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# ABSTRACT

This study set out to assess the impact of support supervision in promoting quality teaching and learning in Kyegegwa District. The researcher observed some five major areas which included: the extent to which teachers understand about support supervision in primary schools; the various supervisory options applied by supervisors in these schools; the procedures employed in classroom observation in primary schools; the extent to which support supervisors discharge their responsibilities; and the challenges existing in the implementation of support supervision in schools. To conduct this study, the researcher employed mixed survey design method, with both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analyses. 40 head teachers as school-based supervisors, 240 teachers and 2 policy officers participated in the study. A questionnaire was used as the main tool of data collection. Interview and document analyses were used to substantiate the data gathered through questionnaires. Frequency tables, percentage and mean considerations were utilized to analyse quantitative data gained 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 supervisory options matching with the individual teacher’s developmental level. Many supervisors were not able to apply the necessary procedures for classroom observation properly. On the other hand, among the factors affecting the support supervision was lack of relevant training programmes for supervisors, scarcity of experienced supervisors in schools, inadequate supervision activities, and lack of supervision manuals in the schools plus the shortage of allocated budget for supervisory activities. The researcher observed conclusively that, support supervision can be improved in primary schools in Kyegegwa district by providing relevant in-service training for supervisors in order to upgrade their supervisory activities and also by supplying supervisors with manuals and a facilitation of adequate budgets that support the implementation of support supervision in schools.
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# CHAPTER ONE

# INTRODUCTION

1.0 Overview of the chapter

This chapter presents the background information on the impact of support supervision in promoting quality teaching and learning in primary schools. It also consists of problem statement, purpose of the study, specific objectives, research questions, significance of the study, and justification of the study, conceptual frame work plus the operational terms and definitions.

## 1.1 Background of the study

According to Boissiere (2004) the concern for quality has been the major motivating force for reforms in education. Achieving quality in education has increasingly become crucial in strategic improvement plans of developing countries. Kochhar (2005) states 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. McLoughlin and Visser (2003) argue that educational quality assurance is a matter of accountability and national interest. Igbo, (2002) puts it that supervision is the process of helping, guiding, advising and stimulating growth in subordinate in order to improve on the quality of his work. For Nwaogu, J. I (2006) and Ogakwu, (2010), supervision involves the stimulation of professional growth and the development of teachers, the selection and revision of educational objectives, materials of instruction and methods of teaching and evaluation of instruction. Therefore, in the opinion of the researcher, support supervision is a key factor for any kind of quality production, supervision in school in any business is paramount if quality output is to be realized.

Supervision refers to the process of giving guidance to the subjects in relation to a given task or duty so as to achieve a given goal. Supervision in a school system refers to the process of ensuring that policies, principles, rules, regulations and methods prescribed for purposes of implementing and achieving the objectives for education are effectively carried out. Igwe (2001) stated that supervision involves the use of expert knowledge and experience to oversee, evaluate and coordinate the process of improving teaching and learning in schools.

Management is done through supporting teachers and controlling schools. Functioning and allowing for regular exchanges between schools, can be a powerful tool for quality improvement. This is rarely the case in Africa. Research on school supervision in Africa (De Grauwe 2001; Diarra *et al*. 1997; Garforth 2004; Gumbi and Dlamini 1997; Lugaz *et al*. 2006; Solaux 1997) shows the lack of satisfaction among teachers and supervisors with the impact of supervision on the classroom. The most common reason which supervisors regularly quote concerns the lack of resources. Many supervisors do not have the transport logistics like vehicles or the funds for travel, while at the same time the number of schools per officer has grown. Research at the end of the 1990s in four Southern African systems (Botswana, Namibia, Tanzania mainland and Zimbabwe) showed that a supervisor was on average, responsible for over 150 teachers under him, De Grauwe (2001).

The effective improvement of instructional delivery and maintenance of standards in the school system are enhanced through regular internal and external supervision. Ayodele (2002) argued that secondary schools are presently supervised by two categories of people, namely:

1. Internal supervisors, that is, those within the school, such as the principals, vice-principals and heads of departments;
2. External supervisors outside the school formally designated from the Inspectorate division of the Ministry of Education and the various Area or Zonal Education Offices.

The primary responsibility of supervisors is to see that good 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. Having a Quality Supervisor is important because it will ensure that goods services produced in a country are of highest possible standard. This involves protecting buyers from purchasing sub-standard products, (Uyanga, (2008)).

According to Oriaife in Maduewesi (2005), quality 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 teachers, quality instructional and quality infrastructure. Others include favorable teacher - pupil ratio, favorable pupil - classroom ratio and quality instructional supervision.

Educational systems as an investment lies in its capability to continuously serve its targeted beneficiaries (students, teachers, parents, employers of labour and the society in general) and consistently remain relevant. Systems are therefore faced with the challenge of making schools as good as expected. Quality secondary education can be described as functional Education which emphasizes both the theoretical and practical part of the educational system. It is the education that emphasizes social responsibility, job orientation, political participation, spiritual and moral values and most importantly self-reliance after school. One of the major components of quality education is that it is geared towards the molding all round men and women who grow up to become functionally useful to themselves and their society.

According to Meskil, (2005) without strict adherence to good education it becomes a waste of resources and even poses danger to the other sectors of the nation. It should be noted that good quality education delivery begins from policy makers up to resource providers, the teachers and the students. It has long been found that quality is never an accident; it has always been the result of high intentions, sincere efforts, and intelligent mission statement and focused as well as skilful implementation of those tasks. In education, there is a broad agreement on a number of issues that define quality. They include higher academic standards, vigorous curricula, skilled and experienced teachers, updated textbooks, state of the science and arts laboratories and computing facilities, small class sizes, modern buildings and conducive environment for learning, strict discipline, amongst others. Quality education is needed to guarantee good future for the country. Supervision involves the stimulation of professional growth and the development of teachers, the selection and revision of educational objectives, materials of instruction and method of teaching and evaluation of instruction, Ogakwu, (2010). It is also a process that involves an evaluative, long-term relationship between a “more senior member of a profession” and “a more junior member or members of that same profession” Bada, (2010).

The supportive and educative process of supervision is aimed toward assisting supervisees in the application of theory and techniques to their works, Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, (2003).

Developmental models of supervision have, in common, a focus on supervisee change from novice to experienced professional through a delineated stage process with representative challenges facing supervisees at each level. The characteristics of each developmental stage afford supervisors the opportunity to enhance effectiveness through interventions aimed at facilitating further supervisee development, Watkins, (2004).

The sudden explosion of students’ population coupled with the attendant increased complexity of the school organization and the introduction of the universal basic education programme of education in the country has indeed necessitated a greater attention of supervision more than ever before. This is more so because school supervision occupies a unique place in the entire education system. Just as the personality of each supervisor differs from the other, the supervisory strategies adopted are varied and so are their effects on the education standards in Kyegegwa district.

## 1.2 Problem statement

Although the Government of Uganda is focused on improving the supervision of instruction in schools, much still needs to be done. Informal discussion among people in the community and related research findings of scholars such as Oduro, (2008); Opare, (1999), suggest that poor pupil performance in public schools, in part, is the result of ineffective supervision of teachers. Yet, there is no empirical evidence about the nature or quality of supervision of instruction in Ugandan public schools. Generally, the claim that there is poor supervision of teachers in public schools in Uganda is based on anecdotes and assumptions.

As mentioned earlier, the Ministry of Education,and Sports in collaboration with the Uganda Education Service (UES), has formulated policies to guide supervision of instruction in primary and secondary schools. UES has put supervisory structures in place and occasionally provides in-service training courses and workshops to personnel in supervisory positions (including headteachers) to provide supervision services in schools. Head teachers are therefore, expected to provide effective supervision of instruction services, given the necessary resources and in-service training. Glickman, Gordon and Gordon (2004) also suggest that heads of institutions and any person entrusted with the responsibility to supervise instruction should possess certain knowledge and skills to plan, observe, assess and evaluate teaching and learning processes. With these interventions in place, it would seem reasonable and indeed necessary, to ask why issues remain about the effectiveness of supervision in public basic schools in Uganda. Oduro, (2008) and Opare, (1999).

In his study of student achievement in public and private basic schools in Uganda, Opare (1999) found that pupils in the private schools out-performed their counterparts in the public schools in terms of achievement outcomes. Opare suggested that despite extensive internal and external supervision, public schools are not adequately supervised. But since Opare did not directly investigate supervision of instruction, we remain unable to judge the validity of this tentative explanation. That is, there remains insufficient empirical evidence to assess this claim.

A similar study carried out by the Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (IEPA) at Cape Coast University in Ghana also attributed low quality basic education delivery to the poor performance of some headteachers (Oduro, 2008). The study, dubbed EdQual (Educational Quality Implementation through School Leadership and Management), was aimed at helping to rectify poor leadership and teaching in basic schools in Ghana. This study, like that of Opare, did not directly investigate supervision of instruction in the basic schools and, therefore, also lacked sufficient evidence about the quality of supervision in the schools.

Thus, many unanswered questions remain, such as:

1. On what basis do commentators in the Uganda community judge the state of supervision of instruction in the schools?
2. What does the policy on supervision of instruction require of school-site supervisors?
3. What knowledge and skills do school-site supervisors require to be able to perform their duties effectively?
4. What is the state of supervision of instruction in public primary schools in Uganda?

The nature and quality of instructional supervision within a school is presumed to have effects on the expertise, practice and job satisfaction of teachers and, by extension ultimately, on student outcomes such as achievement. But very little is known about supervision of instruction (school-site supervision) in Uganda.

# 

# 1.3 Objectives of the study

# 1.3.1 Purpose of the study

The general objective of the study was to analyze the impact of support supervision in promoting quality education in primary schools in Uganda.

# Specific objectives of the study

1. To acknowledge that teachers are individuals and professionals with different needs and interests.
2. To consider that taken together, passion for learning and reflective practice provide modeling and the basis for individual perception and insight.
3. To encourage self-initiated professional development.
4. To develop an educational environment characterized by collaboration, cooperation, and communication yielding to a supportive, an environment conducive to foster professional growth.
5. To ensure that all schools have a professional responsibility to continually learn and improve on the quality of education.

# 

# 1.4 Research questions

The following were the research questions:

1. What is the meaning of support supervision?
2. What are some of the things that provide modeling for quality education?
3. How can we maximize individual growth, reflective practice and professional?
4. How can time and support for change and growth be provided to both students and teachers to enhance quality learning?
5. What should be done to encourage self-initiated professional development for quality education?

1.5 Significance of the study

This research was a fulfillment of the partial requirements for the award of a Masters Degree in Education of Nkumba University. In the process of the study the research acquired a number of skills and knowledge for example, communication skills, including listening, writing, and time management skills.

The research introduced the researcher to the world of different people with different opinions and ideas. In the due process the researcher significantly acquired more friends who will help her in creating further opportunities especially employing her or connecting her to other employers.

To the communities that the researcher carried out this research, the researcher helped them to know the benefits of having supervision in their schools and how best they can conduct the supervision.

# 

# 1.6 Justification of the study

Whereas many studies and research have been carried out on supervision in promoting quality education in primary schools, there has been no clear evidence about the impact of support supervision in promoting quality education in primary schools. The study therefore sought to cover the gap that had been left out in the quest on areas of support supervision and its impact on promoting quality education in primary schools.

# 

# 1.7 Scope of the study

The study covered content scope, geographical scope and time scope.

# *1.7.1 Content scope of the study*

The study scope included impact of support supervision in promoting quality teaching and learning in primary schools.

# *1.7.2 Geographical scope of the study*

The geographical scope of the study was Kyegegwa District, Mid Western Uganda. It is 333 kilometers Mid Western Uganda part of Uganda.

*1.7.3 Time scope of the study*

The study took one and half years; from August 2017 to December 2018.

# 

# 1.8 Conceptual framework

**Independent variables Dependent variables**

School Supervision strategies

* Poor performance of schools
* Inefficiency and ineffectiveness of teachers
* Absenteeism of both teachers and pupils
* Government
* Minister of Education and Sports
* Minister of State for Higher Education
* Teachers training and skill equipping
* Quality services and materials in schools
* Proper planning and implementation process

**Intervening variables**

**Source: primary data.**

# CHAPTER TWO

# LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 INTRODUCTION

Improving supervision of instruction in school is of great concern to educational authorities worldwide. In Ghana the Ministry of Education Youth and Sports and the Ghana Education Service have been making concerted efforts to ensure that teachers, are key in education delivery (Vaizey, 1972; and Windham, 1988), are optimally utilized. The scholars discussed concepts, models, and best practices of supervision as viewed by researchers and writers. It also reviewed studies of teachers’ and headteachers’ perceptions of effective supervision and their challenges.

2.1 PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR SCHOOL SUPERVISION

In many countries, officers responsible for inspection and supervision are classified as external and internal (school-site). Officers operating from outside the school are termed external supervisors or school inspectors. In Ghana, and other African countries, external supervisors function on least at three of the four levels: central, regional, district and local/school level, De Grauwe, (2001). Apart from Zanzibar where supervision and support tasks are not delegated to the school level or community but mainly remain fully controlled by the Ministry of Education at the central level, in all other countries school site supervisors are employed, De Grauwe, (2001). The head of school, his/her assistant and other teachers are responsible for improving classroom instruction.

Supervisors of instruction include heads of institutions and their assistants, heads of department, master teachers, subject coaches, lead teachers, programme directors, associate and assistant superintendents. Scholars, Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2004), note that a person’s title or designation is not as important as his or her responsibility. In Ghana, headteachers of primary schools (or 'principals' in other African countries) and headmasters in junior high schools are responsible for school-site supervision. But at a higher level, heads of schools take up administrative tasks, whereas their deputies and heads of department supervise instruction. Assistant headmasters/headmistresses (academic) in senior high schools, vice principals (academic) in polytechnics, teacher training colleges and technical/vocational institutions, and heads of department in these institutions in Ghana supervise instruction.

Different titles are used in different countries for personnel responsible for direct supervision of instruction at the school level. In some countries, supervision of instruction is the responsibility of the school administrator (a title usually used for a head of a school district in New York City public schools), although literacy and mathematics coaches are often called upon to facilitate the observation and supervision process Glanz, Shulman, & Sullivan,(2007). Other teachers complement supervisory activities in their respective schools; lead teachers in Ghana, senior subject teachers in Namibia and Botswana, teachers-in-charge in Zimbabwe De Grauwe, (2001), and coaches in New York Glanz, et al., (2007). But in Ghana, unlike the other personnel mentioned above, the position of a lead teacher is temporary.

It could be observed that headteachers, assistants (academic), vice principals (academic) in Ghana and administrators in other countries are always at the forefront of school-site supervision, whereas the other personnel mentioned above support supervisory activities. In the New York City primary schools, coaches are often directed by administrators to visit classrooms to work with teachers to model lessons Glanz, et al., (2007). They report that coaches are requested by teachers to share best practices with them. Glanz and colleagues indicate that the coaches act as follow-up to an administrator’s observation of a teacher or an assistant teacher in preparation for an observation. According to them, both administrators and coaches view the coach as an instructional mentor, but not an “instructional leader”. Coaches were seen as collaborators, responsible for helping teachers to implement initiatives.

In the Ugandan context, lead teachers play similar roles. Whenever there is an intervention in literacy or mathematics, some teachers on the staff are selected to attend workshops and, on their return, lead other members of staff to implement the intervention/initiative. After the intervention, their roles as mentors cease to exist. They complement the supervisory roles of the school supervisor, but are not supervisors per se because their roles are short-lived.

Researchers also suggest some differences between a coach and a supervisor of instruction Glanz, et al, (2007); Hawk & Hill, (2003). Glanz and colleagues (2007) indicate that coaches are only trained in subject specific initiatives which they are supposed to coach. This presupposes that principals in the US are given special training, although coaches are not. In Ghana headteachers are occasionally given in-service training in general management issues, including supervision of instruction. Coaches, unlike school heads and other supervisors, do not have any formal training in classroom observation and supervision. Glanz, et al. (2007) and Hawk and Hill (2003) argue that the coaches receive training in specific subject areas, but not generic coaching skills. But supervisors are expected to advise and provide support to all teachers. Similarly, the main beneficiaries of coaching programmes in New Zealand are teachers who are new to a school, and those whose performance needs improvement Hawk & Hill, (2003).

The positions of senior staff, guardian teachers and teachers-in-charge are quite different from those of coaches and lead teachers. In other African countries these personnel are more or less permanent supervisors De Grauwe, (2001). According to De Grauwe, the current education policy in Botswana empowers school heads and senior staff to function as instructional leaders. These teachers provide in-service training to teachers within their schools and, therefore, are recognized as school supervisors. The only title which has functions similar to coaches is guardian teachers in Namibia. Guardian teachers in Namibia also provide direct assistance to newly appointed teachers like coaches, but they do not provide assistance and support to all categories of teachers.

Researchers have suggested that quality improvement can come from the schools themselves such as through school-site supervisors (UNESCO, 2007). “There is a growing conviction that empowerment of school-site supervision actors (headteachers and other teachers discussed above) can make schools responsive to their environment and the needs of their students” (UNESCO Module 6, 2007, p. 4). The document noted that school-based monitoring and supervision is seen as a guarantee for not only better quality, but also for greater relevance to the needs of students. According to UNESCO several attempts to bring supervision closer to the school have taken different forms: further decentralization of the service; the establishment of school clusters and resource centers; and the creation of a special category of master teachers. The report argues that the distance between external supervision and the school or the classroom is too wide for supervisors to have long lasting impact on teaching and learning. The UNESCO report (2007) notes that too many programmes for quality improvement have been imposed from above and have failed, and that Ministries have come to realize that quality improvement cannot be imposed from outside. The report notes that in the end, it is the teacher and the principal (headteacher), who have to facilitate improvement. It suggests that schools themselves should be encouraged and empowered to monitor and improve the quality of the services they deliver. The statement posits that without the commitment of teachers and headteachers “very little happens”, and this commitment comes from internal conviction.

2.2 CONCEPTS OF SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

Some researchers have defined or explained supervision of instruction to include supposed purposes. Researchers have assigned several definitions and interpretations to supervision, but almost all of them centre on a common aim or objective. The main objective of supervision is to improve teachers’ instructional practices, which may in turn improve student learning.

Researchers have offered several purposes of supervision of instruction, but the ultimate goal is to improve instruction and student learning. Beach and Reinhartz (1989) think the focus on instructional supervision is to provide teachers with information about their teaching so as to develop instructional skills to improve performance. Also, in Bolin and Panaritis’ view (as cited in Bays, 2001), supervision is primarily concerned with improving classroom practices for the benefit of students regardless of what may be entailed (e.g., curriculum development or staff development) Bays, (2001). Further, McQuarrie and Wood (1991) also state that “the primary purpose of supervision is to help and support teachers as they adapt and adopt, and refine the instructional practices they are trying to implement in their classrooms”.

Otherscholars believe the purpose of supervision is helping teachers to be aware of their teaching and its consequences for their learners Glickman, Gordon, & Gordon, (1997; Nolan, 1997). Some researchers have also theorized that supervision is an act of encouraging human relations Wiles & Bondi, (1996) and teacher motivation Glickman, Gordon, & Gordon, (1998) and enabling teachers to try out new instructional techniques in a safe, supportive environment, Nolan, (1997). Supervision is believed to provide a mechanism for teachers and supervisors to increase their understanding of the teaching -learning process through collective inquiry with other professionals, Nolan & Francis, (1992). The purposes of supervision provided by these researchers 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.

Supervision was initially described as inspection, which has the connotation of direct control of teachers by school inspectors. The term supervision has gradually taken over inspection, but both terms are sometimes used together. But Musaazi (1982) posits that school supervision which began as inspection has been replaced by that of supervision. The concept and practice of supervision of instruction has evolved over the years Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2004; Hoy & Forsyth, (1986); Musaazi, (1982); Neagley & Evans, (1980); Oliva & Pawlas, (1997). Early supervisors in the 19th century set strict requirements for their teachers and visited classrooms to observe how closely the teachers complied with stipulated instructions; departure from these instructions was cause for dismissal, Oliva & Pawlas, (1997). Oliva and Pawlas bemoan that some school supervisors or inspectors, as they are called in other countries, continue to fulfill their tasks with an authoritarian approach. They note, however, that superintendents (supervisors) have changed their focus from looking for deficiencies that would merit dismissal of teachers to helping teachers overcome their difficulties.

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”. They believe that because the historic role of supervision has been inspection and control, it is not surprising most teachers do not equate supervision with collegiality. Hoy and Forsyth (1986), for their part, noted that supervision has its roots in the industrial literature of bureaucracy, and the main purpose was to increase production. To them, the industrial notion of supervision was overseeing, directing and controlling workers, and was, therefore, managements’ tool to manipulate subordinates. 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).

Some researchers such as Bolin and Panaritis (1992), Glanz (1996), and Harris (1998) as cited in Bays, (2001) argue that defining supervision has been a recurrent and controversial issue in the field of education. Harris, for instance, observes that current thoughts in the definition of supervision of instruction do not represent full consensus, but has listed some common themes across different definitions. These include supporting teaching and learning; responding to changing external realities; providing assistance and feedback to teachers; recognizing teaching as the primary vehicle for facilitating school learning; and promoting new, improved and innovative practices. Harris, however, noted that questions of roles, relationships, positions, and even skills and functions remain without full consensus.

Supervision is a service provided to teachers, both individually and in groups, for the purpose of improving instruction, with the student as the ultimate beneficiary, Oliva & Pawlas (1997). Oliva and Pawlas note that it is a means of offering to teachers specialized help in improving instruction. They argue that supervisors should remember that teachers want specific help and suggestions, and they want supervisors to address specific points that can help them to improve.

Similarly, supervision of instruction is seen as a set of activities designed to improve the teaching and learning process. Hoy and Forsyth (1986) contend that the purpose of supervision of instruction is not to judge the competencies of teachers, nor is it to control them but rather to work co-operatively with them. They believe that evaluation, rating, assessment, and appraisal are all used to describe what supervisors do, yet none of them accurately reflects the process of supervision of instruction. To them, such terms are a source of suspicion, fear and misunderstanding among teachers. Hoy and Forsyth (1986) state that although assessment of teacher effectiveness may be necessary, it is not supervision of instruction. They think evaluation is likely to impede and undermine any attempt to improve the teaching-learning process. They suggest the following propositions form a basis of theory and practice of supervision whose purpose is to improve instruction:

1. The only one who can improve instruction is the teacher himself/herself;

2. Teachers need freedom to develop their own unique teaching styles;

3. Any changes in teaching behavior require social support as well as professional and intellectual stimulation;

4. A consistent pattern of close supervision and coercion seems unlikely to succeed in improving teaching;

5. Improvement in instruction is likely to be accomplished in a non-threatening situation, by working with colleagues, not supervisors, and by fostering in teachers a sense of inquiry and experimentation

Hoy and Forsyth (1986) conclude that the goal of the supervisor is not to solve an immediate problem, but rather to study the process of teaching and learning as part of ongoing system of evaluation and experimentation.

