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# DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

**Education:** is the process of facilitating learning, or the acquisition of knowledge, skills, values, beliefs, and habits.

**Support:** The provision of resources (time, expertise, advice, financial and material resources, educational opportunities, etc.) to individuals or entities.

**Supervision:** The regular/periodic oversight of individuals or entities, which uses the results of evaluation (and sometimes inspection) to inform and direct action of those supervised.

**Support Supervision:** is a facilitative approach to supervision that promotes mentorship, joint problem-solving and communication between supervisors and supervisees.

**Academic performance:** Is the extent to which a student, teacher or institution has achieved their educational goals.

**Classroom:** Any place where one learns or gains experience. A room as in school or college, in which classes are attended.

**Teacher:** A person who teaches or instructs, especially as a profession.

**Pupil:** a person who is taught by another, especially a schoolchild or student in relation to a teacher.

**Primary school:** is a school for children from about five to eleven years old, in which they receive primary or elementary education.

# ABBREVIATION AND ACRONYMS

ADE: Assistant Director of Education

DES: Directorate of Education Standards

ETC: Elementary Teaching Certificate

GES: Ghana Education Service

IEPA: Institute for Education Planning and Administration

MEO: Municipality Education Officer

MoEs Ministry of Education and Sports

PH: Primary High Teaching Certificate abbreviation

PL: Primary Lower Teaching Certificate

PLE: Primary Leaving Examinations

PTC: Primary Teacher College

SPSS: Statistic Package for Social Sciences

TLM: Teaching Learning Materials

UES: Uganda Education Service

UNATU: Uganda National Teacher’s Union

UNEB: Uganda National Examinations Board

UNESCO: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization

US: United States of America

# ABSTRACT

This study set out to assess the impact of support supervision to teachers on pupils’ academic performance in the west division schools of Mubende Municipality. The researcher observed four major areas which included: the rationale for support supervision to teachers, the role of supervisors in relation to support supervision to teachers, the various aspects of support supervision practiced by head teachers and the frequency of support supervision in schools. To conduct the study, the researcher employed a mixed survey design method, with both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analyses. A total of 84 respondents that included 50 teachers and 34 policy officers participated in the study. A questionnaire was used as the main tool of data collection. Interview and document analysis was used to substantiate the data gathered through questionnaires. Frequency tables and percentages were used to analyze quantitative data obtained through the questionnaires. The qualitative data gathered through interview and document analyses were interpreted by narration. The overall results of the study indicate that teachers lack awareness and orientation on the activities and significances of support supervision. There was ineffectiveness of the practices of supervision among the schools of the west division of Mubende municipality. Many supervisors were unable to apply the necessary procedures for proper classroom observation and assessment. The findings also indicate that although there was supervision in schools, the right procedures towards supervision were not being followed, teachers were evaluated but not given feedback on their weaknesses, which left a gap in checking their performance towards better academic performance. The study revealed however that involvement of teachers and head teachers in decisions about instructional supervision can improve instruction and, by extension, the environment for learning in the schools for better academic performance. The study recommends that, support supervision can be improved in primary schools in Mubende Municipality by providing relevant in-service training for supervisors in order to upgrade their supervisory activities and skills. The government of Uganda should also increase on the non-wage budgetary allocations to the education sector to cater for recruitment of more inspectors and procuring facilities for mobility of inspectors.

# CHAPTER ONE

# BACKGROUND

This chapter consists the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, hypothesis of the study, scope of the study and the significance of the study

# 1.1 Background of the study

Igwe (2001) defines support supervision as follows: “the process involving the use of expert knowledge and experience to oversee, evaluate and coordinate the process of improving teaching and learning in schools. Kochhar (2005) built on this definition, stating that: “supervision includes those activities which are primarily and directly concerned with studying and improving the conditions which surround the learning and growth of pupils.” Supervision that is below standards compromises performance of learners, while supervision that matches the standards results in improved performance of learners. Exceeding expectations of support supervision leads to high level performance of learners.

The definition of Igbo (2002) is however slightly different from that of Igwe: “supervision is the process of helping, guiding, advising and stimulating growth in subordinate in order to improve on the quality of his work.” The emphasis of Igbo (2002) is thus on improving the quality of teaches work as opposed to attaining the main objective of the school.

The definition of Igwe will be used in the current study, given the main goal of education is towards improving the academic performance of learners. This meshes well with the primary schools in the West division of Mubende Municipality which desires to improve the academic performance of pupils in the region. Although Igbo (2002) says that support supervision entails improving quality of teachers, it does not reflect the main desire to achieve academic objectives. The definition of Igwe (2001) is therefore more relevant to the current study, but with a few modifications.

Igwe’s supervision model;

Teaching is said to be effective if the objectives are achieved. In his model (figure 1), Igwe shows that The lesson plan shows the level of preparedness and the effort the teacher made in gathering information for the lesson. If the lesson plan is poorly prepared, it indicates how the teacher is committed through his teaching.

The nature of lesson plan

Lesson presentation

* Introduction of the lesson and the ability of the teacher to carry the learners along during the lesson
* Good use of classroom management techniques to enable the participation of learners
* Teachers knowledge about the subject matter
* The teachers’ voice, how audible it is and clarity of expression, appropriate use of language and instructional material
* The clarity and appropriateness of the learners’ behavioral objectives
* The relevance and the adequacy of the lesson note
* Selection of the appropriate teaching aids
* Appropriate evaluation techniques to determine the extent of achieving the objectives

Support supervision

**Figure 1: The model of supervision (Igwe, 2001)**

Support supervision was found in the growth of charitable social agencies across Europe and North America during the nineteenth century and it involved the recruitment, organization and oversight of a large number of volunteers and later paid teachers (Gordon, 2004). Onen (2016) pointed out that one of the overseer’s job was to ensure that work was done well and to standard, and this could be viewed as an administrative task. Howley & Pendarvis, (2002) suggested that in order to reduce pressures for head teachers, there is need to provide professional development programs that enable new administrators to meet challenges in educational leadership, which obviously involves supervision.

A research by Kapur (2018) revealed that among other countries, India shares a challenge of academic performance. A large number of students attend class in one room, which creates a challenge to teachers who become unable to implement the teaching-learning processes in an appropriate manner, hence affecting the learners’ academic performance. The teachers need support from their mentoreds to provide strategies and ensure that they understand effective classroom management, in order to manage the numbers for better results. Having many learners in one class is not a problem that can end soon in countries like India, therefore, on top of other strategies, joint problem solving and effective mentoring of teachers can make teachers work effectively with in the available situation. Once teachers are not effectively mentored on how to manage such big classes, they end up implementing such strategies the wrong way which affects learners’ academic performance (Maganga, 2016).

The case of Uganda is not any different from India and Ghana, academic performance in PLE has received considerable challenges that need to be addressed. These range from the failure of government to sufficiently staff schools to having teachers effectively deliver to the pupils. Despite the free education system, not many pupils have benefited through quality education, a few pupils from government funded schools can compete effectively with those from most private school. Although Uganda has been well known in the East African region for producing good quality teachers (Ssekamwa & Lugumba, 2010), attributed to a strong higher education sector that the country has, this proved not enough to achieve better academic performance among pupils in PLE.

According to the UNEB (2015), there is evidence that the way teachers in public primary schools in most parts of Uganda are teaching does not conform to the standards set by the National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC) and the Directorate of Education Standards (DES). Available records show that many teachers in public primary schools in most parts of Uganda hardly prepare schemes of work and lesson plans; and neither do they conduct sufficient practical lessons or give time for remedial classes for academically weak students (Ministry of Education & Sports [MoES], 2014a). These pedagogical practices are believed to be responsible for the poor performance of many students in the national examinations - year after year (UNEB, 2015).

The situation identified is typical to the schools in Mubende Municipality, in the west division. The public primary schools in the region have been characterized by poor performance in their PLE, as compared to their counterparts in private schools and in other divisions within the municipality. According to the Municipality Education Officer’s report (2019) PLE results released in 2018, reveal a big number of failures in the division. Out of the 162 PLE failures in the region, the West division contributed 86 failures that was a ratio of 8.9% of the total failures. The west division was also the last among the good performers in the three divisions. In all grades, the division recorded 12.94% first grades, which was the lowest in the municipality; 38.3% second grades and a higher number of third and fourth grades, 17.19% of the pupils in the municipality passed in grade III and 15.24% passed in grade IV.

Many studies have been conducted on how to improve academic performance of pupils, but a few have focused on the aspect of the effectiveness of support supervision in bringing about the desired academic performance in the Primary Leaving Examinations of schools in Uganda. Yet according to Young (2002), school support supervision is perceived as a major tool for both quality control and for improving the quality of education and has received wide support internationally. It is against this background that this study is being undertaken.

# 1.2 Statement of the Problem

Academic performance of learners has been attributed to the level to which the pupils can pass their primary leaving examinations (MOEs, 2014). The performance of a school is measured on how many first and second grades the school is capable of producing in the final exams (UNEB, 2015). However, there are a number of factors that contribute to performance of learners in the school setting, which, when not checked result into poor performance.

Academic performance of pupils in the West division schools of Mubende Municipality has received much attention in the recent past, especially in the Primary Leaving Examinations. The results released by the Uganda National Examinations Board for the year 2017 show that schools in the West division of Mubende Municipality are still lagging behind in performance when compared to their counterparts in the region. A number of pupils have been seen bringing results above the second division. According to the municipal’s Education Officer report (2018 and 2019), the west division was the last among the good performers in the three divisions that make up the municipality. In all grades, the west division recorded 12.94% first grades, which was the lowest in the municipality; 38.3% second grades and a higher number of third and fourth grades, that was 48.8%.

