

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

**Assessment of Principals' Supervisory Behaviors as Instructional
Leaders: the Case of School-Based Supervision in Primary Schools
of Arbaminch Town**

**By
PAULOS DEA**

**JULY 2013
ADDIS ABABA**

Assessment of Principals' Supervisory Behaviors as Instructional Leaders: the Case of School-Based Supervision in Primary Schools of Arbaminch Town

**By
PAULOS DEA**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED To The SCHOOL Of GRADUATE STUDIES Of
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY In PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF The
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION IN
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**

**JULY 2013
ADDIS ABABA**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**

**Assessment of Principals' Supervisory Behaviors as Instructional
Leaders: the Case of School-Based Supervision in Primary Schools
of Arbaminch Town**

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

_____	_____	_____
CHAIR MAN, DEPARTMENTS	SIGNATURE	DATE
_____	_____	_____
ADVISOR	SIGNATURE	DATE
_____	_____	_____
INTERNAL EXAMINER	SIGNATURE	DATE
_____	_____	_____
EXTERNAL EXAMINER	SIGNATURE	DATE

Declaration

I here by declare that this thesis is my own original work and has not previously been submitted to any other institution of higher education. I further declare that all sources cited or quoted are indicated and acknowledged by means of comprehensive list of references.

Signed:

Date:

(Paulos Dea Sedisso)

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

Name: GIRMA LEMMA

Signature:.....

Date:

Acknowledgments

I would like to express sincere gratitude to my advisor Girma Lemma for his constructive comments and advice in writing my thesis. I have to express my sincere appreciation to my brother Ato Emnen Dea for his unreserved support and encouragement. I also indebted to all the teachers of Arbaminch primary schools for their genuine cooperation in the undertakings of this study. I am greatly thankful to the principals, vice principals and cluster school supervisors of above stated schools. Finally, I would like to extend my heart felt thanks to all my colleagues, family and friends for giving me moral support in my course of study.

Table of Contents

Contents	pages
Acknowledgement-----	I
Table of Contents-----	II
List of Tables-----	IV
Acronyms and Abbreviations-----	V
Abstract-----	VI
Chapter One-----	1
1.1. Background of the study -----	1
1.2.Statement of the Problem-----	8
1.3.Objectives of the study -----	12
1.4.Significance of the study-----	13
1.5.Delimitation of the study-----	13
1.6.Operational definition of terms(concepts)-----	14
1.7. Limitations and directions for the future research-----	14
Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature-----	16
2.1. Communicating Goals -----	17
2.2. Supervising instruction -----	18
2.3. Promoting the Continuous professional development-----	21
2.4. Promoting the implementation of Curriculum -----	25
2.5. Promoting Action research -----	27
2.6. Providing Incentives -----	28
2.7. Providing Resources -----	29
2.8. Assessing and Evaluating Teachers' Performance-----	30

Chapter Three: Methodology and Design of the Study-----	34
3.1. Design of the study-----	34
3.2. Population, Sample selection and Sampling Technique-----	35
3.3. Data collection Instruments and Procedure-----	36
3.4. Techniques of data analysis -----	39
Chapter Four: Findings and Discussions-----	40
4.1. Teachers, and SBSCMs Opinions on the Selected Principals’ Supervisory Behaviors -----	40
4.2. Teachers’ Opinions on the Statistically Significant Principals’ Supervisory Behaviors-----	53
Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations-----	60
5.1. Summary-----	60
5.2. Conclusions-----	61
5.3. Recommendations-----	62
References	
Appendices	

List of Tables

List	Pages
Table 1: Total population and Sample Size-----	37
Table 2: Content Validity Agreement Scales-----	39
Table 3: Reliability Estimates-----	40
Table 4: Respondents Demographic Profile-----	44
Table 5: The Group Statistics Table of Teachers & SBSCMs Preceptions-----	45
Table 6: Independent Samples Test for Significant difference between teachers' & SBSCMs Perceptions -----	47
Table 7: Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Perceptions on PR and CG by principals-----	57
Table 8:MANOVA table of Teachers' Perceptions on PR & CG by principals-----	60
Table 9: Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Perceptions on PAR and CIOC by principals-----	61
Table 10:MANOVA table of Teachers' Perceptions on PAR & CIOC by principals-----	62

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AAET	Assessing and Evaluating Teachers
ATTC	Abaminch Teachers' Training College
CG	Communicating Goals
CIOC	Coordinating the Implementation of Curriculum
CPD	Contineous Professional Development
GEQIP	General Education Quality Improvement Program
HDP	Higher Diploma Program
MANOVA	Multiple Analysis of Variance
MOE	Ministry of Education
NGOs	Non Governmental Organizatons
P	Principals
PAR	Promoting Action Research
PIFT	Providing Incentives For Teachers
PPD	Promoting Professional Developmen
PR	Providing Resources
SBSCMs	School Based Supervision Committee Members
SI	Supervising Instruction
SNNPRS	Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State
T	Teachers
TDP	Teacher Development Program
TOT	Training of Trainers
UNESCO	United Nations Educations, Scientific and Cultural Orgnizations

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to investigate the status of school based instructional supervision in Government Upper primary Schools of Arbaminch Town. The study particularly, treats the practice of primary school principals in promoting teachers professional development, providing resources, communicating school goals, providing incentives for teachers, supervising instruction, promoting action research, coordinating the implementation of curriculum at the school level, and assessing and evaluating teachers. To accomplish this purpose, the study employed a descriptive survey method, which is supplemented by qualitative research to enrich data. The study was carried out in randomly selected six upper primary schools of Arbaminch Town. A total of 100 teachers and 60 school based supervision committee members were selected for the study. All the 6 principals, 6 vice principals, 2 cluster school supervisors and 12 teachers were also involved in the study for interviewing. Questionnaire and Interviews were instruments used in the study. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean average and inferential statistics such as independent samples t-test and MANOVA were used to analyse the data from the questionnaire. The qualitative data obtained through interview were analyzed using constant comparative method. The results of the study reveal that the school based instructional supervisory practices were ineffective. School principals were also inefficient in setting mutually supportive instructional goals, promoting professional competence of teachers, providing incentives and instructional resources(such as lack of support like manuals, shortage of budget), supporting teachers' implementation of curriculum at school level, supervising instruction and providing frequent feedback for teachers . Furthermore, the study revealed that inadequate implementations of teachers assessment and evaluation hinder proper implementation of school based supervision. Finally, recommendations were drawn based on the above findings. The point of the recommendations include: raising awareness on the part of principals and teachers through seminars, organizing workshops and discussion forums on the different strategies of supervision in order to bring professional growth of teachers and improve their instructional practice.

Chapter One

1.1. Background of the study

The Education and Training Policy has stipulated that ensuring the quality, equity as well the relevance of the Ethiopian education requires effective management and leadership at all levels of the education system. Extending this stipulation of the policy to the school level, the General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) has included school teachers, principals, and supervisors capacity building strategy with clear objectives to facilitate and support schools improvement. As a component of the quality improvement package, the Ethiopian teacher development program general guideline (Blue print) is stressing the need for school leadership and supervisors that can effectively support schools in various aspects including vision and strategic plan development and implementation for schools improvement (MoE,2012)

It is also indicated that achievements with the implementation of the Ethiopian Education and Training Policy, strategies and guidelines are all fundamentals to allow the country to progress towards becoming a middle income economy by the year 2025 as per the country's vision. Accordingly, with the implementation of the policy under ESDP III the country showed significant progresses in education. Access at all levels of the education system increased at a rapid rate in line with a sharp increase of inputs. Disparities decreased through a more than average improvement of the situation of the disadvantaged and deprived groups and of the emerging regions. The quality challenge particularly in the general education sub-sector including improvement of students achievement through consistent focus on the enhancement of learning and teaching process and the transformation of the school into a motivational learning environment are, however, still remained in order to contribute to the realization of the indicated long term vision(MoE, 2012).

In reality, School supervision has to go with the national education system. Likewise school supervision in Ethiopia need to accompany the direction set by the education and training policy. Here, it must be recognized that education is an integral part of a nation-building exercise. Therefore, the priority action programs in the ESDP IV have included capacity development for improved quality schools management and supervision for better learning achievements at schools.School

supervisory services are supposed to contribute to the creation of a unified and standardized quality school system. This implies that school supervisors are expected to undertake three sets of tasks including control (in a sense of monitoring compliance requirements and providing feedbacks), support, evaluation and liaison at schools to achieve the supposed unified and standardized school system. School supervisors must be able to facilitate both vertical and horizontal communications (work as liaison). They are expected to promote communications vertically informing schools with policies and rules and the ministry with the needs and realities in the schools; and horizontally facilitating interactions, net workings between schools' function. Realization of these all tasks of school supervisors, however, requires National Professional standards framework for the supervisors as an integral part of ensuring quality learning and teaching at all the schools(MoE, 2012).

In Ethiopia, as elsewhere, instructional supervision has evolved from a focus on inspection where a central or mid-level authority ensures that teachers observe school and classroom rules and maintain existing pre-determined standards (Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012). Many teachers will remember being evaluated on their performance on the blackboard rather than their teaching effectiveness(Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012). More often than not, inspection has traditionally functioned less on improving teaching and learning and more on enforcing authority. In Ethiopia, principals are expected to be both leaders and managers:“management skills constitute an integral part of leadership skills....School principals must be able to manage people, time, material and financial resource (Ministry of Education reference manual 2006:128-132). In relation to this, research on education systems in developing nations has shown that given the chronic lack of resources from the central level, the traditional inspection system functions poorly. Supervisors are often inadequately trained to help implement policy, and manage professional development and in-service training; they often have no means of transportation to travel to schools and inspection visits to classrooms are infrequent (Lockheed and Verspoor, 1991; cited in Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012). Moreover, experience has indicated that those closest to the school and classrooms are more effective supervisors. Studies on effective schools indicate that the school principal is in the best position to observe and influence teachers and is the best source of instructional supervision (Lockheed and Verspoor,1991). More recent approaches to instructional supervision focus on on-going professional development to assist teacher in developing new skills to improve learning. In-service education and continuous professional development are now considered a major and high priority function for instructional supervision and the best and most powerful way to improve

learning. Today supervision is generally seen as leadership that encourages the continuous involvement of all school personnel in the cooperative attempt to achieve the most effective school program (Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012). It is a service for teachers that should result in improved instruction, learning and curriculum through a positive, dynamic and democratic interaction, involving all concerned, i.e. the child, the teacher, the supervisor, the administration and parents (Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012). Similarly Melchior (1950) stated that in the broader sense, the study of supervision does not deal merely with a single functionary, the supervisor, but with any of several educational leaders, principals, supervisory principals, heads of departments, special supervisors, directors of instruction and superintendent. In any case, to Melchior, two major functions of professional leadership are commonly accepted – administration and instructional supervision.

According to Davison, Berhanu, and Berhanu (2010), the quality of teaching in the classroom needs further improvement and to allow this to happen, more systematic attention should be given to teacher professional development through strengthening pre-service and in-service training and improving teacher supervision and support. Further they stated that for schools to experience sustained improvement, they need to be supported by the experts, supervisors and principals in the administration.

According to Tyagi (2011) the quality of schooling is a matter of concern to all stakeholders in society: parents, teachers, and government at large. What makes a school good or bad depends upon the judgment that is made about its resources and activities. Inspection and supervision across the world has been considered as the process of assessing the quality and performance of schools by internal and external evaluations (Tyagi, 2011). In recent years, many countries have re-examined their inspection and supervision systems in the face of demands that schools should be made more transparently accountable for the outcomes and standards that they achieve and, therefore, responsible for continuously assessing their performance (Tyagi, 2011).

Since its origin in the early nineteenth century in Britain (as cited in Tyagi, 2011) school supervision has been the main instrument of facilitating and ensuring quality improvement in schools. It started in the form of a systems' tool for monitoring by inspectors of Schools that was based on a top-to-down authority and control model, as well as on rules, regulations, acts, and codes (Tyagi., 2011). The new

system now, however, ensures that schools are inspected by teams which focus upon the parents' opinions about the school (Tyagi, 2011) .

Studies have also shown that the purpose was to control and maintain the education system rather than its improvement and development. Its nature was authoritative, autocratic, and unscientific. In the beginning of the 20th Century, the concept of inspection was modified and came to be known as supervision. In the 1930s, however, the emphasis was shifted from rigid inspection to democratic supervision, and subsequently on human relations and cooperative efforts of supervisors and teachers, to bring about improvement in all school activities (Tyagi, 2011).

According to Asfaw & Woldegerima (2012) instructional supervision is defined as those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning. In practice, this means that the principal encourages educational achievement by making instructional quality the top priority of the school and brings that vision to realization. They also further argue that role of an instructional leader differs from that of traditional school administrator in a number of meaningful ways. Whereas a conventional principal spends the majority of his/her time dealing with strictly administrative duties, a principal who is an instructional leader is charged with redefining his/her role to become the primary learner in a community striving for excellence in education. As such, it becomes the principal's responsibility to work with teachers to define educational objectives and set school-wide or woreda wide goals, provide the necessary resources for learning, and create new learning opportunities for students and staff. The instructional leader provides direction, coordination, and resources for the improvement of curriculum and instruction(Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012).

Inspection described as the critical examination and evaluation of a school as a place of learning (Ojelabi, 1981; cited in Onasanya, 2010).Through inspection, necessary and relevant advice may be given for the improvement of the school. Such advice is usually registered in a report (Ojelabi,1981). On the other hand, supervision is distinct from inspection since it can be described as a constant and continuous process of personal guidance based on frequent visit to a school to give concrete and constructive advice and encouragement to teachers so as to improve the learning and teaching situation in the school. On such visits, attention is paid to one or more aspects of the school and its organization. Therefore, it is normal to refer to both at the same time (Ojelabi, 1981; cited in Onasanya, 2010).

Farley et al., (2010) have shown that teachers and other educational functionaries perceived the terms 'inspection' and 'supervision' differently. Inspection has been referred to the system-based assessment and evaluation of schools, teachers and students. It could be seen as a review and reporting on a school's work by the local authority personnel, inspectors, and advisors who play an important role in reviewing performance, with varying combinations of audit and support. Supervision, however, is more concerned with the assessment of academic aspects of an institution. School supervision since its origin in early nineteenth century, however, has been the main instruments of the quality improvement in schools. Tremendous changes have taken place over the years in its organization, functions, and objectives. Studies have shown that in several countries it is now recognized as a school-based activity and a mechanism for continuous school improvement, which can enhance teaching practices in ways that empower teachers, and facilitates students' learning.

The sudden explosion of pupils population coupled with the attendant increased the complexity of the school organization and the introduction of the new school system of education in many countries and necessitate a greater attention of supervision more than ever before (Onasanya, 2010). This is more so because school supervision occupies a unique place in the entire education system.

If qualitative education is a thing seriously desired in schools so that standard of education in our schools can be highly improved, school supervision must therefore be accorded high priority(Onasanya, 2010:1).Through inspection and supervision, the inspectors and supervisors assist in improving classroom instructions because teachers are made more competent and efficient, parent are satisfied with the performance of their children, children are motivated to work harder in order to achieve the required standard, hence in the long run, the goal of education is achieved (Onasanya, 2010).

Supervision is a way of stimulating, guiding, improving, refreshing and encouraging and overseeing certain group with the hope of seeking their cooperation in order for the supervisors to be successful in their task of supervision (Ogunsaju,1983; cited in Onasanya,2010). Supervision is essentially the practice of monitoring the performance of school staff, noting the merit and demerits and using

amicable techniques to ameliorate the flaws while still improving on the merits thereby increasing the standard of schools and achieving educational goals (Onasanya, 2010).

The term supervision is derived from word “Super video” meaning to oversee(Adepoju,1998;cited in Onasanya,2010:2). It is an interaction between at least two persons for the improvement of an activity. It is also a combination or integration of processes, procedures and conditions that are consciously designed to advance the work effectiveness of individuals and group. Adepoju (1998), in Onasanya(2010) defines school supervision as the process of bringing about improvement in instruction by working with people who are working with pupils. It has also been described as a process of stimulating growth and a means of helping teachers to achieve excellence in teaching. Supervision in school therefore is a vital process and combination of activities which is concerned with the teaching and improvement of the teaching in the school framework (Adepoju, 1998).

The importance of supervision in schools includes improvement of teaching and learning, systematic efforts to help students understand themselves, get in touch with their own feelings and monitor their own behaviour (Adewole and Olaniyi,1992; cited in Onasanya,2010:4).