Supervision of instruction is also defined as a consciously planned programme for the improvement and consolidation of instruction. Musaazi (1982) posits that supervision focuses upon the improvement of instruction, and is concerned with the continuous redefinition of goals, the wider realization of human dynamic for learning and for co-operative efforts and the nurturing of a creative approach to problems to teaching and learning. Musaazi emphasizes that school supervision does not simply refer to that specific occasion when the whole school is examined and evaluated as a place of learning, but it is also means that constant and continuous process of guidance based on frequent visits which focus attention on one or more aspects of the school and its organization. He notes that achieving the purpose of supervision depends on the skills and efficiency of the supervisor in working with teachers.

Neagley and Evans (1980) define instructional supervision as that phase of school administration which deals primarily with the achievement of the appropriate selected instructional expectations of educational process. They also define supervision as any leadership function that is primarily concerned with the improvement of instruction. Neagley and Evans (1980) argue that modern supervision is democratic in nature:

Modern supervision is considered as any service for teachers that eventually result in improving instruction, learning, and the curriculum. It consists of positive, dynamic, democratic actions designed to improve instruction through the continued growth of all concerned individuals the child, the teacher, the supervisor, the administrator, and the parent or other lay person.

Supervision is 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, Module 2). 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 Module 6, 2007).

Oghuvbu (2001) claims 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) claim 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 programme, and assesses goal achievements.

Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (1998) also define supervision as the school function that improves instruction through direct assistance to teachers, group development, professional development, and curriculum development and action research. Glickman, Gordon, and Ross Gordon (1997) posit that the long-term goal of developmental supervision is teacher development towards a point at which teachers, facilitated by supervisors, can assume full responsibility for instructional development.

The definition provided by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) is similar to that of Glickman et al. above, but the latter emphasize respect, caring and support for teachers. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) note that supervisors and teachers working together can make the learning environment more user friendly, caring and respect for students, and supportive of a community of leaders. They argue that this remains a primary intellectual and moral challenge of supervisory leadership.

Some researchers have also defined supervision of instruction as a process which utilizes a wide array of strategies, methodologies, and approaches aimed at improving instruction and promoting educational leadership as well as change (Glanz & Behar Horenstein, 2000). These researchers note that the process of supervision and evaluation of instruction at the school level depends primarily on whether the principal functions as an instructional leader. Neagley and Evans (1980) propose some of the principal’s functions as an instructional leader. They believe that “a successful instructional leader helps teachers to discover problems related to instruction and learning, assist them in finding procedures to solve these problems, and provides time and resources for creative solutions”.

The contemporary concepts of supervision suggest that school supervision is moving gradually from the negative notion of “watching over”, “directing”, and checking teachers to an arena of supportive, democratic and flexible activity. Such definitions encompass curriculum planning and development, staff development, group discussion on instructional programme and action research. The definitions of supervision of instruction suggest that those who are being assisted (teachers) be also directly involved in the supervision process. Contemporary definitions also suggest that supervision requires commitment, trust, and respect on the part of both supervisors and teachers, and caring and support for teachers.

2.3 EFFECTIVE SUPERVISION

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.They also posit that supervisors should engage teachers in action research by systematically studying faculty to find out what is happening in the classroom and school with the aim of improving student learning. Neagley and Evans (1980) also conceive that effective supervision requires a high level of leadership. They propose that the successful supervisor should be intelligent, well trained in educational psychology, likable, experienced, and an expert in democratic group processes.

Other researchers also share similar views as those upheld by Glickman and colleagues.

For example, Glanz, Shulman and Sullivan (2006) believe that an effective principal possesses the following characteristics: is situationally aware of details and undercuts in the school; has intellectual stimulation of current theories and practices; is a change agent; and, actively involves teachers in design and implementation of important decisions and policies.

They also believe that effective principals provide effective supervision. To them, an effective principal creates a culture of shared belief and sense of cooperation, monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of school practices, is resourceful and communicates and operates from strong ideas and beliefs about schooling. Blasé and Blasé (1999) propose a model of effective principal derived from data (findings) which consists of two major themes: talking with teachers to promote reflection and promoting professional growth. According to them, effective principals value dialogue that encouraged teachers to critically reflect on their learning and professional practice through the following strategies: making suggestions, giving feedback, modeling, using inquiry and soliciting advice and opinions, and giving praise. They also argue that effective principals use six strategies to promote teachers' professional growth: emphasizing the study of teaching and learning; supporting collaboration efforts among educators; developing coaching relationships among educators; encouraging and supporting redesign of programmes; applying the principles of adult learning, growth, and development to all phases of staff development; and implementing action research to inform instructional decision making.

Other researchers also believe that 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.

Reference made to the adherence of strict time table and school regulations by this researcher as determinants of effective supervision should be compromised. The reason for his stance may stem from his personal philosophy and/or the context within which the study was conducted. Bureaucratic procedures in supervision may be characteristic of some African and other developing countries. The definition presented by IIEP/UNESCO (2007) testifies to this belief, since most of their studies have been conducted in this context.

As shown in this section, all researchers share the belief that supervision is effective if the supervisor possesses and exhibits qualities and characteristics related to knowledge, interpersonal and technical skills. They are silent, however, on the direct causal effect of such qualities on student performance.

2.4 HISTORICAL MODELS OF SUPERVISION

Supervision takes on several forms. According to Zepeda (2003), the form may be formal or informal, clinical or some of the modifications of the original clinical supervisory model (action research, differentiated or developmental).

Models of supervision refer to eras or periods of time in which supervision was influenced by social, political and economic movements in society and education, as described by Bolin and Panaritis (1992); and Glanz (1996) (cited in Bays, 2001). They traced the history, which they term models, from the 19thcentury to the present day. Sullivan and Glanz (2000) observe that supervisory practice has evolved since its origin in colonial time, and its effectiveness as a means of improving instruction depends on the ability of educational leaders to remain responsive to the needs of teachers and students. It is because of this assertion that in most cases advocates and practitioners build upon and/or modify existing strategies with the intention of improving practices.

Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon; (1998), collegial (Glatthorn, 1990; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000), differentiated supervision (Glatthorn, 1990), and self-directed (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993), which have their roots in clinical supervision.

**2.5 CATEGORIES OF SUPERVISION**

There are five categories of supervision identified by scholars.

**2.5.1 Supervision as inspection**

Supervision as inspection (also termed the traditional form of supervision) was the dominant method for administering schools in the 19th century (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). Teachers were viewed as deficient and inspectors inspected their practices for errors (Glanz, 1998). Supervisors employed the tools of directing, controlling and overseeing the activities of teachers to ensure that teachers performed their duties as expected. In this form of supervision, supervisors are seen to devote most of their time and attention to finding out what is wrong with what teachers are doing in their classrooms (Daresh 2006).

The behavior of supervisors using inspectional practices reflects the view that most teachers are incompetent. Teachers were seen by nineteenth century supervisors as inept (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). Daresh (2006) notes that supervisors who use this approach are inclined to suggest what and how teachers should teach. The explanation is that teachers (mostly female and disenfranchised) were seen as “bedraggled troop- incompetent and backward in outlook” (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992, p. 8).

Daresh (2006) also thinks that it is doubtful if those employed (teachers) knew much more than the students. According to Daresh, this resulted in employing more experienced teachers (inspectors) who provided basic oversight to ensure that teachers provided quality of instruction. In colonial African countries (including Ghana) most teachers were untrained. Even today “pupil teachers” are found in some Ghananian primary schools.

The consequence of this model is that the supervisor has the responsibility of intervening directly in the work of teachers to correct faulty performance. Sullivan and Glanz 29 (2000) refer to the first textbook on supervision (Payne, 1875) in which it is stated emphatically that “teachers must be held responsible for the work performed in the classroom and that the supervisor, as expert inspector, would oversee and ensure harmony and efficiency” (p. 8). Because of this, educational supervisors as inspectors were very popular in the earliest period of formal schooling in the US (Daresh, 2006).

**2.5.2 Supervision as social efficiency**

Supervision as social efficiency was espoused at the beginning of the twentieth century. This model of supervision was greatly influenced by the technological advancement of the time. Glanz (1998) has noted that supervision at that time was influenced by the scientific principles of business management and industry, and was aimed at making teaching more efficient. Bobbitt (1913, cited in Sullivan & Glanz, 2000) tried to apply the ideas espoused by Taylor to the problems of educational management and supervision (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). According to Sullivan and colleague, what Bobbitt called scientific and professional supervisory methods were, in fact, scientific and bureaucratic methods of supervision which were aimed at finding a legitimate and secure niche for control-oriented supervision within the school bureaucracy, but not to provide professional assistance and guidance to teachers. Bobbitt also maintains that supervision is an essential function to coordinate school affairs. Bobbitt is quoted as maintaining that “supervisory members must co-ordinate the labors of all, find the best methods of work, and enforce the use of these methods on the part of the workers” (cited in Sullivan & Glanz, 2000, p. 13). Bobbitt’s assertion suggests that this model of supervision is similar to supervision by inspection.

The only difference between the social efficiency model and inspection is the attempt to introduce impersonal methods in the process of supervision. Sullivan & Glanz note that supervisors believed, as did Bobbitt himself, that “the way to eliminate the personal element from administration and supervision is to introduce impersonal methods of scientific administration and supervision” (p. 14). And this brought about the development of rating schemes, and supervision became synonymous with teacher rating. Supervisors who use this model of supervision rely heavily on teacher rating and evaluation. These supervisors, as well as the proponents, hold the view that rating schemes are objective and purposeful.

**2.5.3 Democracy in supervision**

The movement to change supervisory theory and practice to a more democratic one occurred in the 1920s as a direct result of growing opposition to autocratic supervisory methods (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). From the 1920s to the 1940s attempts were made to make supervision a more democratic process. Bays (2001) indicates that supervision at this time was seen as a helping function and aimed at improving instruction through paying attention to human relations. Sullivan and Glanz (2000) note that democratic supervision was influenced by Dewey’s (1929) theories of democratic and scientific thinking as well as Hosic’s (1920) ideas of democratic supervision. According to Pajak (1993), supervisors at that time attempted to apply scientific and co-operative problem-solving approaches to educational problems. Hosic (1920, cited in Sullivan & Glanz, 2000) thought that it was not humane, wise, nor expedient for supervisors to be autocratic. Hosic cautioned that the supervisor should eschew his/her “autocratic past”.

This model of supervision advocated respect for teachers and co-operation in supervisory processes. Sullivan and colleague hypothesize that the tenets of democratic supervision assumed that educators, including teachers, curriculum specialists, and supervisors would cooperate to improve instruction. Newlon (cited in Sullivan & Glanz, 2000, p.15) maintains that school organization must be set up to “invite the participation of the teacher in the development courses....” This model recognizes the teacher as a fellow worker rather than a mere “cog” in a big machine (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). The idea behind this model is that supervisors and teachers decide together what and how to teach. This was an initial attempt to introduce collaboration in supervision which involved supervisor and teacher, but not collaboration among teachers.

**2.5.4 Scientific supervision**

Scientific supervisory practices, the dominant model between the 1920s and 1950s, were advocated by Burton, Barr and Stevens (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). These advocates thought the use of rating cards as a scientific tool for supervising teachers was inadequate. According to Sullivan and Glanz (2000), Burton (1930) recognized the usefulness of rating scales in some instances and believed it was desirable to devise more objectively pre-determined items to evaluate teaching procedures. Sullivan and Glanz (2000) quote Barr (1931) as having stated emphatically that the application of scientific principles “is a part of a general movement to place supervision on a professional basis” (p. 16).

Like other models discussed, proponents of the scientific model of supervision suggest that supervisors should have some level of expertise and skill to direct teachers the way they should teach. Barr (1931, quoted in Sullivan & Glanz, 2000) states in precise terms what the supervisor needs to know:

Supervisors must have the ability to analyze teaching situations and to locate the probable causes for poor work with a certain degree of expertness; they must have the ability to use an array of data-gathering devices peculiar to the field of supervision itself namely, they must possess certain constructive skills for the development of new means, methods, and materials of instruction; they must know how teachers learn to teach; they must have the ability to teach teachers how to teach; and they must be able to evaluate. In short, they must possess training in both the science of instructing pupils and the science of instructing teachers. Both are included in the science of supervision.

Scientific supervision is based on the premise that measurement instruments should be used to determine the quality of instruction. Barr (1925, cited in Sullivan & Glanz, 2000) argued that the methods of science should be applied to the study and practice of supervision, and as such the results of supervision must be measured. He was of the view that the probable causes of poor work could be explored through the use of tests, rating scales and observational instruments. The use of observational instruments as a means of improving supervision was reinforced by the use of “stenographic reports” which were devised by Romiett Stevens. He thought the best way to improve instruction was to record verbatim accounts of actual lessons “without criticism or comment”. Hoetker and Ahlbrand (1969, cited in Sullivan & Glanz, 2000, p. 17) noted that Stevens’ stenographic accounts were “the first major systematic study of classroom behavior”.

**2.5.5 Supervision as leadership**

The fifth phase of supervision, which emerged in the 1960s, is supervision as leadership. Robert R. Leeper (cited in Sullivan & Glanz, 2000) compiled articles about this model from several advocates and authors and published them in the journal Educational Leadership. Leeper (1969, cited in Sullivan and Glanz (2000) argued that supervision as inspection which found justification in the production-oriented, social efficiency era and bureaucratic supervision was no longer viable. The basis of supervision as leadership model was to remove itself from supervisory practices of the past.

The model of supervision they proposed then focused on democracy and human relations. According to Sullivan and Glanz (2000), Leeper (1969) and other authors of this model maintain supervisors must extend “democracy in their relations with teachers”. The advocates propose that those engaged in supervision should provide leadership in five ways: developing mutually acceptable goals, extending co-operative and democratic methods of supervision, improving classroom instruction, promoting research into educational problems, and promoting professional leadership.

**2.5.6 Clinical supervision**

The Clinical supervision model emerged in the 1970s and 33 originated from the pioneering work of Robert Goldhammer and Morris Cogan in a collaborative study of teaching through Harvard University (Miller & Miller, 1987). Through a research base, Goldhammer and Cogan wrote their books with the same title “Clinical Supervision” in 1969 and 1973 respectively (Miller & Miller, 1987). This was the period when the field of supervision was plagued by uncertainty and ambiguities (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). According to Sullivan and Glanz, Goldhammer and Cogan developed this model at the time when practitioners and researchers were making concerted efforts to reform supervision, and their work was reflected in a broader attempt to seek alternatives to traditional education practice. Clinical supervision, therefore, emerged as result of contemporary views of weakness and dissatisfaction with traditional education practice and supervisory methods (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000).

The early developers of clinical supervision contend that the focus of supervision should be on the teacher as an active member in the instructional process (Cogan, 1973; and Goldhammer, 1969). Cogan (1973) asserts that the central objective of the entire clinical process is the developments of a professionally responsible teacher who can analyze his/her own performance, open up for others to help him/her, and be self-directing. He advises, however, against the misconception that the teacher can dispense with the services of a supervisor entirely. To him such situations rarely occur, and that almost all teachers need some sort of contributions from supervisors and other personnel occasionally, and at appropriate intervals.

Clinical supervision is based on the premise that teaching would be improved by a prescribed, formal process of collaboration between the teacher and supervisor. The principal advocates (Goldhammer and Cogan) believe the focus of clinical supervision is a face-to-face interaction between teacher and supervisor with the intent to improve instruction and increase professional growth (Acheson & Gall, 1980). Cogan conceives that the purpose of supervisors working collaboratively with teachers is to provide expert direct assistance to them (teachers) with the view of improving instruction.

Advocates of clinical supervision also believe that the focus of the model is on collection of descriptive data from detailed observation of the teaching process to guide practice. The data includes what teachers and students do in the classroom during teaching learning process. These are supplemented by information about teachers’ and students’ perceptions, beliefs, attitudes and knowledge relevant to the instruction Cogan, (1973). Cogan believes that for supervision to be effective, both the supervisor and teacher involved should collaboratively use the data collected in the classroom to plan programmes, procedures and strategies to improve the teachers’ classroom behavior, including instructional techniques.

Although the original developers of clinical supervision (Cogan & Goldhammer) propose eight phases, other authors have proposed different numbers of phases, usually three to five. The original eight phases (Cogan, 1973, p. 10-12) include:

Phase 1: Establishing the teacher-supervisory relationship. At this stage, the supervisor: establishes the clinical relationship between her/himself and the teacher (rapport); helps the teacher to achieve some general understandings about clinical supervision as a perspective on its sequences; and begins to induct the teacher into the new functions of supervision.

Phase 2: Planning with the teacher. The supervisor and the teacher plan a lesson together, anticipated outcomes and problems of instruction are shared and materials and strategies of teaching, processes of learning and provision for fee d-back and evaluation are agreed upon.

Phase 3: Planning the strategy for observation. The supervisor and the teacher agree on the objectives, processes and aspects of observation to be collected. At this stage, the functions of the supervisor in the observation process are clearly specified.

Phase 4: Observing instruction. The supervisor observes the classroom (lessons) and records the actual classroom event as he/she see it, but not her/his interpretation.

Phase 5: Analyzing the teaching-learning processes. The teacher and supervisor analyze the events that took place in the classroom. Decisions are made about the procedures with careful regard to teacher’s developmental level and needs at that moment.

Phase 6: Planning the strategy of the conference. Initially, the supervisor alone develops the plan (alternatives and strategies for conducting the conference). At subsequent times, this planning could be done jointly with the teacher.

Phase 7: The conference. At this phase, the supervisor and teacher meet to review the observation data.

Phase 8: Renewed Planning. The supervisor and teacher decide on the kinds of changes to be effected in the teachers’ classroom behavior. Both supervisor and teacher begin to plan the next lesson and the changes the teacher will attempt to make in his instructional processes.

Then they begin planning when the next cycle will take place.

Other researchers have reduced the original eight phases to between three and five (Acheson & Gall, 1980; and Glickman, 1990). Acheson and Gall describe the three phases as: planning a conference (pre-observation conference); the actual observation; and feedback conference. Glickman (1990) also describes five phases as: pre-conference; class observation; analysis and interpretation; post-observation conference; and critique of four phases.

Glickman’s (1990, p. 280-285) five phases are:

1) Pre-conference with teacher; the supervisor meets with teachers and presents to her/him the reason and purpose for the observation, the focus, method and form to be used, time of observation and time for post-conference;

2) Observation of class; observation methods may include categorical frequencies, physical indicators, performance indicators, visual diagramming, space utilization open-ended narratives, participant observation, focused questionnaire etc. (in this phase, the supervisor only has to describe the events as they unfold, but not to interpret them);

3) Analyzing and interpreting observation and determining conference approach; the supervisor leaves the classroom and carry out the analysis and interpretation alone;

4) Post-observation conference with teacher; both the supervisor and the teacher discuss the analyses of observation and finally produce a plan for instructional improvement; and,

5) Critique of the previous four steps; both supervisor and teacher review format and procedures from conference to ascertain whether they were satisfactory and whether there was the need for revision, and put a plan in place to begin the cycle.

Miller and Miller (1987) argue that clinical supervision has advantages over the previous models. They note that clinical supervision allows for objective feedback, which if given in a timely manner, will lead to improved results. Clinical supervision also diagnoses instructional problems and provides valuable information to solve such problems. In the end, improvements in instruction are heightened as teachers are able to develop new skills and strategies. Data on students may include feedback from class work and test results, which could also be useful to improve instruction. A wide range of data collection instruments employed in this model would provide supervisors with individual teachers’ peculiar problems than pre-determined rating scales and evaluation procedures inherent in the “scientific supervision”.

**2.5.7 Developmental supervision**

This model of supervision was proposed by Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (1998). In this model, the supervisor chooses an approach which will suit the individual teacher characteristics and developmental level. The notion underlying this model is that each person is continuously growing in fits and starts in growth spurts and patterns (Leddick, 1994). The supervisor might choose to use directive, collaborative or non-directive approaches when working with each teacher.

In reviewing developmental supervision, Worthington (1987, cited in Leddick, 1994) notes some patterns of behavior change in the supervisory activity. He observes that supervisors’ behavior changes as supervisees gain experience and supervisory relationships also change. Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987, cited in Leddick, 1994) indicate that supervisees’ progress in experience from a beginning stage, through intermediate to advanced levels of development (p. 35). They observe that at each level of development, the trend begins in a rigid, shallow, imitative way and moves towards more competence, self-assurance and self-reliance.

Researchers have also observed the changing level of autonomy of supervisees as they progressively gain experience. Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987, in Ledick, 1994) believe that beginning supervisees may depend on the supervisor to diagnose clients’ (students’) behavior and establish plans for remediation, whereas intermediate supervisees would depend on supervisors for an understanding of difficult clients, but would sometimes chafe at suggestions. To them advanced supervisees function independently, seek consultation when appropriate, and feel responsible for their correct and incorrect decisions.

**2.5.8 Differentiated model of supervision**

Another contemporary model which evolved from clinical supervision is differentiated supervision. Sergiovanni (2009) states categorically that no one-best-way strategy, model, or set of procedures for supervision makes sense apart from differentiated supervision. He notes that “a differentiated system of supervision which is more in tune with growth levels, personality characteristics, needs and interests, and professional commitments of teachers is needed” (p. 281). In support of this assertion, Glatthorn (1990) observes that clinical supervision is often offered from a “one-up” vantage point: the supervisor is assumed to know all the answers, and is ready to help the teacher who needs to be improved. He proposes that each school or system should develop its own model which will be responsive to its needs and resources.

The rationale for differentiated supervision is that teachers are different (Sergiovanni, 2009). Sergiovanni points out that formal clinical supervision may be suitable for some teachers, but not all. According to him teacher needs and disposition s as well as work and learning styles vary. Individual teachers respond to different approaches to supervision taking into consideration their needs and competencies, rather than a one-best-way approach.

Glatthorn (1990) also believes differentiated supervision allows teachers to choose from a menu of supervisory and evaluative processes, instead of using the same strategy to supervise all teachers. In view of this, Sergiovanni (2009) suggests that teachers should take an active part in deciding which options for supervision will work well for them and accept responsibility for making options work.

Differentiated supervision also involves the use of informal classroom visitations to assess and assist individual teachers. Sergiovanni (2009) suggests that principals should view themselves as coaches and principal teachers by working side by side with teachers in planning lessons together, teaching together, and trying to understand what is going on in the class together. He posits that principals who supervise by practicing coaching by “walking around” can make significant impact in helping, in building trust, and in learning with their teachers.

