns for the school head. European Journal of Scientific Research, 39(4), 589-605.

Harris, B. M. (1998). Paradigms and parameters of supervision in education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Jacklyn, R. (2008). Supervision for instructional improvement. Retrieved from January 30, 2006 at www Docstoc.com>Education>Teachers

Jones, J. (1993). Appraisal and staff development in schools. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Jose, F&Gonzales (1993).Methods of research and thesis writing. Paris National Boore, Acept Marulas.

Kwong, Y. F. (1992). A descriptive study of clinical supervision in an aided secondary school. Retrieved from www.fed.cuhk.edu.hk/en/cuma/92yfkwong/conclusion.htm, December 18, 2006

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.

Lindlof, T. R. & Taylor, B. C. (2002).Qualitative communication research methods (2nd ed) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Merga, Feyisa.(2007). Approaches to educational supervision. Unpublished training Manuscript, Oromia REB: Finfine.

Million Morki. (2010). an assessment on the status of school-based instructional supervision In Secondary schools of West Arsi Zone. Unpublished Masters of Arts thesis, Addis Ababa University at Addis Ababa.

MoE (1994).Educational supervision manual. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.

MoE (2002).Educational leadership and administration community participation and financial directive. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.

MoE (2006).Decentralized management of education in Ethiopia: A reference manual. AddisAbaba: Ged Printing and Packaging Plant.

MoE (2006). School improvement program. Addis Ababa: EMPDA. MoE (2009).Continuous professional development for primary and secondary school teachers, Leaders, and supervisors in Ethiopia. Unpublished framework, Addis Ababa.

MoE (2010). ESDP IV Version 1 for internal discussion. Unpublished educational sector Development program document, Addis Ababa

Musaazi, J. C. S. (1982). The theory and practice of educational administration. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Publishers.

Nolan, J. J., & Hoover, L. A. (2004). Teacher supervision and evaluation: NJ: John Wasey & Sons.

Oliva, P. F. (2001). Developing the curriculum. Retrieved from media.wiley.com/product_ data/excerpt/53/04711516/0471151653.pdf February 4.2006.

Rashid, A. (2001). Supervision practices as perceived by teachers and supervisors in Riyadh Schools.UnpublishedDoctoral thesis, Ohio University. Retrieved from faculty ksu.edu.sa/dr.rashid/Documents/My20%Dissertation.doc September 15.2006.

Rogers, C. (2004). Administrative guidelines for supervisors and municipal teacher training Offices on the Angola TEP program.Norwegian refuge council. Retrieved from toolkit.ineesite.org/...Teacher_Ed_Program_Supervisor_Manual.PDF,March8,2006.

Ross, L. N., & Dean, N. E. (1980). Handbook for effective supervision of instruction (3rd ed.). NJ: Englewood Prentice-Hall.

Ruth, W. (1992). Classroom observation tasks. UK: Cambridge University Press. Samuel, C. C. (2006). Supervision: New York: McGraw-Hill Company.

Samuel, C. C. (2006). Supervision: New York: McGraw-Hill Company.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). The principalship: Boston: Allyn and Beacon

Sergiovanni, T. J., &Starratt, R. J. (2002).Supervision: (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.

Sergiovanni, T. J., &Starratt, R. J. (2007).Supervision: (8th ed). New York:McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.

Stadan, V. E. (2000). Human resource management (2nd ed). Pretoria: AACTE.

Sullivan, S., &Glanz, J. (2000).Alternative approaches to supervision: Cases from the Field212-235. Sullivan, S., &Glanz, J. (2005).Supervision that improves teaching (2nd ed.). London: Corwin Press.

Sumaiya.Q. (2010): Educational supervision. Retried a from ww.dostoc.com/42102783/ Supervision October 12.2006.

Teck Hong,T.and Waheed,A.(2011).Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory and job satisfaction in the Malaysian:The mediating effect of love of money Asian Academy of Management Journal,vol.16,No.1,73-94

UNESCO (1999).Quality education through school-based supervision and support. Retrieved from unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001174/117472e.pdf January 5, 2006.