In its Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP IV:2010:12), the Ministry of Education stated that although the decentralization reforms have been implemented some years ago and important responsibilities have been transferred to the woreda offices, “many offices however do not yet have the required capacity to exercise their responsibilities effectively. School functioning also needs further improvement, in particular concerning school leadership.”In face of the rapid expansion of the educational system, schools are facing a crisis of quality. Improving the quality of school requires strong instructional leadership and supervision.

The Ministry of Education has also placed great emphasis on professional development for school principals, deputy school principals, department heads, as well as officers in charge of education at Federal, Regional, sub-regional and woreda levels. Several pre-service and in-service training programmes are already being run through various universities. The mode of delivery has also diversified to include distance education with short face-to-face contacts. It was thus being fully aware of these challenge that the Ministry of Education, in its Blue Print (MOE, 2007:1),

acknowledged that “educational leadership and supervision are professions by their own with established theories and practices”. “Those who assume these roles should be equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to exhibit proper professional ethics that are necessitated at national, regional, zonal, woreda and school levels”(MoE,2009). According to the MOE (2009), in the past, the principal’s role as a school leader emphasized leadership issues other than improvement of student learning, such as administration, organization and management, allocation of resources. However, the new role of the principal focuses on instructional improvement and increased student learning.

The behaviour of employees in organisational life and their correlation with their jobs are affected by many variables (Cokluk & Yılmaz, 2010; cited in Bas, 2012:5). One of the most important of these variables is instructional leadership of school principals since instructional leadership is considered as the behaviour of influencing teachers. The effects of instructional leadership of school principals on teachers’ organisational trust perceptions and performance can be regarded as one of the most crucial factors which play a critical role in the positive development of teachers’ organisational trust and performance at school(Cokluk & Yılmaz, 2010; cited in Bas, 2012). Thus, school principals should have the necessary power to influence the teacher trust and performance in their school by demonstrating instructional leadership behaviours (Baş & Yıldırım, 2010; Yavuz & Baş, 2010; cited in Bas, 2012). For example, instructional leadership consists of principal behaviours that set high expectations and clear goals for student and teacher performance, monitor and provide feedback regarding the technical core (teaching and learning) of schools, provide and promote professional growth for all staff members, and help create and maintain a school climate of high academic success (Blase & Blasé et al., 1999; cited in Bas, 2012). Effective instructional leadership is generally recognised as the most important characteristic of school principals (Hoy & Hoy, 2009; cited in Bas, 2012). As Barth (1990) cited in Bas(2012) stipulates that the principal is the key to a good school. Thus, the school principal’s role as a leader, administrator and change agent is far reaching. Principals are responsible for working with the entire spectrum of stakeholders: from students to school board members, parents to policymakers, teachers to local business owners, support staff to union officials.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

School based instructional supervision is focusing mainly on teachers' professional growth so as to enhance the instructional practice of the schools and to bring about the desired change of behavior on the parts of their students. In line with this, Paulos (2001) as cited in Million (2010:2) mentioned that school based supervisory practice of supervisors is useful for individual teachers' development, school improvement, and fulfillment of public demands. To materialize this, school based instructional supervision should be well planned, organized and based around the interest and needs of teachers, students and parents.

It is obvious that instructional supervision is helpful for both continuous professional development (CPD) and for the overall improvement of the quality of education. In relation to this Goble and Porter (1977:14); as cited in Million (2010:2) stated that the teachers on job are in need of in service training and support either to remedy deficiencies that they have discovered in their professional skill and to develop their potential competence in some specialized field. Similarly, West & Bollington (1990:55) as cited in Million mentioned that when instructional supervision is properly managed or implemented, it is believed to have favorable consequences in developing professional competence of teachers, enhancing instructional improvement and updating curriculum contents. Thus, due attention should be given to the school based instructional supervisory practices in order to improve the teaching learning process. The responsibility of supervisory function is not exclusively on the domain of principals, supervisors and department heads. In stead, it includes all the staff members who are involved in the process of improving schooling.

According to McNell and Lucio (1979:16) as cited in Million(2010) indicates that supervision today is not the responsibility of an individual or particular position; rather it is the responsibility of workers and is part of human organization. Supervision in modern school system is cooperative endeavor. It needs cooperative effort of the entire staff in the study of educational problem of the school. Accordingly, the school principals, vice principals department heads and senior teachers, should take major responsibility of supervisory practice with in their schools, through regular observation of teachers, and organizing workshops and meetings so as to enhance the professional competence of teachers and improve the quality of education in their school.

The principal as a leader of group of teachers in the school system has the function of interacting with the teachers to improve the learning situation for the students through instructional supervision. Instructional supervision is the process by which school administrators attempt to achieve acceptable standards of performance and results (Nakpodia, 2011). It is the tool of quality control in the school system and a phase of school administration which focuses primarily upon the achievement of appropriate expectation of educational system (Peretomode, 2004; cited in Nakpodia, 2011:15-16); and it is also seen as those activities carried out by principals to improve instruction at all levels of the school system (Dittimiya, 1999; cited in Nakpodia, 2011).

Supervision is a multifaceted process that focuses on instruction to provide teachers with information to improve their teaching performance (Beach & Reinhartz, 1989; as cited in Farley, 2012). The role of the principals is to facilitate the implementation of the various learning programmes aimed at improving the learning situation. Teachers whether new or old on the job need necessary support in implementing the instructional programmes. Principals as school heads, therefore, need to provide this support to teachers, they have to be involved in the implementation of instructional programmes by overseeing what teachers are doing with the students. A good principal should devote himself to supervise the teaching –learning processes in his school.

The principal as the supervisor is the one who oversees the activities of teachers and other workers in the school system to ensure that they conform to the generally accepted principles and practice of education (Nakpodia, 2011). In the school system, the responsibility of coordinating these activities normally falls on the principal. The principal is a professional leader who holds the key position in the programme of instructional improvement through supervision of instruction (Nakpodia, 2011). If the teachers are not well supervised, effectiveness in instruction will be adversely affected and the instructional purposes may not be well realised. But, negligence in the improvement of instruction through improper supervision by the principal can go on indefinitely without being detected. This may lead to low quality of instruction and invariably, teachers' lack of commitment to job (Nakpodia, 2011). As a result, the principal as the supervisor provides professional guidance to teachers in order to improve the conditions which affect learning and growth of the students and teachers (Nakpodia, 2011). In discharging his supervisory role, the principal can help the teachers for better task performance in the following areas: Preparation of lesson plans and lesson notes before going for

lessons; Good use of instructional methods and teaching aids; Keeping and maintaining of school records etc. Supervision of instruction therefore directed towards maintaining and improving the teaching-learning process of the school. It is highly instructionally related, and the instructional supervisor's role is that of supporting, assisting and sharing rather than directing(Nakpodia,2011). Instructional supervision is a service activity that exists to help teachers do their job better. It becomes imperative that principals' supervisory behaviour must be adequately positioned for effectiveness and efficiency to influence teachers in their job tasks. This desired expectation in education could be achieved through effective supervision. In relation to this, Peretomode (2004) as cited in Nakpodia(2011:16) suggested the following as the purpose of instructional supervision in schools: "To directly influence the behaviour of teachers and the teaching processes employed to promote student learning; to ensure that each individual teacher within the school system has been performing the duties of which he was scheduled and to cooperatively develop favourable climate for effective teaching and learning".

The techniques of instructional supervision have been described by Onoyase(2007) in Nakpodia(2011) as modern strategy of supervision which can be employed by supervisors and principals to help teachers improve on the job and also facilitate effective instruction in schools. According to Onoyase(2011), the techniques should include: Classroom visitation, Interschool visitation, Micro- teaching and Workshops. The point has been made earlier that the principal is an instructional supervisor in his institution. The way people see him in the course of discharging his duties and functions has given rise to a variety of names and titles labeled on him. Thus, is seen as the Head teacher, leader, instructional supervisor, adviser, public relation officer, curriculum director, chief education officer, policy maker(for secondary school principal), etc.

The problem that principals and supervisors face in improving school quality is knowing what inputs and actions will lead to the results that they seek. There is little understanding of how to convert additional resources into improved learning experiences for students. That conversion depends largely on the reasons for low performance in the first place. If low performance is due entirely to inadequate inputs (lack of good textbooks; lack of discretionary funding to purchase materials) raising performance would be straightforward. However, low achievement often stems from a more complex constellation of problems; poor teacher performance; lack of effective instructional supervision; low

pupil motivation or self esteem. These issues constitute the core problem of supervision and the Supervisors and principals both lack the skills required to deliver instructional leadership, which is key to school improvement and teacher performance. In particular neither group currently has the capacity to conduct informed classroom observation and provide appropriate, constructive feedback to improve teacher performance. The lack of these skills constrains the ability of either group to formulate robust school plans. Cluster supervisors and school principals bear the brunt of decentralisation and many feel under pressure. Supervision in schools is constrained by the lack of authority given to school principals to hire and fire as well as a lack of professional expertise.

Teachers complain of the lack of a supportive regulatory framework within schools and limited collegiality. Objective performance appraisal of teachers is limited by the limited skills of principals in instructional leadership (including classroom observation) and the lack of agreed performance targets, although the introduction of school planning is beginning to rectify the latter. The challenges of supervision require the development of skill sets for woreda and cluster supervisors, and principals or senior teachers if quality assurance is to play a key role in quality improvement. If professional support is to be given to teachers, a sound understanding of the theory and practice of active learning will be required. Progress has been made in developing pedagogic understanding and skills on the Higher Diploma Programme (HDP) but this feature has not been incorporated into the Leadership and Management Program training for supervisors and principals. Teacher Development Program (TDP) indicators are a good start in formulating the essentials of active learning, but are not sufficiently refined to identify the quality of the learning process. Consideration needs to be given to the appropriateness of organising classrooms according to different modes of teaching (whole class; group or pair work; individual work) for different learning objectives as well as emphasising activity in itself. Means of recognising the quality of different learning activities and talk in the classroom need to be developed and these all need the help of school principal.

The report from supervisors, principals and education officers indicate that the practice of school based instructional supervision in government primary schools of Arbaminch town is inefficient to improve the quality of teachers and the achievement of learners. School-based supervisors are not putting the necessary effort in providing the in-service training to enhance teachers' effectiveness.

Although the frequent classroom visit or observations allow principals to see what is going on in the class rooms, better positioning them to monitor instruction , provide support to teachers and influence the instructional climate of their shools, the school-based instructional supervision in Arbaminch town is different from this. For instance,as the report indicate some supervisors and school principals emphasize the class room visit or observations as the only practice of supervision. In Arbaminch primary schools, the supervisory practices seem to be serving more the purpose of summative evaluation than empowering teachers and improving instruction. Eventhough, there are some local research studies(Million et al., 2010) on the assessment of the status of school based supervision, little is known about the Arbaminch town upper primary school-based supervision. Consequently, the aim of this study is to assess and explore the school-based supervisory practices of upper government primary schools in Arbaminch.

Thus, the present study will provide answers to the following basic research questions:

1. What are the major school-based supervisory practices made to improve the instructional process in government upper primary schools of Arbaminch town?
2. Will there be statistically significant differences between teacher and school-based supervision committee members perceptions of the principal's supervisory behaviors?
3. To what extent the perceived principals' supervisory behaviors differed among teachers who differ in their years of teaching experience and gender.

1.3. Objectives of the study

The general objective of this study is to assess and explore the Principals' role as instructional leaders in Government upper Primary schools of Arbaminch town.

The specific objectives of this study are:

- To identify the major school-based supervisory practices made to improve the instructional process in upper government primary schools of Arbaminch town.
- To examine if there will be statistically significant differences between teacher and school-based supervision committee members perceptions/openions of the principal's supervisory behaviors/roles.
- To investigate the extent that the perceived principals' supervisory behaviors differed among teachers who differ in their years of teaching experience and gender.

1.4. Significance of the study

The findings of the study will serve for different pertinent bodies as an input and source in the following ways:

- It is important to provide information for regional, and zonal educational officials on the current status of school based instructional supervision and help them to contribute(providing training and manuals) their share to improve supervisory practice in primary schools.
- It is also important to give pertinent and timely information to principals, teachers, supervision committee members and educational officers in Gamo Gofa Zone concerning the existing system and practice of school based supervision at upper primary level.
- It is important to show the major contributions of school based instructional supervision for the professional development of primary school teachers .
- It may serve as a starting point for other researchers who are interested to do Similar studies on instructional supervision.

1.5. Delimitation of the study

Taking in to consideration of different factors such as availability of resources(paper and photocopy from the college) and the researchers' familiarity of the research setting and subjects(the researcher has about four years of experience in teaching primary school teachers and principals), the study was delimited to six government upper primary schools in Arbaminch town, Gamo Gofa Zone. In the case of variables, not all supervisory behaviors of principals were included in the study because it would be difficult to examine and collect data on all of them. Thus, the study would be delimited to eight supervisory behaviors of principals; such as communicating goals, supervising instruction, promoting professional development, promoting action research, managing curriculum implementation, providing resources, providing incentive, , assessing and evaluating teachers.

1.6. Operational definition of terms(concepts)

- ❖ **School based supervision** – refers to a supervision that is conducted at upper primary school level by upper primary school principals, or vice principals.
- ❖ **Instructional supervision-** supervisory behaviors, strategies or practices aimed at the improvement of teachers' instruction and performance.
- ❖ **School- based supervisors** - are internal supervisors(principals or vice principals).
- ❖ School-based supervision committee members – department heads, senior teachers, and unit leaders of upper primary schools).
- ❖ **Supervisory behaviors/roles-** the opinions or views of upper primary school teachers, school based supervision committee members, principals and supervisors.

1.7. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

There are a number of areas where additional research is encouraged.

- ❖ First, a replication of this study would prove valuable in assessing the quality of the data and of the instruments used. In addition, the principal behavior rating scale (The Principals' Supervisory Behaviour Scale) was initially developed for this specific study and should be evaluated further through additional studies that attempt to replicate its use.
- ❖ More interviews were needed to get a better idea of school based supervisory behaviors of principals. The researcher conducted interviews with 12 principals, 12 teachers and 2 cluster school supervisors in the qualitative study. These were brief interviews that asked a general question concerning principals' supervisory behaviors. More interviews with central office supervisors may give future researchers a better picture of what supervisory behaviors principals are making. Relying on self-reports from principals may not be the best source for indicating the level of school based supervision by principals.


- ❖ This study was about the direct instructional supervisory behaviors of principals primary school principals. Researching the indirect principals' supervisory roles may help understand what principals do that affect teacher instruction. Indirect influences include the principal's impact on school culture, the principal's handling of distractions such as disgruntled parents and student discipline, the principals ability to deal with the many things that can interrupt instructional time in the day to day operations of schools, and how principals handle the scheduling of teachers.

- ❖ This study also did not find a significant difference on four principals supervisory behaviors by teachers' experience and gender: promoting professional development, providing incentives for teachers, supervising instruction and assessing and evaluating teachers. There fore, more studies were needed to get a better idea on these behaviours.

Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

In this section, an attempt was made to provide analytical and empirical background to the present study. Accordingly, relevant studies were reviewed to establish the link among the study variables, in particular, research results that assessed and explored the principals' instructional supervisory behaviors in primary school.



An Analytical Frame work on Principals' Supervisory Behaviors

2.1. Communicating Goals

School supervisors are responsible for creating and articulating a vision of high standards for learning at schools that can be shared by the school...and they are expected to have the willing to examine their own assumption, beliefs and practices...and commit themselves to high levels of personal performance in order to ensure implementation of the shared vision of learning(MoE, 2012).

According to Martin(1999), it is accepted that the most effective organisations are those which place a great emphasis on clarifying their aims and objectives, as well as engaging in corporate, collaborative and comprehensive planning in order to achieve those aims and objectives.Martin further explained that the school is also an organisation and likewise needs to be effective. In order to be so, it needs to enable all its partners to join in the clarification and statement of its aims and objectives and to agree on strategies to achieve them(Martin, 1999).To assist the school in becoming effective and in promoting school improvement, a strategy is necessary to harmonise the sometimes differing expectations of teachers. Collaborative school planning and the production of a School Plan can provide a framework for the development of such a strategy. Similarly, Baffour(2011) stated that school principals should provide leadership by developing mutually acceptable school goals. Stafford(1994) stated that collective identification of school goals improves productivity and teachers satisfaction. Lunenburg(2010) indicated that without school goals staff would not know precisely how to use their time and energies efficiently and effectively. Subsequently, they would respond to their job responsibilities randomly, wasting valuable human resources. The principal's role can be defined as getting things done by working with all school stakeholders in a professional learning community (Hord & Sommers, 2008; as cited in Lunenburg, 2010). Principals cannot do all of the work in schools alone. They must, therefore, influence the behavior of other people in a certain direction. To influence others, the principal needs to understand something about....communication. Leading means communicating goals to staff members, and influencing them with the desire to perform at a high level (English, 2008; as cited in Lunenburg,2010). Because schools are composed largely of groups, leading involves motivating entire departments or teams as well as individuals toward the attainment of goals.