Although some schools in other regions of the Municipality have the same problem of poor performance of pupils in Primary Leaving Examinations, there is however relatively better results achieved by the private schools within the same regions. Among the factors believed to affect academic performance in schools cited by Sekamwa & Lugumba (2010) is the level, quality, consistency, and effectiveness of supervision. The current study therefore sets out to determine whether support supervision is responsible for the poor performance standards of the Western division schools of Mubende Municipality.

# 1.3 Purpose of the study

The main purpose of this study is to examine the impact of support supervision to teachers on pupils’ performance in Primary Leaving Examinations (PLE), in Mubende Municipality.

# 1.4 Objectives of the study

Specifically, the researcher seeks to:

1. To examine the rationale for support supervision to teachers in the West division of Mubende Municipality.
2. To identify the role of supervisors in relation to support supervision to teachers in the West division of Mubende Municipality.
3. To examine the various aspects of support supervision practiced by head teachers in the West division of Mubende Municipality.
4. To find out the frequency of support supervision in schools in the West division of Mubende Municipality.

# 1.5 Research questions

The study was guided by the following research questions

1. What is the rationale for support supervision to teachers in the West division of Mubende Municipality?
2. What are the roles of supervisors in relation to support supervision to teachers in the West division of Mubende Municipality?
3. Which aspects of support supervision do teachers and head teachers practice in the West division of Mubende Municipality?
4. What is the frequency of support supervision in schools in the West division of Mubende Municipality?

# 1.6 Hypothesis of the study

The null hypothesis below was tested;

H0: There is no significant relationship between support supervision to teachers and academic performance of pupils in the selected primary schools of the West division, Mubende Municipality.

# 1.7 Scope of the study

**Content scope of the study**

The study scope included impact of support supervision to teachers in promoting academic performance of learners primary schools.

**Time scope of the study**

The study examined records related to academic performance in Primary Leaving Examinations at the Municipality level for the period between 2016 to 2018. The study was conducted in the period between February 2019 to July 2019.

**Geographical scope of the study**

The geographical scope of the study was the West Division of Mubende Municipality in Mubende District. It is 133 kilometers along Kampala Fort Portal highway in the western part of Uganda.

# 1.8 Conceptual framework

This section conceptualizes the relationship between support supervision and the level of academic performance. Support supervision practices enhance the level of academic performance in the school. With the right support supervision practices, pupils’ performance is bound to improve.

**Independent Variable** **Dependent Variable**

**Level of Academic performance**

* PLE outcome
* Quality of Homework delivered
* Participation in class
* Participation in extracurricular activities

**Support Supervision**

Rationale of support supervision

* Improving Instruction
* Fostering Curriculum and Staff Development
* Encouraging Action Research

Role of supervisors

* Feedback to teachers
* Mentoring teachers
* Supporting collaboration

Aspects of supervision

* Internal reviews
* Ongoing monitoring
* Onsite training

Frequency of supervision

* Regular review of work
* Repetitive assignments
* Continuous development

**Intervening variables**

* Resources from government
* Quality of standards set by government
* Pupils’ welfare

**Source: Study literature**

Source: *developed by the researcher as guided by the works of Baffour-Awuah, (2011)*

# 1.9 Significance of the Study

It is envisaged that findings from the study may reveal supervisory shortfalls that influence the academic performance of pupils in PLE in the western division schools of Mubende Municipality. This exposition would help the department of Education to adopt workable supervisory measures or strategies that are likely to improve the performance of the pupils in PLE.

The study would provide information that is likely to be useful for the purposes of in-Service training for head teachers, circuit supervisors, teachers and other stakeholders in education in the district.

It may also serve as a reference material for policymakers to consider in the design of programs to pursue at the basic level of education that might yield encouraging PLE results.

# CHAPTER TWO

# LITERATURE REVIEW

# 2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature that cited by other authors in relation to support supervision and academic performance. The reviewed literature also takes into consideration the study variables. Therefore, the research gaps identified form the basis of this research.

# 2.2 Theoretical review

The study premised on two key theories: Collegial Supervision and Theory Y, as cited in Ankoma-Sey & Maina (2016).

**Collegial supervision theory**

Heads cannot work in isolation; heads cannot have a field day supervising all other things without having to supervise their staff, especially, teachers. More than a few authorities in the area of supervision recommend collegial processes as options for supervision of teachers (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). Promoting collegiality among teachers is an important way to help schools change for the better. According to them, collegial supervision refers to “the existence of high levels of collaboration among teachers and between teachers and principals and is characterized by mutual respect, shared work values, cooperation, and specific conversations about teaching and learning” Again, the cooperative professional development is explained as a process of fostering teacher growth through systematic collaboration with peers and includes a variety of approaches such as professional dialogue, curriculum development, peer observations and feedback, and action research projects. As observed by Igwe (2001), supervision involves a collective responsibility between the supervisor and the supervisee. The collegial supervision theory is therefore relevant to the current study because is emphasizes collective responsibility towards achieving the objective of the school.

**Theory Y**

Douglas McGregor’s Theory X and Y were not developed for the educational area; they were propounded for the industrial sector (Kelechukwu 2011). However, it is not misplaced to make use of his theoretical concepts in educational management. The theories can be modified to suit the educational situations based on the assumptions that the student cannot be considered as a worker and secondly, the classroom cannot be considered as a factory. Additionally, there are differences between teacher-student relationship and a manager-worker relationship. Looking at the following assumptions of Theory Y, management's role is to develop the potential in employees and help them to release that potential towards common goals. Thus;

i. Work is as natural as play and rest.

ii. People will exercise self-direction if they are committed to the objectives (they are NOT lazy).

iii. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.

iv. People learn to accept and seek responsibility.

v. Creativity, ingenuity, and imagination are widely distributed among the population. People are capable of using these abilities to solve an organizational problem.

vi. People have potential (McGregor, 1960).

In adapting Theory Y to the educational settings, “people” can mean “students” and hold that students will exercise self-direction if they are committed to the objectives, students learn to accept and seek responsibility, (Kelechukwu 2011). To spice it up, there are levels of supervision and others believe the purpose of supervision is helping teachers to be aware of their teaching and its consequences for their learners. Some researchers have also hypothesized that supervision is an act of encouraging human relations and teacher motivation and enabling teachers to try out new instructional techniques in a safe, supportive environment. the theory is therefore relevant to the current study since the main objective is to improve the academic performance of pupils in primary schools. Improving academic performance requires teachers with a positive attitude towards work.

# 2.3 The Concept of support supervision and the role of supervisors

The quality of teachers can be improved through continuous support supervision, it is one thing to produce qualified teachers and it is also another thing to ensure that the teachers are mentored and supported into the education system to ensure good results (Baffour-Awuah, 2011). Given the challenges they may encounter in the field, even the best performing teacher can be less productive if they are not offered the necessary continuous support while in the field. Support supervision provides a mechanism for teachers and supervisors to increase their understanding of the teaching-learning process through collective inquiry with other professionals. The purposes of support supervision thus can be grouped under the following themes: improving instruction; fostering curriculum and staff development; encouraging human relations and motivation; and encouraging action research and supporting collaboration. Support supervision was initially described as inspection, which has the connotation of direct control of teachers by school inspectors. The term support supervision has however, gradually taken over inspection, as a facilitative approach to supervision

Marzano, Frontier and Livingston (2011) maintain that the clergy were among the first supervisors used in schools and these individual supervisors or supervisory committees were charged with monitoring the quality of instruction. These supervisors had nearly unlimited power to establish criteria for effective instruction and to hire and fire teachers (Burke &Krey, 2005). Because there was no necessary agreement as to the importance or nature of pedagogical expertise, the quality and type of feedback to teachers was highly varied (Marzano, Frontier and Livingston, 2011).

Supervision is thus a method of teaching staff to act in more conscious ways, that provides teachers and supervisors with more information and deeper insights into what is happening around them (Raymond & Stanley 2019). This increases the options teachers have as they work with students. If the partnership between supervisors and teachers, teachers learn to identify and resolve their problems, while supervisors get a better idea about what is happening in different classrooms. This provides supervisors with more opportunities to think about their actions and emotions and to adopt conscious plans to improve the learning situation. Supportive Supervision in schools therefore guides teachers and administrators who want to create good school climates and a school culture that encourages professional growth and development among staff members. It uses a conferencing method to allow teachers, administrators, and students to discuss and reflect upon what they are doing inside the school building.

Some researchers suggest that supervision was historically viewed as an instrument for controlling teachers. Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) refer to the dictionary definition as to “watch over”, “direct”, “oversee”, and “superintend”. However, the researcher also believes that because the historic role of supervision has been inspection and control, it is not surprising most teachers do not equate supervision with the feeling of shared responsibility (collegiality). This negative consequence of external control of teachers’ work lives has resulted in the flight of both new and old teachers from education, (Ingersol, 2003).

Supervision is also viewed by other researchers as a combination of administrative procedures and supervision of instruction. The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), a division of UNESCO, observe that supervision practices can be classified under two distinct, but complementary, tasks: to control and evaluate, on one hand, and to advise and support teachers and headteachers (IIEP/UNESCO, 2007). The statement explains that “although the ultimate objective of in -school supervision is to improve the teaching/learning processes in the classroom, in practice it must cover the whole range of activities taking place in the school: from the most administrative ones (e.g. ensuring that records are properly completed) to purely pedagogical ones” (IIEP/UNESCO, 2007).

Oghuvbu (2001) mentions that supervision of instruction involves the process of checking the positive implementation of curriculum and assisting those implementing it. He conceives inspection and supervision differently, but complementary actions aimed at achieving organizational goals. To him, inspection deals with fact finding, and supervision is the assistance aspect concerned with the establishment of a positive superior and subordinate relationship, with special emphasis on specialization directed towards utilization of available human and material resources in achieving organizational goals.