**2.5.9 Collegial supervision**

Some researchers in the field of supervision also propose collegial supervision- another offspring of clinical supervision (Glatthorn, 1990; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993; Sergiovanni, 2009; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) believe that promoting collegiality among teachers is an important way to help schools change for the better.Collegial supervision, according to Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993), 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” (p. 103). Glatthorn (1990) describes collegial supervision as a “cooperative professional development process which fosters teacher growth through systematic collaboration with peers” (p. 188). He asserts that this process includes a variety of approaches such as professional dialogue, curriculum development, peer observations and feedback, and action research.

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993), citing Little’s (1982) work note that in collegial supervision, teachers engage in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete talk about teaching practice, frequently observe one another and provide useful critiques of their teaching practice. Collegial supervision also affords teachers the opportunity to plan, design, research, evaluate and prepare teaching materials together. In summarizing the research on collegiality, Fullan (cited in Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993), believes interaction with others influences what one does and results in learning something new. He argues that the theory of change points to the importance of peer relationships in a school, and that interaction is the primary basis for social learning.

In collegial supervision, teachers take turns assuming the role of clinical supervisor as they help each other (Sergiovanni, 2009). But for teachers to assume the position of supervisors (peer supervision), Sergiovanni suggests that they (peers) need training and experience. According to Sergiovanni, participation requires much more training in conferencing, information collecting, and other supervisory techniques than typically necessary for other forms of supervision. He asserts that for teachers to be clinical supervisors, they will need to receive the proper training; and training takes time and experience.

2.6 APPROACHES TO SUPERVISION

Researchers have identified different approaches that supervisors who use clinical, and other supervision models which evolved from clinical supervision, apply to supervision.Glickman and Tamashiro (1980) note that during post- observation conference, supervisors may employ directive (control or informational), collaborative, and non-directive approaches to address issues which crop up to plan actions for instructional improvement. They contend that even though a supervisor may employ a combination of these approaches, he/she may be more inclined to one of them. A supervisors’ inclination to any one of a combination of these approaches stems from his/her philosophical orientation or previous experience with other supervisors.

Supervisors’ use of a particular approach may differ from one teacher to another. Glickman and Timeshare (1980) argue supervisors consider the teacher’s level of experience in instructional practices and developmental level when selecting a supervision approach. It is also likely that the contexts within which a supervisor works influences his/her approach. State and national policies may also spell out procedures and approaches to be used by supervisors in their schools.

**2.6.1 Directive approach**

Supervisors who use a directive approach believe that teaching consists of technical skills with known standards and competencies for all teachers to be effective in their instructional practices (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980; Glickman, 2002).

According to this approach, the roles of the supervisor are to direct, model, and assess competencies. These researchers observe that supervisors using this approach present their own ideas on what information is to be collected and how it will be collected, direct the teacher on the action plan to be taken, and demonstrate the appropriate teaching methods. The directive supervisor sets standards for improvement based on the preliminary baseline information from classroom observation, shows teachers how to attain standards, and judges the most effective way to improve instruction.

The directive supervisory approach takes two forms: directive control and directive informational. In both situations, the supervisor and teacher go through the clinical supervisory stages up to the post-conference phase where action plans for improvement are to be taken (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980). Glickman and Tamashiro (1980) and Glickman (2002) indicate that in the directive control supervisory approach, the supervisor details what the teacher is to do, and spells out the criteria for improvement. But in the directive informational approach, the supervisor provides alternative suggestions from which the teacher can choose, instead of telling the teacher what actions to take. The supervisor does not directly determine what action a teacher should embark upon. However, the ideas come from the supervisor.

The directive approach in clinical supervision is a reminiscent of the traditional form of supervision. It presumes that the supervisor is more knowledgeable about instructional procedures and strategies than the teacher, and that his/her decisions are more effective that those of teachers in terms of instructional improvement. However, in the directive approach to supervision the supervisor employs the clinical techniques discussed above, especially a vast array of data collecting instruments. In the traditional model of supervision, all teachers are thought to be at the same level at the same time, and are expected to use the same approach to teaching similar contents. The directive approach to clinical supervision does not emphasize fault-finding as practiced by inspectors in traditional supervision.

Researchers suggest the directive approach to supervision should be employed when dealing with new and inexperienced teachers (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980; Glickman, 1990). They believe that this approach should be used in an emergency situation in which the teacher is totally inexperienced, or incompetent in the current classroom situation. Similarly, Glickman (1990) believes this approach is useful when the teacher does not have awareness, knowledge, or inclination to act on issues that the supervisor thinks to be of crucial importance to the students. According to Glickman (1990), this approach is employed “to save the students by keeping the teacher from drowning in the sea of ineffective practice” (p. 83). Pajak (2001) also suggests the directive approach should be used on new and inexperienced teachers. He argues a new teacher may have difficulty grappling with a problem presented in a straightforward manner. He, however, cautions that being overly directive can easily encourage dependency in the new teacher toward the supervisor.

In this study, the researcher believes that if even the teacher has little knowledge or expertise about an issue the supervisor should try as much as possible to avoid the directive control approach. Teachers will feel more secure and respected when their views are sought on issues that concern them.

**2.6.2 Collaborative approach**

Supervisors who employ this approach believe that teaching is primarily problem-solving, in which two or more people pose a problem, experiment and implement those teaching strategies that are deemed relevant. According to Glickman (1990), the supervisors’ role in this approach is to guide the problem -solving process, be an active member of the interaction and help keep teachers focused on their common problems. The leader and teacher mutually agree on the structures, processes, and criteria for subsequent instructional improvement.

In the collaborative approach to supervision both the supervisor and teacher mutually negotiate the plan of action (Glickman, 1990). Views of both parties are included in the final plan of action for instructional improvement. According to Glickman, both the supervisor and teacher review, revise, reject, propose and counter propose until they both come to a mutual agreement. He posits that each party must accept modifications of ideas, rather than taking a hard stand. Glickman (1990, p. 147) contends that the final product of the collaboration is a contract agreed upon by both and carried out as a joint responsibility in the following manner:

1. Presenting: the leader confronts the teacher with his/her perceptions of the instructional area needing improvement;
2. Clarifying: the leader asks for the teachers’ perceptions of the instructional area in question;
3. Listening: the supervisor listens to teachers’ perceptions;
4. Problem-solving: both the supervisor and the teacher propose alternate actions for improvement (supervisor does not impose action plans on teacher);
5. Negotiating: the supervisor and teacher discuss the options and alter proposed actions until a joint plan is agreed upon.

The assumption underlying this approach is that both supervisors and teachers perceive each other as valuable partners in the supervisory process. There is, therefore, a sense of trust and respect between the two parties. The supervisee in this approach is likely to not feel threatened in pursuit of his/her instructional practices, and will probably welcome the observation processes.

Collaborative supervision is premised in participation. Glickman and Tamashiro (1980) and Glickman (1990) suggest that this approach is employed when both the supervisor and teacher intensely care about the problem at hand, and will be involved in carrying out a decision to solve the problem. Glickman and colleague also suggest that this approach should be employed when both the supervisor and teacher have approximately the same degree of expertise on an issue to decide on. The more supervisors involve teachers in decisions affecting their instructional practices, the more the latter make an effort to contribute and are willing to implement a plan they have been part of.

**2.6.3 Non-directive approach**

This approach is based on the premise that teachers are capable of analyzing and solving their own instructional problems. Glickman (2002) argues that when an individual teacher sees the need for change and takes responsibility for it, instructional improvement is likely to be meaningful. The leader in this approach is only a facilitator who provides direction or little formal structures to the plan. This behavior of the leader (supervisor), according to Glickman, should not be misconstrued as passive, or allowing complete teacher autonomy. Instead, the supervisor actually uses the behavior of listening, clarifying, encouraging and presenting to guide the teacher towards self-recovery.

The leader who adopts the non-directive approach may not use the five steps of the standard format of clinical supervision. Glickman indicates that the supervisor may simply observe the teacher without analyzing and interpreting, listen without making suggestions, or provide requested materials and resources rather than arrange in-service training. A non-directive approach to supervision is often employed when dealing with experienced teachers (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980; Glickman, 2002). Glickman (2002) suggests that the nondirective approach to supervision should be employed when a teacher or group of teachers possesses most of the knowledge and expertise about an issue and the supervisors’ knowledge and expertise is minimal. Glickman and Timeshare also suggest that a non-directive approach should be employed when a teacher or a group of teachers has full responsibility for carrying out a decision, or care about solving a problem and the supervisor has little involvement.

When a supervisor has little knowledge and expertise about an issue, he/she can still employ the collaborative approach. On such occasions, the supervisor should not lead the discussion, but rather solicit opinions, ask for clarification, reflect on issues being discussed, and present his/her opinions and suggestions.

2.7 SUPERVISOR CHARACTERISTICS AND SUPERVISORY PRACTICES

In this section the study reviews supervisor characteristics and practices from theories and empirical studies. Theorists and empirical studies have described how supervisor characteristics and practices have the potential to improve instruction. The characteristics include personal attributes that supervisors possess and exhibit in the course of their work, as well as their knowledge of content, expertise and skills, behavior, and attitudes towards teachers. The practices may include activities they go through and the techniques they employ while performing their roles as instructional supervisors.

Blasé and Blasé (2004) note that there is a paucity of research that describes how instructional supervision is actually practiced in schools, as well as how teachers are actually affected by such supervision. Blasé and Blasé (2004) cite other researchers to support their claim that what actually exist are exploratory studies of supervisory conferencing (Dungan, 1993; Roberts, 1991a); micro politics of supervisor-teacher interaction in public schools (Blasé & Blasé, 2004); and, related studies of precepting in medical schools (Blasé & 45 Hekelman, 1996; Hekelman & Blasé, 1996).

Many studies have referred to Blasé and Blasé’s (1999) study of teachers’ perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. The data were provided by teachers who were taking a course at three major universities located in the south-eastern, mid-western and north-eastern USA. The teachers provided a range of supervisor characteristics and practices which has served as an inventory to Blasé and Blasé. They grouped the characteristics into two: those which promoted effective supervision, and those which were found to be ineffective. The respondents in their study used terms like successful and effective to describe situations which they deemed appropriate to improvement of instruction.

**2.7.1 Trust and respect**

Researchers believe that teachers have trust and confidence in a supervisor who is knowledgeable and is also an instructional expert. Supervisors are expected to be knowledgeable in content and teaching strategies to be able to provide assistance and support to teachers. Teachers’ trust in the principal’s ability to assist and support them in their instructional practices is essential in the supervisory process (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). They suggest that teachers must be able to rely on supervisors for instructional assistance, moral boosting, and curriculum planning. They also suggest that supervisors should be honest to their teachers and be open to discussions. They finally propose that supervisors must have a working knowledge of the curriculum and pedagogy and, be a “master teacher”.

Similarly, Holland (2004) suggests that educators (supervisors) must demonstrate evidence that they have the necessary knowledge and skills to make important decisions about what they do and how they do it. She believes that credentials alone do not inspire trust, but rather how they are applied in practice. She also believes that teachers would trust a supervisor with whom they can confide. Teachers will not trust a supervisor who discusses teachers’ performances and instructional practices with other people, whether openly or surreptitiously.

Sullivan and Glanz (2000), on their part, believe the supervisors continued attendance at in-service training helps him/her to be able to provide useful assistance, advice, and support to teachers; and thereby develop the trust that teachers have in him/her. Having knowledge alone is not important, but using it judiciously to help teachers grow professionally is the ultimate objective. Pansiri (2008), in his study of teachers’ perspectives of “instructional leadership for quality learning” in Botswana, found that 77 percent of the public primary teachers who participated in his study trusted their supervisors. Rous (2004) study of public primary schools in the US state of Kentucky revealed, however, that although the supervisors in her study were knowledgeable, they neglected the teachers most of the time.

Rous (2004) in her study in the US public primary schools on teachers’ perspectives about instructional supervision and behavior that influence preschool instruction found out that instructional supervisors in her study who showed respect for staff, families, and children and demonstrated caring for children and teachers facilitated classroom instruction. Teacher participants in this study reported that their supervisors did not force them to teach in limited ways, nor were they criticized by their instructional leaders for trying out new approaches and teaching strategies.

**2.7.2 Listening**

Listening to, and hearing the needs of teachers are one of the responsibilities of supervisors (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). Teachers in Blasé and Blasés (1999) study indicated that their supervisors listened to their concerns and tried to assist them in any way possible. One respondent remarked that his supervisor shared upcoming units with him, and often offered additional ideas to enhance his lessons. Public primary school teachers in Botswana who participated in Pansiris (2008) study also indicated that their supervisors listened to their concerns, as well as being accessible and approachable.

Praise Researchers have theorized and shown empirically that praising teachers significantly affects teacher motivation, self-esteem, and efficacy (Blasé & Blasé, 1999, 2004). They are also of the view that praise fosters teachers’ reflective behavior, by reinforcing teaching strategies, risk-taking, and innovation/creativity. Praising teachers is a critical function in instructional leadership (Blasé & Blasé, 2004) and pedagogical leadership (Pansiri, 2008). In his study in Botswana, Pansiri (2008) reported that 70 percent of the public primary school teachers who participated in his study indicated that their supervisors praised them for demonstrating good teaching strategies. Blasé and Blasé (1999) also found that principals (instructional supervisors) in their US study gave praise that focused on specific and concrete teaching behavior.

**2.7.3 Planning for lesson observation**

Proponents of clinical supervision such as Cogan and Goldhammer advise that supervisors mutually plan lesson observation with teachers, rather than supervisors entering the classroom unexpectedly, and with pre-determined rating items.

Blasé and Blasé (2004) suggest that supervisors should mutually decide with their teachers on what and how to observe before proceeding to the classroom to observe a lesson. In Pansiris’ study (2008), 75 percent of his teacher participants in Botswana indicated their supervisors planned class visits with them. The teachers accepted the supervisors as partners for instructional improvement, rather than viewed their visits as intrusion into their private instructional behavior. Ayse Bas (2002) study of Turkish private schools found, however, that the principal determined when visits would be conducted without consulting with teachers.

**2.7.4 Informal visits**

Some researchers have theorized that supervisors’ frequent visit classrooms (walk-troughs) make their presence felt in the school (Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Rous, 2004). Such visits are usually not planned, but to put teachers on the alert to ensure that they (teachers) make good use of instructional time, and chip in support to teachers when necessary. Rous (2004) reported that lack of contact between teachers and instructional supervisors in her study negatively affected instructional practices.

Empirical studies have also shown that informal visits motivated teachers to improve their instructional strategies and teachers’ time -on-task. In her study of selected public primary school teachers in the US, Rous (2004) found that most teachers believe that their supervisors’ frequent visits and calls were important activities, whereas others reported that their supervisors were not seen in the classrooms enough. She observed that teachers were energized when supervisors “dropped by” the classrooms and interacted with the students.

This was seen as a demonstration of supervisors’ concern for teachers, students and programme. Similar studies conducted in Ghana have shown that frequent visits to classrooms are necessary to improve teachers’ time-on-task. Oduro (2008) and the World Bank report (Education in Ghana: Improving equity, efficiency and accountability of education delivery, (2011) have found that some teachers in public primary schools in Ghana are in the habit of absenting themselves from school. The World Bank report revealed that only 109 out of 197 school days are fully operational as teachers spent other days engaged in activities such as collecting salaries, attending funerals, and travelling long distances to their schools.

**2.7.5 Observing lessons**

Lesson observation is one major function of supervisors. In almost all models discussed earlier, lesson observation has been seen as a major tool that supervisors use to assess the content knowledge of teachers and their competency in instructional strategies and practices, so as to provide the necessary assistance to improve instruction. In such visits, it is imperative for the supervisor to focus on what was agreed upon to be observed during the pre-observation conference (Cogan, 1973; Glickman, 1990; Goldhammer, 1969; Miller & Miller, 1987). This is supposed to guide supervisors to stay on track and be objective in their practices.

Empirical studies have shown that although some supervisors were able to observe lessons, others were unable to do so. Some participants in Pansiri’s (2008) study indicated that their supervisors visited classrooms with the intention of supervising instruction but were unable to provide professional support to the teachers. However, other participants reported their supervisors observed classes and wrote notes based solely on what was occurring in the classroom. Pansiri did not show the proportion in each case. The group of participants who received feedback reported that their supervisors carried out classroom supervision positively.

Pansiri did not, however, indicate whether those supervisors who could not offer professional support to the teachers were not knowledgeable in the subjects been taught or limited in expertise. Rous (2004) also reported that supervisors in her US study did not have enough time to observe lessons. Some participants in her study reported that their supervisors were not seen in their classrooms enough.

**2.7.6 Questioning**

Proponents of clinical supervision such as Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969) suggest that supervisors use questioning to guide and assist teachers improve their instructional strategies. Supervisors are expected to use probing questions during pre-observation conferences, classroom observations, and post-observation conferences to guide and assist teachers plan their lessons, use appropriate teaching techniques, and take decisions to improve instruction (Blasé & Blasé, 2004). Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969) put forward that questioning could be used at any stage of the supervisory process- planning a lesson, selecting instructional materials, during teaching, and assessing students.

A study of public-school teachers’ perceptions about instructional leadership in the US revealed that supervisors who participated in the study often used questioning approach to solicit teachers’ actions about instructional matters (Blasé & Blasé, 1999). Participants in that study remarked that such questions served as guide to make them reflect on their actions, know what to do next, and evaluate what they did. In a similar study, all five participants in a 3-year longitudinal study agreed that using thought-provoking questions to guide teachers improved their instructional practice (Holland, 2004). The participants indicated that such questions are designed to reassure teachers that supervisors are simply seeking information, but do not put teachers on the defensive by telling them what they should do or what they are not doing. The participants were from the same large urban school district and were being groomed as secondary administrators. Holland did not, however, mention the place (context) in which the study took place. It could be helpful if supervisors use probing questions to assess individual teachers’ content knowledge and instructional skills so as to provide the necessary guidance and assistance to improve instruction.

**2.7.7 Offering suggestions**

Another supervisory practice which researchers have found to be fruitful is the provision of suggestions to guide instruction (Blasé & Blasé, 2004). Suggestions serve as guides to help teachers choose among alternative plans, varied teaching strategies, and classroom management practices. Blasé and colleague (2004) observe that principals (supervisors) make suggestions in such a way as to broaden, or enrich teachers’ thinking and strengths. They note that suggestions encourage creativity and innovation, as well as support work environment.

The teachers in Blasé and Blasé’s (1999) study overwhelmingly reported that successful principals (supervisors) offered suggestions to improve teaching and learning, vary their instructional methods, and help solve problems. The participants found principals suggestions fruitful and strongly enhanced reflection and informed instructional behavior.

Rous (2004) findings were consistent with the one mentioned above. Public primary school teachers in her US study reported that their principals commonly offered suggestions. The teachers acknowledged that when their supervisors offered helpful suggestions on instructional practices, it increased their ability to solve classroom problems. Rous observed that teachers in her study were willing to try suggestions which were offered sincerely and positively. The use of the word “helpful” in the report suggests that not all suggestions may be useful to the teachers.

Visiting classrooms and providing feedback to teachers is considered one of the major roles of supervisors. Feedback provides teachers help them reflect on what actually took place in the teaching-learning process. Blasé and Blasé (2004) believe that feedback should not be a formality, but should serve as a guide for instructional improvement when it is given genuinely. Similarly, feedback (whether formally or informal, written or oral) should focus on observations rather than perspectives. Blasé and Blasé (2004) theories that feedback reflectively informs teacher behavior; and this results in teachers implementing new ideas, trying out a variety of instructional practices, responding to student diversity, and planning more carefully and achieving better focus.

Teachers in Blasé and Blasé’s (1999) study reported that effective principals provided them with positive feedback about observed lessons. They indicated that such feedback was specific; expressed caring, interest and support in a non-judgmental way; and encouraged them to think and re-evaluate their strategies. Similarly, Rous (2004) also reported that in the US public schools, feedback offered by supervisors was a formal behavior, and was objective and based solely on class observation.

Teachers in this study saw feedback to be constructive, and very helpful to them in their instructional practices. Pansiri (2008) also reported that 70 percent of public primary school teachers in Botswana who participated in his study indicated their supervisors provided them with constructive feedback about classroom observation. However, these findings are inconsistent with Bays’ (2001) findings in rural districts in the state of Virginia. She found that instructional support and specific feedback for teacher participants in the area of special education appeared to be limited. Modeling lessons. Researchers have theorized that lesson demonstration can improve teachers’ instructional practices (Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006).

Supervisors use demonstration lessons to assist teachers individually and in groups. This practice is not only used to guide new and inexperienced teachers, but veterans as well. Supervisors may learn strategies from teachers during their classroom observations, and transfer such learned activity to other teachers to try them out in their classrooms.

Research studies have shown that supervisors use lesson demonstrations to help teachers to improve their instructional practices. US pre-school teachers in Rous’ (2004) study reported that their instructional supervisors modeled appropriate techniques, and admitted that such practices were a good source of assistance in dealing with children with special needs. Similarly, Blasé and Blasé (1999) found in the US that those supervisors in their study demonstrated teaching techniques during classroom visits. In Blasé and Blasé’s study, participants did not consider the supervisors’ actions as intrusive, because the latter had already cultivated respectful and trusting relationship with teachers.

On the flip side, 71 percent of the teachers in Botswana who participated in Pansiris (2008) study indicated that their supervisors neither gave demonstration lessons nor coached them how to handle certain topics or lessons. Glanz, Shulman and Sullivan (2006) also found in the US that supervisors in their study never modeled teaching. One participant remarked “she (principal) doesn’t model anything”.

**2.7.8 Teaching Resources**

It is widely believed that teaching-learning resources can improve instruction. An empirical research study has shown that some instructional supervisors ensured that teachers were provided with, and assisted to select appropriate teaching materials and resources to improve instruction (Rous, 2004). Rous (2004) indicated that although some supervisors in her study in the US public schools provided teachers with resources, materials, and funds to support classroom activities, others reported instances where instructional supervisors failed to provide resources needed by teachers to implement quality instruction. In Botswana, 59 percent of the teachers in the public primary schools Pansiri (2008) studied reported that they did not have all the teaching materials they needed for their classes. Only 22 percent of the participants in his study said they were provided with enough teaching materials. This situation of insufficient learning resources may be due to economic reasons and not peculiar to Botswana alone but common in public schools in other developing countries as well.

In some African public schools, for example in Ghana, textbooks are supplied by the government, but headteachers have to make requisition for the quantity needed in every subject. With respect to other teaching resources, the schools procure what they require. In Pansiri’s study, 53 percent of his teacher participants reported that their supervisors did not involve them in resource selection and procurement. Under the new policy, heads in Ghana are expected to involve teachers in the preparation of the School Performance Improvement Plan (SPIP). The teaching materials and resources (apart from textbooks) which the school would need for an academic year are included on the item list of the SPIP.

**2.7.9 Workshops and Seminars for Professional Development**

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

In their study, Blasé and Blasé (1999) found that successful principals provided teachers with information about and encouraged teachers to attend workshops, seminars, and conferences about instruction. These supervisors were also reported to have provided their teachers with funds, informed teachers of innovative seminars, and workshops.