Principals communicate school goals in many different ways. They often do it through faculty meetings and departmental chair meetings.They communicate them through individual meetings such as follow-up conferences to classroom observations. Teachers perceive their principals to be strong

instructional leaders when they communicate school goals through interacting with them on their classroom performance, being accessible to discuss instructional matters, allowing teachers to try new instructional strategies by letting them know that it is okay to take risks, and clearly communicating a vision for the school (Smith & Andrews, 1989; cited in Lineburg ,2010:10-11). Communicating school goals was found to positively affect the type of instruction teachers delivered (Blasé & Roberts,1994; Sheppard, 1996; cited in Lineburg ,2010). Communication of school goals by the principal has a significant, positive relationship with teacher classroom innovativeness (Sheppard, 1996). Classroom innovativeness is a teacher's willingness to try new and various instructional approaches (Sheppard, 1996). At the school level, Sheppard found that communication of school goals by the principal accounted for the largest amount of variance in classroom innovativeness. He discovered that communicating school goals, framing school goals, and promoting professional development together accounted for the variance in classroom innovativeness. Sheppard reported that framing school goals accounted for the largest amount of variance, but did not report the specific amount of variance. Communicating school goals encourages teachers to use more reflection, which may lead to teachers adjusting their instructional techniques to address the different learning needs of students (Blase & Roberts, 1994). They discovered that of teachers felt communicating school goals encouraged them to use more reflection. Debela(2011) found that principals had low skills in in developing the school plan and objectives. He suggasted that principals should higher the capability in encouraging the staffs towards the achievemnt of expected goals.

2.2. Supervising instruction

Frequent and constructive classroom observation is directly linked to improved teacher performance and improved student learning. Most experts agree that teachers should be observed in the classroom at least 2 to 3 times per year(Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012).

Clinical supervision defines a series of actions to be undertaken by the principal/observer. According to Haileselassie and Abraha (2012), the pre-observation conference between teacher and observer determines the methods, focus, and duration of the observation. Similarly, to Lovell and wiles (1983) as cited in Panigrahi(2012), the pre-observation conference (behavior system) provides an opportunity for the principals and the teacher to establish relationship, mutual trust and respect. The teacher and principals get to know each other as fellow professionals. 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 clearly outweigh information, experience, and capabilities as cited by (Glickman *et al.*, 1998).

According to Panigrahi(2012),the school principals observe the teacher at work during formal lesson.As part of clinical supervision,class room observation creates opportunities for the principal to help her/his test reality, the reality of his/her own perceptions and judgments about teaching. Acheson and Gall (1997), as cited in Panigrahi(2012), agree that the selection of an observation instrument will help sharpen the teacher's thinking about instruction. The conditions under which observations are made are very important to the teacher. Most teachers prefer the supervisor and principal to notify them of the visit so that they can prepare their lessons. Indeed Goldhammer (1980), as cited in Panigrahi(2012), proposes, "If supervisors and principals were 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. Classroom observation is a valuable means to obtain first hand information and experience of the classroom atmosphere.

The classroom observation uses a variety methods that include categorical frequencies (number of student-teacher interaction, number of student to student interactions, types of questioning, etc.); physical indicators such as the disposition of the students in the classroom, the movement of the teacher in the classroom, etc.; performance indicators, visual diagramming, space utilization, descriptive running logs focused observation form(Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012).

The post observation conference between teacher and observer discusses results and remedial action. This type of supervision is referred to as "clinical" because it focuses on observable and verifiable behaviors and actions and is diagnostic. While the principal may not always have a pre-observation conference and/or a post-observation conference with the teacher, it is important to focus on issues the teacher has identified and to provide constructive and timely feedback. Observation should be long enough to include a complete learning sequence or lesson(Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012). Further more, in this stage the major purpose of principal 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 principal. Whether or

not any positive change occurs depends on the quality of feedback that is provided to teachers (Sullivan and Glanz, 2002; as cited in Panigrahi,2012).

Peer supervision and coaching have become an alternative method of improving instruction. Teachers work together to identify teaching and learning issues or learning problems and observe each other in their classrooms. Teacher circles where teacher discuss problems and develop solutions have proved effective in helping teachers performance. Principals can help teachers set goals for these kinds of programs(Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012:41).

Supervision provides direct assistance to teachers as it continuously focuses on improvement of classroom instruction, whereas, formal evaluation periodically measures performance (an acceptable standard of teaching). Some scholars recommend that supervision and evaluation be performed separately by different individuals; however, Glickman (1990) cited in Haileselassie and Abraha(2012:41) believes that both tasks can be performed by the same person if that individual can maintain a relationship of trust and credibility with teachers.

Supervision of teachers' performance by principals can affect classroom instruction. Principals can use classroom observations and informal visits to the classroom to see what teaching strategies are being used and assess their effectiveness.They can then use instructional conferences to talk with teachers about classroom objectives and instructional methods. It includes principals observing teachers in the classroom, conducting instructional conferences, and using professional development for classroom improvement. Instructional conferences with teachers have an effect on teacher classroom instruction (Blase & Blase, 1998;cited in Lineburg,2010:11-14). Blase and Blasé(1998) found that teachers believe good principals use five strategies during instructional conferences: “making suggestions for instructional improvement, giving feedback on classroom observations, modeling good instruction, using inquiry to discover what teachers think, and soliciting advice and opinions from teachers”.These strategies positively affected teachers by increasing their use of reflectively informed instructional behaviors, which referred to teachers taking more risks in the classroom by using different instructional strategies and placing more emphasis on instructional planning (Blase & Blase). According to Blasé et al.(1998) instructional conferences with principals influenced teachers to implement higher-order thinking skills in their lessons for primary school students. In follow-up discussions with teachers in which they both analyzed a lesson, principals

encouraged teachers to use more pedagogy that focused on higher-order thinking skills. Consequently, teachers moved away from more traditional types of pedagogy such as direct instruction. These supervisory behaviors created a climate at the school in which teachers openly discussed and critically thought about instructional issues related to higher-order thinking skills . Visiting classrooms is a supervision strategy that positively affects teachers (Blase & Blase, 1998; Blase & Roberts, 1994;cited in Lineburg, 2010). In this strategy, principals use informal visits to classrooms to learn what teachers are doing, to assess whether sound instruction is being delivered, and to interact with teachers (Blase & Roberts et al., 1994). Blase and Roberts noted that visibility was related to using new teaching strategies, considering different teaching techniques to address the needs of students, and increasing levels of instructional time on task. They believed that visibility had these effects on teachers because of increased interaction, feelings of trust, feelings of respect, and more opportunities for teachers to express themselves. Blase and Blase (1998) added to the findings of Blase and Roberts (1994). They found that visibility in the school by walking around and informally visiting classrooms was related to increased use of reflectively informed behaviors and good teacher behavior. The similarity in findings with almost identical populations supports their validity. Some behaviors of principals were found to have a negative effect on teachers (Blase & Blase, 2004; cited in Lineburg, 2010). These behaviors included discounting teachers' needs, isolating teachers, withholding resources from teachers, spying on teachers, overloading teachers, criticizing teachers, threatening teachers, giving teachers unfair evaluations, and preventing teacher advancement. Blase and Blase found that teachers felt their creativity was limited by these behaviors. Teachers stated that they could not be instructional risk takers and relied on traditional teaching methods because of a lack of support from their principal (Blase and Blasé, 2004).

2.3. Promoting the Continuous professional development

In-service training in the form of workshops, conferences, and symposia, as well as distributing literature about instruction, equip teachers with expertise as a form of professional development (Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Glickman, 2003; cietd in Baffour,2011). It is the responsibility of principals to provide teachers with in-service training sessions, as well as encourage them to attend workshops and conferences to bring them abreast with time in their instructional practices.

The nature of effective on-going continuous professional development for Principals and supervisors can focus school staff on instructional improvement through meaningful in-service activities. The

elements of effective in-service programs are:concrete, continual, relevant, and "hands-on" activities, follow-up assistance, peer observation, school leader participation at in-service, post observation analysis and conferencing focused on skills introduced in workshops,classroom experimentation and modification of implemented skills, release-time provision for teacher leaders, individualized activities, teacher-planned in-service workshops. When planning for in-service, it is helpful to understand that teachers' thinking concerning inservice topics will vary from concrete to abstract levels. Teachers may view in-service activities as providing information for implementation, as a collaborative venture, or as time to refocus or to be informed. Principals, by respecting and considering these varying levels in teacher thinking concerning in-service, enable teachers to become "the agents rather than the objects of staff development" (Glickman, 1990; cited in Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012:41).Other ways the instructional leader can provide professional development are planning all school in-service days, afternoon workshops, focused staff meetings, professional readings.Kalayou(2011) found that the practice of professional learning for school improvement(CPD), encouragement of individual staff effort for their professional development was the responsibility of the principals.

Professional development is an ongoing, planned, continuing education through which certified, qualified teachers, and other education professionals improve skills, knowledge, and attitudes/dispositions related to assisting students achieve the goals of the organization i.e. improved student performance and outcomes(Achilles and Tienken in Hughes, 2005: 206; cited in Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012:41).

Teacher professional development can make a difference in student achievement depending on the type of program and support put in place. Research studies of promising practices in teacher education programs have identified the following characteristics (Craig, Kraft & du Plessis, 1998; in Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012):Teachers need to participate actively in planning, implementing and evaluating the change process:when teachers are actively involved and empowered in the reform of their own schools and classrooms, they are capable of changing their teaching behaviors, the classroom environment and improving the learning of their students. Conversely, when teachers are ignored and when changes suggested are not rooted in the everyday reality of their classrooms even

the best programs will fail. This implies respect for adult learning in the workplace(Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012).

According to Baffour(2011) teachers need on-going professional development and support; i.e. teachers need support in trying out new approaches in the classroom through observation, assessment and incentives. They need to work with other teachers, principals and supervisors to help them solve problems and find solutions. Discussion circles, modeling and coaching are effective follow on to more formal training programmes.This implies continuous administrative support, including provision of time and other resources.Baffour(2011) further stated that professional development is a process in which good teachers develop their skills over time and through experience. Teacher should have frequent opportunities to learn new skills. This implies that the instructional leader develop long-term plans for professional development and programmes adapted to the experience level of the teacher. Baffour further explained that ongoing assessment and feedback is crucial to teacher development. Teachers need to receive positive feedback and be able to communicate their individual and collective concerns about the change process to their principals. It is the task of the instructional leader and principal in planning for professional development to ensure open and collaborative communication with staff, understand and analyze the school situation, and identify clear goals for student learning.

Promoting professional development is the most common principal leadership behavior found by the researcher to have a positive effect on teacher classroom instruction (Blase & Blase, 1998; Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, & Birman, 2002; Johnsen, Haensly, Ryser, & Ford, 2002; Sheppard, 1996; cited in Lineburg, 2010:14-16). Professional development is thought to be a key to improving teacher instruction (Elmore & Burney,1999; cited in Lineburg,2010). Administrators at the district and school levels are responsible for providing teachers with quality professional development (Desimone, Smith, & Ueno, 2006; cited in Lineburg, 2010). Principals accomplish this through alerting teachers to professional development opportunities and organizing in-service activities at their schools that focus on specific instructional goals (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; cited in Lineburg,2010). Principals promote professional development by using supervisors and colleagues to train teachers on instructional strategies, giving teachers time for independent studies, and using external sources such as college courses, district-level workshops, and consultants who are experts in a particular area

(Duke, 1987; cited in Lineburg, 2010). The promotion of professional development by principals increases teachers' use of higher-order instructional strategies when they receive professional development on a particular strategy (Desimone et al., 2002; cited in Lineburg, 2010). Higher-order instructional strategies involved teaching in non-traditional ways and were found to increase the learning capacity of students. Principals were perceived by teachers to improve writing instruction by providing staff development on teaching the writing process (McGhee & Lew, 2007; cited in Lineburg, 2010). A significant relationship was found between principals promoting professional development and teacher willingness to try new and various instructional ideas in the classroom (Shepperd, 1996; cited in Lineburg, 2010). There was no mention by Sheppard of what specific activities that principals engaged in to promote professional development. Sheppard (1996) produced an interesting result. The only area in which promoting professional development was not the most important effect on teachers was on teacher innovativeness at the high school level. This raises a question concerning the effect high school principals have on teacher classroom instruction. It could be that principals at the high school level are not the ones promoting professional development; rather teachers could be influenced by other sources such as supervisors in the central office.

The promotion of professional development by principals increases teachers' use of reflectively informed behaviors, including innovative ideas and instructional risk-taking (Blase & Blase, 1998; cited in Lineburg, 2010). Blase and Blase provided a list of strategies principals used to promote professional development that increased teachers' use of reflectively informed behaviors: emphasizing the study of teaching and learning, supporting collaboration among educators, developing coaching relationships among educators, and applying principles of adult learning to staff development.

Principals supporting and encouraging participation in professional development activities influence teachers to change their classroom practices to meet the needs of gifted students (Johnsen et al., 2002; cited in Lineburg, 2010). These professional development activities included training from a private organization on how to change the curriculum to meet the needs of gifted students. Principals actively encouraged teacher participation in these professional development activities, and this support motivated teachers to continue participating (Johnsen et al., 2002). King (1991); cited in

Lineburg(2010) found that the participation of principals in curriculum work with teachers was a key to the implementation of higher-order thinking skills by these teachers.

2.4. Coordinating the Implementation of Curriculum

Teachers are the most essential forces in a given school system in helping students grow and become self- actualizing persons . In otherwords, teachers are in the front-line of implementing the curriculum(Sears & Marshall,1990; as cited in MoE,1998). Hence, there has to be what is called a “consensus” on the part of teachers to implement the curriculum. In the absence of it, teachers may refuse to cooperate and undermine the implementation(MoE,1998). In other words, any curriculum innovation has to involve the teachers from the beginning so as to minimize the likely burdens of incompetence which would lead to rejection or inadequate implementation. Moreover, teachers are expected to have various curricular skills(instructional planning and implementation, use of instructional media etc.) and above all, skills for diagnosing their students’ readiness to learn (MoE,1998). Such professional orientations will also build the confidence and performance of teachers to play active roles in school system (MoE,1998). Berhan(2009) found that curriculum materials(syllabus,textbooks, and teachers guides) are not evaluated by teachers for appropriateness to the needs of and developments stages of students as well as inclusiveness. According to Berhan(2009), the curriculum materials were not evaluated by teachers to ensure that they are relevant to the objective reality(context) of the areas.

The quality of student learning is directly related to the quality of classroom instruction. Therefore, one of the most important aspects of instructional leadership is to provide the necessary climate to promote ongoing instructional improvement. Instructional leader is responsible to identify the training needs of the teachers and organize in-service programs in the form of work shop, seminars, conference, faculty meeting, intra school and inter school visits and other services are useful to be utilized, so as to realize effective staff professional development(MOE,1994).

Effective instructional supervisors help teachers track what they are teaching and what their students are learning. Although teachers may work together for year, they usually have sketchy knowledge about what goes on in each other’s classrooms. Teachers often complain that their students do not

have the prerequisite knowledge and skills to learn what they are supposed to teach. Curriculum mapping is one way the principal or supervisor can help teachers improve the ways they implement the curriculum (Jacobs, 1997; cited in Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012:42).

In mapping the curriculum, first, individual teachers collect and note the content and skills taught and their methods of assessment. Next, the whole teaching staff shares and analyzes the results, looking for areas of congruence, redundancies, gaps, and in need of improvement. The staff then identifies what can be improved immediately and proceeds with implementation. Then the staff determines those points that will require long-term research and development.

According to Dereje(1998) Curriculum implementation has become the major function of instructional supervision. Pertains to designing or redesigning that which is to be taught, by whom, when, where and in what pattern developing curriculum guides, establishing standards, planning instructional units and instituting new courses are examples of this task area(Harris ,1985:10;2005; Million, 2010:16-17). There fore, improving every phases of educational program like curriculum revision and implementation is the major function of supervisor and principals. Another task of instructional supervisor and principals with regard to curriculum implementation is to provide support and service directly to teachers to help them improve their performance. Such a support enables teachers and supervisors to examine plans for instruction and analyze instruction with reference to what was planned, what happened and what results were achieved. Similarly McNeil (1979) and Dull (1981) as cited in Million(2010) suggested the major responsibilities of supervisors and principals in curriculum implementation process: assist individual teachers in-determining more appropriate instructional objectives; aid in goal definitions and selections at local state and federal levels; plan and implement a well established in service training program; and produce evidence as to the soundness of the innovation in relation to the aims of the school. In general, instructional supervisors are resource personnel who provide support to help directly to the teacher to correct or improve some existing deficiencies in the education system in general and in specific curriculum in particular(Million,2010).