In their review, Wanzare and da Costa (2000) mentions that several definitions of supervision of instruction in literature are unique in their focus and purpose, and fall into two broad categories: custodial and humanistic supervision. Citing Drake and Roe, Wanzare and da Costa (2000) note that the “custodial” definition of supervision can mean general overseeing and controlling, managing, administering, evaluating, or any activity in which the principal is involved in the process of running the school. However, according to Pfeiffer and Dunlap (also cited in Wanzare and da Costa, 2000) the “humanistic” definition suggests that supervision of instruction is multifaceted, interpersonal process that deals with teaching behavior, curriculum, learning environments, grouping of students, teacher utilization and professional development.

Contemporary definitions of supervision are more elaborate, and focus on the school as a learning community. Specifically, contemporary definitions of supervision of instruction emphasize individual and group development, professional development, curriculum development, and action research. Burke &Krey (2005) define supervision as instructional leadership that relates perspectives to behavior, focus on processes, contributes to and supports organizational actions, coordinates interactions, provides for improvements and maintenance of instructional program, and assesses goal achievements.

# 2.4 The rationale for support supervision to teachers

For supervision to benefit teachers, it must be effective, in a manner that it addresses the needs of the supervisee. Researchers conceptualize effective supervision not as an end result or product, but rather as the collection of knowledge and skills that supervisors possess. Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) posit that effective supervision requires well trained personnel with knowledge, interpersonal skills, and technical skills that are prepared to provide the necessary and appropriate guidance and support to the teaching staff. According to Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004), these personal attributes are applied through the supervisory roles of direct assistance to teachers, group development, professional development, and curriculum development and action research. They believe that “this adhesive pulls together organizational goals and teacher needs and provides for improved learning” (p. 9).

Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) propose that to facilitate effective supervisory processes supervisors should perform the following roles: providing personal development by providing on-going contact with the individual teacher to observe and assist him/her in classroom instruction; ensuring professional development by providing the learning opportunities for faculty provided or supported by the school and school system; and providing group development through the gathering together of teachers to make decisions on mutual instructional concern. Similarly, supervisors should support curriculum development through the revision and modification of content, plans and materials of classroom instruction.

Successful supervisors are those who link interpersonal skills with technical skills. Brennen (2008) notes an effective supervisor who links interpersonal with technical skills will be successful in improving instruction. He suggests that an effective supervisor should be able to build self-acceptance, moral, trust, and rapport between the two parties. Brennen suggests that the supervisor in an effective supervision process should not delve deeply into the role of a counselor. The focus is always on the teaching act, rather than matters affecting the teacher that are beyond the confines of the classroom. Objectivity, devoid of personal biases, should be the hallmark if supervision is to be effective, he asserts. It is for this reason that Brennen (2008) posits that effective supervision results when a supervisor clearly sets out the criteria to be used in the evaluative process and ensures that even if the final assessment is a negative one, the teacher will benefit from the exercise and leave with his self-esteem intact.

Oghuvbu (2001) believes that effective supervision involves adherence to bureaucratic processes to control and guide teachers. He identifies common determinants of effective supervision as: teachers and students working rigidly according to school time table, following school regulations, neat and decent environment, and proper student management and disciplined students. In addition, there should be delegation of duties by school heads, and positive, cordial, social and professional relationship among teachers. He suggests that there should be well-prepared current records and research findings in the school which the supervisor can use to guide teachers’ classroom practices.

According to Isa (2014), historically supervision helps in improving educational programs hence enabling teachers to achieve both qualitative and quantitative instructional delivery from the foregoing. Supervision is hence an indispensable variable in the teaching learning process as well as the overall school and educational objectives. However, the problems of inadequate funding of schools constitute lots of crises for the system. Van Deventer and Kruger (2003) stated that the elements of supervision are managing the curriculum and instruction, supervising teaching, monitoring and promoting learner progress. According to Boissiere (2004) the concern for quality has therefore been at the core of the motivating forces for support supervision in education. According to Kochhar (2005), achieving quality in education has increasingly become crucial in strategic improvement plans of developing countries especially in regards to those activities which are primarily and directly concerned with studying and improving the conditions which surround the learning and growth of pupils.

Fisher (2011) contends with the findings of Kochhar (2005), when the notes that a basic premise of support supervision is that a teacher’s instructional behavior affects student learning and growth. The schools’ support supervision system therefore should include all efforts of school officials directed to provide leadership to the teachers and other educational workers in the improvement of instruction. The improvement of teaching and learning in schools then becomes the general purpose of support supervision. This is why Akinwumiju and Agabi (2008) have highlighted functional similarities that supervision and inspection are administrative functions directed towards the efficient achievement of organizational goals. Their central purpose being to enhance productivity and both constitute tools for educational coordination. However, the authors still found differences, thus: the words “supervision” and “inspection” are often used to mean the same but they are two different concepts in terms of job content and scope.

Supervision is designed to achieve improvement in instruction, resolution of school constraints, maintenance of superordinate-subordinate cooperation, professionalism and autonomy of staff and achievement of intrinsic motivation while Inspection is carried out specifically to ensure that minimum standards are maintained in the basic activities of teaching and learning. This is with regards to content coverage, resource provision, maintenance of discipline and keeping of statutory records and accounts. It also provides opportunities to access the challenges confronting the school and the level of success achieved in the pursuit of school goals (Akinwumiju and Agabi, 2008).

Isa (2014) has on that note therefore, noted that the quality of education is adversely affected when the educational system is too loose and stakeholders are allowed to do whatever they like. A Laissez faire support supervisory system does not help the quality of education in primary schools as most people do not do what is right at the right time if there is no authority that stipulates what is to be done and also monitor them properly on the job. Achieving the purposes of improving support supervision in primary schools makes the achievement of the goals of primary education much easier. The effective improvement of instructional delivery and maintenance of standards in the school system are therefore enhanced through regular internal and external support supervision.

Ayodele (2002) is in agreement with Isa (2014) when he argued that schools are presently supervised by two categories of people, viz: (i) internal supervisors those within-the school, supervisors as principals, vice-principals and heads of departments: (ii) external supervisors those outside the school, supervisors as the formally designated officials from the inspectorate division of the Ministry of Education and the various Area or Zonal Education Offices, where the primary responsibility of the supervisors is to see that high standards are maintained and that schools are run in accordance with the laid down regulations. The supervision of personnel and materials in order to ensure the set minimum standards are attained, sustained and seen to meaningful impact on society (Uyanga, 2008).

Oriaife (2005) adds that quality support supervision is a baseline standard in education which can be measured on a scale of reference. It is an expression of standard or a means by which a certain set standard in education can be achieved. It could easily be deduced therefore that quality in education is a totality of the combination of such indispensable variables as quality support supervision, quality teachers, quality instructional materials and quality infrastructure (classrooms, seats, tables, chalkboards etc.). All these and more surely results quality product (pupil) who is exposed to a balanced and result oriented education, especially in their Primary Leaving Examinations.

# 2.5 The Aspects of support supervision

The cornerstone of support supervision is working with staff to achieve a common goal, monitor performance, identify and correct problems and proactively improve the quality of service as a way of being consistent while training supervisors, keen interest must be paid to the following key areas of the supervisory task. Thus;

Internal and external support; support supervision moves away from the traditional way of supervising teachers where only external supervisors are supposed to be recruited and designated to a given school by the regulatory authorities (Raymond & Stanley, 2019). A new aspect of supervision emanates that in addition to the external supervision they receive, requires staff from other departments from within the school to perform self-assessments and share ideas with fellow teachers on how to improve their teaching skills. They share weaknesses and solutions to overcome these weaknesses for better service delivery to the pupils. They receive prompt feedback on their challenges making internal supervision highly effective.

Period of supervision; another aspect of support supervision is that there is continuous activity. All year through the school utilizes on the expertise of teachers who guide fellow teachers in many aspects of life. The continuity in supervision helps to timely check any challenges, poor pedagogical skills and will help in weeding out incompetent teachers. This aspect of support supervision comes at a lesser cost to the school and yet remains effective because independent analysis is done by the supervisors and hence the quality of feedback is maintained (Wanzare& Da Costa, 2000).

Other notable aspects of support supervision is that there is observation of performance and comparison to standards, provision of corrective action and supportive feedback on performance, discussion with pupils, provision of technical updates or guidelines, onsite training, timely use of data and pupils input to identify opportunities for improvement, joint problem solving, follow up on previously identified problems (Raymond & Stanley, 2019).

# 2.6 The frequency of support supervision in schools

This will answer the question on the number of times that the supervisor has to interact with the supervisee. The frequency of supervision equals to the level of effectiveness of supervision in the teaching-learning process (Deebom, &Zite, 2016). The higher the frequency of supervision the higher the quality of results from the supervisee. However, there is need to take caution on the strategies to use during the supervisory process. Some people respond differently to the levels of supervision, too much supervision can as well be dangerous as it may create tension and fear among the subjects. On the other hand “little” supervision may result in low productivity to some people. Some people have the ability to supervise themselves whereas optimum hers have to be pushed.

According to Orenaiya et al. (2014), supervisors and inspectors in technical schools perform the functions of monitoring/overseeing/supervising and inspecting teachers and their teaching activities. It was further stressed that supervisors/inspectors are routinely required to visit schools to collect administrative data which is a prerequisite for any administrative functions of teachers’ posting, transfer, correspondence matters, settling disciplinary and disputes and regular visits to schools to do some things and also to observe teachers in the classroom and mostly check lesson notes and other records (school register, teachers’ time book etc). Frequent supervision and inspection will definitely reduced the rate of late coming to school by teachers and perpetual absentees from classes by teachers. Supervision in Rivers State technical college should be carried out jointly by the teachers, principal and ministry of education personnel. The teachers should supervise the students and report to the principal while the principal supervises the teachers for effectiveness and the ministry of education undertakes the final supervision of the student, teachers and the principal. When this is done, there will be enhancement in the effectiveness of teaching and learning process.