Teachers in this study admitted they had learnt a lot of new techniques and challenges to stay abreast with recent development. Similarly, 83 percent of public-school teachers who participated in a study in Botswana indicated that their supervisors ran school based workshops to address the curriculum needs of teachers, and 73 percent of them were given the opportunity to facilitate in such workshops (Pansiri, 2008).

Another form of support supervisors are expected to provide to teachers is professional literature and current issues about instruction. Blasé and Blasé (1999) indicated supervisors in their study regularly distributed professional literature about current and useful instructional practices to their teachers. Supervisors in government and private-aided senior secondary schools who participated in Tyagis (2009) study in India used weekly staff meetings to make teachers aware of current educational programmes. In addition, teachers in that study were given access to relevant professional literature, journals and magazines.

**2.7.10 Promoting collaboration**

Researchers suggest that supervisors provide time and opportunities for teachers to collaborate with one another to improve their instructional strategies and skills (Blasé and Blasé, 1999; DuFour, 2004; Glickman, Gordon & Ross Gordon, 2001; Sergiovanni & Starratt 1993). DuFour describes collaboration as a systematic process in which teachers work together to analyze and implement their classroom practices to improve instruction. He suggests that formal teams must have time to meet during the weekday and throughout the school year. Promoting collegiality (collaboration) among teachers has been theorized by researchers as an important way to help schools change for the better (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993) because interaction with one another influences what one does (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; cited in Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). Blasé and Blasé (2004) argue that collaboration results in teacher motivation, self-esteem, efficacy, and reflective behavior, such as risk taking, instructional variety, and innovation/creativity.

Public primary school teachers who participated in a study in the US reported that their supervisors recognized that collaboration among teachers was essential for successful teaching and learning (Blasé & Blasé, 1999). Supervisors in their study modeled teamwork, provided time for teams to meet regularly, and advocated sharing, and peer observation. The supervisors were also reported to have encouraged teachers to visit other teachers, even in other schools, to observe their classrooms and programmes. Similarly, study participants (heads) in government and private-aided senior secondary schools in India provided further opportunity for teachers to meet with other teachers in their discipline from different schools to discuss programmes (Tyagi, 2009).

In a similar study, Rous (2004) found that supervisors in her study in the US promoted interaction among staff members through meetings. Teachers in this study admitted that such meetings were helpful in increasing creativity in their instruction. The teachers further indicated such meetings provided opportunity for them to take part in decisions about issues that affected their classrooms. Similarly, in Bays’ (2001) study, teachers in rural district schools in the US mentioned interaction with peers as helpful and desirable, and that she envisaged potential for collegial supervisory processes in the districts in terms of teachers being receptive to the idea of learning from peers. This supports the call for the collegial supervision model as espoused by Glatthorn (1990) and Glanz (2002).

**2.7.11 Sharing knowledge and experience**

Researchers have suggested that supervisors should possess some working knowledge and skills to be able to provide the necessary assistance, guidance, and support services to teachers for improved classroom practices (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2004; Holland, 2004). Holland believes that educators (supervisors) must offer evidence that they have the necessary knowledge and skills to make important decisions about instruction, and credentials in the form of degrees and diplomas are a form of evidence, but acknowledges that credentials alone do not inspire trust.

It is a common belief that academic qualifications and long term working experience provide people with knowledge and skills to be able to perform satisfactorily in an establishment. Researchers have not set a minimum qualification as a benchmark to be attained by supervisors, but minimum teaching qualifications differ from country to another.

One difference may be between developed and developing nations. In most African countries the minimum teaching qualification is Teachers’ Certificate ‘A’ Post -middle or Postsecondary, whereas that of developed countries is a Bachelor of Education. However, most developing countries are now phasing out those qualifications and replacing them with degrees and diplomas De Grauwe, (2001).

It is expected that supervisors have higher qualifications than their teachers, or at worst, at par with them so that they will be able to provide them with the necessary guidance and support. A higher qualification like Bachelor of Educational Psychology or Diploma in Education is sufficient for persons in supervisory positions. But in many developed countries, supervisors do not have such qualifications, and this may pose a challenge to required practice.

De Grauwe (2001) found in four African countries that both qualifications and experience seemed important in the selection of supervisors, but at the primary level, many of the most experienced teachers did not have strong academic background because they entered the teaching profession a long time in the past when qualification requirements were low. He indicated, however, that apart from Tanzania the situation in the other countries has now improved, and supervisors (including headteachers) have strong background and qualifications which are higher than the teachers they supervise. In Botswana, for instance, teachers were by then trained up to Diploma level De Grauwe, (2001). This finding is corroborated by Pansiri (2008). He also observed that diploma and degree qualifications were new programmes for primary school teachers which were introduced in the mid-1980s in Botswana. He found that most teachers were trained at the certificate levels: Primary teachers’ Certificate (PTC), Primary High Teaching Certificate (PH), Primary Lower Teaching Certificate (PL), or Elementary Teaching Certificate (ETC). In Ghana, most primary school teachers (including headteachers) hold Teachers’ Certificate ‘A’ Post-middle or Postsecondary. Initial (basic) Teacher Training Colleges in Ghana have recently been up-graded to Diploma Awarding Institutions.

In most countries, headteachers are promoted on the basis of seniority and experience De Grauwe, (2001), and by virtue of their position as heads, they automatically become the instructional supervisors at the school level. In some developing countries, most primary school teachers do not possess higher qualifications in the form of degrees and diplomas; so they occupy supervisory positions on the basis of seniority and long service. It would be proper for supervisors to possess higher qualifications and longer years of teaching experience than the teachers they supervise. Such supervisors would have sufficient knowledge and experience in both content and pedagogy to be able to confidently assist, guide and support their teachers.

The minimum number of teaching years required for promotion to headteacher or supervisor differs from one country to another. In reviewing years of teaching as requisite to a supervisory position, Carron and De Grauwe (1997) found that in Spain it is from three to seven years (Alvarez & Collera), nine years in Italy (EURDICE) and 20 years in Venezuela (Lyons & Pritchard). In Ghana, longer years are preferred, but there is no minimum number of years. As already indicated above, the position depends on which teacher in the school has the highest qualification and longer years of service. However, there are situations where new graduate teachers work under the supervision of experienced headteachers with lower qualifications.

**2.8 CHALLENGES FOR SUPERVISORS’ COMPETENCES**

The issue of concern is when a young degree holder from university is posted to a school to work under the supervision of a relatively older and experienced supervisor with lower qualifications. The former may not have the opportunity to try his/her new ideas if the supervisor uses a directive approach. In such situations, the supervisor may want to suggest to or direct the teacher as to what he/she should do and how it should be done. Innovation in instructional practices will be stifled, and the status quo in both instructional strategies and supervisory practices will be the norm.

If academic qualifications should take precedence over experience, then one would have thought that new degree and diploma holders should be made to take over from headteachers (supervisors) who have lower qualifications but served for a longer number of years in teaching. But De Grauwe (2001) argues that appointing younger teachers fresh from the universities and providing them with specific training for these positions may also not solve the problem, because they may lack classroom experience.

**2.8.1 Training of Supervisors**

Another issue of concern is whether supervisors are given enough training to function properly in their practice. Carron and De Grauwe (1997) expressed little doubt that advisers, inspectors and other such staff need regular training, but they seldom receive it. They believe that whatever pattern of recruitment and promotion procedures, supervisors (advisers, inspectors or other such staff) needs regular training but they are seldom provided with pre-service or in-service training. They note that throughout the history of supervision, training of supervisors has been considered important. They referred to the International Conference on Education (1937) “that persons appointed to supervisory positions be placed on a period of probation or by following a special course organized by a postgraduate Institution” (p.30). They acknowledged, however, that “pre-service or in-service training programmes are still few and far between” (p. 30).

In Botswana and Zimbabwe formal induction training programmes existed, but not all newly appointed supervisors had the opportunity to attend De Grauwe, (2001). He observed that the in-service training courses which took place in the four countries were not integrated within the overall capacity-building programme, and did not focus sufficiently on supervision issues. According to De Grauwe, many of those training programmes were adhoc and were related to the implementation of a particular project. Carron and De Grauwe (1997) also note that developing countries are in want of a well-organized system to prepare both supervision and support staff for their role and to keep them up to date. In a related study conducted in Ghana by Oduro (2008), about 75 percent of the interview participants (heads) reported that they received little or no training in leadership and, therefore, used trial and error techniques to address challenges they encountered in their leadership roles. He also found that 72 percent of the heads had some training in leadership and management, but lasted between one day and two weeks. This study did not mention supervision directly.

The situation is different in developed nations. Citing Eurydice, Carron and De Grauwe (1997) found that primary school supervisors in Ireland pass through a probation period of six months, whereas their counterparts in Portugal followed a one-year course.

Glanz, Shulman and Sullivan (2007), note that coaches, unlike school heads and other supervisors in New York Public Schools did not have any formal training in classroom observation and supervision. Glanz, et al. (2007) and Hawk and Hill (2003) found that coaches in the US and New Zealand respectively received training in subject specific areas, but not generics training (general supervision). This suggests the supervisors in those countries had formal training in supervision, but these researchers did not provide specific details. Bays (2001) also indicated that in the US, administrator training is a certification requirement; such training provides principals with knowledge of supervision theory, practice, and personnel management that prepares them with general strategies to supervise all their teachers. Bays also found in her study that only one principal out of nine had background experience and training in instructional practices for students with disabilities.

This suggests that, apart from generic training in supervisory practices, principals posted to special schools may be given training in that special field.

In the absence of pre-service or in-service training, supervisors may be inclined to rely on their experiences with their previous supervisors over the years, as well as their existing knowledge in administration and pedagogy. In such situations, practices may differ from one supervisor to another in the same education system. There is also the possibility of stagnation in practice, instead of innovation and improvement.

**2.8.2 Professional support for supervision**

Apart from the training supervisors will receive, there is the urgent need for support instruments and materials to support practice. Data bases are needed to prepare and monitor the supervision work Carron & De Grauwe, (1997). Access to the internet, bulletins and journals is another source of support to supervisors. Supervision guides and manuals may serve as reminders to supervisors about how certain practices and behavior should be followed, and provide a uniform platform for supervisors to operate, thereby re assuring teachers of the personal biases which individual supervisors may introduce. They can guide practitioners to avoid relying solely on their own individual experiences or orientation.

In this era of technological advancement, literature on current instructional practices and content knowledge abound on the internet data bases, bulletins and journals. Blasé & Blasé (1999) found in the US that principals who participated in their study enhanced their teachers’ reflective behavior by distributing literature on instructional practices to them. Such materials are relatively inaccessible to supervisors/educators in less-developed countries.

Schools in developing countries often do not have access to computers, let alone being connected to the internet. Searching the internet and data bases for relevant instructional materials and making them available to their teachers is relatively difficult, therefore, for supervisors in developing countries. Similarly, most schools do not have access to education newsletters, bulletins and journals that cover current issues about supervision and instructional practices.

The presence of supervision guides and manuals has the potential to improve supervision practices because they serve as reference materials for practice. Similarly, education newsletters, bulletins and journals provide supervisors with current trends in instructional strategies and content materials which they can make available to the teachers they supervise. The absence of these may pose a challenge to practice.

**2.8.3 Combining supervision with other duties**

Another challenge to supervision is a situation where headteachers, by virtue of their position, are administrators, financial managers and instructional supervisors. Such heads have relatively little time for supervision of instruction. When a choice is to be made between administrative and pedagogical duties, the latter suffers De Grauwe, (2001). De Grauwe contends that supervisors may focus their attention on administration rather than pedagogy, because they have much power over administrative decisions. De Grauwe (2001) conceives the situation to be worse in developing countries than developed ones, because the latter can afford to employ several staff (e.g. administrative as opposed to pedagogic supervisors), so that the workload of each officer becomes less heavy and responsibilities become much clearer. In the US, a respondent in Rous’ (2004) study indicated that she would have liked her supervisor’s opinions on how to deal with certain children’s behavior, but she (the supervisor) did not have time. Other participants in the same study reported that their supervisors were not seen in their classrooms enough. Rous’ study of public primary schools in the US state of Kentucky is a recent one conducted in a developed country, but she did not mention whether the principals (supervisors) had multiple duties/responsibilities.

In a similar study in a rural public-school district in the US, Bays (2001) found that principals performed duties in the areas of management, administration and supervision. She described the separation of these functions as an “artificial” activity for the principals she observed, as they moved from one type of activity to another constantly throughout the day.

Bays observed that administrative and management issues took much of the principals’ time and energies and detracted them from providing constant direct supervision to teachers. In Ghanaian public primary schools, headteachers perform “a magnitude of tasks”, and those in remote and deprived communities combine their supervisory roles with full-time teaching and visiting pupils in their communities (Oduro, 2008). In such situations, supervisors may not be able to sufficiently supervise instruction. Carron and De Grauwe (1997) observe that countries such as Spain, France and Guinea which separate administrative from pedagogical supervision do not experience such problems. Thus, combining administrative and supervisory duties is another challenge to supervision of instruction.

Teachers’ attitudes and supervisors’ approaches to supervision. The way and manner that teachers react to supervision of instruction is another concern to supervisory practices. If teachers, who are the direct beneficiaries of instructional supervision, have a negative attitude towards the practice, the whole process will not yield the desired results. This is because supervision which aims at providing assistance, guidance and support for teachers to effectively provide instruction thrives on co-operation, respect and mutual trust.

**2.8.4 Control and intimidation**

Some teachers see supervision as a tool used by administrators to control and intimidate them. This notion makes teachers feel unsafe and threatened when they experience any form of supervision. Ayse Bas (2002) found in Turkish private primary schools that some teachers who participated in his study felt supervision was an intrusion into their private instructional practices. Teachers in his study bemoaned that the principal’s intrusive monitoring and physical presence changed the setting in the classrooms which resulted in false impressions. According to the teachers, there was always an element of stress and overreaction on the part of teachers and students during classroom observations.

Supervisors’ approach to supervision may pose a challenge to supervision of instruction. Supervisors in Ayse Bass (2002) study (Turkish private primary schools) used controlling and intimidation approaches in their supervisory practices. The teachers confided in the researcher that they lived in a stat e of fear and frustration of dismissal due to the systems summative nature. This is supportive of Oliva and Pawlass (1997) perception that some school supervisors or inspectors, as they are called in other countries, continue to fulfill their tasks with an authoritarian approach. Some respondents in Rouss (2004) study in the US expressed feelings of fear and disappointment, which were associated with the use of criticism by instructional supervisors. The supervisors’ criticisms were reported to have stifled the teachers’ use of innovative practices. Yimaz, Tadan, and Ouz (2009) found that supervisors in Turkish primary schools who participated in their study used the traditional approach to supervision, and such activities were geared towards the determination of conditions, to assess and control, whereas activities like supporting, guiding and improving were ignored.

**2.9 SUMMARY**

Previous studies have examined the perceptions of teachers, principals (headteachers), department heads and education officers about supervision practices. Whereas some of these studies examined the supervision beliefs of heads (Yimaz, Tadan & Ouz, 2009), others examined how supervisors provide supervision, how supervisors improve supervision and how supervisors promote teaching and learning (Bays, 2001; Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006; Pansiri, 2008; Tyagi, 2009). Some studies have also examined supervisor behavior that influence practice (Rous, 2004) and working relationships between supervisors and teachers (Holland, 2004). Another study examined the perceptions of participants about how they perceive instructional supervision in terms of strengths and weaknesses (Ayse Bas, 2002). This study, however, examined the perspectives of teachers and head teachers about how they experienced instructional supervision in their schools, their conceptualizations of instructional supervision, and aspects of instructional supervision they want to practice.

# CHAPTER THREE

# METHODOLOGY

3.0 Overview of the chapter

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

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

In this study the researcher used a mixed methods survey design, with both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis. “Survey research (also called descriptive research) uses instruments such as questionnaires and interviews to gather information from groups of subjects” (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorensen, 2006, p. 31). In survey research, investigators ask questions about peoples’ beliefs, opinions, characteristics, and behavior (Creswell, 2003). Surveys may also investigate associations between respondents’ characteristics such as age, education, social class, race and their current attitudes or beliefs towards some issue.

An overview of this study design, framed against the research questions, is given in Table 1 below.

**Table 1:** Overview of Research Design

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Research Question | Participants | Instrument(s) | Type of Data Collected |
| What does the MoES policy on supervision of instruction require of head teachers? | Head teachers  (n=10) and Policy  Officers (n=2) | Interviews:  (standardized open-ended). | Qualitative:  (Interview transcripts). |
| How do participants  conceptualize and  experience  supervision of  instruction in primary  schools? | Headteachers  (n=40) and  Teachers (n=240) | Questionnaire:  (Likert scale and  Open-ended items).  Interviews:  (standardized open-ended). | Quantitative:  (questionnaires)  Qualitative: (interview  transcripts). |
| Which aspects of  instructional  supervision do  teachers and  head teachers want to  practice? | Headteachers  (n=40), Teachers  (n=240) and Policy  Officers (n=2) | Questionnaire:  (Likert scale and  open-ended items).  Interviews:  (standardized open-ended). | Quantitative:  (questionnaires).  Qualitative:  (interview transcripts). |
| What are the  differences, if any,  between teachers and  headteachers, in expectations and experiences of supervision of instruction? | Headteachers  (n=40) and  Teachers (n=240) | Questionnaire:  (Likert scale and  open-ended items).  Interviews:  (standardized openended). | Quantitative;  (questionnaires).  Qualitative:  (interview transcripts). |
| What systemic  challenges are likely  to affect supervision  of instruction in the  schools? | Headteachers  (n=40), Teachers  (n=240) and Policy Officers (n=2) | Questionnaire:  (open-ended items).  Interviews:  (standardized openended). | Quantitative:  (questionnaires).  Qualitative:  (interview transcripts). |

**Note: All data were collected during March 2018**

Sampling technique was used in this research work. Sampling was imperative since it was not possible for the researcher to move in all schools around Kyegegwa Distict Local Administrationdue to time fact and other resources that were needed for the research work to be done. Under sampling census was applied.

For purposive sampling to be effective, participants had to be identified based on qualifications and characteristics they possessed. “Purposive sampling allows sample elements judged to be typical or representative to be chosen from the population” (Ary et al., 2006, p.174). The study used a purposive sampling technique to invite an officer from the Inspectorate Division of the Ghana Education Service (GES) and the Assistant Director of Education responsible for Supervision (ADE Supervision) in the selected Municipal Education office for the interview because of their unique positions in the service. A number of unsuccessful attempts had been made to arrange a meeting with the national head of supervision (Chief Inspector). The researcher made an alternate arrangement and interviewed a subordinate from the same office. The ADE Supervision, who is the Chief Inspector in the district and the officer from Inspectorate Division in the GES, expected to have in-depth knowledge about supervision. The researcher invited only two officers for this interview because the importance of the sample lies in the quality of knowledge of the participants in the study, not the size of the sample (Patton, 1990).

3.2 DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

This is also another method that can or shall be applied in the process of conducting the research, a questionnaire and a standardized open-ended (semi-structured) interview protocol to collect data for the study.

The researcher chose questionnaire strategy because the participants werefunctionally literate, and therefore could read and respond to the items. Closed-ended questionnaires can be answered more easily and quickly by respondents (Ary et al., 2006). Similarly, the large number of respondents to be interviewed favoured the approach. The studyused self-administered questionnaires to collect data from headteachers and teachers in public primary schools in the 2009/2010 academic year (Appendix A and B respectively). The study selected characteristics and practices (strategies, behavior, attitudes and goals) of effective instructional leadership (Blasé & Blasé, 1999) and other sources derived from the literature to construct the items in the questionnaire. The study divided the questionnaire into three parts: items relating to the background information (demographics) of participants, 24 Likert scale items, and four open-ended items.

The demographic items included sex, age, educational qualification, years of teaching experience, and years in the present position. The second section, the Likert scale, consisted of aspects of supervision of instruction. On the left-hand side of the items, - participants were asked to indicate by a tick how often; - always, sometimes, rarely, and never, supervisors exhibited certain characteristics and practices. On the right-hand side of the same items, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement - strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree - with each of the listed practices. In the last section, participants were asked to respond to four open-ended questions about their views of supervisory practices in their schools.

The researcher used interviews to complement the questionnaire because interviews allow the studyto enter another person’s viewpoint, to better understand his/her perspectives Patton, (1990). Interviews also allow a wide range of participants’ understanding to be explored, and can reveal important aspects of the phenomena under study. Semi-structured interviews allow the interviewer to focus on the research questions, yet open up new avenues for further questions (Ary et al., 2006). Ary and colleagues have suggested that in a semi structured interview, respondents should be asked the same questions, but in a more conversational way. They, however, note that the interviewer has more freedom to arrange the order of the questions or even rephrase them.

The study used a standardized open-ended (semi-structured) interview protocol to collect data from 10 teachers, 10 headteachers and two police officers. The study used this instrument to examine how headteachers and teachers practiced and experienced instructional supervision in their schools (Appendix C and D respectively). The study also used this instrument to examine how teachers and head teachers conceptualize instructional supervision. The study also used a standardized openended (semi-structured) interview protocol to examine how the heads of supervision at the national and district levels conceptualize supervision of instruction, or how they expected supervision policies to be implemented at the school level (Appendix E and F respectively).

The researcher used the interview protocol to explore the potential problems which might negatively affect instructional supervision in the schools as perceived by all the three groups of interviewees. The researcher conducted face-to-face interviews with all of the twenty-two participants. Personal interviews improved the reliability of the interview process since a consistent approach was adopted.

The study used an audio-recorder to capture each interview with the participants. While interviews with teachers and heads lasted between 10 and 15 minutes, those with the policy personnel lasted between 20 and 30 minutes. The interview times were short because of the structure of the items. Standardized open-ended questions are straight-forward but allow for flexibility. In addition to this, the interview questions involved were not many. In spite of this, the researcher was able to gather rich data beyond the scope of the closed-ended items of the questionnaire.

The interviewees were audio taped to ensure that a more accurate picture of the questions and answers (Patton, 1990) and therefore to enhance validity (Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell, & Alexander, 1995). Similarly, recording the interviews allowed me to give full attention to the interviewee rather than pausing to take notes (Elliot, 2005; Patton, 1990).

3.3 ADMINISTRATION AND RETRIEVAL OF INSTRUMENTS

The researcher personally administered the questionnaires and interviewed all the participants. Both instruments were administered concurrently (simultaneously). In this design, the researcher collects two or more forms of data simultaneously (one-shot) during the study period and then integrates the information in the interpretation of the overall results (Creswell, 2003). The data collection took place in a Kyegegwa municipal from September 2015 to October 2017. The studywas issued with a permission letter from the Municipal Education Directorate, and was accompanied to each participating school by a circuit officer, who introduced me to the headteachers and teachers. The circuit supervisors accompanied me to the schools purposefully to show me the locations of the schools and introduce me to the staff members. The researcher made subsequent visits to the schools alone to retrieve the questionnaires and conduct the interviews. She used the first five minutes to discuss social and environmental issues in Australia with participants in order to establish rapport with them.