2.5. Promoting Action Research

One way instructional principals can help teachers make better instructional decisions is to encourage them to study what is occurring in their classroom. Action research is a study the teacher carries out to examine their teaching processes and the results of these processes with the primary focus of improving their instruction. Action research or participatory research is a reflective process of progressive problem solving to improve the way issues are addressed and problems are solved. For example, a teacher may have identified a persistent problem with sentence structure. The teacher or, preferably, a group of teachers, design a research project to collect data (student writing, for example), evaluate, analyze, assess and interpret the data and try out new approaches(Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012). Action research provides teachers and administrators with an opportunity to better understand what happens in their school. This process establishes a decision-making cycle that guides instructional planning for the school and individual classrooms. Creating the need for research and establishing an environment for conducting classroom action research is the responsibility of a school administrator(Hewitt and Little,2005).Berhan(2009) found that there are no up -to- date action research based procedures established for the support of teachers practice, through critical reflection and understanding of effective methods. Meles(2010) in his study found that currently lack of adequate research fund, unsuccessful inservice research training in particular are morethan insufficient.

Action research is a model of professional development that promotes collaborative inquiry, reflection, and dialogue. “Within the action research process, educators study student learning related to their own teaching. It is a process that allows educators to learn about their own instructional practices and to continue to monitor improved student learning” (Rawlinson & Little, 2004; as cited in Hewitt and Little,2005). “The idea of action research is that educational problems and issues are best identified and investigated where the action is: at the classroom and school level. By integrating research into these settings and engaging those who work at this level in research activities, findings can be applied immediately and problems solved more quickly” (Guskey, 2000; cited in Hewitt and Little,2005). Therefore action research is a continuous and reflective process where educators make instructional decisions in their classrooms based on student needs reflected by classroom data.

Action research is also closely related to teacher empowerment and has become an important component of what is considered good teacher development. Action or participatory research refers to teachers individually or in groups gathering and analyzing information in order to solve problem at the school level. In addition to mobilizing teachers to study and reflect on their practice, action research advances the professionalization of teachers by helping them develop and validate their knowledge (Hopkins, 2002; Kemmis, 1994; cited in Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012:42). Action research often begins, in a teacher's practice, as school-based studies that are part of a preservice teacher education program and continue as part of school-based teacher professional development programs.

Singh(2006); Cohen, Manion & Morrison(2005) found that action research projects are conducted to improve the working conditions of school environment, to develop the scientific attitude among teachers and principals for studying their problems,to develop the scientific attitude among students and teachers for understanding and solving their problems,to bring excellence in school teachers, to bring changes in teachers' professional skills and roles,to seek to improve the quality of teacher actions,to increase the awareness of teachers in the classroom issues, and to broaden the views of teachers on teaching. There fore, according to Singh(2006),action research projects may be designed by teachers in improving and modifying the classroom teaching strategies, tactics and teaching aids; developing interests; attitudes and values of the students towards their studies; dealing the classroom problems and school problem relating to discipline and code of conduct; assigning the home work so that students should take interest in completing them; improving the spelling errors and wrong pronunciation; dealing with the problems of poor attendance in class as well as In school and coming late in school; developing the habit of completing class notes and active participation; removing the practice of copying in the examination.

2.6. Providing Incentives

Organizations use incentives such as praise, good working conditions, material rewards, pride in work completed, emotional attachment to the organization, and positive working relationships with colleagues to motivate employees (Barnard,1938; cited in Lineburg, 2010). Providing incentives for teachers is a strategy principals can use to motivate teachers to improve their instructional practices. Principals provide incentives by giving formal awards and using public or individual praise for

teachers (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; cited in Lineburg, 2010:17). Praising teachers in front of their peers can be effective because it encourages improvement by all teachers. Most teachers do not receive sufficient monetary compensation for what they do in the classroom (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Recognizing teachers for their classroom performance provides an incentive for improvement and continued growth. Providing incentives for teachers influences teacher innovativeness in the classroom (Blase & Roberts, 1994; Sheppard, 1996; cited in Lineburg, 2010:17). Sheppard found that providing incentives was one of variables that accounted for the variance in teachers' innovativeness at the elementary level. Providing incentives did not account for variance in teacher innovativeness at the high school level. Sheppard concluded that elementary principals had more of an impact on teacher instruction than their high school counterparts. Gashaw(2008) found that lack of incentives is one of the factors that affect teachers to get together and accomplish tasks cooperatively.

Principals motivate teachers to try instructional strategies through rewards such as praise and material rewards (Blase & Roberts, 1994; cited in Lineburg, 2010:18). Rewards were found by Blase and Roberts to positively affect teachers by increasing their use of innovative ideas within the classroom. Blasé and Roberts(1994) also noted that the use of rewards increased levels of time on task.

2.7. Providing Resources

Instructional leaders in the school should support teachers with learning resources and learning materials developed under the School program, manuals, school learning resources, published and commercially available support materials for school learning, references and texts, School Learning support materials such as: text books, teachers' guides, case studies, professional development materials, assessment materials videos, and audio tapes(MoE, 2012).

Principals influence classroom instruction by supplying teachers with necessary resources. Providing resources includes more than just monetary resources and materials(Lineburg, 2010). According to Duke (1987); cited in Lineburg(2010:16-17) providing resources includes scheduling, developing the school calendar, hiring and correctly placing teachers, adopting textbooks, purchasing necessary materials to support instruction. Principals influence student achievement through helping teachers acquire necessary resources to support instruction (Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990). The lack of resources may be a barrier to the use of some instructional strategies by teachers. The lack of science

equipment and reference materials was found by many researchers to dictate how teachers taught their students. Schools did not have the necessary resources to support certain instructional strategies and activities. Teshome(2008) found that lack of instructional materials has been found as a major problem for the existing educational system.

It is widely believed that teaching-learning resources can improve instruction. An empirical research study has shown that some instructional leaders ensured that teachers were provided with, and assisted to select appropriate teaching materials and resources to improve instruction (Rous, 2004; cited in Baffour,2011). Rous (2004) indicated that although some school leaders in her study in the US public schools provided teachers with resources, materials, and funds to support classroom activities, others reported instances where instructional leaders failed to provide resources needed by teachers to implement quality instruction. This situation of insufficient learning resources may be due to economic reasons and not peculiar to Botswana alone but common in public schools in other developing countries as well.

Providing resources is viewed by teachers as effective leadership by principals and teachers perceived that principals improved their writing instruction by providing resources such as technology (McGhee & Lew, 2007). It was discovered that majority of strong instructional leaders were given positive ratings as resource providers when they were seen as promoting staff development activities for teachers, possessing knowledge of instructional resources, mobilizing resources and district support to achieve academic goals, and the most important instructional resource in the school. Teachers perceived the most important strategies principals engaged in as resource providers were promoting professional development and providing teachers with support through instructional resources (Smith & Andrews, 1989; cited in Lineburg, 2010).

2.8. Assessing and Evaluating Teachers' Performance

Assessment methods may include analysing portfolios and evidence compiled, questioning (for example, computer, oral and written questions),real work, real time activities (for example, direct observation and third party reports), reviewing evidence regarding recognition of current competence / knowledge, skills and attitudes recognition,instruments for recording summative assessment outcomes against the requirements of a unit of competence, procedures, information and instructions

for the assessor or candidate on use of assessment instruments and assessment conditions, tools for use in assessments such as: evidence or observation checklists, template, profile of acceptable performance measures, specific questions or activities, checklists for the evaluation of work samples, candidate self-assessment materials(MoE, 2012) .

Principals have high hopes for the processes and results of teacher evaluation and high expectation for themselves as teacher evaluators. Evaluation provides visible principal leadership in the school. Teacher goal setting and planning for improvement are ways to advance principal, school, and district agendas. Effective teacher evaluation recognizes student achievement, acknowledges good practice, supports teacher goals, shapes performance, motivates to improve on weaknesses, and removes the rare bad teacher from the profession (Peterson,2005).

According to Stronge(2003) evaluation is the process of comparing an individual teacher's documented job performance with the previously established roles and responsibilities and acceptable performance standards. Stronge(2003) argue that while this step clearly entails an end-of-cycle summative evaluation, evaluating performance also must include periodic feedback through formative assessment. As Stronge(2003) stated, by providing feedback throughout the evaluation cycle, the teacher is supported in his/her ongoing efforts to fulfill performance expectations and is able to identify areas of performance that need attention while there is still time to improve. Additionally, an opportunity for adequate notice is provided through periodic formative feedback, leading to a fair summative evaluation in which there should be no surprises.

Summative evaluation provides an opportunity to determine individual merit based on performance. Further, the evaluation affords the basis for judging worth, first, by viewing evaluation performance in light of the school's goals and, second, by maintaining compatibility between individual performance and school goals. In an ongoing, systematic evaluation process, identifying system needs and relating those needs to performance ensures that the evaluation is concerned with both the merit (internal value) and worth (external value) of performance (Casterter, 1996; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Frels & Horton, 1994; Medley, Coker, & Soar, 1984; Scriven, 1973, 1995; Valentine, 1992; as cited in Stronge, 2003).

Teacher evaluation is, first, about documenting the quality of teacher performance; then, its focus shifts to helping teachers improve their performance as well as holding them accountability for their work. "In recent years, as the field of education has moved toward a stronger focus on accountability and on careful analysis of variables affecting educational outcomes, the teacher has proven time and

again to be the most influential school-related force in student achievement” (Stronge, 2003). Thus, a conceptually sound, well designed, and properly implemented evaluation system for teachers is an important – indeed, essential - component of an effective school. Despite the fact that proper assessment and evaluation of teachers is fundamental to successful schools and schooling, this key element in school reform is too frequently neglected - due not to the absence of teacher evaluation, but rather to the implementation of poor evaluation systems and poor evaluation practices. Similarly, Peterson(2005) pointed out that everyone expects the principal to take the lead in teacher evaluation, but in practice few educators take the actual procedures seriously. Everybody has ideas about what a good teacher should be like, but not enough time is made available for anyone to evaluate how teachers, educational theories, or “reforms” actually work. Many teachers are doing a wonderful job, but tools to document, assess, and acknowledge their performance too often are inadequate. The basic needs in a quality teacher evaluation system are for a fair and effective evaluation based on performance and designed to encourage improvement in both the teacher being evaluated and the school. An important feature of an effective teacher evaluation system is the use of multiple data sources for documenting performance. The most common method for evaluating teachers is a clinical supervision model consisting of a pre-conference, observation, and post-conference. In fact, as noted in a study conducted by the Educational Research Service (1988), 99.8% of American public school administrators use direct classroom observation as the primary data collection technique. A study conducted in 1996 reached similar conclusions regarding the use of direct classroom observations, with 94.1% of school districts reporting using this technique as a primary method of data collection (Loup, Garland, Ellett, & Rugutt, 1996; as cited in Stronge, 2003). However, primary reliance on formal observations in evaluation presents significant problems (e.g., artificiality, small sample of performance). The creative use of multiple data sources to provide an accurate measure of teacher performance invokes a fuller view of performance than would be available through a more narrowly defined approach to data collection (Peterson, 2000; Stronge & Tucker, 2003). While formal classroom observation can be a significant data source, it is too limiting as a single source of data for teacher evaluation.

Thus, teacher performance can be judged best by means more comprehensive and inclusive than merely direct observation. According to Stronge(2003) the major sources for teacher evaluation include:

Observation (observation of teachers, e.g., formal classroom/work setting observation, ongoing anecdotal observation of performance, *and* observation of student work); Client feedback (i.e., client interviews or surveys for students, parents, subordinates, and peers); Student performance data (i.e., student achievement); Portfolios (e.g., actual materials and reflections on performance logs, case notes, lesson plans); and Self evaluation (i.e., self reflection and analysis of performance).

Integrating multiple data sources in a teacher assessment and evaluation system offers a much more realistic picture of actual job performance and provides a stronger platform upon which to build realistic improvement plans than would be possible with merely a single source of information such as classroom observation. As multiple data sources are properly employed in performance evaluation, the validity and utility of the process can be dramatically enhanced.

According to Peterson(2005) multiple data sources improve teacher evaluation because teaching is so complex that no one source sufficiently captures all the role or performance. Also, no single data source is valid or feasible for each and every teacher in a school. Rather, multiple and variable data sources are needed to accurately and fairly evaluate all teachers, taking into account their setting,

style, actual performance (not mere compliance with an overgeneralized model), and documented results. Gathering additional objective data has benefits beyond better data for decision making. They can take pressure off administrators as the single data source. Principal reports of teacher performance can be surprisingly uninformative and even inaccurate because of the role conflict between principal as individual teacher judge and principal as instructional team leader (Barr & Burton, 1926; Lortie, 1975; Medley & Coker, 1987; Peterson, 2000; Popham, 1988; Scriven, 1981; Stodolsky, 1984; as cited in Peterson,2005).The additional data sources can assist principals in supervising teacher evaluations that accurately show outstanding performances, highlight effective practices, and acknowledge excellent results. Finally, there are sociological reasons for using multiple data sources in teacher evaluation.

Chapter Three

Methodology and Design of the Study

Overview

In this chapter, the first section describes the research design, while the second describes the participant sampling and selection procedures. In the third part, the data collection instruments and administration procedures were detailed. The fourth section describes the methods of data analysis used in the study.

3.1. Design of the study

In this study the researcher used a mixed methods survey design, with both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis.

The researcher used a survey design in this study because it sought the views of respondents about how they experience/perceive principals' instructional supervision practices/roles in their schools. Survey (descriptive) research mostly uses questionnaires (Creswell, 2003), but may use both questionnaires and interviews to gather information from groups of respondents about their opinions of some issue. The researcher used a concurrent mixed methods design in the current study. In a concurrent approach, two or more data collection instruments were administered within the same time frame. The researcher collected both forms of data (questionnaire and interview) at the same time during the study, and then integrated these data into the interpretation of the overall results (Creswell, 2003). The researcher also used a concurrent approach because the data gathering was in Gamo Gofa Zone, Arbaminch town and financial constraints only allowed for one trip. The researcher could not have administered one of the instruments and used the results to construct and administer the other instrument later on (sequential approach) within that short period.

The purpose of using a mixed method design was also to use both the responses obtained from the questionnaire and those from the interviews to provide a comprehensive analysis of the research questions asked. A secondary reason was the possibility of using the results from one instrument to confirm or corroborate findings from the other (Creswell, 2003). The researcher administered both instruments at one point in time (cross-sectional).

3.2. Population, Sample selection and Sampling Technique

The population of the study included school teachers, school based supervision committee members (department heads, unit leaders), principals and vice principals of government upper primary schools of Arbaminch town of Gamo Gofa Zone and cluster school supervisors of the town. In order to identify the target population, the existing population was further refined in terms of their respective groups. Then after, appropriate number of representatives were selected by using the random and purposive sampling techniques. The research may also need to stratify the subjects within this sample if useful data, i.e. those which are focused and which demonstrate discriminability, are to be acquired (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2005).

Table 1: Total population and Sample Size

Groups	Types of respondents	Total population	Sample size	%	Sampling technique
1	Teachers	210	120	60.61	Random and Proportional
2	Principals and vice principals	12	12	100	Purposive
3	SBSCMs	80	70	87.5	Random
4	Cluster school supervisors	2	2	100	purposive

As can be seen from table 1, researcher used a simple random sampling technique to select the target participants (teachers and SBSCMs) to respond to the questionnaire. Out of the 120 and 80 eligible teachers and SBSCMs in the selected government primary schools in the town, 100 teachers and 60 SBSCMs returned their questionnaires. Therefore, the response rate for this study was 83% for teachers and 75% for SBSCMs.

The researcher also employed a combination of purposive and proportional sampling techniques to invite 12 teachers, 12 principals/vice principals, and two cluster school supervisors in interviews. The power of purposive sampling is to select information-rich participants (Patton, 1990). The researcher also used a purposive sampling technique to invite cluster school supervisors and principals in the selected schools for the interview because of their unique positions (characteristics) and expertise in the topic under investigation.

The researcher used proportional sampling to invite two teachers from each of the six schools in the town. The primary purpose of this sampling process is to ensure that each stratum (circuit)

was represented by an adequate sample size as part of the total population (Rea, & Parker, 2005). The reason for using this procedure was also to ensure that all selected schools were represented in the study. In all, the researcher conducted 26 one-on-one interviews, comprising of 12 teachers, 12 principals, and two cluster school supervisors.