Recalling from the theory X and theory Y, employees under theory Y require minimum supervision and employees under theory X require maximum supervision (Kelechukwu 2011). It is therefore upon the supervisor to understand the abilities of the teachers in order to develop the most effective method of supervision. The frequency of supervision will be dependent on the characteristics of the teachers. In other cases, the frequency of supervision will be determined by the learning capacities of the supervisees. The supervisors will develop new techniques of operation and they will need to teach the supervisees these techniques. However, the number of times that the supervisors will have to repeatedly convey the message to the teachers will depend on the intellectual capabilities of the teachers. If the larger portion of teachers can grasp content so fast, then the number of times that the supervisor has to repeat himself will probably reduce as opposed to a situation when they cannot grasp new content (Orenaiya et al. 2014). Therefore, the way in which the supervisor packages information to the teachers will also impact on the speed to which the teachers will grasp the content.

# 2.7 The concept of academic performance

Ali et al. (2009), contented that academic performance plays an important role in producing the best quality leaders and manpower for the country thus being responsible for the country’s economic and social development. However, to achieve this, Crosnoe, Johnson & Elder, (2004) have noted the need to improve the quality of education. Educators, trainers, and researchers for quite a longtime have been interested in exploring variables that contribute to quality performance of learners. The variables whether inside or outside school that affect students’ quality academic achievement are categorized by Okioga (2013) as student factors, family factors, school factors and peer factors.

Shachar& Neumann (2010) are in support with the findings of Okioga (2013) when they observe that a lot of factors including effective supervision go to affect academic performance but these factors vary from person to person and country to country sometimes based on the administrative styles of school heads. They confirm that students’ performance depends on factors such as learning facilities, gender and age differences, etc. that can affect student performance. And the factors cited by Schachar& Neumann (2010) therefore are in line with the factors cited by Okioga (2013). Mushtaq and Khan (2012) also identified four factors that affect students’ academic performance, to include students’ communication skills, learning facilities, proper guidance and family stress. The findings of these researchers therefore are an indication that the factors affecting academic performance are both internal and external factors to the schools under study. However, none of the scholars have identified support supervision as one of the factors affecting academic performance in schools.

Much as the findings by Schachar& Neumann (2010) looked at effective supervision as one of the factors that can affect academic performance of learners, it did not specifically emphasize it in regards to the effectiveness of support supervision. Supervision in its sense is a broad term, but purposely for this study we need to understand how support supervision can be made effective towards improving academic performance of learners. On that note therefore, Raymond & Stanley (2019) have opined that supportive supervision is a learning situation for both teachers and their supervisors, often turning into unlearning old ideas and learning new ways of thinking and doing things. Therefore, to be considered effective, supervisors have to learn to trust the eyes and ears of teachers, while teachers have to trust that supervisors will use the information gathered to help teachers help themselves. The results will often be seen in more friendly way that is towards not only improving academic performance, but also improving collegial relations between supervisors and teachers towards a better understanding of classroom behavior this will make learners enjoy school and hence be able to complete their studies.

Notwithstanding the above observations, Adeyemi (2014) regards teachers as the hub of the educational system. Teachers therefore constitute an important aspect in students’ learning. Supporting this point, Ankoma-Sey&Maina (2016), argued that “the level of performance in any school is intimately related to the quality of its teachers” while “the quality of any school system is a function of the aggregate quality of teachers who operate it.” His argument was in agreement with Isa (2014) contention that competent teachers would improve effective teaching in schools. The question therefore arises on how to improve the quality of teachers.

# 2.8 Summary of reviewed literature and identified gaps

The studies by the various authors identified in this study on support supervision and academic performance have remarkable variations. These are identified in the studies of Baffour-Awuah, (2011), Isa (2014) among others and a lot of arguments, agreements and disagreements were noted.

The identified gaps are such that although Schachar& Neumann (2010) looked at effective supervision as one of the factors that can affect academic performance of learners, it did not specifically emphasize it in regards to the in depth aspects of support supervision. The identified gaps therefore are in line with the objectives of the current study.

# CHAPTER THREE

# METHODOLOGY

# 3.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the methodology used in the study. It provides an insight into the research design, area of study, description of the population, sampling techniques, data collection instruments, procedures for data collection data quality control and data analysis.

# 3.2 Research Design

The researcher used both qualitative and quantitative approaches which were used to capture insightful, clear and understandable information to form explanation and in-depth justifications statistically (Kothari, 2004). The study used descriptive, correlational and cross sectional research design. The study was descriptive because it describes the phenomenon as it exists at the time of the study while relying on responses, and opinions from the selected population (Kombo and Tromp, 2006), it was correlational because it established the relationship between support supervision and academic performance, it was cross-sectional because data was collected at one point in time among several respondents. The triangulation of the research design was done to mitigate the limitations of the study.

# 3.3 Location of the study

The study was limited to West Division of Mubende Municipality. The researcher selected this area because no research has been carried out in this Division and Mubende Municipality as whole. In addition, this area contains many schools of different categories / status depending on enrolment and ownership. Besides the Division has more schools compared to other Divisions hence representative of the municipality (See appendix III).

# 3.4 Population of the study

The population of the study was 84 respondents and consisted of the inspectors of schools, Associate Assessors, teachers, head teachers, deputy head teachers, MIS, & MEO, of Mubende Municipality. The population size was selected on the basis of their knowledge and involvement in the supervision system of schools in the municipality.

# 3.5 Sample size

The sample size used in the study consisted of 84 respondents.

# 3.6 Sampling Procedure

Purposive sampling was employed in selecting the required 84 members for the study. Purposive sampling was used because the study required inclusion of only those elements that best suit the purpose of the study. The method is also supported by Amin (2005) who states if respondents of a given class are below 100, then there is a census of respondents and questions. The unit of analysis was the selected schools in the west division of Mubende municipality and the unit of inquiry was the staff with knowledge and involvement in the supervision and academic performance in the selected schools. Table 1 shows the strata of the population and their respective sample size and sampling technique.

**Table 1: Showing sample size determination**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strata** | **Population** | **Sample size** | **Sampling technique** |
| MEO | 1 | 1 | Purposive |
| MIS  | 1 | 1 | Purposive |
| Inspectors  | 1 | 1 | Purposive |
| Associate Assessors | 3 | 3 | Purposive |
| Teachers  | 50 | 50 | Purposive |
| Deputy Head teachers  | 14 | 14 | Purposive |
|
| Head teachers  | 14 | 14 | Purposive |
| **TOTALS** | **84** | **84** |   |

# 3.6 Research Methods and Instrument

In this study, the survey research method was used to obtain responses from the respondents, this involved asking questions on the topic under study and thereafter describing their responses.

# 3.6.1 Questionnaire

The research instrument that was used to collect the data from the respondents was the self-administered questionnaire (See appendix I). The decision of the researcher to use the questionnaire is because all those respondents are literate and can respond to the questions. The questions were developed based on measurement items derived and utilized in previous research studies according to Onen (2016), but with a few modifications. The questionnaire was constructed in English language with closed ended questions in accordance with the study questions and objectives. The instrument was used because it is a means through which accurate information can be drawn out in the study of this kind where the variable under investigation requires statement of facts. This method gives the necessary information the researcher wants from the respondents.

This questionnaire was then divided into two sections A, B. Section A covers the background information of respondents including gender. Section B deals with the research questions. The level of support supervision was measured under dimensions of: the level of curriculum and staff development, sufficient resources, the level of human relations, motivation and support collaboration. On the other hand, the level of academic performance in PLE was measured under performance in PLE, homework, classroom participation and co-curricular activities. This was done in order to help the researcher to elicit for adequate information on the topic under study.

# 3.6.2 Interviews

The interview method was used for the study which requires identifying respondents and requesting them to answer questions as per the interview guide. The interview guide (see appendix II) was designed in line with the study objectives. The answers were written down and recorded in some instances. The most important was the ability to approach the identified respondent in person and persuade them to participate in the study as indicated by Kombo and Tromp (2006). The study used key informants who comprised of only those with necessary knowledge in the study area, thus the MEO, MIS, inspectors, associate assessors, deputy head teachers and head teachers

# 3.6.3 Document Reviews

A review of records kept at the selected schools was done to beef up the study findings. A documentary review was done on teachers’ lesson plans, notes, examination guides, public records from the MEOs and MIS. According to Bowen (2009) the use of documentary reviews assists in triangulation of data collection methods.

# 3.7 Data Quality Control

A number of methods was used during the process of data collection, to ensure reliability and validity of the study. These included suspension of personal prejudices and biases, systematic and accurate recording of the results. There was establishment of rapport with all the respondents which helped in establishing trust and hence able to collect the data.

# 3.8 Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

**Validity of the instruments**

The content validity index was used to ensure that all items address the intended research objectives. It was obtained by dividing the total number of relevant items with the total number of items in the research instrument as recommended by Kothari (2004), the CVI value determined was found greater than 0.6 and were hence considered valid.

**Reliability of the instruments**

To test reliability, a pre-test on 35 teachers from selected primary schools in the eastern division of Mubende municipality was carried out since it had similar characteristics with the study area. To carry out the pre-test valid 35 questionnaires were given to the teachers and later using a computer, their responses were captured. SPSS computer software version 23 was used to generate reliability coefficient (α) which was determined using Cronbach Alpha formula. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients obtained for each subscale of the questionnaire was 0.88. The questionnaire was considered reliable for final data collection.