UNESCO (2006). Teachers and educational quality: Monitoring global needs for 2015. Montereal: Succursale Center-Ville.

UNESCO (2007). Reforming school supervision for quality improvement. Retrieved from www.iiep.unesco.org/filedmin/.../Supervision/SUP_Mod8.pdf October 16, 2006.

Unruh A., & Turner, H. E. (1970). Supervision for change and innovation. Boston: Mifflin.

Wasiam, G. C. (1977). Sampling techniques (3rd ed.). Canada: John Wasey & Sons Inc.

Yalew Endaweke Mulu. (1998). Fundamental principles of research and its implementation. Bahir Dar: Alpha printing enterprise.

Zepeda, S. J. (2003).Instructional supervision. New York: Eye on Education Inc.

Annex -A-

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

This questionnairewas filled out by school-based supervisors and Senior teachers.

Dear respondent, The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect relevant data for the study entitled "Practices and Challenges of School-Based Supervision in lidetasub-city Government Secondary Schools''Your responses are vital for the success of the study. So, you are kindly requested to read all questions and fill the questionnaire with genuine responses. Be sure that the responses you give was be used only for educational and academic purposes and information is kept confidential.

Please note the following points before you start filling out the questionnaire!

1. Do not write your name on the questionnaire.
2. Read all the questions before attempting to answer the questions.
3. No need to consult others to fill out the questionnaire.
4. Provide appropriate responses by putting a "√" mark to choose one of your responses and write on the space provided when necessary.

Thank you for your cooperation!

If you need further explanation,you can contact me through the address indicated below;

HaftuBirhanu ,

Mobile no: +251 9 2562 17 43

Email :haftubre1979@gmail.com

PARTONE: Demographic Information

Indicate your response by using "X"

1. School Name :		
2. Sex	Male	
	Female	
3. Work Experience	16-20 years	
	21-25 years	
	26-30 years	
	31 and above years	
4.Educational Backgruond	1st degree	
	MA degree	
5.Current Position	Teacher	
	Department Heads	

PART: TWO

1. Views on how the Function of School-based Supervision(SBS) is facilitated.

Indicate your responses for the following Likert format items by putting the"√" mark to write in the box corresponding to an action.

1=Very low (VL), 2= low (L), 3=Avarege(A), 4=High (H), 5=Very High (VH)

No	Items	Scales				
		VH 5	H 4	A 3	L 2	VL 1
1	How SBS Facilitating capacity-building programs for teachers					
2	How SBS hold conferences before and after classroom observations.					
3	How SBS organize peer coaching and experience sharing programs					
4	How SBS conduct unplanned and occasional supervisory act					
5	How SBS encourage teachers to plan their professional development.					
6	How SBS support teachers to conduct action research.					
7	Please, explain if there are any other ways of implementing and organizing the function of school-based supervision_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____					

2. View on the actual practices of school-based supervision corresponds to the expected standards to assist Teacher's Professional Improvement.

1=Very low (VL), 2= low (L), 3=Avarege(A), 4=High (H), 5=Very High (VH)

No	Items	Scales				
		VH 5	H 4	A 3	L 2	VL 1
1	The extent to which School-based supervisors are arranging induction training for beginner teachers					
2	The extent to which School-based supervisors in the school assist teachers in lesson planning					
3	The extent to which School based supervisors facilitate experience sharing programs					
4	The extent to which School-based supervisors assist teachers in developing/selecting instructional materials					
5	The extent to which School-based supervisors spread best practices & teaching methodologies among schools and teachers.					
6	To what degree School-based supervisors are facilitating the professional growth of teachers through short-term training, workshops, and seminars?					
7	To what extent do supervisors support teachers to do action research?					
8	If there are any other ways of intervention to assist teachers to improve their instructional limitations in the classroom, please write them down briefly_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____					

3. **Teachers' perception of implementing School-Based supervision in government secondaryschools**

1=Very low (VL, 2= low (L, 3=Avarege(A), 4=High (H), 5=Very High (VH)