3.3. Data collection Instruments and Procedure

The researcher used a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview protocol to collect data for the study.

Questionnaire

The researcher selected practices, strategies or behaviours of effective instructional leadership (Blasé & Blasé et al, 1999) derived from the literature to construct the items in the questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into two parts: items related to the background information (demographics) of participants, and 55 Likert scale items on supervisory behaviors. The demographic items included sex, age, educational qualification, years of teaching experience, and the present position of the participants. The second section (Likert-scale) consisted of supervisory behaviors of instruction. Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree) with each of the supervisory practices.

The questionnaires were pilot-tested in one government primary school in the town (Arbaminch) before the researcher carried out the main study. In all, 10 teachers and seven SBSCMs consented to take part in the pilot test of the questionnaire. Those who took part in the pilot test had characteristics similar to the study participants as recommended by Ary et al. (2006). Pilot-testing the instruments allowed the suitability of the items to be determined. The process revealed that some items in the questionnaire needed further explanation. Before the main study, the researcher, therefore, read, further explained and reconstructed these items (grammar change was made on items 1.4., 2.3, 4.6. & 6.5.). This was found to be helpful in the main study. The face and content validity were used to establish the validity of the questionnaire. Content validity refers to the degree to which the individual questions that make up the subscales are appropriate measures of instructional leadership. Creswell (2003) suggest that items should achieve 80% agreement for inclusion on the instrument. Experts familiar with the instructional management functions of principals were asked to categorize items under one of eight functions. These 8 functions became the subscales for the instrument. Agreement scores are indicated in Table 1.

Table 1: Content Validity Agreement Scales

Sub-scale	No. of items	Average Agreement
Communicating Goals	7	96%
Promoting Professional Development	7	80%
Providing Resources	7	94%
Providing incentives for teachers	7	80%
Supervising instruction	7	80%
promoting action reserch	7	85%
Coordinating the implementation of Curriculum	7	80%
Evaluating Teachers	6	80%

The reliability of the instrument(questionnire) was ascertained by using the split half reliability method on respondents in one of upper Primary school in the study setting. For the split half method, the data collected were divided into the halves using the odd number items and the even numbers for the others, and as a result, a correlation formula (the Spearman Brown Prophecy formula) was applied to the coefficient. Reliability refers to the degree to which the rating scales measure the targeted behavior consistently. An internal consistency measure, or analysis of inter-rater reliability, was utilized. Creswell(2003) stated that a minimum standard of 80% should be set. Reliability estimates are indicated in Table 3.

Table 3: Reliability Estimates

Framework of analysis	Reliability
Communicating Goals	.89
Promoting Professional Development	.89
Providing Resources	.90
Providing incentives for teachers	.90
Supervising instruction	.90
promoting action reserch	.84
Coordinating the implementation of Curriculum	.87
Evaluating Teachers	.90
Overall reliability coefficient	.89

After appropriate training on the purpose, construct, and instruments of the study to the data collectors, the researcher with his colleagues personally administered the questionnaires on the respondents in their respective schools. The researcher used self-administered questionnaires to

collect data from the supervision committee members and teachers in government upper primary schools in Gamo Gofa Zone, Arbaminch. Questionnaires were appropriate for this study because they can reach a large number of people relatively quickly and with minimal expenditure (Ary, et al., 2006). Additionally, numerous variables could be measured by a single instrument, and statistical manipulation during data analysis can permit multiple uses of quantitative methods.

Interview

The interview permitted greater depth of response which was not possible through any other means. Thus, the purpose of the interview was to collect more supplementary opinion, so as to stabilize the questionnaire response.

The researcher used semi-structured interviews to complement the questionnaires. The researcher chose interviews because they have the potential to provide insight into how respondents experienced and thought about principals' supervisory practices or roles, since they would provide the opportunity to probe further for explanations of responses provided by participants. Furthermore, interviews were intended to provide additional information that would be difficult to capture using a questionnaire. Interviews were also appropriate because they allowed exploration of variables under investigation in greater detail, and so complement the survey (Creswell, 2003). The researcher used a semi-structured interview guide (Patton, 1990) to examine the perceptions of 12 principals, 12 teachers and two supervisors about supervision of instruction by principals in schools. Semi-structured interviews consisted of eight questions carefully worded and arranged with the intention of taking each respondent through the same sequence of issues by asking them the same questions using essentially the same words to minimise variation in the questions being posed (Patton, 1990). This type of interview protocol was used because the researcher had specific questions in mind and wanted to take respondents through the questions in a fixed order in order to avoid variations from the main focus (Ary et al., 2006). The researcher chose this type of interview protocol because it was highly focussed and efficient. Even though an open-ended semi-structured interview allowed less flexibility than an unstructured interview, it can reduce interviewer effect and facilitate data analysis (Patton, 1990). Questions used in this approach were the same and guided to minimize variations so the responses usually fall into their respective categories/themes, and thus facilitated fast of data analysis. Similar to the questionnaire, the interview instrument was also pilot-tested in one government primary school in the

town(Arbaminch) before the researcher carried out the main study. In all, two teachers and two principals took part in testing the interview protocol. Those who took part in the pilot test had characteristics similar to the study participants as recommended by Ary et al. (2006). Pilot-testing the instruments allowed the suitability of the items to be determined. The process revealed that probing techniques needed to ensure that the interviewees understood the questions during the main study, which ensured that no item was ambiguous. During the main study, the researcher, therefore, read, further explained and used probing techniques. This was also found to be helpful in the main study.

3.4. Techniques of data analysis

The selection of the appropriate statistics is largely determined by the nature of the research questions being asked and the types of variables being analysed(Cohen , Manion & Morrison, 2005). Therefore, the quantitative data from the questionnaire to teachers and school-based supervision committee members was analysed by using descriptive statistical analysis such as mean average, standard deviations, and percentages and inferential statistical analysis such as independent samples test, and unrelated two way multiple analysis of variance for testing difference between means of study variables or groups.The reason behind the selection of unrelated MANOVA was that there would be more than two sets of mean scores come from two different samples(teachers and school-based supervision committee members).

The qualitative data from the interview was analyzed with the constant comparative method(Cohen , Manion & Morrison, 2005). The constant comparative method is an inductive approach to data analysis in qualitative research. Specifically, the transcripts would be read and re-read to identify the categories and units of meaning. The units of meaning would be based on the words of participants. Then, the units of meaning were placed under appropriate categories.

Chapter Four

Findings and Discussions

4.1. Teachers, School Based Supervision Committee Members and Principals’ Opinions on the Selected Principals’ Supervisory Behaviors

This chapter deals with analysis and discussions of the data gathered from the respondents through questionnaires, and interviews. Thus, the quantitative as well as qualitative analysis of data was incorporated in to this chapter. The qualitative part was supposed to be complementary to the quantitative analysis. Hence, the qualitative data includes the data gathered through interviews. The data was collected from a total of 186 respondents. To this effect, a total of 200 copies of questionnaires were distributed to 120 teachers and 80 school based supervision committee members. The return rates of the questionnaires were 80% from teachers, 75% from school based supervision committee members. Moreover, 12 primary school principals, 12 teachers and 2 cluster school supervisors were interviewed. This chapter consists of two major parts. The first section deals with the characteristics of the respondents, and the second section presents the analysis and interpretation of the main data.

As indicated in table 4, a total of 100 teachers and 60 SBSCMs responded to the questionnaire. The data presented in table 4 indicates the frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents according to variables such as gender and teaching experience. The data showed that the majority of the teachers (60%) and the SBSCMs (81.67%) were males. A large majority – i.e. 90% of the SBSCMs and 67 % of the teachers have more than 11 years of teaching experience.

Table 4: Respondents Demographic Profile

Variable	Teachers(N=100)		SBSCMs(N=60)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Gender				
Male	60	60	49	81.67
Female	40	40	11	18.33
Teaching Experience				
0-5	17	17	-	-
6-10	16	16	6	10
11-15	27	27	19	31.67
>15	40	40	35	58.33

Table 5. The Group Statistics Table of Teachers & SBSCMs Preceptions on the Selected Supervisory Behaviors

Groups		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PPD	Teachers	100	3.1457	1.11750	.11175
	SBSCM	60	3.9500	1.02606	.13246
PR	Teachers	100	3.0814	.74390	.07439
	SBSCM	60	4.0571	.87480	.11294
CG	Teachers	100	3.7314	.79196	.07920
	SBSCM	60	4.1619	.61654	.07960
PIFT	Teachers	100	3.0871	.92334	.09233
	SBSCM	60	3.7333	.92972	.12003
SI	Teachers	100	3.0843	.66978	.06698
	SBSCM	60	3.3738	.76462	.09871
PAR	Teachers	100	3.2971	.94645	.09464
	SBSCM	60	3.9381	.87407	.11284
CIOC	Teachers	100	3.4614	.88736	.08874
	SBSCM	60	3.9238	.67544	.08720
AAET	Teachers	100	3.1917	.59806	.05981
	SBSCM	60	3.8139	.79611	.10278

This section sought to find out if teachers and SBSCBs differed in their perspectives on the selected instructional supervisions. Moreover, the researcher was interested in comparing and triangulating the data from interviews of teachers, principals and supervisors.

Promoting Professional Development

As idicated in tabl 5, teachers felt that the principals role in promoting professional development opportunities was less adequate($m=3.15$) compared to the school based supervision committee members' opinions($m=3.95$). An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the perceived behavior differed significantly as a function of whether the staff development opportunities were significantly in a low or high status. The test was significant, $t(158) = 4.54, p < .000$. An examination of the group means,therefore, indicated that teachers' mean score on the staff development opportunities was ($M = 3.15, SD = 1.12$) significantly less than the school based supervision committee members' mean score($M = 3.95, SD = 1.03$).

In the interview sessions, six principals stated that promoting professional development influenced teachers to improve their instructional practices. They did this by sending teachers to workshops, organizing in-house staff development opportunities, and bringing in guest speakers to address instructional strategies. One principal stated:

Despite its small size, we played a significant role in providing professional development opportunities to our teachers. While our assistance was optional for teachers, most teachers took advantage of at least some professional development offerings. The central office, ATTC and NGO conducted workshops and used the TOT, asking schools to send a few teachers to district-level training with the understanding that once trained, these teachers would conduct workshops at their home school sites. Therefore, we are paying a lot of attention to this. We are sponsoring a lot of professional development opportunities and allowing our teachers to go to workshops to learn about different ways of teaching strategies in that to improve their class room instruction. (P1)

While two teachers and three principals stated that for most of the teachers it appeared that it was difficult to fully implement the train-the trainer model in their schools. One principal stated:

We provided optional summer and after school workshops for our school teachers. However, during our evaluation of the teachers who participated in the training through class room observation and feed back from school based trainees they have difficulty in making practical what they have got from the training.(P2).

All teachers mentioned that professional development as an influence on their instructional practices. However, only one teacher cited the principal as the person who provided them professional development opportunities. The teacher stated:

I am mathematics teacher and my principal provided me an opportunity to participate in conferences invited by the ATTC in Konso town. By participating in the workshops, I learned a lot of pedagogical strategies that helped me to teach mathematical theories and principles.(T13)

Table 6. Independent Samples Test for Significant difference between teachers' & SBSCMs Perceptions on the Selected Supervisory Behaviors

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower bound	Upper bound
PPD	Equal variances assumed	1.475	.226	-4.542	158	.000	-.80429	.17706	-1.15399	-.45458
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.641	132.783	.000	-.80429	.17331	-1.14708	-.46149
PR	Equal variances assumed	8.258	.005	-7.513	158	.000	-.97571	.12987	-1.23223	-.71920
	Equal variances not assumed			-7.215	109.068	.000	-.97571	.13523	-1.24374	-.70769
CG	Equal variances assumed	.821	.366	-3.604	158	.000	-.43048	.11944	-.66637	-.19458
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.834	147.494	.000	-.43048	.11228	-.65237	-.20859
PIFT	Equal variances assumed	.000	.989	-4.275	158	.000	-.64619	.15117	-.94477	-.34761
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.267	123.681	.000	-.64619	.15143	-.94593	-.34645
SI	Equal variances assumed	.743	.390	-2.509	158	.013	-.28952	.11540	-.51745	-.06160
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.427	111.720	.017	-.28952	.11929	-.52589	-.05316
PAR	Equal variances assumed	.193	.661	-4.266	158	.000	-.64095	.15025	-.93771	-.34420
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.352	132.214	.000	-.64095	.14728	-.93228	-.34962
CIOC	Equal variances assumed	5.412	.021	-3.476	158	.001	-.46238	.13304	-.72515	-.19961
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.717	149.147	.000	-.46238	.12441	-.70821	-.21655
AAET	Equal variances assumed	15.738	.000	-5.613	158	.000	-.62222	.11085	-.84116	-.40328
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.233	98.958	.000	-.62222	.11891	-.85817	-.38627

The table value $t = 1.96$ at 0.05 significant levels with 158 degrees of freedom to equal variances

As can be seen from table 6, the school based supervision committee members' mean score significantly exceeds the teachers mean score in all cases of the supervisory roles of school principals. This indicated that teachers and school based supervision committee members perceived the roles of school principals differently.

Providing Resources

Table 5 indicated teachers also felt that the principals' role in providing instructional resources was less adequate ($m=3.08$) compared to the school based supervision committee members' opinions ($m=4.06$). Further more, using an alpha level of .05, an independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the perceived behavior differed significantly as a function of whether the provision of resources by the school principals was significantly in a low or high status. The test was significant, $t(109.07) = 7.22, p < .000$ (see table 5). An examination of the group means, therefore, indicated that teachers' mean score on the resource provision by the principal was ($M = 3.08, SD = 0.74$) significantly less than the school based supervision committee members' mean score ($M = 4.06, SD = 0.87$).

Interview sessions with participants indicated that principals were found to provide teachers with instructional materials and curriculum texts to support teaching standards. Two principals and two teachers identified this strategy. One teacher explained that the main improvement in his instruction was aligning his lessons around state standards. He credited his school's administration with providing resources from the districts office of education to support this effort (T2). Support by the principal in purchasing materials was not adequate for one teacher who stated: *"When I asked my principal to help me buy the supplies like commercially published text books and commercially produced visual aids that I need in my class room, the principal did not like and interested to support me"*. (T6)

One principal felt that she promoted collegiality among teachers, such as sharing lessons and assessments and by providing teaching materials they need (P8). Another principal wanted teachers to use commercially produced visual aids. However, he reported that the materials were inadequate because they are costly to buy. (P9). It was evident from the principals' and teachers' responses that commercially published textbooks and visual aids were generally inadequate and was by far the most frequently used teaching material. One supervisor indicated that audio visual aids that are commercially produced, are rarely or never employed in teaching. Another supervisor indicated that they are not affordable. On the whole, the teachers, principals and supervisors felt most primary schools, especially those targeted did not have sufficient instructional materials and resources for teachers and students. Principals claimed that they could

not afford to buy those materials because their authorities at woreda level did not allocate them sufficient funds to buy the materials.

Communicating Goals

This study also investigated the opinions of teachers and school based supervision committee members on the principals role in formulating and communicating the school goals. As exhibited in table 5, the teachers felt the school missions and goals communicated by the school principal were less adequate($m=3.73$) compared to the school based supervision committee members' opinions($m=4.16$). An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the perceived behavior differed significantly as a function of whether the formulation of school goals by the school principals was significantly in a low or high status. The test was significant, $t(158) = 3.6, p < .000$ (see table 6). An examination of the group means, therefore, indicated that teachers' mean score on the formulation of mutually supportive and beneficial goals by the principal was ($M = 3.73, SD = 0.79$) significantly less than the school based supervision committee members' mean score ($M = 4.16, SD = 0.62$).

Interview sessions with two school principals and one teacher showed that goal setting affected the instructional practices used by teachers. The teacher stated that his school had re-aligned its curriculum with regional standards to raise and improve students achievement. He cited his principal for this re-alignment (T4). Both principals enhanced goal setting through their school improvement plan. When asked who helped teachers with implementing different instructional strategies and materials, one principal explained:

Of course we always go through our school improvement plan. In our school we have a school improvement plan that involved teachers, parents, and administrators on it. I mention to them what I think our goals should be, and part of our goal was to improve the school teachers implementation of different instructional strategies and materials that was part of it as well. (P6).

One teacher stated that:

We have school plans posted in our school and informed by our principals at the beginning of the semester but it did not engage all staffs in an ongoing collaborative process and not specifically address the issue of communication to make all the partners aware of the mechanisms which may be used to learn about the work of the school, to share information, seek help and advice, and to participate fully in the life of the school.(T 3).