**Table 2: Reliability of research instruments**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reliability Statistics** |
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|  .880 |  35 |

# 3.9 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher obtained a letter of introduction from the school of education, humanities and science of Nkumba University in order to enable him secure trust from the respondents. In order to get respondents to respond to the instrument on time, the researcher intends to make an initial contact explaining the objective of the dissertation and soliciting the respondents’ cooperation.

The researcher explained to the respondents the rationale and purpose of the study and appealing to them to participate in the study. The researcher took time to explain the items to the respondents to enhance the validity of the data. A number of follow ups were made to ascertain whether the respondents had completed the questionnaires. These visits were necessary because they provided an opportunity for further explanations to respondents who had some difficulties.

# 3.10 Data Analysis and Presentation

The validity and reliability of instruments, the appropriateness of data and adequacy of sample size was confirmed using SPSS. Valid data were used for further analysis to answer the objectives of the study. During data analysis, descriptive statistics and inferential analysis was used to present the results of the study. Descriptive analysis was used to answer the research objectives percentages and frequencies were used to analyze the data quantitatively. Pearson correlation was used to determine the relationship between support supervision and academic performance.

# CHAPTER FOUR

# PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

# 4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from the questionnaire and interview data. The questionnaire was divided into three sections: demographic data of the respondents, Likert scale items, and open-ended items. The findings from both instruments sought the opinions of supervisor) on how they experienced supervision of instruction in their schools, as well as how they thought supervision of instruction should be practiced to improve pupils’ academic performance.

The study obtained the demographic data of the respondents. The demographics sought were the gender, qualification, length of service, school type. The second part of the questionnaire was divided according to the research objectives. For each item, respondents were asked to indicate, their agreement or disagreement on how they thought it was being practiced. Responses on both sides of the questionnaire were arranged on a continuum from 1(Agree) to 2 (Disagree) respectively. To facilitate analysis and discussion, descriptive statistics was employed to find frequencies and percentages of responses. Pearson’s Chi-Square was used to determine whether observed differences in opinions between two groups of participants were statistically significant.

Comments from the interview guide together with findings from review of available records (documentary reviews) were presented and analyzed to support the findings from the questionnaires. These responses are therefore analyzed together with the open ended questions.

# 4.1 Demographic characteristics of the respondents by dominancy

An overview of the demographic characteristics of the study respondents is presented in Table 1 below.

**Table 3: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
| Gender | Male | 50 | 59.5 |
|  | Female | 34 | 40.5 |
| Qualification | Diploma | 35 | 41.7 |
|  | Bachelors | 29 | 34.5 |
|  | Post-graduate | 20 | 23.8 |
| Length of service | Less than 3 years | 12 | 14.3 |
|  | 3 to 10 years | 40 | 47.6 |
|  | 10 years above | 32 | 38.0 |
| School type | Government aided | 64 | 76.2 |
|  | Private  | 20 | 23.8 |
|  |  |  |  |

*Source:* Primary data

Results in Table 1 show that more male teachers (59.5%) participated in the study as compared to their female counterparts (40.5%). This suggests a gender disparity in employment of teachers in public secondary schools with more male teachers being employed compared to females. The results also show that the majority of the teachers (41.7%) in the sample had the requisite qualification (at least a diploma) to teach at primary school level. This shows that the teachers involved were knowledgeable in the context of the study. In relation to numbers of years spent in the schools, findings show that majority of the sampled teachers (52.3 %) had taught for more than three years in their respective schools. This indicated that the respondents had long standing cognate experience in serving as teachers. Results in the same table further reveal that of the teachers who participate in the study, 76.2% of them worked in government schools while 23.8% worked in private schools. This suggests that there are fewer teachers working in the private schools in the western division of Mubende Municipality.

# 4.2 The rationale for support supervision to teachers

**Table 4: The rationale for support supervision to teachers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Disagree | Agree |  |
| Evaluating teachers’ classroom instructional practices | 22 | 28 |  |
|  | (44%) | (56%) |  |
| Assessing teachers’ content knowledge | 21 | 29 |  |
|  | (42%) | (58%) |  |
| Ensuring teachers make good use of instructional time | 14 | 36 |  |
|  | (28%) | (72%) |  |
| Making informal visits to classrooms | 21 | 29 |  |
|  | (42%) | (58%) |  |
| Formally observing teaching and learning | 34 | 16 |  |
|  | (68%) | (32%) |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Source: Primary data

The results in the table above indicate that 56% of the respondents mentioned that support supervision helps in evaluating teachers’ classroom instructional practices, 58% mentioned that it helps in assessing teachers’ content knowledge, 72% mentioned that it ensures teachers make good use of instructional time, 58% observed that is enabled informal visits to classrooms. However, 68% said that it may not enable formal observation of teaching and learning.

The results further show differences in opinions on the rationale of supervision to teachers. The Chi-square test of significance revealed a statistically significant difference between teacher perceptions on the rationale of support supervision and the level to which supervisors inspected teachers’ instructional practices for errors (x2=16.164, df=3, p=0.002).

During the interviews, one head teacher observed that;

*“… supervisors ensure good use of instructional time, and this was a function they perform in their schools”.*

# 4.3 The role of supervisors in relation to support supervision to teachers

**Table 5: The role of supervisors in relation to support supervision to teachers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Disagree | Agree |  |
| The head teacher usually reviews my schemes of work | 8 | 42 |  |
|  | (16%) | (82.4%) |  |
| My head teacher gives constructive often comments on my scheme of work | 27 | 23 |  |
|  | (52.9%) | (45.1%) |  |
| My subject heads often reviews my schemes of work | 8 | 42 |  |
|  | (15.7%) | (82.4%) |  |
| My subject heads of department always review the lesson plans | 31 | 19 |  |
|  | (62%) | (38%) |  |
| My subject heads of department usually reviews my lesson notes | 30 | 20 |  |
|  | (60%) | 40%) |  |
| The head teacher regularly usually reviews sampled students’ notes | 29 | 21 |  |
|  | (58%) | (42%) |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Source: Primary data

Results in Table 4 indicate that to a large extent (82.4%), schemes of work are reviewed. However, only 45.1 % of the teachers’ schemes of work get constructive comments from head teachers. The discrepancy between the proportion of respondents whose schemes of work were regularly reviewed and those who got constructive comments from the head teachers, suggests that the administrators were not adequately reviewing the schemes of work. Results also indicate that; only 38% of the lesson plans are reviewed to ensure relatedness to the syllabi, 40% of the teachers’ lesson notes are reviewed, and 42 % of the sampled students’ notes are reviewed. The results reveal that with regard to teacher preparation, school authorities place more emphasis on review of schemes of work than the lesson plans and teacher’s lesson notes. These findings suggest that school authorities were keen on the teachers’ completion of the syllabi and learner assessments. There was a statistically significant difference between teachers’ opinions on this aspect (x2=11.360, df=3, p=0.010).

Findings from the review of documents were in agreement with the results in Table 4. Most of the schemes of work reviewed had signatures of the head teachers but hardly had comments from the head teachers.

The inspector during interviews stated that;

*“…All teachers are obliged to make schemes of work and lesson notes at the beginning of the academic term in accordance with the guidelines of the Ministry of Education, and Sports. The teachers are required to submit the schemes of work and lesson notes to the head teacher through the subject head of department at the beginning of every term for review”*

However, a scrutiny of the teachers’ lesson notes showed that only a handful of them had signatures or school stamps to show that they had been reviewed by the administrators. In relation to review of the teachers’ record of work, moderation of tests and examinations, and review of students’ results and records, one head teacher observed during interview that:

*“…Performance of schools is not measured by how well teachers teach, but by how students perform in national examinations. It is therefore critical to ensure early completion of the syllabi, setting of standard tests and examination questions and close monitoring of the students’ academic performance in the termly examinations.”*

# 4.4 Aspects of support supervision teachers and head teachers practice

**Table 6: Aspects of support supervision teachers and head teachers practice**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Disagree | Agree |  |
| Using variety of teaching methods | 20 | 30 |  |
|  | (40%) | (60%) |  |
| Revising homework exercises with students | 17 | 33 |  |
|  | (34%) | (66%) |  |
| Returning marked scripts in time | 19 | 31 |  |
|  | (38%) | (62%) |  |
| Help students make corrections | 12 | 38 |  |
|  | (24%) | (76%) |  |
| Assessing students’ prior knowledge | 13 | 37 |  |
|  | (26%) | (74%) |  |
| Making schemes of work | 18 | 32 |  |
|  | (36%) | (64%) |  |
| Making lesson plans | 27 | 23 |  |
|  | (54%) | (46%) |  |

Source: Primary Data

Results in Table 5 show that 60% used a variety of teaching methods, 66% revise homework exercises with students, 62% returned marked scripts before giving the next test, 76% made corrections whenever they returned marked scripts, 74% of the teachers assessed the students’ prior knowledge and skills, and 64% of the respondents made schemes of work. These findings suggest that teachers, to a great extent, exhibit effective pedagogical practices in the selected primary schools of Mubende municipality. However, results also show that only 46% of the respondents make lesson plans. These suggest that several teachers in the schools do not make lesson plans but probably rely on schemes of work. Results in Table 5 also show that whereas teachers regularly give homework and class exercises to learners, only 66% revise marked homework with their learners. These results further suggest that teachers are more vigilant when it comes to assessment of tests than the assessment of class exercises and homework. A Chi-square test showed there were no statistically significant differences between teachers’ opinions on this aspect of supervision (x2=6.234, df=3, p=0.101).