The researcher provided each participant with a copy of the Information Letter (Appendix G) which stated the purpose of the study and assured the participants of confidentiality, in that no information would be attributed to any individual person. The researcher then distributed the questionnaires to the respondents and explained and clarified some of the items which the field test had shown could be potentially confusing. In most cases, the researcher returned to the schools at an agreed date to collect the completed questionnaires. However, she visited some schools more than twice before she could retrieve the completed questionnaires.

In the process of distributing the questionnaires the researcher asked the teachers and headteachers for their consent to be interviewed. The first two teachers and two heads in each circuit that consented signed the consent forms (Appendix H), and the interviews were scheduled at a date and place convenient to the interviewees. While some interviews took place at the headteachers’ offices, others were conducted at the municipal education office. The study audio-recorded the interviews to capture the responses, in this study, whenever the researcher found that a respondent had misinterpreted a question, she tried to paraphrase it to make the question clearer and put the participant on track in order for him/her to provide straightforward responses Ary et al., (2006). Even though the interview questions were standardized open-ended items, the study probed further for more detailed information when interviewees provided responses which The study thought were incomplete, as suggested by Minichiello et al. (1995).

At the end of each session, the researcher played back the recorded conversation to the interviewees to make sure they agreed to what had been shared. Additional recordings were made of three interviews in which respondents wanted to add a few comments. The researcher used this approach because shefound that it would be difficult to send the transcripts back to the interviewees in Gulu.

Most interviewees did not want to be identified so they declined to provide their particulars on the consent forms but rather appended their signatures.

A headteachers’ manual (UES policy document) which contained guidelines on school administration, management and instructional supervision was not readily available but the researcher had a copy of the headteachers’ appraisal form (Appendix I). Circuit supervisors use this form to assess the performance of the headteachers in the areas of administration, management and instructional supervision. **Researcher** analyzed the aspects related to instructional supervision and integrated them in the interpretation of the overall results.

3.4 METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

Researcher analyzed the data obtained from the two main instruments separately. The study first analyzed the data from the questionnaire, which was divided into three parts. The study coded the demographic and Likert scale data and analyzed them using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The study analyzed the responses on either side (left- and right-hand side) of the Likert scale items separately. The study then used the SPSS to generate contingency tables for frequencies, percentages and Pearson’s Chi-square. The study used the Chi-square to determine whether perceived differences between teachers and head teacher’s responses were statistically significant or likely due to chance or error. The study also used the SPSS to draw column graphs to show in pictorial form the comparison between teachers and head teachers’ opinions about how often they experienced various forms of instructional supervision in their schools. The study compared the differences between responses from teachers and head teachers on both sides of the items. The left-hand side of the items explored how often teachers and heads experienced supervision of instruction in their schools, while the right-hand side examined how they conceptualize supervision of instruction.

The Researcher also analyzed the responses to the third part of the questionnaire (open-ended items). In this part, the study analyzed responses from common items for teachers and head teachers together and analyzed items peculiar to each group of respondents separately. The study summarized responses for each item and presented them as part of the findings. Every individual’s response to each item was included in the analysis.

The study analyzed the interview responses from the three groups of interviewees (teachers, head teachers, and policy personnel) after transcription. The study used a cross-case analysis procedure Patton, (1990) to analyze the interview data. In this approach, responses to a common question from all interviewees in each category are analyzed together. Thus, each question was analyzed separately for teachers, headteachers, and the policy personnel. Patton (1990) posits that it is easy to do a cross-case analysis for each question in the interview when a standardized open-ended approach is used. In a cross-case analysis, participants’ responses to a particular question/item are combined. Common themes across participants (cases) are then identified, analyzed and interpreted item by item.

The interview data for the three groups of respondents were analyzed in a systematic manner. First, the researcher replayed the audio recordings of each respondent and transcribed them by hand on paper. The researcher transcribed sentences and phrases directly to avoid misinterpretation of the sense or meaning of information participants provided as suggested by Patton (1990). The researcherread through the responses for each item across all the ten teachers, ten headteachers and the two police officers separately and recorded the key ideas.

Responses from each question were grouped together and analyzed on central issues Patton, (1990). If an interviewee provided a response to a particular question but this was found to answer a different question, researcher transferred the particular response to include it in the responses for the latter. Since researcher used a standardized interview protocol, questions were framed around specific ideas drawn from the literature. For each interview item, the researcher looked for common phrases or statements, and organized them under the pre-determined themes based on the literature. Therefore, the key ideas from responses were organized by question. However, problems/challenges participants faced in the conduct of supervision did not have pre -set themes. In this case, common phrases or statements which fit together were put into categories and organized into themes. For example, responses such as my supervisor “is too busy”, “doesn’t have time”, “is always occupied” and “is not seen often in the classroom” etc. were organized under the theme “time constraint/lack of time”.

3.5 QUALITY OF THE INSTRUMENTS/DATA

Theresearcher found the two instruments researcher used in the study to be valid and credible. The items in the questionnaire (Likert scale and open -ended) items were developed from the theoretical and empirical literature and were edited by my supervisors. The studyexplained each item to the participants to ensure that they understood and responded appropriately.

Cronbachs Alpha Co-efficient Reliability test for the left- and right-hand side (experience and conceptualization scale) of the Likert scale items were 0.75 and 0.73 respectively. The four open-ended items elicited straight-forward responses which were reported in their respective categories/themes.

Theresearcherpersonally conducted the standardized open-ended interviews so that the approach was consistent and, thus reduced the interviewer effect. The study found the open-ended interviews to be reliable in that they were focused on the research problem. Additionally, the analysis of interview data, unlike unstructured ones, was credible because the study simply grouped common responses to each item and presented the results without making inferences or assumptions.

The results were also credible because audio-recording of the interview process ensured accurate data in their original form. To ensure the accuracy and trustworthiness of the data, the researcher played back the audio tapes for participants to agree to what had been shared since it was not possible to return the transcripts to them for confirmation. However, during the interview session, the studyused probing questions to make sure my interpretations of their statements were their intended descriptions of the phenomenon under study**.** The study also used direct quotations (low level descriptors) to help readers experience the participants’ world, Ary et al., (2006, p. 506).

The findings of this study were also credible because the study used multiple data sources (data triangulation) including questionnaire, interview and relevant documents to understand the phenomenon from various points of view. Ary et al. (2006) posit that convergence of a major theme or pattern in the data from various sources lends credibility to the findings.

The findings of this study were also credible because the study looked for and tried to explain any discrepant or contradictory data. Ary and colleagues posit that researcher bias may result from selective observations by allowing personal attitudes, feelings and preferences to affect interpretation of data.

3.6 SUMMARY

This study investigated how teachers and headteachers in public primary schools in Kyegegwa experienced supervision of instruction in their schools, as well as the concepts they hold about instructional supervision. The main rationale for the study was to use its results to inform policy makers about teachers’ and headteachers’ current views, and about likely relationships between policy and practice in the supervision of instruction in public primary schools in Gulu. This might in time help improve the planning and implementation of policies regarding instructional supervision which may, in the end, help improve student outcomes.

Notwithstanding these aims, the study also has its limitations. First, the study’s findings are built around self-reported data. For example, one section of the survey required teachers and heads to indicate the frequency with which they experienced selected aspects of instructional supervision in their respective schools. The results from this section showed that a greater percentage of heads reported that they experienced the listed practices more often than did teachers. There exists some possibility that heads might have provided more positive responses if they perceived that they were assessing their own performance against some perceived standards. That is, supervisors in this study may have indicated that they performed the various activities more often than they actually did. Similarly, head teachers in this study reported on their experiences with multiple teachers, while most teachers would have been reporting on their experiences with only one supervisor. Again, this may have skewed the data because several teachers might have thought that their one supervisor did not perform an activity regularly, while a head who supervises multiple teachers might think he/she did so regularly.

Secondly, circuit supervisors accompanied me to each school on my first visit to show me the location of the schools and to introduce me to the head teachers and teachers. They did not accompany the researcher on subsequent visits, when she administered the instruments. Their presence in the schools might have biased participants’ responses to the questionnaires and interviews.

However, participants did not complete and return the questionnaires to me on my first visit. Neither was the participants interviewed on that first day or in the presence of the circuit supervisors. It is, therefore, unlikely that the mere sight of the circuit supervisors on my first visit to each school would bias participants’ responses.

Thirdly, the data collection procedures did not include direct observation of supervision of instruction as practiced in Ugandan primary schools. This would have provided an opportunity to directly observe the frequency with which supervisors engaged in their instructional supervision roles over a period of time, or to be present as an observer during observation. Similarly, the research did not examine activity records which could have shown the frequency with which the supervisors performed their roles.

Fourthly, this study focused mainly on teachers and heads, even though it included the district head of supervision and an officer at headquarters. The perspectives of circuit supervisors in the municipal district would have provided additional information about how head teachers in the study performed their supervisory roles. These officers directly assess the performance of heads and report to the ADE Supervision. Their views would have served as triangulation to the responses provided by the heads in their circuits. However, the circuit supervisors accompanied me to the schools in their various circuits and introduced me to the teachers and head teachers. The study therefore decided to not include them in the study because this would have meant that they would be playing two roles, and as such may have perceived a conflict in being both facilitators of my collection of research data from heads and teachers as well as providers of data regarding the performance of heads.

Finally, the relatively defined sample might not be large enough to generalize the results to other regions of Kyegegwa or to other countries in Africa more generally. The study collected data from one municipal education district out of almost 200 districts across the ten regions of Ghana. On the positive side however, this municipal district was seen to be widely representative because it has characteristics of both metropolitan and per-urban (rural) areas in Gulu. Furthermore, the researcher was able to obtain rich data from 280 teachers (including head teachers) who responded to closed and open-ended survey items, as well as interviews with ten teachers, ten heads, and two police officers. Because of challenges associated with travelling between districts in Gulu, obtaining such rich data would not have been possible if the sample were to include multiple districts.

It is unlikely however that these limitations related to the data collecting process seriously affected the conclusions of the study. This is because a mixed methods approach was used to collect data from multiple sources including surveys, interviews and policy documents on instructional supervision. These various sources complemented, and provided corroboration for one another by providing explanations and confirmation to the responses in each section.

# 

# CHAPTER FOUR

# RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.0 Overview of the Chapter

This chapter presents the findings from the questionnaire and interview data. The first part of the chapter presents the findings from the questionnaire, and the second presents comments obtained from the standardized (semi-structured) interview schedules. The questionnaire was divided into three sections: demographic data for teacher and headteacher respondents, Likert scale items, and open-ended items. The findings from both instruments sought the opinions of teachers and headteachers (supervisors) on how they experienced supervision of instruction in their schools, as well as how they thought supervision of instruction should be practiced.

The study got the demographic data for the respondents. The demographics sought were the sex, age group, location (urban or rural) of school and highest qualification. This section also asked respondents about their position (teacher or headteacher) and number of years in their current positions as teacher or headteacher.

The second section of the questionnaire included 24 Likert scale items about supervision aspects and practices. The questionnaire was divided into two parts. For each item, teachers and headteachers were asked to indicate, on the left hand-side, how often they experienced the particular aspect of supervision of instruction in their respective schools, and on the right, their level of agreement or disagreement on how they thought it should be practiced. Responses on both sides of the questionnaire were arranged on a continuum from “Never” to “Always” and “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree” respectively. In the third section of the questionnaire, teacher and headteacher respondents were asked four open-ended items about supervision of instruction. The three items which were common to both the teachers and heads were analyzed together, while the other one was analyzed separately for each group.

To facilitate analysis and discussion, the closed-ended items (Likert scale items) were grouped into six sub-themes: Traditional Supervision Beliefs/Practices; Assistance and Support; Oversight; Leadership Skills; Professional Development; and, Collaboration.

Descriptive statistics was employed to find frequencies and percentages of responses. Relative frequencies (percentage responses) were used to draw column graphs to show pictorial representation of responses. Pearson’s Chi-Square was used to determine whether observed differences in opinions between the two groups of participants (teachers and headteachers) were statistically significant.

Findings from the third section of the questionnaire, which comprise responses to open-ended questions, are summarized and presented separately for teachers and headteachers.

The final part of the chapter presents a summary of findings from the standardized interview schedule. Comments from respondents were presented in the same manner as those from the open-ended items on the questionnaire. The responses associated with each item were grouped to facilitate discussion.

4.1 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The demographic data are based on selected variables which included sex, age, location of school (urban and rural), professional status, highest qualification, position and years of experience in current position as teacher or headteacher. These are detailed in Table 2 below.

**Table 2:** Demographics of Questionnaire Respondents

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Respondents** | | | | |
| **Variable** |  | **Teachers** | **Headteachers** | **Total** | **Percentage** |
| **Sex** | Male | 76 | 18 | 94 | 34 |
| Female | 164 | 22 | 186 | 66 |
| **Age (Years)** | Up to 29 | 38 | 0 | 38 | 14 |
| 30 – 39 | 56 | 1 | 57 | 20 |
| 40 – 49 | 79 | 11 | 90 | 32 |
| 50 – 59 | 63 | 26 | 89 | 32 |
| 60 + | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| **Location** | Rural | 61 | 10 | 71 | 25 |
| Urban | 177 | 30 | 207 | 74 |
| **Qualification** | Certificate | 132 | 26 | 158 | 56 |
| Diploma | 75 | 7 | 82 | 29 |
| Degree | 30 | 7 | 37 | 13 |
| Other | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| **Professional Status** | Trained | 236 | 40 | 276 | 99 |
| Untrained | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| **Years Served** | 0 – 4 | 93 | 18 | 111 | 40 |
| 5 – 9 | 44 | 15 | 59 | 21 |
| 10 + | 102 | 7 | 109 | 39 |

The questionnaire was administered to 380 potential participants (332 teachers and 48 headteachers). Two hundred and eighty (74%) participants comprising 240 teachers and 40 heads returned their questionnaires. Table 2 shows that the majority of the respondents were females (66%). Table 2 further shows that the majority of respondents (74%) taught in urban locations. This was so because the selected district for the study was municipal, with few rural schools.

The results show that almost all the study participants were professional (trained), with 56 percent holding the basic teaching qualification for primary schools in Ghana (Teachers’ Certificate ‘A’). There are three categories of Certificate ‘A’ teachers in Ghana: 1) four-year post-middle; 2) two-year post-secondary; and, 3) three-year post-secondary. Even though the basic teaching qualification in Ghana is Teachers’ Certificate ‘A’, the educational qualifications of study participants varied. Participants’ qualifications ranged from Certificate ‘A’ through Diploma to Bachelor’s Degree. Of the remaining four (4) teachers, one held a Middle School Leaving Certificate, and three held Ordinary Level Certificates.

In Gulu, basic teachers’ certificates depend on the entry point in the teacher training college and the type of programme that was running within that period. Prior to the 1987 Education Reforms, pre-tertiary education structure was six years of primary school, four years middle, five years ordinary level, and two years advanced level. Pupils who sat the then Common Entrance Examination when in form 2 or 3 in the middle school entered into secondary schools. Graduates from middle schools (holders of Middle School Leaving Certificates) could also, however, enter secondary schools. Teachers who entered training colleges from middle school did the course for four (4) years, and were awarded Teachers’ Certificate ‘A’ (a four-year course). Those who entered from secondary school (ordinary or advanced level) were awarded with Teachers’ Certificate ‘A’ (a two or three-year course) depending on the duration of the course and point of entry. With the introduction of the 1987 Education Reforms, senior secondary school (senior high school) graduates pursued courses which led to the award of Teachers’ Certificate ‘A’ (a three-year training).

A second level of teacher certificate in Kyegegwa is the Diploma in Education. Previously, there were six Advanced Teacher Training Colleges which ran education courses in various subject areas. At the moment, those colleges have been combined into one university (University of Education) with six campuses. Teachers with certificates ‘A’ and Diplomas are admitted into this university to pursue four-year further studies in education. However, holders of diploma certificates with first class honors and second class upper division are allowed to do two-year Post-Diploma courses. Graduates from Senior High Schools who wish to become teachers are, however, admitted to pursue four-year bachelor degree programmes in Education. Diploma holders from Polytechnics also enter into teaching in Kyegegwa as non-certificated teachers, unless they already hold Teachers’ Certificate ‘A’. Diploma certificates in Kyegegwa are considered to be equivalent to Diplomas awarded by TTC in Gulu.

4.1.1 Group Comparison of Participants’ Responses to Questionnaire Items

This study sought to find out from personnel engaged in school-site supervision in public primary schools in Kyegegwa (head teachers) and those who are being supervised (teachers) about their perspectives of instructional supervision. In essence, the study examined how teacher and headteacher participants experienced instructional supervision in their current schools, as well as their degree of agreement with and desire for the instructional supervision practices selected from the literature and included in the questionnaire.

In this study, the study was only interested in comparing responses from supervisors (headteachers) and those being supervised (teachers). In this section, a distribution of participants’ profiles sought in the questionnaire is briefly described to provide non-Kyegegwa readers a fair picture of the composition of public primary school teaching staff in a typical school district in Kyegegwa.

The study was interested in uncovering the differences in views across gender, geographical location and experience of participants. To do this, the researcherconstructed frequency distributions that portray the percentages of teachers and heads who responded to the selected instructional supervision practices on the questionnaire. However, these frequency distributions showed little apparent differences across the categories examined, and therefore, no further analysis was pursued. Tables showing these percentage differences by group can be found in Appendix J.

**4.2 HOW RESPONDENTS EXPERIENCED SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION IN THEIR SCHOOLS**

This section presents the findings from respondents about how they experienced supervision of instruction in their respective schools. Responses have been grouped into six sub-themes, and findings of items are presented in groups and individually. Responses are summarized in frequency distribution tables showing frequencies and percentages. Responses are also displayed in bar graphs.

**4.2.1 Traditional supervision practices**

**Responses to these items are given in Table 3 below**

**Table 3: Distribution of respondents by how they experienced Traditional Supervision**

**Note: Percentages are given in parentheses**

Three items were grouped under this heading: 1) Suggesting to teachers how they should teach; 2) Using control to affect teachers‟ instructional practices; and 3) Inspecting teachers‟ instructional practices for errors.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Responses** | | | | |
| **Item** |  | **Always** | **Sometimes** | **Rarely** | **Never** | **Total** |
| **Suggesting to teachers how they should teach** | Teacher | 52 (21) | 149 (62) | 17 (7) | 22 (9) | 240 |
| Head | 14 (35) | 25 (63) | 1 (3) | 0 (0) | 40 |
| Total | 66 (24) | 174 (62) | 18 (6) | 22 (8) | 280 |
| **Using control to affect teachers’ instructional practices** | Teacher | 21 (9) | 82 (35) | 34 (14) | 100 (42) | 237 |
| Head | 3 (8) | 19 (51) | 7 (19) | 8 (22) | 37 |
| Total | 24 (9) | 101 (37) | 41 (15) | 108 (39) | 274 |
| **Inspecting teachers’ instructional practices for errors** | Teacher | 50 (22) | 101 (43) | 29 (12) | 53 (23) | 233 |
| Head | 12 (34) | 6 (17) | 11 (31) | 6 (17) | 35 |
| Total | 62 (23) | 107 (40) | 40 (15) | 59 (21) | 268 |

As shown in Table 3, a majority of both groups of respondents had the experience that supervisors sometimes suggested to teachers how they should teach. This is the only item in this category for which a majority of both groups of respondents gave the same response. In the other two aspects of traditional supervisory practices, the two groups provided different responses. Sixty-two percent of teachers, as well as 63 percent of headteachers said they sometimes experienced a situation in which supervisors suggested to teachers how they should teach. But the proportion of heads (about 98%) that said they always or sometimes suggested to teachers how they should teach was somewhat greater than that of teachers (84%). Figure 1a below further shows there were not large differences in the distributions of teachers’ and headteachers’ responses to this item.

Figure 1a. Suggesting to teachers how they should teach: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences. Table 3 also shows that a plurality of all respondents (39%) reported that they never experienced a situation where supervisors used control to affect instruction. The table also shows that while a majority of headteachers (51%) sometimes experienced a situation where supervisors used controlling to affect instruction, a plurality of teachers (42%) reported that the practice never happened. Further, while a greater proportion of heads (60%) reported that they sometimes or always controlled teachers’ instructional practices, less than half of teachers (44%) reported similarly.

The Chi-squared test was used to determine whether observed differences were statistically significant. There were, however, no statistically significant differences between the opinions of teachers and headteachers on this issue (x2=6.341, df=3, p=0.096). Figure 1b graphically compares the opinions of the two groups of respondents on this supervisory practice.

**Figure 1 b.** Using control to affect teachers’ instructional practices: teachers’ and headteachers’ experience

On the issue of how often supervisors inspected teachers’ instructional practices for errors, a majority of teacher respondents (65%) said it happened always or sometimes. In contrast, 51 percent of heads always or sometimes reported that the occurrence of this aspect of supervision. The findings also showed that 43 percent of teachers observed supervisors sometimes inspected their instructional practices for errors, while only 17 percent of head teachers said they did so sometimes.

The pictorial representation of the results further shows differences in opinions as to how often supervisors inspected teachers’ instructional practices for errors (Figure 1c). These differences in opinions did not happen by chance. The Chi-square test of significance revealed a statistically significant difference between teacher and headteacher respondents on the frequency with which supervisors inspected teachers’ instructional practices for errors (x2=15.178, df=3, p=0.002).

**Figure 1c.** Inspecting teachers’ instructional practices for errors: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences

In this category (Traditional Supervision), teachers and headteachers were relatively consistent in their opinions in one item and differed in two other items. Almost the same percentage of teachers as heads experienced that supervisors sometimes suggested to teachers how they should teach. But while a majority of heads said they used control to affect instruction, a plurality of teachers indicated that they never experienced this practice. In this category, it was only this item that more than 50 percent of teachers said they rarely or never experienced such a situation in their schools. Similarly, while a plurality of heads said they always inspected teachers’ instructional practices for errors, a plurality of teachers reported that this happened only sometimes.

**4.3 SUPERVISION FOR ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT**

Five items were grouped under assistance and support. 1) Helping teachers find solutions to problems they encounter in their instructional practices; 2) Readily availing themselves (supervisors) for advice and instructional support; 3) Ensuring that teachers have adequate teaching-learning materials; 4) Offering useful suggestions to improve instructional practices; and, 5) Providing teachers with professional literature. Results are shown in Table 4 below.