Providing Incentives for Teachers

Moreover this study explored the opinions of teachers and school based supervision committee members on the principals' role in providing incentives for teachers. As exhibited in table 5, the teacher felt that the rewards and incentives provided by the school principal was less adequate($m=3.09$) compared to the school based supervision committee members' opinions($m=3.73$) an independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the perceived behavior differed significantly as a function of whether the motivation of teachers by the school principals was significantly in a low or high status. The test was significant, $t(158) = 4.28, p < .000$. An examination of the group means, therefore, indicated that teachers' mean score on the provision of incentives by the principal ($M = 3.09, SD = 0.92$) was significantly less than the school based supervision committee members' mean score ($M = 3.73, SD = 0.93$).

Incentives were mentioned by two teachers and one principal as important factor in encouraging teachers' instruction in the classroom. As stated earlier, one teacher reported that motivation and incentives in our schools did not go beyond certifying teachers, and no specific incentives were mentioned by the teacher (T8). One principal felt that teachers were not adequately rewarded and motivated to make further improvement in their teaching. The principal stated:

In designing systems to reward good teachers, less attention has been given to the relationship between motivation and teachers performance. Incentives are not effectively used to motivate our teachers and bring about positive improvement in the schools. To me higher wages and special monetary rewards appear to be the most common incentives even though there is a less recognition of the importance of these incentives that improve our teachers job. (P9).

Another teacher felt that the incentives and motivation provided by his principal was less in implementing more inquiry-based lessons and learning strategies. He explained:

I hav been certified by my principal because of my effective implementation of inquiry based Lessons and improvement of my students scores .However, I was not satisfied with the mere certification from my principal and it lacks fairness and relevance to my performance. (T6).

Supervising Instruction

Further more this study investigated the perceptions of teachers and school based supervision committee members on the principals' role in supervising teaching and learning process for teachers. As exhibited in table 5, the teachers felt that the supervision of instruction by the school principal was less adequate($m=3.08$) compared to the school based supervision committee members' opinions($m=3.37$). An independent-samples t test was also conducted to evaluate whether the perceived behavior differed significantly as a function of whether the supervision of teachers by the school principals was significantly in a low or high status. The test was significant, $t(111.72) = 2.43$, $p < .017$. An examination of the group means, therefore, indicated that teachers' mean score on the supervision of instruction by the principal was ($M = 3.08$, $SD = 0.67$) was significantly less than the school based supervision committee members' mean score ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 0.76$).

One principal felt that he promoted the sharing of teaching strategies by having teachers observe two other teachers, one in their content area and one outside of it. When asked if teachers had shared instructional practices, he stated that it was more sharing of teaching strategies (P2). Three teachers stated that principals need to indicate openness and should focus on providing teachers constructive feedback and telling areas that need improvement after observation. One teacher stated.

Some times my principal took over as my evaluator. So he would come in and observe my class and instead of telling me the positive criticism that would improve my weak side, his feed back associated with fault finding, threatening and lack objectivity. In addition, my principals' feedback is not timely provided soon after the observation to improve my instructional performance.(T8)

Another teacher stated that principals should use multiple observation methods and tools during their observation. He explained that:

My principal during his observation in my class has not taken notes, script taping, and observation tools designed to collect data from instruction in particular lesson areas. Therefore, actual and concrete feedback was not provided by my principal and not addressed the specific areas of improvement.(T9).

Promoting Action Research

This study also investigated the teachers and school based supervision committee members' perceptions on the principals' role in promoting the teachers' research. In table 5, the teacher felt that the support of action research by the school principal was less adequate($m=3.3$) compared to the school based supervision committee members' opinions($m=3.94$). Using an alpha level of .05, an independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the perceived behavior differed significantly as a function of whether the promotion of action research by the school principals was significantly in a low or high status. The test was significant, $t(158) = 4.27, p < .000$. An examination of the group means, therefore, indicated that teachers' mean score on the promotion of action research by the principal was ($M = 3.3, SD = 0.95$) was significantly less than the school based supervision committee members' mean score($M = 3.94, SD = 0.87$).

Interview sessions with two principals indicated that they promoted an inquiry-based supervision in which they should guide teachers in research and finding strategies to implement changes and share ideas with colleagues. When asked if teachers had shared ideas through action research, they stated that it was more of targeted to have promotion rather than to understand what happens in their class room and practically solve instructional problems (P2). One principal stated that:

In our school we promoted teachers to conduct both individual and collaborative research. However, most teachers conduct action research not to reflect on their practices and improve their instructional performance and raise students achievement but to have salary increament and educational opprtunity. We also realized that teachers have problems to systematically investigate their instructional practices and techniques in order to improve their teaching eventhough we gave them an opprtunity to participate in workshopes on action research provided by the ATTC.(P10).

Four teachers stated that principals need to indicate fairness and objectivity in providing teachers with an opportunity to participate in conferences on action research. One teacher stated:

My principal must establish the environment in which action research is viewed as a systematic process that affords greater opportunity for each and every teacher to direct his or her own professional growth. In our school supporting teachers profession through action research is not adequately used and we lack an experience and knowledge to identify our instructional problems and take measures on these problems based on data collected through action research. I felt that the opportunity to participate in action research workshop was provided only for one or two teachers frequently and the selection of these teachers by the principal was not fair and objective and most of the teachers have no experience and opportunity. (T11).

Another teacher stated that principals should encourage teachers' collaboration and cooperation through action research. He explained that:

My principal did not provide sufficient and consistent opportunities in our school for collaborative action research (studying, analyzing student work, dialoguing collaboratively, and analyzing student data to make instructional decisions). My principal has almost no experience to build a support system for teachers as a coach or a knowledgeable person(s) of the action research process, student learning, and instructional practices. (T12).

Coordinating the Implementation of Curriculum

Another aspect explored was the teachers and school based supervision committee members' perceptions on the principals' role in facilitating the implementation of curriculum. As exhibited in table 5, the teacher felt that the support of curriculum implementation by the school principal was less adequate ($m=3.46$) compared to the school based supervision committee members' opinions ($m=3.92$). An independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the perceived behavior differed significantly as a function of whether the promotion of curriculum implementation by the school principals was significantly in a low or high status. The test was significant, $t(149.147) = 3.72, p < .000$. An examination of the group means, therefore, indicated that teachers' mean score on the promotion of school based curriculum implementation by the

principal was ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 0.89$) was significantly less than the school based supervision committee members' mean score($M = 3.92$, $SD = 0.68$).

Principals helped the teachers in the implementation of curriculum by providing the instructional direction. Four principals and two teachers felt the principal helped teachers to design and prepare student centered lesson and to select appropriate instructional materials. However, two teachers cited the principals' support for the teachers' implementation of the curriculum was not adequate and enough. One teacher explained:

I am grade 8th physics teacher. In the last semester I faced a problem in selecting and preparing 3-dimensional instructional materials and I asked my principal to help me in preparing these materials. We sat together and planned and selected the materials that are important to prepare the 3-dimensional materials. However the principal told me that he has no experience in how to prepare the material and I got a support from my colleague.(T12)

Another teacher stated :

In our school most of the teachers have problems in using continuous assessment techniques. So we usually use frequent testing of students as continuous assessment. With my colleagues I asked my principal to support us in applying different instructional strategies. However, very less support was provided by our principal.

Assessing and Evaluating Teachers

The final aspect in the supervisory behavior looked into the role of principals in assessing and evaluating teachers. As exhibited in table 5, teachers viewed that the assessment and evaluation of teachers by the school principal was less effective ($m=3.19$) compared to the school based supervision committee members' opinions($m=3.81$). Further more, using an alpha level of .05, an independent-samples t test was conducted to evaluate whether the perceived behavior differed significantly as a function of whether the ongoing assessment and evaluation of teachers by the school principals was significantly in a low or high status.

The test was significant, $t(98.96) = 5.23$, $p < .000$. An examination of the group means, therefore, indicated that teachers' mean score on the provision of feedback throughout the evaluation cycle by the principal was ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 0.6$) was significantly less than the school based supervision committee members' mean score($M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.8$).

Principals have the responsibility to assess and evaluate teachers and should provide options for teachers in evaluating what they do in the classroom. Eight teachers and five principals discussed that principals assess and evaluate the performance of teachers instruction. When asked how teachers performance was assessed and evaluated and the purpose of the evaluation, one principal said that he used different assessment and evaluation tools. He also reported that the data from the evaluation used mostly for improvement of teachers' profession.(P3). Four principals felt that the evaluation and assessment of teachers should include multiple data sources and the purpose of evaluation should be for the on going progress of teachers instruction. One school principal explained:

We used different strategies such as checklists, examining student attainment(progress) to see if trends emerge which indicate possible strengths and weaknesses in teachers' instruction and also we devised and teachers participated in an agreed appraisal system....You Cannot measure a school's or teacher's success by a single measure such as performance on a test.(P4).

Eight teachers stated that rating and ranking teachers at one point in time, either in the beginning or at the end of the academic session of school would not address(indicate) the strong and weak sides of teachers. One teacher stated:

Our school principals' assessment and evaluation of teachers was not progressive and ongoing to help us improve our performance by establishing teacher-principal rapport, reflect practices, instructional conferences, classroom observation, and analysis of teaching and learning, and application of findings and conclusions for providing further instructional support. The evaluation by our principal most of the time took over twice a year and immediate feedback was not provided on time to address and improve our weak sides.(T5).

Teachers said that principals did not use feedbacks or data from alternative sources. One teacher explained:

Most of the time our school principal used a single checklist during observation in our class and the purpose was simply for promotion. The principals' evaluation process did not include a peer group evaluation, and self-evaluation. Our principal has less experience to take feedback from peers and other sources that provided principals with ongoing guidance about our performance and information about how to improve our practices and professional growth. (T4).

As indicated in table 6, in all cases of the supervisory roles of the principals, the (p values) are all less than the selected alpha value 0.05. Therefore, this indicated that there was statistically significant differences between teacher and supervision committee members' perceptions on the selected supervisory behaviors practiced by the school principals. Similarly, the critical table value $t = 1.96$ at the 0.05 significant levels with degrees of freedom for equal and not equal variances assumptions was less than the computed t value for all supervisory behaviors.

Therefore, the findings from the interview and the survey suggested that the school principals should promote teachers in providing ongoing professional development opportunities to enhance their instructional performance and effectiveness that also improves student learning and results. It was also suggested in the discussions that principals should provide teachers with relevant and appropriate instructional materials to the contents, objectives, grade levels and characteristics of learners. The findings from the interview and questionnaire also indicated that principals should assess and evaluate teachers by using multiple sources of data such as from class room observation, portfolio, peer observations, parents and students and the results should be used for continuous professional growth (MOE, 2012). The participants also indicated that there should be frequent frequent observation and feedback by the principals. It also indicated that principals should discuss with teachers on areas that should be focused during the class room observations before the observation sessions. It was also suggested that the school goal should be designed and communicated by principals that encourage teachers towards the achievement of school expectations. Provision of incentives and support in the implementation of school level curriculum were also areas of interest by the study participants (Blase & Blase, 1998; Blase & Roberts, 1994).

4.2. Teachers' Opinions on the Statistically Significant Principals' Supervisory Behaviors

This section sought to find out if teachers differed in their perspectives of school based instructional supervision based on gender and teaching experiences. Moreover, the researcher was only interested in comparing statistically significant supervisory behaviors based on teachers' experiences and gender.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Perceptions on Provision of Resources and Communication of School Goals by Principals

	Gender	Teachingxperience	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PR	Female	0-5	2.6190	.08248	7
		6-10	2.0000	.71429	7
		11-15	2.1429	.55787	10
		>15	3.2759	.44678	16
		Total	3.0833	.60356	40
	Male	0-5	3.7143	.67386	10
		6-10	2.5238	.08248	9
		11-15	3.1429	1.48461	17
		>15	2.9942	.77808	24
		Total	3.0804	.81684	60
	Total	0-5	3.4405	.75950	17
		6-10	2.2619	.53769	16
		11-15	2.8929	1.31125	27
		>15	3.0989	.68466	40
		Total	3.0814	.74390	100
CG	Female	0-5	4.1429	.57143	7
		6-10	2.3810	.59476	7
		11-15	3.2857	.51228	10
		>15	3.9113	.40119	16
		Total	3.7857	.60657	40
	Male	0-5	4.3968	.51892	10
		6-10	3.8571	.75593	9
		11-15	3.2857	1.97949	17
		>15	3.5889	.82098	24
		Total	3.7009	.88236	60
	Total	0-5	4.3333	.51807	17
		6-10	3.1190	1.01183	16
		11-15	3.2857	1.61624	27
		>15	3.7088	.70942	40
		Total	3.7314	.79196	100

According to the participants' data and analysis in the study, the interaction between the explanatory variables gender and teaching experiences was not significant for the four supervisory functions such as promoting professional development($F = 2.18$, $P = 0.96$), providing incentives for teachers($F = 2.05$, $P = 0.11$), supervising instruction($F = 2.09$, $P = .108$), and assessing and evaluating teachers($F = 1.13$, $P = 0.34$). So it was concluded that the principals' support with these behaviours across the four levels of teachers years of experience was the same for both male and female teachers and the reverse was true for both genders across the four levels of teaching experience.

The significant principals' supervisory behaviors reported by the participants were providing instructional resources, communicating school goals, promoting action research and coordinating the implementation of curriculum at the school level. The researcher was interested in uncovering the differences in views among teachers across gender and teaching experience on the four supervisory behaviors by using descriptive statistics and MANOVA.

In table 7, the descriptive statistics revealed a significant interaction between the two factors among (0-5 and >15); (11-15 and >15) years of experiences, suggesting that male teachers with 0-5 ($m=3.71$) and 11-15 ($m=3.14$) experiences were more positively perceived the principals' role in providing resources to achieve the organizational goals depending upon the gender of the teachers compared to those with >15 ($m=2.99$) extensively experienced teachers. New(0-5) and experienced(11-15) male teachers tend to focus most closely on their instructional practice, hoping to translate the classroom theory learned in their undergraduate or diploma programs into practice in their own classrooms.

The notion that new teachers feel fully prepared to independently run a classroom for a full school year on their own is not possible without the help of principals. As presented in table 7, new and experienced male participant respondents indicated that they were better satisfied in working with principals who are able and willing to provide relevant instructional resources compared to those of extensively experienced teachers. The data in table 7 indicated that principals were more interested in providing the instructional resources that help the new male teachers continually improve their performance and instructional effectiveness. However these conditions were reversed for female teachers.

Communicating school goals was the second significant principal behavior reported by participants with (6-10 and 11-15); (6-10 and >15) years of experiences (see Table 7). The participants in table 7 suggested that male teachers with 6-10 ($m=3.86$) experiences were more positively perceived the principals' role in conducting staff meetings to deal with the school goal depending upon the gender of the teachers compared to those with 11-15($m=3.29$) and >15($m=3.59$) experiences. Male teachers with slightly more experience (6-10 years) still maintain a positive interest in communicating instructional expectations or goals by the school principals. Results from male participants with between 6 and 10 years of experience showed statistically significant principal behavior of communicating the school goals. This group of male participants indicated a relative satisfaction with the principal leadership in the area of communicating instructional expectations along with an interest being involved in some aspects of the school. Based on these results, teachers between 6 and 10 years of experience appear to be more benefited in understanding the school culture and learning about what is happening on a larger scale outside of their classroom compared to those with 11-15 and >15 years of experience. They appeared to see the goal communication from the principal as a way that increased their understanding of the school and things that happen on a daily basis. However, these conditions were reversed for female teachers. This also indicated that principals provide ongoing support with instructional resources and effective goal setting to teachers based on gender and teaching experience.

Table 8. MANOVA table of Teachers' Perceptions on Provision of Resources and Communication of School Goals by Principals

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Gender	PR	2.186	1	2.186	4.598	.035	.048
	CG	.793	1	.793	1.478	.227	.016
Teachingexperience	PR	4.855	3	1.618	3.404	.021	.100
	CG	5.465	3	1.822	3.396	.021	.100
Gender*Teachingexperience	PR	5.250	3	1.750	3.681	.015	.107
	CG	4.888	3	1.629	3.037	.033	.090
Error	PR	43.737	92	.475			
	CG	49.353	92	.536			

a R Squared = .202 (Adjusted R Squared = .141)

b R Squared = .205 (Adjusted R Squared = .145)

From table 8, the F-ratios for the interaction between teaching experience and gender on provision of resources and communication of school goals by principals are $F = 3.68$, and 3.04 respectively and the critical table values with $df(3,92)$ at 0.05 alpha level is 2.7 . Since the computed values 3.68 and 3.04 far exceeds the critical table value 2.7 , there was statistically significant opinion differences between teachers on the two supervisory behaviors. The findings from table 8 indicated that the principals role in supervising teachers by setting mutually supportive instructional goals and providing relevant and appropriate instructional resources was affected by gender and experiences of teachers interactively. As can be seen from table 8, the residuals(with in group variances) for provision of resources and communication of goals by the principals are 0.475 and 0.536 respectively. So the estimate of the population standard deviation for each group(gender and years of experience) are 0.69 for CG and 0.73 for PR by principals. There fore, about 95% of the mean scores for any gender and years of experience was with in the 1.38 points of that groups mean score for provision of resources by the principals. Similarly, it was found that about 95% of the mean scores for any gender and years of experience was with in 1.46 points of that groups mean score for communicating the goals.