During the review of some performance reports prepared by the head teachers, it was discovered that although schemes of work were made at every beginning of the term, most schemes of work lacked evidence of planning for teaching or learning aids and use of learner-based methods of teaching. Scrutiny of the schemes of work revealed that most teachers did not refer to the NCDC guidelines that emphasized learner-based approaches of teaching and practical teaching of science subjects. In fact, with regard to making lesson plans, analysis of interview data revealed that teachers perceived making lesson plans as a waste of time; hence, many of them relied mainly on lesson notes and text books in order to teach.

As one head teacher observed during the interviews;

*“teachers only make lesson plans during their teaching practice and when they expect inspectors from DES. To them, making lesson plans only wastes their time. It is an unfortunate practice - but one that we have learnt to cope with*”. This implies that some teachers employ undesirable pedagogical practices with the complete knowledge of their supervisors.

With regard to using a variety of teaching methods and specifically learner-based methods of teaching, the head teachers explained that teachers often find it difficult to go by the NCDC guidelines because they would not be able to complete the syllabi in time for the national examinations.

One head teacher during the interviews described the situation as:

*Teachers shun learner-based methods of teaching because these methods consume a lot of time. The teachers cannot complete the syllabi if they are to follow the NCDC guidelines*. However, mathematics and science teachers, to a certain extent, use learner-based methods of teaching since these subjects are practical in nature.

These meant that the teachers’ pedagogical practices were skewed towards doing what could be considered undesirable; thus ineffective practices.

**4.5 The frequency of support supervision in schools**

**Table 7: The frequency of support supervision in schools**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Disagree | Agree |
| The subject heads regularly observes my teaching | 22 | 28 |
|  | (44%) | (56%) |
| My subject head usually gives immediate feedback after the lesson observation | 19 | 31 |
|  | (38%) | (62%) |
| I always plan with my subject head of department for the lesson observation | 32 | 18 |
|  | (64%) | (36%) |
| I regularly hold discussions with my subject head of department after the lesson observation | 29 | 21 |
|  | (58%) | (42%) |
| Inspectors from the Ministry of Education usually supervise the way I teach | 28 | 22 |
|  | (56%) | (44%) |
| I regularly get feedback whenever the Ministry officials supervise me | 31 | 19 |
|  | (62%) | (38%) |
|  |  |  |

Source: Primary Data

Results in Table 6 indicate that 56% of the teachers’ lessons were observed by subject heads and only 44% by Ministry of Education officials. These imply that lesson observations are mostly conducted by subject heads of department probably because they have an in-depth understanding of the subject areas. Furthermore, findings show that only 62% of the teachers got feedback on the lesson observations from subject heads of department, and 38% from Ministry’s officials. These imply that less than 50% of the teachers whose lessons were observed ever got feedback from the supervisors. With regard to teachers planning lessons with their subject heads, the results show that 36% do so with the observation of their subject heads and only 42% hold discussions with subject heads during their lessons. The findings imply that majority of the teachers do lesson planning without their supervisors.

A larger proportion of teachers therefore reported they always experienced supervision from their immediate superiors. A Chi-square test of significance showed statistically significant differences between the opinions of teachers on how often supervisors evaluated their classroom practices (x2=10.207, df=3, p=0.017).

Analysis of interview data revealed that head teachers of non-government schools did not see the necessity of conducting classroom observations unless when students or parents complained about the quality of teaching of a particular teacher. When one head teacher of a non- government school was asked how often he carried out classroom observation, she said:

 *…the teachers posted to this school know exactly what is expected of them as per the posting instructions; and since they are all university graduates, they should be able to learn the culture of quality teaching that they have found here. I do not think it is really necessary to go and sit in their classes to observe how they teach. Maybe when students or their parents complain….* Yet, findings from interview with head teachers of government schools revealed that classroom observations were more pronounced in these schools because teachers taught in several schools or were engaged in other income generating activities. One head teacher of a government school for instance had this to say during an interview:

*…our teachers earn only government salary; we do not pay monthly allowances like our colleagues in the Non-government schools because we are not supported by parents through the Parents Teachers’ Associations (PTA). And because of this, our teachers teach in several private schools to raise extra income and many times miss teaching learners in their “mother” schools. As a head teacher, I have to closely monitor the teachers by walking around the school and conducting regular lesson observations in order to ensure that my students are taught well.*

These recorded responses implied that different schools approached the issue of supervision of teachers differently; that is, while some head teachers preferred short frequent visits to classrooms to whole lesson observations because these kept them abreast with what was happening in the classrooms, others did not. In fact, one head teacher during the interview remarked;

*“… short visits to classroom update me on what is exactly happening in the classrooms and helps me to ensure that the teaching and learning process goes on as expected…”.* Several head teachers interviewed acknowledged that it was important to discuss with the individual teachers immediately their lessons were observed. Indeed, some head teachers also revealed that they used the “teacher monitoring tool” which is a form given to students to indicate teacher attendance, punctuality, and time on task to conveniently monitor what was going on in the classroom. These forms, according to the head teachers, were given to students on Monday morning and collected on Friday evening for analysis. When asked about the type of action that is taken after the monitoring forms were analyzed, one head teacher said,

*“…the names of the teachers who miss lessons are read during the assembly at the beginning of every week. I have found this to work well because most teachers do not want to have their names read at assembly.”* This finding implied that certain head teachers were reluctant to provide teachers with relevant feedback when they are supervised in a supportive and collegial approach.

**4.6 Relationship between support supervision and academic performance**

# Relationship between support supervision and academic performance in primary schools of Mubende Municipality

Table 8: Relationship between support supervision and academic performance in primary schools of Mubende Municipality

|  |
| --- |
| **Correlations** |
|  | TT Academic performance | TT Support supervision  |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .414\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .001 |
| N | 60 | 60 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | .414\*\* | 1 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level (2-tailed). |

There is a significant linear positive relationship between support supervision and academic performance (r = 0.414, p = 0.001). The findings imply that an improvement in quality of support supervision improves the level of academic performance in primary schools of Mubende Municipality. This also means that, based on the results, decisions based on supervision can affect academic performance of pupils. Since the overall effect of supervision in schools must result in academic performance, it is likely that heads do not really understand their roles as supervisors because the results contradicts Isa (2014) assertion that supervision provides a mechanism for teachers and supervisors to increase their understanding of the teaching-learning process through collective inquiry with other professionals. Though respondents are very qualified in their capacities, on the flip side, one may agree that they lack the requisite training or professional skills in supervision and this is consistent with Gordon (2004) who posits that supervision requires well trained personnel with knowledge, interpersonal skills, and technical skills who are prepared to provide the necessary and appropriate guidance and support to the teaching staff.

**4.7 Verification of the research hypothesis**

Table 9: verification of the research hypothesis

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Coefficients | P-value | Lower bound | Upper bound |
| Classroom observation | 4.1 | 0.000 | 3.598 | 4.699 |
| Feedback | 2.3 | 0.000 | 1.814 | 2.697 |
| Performance achievement  | 0.03 | 0.788 | -.169 | 2.697 |
| School status | 0.55 | 0.038 | -.053 | .869 |
| Gender | 0.03 | 0.900 | -.436 | .496 |
| Educational level | -0.26 | 0.146 | -.6189 | .092 |
| Duration | -0.32 | 0.012 | -.579 | -.071 |
| Subject type | 0.01 | 0.94 | -.444 | .459 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

PseudoR2 =0.722; Number of respondents = 84; LR χ2 (11) = 1403.92; Prob> χ2 =0.0000

Results in Table 8 show that all the 84 observations were used in the analysis. The likelihood ratio chi-square of 1403.92 with a p-value of 0.000 (ρ < 0.05) indicates that the model as a whole was statistically significant compared to the null model with no predictors. Pseudo R2 = 0.722 means that the explanatory variables in the model explained 72.2% variability in teacher pedagogical practices and 27.8% variability is explained by other unknown factors. In the model, classroom observations, feedback the category of school and the number of years a teacher taught in the school were found to be statistically significant (ρ < 0.05) in explaining variations in pedagogical practices. Meanwhile, performance achievement, status of the school, gender, level of education, and category of subject taught did not significantly explain variations in the pedagogical practices (p > 0.05) of teachers. Further findings also indicated that classroom observation has the greatest influence on pedagogical practices (odd ratio = 4.1) followed by feedback (odd ratio = 2.3). In addition, the results in Table 8 also indicated that a shift from one category to a higher category of the duration a teacher taught in a school, resulted into a 0.32 unit decrease in the ordered log odds. This meant that with other predictors held constant, pedagogical practices became poorer with the increasing number of years a teacher had taught in a school. This could be attributed to the teachers becoming complacent to the work situation. The results also showed that a unit increase in the category of schools (shift from government coded 1 to non-government coded 2) resulted into a 0.55 unit increase in the effectiveness of pedagogical practices. This meant that pedagogical practices were better in non-government schools as compared to their counterparts in government schools. Based on the findings in Table 8, the null hypotheses: Ho1: there is no significant effect between support supervision and academic performance was thus rejected. The results thus imply that instructional supervision significantly explains variations in the academic performance of learners.

# CHAPTER FIVE

# INTERPRETATION OF MAJOR FINDINGS

# 5.0 Introduction

This chapter is comprised of two sections. The first section briefly summarizes the major findings for each of the five research questions which guide the study. The second part discusses the major findings and relates them to the literature reviewed in Chapter Two.

# 5.1 Summary of Results

1. What is the rationale for support supervision to teachers?
2. What are the roles of supervisors in relation to support supervision to teachers?
3. Which aspects of support supervision do teachers and head teachers practice?
4. What is the frequency of support supervision in schools?