**Table 4** Distribution of Respondents by How Often They Experienced Assistance and Support in Supervision

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Responses** | | | | | |
| **Item** |  | **Always** | **sometimes** | **Rarely** | **Never** | **Total** |
| Helping teachers find solutions to problems they encounter in their instruction | Teacher | 103 (43) | 109 (46) | 15 (6) | 11 (5) | 238 |
| Head | 24 (60) | 14 (35) | 1 (3) | 1 (3) | 40 |
| Total | 127 (46) | 123 (44) | 16 (6) | 12 (4) | 278 |
| Readily availing self for advice and instructional support | Teacher | 103 (44) | 25 (11) | 25 (11) | 13 (6) | 235 |
| Head | 31 (78) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (3) | 40 |
| Total | 134 (49) | 25 (9) | 25 (9) | 14 (5) | 275 |
| Offering useful suggestions to improve instructional practices | Teacher | 107 (46) | 14 (6) | 14 (6) | 6 (3) | 233 |
| Head | Head (68) | 3 (8) | 3 (8) | 0 (0) | 40 |
| Total | 134 (49) | 17 (6) | 17 (6) | 6 (2) | 273 |
| Ensuring teachers have adequate teaching materials to teach | Teacher | 106 (45) | 33 (14) | 33 (14) | 12 (5) | 236 |
| Head | 31 (80) | 2 (5) | 2 (5) | 0 (0) | 40 |
| Total | 137 (50) | 35 (13) | 35 (13) | 12 (4) | 275 |
| Providing teachers with research findings about instruction | Teacher | 30 (13) | 49 (21) | 49 (21) | 75 (32) | 236 |
| Head | 2 (5) | 9 (24) | 9 (24) | 7 (19) | 37 |
| Total | 32 (12) | 58 (21) | 58 (21) | 82 (30) | 273 |

**Note. Percentages are given in parentheses**

As shown in Table 4, almost all the respondents (90%) said supervisors always or sometimes helped teachers find solution to problems they encountered in their instructional practices. A majority of the head teacher respondents (60%) reported that they always provided such assistance, while a plurality of teachers (46%) said they sometimes received such assistance. Similarly, a larger proportion of heads than teachers reported they always experienced this practice. However, the difference was not statistically significant (x2=4.216,df=3, p=0.239). Figure 2a below graphically compares how the two groups of respondents experienced the supervisory practice of helping teachers find solutions to problems they encountered in their instructional practices.

**Figure 2a.** Helping teachers find solutions to problems they encounter in their instructional practices: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences.

Results from Table 4 also show that 78 percent of headteachers said they always readily availed him/herself for advice and instructional support, while 44 percent of teachers said they always experienced this supervisory practice. On the other hand, a larger proportion of teachers than heads said they sometimes experienced this supervisory practice. These differences are statistically significant. A Chi-square test showed a statistically significant difference between teachers’ and headteachers’ (supervisors) opinions about how often the latter readily availed themselves for advice and instructional support (x2=16.512, df=3, p=0.001).

However, while almost all headteachers (98%) said they always or sometimes availed themselves for advice and instructional support, 84 percent of teachers reported that they experienced such assistance and support always or sometimes. Only one headteacher indicated that he/she never performed this activity. Figure 2b graphically compares responses of headteachers and teachers about how often supervisors made themselves available for advice and instructional support.

#### Figure 2b. Availability of supervisors for advice and instructional support: teachers and

#### Headteachers’ experiences

On the issue of supervisors offering useful suggestions to improve instructional practices, the pattern of responses (always and sometimes) is similar to the previous item.

Table 4 shows that more than 90% of each group of respondents said this happened always or sometimes. But as compared with teachers’ responses, a much larger proportion of heads believed they were doing this always. Specifically, 68 percent of headteachers and 46 percent of teacher respondents said they always experienced this supervisory practice. On the other hand, a much larger proportion of teachers said they experienced this aspect of supervision sometimes.

However, a Chi-square test showed there were no statistically significant differences between teachers’ and heads’ opinions on this aspect of supervision (x2=7.765, df=3, p=0.051). Figure 2c compares how respondents experienced the supervisory practice of offering useful suggestions to improve instruction.

**Figure 2c.** Offering useful suggestions to improve instructional practices: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences

When it came to ensuring that teachers had adequate teaching-learning materials to teach, over 90 percent of all respondents indicated they experienced this aspect of supervision always or sometimes. These are detailed in Table 4 above. However, while 45 percent of teachers observed that supervisors always ensured the former had adequate teaching-learning materials to work with, 80 percent of the supervisors said they always provided such support to teachers. A Chi-square test showed a statistically significant difference between teachers’ and headteachers’ opinions on this issue (x2=16.380, df=3, p=0.001).

**Figure 2d** depicts how teachers and headteachers differ in opinions on how often they experience this practice in their schools. Similar to the previous item, the pattern is evident that heads thought they were performing this activity with much greater frequency than do teachers.

**Figure 2d.** Ensuring that teachers have adequate teaching-learning materials to teach: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences

When respondents were asked to indicate how often they experienced the provision of professional literature to teachers, less than half of the respondents said they always or sometimes observed this in their schools as seen in Table 4. Even though a plurality of participants (37%) responded that supervisors provided teachers with professional literature sometimes, more headteachers than teachers provided the same response. Figure 2 e shows how teachers and headteachers differed in their opinions on this supervisory practice.

**Figure 2e.** Providing teachers with articles on research about instruction: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences

In all five items in this category, a majority of headteachers responded that they always provided various forms of assistance and support to teachers, except for providing teachers with professional literature. On the part of teachers, a plurality responded that supervisors sometimes provided teachers with professional literature, as well as helped them (teachers) find solutions to problems they encountered in their instructional practices. A plurality of teachers said their supervisors always made themselves available for advice, offered useful suggestions to improve instruction, and ensured that they had adequate teaching materials to teach. Results also showed there was not a single item in this category for which a majority of teachers held a common opinion.

**4.4 OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITIES IN SUPERVISION**

Five practices were included in the category of oversight responsibilities of supervisors:

1) Evaluating teachers’ classroom instructional practices;

2) Assessing teachers’ content knowledge;

3) Ensuring that teachers make good use of instructional time;

4) Making informal visits to classrooms; and

5) Formally observing teaching and learning.

An examination of Table 5 shows that supervisors always ensured that teachers made good use of instructional time, but practiced the other activities only sometimes. The table also shows that a majority of the respondents (between 70 and 94%) sometimes or always experienced all of the activities included within the category of oversight responsibilities of supervisors.

**Table 5:** Distribution of Respondents by How Often They Experienced Oversight Responsibilities

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Responses** | | | | | |
| **Item** |  | **Always** | **Sometimes** | **Rarely** | **Never** | **Total** |
| Evaluating teachers’ classroom instructional practices | Teacher | 66 (28) | 120 (51) | 29 (12) | 19 (8) | 234 |
| Head | 16 (41) | 23 (59) | 0 (0) | 0(0) | 39 |
| Total | 82 (30) | 143 (52) | 29 (11) | 19 (7) | 273 |
| Assessing teachers’ content knowledge | Teacher | 42 (18) | 114 (49) | 29 (12) | 48 (21) | 233 |
| Head | 12 (32) | 23 (62) | 2 (5) | 0 (0) | 37 |
| Total | 54 (20) | 137 (51) | 31 (12) | 48 (18) | 270 |
| Ensuring teachers make good use of instructional time | Teacher | 166 (70) | 56 (24) | 11 (5) | 3 (1) | 236 |
| Head | 35 (90) | 3 (8) | 0 (00) | 1 (3) | 39 |
| Total | 201 (73) | 59 (22) | 11 (4) | 4 (2) | 275 |
| Making informal visits to classrooms | Teacher | 32 (14) | 159 (67) | 29 (12) | 16 (7) | 236 |
| Head | 10 (27) | 23 (62) | 3 (8) | 1 (3) | 37 |
| Total | 42 (15) | 182 (67) | 32 (12) | 17 (6) | 273 |
| Formally observing teaching and learning | Teacher | 27 (12) | 143 (61) | 35 (15) | 29 (12) | 234 |
| Head | 7 (18) | 19 (64) | 6 (15) | 1 (3) | 39 |
| Total | 34 (13) | 168 (62) | 41 (15) | 30 (11) | 273 |

**Note. Percentages are in parentheses**

Table 5 shows there were slight differences between teachers and headteachers on how they experienced individual activities under oversight responsibilities in the schools. The table shows that the modal response for all items is sometimes, except for ensuring that teachers make good use of instructional time.

As to how often supervisors evaluated teachers’ classroom instructional practices, a majority (52%) of all respondents said that they sometimes experienced this. However, Table 5 shows there were differences in the opinions of teachers and headteachers as to how often they experienced this aspect of supervision. All the headteachers (100%) said they sometimes or always evaluated teachers’ instructional practices, while 80 percent of teachers indicated they sometimes or always experienced that aspect. A Chi-square test of significance showed statistically significant differences between the opinions of teachers and headteachers on how often supervisors evaluated teachers’ classroom practices (x2=10.207, df=3, p=0.017). Figure 3a presents the pictorial form of how respondents’ opinions differ on this issue.

**Figure 3a.** Evaluating teachers’ classroom instructional practices: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences

As shown in Table 5, 51 percent of all respondents indicated that they sometimes experienced the practice where supervisors assessed teachers’ content knowledge. However, there were differences between teacher and headteacher respondents on how often they experienced this supervisory practice. While 62 percent of headteachers responded that supervisors sometimes assessed teachers’ content knowledge, only 49 percent of the teachers responded in the same manner. Similarly, 95 percent of headteachers said they sometimes or always assessed teachers’ content knowledge. In contrast, 67 percent of teachers said they experienced this practice. There was a statistically significant difference between opinions of the two groups of respondents on this issue (x2=13.417, df=3, p=0.004). The column bar below (Figure 3b) shows how respondents differed in their opinions on this supervisory practice.

**Figure 3b.** Assessing teachers’ content knowledge: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences

When respondents were asked to indicate how often supervisors ensured that teachers made good use of instructional time, most respondents (73%) said they experienced this practice always. However, Table 5 shows differences between teachers and headteachers on this practice. The results show that while 70 percent of teachers indicated their supervisors always ensured they made good use of instructional time, 90 percent of headteachers were of the same opinion. The difference in responses between the two groups was statistically significant (x2=7.938, df=3, p=0.047).

The column graph below shows a very small percentage of respondents indicated that they rarely or never experienced the practice where supervisors ensure that teachers made good use of instructional time. The chart also portrays the differences in opinions on this aspect of supervision. Again, as compared to teachers, a greater percentage of headteachers thought they were performing this activity always.

**Figure 3c.** Ensuring that teachers make good use of instructional time: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences

On the question as to how often supervisors made informal visits to classrooms, almost 70 percent of all respondents indicated they experienced this sometimes. Table 5 further shows that more than eighty percent of each group of respondents said they always or sometimes observed supervisors making informal visits to classrooms. There were not large differences between teachers’ and headteachers’ responses on this issue. A majority of the two groups of participants (67% teachers and 62% of headteachers) reported that supervisors sometimes made informal visits to classrooms. Figure 3d below shows that all the various responses from the two categories of respondents were almost the same; even though the proportion of heads who said this happened always is higher than that of teachers.

**Figure 3d.** Making informal visits to classrooms: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences

As to how often supervisors formally observed teaching and learning, a majority of all participants (62%) said they sometimes experienced this practice. Table 5 further shows that almost the same percentage of the two groups of participants reported that this practice was observed sometimes and rarely. Only one headteacher had never practiced lesson observation.

**The bar graph below shows where the differences and similarities existed**.

**Figure 3e.** Formally observing teaching and learning: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences

The results from Table 5 show that high percentage of both groups of respondents provided similar response to all the five items in this category. A majority of teachers and headteachers reported that supervisors always ensured that teachers made good use of instructional time. A plurality of teachers and a majority of heads reported that supervisors sometimes assessed teachers’ content knowledge (of the subject matter), but a majority of both groups of respondents said they experienced the remaining three issues sometimes.

Despite that higher percentage of both groups responded similarly to all items in this category, there were statistically significant differences in percentage responses for the first three items (evaluating teachers’ classroom instructional practices, assessing teachers’ content knowledge, and ensuring that teachers made good use of instructional time).

**4.5 LEADERSHIP SKILLS IN SUPERVISION**

**Leadership skills had been selected for this study were:**

**1)**Praising teachers for specific teaching behavior;

2) Establishing open and trusting relationships with teachers; and

3) Treating teachers with respect and caring. Table 6 below shows the distribution of participants’ responses.

**Table 6:** Distribution of Respondents by How Often They Experienced Leadership Skills

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Responses** | | | | |
| **Item** |  | **Always** | **Sometimes** | **Rarely** | **Never** | **Total** |
| Praising teachers for specific behavior | Teacher | 69 (29) | 117 (49) | 29 (12) | 22 (9) | 237 |
| Head | 10 (25) | 25 (63) | 5 (13) | 0 (0) | 40 |
| Total | 79 (29) | 142 (51) | 34 (12) | 22 (8) | 277 |
| Establishing open and trusting relationship with teachers | Teacher | 121 (51) | 66 (28) | 32 (13) | 19 (8) | 238 |
| Head | 31 (78) | 6 (15) | 3 (8) | 0 (0) | 40 |
| Total | 152 (55) | 72 (26) | 35 (13) | 19 (7) | 278 |
| Treating teachers with sense of caring and respect | Teacher | 132 (56) | 74 (31) | 18 (8) | 14 (6) | 238 |
| Head | 32 (80) | 3 (8) | 4 (10) | 1 (3) | 40 |
| Total | 164 (59) | 77 (28) | 22 (8) | 15 (5) | 278 |

**Note. Percentages are in parentheses**

Table 6 shows that teacher and headteacher respondents reported that supervisors always established open and trusting relationships with teachers, as well as treated them (teachers) professionally with a sense of caring and respect. However, a plurality of teachers (49%) and a majority of headteachers (63%) said praising teachers for specific teaching behavior occurred sometimes, but not always.

Even though greater percentages of teachers and headteachers responded similarly to all the three items under leadership skills, there were differences in percentage values. Table 6shows while the majority (51%) of teacher and headteacher respondents indicated supervisors sometimes praised their teachers for specific teaching behavior, a plurality of teachers (49%) and a majority of headteachers (63%) indicated they experienced this aspect of supervision sometimes. The survey showed that most respondents (80%) indicated that supervisors always or sometimes praised teachers for specific teaching behavior. At least, every headteacher rarely exhibited this behavior.

**Figure 4a below shows responses from the two groups of respondents.**

**Figure 4a.** Praising teachers for specific teaching behavior: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences

As to how often supervisors established open and trusting relationships with teachers, a majority of teacher and headteacher respondents (81%) indicated they had always or sometimes experienced such situations. Table 6 further shows more than half of the two groups of respondents (55%) were of the opinion that supervisors always established open and trusting relationship with teachers. However, the results showed the two groups of respondents had different opinions as to how each group perceived the occurrence of this issue in their respective schools. While 78 percent of headteachers said they always exhibited this behavior, 51 percent of teachers said they always found this behavior with their heads.

There was a statistically significant difference between teachers and headteachers on how often the latter exhibited open and trusting relationships with teachers (x2=10.749, df=3,p=0.013). Figure 4b graphically compares how the two groups of respondents differ in this respect.

**Figure 4b.** Establishing open and trusting relationship with teachers: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences

When respondents were asked to indicate how often supervisors exhibited the skill of treating teachers professionally with a sense of caring and respect, a majority of them (59%) said this happened always. Table 6 further shows that 87 percent of the respondents said they always or sometimes experienced this skill. Almost the same percentage of the two groups of respondents indicated supervisors always or sometimes treated teachers with sense of caring and respect, but they differed in their opinions as to whether this happened always. While 56 percent of teachers said supervisors always treated teachers with respect and a sense of caring, 80 percent of headteachers held this opinion. There was a statistically significant difference between teachers’ and headteachers’ opinions on this aspect (x2=11.360, df=3, p=0.010). The differences between the opinions of the two groups of respondents are portrayed on a column graph below.

**Figure 4c.** Treating teachers professionally with a sense of caring and respect: teachers’ and headteachers’ experiences

A greater percentage of both respondents were in agreement in their opinions on all the three items in this category, albeit with significant differences in percentage responses. A majority of the teachers and headteachers indicated supervisors were always found to have established open and trusting relationships with teachers, as well as treating them (teachers) professionally with a sense of caring and respect. But there were statistically significant differences between teachers’ and headteachers’ responses on how often the latter treated teachers with care and respect. The results also showed a plurality of teachers and majority of headteachers reported that supervisors sometimes (not always) praised teachers for specific teaching behavior.

**4.6 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN SUPERVISION**

Four issues were selected under professional development. 1) Demonstrating teaching techniques; 2) Providing objective feedback about classroom observations; 3) Providing in-service workshops to teachers; and 4) Implementing action research in their schools. In this category, either a majority or plurality of both teacher and headteacher respondents indicated each supervisory practice happened sometimes, but not always.

**Table 7:** Distribution of Respondents by How Often They Experienced Professional Development

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Responses** | | | | |
| **Item** |  | **Always** | **Sometimes** | **Rarely** | **Never** | **Total** |
| Demonstrating teaching techniques  Providing objective feedback about classroom observation | Teacher | 28 (12) | 109 (46) | 48 (20) | 52 (22) | 237 |
| Head | 4 (11) | 23 (62) | 8 (22) | 2 (5) | 37 |
| Total | 32 (12) | 132 (48) | 56 (20) | 54 (20) | 274 |
| Teacher | 53 (22) | 108 (45) | 30 (13) | 47 (20) | 238 |
| Head | 10 (26) | 23 (61) | 5 (13) | 0 (0.0) | 38 |
| Total | 63 (23) | 131 (48) | 35 (13) | 47 (17) | 276 |
| Providing in-service workshops to teachers to develop their skills | Teacher | 35 (15) | 115 (49) | 48 (20) | 38 (16) | 236 |
| Head | 6 (15) | 24 (62) | 6 (15) | 3 (8) | 39 |
| Total | 41 (15) | 139 (51) | 54 (20) | 41 (15) | 275 |
| Implementing the use of action research in the school | Teacher | 34 (14) | 91 (38) | 50 (21) | 63 (27) | 238 |
| Head | 7 (18) | 20 (50) | 9 (23) | 4 (10) | 40 |
| Total | 41 (15) | 111 (40) | 59 (21) | 67 (24) | 278 |

**Note. Percentages are in parentheses**

In this category, Table 7 shows that a majority or plurality of each group of respondents said they sometimes experienced all the aspects of supervision. The results further showed that larger percentages of heads than teachers always or sometimes experienced all the four aspects of supervision. Heads thought they provided all those aspects of supervision under professional development more often than teachers perceived.

Table 7 shows a plurality of the two groups of respondents (48%) were of the opinion that supervisors sometimes demonstrated teaching techniques to teachers. The results further showed that a plurality of teacher respondents (46%) and 62 percent of the headteachers were of this opinion. Similarly, while 73 percent of headteachers were of the opinion that they demonstrated teaching techniques, 58 percent of the teachers held this view. Even though this difference in opinion is relatively high, a Chi-square test showed there were no statistically significant differences between teachers’ and headteachers’ opinions on this aspect of supervision (x2=6.234, df=3, p=0.101). Figure 5a compares teachers’ and headteachers’ opinions on the frequency with which supervisors demonstrated teaching techniques. A greater proportion of headteachers thought they performed this activity with much frequency than teachers thought supervisors did.

**CONCLUSION**

In nutshell, the findings showed that support supervision is paramount in the education efficiency in our schools and stake holders should give it the prominence it deserves.

# CHAPTER FIVE

# DISCUSSION 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

**5.1.1 What does the Uganda Education Service policy on supervision of instruction require of headteachers?**

Most of the supervisory practices contained in the headteachers’ appraisal form (policy guidelines) were found to be routine teaching and teaching-related activities required of teachers which headteachers are expected to monitor. The appraisal form contains activities and duties headteachers are expected to perform, and circuit supervisors use this to assess the performance of headteachers. The list of activities on the appraisal form did not include many of the contemporary supervisory practices described in the literature. Rather, the appraisal form comprised mostly the administrative and managerial duties that heads are expected to perform.

**5.1.2 How do participants conceptualize and experience instructional supervision in primary schools?**

Teachers and headteachers experienced a combination of some aspects of traditional and contemporary supervisory practices. In this study headteachers seemed to adopt either a traditional model of supervision, or a directive control approach to supervision. Heads made frequent informal visits to classrooms to check teachers’ punctuality and the regularity of their attendance in class, and pupils’ work output. Supervisors also formally observed lessons but rarely held conferences with teachers prior to lesson observation. Supervisors in the study seemed to relate well with their teachers and provided some forms of assistance and support to teachers. These supervisors (headteachers), however, behaved differently towards teachers during lesson observation.

Teacher and headteacher interviewees shared broad concepts of instructional supervision using similar statements. The study further showed that what teachers considered as aspects of instructional supervision were similar to their experiences. The district head of supervision gave concepts of instructional supervision which encompass almost all the models of supervision described in the literature. On his part, the officer at headquarters gave a general concept which reflects contemporary practices.

**5.1.3 Which aspects of instructional supervision do teachers and headteachers want to practice?** Teachers and headteachers seemed to be generally satisfied with the frequency with which supervisors practiced some aspects of traditional supervision in their schools. However, some teachers complained about their heads’ supervisory behavior. Overwhelmingly, both groups of respondents would like to practice almost all the aspects of contemporary supervision described in the literature. Specifically, teachers and heads wanted more collaboration among teachers and between teachers and heads in the form of peer observation and group meetings to share ideas about instruction. Similarly, both teachers and heads wanted supervisors to promote professional development by providing teachers with literature about instruction, in-service training programmes and demonstrating teaching techniques (modeling lessons). Teachers and heads agreed that supervisors and teachers should plan for lesson observations together. Teachers in particular, wanted their headteachers to inform them prior to lesson observation.

**5.1.4 What are the differences, if any, between teachers and headteachers, in expectations and experiences of instructional supervision?**

Teachers and heads were consistent about the frequency with which they experienced traditional supervisory practices. However, headteachers reported experiencing contemporary supervisory practices more often than their teachers. The most prominent practices that heads seemed to experience more often than their teachers were: modeling lessons; providing objective feedback about classroom observation; providing in-service training workshops to improve instruction; conferencing with teachers to plan lesson observation; and, providing opportunities for teachers to meet and share ideas. This apparent discrepancy between the experiences of headteachers and teachers they supervise may be because heads (supervisors) supervise many teachers whereas each teacher is supervised by only one head. On the other hand, in this study headteachers and teachers both seemed comfortable with the frequency with which supervisors practiced some aspects of traditional supervision. 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.