Table 9. Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Perceptions on promoting action research and coordinating the school curriculum by Principals

	Gender	Teaching experience	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PAR	Female	0-5	3.3810	.45922	7
		6-10	1.5714	.57143	7
		11-15	2.0000	.56212	10
		>15	3.5517	.67302	16
		Total	3.3294	.86582	40
	Male	0-5	3.9841	.79682	10
		6-10	4.0000	.89214	9
		11-15	3.2857	1.97949	17
		>15	3.1050	.91695	24
		Total	3.2790	.99511	60
	Total	0-5	3.8333	.75797	17
		6-10	2.7857	1.48942	16
		11-15	2.9643	1.73940	27
		>15	3.2711	.85794	40
		Total	3.2971	.94645	100
CIOC	Female	0-5	3.6667	.64418	7
		6-10	2.0952	.70470	7
		11-15	2.0000	.63307	10
		>15	3.7389	.54408	16
		Total	3.5476	.75477	40
	Male	0-5	3.8730	.94611	10
		6-10	4.0000	.85714	9
		11-15	3.5714	1.23718	17
		>15	3.2828	.93609	24
		Total	3.4129	.95615	60
	Total	0-5	3.8214	.85741	17
		6-10	3.0476	1.25736	16
		11-15	3.1786	1.27975	27
		>15	3.4524	.83852	40
		Total	3.4614	.88736	100

In table 9, the descriptive statistics indicated a significant gender and experience interaction among (0-5 & >15); (0-5 & 6-10); (6-10 & 11-15); (6-10 & >15); (11-15 & >15) participants. The findings in table 9 suggested that male participants with 0-5, 6-10, 11-15 years of experiences were more positively perceived the principals' role in promoting action research and implementation of school curriculum by teachers compared to those with >15 years of experiences. Depending on the findings, this group of male participants positively felt that their principals set specific times on the school calendar for action research, establish guidelines for professional development to include action research, create schedules so teachers can visit

classrooms of colleagues conducting action research on the same topic and cover classes for teachers to collaborate on action research compared to those of >15 years of experience. Similarly, these participants(male participants below 15 years of experience) more positively felt that the school principals supported their participation in curriculum implementation through the revision and modification of content, instructional plans and materials of classroom instruction. The study also found that male teachers who stayed in the profession longer were less satisfied with their principals' role in promoting action research and school based curriculum implementation compared to their female counterparts. However, the patterns were reversed for female participants.

Table 10. MANOVA table of Teachers' Perceptions on promoting action research and coordinating the school curriculum by Principals

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Gender	PAR	5.994	1	5.994	8.037	.006	.080
	CIOC	4.165	1	4.165	6.000	.016	.061
Teaching experience	PAR	4.256	3	1.419	1.902	.135	.058
	CIOC	3.393	3	1.131	1.629	.188	.050
Gender*Teaching experience	PAR	14.333	3	4.778	6.405	.001	.173
	CIOC	10.541	3	3.514	5.062	.003	.142
Error	PAR	68.624	92	.746			
	CIOC	63.864	92	.694			

a R Squared = .226 (Adjusted R Squared = .167)

b R Squared = .181 (Adjusted R Squared = .118)

From table 10, the F-ratios teaching experience and gender on the promotion of action research and school level curriculum implementation by principals are $F = 6.41$, and 5.06 respectively and the critical table values with $df(3,92)$ at 0.05 alpha level is 2.7. Since the computed values 6.41 and 5.06 far exceeds the critical table value 2.7, there was statistically significant opinion differences across years of experience between male and female teachers on the two supervisory behaviors in table 10. The findings indicated that the principals role in guiding teachers by promoting action research and curriculum implementation was based on gender and experiences of teachers interactively.

As can be seen from table 10, the residuals(with in group variances) for promotion of action research and curriculum implementation by the principals are 0.746 and 0.694 respectively. The estimate of the

population standard deviation for each group (gender and years of experience) are 0.86 for PAR and 0.83 for CIOC by principals. Therefore, about 95% of the mean scores for any gender and years of experience was within the 1.72 points of that group's mean score for the promotion of action research by the principals. It was also found that about 95% of the mean scores for any gender and years of experience was within the 1.66 points of that group's mean score for supporting the implementation of curriculum by school teachers.

Chapter Five

5. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Summary

Based on the above major findings of the study, the following summary are made.

Instructional supervisory practice require classroom visitation in order to enhance teacher performance and to improve classroom instruction. The findings of the study also noted that the school principals were not capable enough to conduct the classroom observation. Moreover, the findings showed that pre- observation and post observation conference were held rarely in the schools. As a result, school based supervision would have been failed to contribute a lot in bringing professional growth, improving the teaching and learning process and student growth. As shown in the findings, instructional supervisory practices by the primary school principals were ineffective in improving instructional practices of teachers.

In the qualitative study, most of the teacher respondents mentioned the principal was not effective in the slected supervisory behaviours for this study.

Teachers highlighted that school principals did not have a pre conference prior to classroom observations and therefore teachers had no idea of what the classroom observation would be focused on. Furthermore, teachers reported doubts on feedback provided at the end of classroom observations. Besides that, teachers drew attention to the fact that some principals did not have a post observation conference and feedback was not communicated within 24 hours. Moreover teachers pointed out that there was no clear articulation of what would happen next and what aspect teachers needed to work on. Teachers felt that principals were not able to establish a trusting climate leaving teachers suspicious of the whole process and due to this confidentiality issues and biasness became issues of concern for teachers. Literature (MOE, 2012) highlights that effective supervision should be a collaborative and collective effort based on the belief that teaching is primarily problem solving for effective student learning and teacher development.

The findings of the study also showed that school principals were rarely practiced the strategies to promote teachers professional development. Most of school principals were not aware of the

responsibility they had for professional development of teachers, and failed to play their role in creating conducive environment to bring professional competence of teacher.

Teachers also consistently reported that communicating goals about school issues was valued and led to enhanced performance in their instruction with students. Teachers are interested in knowing what is happening in their school, and with this additional information they are able to participate in schoolwide and even district-wide initiatives that support and enhance student learning.

In summary, one of the most productive outcomes of effective instructional leadership is that the principal provides ongoing growth and improvement opportunities, guide teachers to establish the need and the desire to conduct action research in their classrooms, check the positive implementation of curriculum and assist those implementing it and providing instructional resources(Glickman ,2002).

Overall, additional research is necessary to validate these findings and to encourage a differentiated approach to the development of teacher performance.

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the major findings of the study, the following conclusions are made.

It was found that the instructional supervisory practice was not effective in facilitating teacher work, in preparation and provision of teaching manuals and materials, in implementing curriculum and adapting the curriculum to the school context, in providing resources and incentives, communicating goals, promoting professional development, supervising instruction, promoting action research and assessing and evaluating teachers. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that school based supervision was not adequately practiced in upper Government primary schools of Arbaminch town.

The school based supervision committee members' mean score significantly exceeds the teachers mean score in all cases of the supervisory roles of school principals. Therefore, teachers and school based supervision committee members perceived the roles of school principals differently.

There were four supervisory behaviours of principals that significantly differently perceived by teachers based on gender and experience: providing resources, communicating goals, promoting action research, and coordinating the implementation of curriculum.

5.3. Recommendations

The results of this study have the potential to affect the interactions between principals and teachers in school each day and to positively affect student achievement. In addition, this study has the potential to influence at least one aspect of administrator training: addressing the differentiated needs of teachers at various stages of their profession or career. A result of this may be used to enhance efforts to retain teachers and to improve their effectiveness with students. As MOE (2012) stated, “If school principals’ supervision enhances teachers to higher levels of competence and success, then an increased focus on this teacher attribute is critical to the improvement of student performance”.

The most commonly reported principal behaviors with respect to gender and teaching experiences in the current study were providing resources, communicating goals, promoting action research, and coordinating the implementations of school based curriculum. A wide range of participants felt these were essential behaviors that principals should practice to help them enhance their instructional performance. Of all the principal behaviors reported in this study, these ones accounted for the largest portion of the differences across many groups of teachers.

Principals must be both able and willing to lead teachers in the implementation of instructional initiatives as well as competent in working to establish instructional goals for the school and each department or grade level.

By institutionalizing goal communication procedures, principals can provide the essential information that many teachers value and that leads to more effective work with students. Finally, principals must find ways to help teachers see the greater meaning and purpose in their work. By creating opportunities for teachers to contribute to larger goals outside their classroom, and by recognizing those efforts and contributions, the instructional performance of our most experienced teachers can be fostered and enriched.

Principals must differentiate their approach to teachers based on teacher characteristics, background, and particularly the length of teaching experience and gender. Similar to students, teachers come to work with a diverse types of skills, characteristics, and personal history. These characteristics create situations where principals must differentiate their approach to teachers to account for the differences in background and skills. As Glickman (2002) emphasized, the goal in all supervisory interactions is to use the approach that strengthens “a teacher’s capacity for greater reflection and self-reliance in making improvements in classroom teaching and learning”. Using teacher experience and gender as part of an effective approach to supporting teachers would appear to be an important component of the supervisory process. The results of this study emphasize the necessity of approaching each teacher in a unique way that considers his or her individual characteristics as a means to enhance performance. If individual or school-wide action research is to take place, the principal must provide opportunities for communication and learning.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. (2006). *Introduction to research in education* (7th ed.). Canada: Thomson Wadsworth Publishers.
- Abebe Tesema(2010).Perceptions of Teachers Towards the Current Supervisory Services in Secondary Schools of Special Zones of Oromia. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa Universit
- Baffour, P. (2011). *Supervision Of Instruction In Public Primary Schools In Ghana:Teachers' And Headteachers' Perspectives*.
<http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/8483/2/02Whole.p>
- Bas G.(2012). Correlation between School Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviours and Teachers' Organisational Trust Perceptions. Middle Eastern & African Journal of Educational Research, Issue. Retrieved on January 3/2013, from <http://www.majersite.org/issue1/bas.pdf>
- Berhan Hailu (2009). Implementations of the School Improvement Program In addis Ababa City Administration: Achievements, Challenges and Prospects. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Cohen L., Manion L. & Morrison K.(2005). *Research Methods in Education*,5th edition. London and New York.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Davison J. A., Berhanu Soboka & Berhanu Berkie (2010). Federal Democratic Republic Of Ethiopia, MoE: Map Capacity Development Design Study. RFP/GEQIP/QCBS/C-05/09. Retrieved on January 1/2013, from <http://www.moe.gov.et/English/Resources/Documents/MAPfin.pdf>
- Debele Lemessa.(2011). Major Problems of Secondary School Principals In Educational Leadership in West Shewa Zone.Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- DePoy, E. & Gitlin, L. N. (1998). *Introduction to research: Understanding and applying multiple strategies* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia, USA: Mosby Inc.

- Ewnetu Hailu.(2009). Teachers' Perceptions and Practices of Continuous Professional Development: The case of Selected Primar School in Jima Zone. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Farley G. C.(2010). Instructional Supervision: A Descriptive Study Focusing On The Observation And Evaluation Of Teachers In Cyberschools. Retrieved on January 2/2013, from <http://dspace.iup.edu/bitstream/handle/2069/315/Gregory%20Farley.pdf?sequence>
- Gashaw Debassu.(2008). Supervisory Practice of Cluster Primary School Supervisors In Promoting Teachers Professional Competencies in West Gojjam Administrative Zone. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Haileselassie Woldegerima and Abraha Asfaw (2012). Improving Quality of Primary Education Program(USAID/IQPEP) in Ethiopia: A Training Module for Principals, Supervisors, & Educational Officers; August 2012,Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Hewitt, R. & Little, M.(2005). *Leading Action Research in Schools*. Project CENTRAL, University of Central Florida 1673 Mason Avenue, Suite 207 State of Florida<http://www.fldoe.org/ese/pdf/action-res.pdf>.
- Johnson, R. B. & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Lineburg, P. N. (2010). The Influence of the Instructional Leadership of Principals on Change in Teachers' Instructional Practices. Retrieved on January 1/2013, from http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd04072010140111/unrestricted/Lineburg_PN_D_2010.pdf
- Lunenburg, F. C.(2010). *The Principal and the School: What Do Principals Do?. National Forum Of Educational Administration And Supervision Journal Volume 27, Number 4, 2010*. Sam Houston State University.
- Melchior, W. T. ,(1950). Instructional Supervision:A Guide to Modern Practice.School of Education Graduate Division, Syracuse University.
- Marczyk G., DeMatteo D., & Festinger, D.(2005). Essentials of Research Design and Methodology. Retrieved on January 1/20112 ,from <http://www2.hcmuaf.edu.vn/data/quoctuan/Essentials%20of%20Research%20Design%20and%20Methodology%202005>

- Martin(1999). School Planning: Developing a School Plan Guidelines for Primary Schools
content/uploads/2010/02/developing_a_school_plan_guidelines.pdf
- Melese Birhanu(2010).An assessment of the Research Capacity In One of the Ethiopian Higher
educations Institutions: University of Gondar.
- Million Morki (2010). An Assessment On The Status Of School-Based Instructional
Supervision In Secondary Schools Of West Arsi Zone Of Oromia Region.Addis Ababa
University, Ethiopia. Retrieved on January 1/2013 ,from
[http://etd.aau.edu.et/dspace/bitstream/123456789/2242/1/109097113739720662725993
542134249590750](http://etd.aau.edu.et/dspace/bitstream/123456789/2242/1/109097113739720662725993542134249590750)
- MoE(2006). Decentralized Management of Education in Ethiopia:A Reference Manual. Ministry
of Education.
- MoE(2010). Education Statistics Annual Abstract 2002 E.C.(2009/10).Addis Ababa.
- MOE(2007). School Improvement Program:Blue Print.EMPDA, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- MoE(1998). Quality Education In Ethiopia: Visions For The 21st Century.Institute Of Educational
Research,Addis Ababa University.
- MOE (2009).General Quality Improvement Program(GEQIP). Program Implementation
Manual Volume *I,II,III*. MoE, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- MoE(2012). *Ethiopian National Professional Standards Framework for School Supervisors*.
<http://www.moe.gov.et/English/Resources/Documents/aud.pdf>
- Nakpodia E.D .(2011). The Dependent Outcome of Teachers Performance in Secondary Schools
in Delta State: An Empirical Assessment of Principal's Supervision Capacity. African
Journal of Education and Technology, Volume 1 Number 1, April 2011; pp. 15-24.
Retrieved on January 3/2013,from
<http://sachajournals.com/documents/NakpodiaAJET1.pdf>
- Onasanya S., A.(2010). The Concept And Practices Of Supervision/Inspection In Kwara State
Public Primary Schools. Retrieved on January 1/2013, from
[http://www.ilorin.info/kwsubeb/continuous-assessment/the-concept-and-practices-of-
supervision-or-inspection-in-kwara.pdf](http://www.ilorin.info/kwsubeb/continuous-assessment/the-concept-and-practices-of-supervision-or-inspection-in-kwara.pdf)
- Panigrahi, M. R.(2012). Implementation of Instructional Supervision in Secondary School:
Approaches, Praspsects and Problems ISSN: 2226-7522(Print) & 2305 Science,

Technology & Arts Research July-Sep 2012, www.starjournal.org Copyright©2012
STAR. All Rights Reserved

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park,
CA: Sage

Peterson.(2005).*The Principal and Teacher Evaluation: 01-Peterson-4793.qxd*.
http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/8008_Peterson_ch1.pdf

Rea, L. M. & Parker, R. A. (2005). *Designing and conducting survey research: A
comprehensive guide* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Teshom Ayalew, 2008;
Singh Y. K.(2006). *Fundamental of Research Methodology and Statistics*.