**Question One: What is the rationale for support supervision to teachers?**

The study revealed that support supervision was done by both their heads and external supervisors. It was found that supervision is mostly done to ensure that the quality of teaching standards is maintained through evaluation of teachers’ instructional practices, assessing their content knowledge, ensuring that teachers utilize their instructional time. The supervisors ensured that this is done through making formal and informal visits to classrooms. Therefore, the study revealed that support supervision was vital in ensuring that the teachers materially utilize their time at school to follow the right procedures of instruction, through lesson planning, making lesson notes to ensure that the learners are taught exactly what is on the syllabi.

**Question Two:** What are the roles of supervisors in relation to support supervision to teachers?

The study revealed that supervisors enables teachers to review their schemes of work, lesson notes and students notes. Supervisors in the study seemed to relate well with their teachers and provided some forms of assistance and support to teachers. These supervisors however could not give frequent comments on the scheme or their teachers’ work / performance, did not review lesson plans and lesson notes.

**Question Three: Which aspects of support supervision do teachers and head teachers practice?**

Teachers use a variety of teaching methods that are subject to evaluation by their superiors. Among the various methods was revising homework exercises with students, returning marked exam scripts in time and help the students make corrections. The study also revealed that the dimensions of assessing student prior knowledge on a subject matter, making schemes of work and ability to make lesson plans were also major considerations in offering support supervision. The study revealed that teachers wanted collaboration from their supervisors and share ideas on how to improve the various aspects of their work in order to improve students’ academic performance. Teachers and heads agreed that supervisors and teachers should plan for lesson observations together. Teachers in particular, wanted their head teachers to inform them prior to lesson observation.

**Question Four: What is the frequency of support supervision in the schools?**

Teachers and heads were consistent about the frequency with which they experienced support supervision. Subject heads regular observed teachers while teaching, planning lessons was done with supervisors, regular discussions with supervisors after observing their lessons. However, the frequency of visits from the external supervisors was still lacking. However, a majority of both groups would like supervisors to practice all the contemporary supervisory practices described in the literature more often than they currently experience.

# 5.2 Discussion of research findings

# 5.2.1 Rationale of support supervision

The immediate purpose of this study is to better understand the practice of support supervision in Ugandan public primary schools. This purpose, however, is undergirded by a larger purpose: that of improving student learning through improvements in supervising teachers’ instructional practices. One important way of achieving that improvement (after teachers complete their initial preparation) is via appropriate on-the-job supervision, training and development (i.e. instructional supervision). This section, therefore, discusses instructional supervision practices and behavior that contemporary researchers believe has the potential to improve instruction in schools (Blasé &Blase, 2004). This section is presented to serve as a foundation for the study’s conclusions and recommendations.

Empirical research studies have shown that contemporary support supervision practices have the potential to improve instruction and the entire school environment (Sergiovanni, 2009). However, while a direct relationship between contemporary supervision and improved teaching has been established, the further link to improved student outcomes is much more tenuous (Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006). Nevertheless, most researchers and practitioners believe that supervision can improve student learning via improved teaching. Researchers have suggested various supervisory practices and behavior which are likely to guide and equip teachers with the skills and competencies capable of improving their instructional practices and, which ultimately are likely to improve student outcomes (Sergiovanni, 2009).

One important aspect of supervision which researchers have theorized and shown empirically can improve instructional practices is informal visits to classrooms, also called “walk through” (Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Rous, 2004). Researchers have found that such visits provide supervisors the opportunity to identify areas where teachers have difficulties and/or need improvement. Such knowledge helps supervisors provide assistance and support to teachers individually and in groups. Similarly, supervisors’ physical presence in the classrooms affords teachers the opportunity to seek assistance from supervisors, boost their morale and confidence, and encourages them to strive to improve student achievement.

This supervisory behavior (informal visits to classrooms) is not peculiar to schools of Mubende municipality. The research literature shows that supervisors in US primary schools also used such visits to encourage and assist their teachers to improve instruction. For example, Blasé and Blasé (2004) and Rous (2004) noted that supervisors’ frequent visits to classrooms helped boost teachers’ morale, and made their presence felt in the schools. Rous noted that such visits, which are usually not planned, put teachers on the alert to ensure that they make good use of instructional time. In her study, Rous found that teachers in Kentucky public primary schools whose supervisors dropped by the classrooms to interact with the students felt energized, while those teachers who experienced a lack of contact with their supervisors were negatively affected. Such supervisors’ visits may create opportunities for teachers to solicit assistance and support from them. Similarly, heads may use their visits to identify areas in instructional practices for which teachers might need guidance and support. The findings from this study suggest that supervisors visited classrooms primarily to check teachers’ regularity and punctuality to class, and their performance of teaching-related duties, rather than providing instructional guidance and support.

Another important aspect of supervision advocated by researchers is the pre-observation conference. Researchers have empirically shown that pre-observation conferencing between supervisors and teachers improve teachers’ instructional practices (Pansiri, 2008). When teachers and supervisors plan lesson observations together, teachers become aware of what will be observed, and the time and method of observation. During such meetings, supervisors discuss with teachers the areas they want them (teachers) to improve. Such meetings provide opportunities for teachers to prepare adequately and feel confident during lesson presentation and ultimately, provide the basis for improvement in teachers’ instructional strategies and practices.

An equally important aspect of supervision advocated by researchers is feedback. Feedback that is non-judgmental and/or not characterized by fault-finding has potentially positive effects on teacher motivation, self-esteem, efficacy, and sense of security (Blasé & Blasé, 2004). Feedback focused on classroom behavior encourages teachers to reflect upon their performances and re-evaluate their strategies to improve student learning. These researchers also believe that suggestion is given by supervisors during post-observation meetings strongly enhance teachers‟ reflective behavior and their thought processes, and also enhance their planning to improve instruction.

Contemporary researchers of supervision have also found benefits in the provision of professional literature to guide teachers’ instructional practices (Tyagi, 2009). Providing materials about instruction can increase teachers’ repertoire of knowledge and equip them with new strategies and skills to improve their instructional practices.

Demonstrating teaching techniques and providing in-service training for teachers to improve their instructional practices are also considered important aspects of supervision (Blasé & Blasé, 2004; and Pansiri, 2008).

These researchers have found that teachers tend to learn new ideas about instructional supervision from these programs. These activities increase teachers’ repertoire of knowledge and skills, enhance their reflective behavior, and foster their sense of creativity and innovation (Blasé & Blasé, 2004). Teachers are, therefore, in a better position to plan their lessons well and manage their classrooms effectively, both of which are likely to improve student achievement.

# 5.2.2 Aspects / approaches to supervision

Supervisors in this study employed an authoritarian approach consistent with the clinical supervision model. This may be explained by a number of factors. Firstly, absence of a system, where supervisors give the teachers feedback of their scheme of work, lesson plans and lesson notes.

Teachers wanted their supervisors to continue directing them how they should teach, as well as inspecting teachers’ instructional practices. But there seemed to be some inconsistencies in teachers’ responses to this approach.

On the one hand, teachers reported satisfaction with the frequency with which supervisors employed some aspects of supervision, but on the other hand they expressed dissatisfaction about the way their supervisors always queried, found fault with their work, imposed ideas on them, and corrected their mistakes in the presence of pupils. These views of teachers suggest that supervisors’ approaches closely align with a traditional supervision (supervision as inspection) model (Sullivan &Glanz, 2000). Supervision was formally viewed as an instrument for controlling teachers, and it seems that inspectors or supervisors in some countries continue to fulfill their tasks using an authoritarian approach (Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2004).

In Mubende this supervisory approach might make teachers reluctant to have their lessons observed, as reported by some of the heads. The situation may also discourage teachers to seek advice, assistance and instructional support from their heads (supervisors). Equally importantly, teachers may not be likely to try out new ideas (innovation) to improve their instructional practices under such circumstances. The situation may also lead to loss of trust and confidence, resulting in discontent among teachers. The implication is that supervision in Ugandan public primary schools would not be effective and would therefore be likely to impact negatively on student outcomes. Providing training programs and guidelines about contemporary supervisory behavior may guide improvements in practice.

It must also be acknowledged that head teachers in this study may not view their approach as authoritarian, but rather as a way of helping teachers, especially new and inexperienced ones. In the interviews, head teachers remarked that they did not go into classrooms to find fault with their teachers, but to provide assistance, and in their attempts to correct the teachers some of them became angry. All of the ten heads acknowledged that they did not supervise all of the teachers in the same manner, but rather paid much more attention to new and inexperienced teachers. Teacher and head teacher participants in this study would like more contemporary aspects of supervisory practices than they currently experience. Both teachers and heads agreed on the frequency with which teachers should be supervised. Head teachers’ contention that they supervised different categories of teachers according to their level of experience and needs suggests that they employed a differentiated model of supervision. Teachers in this study agreed that all teachers should be supervised according to the individual teacher’s level of experience and professional background.

Evidence from the interviews and survey indicate that teachers and heads in this study may unconsciously embrace the concept of differentiated approach to supervision. This implies that if heads in the current study are able to effectively and frequently provide direct assistance and support to individual teachers taking into account their uniqueness, needs and experiences, then supervision at this level will most likely improve and, consequently, also raise the likelihood of improved student achievement.

# 5.2.3 The frequency of support supervision in the schools

Teaching-related activities which supervisors must out into consideration for continuous refresher training include preparation of lesson plans, the number of exercises given, marked, and corrections made, and keeping of continuous assessment records, which all have to be done regularly, as and when they fall due. Lesson plan preparation is an important activity in Ugandan public schools, and teachers are aware that they are likely to lose their job if they fail to prepare lesson plans. The assumption may be that a well-prepared lesson plan which is effectively followed would lead to improved student learning. But USAID (2010) has observed that in countries where regular supervision and inspection systems exist, personnel are moving away from low-inference measures of preparation and performance like adherence to a standardized lesson plan and the use of attendance registers to an approach that engages teachers in discussions for improvement in student outcomes. The implication is that education authorities in the municipality should not emphasize frequency of supervision, but rather strive to improve supervisor skills in contemporary supervisory practices in order to improve instruction in schools. Such that no matter the number of times the teachers get supervised, a single phase of supervision can yield positive results more than multiple times that a teacher is supervised. This is not only cost effective but result oriented towards better academic performance.