**5.1.5 What systemic challenges are likely to affect supervision of instruction in the schools?**

The study revealed that the USE recruits and appoints people with managerial experience for the position of chief inspector (head of the supervision unit), instead of teachers with professional knowledge about instructional supervision. Secondly, most of the heads in public primary schools in Kyegegwa are full-time teachers and, in addition, perform administrative and management duties/functions. As a result, they are left with little time to supervise instruction. Thirdly, the Inspectorate Unit of the UES and the district directorates did not have sufficient funds for in-service workshops for capacity building among district and school levels supervisors. Fourthly, the district did not have enough funds to fuel circuit supervisors’ motor bikes to enable them visit schools to provide support to teachers and heads. Fifthly, prospective headteachers were not given pre-service training about instructional supervision upon assumption of office. Lastly, despite the finding in Research Question Two that headteachers and teachers related well, it was also the case that teachers complained that heads did not inform them prior to observing their lessons.

Headteachers also complained that teachers did not want their lessons to be observed. Teachers and heads in this study provided broad concepts of instructional supervision using similar statements. However, their responses about instructional practices seemed to be entirely consistent and possibly influenced by the content of the policy guide detailing headteachers’ duties and responsibilities (headteachers’ appraisal form). Teachers are also aware of the content of the appraisal form: they know the instructional-related activities that heads are expected to monitor. The meanings teachers and heads hold about instructional supervision are also translated into practices they experienced in their schools. In general, respondents in this study experienced a combination of both traditional and contemporary aspects of supervision as described in the literature. While participants were satisfied with some aspects of traditional supervision practices, they nevertheless wanted more contemporary aspects of supervision to be practiced.

**5.2 CONCEPTS OF TEACHERS AND HEAD TEACHERS ON SUPERVISION**

This section discusses what the study saw as the concepts teachers and heads hold about instructional supervision, supervisors’ perceived approaches to supervision practices, and what participants considered as challenges to instructional supervision practices and processes in Ugandan public primary schools. The perspectives of participants are discussed under the following sub-headings: participants’ concepts of instructional supervision; (head teachers’) approaches to supervision; collaboration; assistance and support; informal visits to classrooms; the three phases of clinical supervision; leadership skills/behavior; professional development; and, challenges.

The supervisory practices described in the literature were used to frame the items and questions in the survey and interviews. The themes which emerged were organized into subsections for the data analysis and presentation of the survey results. These themes (subheadings mentioned above) form the basis of my discussion.

**5.2.1 Concepts of instructional supervision**

Participants in the present study shared seemingly similar meanings for instructional supervision practices. Teachers and heads used words like making sure, “ensuring”, and “seeing to it that” to describe the activities and practices involved in supervision of instruction. For example, “making sure/seeing to it that teachers perform their duties effectively” was a common response to both the teachers and headteachers. Teachers and headteachers viewed instructional supervision as monitoring teachers’ instruction-related duties, providing teachers with teaching resources, visiting classrooms to observe lessons, and providing assistance and support to help teachers do their work effectively. They also perceived checking teachers’ classroom attendance as an important aspect of supervision. Teachers’ and headteachers’ concepts of supervision of instruction were characterized mostly by monitoring and overseeing, which were likely to have been influenced by the policy guide on headteachers’ duties and responsibilities.

Teaching-related activities which the Uganda Education Service and teachers (including heads) consider important are preparation of lesson plans, the number of exercises given, marked, and corrections made, and keeping of continuous assessment records. 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 (Jan, 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 Kyegegwa should not emphasize these activities, but rather strive to improve supervisor skills in contemporary supervisory practices in order to improve instruction in schools.

The municipal head of supervision also described instructional supervision as an act of inspecting, overseeing, controlling, evaluating, advising, assisting and supporting and teachers. This description, which encompasses almost all the models described in the literature, suggests that a combination of various approaches to supervision is practiced in the schools. For his part, the officer at head office gave a general concept of supervision, which reflects contemporary supervisory practices. He conceptualized supervision of instruction as helping teachers to create the right environment in their classrooms for effective teaching and learning.

**5.2.2 Approach to supervision**

Supervisors in this study seemed to employ either an authoritarian approach reminiscent of the traditional supervision model or a directive control approach consistent with the clinical supervision model. This may be explained by a number of factors. Firstly, the language used in stating the duties of headteachers that are contained in the policy guidelines suggest the use of control and adherence to administrative procedures.

Secondly, both headteachers and teachers wanted supervisors to continue directing teachers how they should teach, as well as inspecting teachers’ instructional practices essentially for errors. 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 traditional 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 (Glic kman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2004). The empirical research literature has shown that supervisors elsewhere also continue to use authoritarian approach to instructional supervision. Yimaz, Tadan and Ouz (2009) found that supervisors in Turkish primary schools continue to use the traditional approach to supervision. According to these researchers, supervisory activities were geared towards the determination of conditions, assessment and control, while activities like supporting and guiding teachers to improve instruction were ignored. Ayse Bas (2002) also found that in Turkish private primary schools, supervisors used control and intimidation in their supervisory practices.

In Kyegegwa 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 programmes and guidelines about contemporary supervisory behavior may guide improvements in practice.

It must also be acknowledged that headteachers 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, headteachers 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. If the heads understood the item, inspecting instruction for errors in the survey differently from fault-finding, then their approach aligns closely with the directive control approach in the clinical supervision model (Glickman, 1990; Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980). Glickman (1990) notes that even though the directive control approach is reminiscent of the traditional form of supervision it does not emphasize fault -finding. Some researchers suggest that this approach could be used most effectively with new or inexperienced teachers (Pajak, 2002), or with incompetent teachers (Glickman, 1990; Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980).

Teacher and headteacher 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. Headteachers’ 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. Glatthorn (1990) posits that individual teachers respond to different approaches to supervision based on their needs and competencies, and cautions against a one-best-way approach. The rationale for differentiated supervision is that teachers are different (Sergiovanni, 2009). According to Sergiovanni, informal classroom visitations and/or formal lesson observations can be used to assess and assist individual teachers.

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 Collaboration**

Responses to the survey indicated that heads felt that they promoted collaboration among teachers and between supervisors and teachers more often than their teachers believed they experienced it. However, both teachers and heads wanted more collegial supervision than they were currently experiencing. Additionally, the interview results showed that teachers used their own informal arrangements to collaborate with each other. Thus, the data do suggest that informal collaboration exists among teachers but rarely between teachers and supervisors. For example, only two teachers (one in an interview and one in response to an open-ended question on the survey) reported that their headteachers were a source of new ideas about instructional improvement.

Headteachers responded on the survey that they often provided opportunities for teachers to meet and share ideas about instruction. This may be interpreted to mean that heads might have encouraged their teachers to consult with or approach their fellows for assistance, but not necessarily to have formal teams and/or scheduled meeting times. On their part, teachers might have also been comfortable with such informal arrangements.

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 in Gulu. In the US, Blasé and Blasé (1999) found that supervisors’ modeled teamwork, provided time for teams to meet regularly, and advocated the sharing of ideas.

According to these researchers, collaboration 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 programmes.

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 Kyegegwa 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.

Collaboration is a systematic process in which teachers work together to analyze and implement their classroom practices which, in turn, leads to higher levels of student achievement (DuFour, 2004). In the current situation, there are no formal teams to meet and discuss new strategies, gain insight into what is working and what is not, and implement findings to raise student achievement. Turning schools into “learning communities” by promoting collaboration can improve student learning.

With regard to peer observation, heads and teachers in this study wanted supervisors to encourage teachers to observe other teachers’ classrooms and programmes to share ideas about instructional improvement. However, supervisors in this study rarely carried out this practice. The empirical research literature has shown that peer-observation improved teacher’s instructional practices in the US schools; this could also be implemented in Gulu. In one study, Bays (2001) found that interaction among peers (teachers) was helpful and desirable.

Bays, however, did not indicate whether such a move was initiated by supervisors. In another study, Blasé and Blasé (1999) reported that supervisors advocated peer observation. Teachers in that study indicated that their supervisors encouraged them to visit other teachers, even in other schools, to observe their classrooms and programmes. Teachers in Blasé and Blasé’s study (1999) indicated that such interactions broadened their outlook and motivated them to try out a variety of instructional strategies.

The policy guide on supervision of instruction in Ugandan public primary schools included the expectation that supervisors would encourage experienced teachers to help other teachers professionally. This seems to convey the notion that collegiality is a one -way relationship in which only experienced teachers help new, weaker and inexperienced peers.

But the research literature suggests a practice wherein individual teachers (which may include heads) learn from one another through peer observation and group meetings. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) posit that collegiality consists of collaboration among teachers and between teachers and principals (supervisors), and is characterized by mutual respect, shared work values, co-operation and specific conversations about teaching and learning.

The statement in the policy guide that experienced teachers should help their counterparts may be beneficial, but it may also be counter-productive if it makes inexperienced teachers reluctant to express their ideas, many of which could be useful. If this statement from the policy guide is translated into practice, it could stifle the initiative and innovation of these categories of teachers, and resort to over dependence on others. Revising this statement could correct the misconception some teachers and heads might hold.

Contemporary models of supervision promote the view that supervisors should provide various forms of assistance and support to teachers to improve instruction. Teachers and heads in this study were satisfied with the regularity with which supervisors provided direct assistance to teachers to help find solutions to instructional problems, readily availed themselves for instructional support and advice, and offered useful suggestions to teachers to improve instruction.

This supervisor behavior in the current study is not a peculiar one; empirical studies in the US and in Africa have found this aspect of supervision practiced. For example, Rous (2004) reported that public primary school principals (supervisors) in the US frequently offered suggestions to improve instruction. Similarly, teachers in public primary schools in the south-eastern, mid-western and north-western states of the US overwhelmingly reported that successful supervisors offered suggestions to improve instructional methods and solve problems (Blasé & Blasé, 1999). Pansiri (2008) found that public primary school supervisors in Botswana listened to the concerns of their teachers, and were accessible and approachable.

In this study, however, the results from the survey that supervisors provided teachers with needed assistance contradict teachers’ comments on an open-ended item. Teachers indicated that their supervisors often queried or found fault with their work, imposed ideas on them, and corrected their mistakes in the presence of the pupils. One head confirmed these claims by saying that he/she sometimes took the chalk from the teachers and helped “bail them out” of difficulties. Consequently, it would seem likely that teachers would lose trust in their supervisors and, therefore feel reluctant to seek assistance or any form of guidance from their heads. Providing training programmes and guidelines about current practices can improve supervision in schools.

On the issue of resource support, a great majority of teachers and heads indicated that supervisors often provided teachers with teaching-learning materials (TLMs). However, teachers wanted the materials to be provided on time and in adequate quantities. Headteachers in Kyegegwa do not have direct control over the quantity and timely supply of teaching-learning materials. They purchase these materials based on an annual grant to the school, when these grants are lodged into the schools’ accounts. As in the case of Gulu, empirical research has shown that some supervisors in the US and Botswana provided their teachers with TLMs, while others did not. Supervisors in public schools may not be held accountable for not providing such support because of administrative procedures. In Kentucky public primary schools, Rous (2004) found that while some supervisors provided teachers with resources, materials, and funds to support classroom activities, others did not. Pansiri (2008) also found in Botswana that while 59 percent of teachers did not have all the teaching materials they needed, 22 percent reported that they did. Another related revelation is that 53 percent of the teachers in Botswana reported that their supervisors involved them in the selection and procurement of teaching resources.

The fact that teachers in Kyegegwa are concerned about the use of teaching-learning materials suggests that they consider these materials crucial for lesson delivery. The UES should, therefore, devise ways to provide schools with the required quantities of teaching resources in a timely manner. These measures alone may not improve student learning if supervisors fail to provide adequate supervision on the selection and effective use of these resources. To improve student learning schools should endeavor to look out for concrete and more durable learning materials, instead of drawing diagrams on cardboard, which tends to perish within a short time.

Similarly, heads would like to provide teachers with professional literature, and teachers also expressed a greater need for such materials than they were currently provided. Responses to the survey indicated that less than half of teachers and heads experienced this type of support often. In response to the survey and interview, not even a single teacher indicated that supervisors provided him/her with professional literature. The municipal head of supervision said the district directorate occasionally provides teachers with professional literature, but this turned out to be something different. The copy of a newsletter he showed me was from the Uganda National Association of Teacher’s Union (UNATU), and contained articles about issues affecting members (teachers) of this professional body, but not issues related to instruction.

Unlike the situation in Kyegegwa, public primary school teachers in the US have access to professional literature to improve their instructional practices. For example, teachers in Blasé and Blasé’s (1999) study acknowledged that their principals enhanced their reflective behavior by distributing written information about instructional practices to them. In the current study, supervisors seldom carried out this practice. However, supervisors of course cannot be held accountable for this because of the economic and technological level of advancement in a lesser-developed country like Ghana, where less than 10 percent of public primary schools have access to computers. Many articles about instruction may be found on the internet, but access to them may be impossible if schools and teachers are not connected to the internet. Nevertheless, it is important to make sustainable arrangements to obtain and disseminate professional literature to teachers in Kyegegwa to improve instruction. Teacher participants’ desire for the provision of professional literature corroborates researchers’ belief that such materials would improve teachers’ instructional practices and consequently, student learning.

Teachers and headteachers in this study experienced regular visits by heads to classrooms, and wanted this practice to be continued. The supervisors visited classrooms regularly and purposefully to make sure those teachers were punctual and present in class, to make sure that teachers taught effectively and made good use of instructional time, to check pupils’ exercise books for output of work, and to ensure that teachers recorded marks on continuous assessment forms. Responses to the survey and interview items suggest that both the teachers and headteachers considered the activities supervisors carried out during such visits very important aspects of supervision, and wanted the practice to continue. Participants’ support/endorsement for supervisors to check the regularity and punctuality of teachers’ school attendance may be explained by the observation that some teachers in public primary schools were in the habit of absenting themselves from school (Oduro, 2008; World Bank, 2011), as well as reporting late to school. Similarly, participants’ support for the practice whereby supervisors visit classrooms to check pupils’ exercise books to find out whether teachers gave enough exercises, marked them, saw to it that corrections were made and marks transferred into continuous assessment records suggests that some teachers may not be performing these activities regularly. Headteachers and teachers may also see such activities as important aspects of supervision in Uganda public primary schools even if the policy guidelines were not there.

This supervisory behavior (informal visits to classrooms) is not peculiar to Kyegegwa. 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.

When teachers are regular and punctual to class and perform their teaching-related duties, students’ time-on-task may increase and enhance student outcomes. Research has shown that increased time spent on learning activities yield increased student learning, provided that the teacher is competent, and the learning activities are effectively designed and implemented (Brophy, 1988). Although the monitoring of these activities is necessary, there is still the need for effective supervision of instruction. Supervision is likely to improve if supervisors pay much attention to the assistance, guidance and support they provide to teachers to improve their instructional practices, rather than continuing to emphasize the monitoring of routine activities.

**5.3 THE THREE PHASES OF CLINICAL SUPERVISION (LESSON OBSERVATION)**

Contemporary researchers of instructional supervision such as Acheson and Gall (1980) and Glickman (1990) have reduced the original eight-phase clinical supervision model developed by Cogan and Goldhammer to three phases: pre-observation conference, actual lesson observation, and post-observation conference and feedback. Headteachers and teachers in this study wanted much more in terms of pre-observation conferencing than they were currently experiencing.

Responses to the survey indicated that a majority of teachers (55%) often experienced pre-observation conferencing. But there were some inconsistencies between these results and those from teachers in response to open-ended survey items and interview questions. Nine out of the ten teachers interviewed, and a majority of teachers who responded to the survey wanted their supervisors to inform them prior to lesson observation; implying that this practice is not common. These responses may be interpreted to mean that most supervisors in this study did not hold pre-observation conferences with their teachers. Researchers in clinical and other contemporary models of supervision suggest that supervisors should hold pre-observation conferences with teachers (Acheson & Gall, 1980; Cogan, 1973; Glickman, 1990; Goldhammer, 1969) to discuss with them the reasons and purposes of the observation, the focus, method and form to be used, and the times for observation and post -observation conference (Glickman, 1990). The pre-observation conference would prepare the minds of teachers and guide them as to what would be expected of them during the period of observation.

The finding in Kyegegwa that supervisors do not involve teachers in pre-observation planning is not an isolated case. In a similar study conducted by Ayse Bas (2002) in Turkish private primary schools, principals determined when visits would be conducted without consulting teachers. But the situation is different from a similar study conducted in an African country. Pansiri (2008) found that in public primary schools in Botswana, 75 percent of teachers said their supervisors planned class visits with them. The practice where supervisors do not conference with teachers prior to lesson observation may be viewed by teachers as a way of trying to find fault with teachers’ instructional practices. For their part, however, heads in this study indicated that they did not visit classrooms to find faults. The fact that both teachers and heads wanted this practice suggests that it could certainly be implemented in Kyegegwa.

Supervision in Ugandan public primary schools would improve if supervisors begin to hold pre-observation conferences with teachers. Involvement in the planning process make teachers aware of what aspect of the instructional process is to be observed, and the time and method of observation (Acheson & Gall, 1980; Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Cogan, 1973; Glickman, 1990; Goldhammer, 1969). Teachers can then prepare adequately, which would potentially raise their level of confidence, boost their morale, and result in improvement in teachers’ instructional practices. Providing heads with some training about contemporary supervision practices may equip them with skills to better provide supervision to teachers to improve teaching and learning in schools.

On the issue of lesson observation, both the teachers and heads experienced this activity, but wanted it more regularly than they currently experienced. The teachers and the heads, as well as the policy officers reported that lesson observations were not very frequent due to headteachers’ tight schedules. Researchers have theorized that lesson observation is an important aspect of instructional supervision since it provides an opportunity for supervisors to assess the instructional strategies of teachers and to better provide the necessary assistance and support which can ultimately improve student outcomes (Acheson & Gall, 1980; Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Cogan, 1973; Glickman, 1990; Goldhammer, 1969). They also believe that the questions supervisors pose in the course of supervision serve as reminders to help teachers reflect upon their performances, as well as raise their level of confidence and eventually improve teachers’ instructional practices.

The situation in Uganda public primary schools in which lesson observations were not as frequent as desired as a result of supervisors’ numerous administrative and managerial duties is not an isolated phenomenon. Researchers have found similar situations in both developed and less developed nations: in the US (Bays, 2001; Kruskamp, 2003; Rous, 2004);and, in four African countries (De Grauwe, 2001). In one of these four African countries, Botswana, almost all the teachers acknowledged that their supervisors visited their classrooms to observe lessons (Pansiri, 2008). Pansiri did not, however, indicate whether lesson observations were interrupted or otherwise limited by supervisors’ administrative and managerial duties. The situation where supervisors are saddled with numerous administrative and managerial duties impacts negatively on instructional supervision and, ultimately, on student outcomes.

Heads and teachers in this study were not specific about post-observation conferences, but noted that supervisors provided teachers with objective feedback about lesson observation. However, both groups of participants indicated that they wanted many more post-observation conferences. Some of the teachers interviewed said their supervisors drew their attention to mistakes, discussed findings, and provided advice during and after lesson observation. The current practice where supervisors provide feedback and suggestions about lesson observation is likely to improve instructional practices, and ultimately, student learning. Feedback and suggestions encourage teachers to reflect upon their performances and re-evaluate their instructional strategies. But for supervision to be more effective, supervisors need to be equipped with skills to practice the three synergistically linked phases of the clinical supervision model. Eventually, this would likely improve student outcomes in the schools (Blasé & Blasé).

Empirical studies in the US and Africa have shown that providing objective feedback about lessons positively affects teachers’ reflective behavior to try out a variety of strategies to improve instruction (Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Pansiri, 2008; Rous, 2004). As in the case of Kyegegwa, these researchers did not indicate whether supervisors provided feedback to teachers during lesson observations or at post-observation conferences. In public primary schools in the US, teachers reported that the feedback they received from their supervisors was specific and non-judgmental, and encouraged them to consider and re-evaluate their strategies (Blasé & Blasé, 1999). In that study, teachers reported that feedback reflectively informed their behavior and this resulted in the implementation of new ideas, trying out a variety of instructional practices, responding to student diversity, planning more carefully and achieving better focus. Similarly, in Kentucky public primary schools, feedback offered by supervisors was a formal behavior, objective and based solely on class observation (Rous, 2004). Pansiri also found that 70 percent of public primary school teachers in Botswana were provided with constructive feedback. But in the rural district public schools in Virginia, specific feedback to teachers in the area of special education appeared to be limited (Bays, 2001). Bays’ finding may be explained by the fact that some of the supervisors were not specialists in the field of Special Education, and might not have had sufficient background knowledge in the content and pedagogy in that field.

**Leadership skills/behavior**

Contemporary researchers in supervision of instruction, such as Blasé and Blasé (1999), believe that the behavior supervisors exhibit in the process of carrying out their duties affect teachers emotionally and psychologically, and hence their performance.

Teachers and headteachers in this study wanted supervisors to give more praise to teachers for specific teaching behavior than what heads were currently doing. Blasé and Blasé (2004) posit that praising teachers significantly and positively affects teacher motivation, self-esteem, and efficacy. They also suggest that praise fosters teachers’ reflective behavior by re-enforcing teaching strategies, risk-taking, and innovation/creativity. Like most participants in this study, public primary school teachers in Botswana received praise from their supervisors for demonstrating good teaching strategies (Pansiri, 2008). Similarly, public primary school teachers in the US said their supervisors offered praise which focused on specific and concrete teaching behavior (Blasé & Blasé, 1999). The current situation in Uganda primary schools whereby supervisors praise their teachers is likely to boost teachers’ morale, encourage them to try out new ideas and ultimately motivate them to strive for excellence to raise student learning. People are encouraged to improve their behavior and performances when they receive genuine praise for specific work done.

Teachers and headteachers in the current study were generally satisfied about their relationships with each other. Almost all of the teachers interviewed and their heads said supervisors were friendly to all teachers, humble, frank and straight-forward and that they felt happy, good, secure and comfortable about such behavior. On the other hand, however, some teachers remarked that their heads were disrespectful and too harsh towards them. These responses seem to contradict each other. Headteachers might have related well with teachers in their schools, but also behaved differently towards teachers during lesson observations.

Thus, teachers might have drawn a distinction between supervisors’ inter-personal relationship with teachers and their behavior towards teachers during supervision. If this explanation depicts the actual situation in the schools, then there is the need for training programmes to improve supervisors’ current practices.

Researchers have theorized that respectful relationships are important in instructional supervision. For example, Mastrangelo et al. (cited in Pansiri, 2008) believe that trust, caring, sharing and morals are essential characteristics in performing the responsibilities of professional leadership. Sullivan and Glanz (2000) also advised that good supervisors must relate well to people, be flexible and open-minded. Researchers have also shown empirically that respectful relationships between teachers and their supervisors can improve teaching.

Rous (2004) for instance, found that in Kentucky public primary school supervisors who showed respect for staff and families and demonstrated caring for children facilitated effective classroom instruction. Supervisors in the current study could certainly behave well towards their teachers not only outside instructional hours, but when supervising instruction to yield results similar to those in Kentucky.