Stronge, J. H. (2003).*Teacher Evaluation And School Improvement: Improving The Educational
Landscape*. http://www.corwin.com/upm- data/7808_Stronge01.pdf

Tyagi R. S. (2011). *Academic Supervision in Secondary Schools: School-Based Approach for
Quality Management*. Retrieved on January 1/2013, from
[http://www.nuepa.org/Download/Publications/Ocassional%20Paper%20RS%20Tyagi_38
.pdf](http://www.nuepa.org/Download/Publications/Ocassional%20Paper%20RS%20Tyagi_38.pdf)

APPENDIX A-1
Addis Ababa University

College of Education

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Dear Teachers

I am MA candidate at Addis Ababa University and conducting research for my thesis on the school-based instructional supervision in government upper primary schools in Arbaminch, Gamo Gofa Zone. As part of my study, I invite you to complete this survey. This survey aims to gather information about how you see your school principals as instructional leaders

By completing this survey, you will help in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of school principalship in your school and how it may be better supported.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and you will remain anonymous and your answers will be kept strictly confidential.

It should take you about 20 minutes to complete the survey. Once you have completed the survey, please give it back to the researcher or data collector.

I thank you in advance for your time and willingness to share your perspective in this study.

Part One: Teachers' Demographic profile(please circle the number that fits you)

Gender: 1. Male 2. Female

Teaching Experience: 1. 0-5 2. 6-10 3. 11-15. 4. Above 15

PartTwo: The Principals Instructional Supervisory Rating Scale

This part consists of 55 behavioral statements that describe your principals' practices and behaviors. You are asked to consider each question interms of your principals leadership for this school year.

Please read each statement carefully and circle a number that best fits the specific supervisory behavior or practice of your school principals during this school year. For the response to each statement the numbers represent:

5 = Strongly agree (SA)

4 = Agree (A)

3 = Neutral (N)

2 = Disagree(D)

1 = Strongly disagree (SD)

Please **circle** only one number per question. Try to answer every question.

Thank You

Item no.	ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD
	1.Promoting Professional Development: the extent to which principals alert and make accessible to teachers opportunities for professional growth.					
1.1	My principal facilitates in-service activities that enlarge my knowledge and skills.	5	4	3	2	1
1.2	Short term training programs are facilitated by my principal.	5	4	3	2	1
1.3	I am encouraged by my principal to participate in professional development opportunities.	5	4	3	2	1
1.4	My principal encourages me to participate in workshops and seminars that improve my teaching profession.	5	4	3	2	1
1.5	My principal invites in qualified professionals in new instructional approaches for staff development opportunities.	5	4	3	2	1
1.6	My principal encourages staff development that includes contineous support in the classroom.	5	4	3	2	1
1.7	I have learned new assessment strategies from professional development opportunities given by my principal.	5	4	3	2	1
Item no.	ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD
	2. Providing Resources: supplying teachers with the necessary materials for instruction	5	4	3	2	1
2.1	My creativity is encouraged by resources from my principal.	5	4	3	2	1
2.2	My principal provides resources that I ask for.	5	4	3	2	1
2.3	My principal does not supply resources for my work.	5	4	3	2	1
2.4	My principal gives enough resources for my work.	5	4	3	2	1
2.5	If I need resources, they are made available to me by my principal.	5	4	3	2	1
2.6	My school did not have the necessary resources to support instructional strategies.	5	4	3	2	1
2.7	I receive appropriate resources for my classroom from my	5	4	3	2	1

Item no.	ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD
	3. Communicating Goals: efforts made by principals to share instructional expectations with teachers	5	4	3	2	1
3.1	My principal communicates instructional goals for the school.	5	4	3	2	1
3.2	My principal communicates instructional goals during faculty meetings.	5	4	3	2	1
3.3	My principal communicates a clear vision for the school.	5	4	3	2	1
3.4	Instructional goals are posted throughout my school.	5	4	3	2	1
3.5	Teachers in my school are aware of the instructional goals for our school.	5	4	3	2	1
3.6	My principal develops a mission for our school.	5	4	3	2	1
3.7	My school does not have instructional goals.	5	4	3	2	1
Item no.	ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD
	4. Providing incentives for teachers: Promoting teacher improvement and growth through public and private recognition of classroom performance, material rewards, and persuasion.	5	4	3	2	1
4.1	Teachers are publicly praised by my principal.	5	4	3	2	1
4.2	My principal uses faculty meetings to praise teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
4.3	My principal celebrates achievements by teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
4.4	Rewards provided by my principal motivate me.	5	4	3	2	1
4.5	My principal recognizes teachers for their achievements.	5	4	3	2	1
4.6	Most incentives come from sources outside of the school.	5	4	3	2	1
4.7	I have been praised by my principal.	5	4	3	2	1

Item no.	ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD
	5. Supervising instruction: giving feedback on instructional strategies during observations, postobservation conferences, formal evaluations, and informal classroom visits					
5.1	My principal does not discuss classroom observations with me.	5	4	3	2	1
5.2	Post-observation conferences by my principal are just a formality.	5	4	3	2	1
5.3	I receive suggestions from my principal following observations.	5	4	3	2	1
5.4	I am frequently observed by my principal.	5	4	3	2	1
5.5	I receive feedback from my principal following observations.	5	4	3	2	1
5.6	My principal values my input during post-observation conferences.	5	4	3	2	1
5.7	Instructional conferences are not used by my principal.	5	4	3	2	1
Item no.	ITEMS	5	4	3	2	1
	6. Promoting Action research	5	4	3	2	1
6.1	My principal encourages teachers make better instructional decisions through action research.	5	4	3	2	1
6.2	My principal helps teachers to design a research project individually or in group.	5	4	3	2	1
6.3	My principal mobilizes teachers to reflect on their teaching practice through action research.	5	4	3	2	1
6.4	My principal encourages teachers to do action research on improving their teaching strategies.	5	4	3	2	1
6.5	My principal brings in experts in action research to improve my instructional performance.	5	4	3	2	1
6.6	My school principal encourages action research to advance the professionalization of teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
6.7	My principal uses action research project to bring excellence in school teachers.	5	4	3	2	1

Item no.	ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD
	7. Coordinating the implementation of Curriculum					
7.1	The school principal monitors the classroom curriculum to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
7.2	The school principal assists teachers in lesson planning.	5	4	3	2	1
7.3	The school principal assists teachers in developing instructional goals and objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
7.4	The principal assists teachers in developing/selecting instructional materials.	5	4	3	2	1
7.5	The school principal helps teachers to evaluate curricula and suggest changes to meet the students' needs.	5	4	3	2	1
7.6	The school principal encourages teachers to use appropriate methods of teaching.	5	4	3	2	1
7.7	Your school principal assists teachers in evaluating student performance.	5	4	3	2	1
Item no.	ITEMS					
	8. Evaluating Teachers	SA	A	N	D	SD
8.1	The school principal evaluates the performance of teachers	5	4	3	2	1
8.2	The school principal uses evaluation as a means for teacher improvement/development.	5	4	3	2	1
8.3	The school principal evaluates teachers only through their classroom performance.	5	4	3	2	1
8.4	The principal overemphasize summative evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1
8.5	The evaluation of teachers by your school principal only looks for teachers' mistakes.	5	4	3	2	1
8.6	The school principal uses more than one source in evaluating teachers.	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX B-2
Addis Ababa University
College of Education

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Interview Protocol to Principals

The aim of the interview is to explore the principal' supervisory role in government upper primary schools of Arbaminch town, Gamo Gofa Zone. The information obtained from the interview will be used to support and triangulate the data and the findings/results from the survey and the transcripts from the teachers. The data obtained will be used for research purpose only.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Questions:

1. Can you tell me the specific examples of the professional development opportunities available to teachers in your school?
2. Can you give me specific examples of the major resources provided to teachers in your school to support their instruction?
3. Can you give me the specific examples of how you have communicated your school goals/ missions to the school teachers?
4. Can you tell me the specific situations how you have recognized and rewarded your school teachers for their performance?
5. Can you tell me about your instructional interactions with your school teachers?
6. Can you tell me the time you have helped your school teachers conduct action research to bring changes in their instructional performance?
7. Would you tell me about the situation you have helped your school teachers during the implementation of school curriculum?
8. Would you tell me how you have decided/determined the performance of teachers and for what purpose you use it?

APPENDIX B-1

Addis Ababa University

College of Education

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Interview Protocol to Teachers

The aim of the interview is to explore the principal' supervisory role in government upper primary schools of Arbaminch town, Gamo Gofa Zone. The information obtained from the interview will be used to support and triangulate the data and the findings/results from the survey and the transcripts from the principals. The data obtained will be used for research purpose only. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Questions:

1. Can you tell me the specific examples of professional development opportunities available to you by your school principal?
2. Can you give me specific examples of the major resources provided by your principal to support your instruction?
3. Can you give me the specific examples of how your school principal has communicated the school goals/missions to the school teachers?
4. Can you tell me the specific situations how your school principal has recognized and rewarded teachers for their performance?
5. Can you tell me about your principal's instructional interactions with you/ school teachers as a whole?
6. Would you tell me the time your principal has helped you/ school teachers conduct action research to bring changes in your/their instructional performance?
7. Would you tell me about the situation your principal has helped you/your school teachers during the implementation of the school curriculum?
8. Would you tell me how your school principal has decided/evaluated the performance of teachers and for what purpose he uses it ?

APPENDIX A-2

Addis Ababa University

College of Education

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Dear school-based supervision committee member

I am MA candidate at Addis Ababa University and conducting research for my thesis on the school-based instructional supervision in government upper primary schools in Arbaminch, Gamo Gofa Zone. As part of my study, I invite you to complete this survey. This survey aims to gather information about how you see your school principals as instructional leaders

By completing this survey, you will help in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of school principalship in your school and how it may be better supported.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and you will remain anonymous and your answers will be kept strictly confidential.

It should take you about 20 minutes to complete the survey. Once you have completed the survey, please give it back to the researcher or data collector.

I thank you in advance for your time and willingness to share your perspective in this study.

The Principals' Instructional Supervisory Rating Scale

Part One: Principals' Demographic profile(please circle the number that fits you)

Gender: 1. Male 2. Female

Teaching Experience: 1. 0-5 2. 6-10 3. 11-15. 4. Above 15

Part Two: This part consists of 55 behavioral statements that describe your principals' practices and behaviors. You are asked to consider each question in terms of your principals' leadership for this school year.

Please read each statement carefully and **circle** the number that best fits the specific supervisory behavior or practice of your school principals during this school year. For the response to each statement the numbers represent:

5 = Strongly Agree (SA)

4 = Agree (A)

3 = Neutral (N)

2 = Disagree (D)

1 = Strongly disagree (SD)

Please **circle** only one number per question. Try to answer every question.

Thank you.

Item no.	ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD
	1.Promoting Professional Development: the extent to which principals alert and make accessible to teachers opportunities for professional growth.					
1.1	The school principals facilitate in-service activities that enlarge teachers knowledge and skills.	5	4	3	2	1
1.2	Short term training programs are facilitated by the school principals.	5	4	3	2	1
1.3	Teachers are encouraged by the principals to participate in professional development opportunities.	5	4	3	2	1
1.4	Your school principals encourage teachers to participate in workshopes and seminars that improve their teaching profession.	5	4	3	2	1
1.5	Your school principals invite in qualified professionals in new instructional approaches for staff development opportunities.	5	4	3	2	1
1.6	The school principal encourages staff development that includes contineous support in the classroom.	5	4	3	2	1
1.7	Teachers have learned new assessment strategies from professional development opportunities given by the school principal.	5	4	3	2	1
	2. Providing Resources: supplying teachers with the necessary materials for instruction	5	4	3	2	1
2.1	Teachers' creativity is encouraged by resources from the principal.	5	4	3	2	1
2.2	The school principal provides resources that teachers ask for.	5	4	3	2	1

2.3	The principal does not supply resources for teachers' work.	5	4	3	2	1
2.4	The principal provides enough resources for teachers' work.	5	4	3	2	1
2.5	If teachers need resources, they are made available to them by their principal.	5	4	3	2	1
2.6	My school did not have the necessary resources to support instructional strategies.	5	4	3	2	1
2.7	Teachers receive appropriate resources for their school principal.	5	4	3	2	1
Item no.	ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD
	3. Communicating Goals: efforts made by principals to share instructional expectations with teachers					
3.1	The principal communicates instructional goals for the school.	5	4	3	2	1
3.2	The principal communicates instructional goals during faculty meetings.	5	4	3	2	1
3.3	The principal communicates a clear vision for the school.	5	4	3	2	1
3.4	Instructional goals are posted throughout the school.	5	4	3	2	1
3.5	Teachers in my school are aware of the instructional goals for our school.	5	4	3	2	1
3.6	The principal develops a mission for our school.	5	4	3	2	1
3.7	The school does not have instructional goals.	5	4	3	2	1

Item no.	ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD
	4. Providing incentives for teachers: Promoting teacher improvement and growth through public and private recognition of classroom performance, material rewards, and persuasion.	5	4	3	2	1
4.1	Teachers are publicly praised by the principal.	5	4	3	2	1
4.2	The school principal uses faculty meetings to praise teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
4.3	The principal celebrates achievements by teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
4.4	Rewards provided by the principal motivate teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
4.5	principal recognizes teachers for their achievements.	5	4	3	2	1
4.6	Most incentives come from sources outside of the school.	5	4	3	2	1
4.7	Teachers have been praised by the principal.	5	4	3	2	1

Item no.	ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD
	5. Supervising instruction: giving feedback on instructional strategies during observations, postobservation conferences, formal evaluations, and informal classroom visits					
5.1	The school principal does not discuss classroom observations with teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
5.2	Post/after-observation conferences by the principal are just a formality.	5	4	3	2	1
5.3	Teachers receive suggestions from the principal following observations.	5	4	3	2	1
5.4	Teachers are frequently observed by the principal.	5	4	3	2	1
5.5	Tachers receive feedback from the principal following observations.	5	4	3	2	1
5.6	My principal values my input during post-observation conferences.	5	4	3	2	1
5.7	Instructional conferences are not used by the principal.	5	4	3	2	1
Item no.	ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD
	6. Promoting Action research	5	4	3	2	1
6.1	The school principal encourages teachers make better instructional decisions through action research.	5	4	3	2	1
6.2	The school principal helps teachers to design a research project individually or in group.	5	4	3	2	1
6.3	The principal mobilizes/encourages teachers to reflect on their teaching practice through action research.	5	4	3	2	1
6.4	The principal encourages teachers to do action research on improving their teaching strategies.	5	4	3	2	1

6.5	The principal brings in experts in action research to improve teachers' instructional performance.	5	4	3	2	1
6.6	The school principal encourages action research to advance the professionalization of teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
6.7	The principal uses action research project to bring excellence in school teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
Item no.	ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD
	7. Coordinating the implementation of Curriculum					
7.1	The school principal monitors the classroom curriculum to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
7.2	The principal assists teachers in lesson planning.	5	4	3	2	1
7.3	The principal assists teachers in developing instructional goals and objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
7.4	The principal assists teachers in developing/selecting instructional materials.	5	4	3	2	1
7.5	The principal helps teachers to evaluate curricula and suggest changes to meet the students' needs.	5	4	3	2	1
7.6	The principal encourages teachers to use appropriate methods of teaching.	5	4	3	2	1
7.7	The principal assists teachers in evaluating student performance.	5	4	3	2	1

Item no.	ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD
	8. Evaluating Teachers					
8.1.	The school principal evaluates the performance of teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
8.2.	The school principal uses evaluation as a means for teacher improvement/development	5	4	3	2	1
8.3.	The school principal evaluates teachers only through their classroom performance.	5	4	3	2	1
8.4.	The principal overemphasize summative evaluation.	5	4	3	2	1
8.5.	The evaluation of teachers by your school principal only looks for teachers' mistakes.	5	4	3	2	1
8.6.	The school principal uses more than one source in evaluating teachers.	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX B-3

Addis Ababa University

College of Education

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Interview Protocol to Supervisors

The aim of the interview is to explore the principal' supervisory role in government upper primary schools of Arbaminch town, Gamo Gofa Zone. The information obtained from the interview was used to support and triangulate the data and the findings/results from the survey and the transcripts from the principals. The data obtained will be used for research purpose only.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Questions:

1. Can you tell me the specific examples of professional development opportunities available to teachers by the school principals?
2. Can you give me specific examples of the major resources provided by the school principals to support teachers instruction?
3. Can you give me the specific examples of how the school principals have communicated the school goals/missions to the school teachers?
4. Can you tell me the specific situations how the school principals have recognized and rewarded teachers for their performance?
5. Can you tell me about the principals' instructional interactions with the school teachers as a whole?
6. Would you tell me the time the school principals have helped teachers conduct action research to bring changes in their instructional performance?
7. Would you tell me about the situation principals have helped school teachers during the implementation of the school curriculum?
8. Would you tell me how the school principals have assessed and evaluated the performance of teachers and for what purpose they use it ?