The findings of this study also indicate that supervisors rarely engaged their teachers in formal meetings. Empirical studies have shown that some supervisors in other countries promoted collaboration among their teachers to improve instruction; this practice could be replicated among the various primary schools in Mubende municipality. In the US, Blasé and Blasé (2004) found that supervisors’ modeled teamwork, provided time for teams to meet regularly, and advocated the sharing of ideas, this was important in achieving togetherness, joint problem solving and working as a team increased their motivation.

Collaboration therefore resulted in increased teacher motivation, self esteem, efficacy and reflective behavior such as risk taking, instructional variety and innovation/creativity. In India, Tyagi (2009) found that in government and private-aided senior secondary schools, principals provided opportunities for teachers to meet with other teachers in their own disciplines and also with teachers from different schools to discuss their programs. Evidence from this study survey and interviews suggests that heads (supervisors) might have encouraged, but not promoted collaboration among teachers and between teachers and their heads. The current situation in the various primary schools in Mubende municipality cannot therefore be characterized as a true “learning community” as advocated in the literature. DuFour (2004) suggests that formal teams must have time to meet during the workday and throughout the school year.

# CHAPTER SIX

# CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

# 6.0 Introduction

In this chapter the study will put in a nutshell the crux of the research. The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of teachers and head teachers in public primary schools in Mubende about how they conceptualized support supervision. The study also sought to discover the aspects of instructional supervision teachers and head teachers want to practice. The following research questions were posed to guide the study:

1. What is the rationale for support supervision to teachers?
2. What are the roles of supervisors in relation to support supervision to teachers?
3. Which aspects of support supervision do teachers and head teachers practice?
4. What is the frequency of support supervision in schools?

The conclusions derived from the findings emerging from the study are discussed under the following areas: the rationale of support supervision; the role of supervisors in relation to support supervision and the frequency of support supervision in schools.

# 6.1 Conclusion

1. The rationale for support supervision to teachers in the West division of Mubende Municipality.

It was revealed that instructional supervision through classroom observations is the most critical factor in enhancing pedagogical practices.

2. The role of supervisors in relation to support supervision to teachers in the West division of Mubende Municipality.

The study revealed that supervisors enhance effective instructional supervision through classroom observations that are collaboratively planned by both the supervisors and teachers followed by feedback that is communicated in a collegial and supportive manner.

3. The aspects of support supervision practiced by head teachers in the West division of Mubende Municipality.

The study revealed that keen review of schemes of work and lesson plan preparation and continuous checking of students’ note books for relatedness and syllabus coverage and giving feedback on the performance parameters were the main aspects of support supervision

4. The frequency of support supervision in schools in the West division of Mubende Municipality.

It was revealed that there is periodic review of teacher’s work, however more supervision has been done internally by subject heads and the head teachers. There was no evidence of consistent inspection from external resource personnel.

# 6.2 The Recommendations

Based on the above findings, discussion and conclusions, the researchers made the following recommendations;

1. The school board supervisors and inspectors should try and exhibit, establish a cordial relationship between them and the teachers to avoid dictatorial pattern of supervision, unsmiling determination towards the teacher and looking down on teachers with resentment and suspicion.
2. The government of Uganda should increase on the non-wage budgetary allocations to the education sector to cater for recruitment of more inspectors and procuring facilities for mobility of inspectors.
3. The Ministry should provide regular in-service trainings to head teachers and subject heads on classroom observations and portfolio supervision.
4. The head teachers through the subject heads should ensure that teacher preparation is in tandem with NCDC’s guidelines and what is taught corresponds to what is prepared.
5. School supervisors, inspectors and teachers should be carefully selected base on higher and professional qualifications, level of experience in order to foster effective teaching and learning process in primary schools

# 6.3 Suggestions for Further Studies

The present study did not delve much into supervisor-supervisee relationships, which would be interesting to examine. Sullivan and Glanz (2000) have advised that good supervisors must relate well to people, be flexible and open-minded. Rous (2004) found empirically that respectful relationships can improve teaching. In this study almost all of the ten teachers interviewed and a majority of teachers and head teachers in the survey reported that supervisors established good inter-personal relationships with their teachers. However, a majority of teachers in response to the survey also indicated that supervisors found fault, corrected teachers’ mistakes in the presence of pupils, queried, and imposed ideas on them.

These results suggest that the supervisors’ behaviour during lesson observations and at other times of the school day differed. Further studies on supervisory relationships between supervisors and teachers using interview and observation instruments would also provide education authorities a better understanding of supervisors’ behavior and teachers’ needs and expectations.

Glanz, Shulman and Sullivan (2006) referred to Witziers, Bosker and Kruger’s observation that making a connection between supervision and student achievement has been elusive and tenuous. In this study, the municipal head of supervision noted that schools with strong headships excelled in the Basic Education Certificate Examination. Since there is no empirical study to that effect, I suggest that correlation studies could be conducted to better understand the relationships between instructional supervision and student achievement.

Researchers could also use document analysis (reports and research findings) and secondary analyses of previously collected data (e.g., test results) procedures to conduct studies in this area. Such studies could further inform policy makers about the need to improve instructional supervision in schools.
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# APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

**A: Questionnaire**

**Dear Participant**,

I am Kaabunga Asaph a student of Nkumba University currently undertaking a study on **“The impact of supervision in promoting quality education in primary schools**”. I kindly request you to fill in this questionnaire as diligently as possible and the responses that you will give during this study will be used for academic purposes only. Thank you for agreeing to help me by completing this anonymous survey which should take less than twenty minutes. Please feel free to indicate your opinion because no response is treated as wrong.

Signed

KAABUNGA ASAPH

**Participant Consent**

I have read the information about the purpose of study of this survey. Any questions I have about the research have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to take part in this research. By handing over the survey to the researcher, I give my consent for the results to be used in the research. I am aware that this survey is anonymous and does not contain any details which may personally identify me by the research.

I know that I may change my mind and withdraw my consent to participate at any time; and I acknowledge that once my survey has been submitted it may not be possible to withdraw my data.

I understand that the researcher will treat all information I provide confidential and will not release it to a third party unless required by law to do so by law.

I understand that no information which can specifically identify me will be published as part of the findings.

**Signature**

**SECTION A**

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Please insert/tick details or circle the appropriate category for you**.

1. Gender of respondent: Male Female
2. Level of qualification

Diploma

Bachelors

Post graduate

1. Length of service

Less than 3 years

3 to 10 years

10 years and above

1. School type

Government aided

Private

**SECTION B: SUPPORT SUPERVISION IN SCHOOLS**

Please tick your answer in the box corresponding to your choice to indicate whether you Strongly Agree (**A)=1**, Agree (**DA)** = 2, Disagree (D) = 3, Strongly Disagree (SD) = 4

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statement** | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **The rationale for support supervision to teachers** |  |  |  |  |
| Evaluating teachers’ classroom instructional practices |  |  |  |  |
| Assessing teachers’ content knowledge |  |  |  |  |
| Ensuring teachers make good use of instructional time |  |  |  |  |
| Making informal visits to classrooms |  |  |  |  |
| Formally observing teaching and learning |  |  |  |  |
| **The role of supervisors in relation to support supervision to teachers** |  |  |  |  |
| The head teacher usually reviews my schemes of work |  |  |  |  |
| My head teacher gives constructive often comments on my scheme of work |  |  |  |  |
| My subject heads often reviews my schemes of work |  |  |  |  |
| My subject heads of department always review the lesson plans |  |  |  |  |
| My subject heads of department usually reviews my lesson notes |  |  |  |  |
| The head teacher regularly usually reviews sampled students’ notes |  |  |  |  |
| **Aspects of support supervision teachers and head teachers practice** |  |  |  |  |
| Using variety of teaching methods |  |  |  |  |
| Revising homework exercises with students |  |  |  |  |
| Returning marked scripts in time |  |  |  |  |
| Help students make corrections |  |  |  |  |
| Assessing students’ prior knowledge |  |  |  |  |
| Making schemes of work |  |  |  |  |
| Making lesson plans |  |  |  |  |
| **The frequency of support supervision in schools** |  |  |  |  |
| The subject head regularly observes my teaching |  |  |  |  |
| My subject head usually gives immediate feedback after the lesson observation |  |  |  |  |
| I always plan with my subject head of department for the lesson observation |  |  |  |  |
| I regularly hold discussions with my subject head of department after the lesson observation |  |  |  |  |
| Inspectors from the Ministry of Education usually supervise the way I teach |  |  |  |  |
| I regularly get feedback whenever the Ministry officials supervise me |  |  |  |  |

**Thank you very much**

# APPENDIX II: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR KEY INFORMANTS

1. Are the teachers required to develop their schemes of work and lesson plans?
2. Are these schemes of work and lesson plans submitted for your review?
3. How do you measure the performance of your teachers?
4. Do you emphasize learner-based methods of teaching?
5. Does the school follow NCDC teaching guidelines?
6. If yes, what challenges do you face with the teachers in implementing those methods?
7. Do you find it necessary to sit in classes while supervising the teachers?
8. What method do you often use in supervising the teachers?
9. What measures do you take to ensure that the teachers attend classes regularly?
10. How effective have the methods been in bringing about improved academic performance?

**Thank you very much**

# APPENDIX III: MAP OF MUBENDE DISTRICT SHOWING THE LOCATION OF MUBENDE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL HEADQUARTERS.