No	Items	Scales				
		VH 5	H 4	A 3	L 2	VL 1
1	Teachers think that School-Based supervisors are incompetent enough in their professional knowledge & skills.					
2	How they perceive supervisors as they have no high experience in the practice of school-based supervision					
3	How teachers are resistant to supervisory activities.					
4	How teachers perceive supervisors as fault finders rather than assisting them.					
5	How they neglect the activities of School based supervisors for what they are the same in their qualification					
6	If there is any negative perception of teachers please explain it in the following space____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____					

4. **How do supervisors assess their contribution to the improvement of instruction in Secondary Schools of lideta sub-city?**

1=Very low (VL), 2= low (L), 3=Avarege(A), 4=High (H), 5=Very High (VH)

No	Items	Scales				
		VH 5	H 4	A 3	L 2	VL 1
1	How school-based Supervisors regularly identify any instructional limitations of teachers in the classroom.					
2	How school-based Supervisors identify teachers' ability to manage the class.					
3	How school-based Supervisors can identify teachers' skill gaps.					
4	School-based Supervisors encourage and facilitate teachers' self-evaluation on instructional matters.					
5	How school based Supervisors facilitate the availability of instructional materials and encourage teachers to use them appropriately					
6	How school-based Supervisors support teachers in setting instructional goals and objectives.					
7	How school-based Supervisors advise teachers to use active learning in the classroom.					
8	How school-based supervisors design appropriate interventions to minimize the identified limitations of teachers in the classrooms.					
8	If there are any other means of identifying instructional strengths and limitations of teachers, please write them briefly_____					

5. The Challenges that affect secondary School-based supervisors while implementing supervisory activity in lideta sub-city.

1=Very low (VL), 2= low (L), 3=Avarege(A), 4=High (H), 5=Very High (VH)

No	Items	Scales				
		VH 5	H 4	A 3	L 2	VL 1
1	How SBS have lack of strategic and short-term plan to implement School based school supervision.					
2	How the supervisors are overloaded with classroom activities					
3	How school-based supervisors teach the same credit as ordinary teachers					
4	How SBS have lack of adequate training system on the practices of School based supervision.					
5	How SBS have inadequate pre-service and in-service training					
6	How SBS have supervisors' attitude towards supervision work					
7	How SBS have ability to conflict resolution and performance counseling					
8	How SBS have inadequate attention is given to supervision service					
9	How SBS have lack of clear direction from sub-city Education experts					
10	How SBS have lack of cooperative, honest, friendly, and collegial relationship					
11	If there are any other challenges faced by secondary School-based supervisors, please write them briefly_____ _____ _____ _____					

Annex-B

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

This interview was conducted bysub-city Education Office Secondary School Principals and Vice Principals. The purpose of this interview is to get relevant information related to the "Practices and Challenges of School-Based Supervision in lideta sub-city Government Secondary Schools." The information obtained from the respondents was help to improve the secondary schools of lideta sub-city internal supervisory practices. Data obtained was used for research purposes only.

Thank you for your cooperation!

PartI: General information

1.Sub city _____

2. Sex_____

3. .Qualification_____

4. Current position_____

5. Experiences as: Principals _____Vice Principals_____

Part II: Interview questions prepared to be distributed to sub-city Education OfficeSecondary School Principals and Vice Principals.

1. To what extent the Function of School based Supervision is Organized in your school?

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. To what extent do School-based supervisors design various interventions to assist teachers to improve their profession? Can you list areas of their interventions?_____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. How did teachers perceive School based supervision in your schools?_____

4. To what extent do school-based supervisors identify the strengths and limitations of teachers in the classroom to design appropriate interventions? Can you give examples from your experience?_____

5. What is your expectation about professional support teachers gain from supervisors to improve their instructional skills in the school?_____

6. How far do School-based school supervisors encourage teachers to assure the quality of education?_____

7. In your opinion, list out challenges that affect secondary School-based school supervisors while implementing supervisory activities._____

8. What do you suggest to overcome these problems?_____