When superior officers establish good inter-personal relationships with their subordinates during and after working hours the latter are encouraged to embark on activities that will accomplish desired goals. Supervisor behavior during instructional hours is likely to motivate teachers to confide in them, seek their assistance and guidance, and try out new ideas about instruction to improve student learning without fear of reprimand. Supervision of instruction in the schools may improve if teachers have trust in their supervisors. And this will be achieved when supervisors behave well towards teachers during supervision.

**5.4 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Contemporary researchers of supervision of instruction advocate that supervisors should model lessons, as well as provide school-based in-service training workshops to develop the professional skills of teachers.

Teachers and heads indicated in the survey that they needed more demonstration lessons to help improve teachers’ instructional practices than they currently experienced. There appeared to be some inconsistencies between responses from both groups on the survey and responses provide by teachers in the interviews. While about 60 percent of teachers and heads indicated on the survey that they often experienced lesson modeling, only one teacher and two out of ten headteachers in their interviews said they experienced modeling of lessons. These interviewees might not have considered modeling of lessons an important aspect of supervision since it is conspicuously missing from the policy guide.

While some empirical research findings in the US have shown that demonstrating teaching techniques to teachers can improve instruction, and consequently, raise student learning (Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Rous, 2004), some supervisors in the US and Botswana never modeled lessons (Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006; Pansiri, 2008). In the same US (Kentucky), teachers reported that their supervisors modeled appropriate teaching techniques (Rous, 2004). Blasé and Blasé (1999) also found in the US that supervisors demonstrated teaching techniques during classroom visits. In contrast, Glanz, Shulman and Sullivan (2006) found in the US (New York public primary schools) that the supervisors never modeled teaching techniques. Similarly, Pansiri (2008) found that 71 percent of teachers in Botswana public primary schools neither experienced demonstration lessons nor were they coached about how to handle certain topics or lessons.

Evidence from the survey and interviews in this study suggest that supervisors in the study rarely demonstrated teaching techniques to teachers to improve instruction. And the fact that teachers and heads want supervisors to provide model lessons suggests that they believe such activities can lead to significant improvement in instruction. The practice should, therefore, be encouraged in Uganda public primary schools.

Teachers and heads in this study wanted much more time for in-service training than they currently had. However, there were also some inconsistencies in participants’ responses. Sixty-five percent of teachers and heads indicated on the survey that supervisors often organized in-service workshops to improve teachers’ instructional practices. But only three teachers and no headteacher in their interview responses acknowledged that supervisors organized in-service training for teachers. When teachers were also asked about their sources of new ideas and/or changes in their instructional practices in the survey and interview, a majority of them in either case mentioned in-service workshops organized by the municipal education directorate. It seems that headteachers in this study did not consider in service training provided by heads as an aspect of instructional supervision because it had been placed under professional development within the policy guide.

Unlike supervisors in Kyegegwa, researchers have shown empirically that some supervisors directly or indirectly provide teachers with this type of professional support to improve their instructional practices. For example, Blasé and Blasé (1999) found that supervisors in public primary schools in the US provided their teachers with funds and information about innovative seminars and workshops. According to Blasé and Blasé, in-service training provides teachers with new ideas that broaden their outlook, and increases instructional variety and innovation. In Pansiri’s (2008) study, 83 percent of public primary school teachers in Botswana indicated that their supervisors ran school -based in-service workshops for them to address their curriculum needs.

**5.5 CHALLENGES**

From the perspectives of teachers, headteachers and policy officers, the main challenges which were likely to affect supervision of instruction in public primary schools in Ghana were: 1) the criteria used by the Uganda Education Service (USE) to recruit and appoint the head of the Inspectorate Unit (the chief inspector); 2) time constraints on the part of headteachers (supervisors); 3) lack of funds for capacity building; 4) inadequate preparation (training) for prospective headteachers; and, 5) teachers‟ and headteachers’ attitudes towards lesson observation.

The interview responses suggested that USE recruits and appoints people (Chief Inspectors) who have been in management positions for seven years or more without considering their professional background in education, and more specifically, in supervision of instruction. The officer at headquarters wanted changes in the mode of selection of officers to this position. Researchers have theorized that instructional supervisors should have sufficient knowledge and technical skills (Glickman et al., 2004; Holland, 2004; Huse (1980) cited in Kruskamp, 2003) to be able to provide assistance and support to improve instruction.

In most cases, credentials serve as evidence. For example, the professional knowledge and technical skills of the national head of supervision (Chief Inspector), to a large extent, would have an influence on the supervisory practices of personnel in the schools. The person in this capacity is most likely to influence the planning and implementation of policies affecting supervision. Such a person should, therefore, be a professional in the field of supervision so that he/she would be in a good position to provide inputs to improve instructional supervision in the schools.

This finding that heads of supervision are selected based on their managerial experience (and not their expertise in instructional supervision) is not consistent with suggestions provided by researchers in the literature. Glickman et al. (2004) and Holland (2004) maintain that supervisors must offer evidence that they have the necessary knowledge and skills to make important decisions about instruction. According to Holland, degrees and diplomas are a form of such evidence, but credentials alone do not inspire trust. The finding in the current study in which the Chief Inspector may not be an expert in instructional supervision could result in role ambiguity. According to Huse (1980, cited in Kruskamp, 2003), role ambiguity occurs when an individual has insufficient knowledge of the expectations associated with assigned roles and responsibilities. The empirical research literature (De Grauwe, 2001) has shown that in four African countries (Botswana, Tanzania, Zanzibar and Zimbabwe) qualifications and experience seemed important in the selection of supervisors (including headteachers); this practice could also be implemented in Kyegegwa.

Evidence from the interviews, however, suggests that USE is recruiting and appointing personnel to this position who do not have the necessary experience. Managerial experience may be necessary, but not sufficient. If a person is abreast with contemporary supervisory practices and has in-depth knowledge of current educational issues, he or she will likely be able to make a significant impact on instructional supervision. It is likely that instructional supervision in public primary schools in Kyegegwa would improve if UES reconsidered its method of selecting instructional supervisors, including headteachers.

Participants in this study also thought that headteachers’ time constraints negatively influence instructional supervision. All three groups of respondents were consistent in their view that heads had little time to supervise instruction. Headteachers in public primary schools in Kyegegwa need more time to supervise instruction. Some headteachers are allocated full-time teaching duties in addition to their administrative, managerial and supervisory roles.

According to Oduro (2008), apart from the “magnitude of tasks” that headteachers in Ugandan public primary schools perform, those in remote and deprived communities combine their supervisory roles with teaching and visiting pupils in their communities. The situation in Kyegegwa in which supervisors do not have enough time to supervise instruction is not an isolated case. For example, Rous (2004) found that teachers in Kentucky public primary schools did not see enough of their supervisors in their classrooms. One of the respondents in Rous’ study said he would have liked to seek his supervisors’ opinion on how to deal with certain children’s behavior, but she (supervisor) did not have time. Bays (2001) also found in the US (Virginia) that management and administrative issues took much of the principals’ time and energies, and detracted from principals providing consistent supervision to teachers. De Grauwe (2001) also found in four African countries that supervisors focused much attention on administration rather than pedagogy. In another related study in a high school in the US (Georgia), Kruskamp (2003) reported that time was a constraint to the practice of instructional supervision. All the three department heads in his study said they had too many tasks, and not enough time to supervise instruction. However, countries like Spain, France and Guinea did not experience such problems because they separate school administration from pedagogical supervision (Carron & De Grauwe, 1997).

Supervision may not be effective because supervisors in the study are pre-occupied with administrative and managerial duties, and left with little time to visit classrooms to supervise instruction. Reducing or removing administrative and managerial duties could improve instructional supervision in Ghana. Better still, the kind of arrangement in Spain, France and Guinea where administrative duties and pedagogical supervision are performed by separate officers could be considered in Ghana to improve supervision.

Lack of funds for capacity building was considered a challenge by the two police officers. The two police officers interviewed in this study were consistent in their responses that a lack of funds for training was likely to affect supervision of instruction. The districts and headquarters needed more financial resources to provide in-service training to improve supervision for district and regional supervisors, as well as headteachers. The municipal directorate also needed funds to fuel circuit supervisors’ motor bikes to enable them to visit schools regularly to provide support to heads to improve supervision. Kyegegwa, like other lesser developed countries, depends largely on development partners for technical and financial support to provide various forms of in-service training for the teaching service. This explains to some extent why such training programmes are not held on a regular basis. The current situation is unfortunate, though, as the UES has not put in place sustained training programmes for up-grading personnel at the regional, district and school levels to effectively supervise instruction in the schools. Over reliance on donor countries to fund training programmes for supervision staff may lead to stagnation when funds and other forms of support are not forthcoming or suspended.

Headteachers and the head of supervision at the district were consistent in their responses that prospective heads are not given sufficient service training. Prospective heads were selected through interviews and then simply given their job descriptions. Thus, the heads were left to use their own experience and the policy guide to supervise instruction.

Headteachers in public primary schools in Kyegegwa need pre -service and regular in-service training to equip them with the knowledge and technical skills to be able to perform their supervisory roles effectively.

This finding is not an isolated case: it confirms other studies conducted in Kyegegwa and in other countries. For example, about 75 percent of interview participants (heads) in a related study conducted by Oduro (2008) in Ghana reported that headteachers had received little or no training in leadership, and therefore used trial and error techniques to address challenges they faced in their leadership roles. De Grauwe (2001) found that in Botswana and Zimbabwe, formal pre-service training existed, but not all newly appointed supervisors had the opportunity to attend. In another related study, Kruskamp (2003) reported that only one of three senior secondary school department heads in the US State of Georgia had completed a course which included a topic in instructional supervision, yet he/she did not receive any formal training from the local system in the practice of instructional supervision.

The opposite appears to be true in findings from studies conducted in some developed countries. Bays (2001) found in the state of Virginia that administrator training was a certification requirement to provide principals with knowledge of supervision theory and practice and personnel management. EURYDICE’s report (1991, cited in Carron & De Grauwe, 1997) also indicated that primary school supervisors in Portugal completed a one-year course (unit) in supervision of instruction. Pre-service programmes for newly appointed heads are necessary, and likely to improve their skills and competencies to enable them to effectively provide assistance, guidance and support to teachers to improve their instructional strategies. This would be likely to eventually raise student achievement.

Respondents also thought the attitudes and behavior of teachers and heads towards lesson observation were likely to affect supervision of instruction in schools. Even though teachers and headteachers had earlier indicated that they related well to each other, some teachers also complained that their heads did not inform them prior to lesson observation.

Most headteachers, on the other hand, noted in the interviews that some teachers felt reluctant for their lessons to be observed. Each group of respondents wanted changes in the behavior and attitudes towards supervision: heads wanted teachers to embrace lesson observation, while teachers wanted to be consulted before observation. Blasé and Blasé (2004) suggest that supervisors should mutually decide with teachers on what and how to observe before proceeding to the classroom to actually conduct observation. As discussed earlier in this chapter, education authorities should provide heads with training programmes to develop their skills in contemporary supervisory practices. And more importantly, supervisors at this level should endeavor to change their approach in order to attract teachers’ co-operation in the supervision process.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, while this finding is similar to one conducted in Turkish private primary schools (Ayse Bas, 2002), it differs from a similar study conducted in Botswana (Pansiri, 2008). Headteachers in Ghana may not have involved teachers in pre-observation planning because the policy guide is silent on the practice of pre-observation conferencing, and therefore they did not see the need to inform teachers or conference with them. Teachers might also not have had any idea about the possibility of a pre-observation conference, but simply needed to be informed so that they would prepare for it. Supervisors should endeavor to involve teachers in pre-observation planning process to improve the benefits that can accrue from collaborative, collegial supervision of instruction.

**5.6 IMPORTANCE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION**

The immediate purpose of this study is to better understand the practice of instructional 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 (Blase & Blase, 2004; Dufour, 2004; Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006; Pansiri, 2008; Rous, 2004; Sergiovanni, 2009; Sergiovanni & Starrat, 1993; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000; Tyagi, 2009). This section is presented to serve as a foundation for the study’s conclusions and recommendations.

Empirical research studies have shown that contemporary instructional supervision practices have the potential to improve instruction and the entire school environment (Blase & Blase, 2004; Dufour, 2004; Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006; Pansiri, 2008; Rous, 2004; Sergiovanni, 2009; Sergiovanni & Starrat, 1993; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000; Tyagi, 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 improved instructional 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 (Blase & Blase, 2004; Dufour, 2004; Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006; Sergiovanni, 2009; Sergiovanni & Starrat, 1993; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000).

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.

Another important aspect of supervision advocated by researchers such as Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969) is the pre-observation conference. Researchers have empirically shown that pre-observation conferencing between supervisors and teachers improve teachers’ instructional practices (Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006; 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.

In support of Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer’s (1969) views, researchers have shown empirically that lesson observation provides supervisors the opportunity to assess teachers’ instructional strategies, and also better provides them with the necessary guidance and support for instructional improvement (Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006; Pansiri, 2008; Rous, 2004; Sergiovanni, 2009; Tyagi, 2009). Questions posed and suggestions made during the observation process can serve as guides and prompts to help teachers reflect on their actions, behavior and performances, and to make changes for improvement. When teachers’ reflective behavior and thought processes are enhanced, they are motivated to implement new ideas, vary their instructional strategies, and respond to student diversity (Blasé & Blasé, 1999). These behavioral changes on the part of teachers are likely to lead to improved student outcomes.

An equally important aspect of supervision advocated by researchers is the post-observation conference proposed by Cogan and Goldhammer. Empirical evidence has shown that this strategy provides supervisors the opportunity to provide feedback and suggestions to teachers about lessons observed (Blase & Blase, 2004; Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006; Pansiri, 2008; Rous, 2004; Tyagi, 2009). 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; 1999). 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 suggestions which were 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 (Blasé & Blasé, 1999; 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; Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006; Pansiri, 2008; Rous, 2004; Tyagi, 2009).

These researchers have found that teachers tend to learn new ideas about instructional supervision from these programmes. These activities increase teachers’ repertoire of knowledge and skills, enhance their reflective behavior, and foster their sense of creativity and innovation (Blasé & Blasé, 1999; 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.

Theorists and empirical researchers consider collegial meeting (where teachers meet and collaboratively discuss and take decisions on instruction) an important aspect of instructional supervision (Bays, 2001; Blase & Blase, 2004; Dufour, 2004; Sergiovanni & Starrat, 1993; Sergiovanni, 2009; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). According to these researchers, when teams of teachers meet to analyze and plan instruction together, members gain insight into what is working and what is not. The team discusses new strategies to implement in their classrooms to improve instruction and, eventually, raise student learning. Researchers believe that collegial meeting encourages teacher reflection, creativity, and risk-taking (Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Dufour, 2004). Collaboration among teachers and between teachers and their supervisors can help schools become learning communities.

Researchers have also observed empirically that leadership skills like praise, trust and respect, and good inter-personal relationships motivate teachers to perform their duties effectively (Blase & Blase, 2004; Pansiri, 2008; Rous, 2004; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000).

Genuinely praising teachers for demonstrating specific instructional behavior can increase teachers’ motivation, self-esteem, and efficacy. Praise also fosters teachers‟ reflective behavior, boosts their morale, and encourages risk -taking and creativity. Good inter-personal relationships among people are likely to result in trust and respect for one another (Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Pansiri, 2008; Rous, 2004; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). These researchers have found that teachers typically respect and trust supervisors who relate well with them both within instructional hours and other times of the school day. Teachers who trust their supervisors are often willing to confide in their supervisors and approach them for instructional assistance and support. Similarly, when teachers get to know that their supervisors respect them, as well as have trust in them, they are more likely to be willing participants in supervisors’ observation of their lessons, seek assistance and support from supervisors, and feel secure to try out new strategies. Trusting teachers and respecting their dignity serves as motivation for teachers to embark on activities which will result in improvement in their instructional practices.

The previous section of this chapter presented a summary of the major findings of the study. Both teachers and heads expressed the desire for more contemporary instructional supervision practices than they currently experienced in their schools. The current section has shown that contemporary instructional supervision practices improve teachers’ instructional strategies, which in turn are likely to improve students’ learning experiences and outcomes.

Based on the summary of findings and the discussion about the role of contemporary instructional supervision in improving teachers’ instructional practices, the next section offers conclusions and recommendations to improve instructional supervision, and by extension, the teaching and learning environment in Ghanaian public primary schools.

5.7 CONCLUSION

Supervision of instruction in Ghanaian public primary schools follows the guidelines established by the authorities. Supervisors (headteachers) are doing what is expected of them, and they are also practicing many of the traditional aspects of supervision, such as monitoring and evaluating teachers, that have been identified in the literature. The findings also show, however, that teachers and headteachers would like to practice all the contemporary supervisory practices described in the literature more often than they currently experience.

Teachers and headteachers in the current study conceptualize supervision of instruction in several forms, including: monitoring teachers’ performance of their teaching-related duties, providing teaching resources and checking teachers’ absenteeism and lateness to school. They also see supervision as an act of visiting classrooms, observing lessons and providing other forms of assistance and support to teachers. These activities were typically all contained in the policy guide used by circuit supervisors to assess the performance of headteachers in Ghanaian public primary schools.

In the schools, teachers and heads experienced a combination of traditional and contemporary models of supervision. However, a greater proportion of heads than teachers experienced many of the canvassed supervisory practices. Both teachers and heads wanted a more contemporary version of instructional supervision to be practiced in the schools than they currently experienced. Policy officers, on their part, wanted changes in recruitment and selection of Chief Inspectors of the Inspectorate Unit, as well as more financial support to train and resource regional and district supervisors and heads.

Headteachers and policy officers in the current study wanted USE to provide heads with pre service and in-service training programmes to equip them with knowledge and skills to perform their roles as supervisors effectively. Headteachers and teachers in this study wanted supervisors to be relieved of some administrative duties so as to have more time to provide assistance, guidance and support to teachers to perform their duties effectively and, consequently, to improve student outcomes.

# CHAPTER SIX

# CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of teachers and headteachers in public primary schools in Kyegegwa about how they conceptualized as well as experienced supervision of instruction. The study also sought to discover the aspects of instructional supervision teachers and headteachers want to practice. The following research questions were posed to guide the study:

1. What does the Uganda governments’ (UES) policy on supervision of instruction in Ugandan primary schools require of supervisors (headteachers)?

2. How do participants conceptualize and experience instructional supervision in primary schools?

3. Which aspects of instructional supervision do teachers and headteachers want to practice?

4. What are the differences, if any, between teachers and headteachers, in expectations and experiences of supervision of instruction?

5. What challenges are likely to affect supervision of instruction in the schools?

The conclusions derived from the findings emerging from the study are discussed under the following areas: participants’ conceptions about instructional supervision; the status of instructional supervision in the schools; aspects of instructional supervision that teachers and headteachers want to practice and, challenges to supervision.

Evidence from the study showed that teachers and headteachers shared similar concepts about instructional supervision. Both groups conceptualized instructional supervision as headteachers “making sure”, “ensuring”, or “seeing to it” that teachers perform their duties effectively. When participants were asked to itemize aspects of instructional supervision, all of the supervisor practices they mentioned were consistent with the USE policy guide on instructional supervision and teacher development. These included the provision of resources to teachers, visiting classrooms to observe lessons, checking teachers’ classroom attendance and monitoring the performance of teachers’ teaching-related duties. Teachers’ teaching related duties which headteachers were expected to monitor, which were counted as aspects of instructional supervision, included teachers’ lesson plan preparation, pupils’ output of work (the number of exercises teachers give to pupils, mark, and on which corrections are made), and teachers keeping continuous assessment records. The municipal head of supervision described instructional supervision as the act of inspecting, overseeing, controlling, evaluating, advising, assisting and supporting teachers. For his part, the officer at UES headquarters conceptualized instructional supervision as helping teachers to create the right environment in their classrooms for effective teaching and learning.

The study also showed that supervisors spent much of their time performing the duties and activities listed in the GES policy guide on instructional supervision (which have been mentioned in the previous paragraph). In other words, experiences closely matched the ways in which teachers and headteachers conceptualized instructional supervision. Evidence gathered from the study further showed that supervisors in this study employed a combination of practices from both traditional and contemporary models of instructional supervision. The 40 supervisors who participated in the study tended to employ traditional authoritarian approaches such as finding fault, correcting teachers’ mistakes in the presence of pupils, querying, and imposing ideas on teachers. However, almost all the teachers reported that their supervisors established good inter-personal relationships with them. The study also revealed that supervisors did not frequently observe lessons due to their numerous administrative and managerial duties.

While supervisors in this study were able to provide some forms of instructional support to teachers, there were others areas in which they rarely assisted. Teachers noted that headteachers provided them with feedback and suggestions about ways to improve instruction when they were able to observe lessons. Teachers and headteachers further reported that teachers were supervised differently according to the stages of their careers and individual needs. Some of the teachers also reported that their supervisors provided them with some assistance and support, but rarely provided in-service training programmes or modeled lessons to show teachers how to improve their instructional strategies. Additionally, supervisors did not inform their teachers about impending lesson observation, which suggests that they did not involve teachers in pre-observation planning. The study further revealed that supervisors were unable to provide teachers with professional literature to improve their instructional practices. Materials about instruction can increase teachers’ repertoire of knowledge and equip them with new ideas to improve instruction, but public primary schools in Kyegegwa are not connected to the internet. The study also revealed that headteachers (supervisors) did not promote collaboration among teachers or between teachers and heads in their schools. Rather, teachers used their own initiative to consult one another for assistance when needed.

Evidence from the study showed that while some teachers and headteachers seemed to be satisfied with some aspects of traditional supervision, these participants overwhelmingly wanted to practice all aspects of contemporary instructional supervision as described by leading researchers. Among the traditional supervision practices that some participants wanted was that supervisors should direct teachers in the ways they should teach. The results from the survey and interviews also showed that a majority of these participants wanted supervisors to pay regular visits to classrooms to provide direct assistance and support to teachers in improving instruction. Further, almost all the teachers and headteachers wanted supervisors to involve teachers in pre-observation planning, observe teachers’ lessons, and hold post-observation conferences with teachers. Most teachers and headteachers also wanted supervisors to provide teachers with objective feedback and suggestions to improve their instructional practices. In addition, teachers wanted their supervisors to praise teachers for demonstrating desired instructional behavior. The study also revealed that a majority of teachers and headteachers embraced the idea that supervisors should provide teachers with professional literature, in-service training, and demonstrate teaching techniques to guide and equip them with knowledge and skills to improve their instructional strategies. Similarly, both groups of participants wanted supervisors to promote peer observation and collaboration among teachers in their schools. Finally, both teachers and headteachers wanted to experience a more trusting relationship, based on mutual respect, than they currently experienced in their schools.

This study’s findings also highlight a number of problems which are likely to negatively affect the conduct of instructional supervision in the schools. Almost all teachers and headteachers, as well as the two police officers acknowledged that heads (supervisors) were occupied with too many administrative and managerial duties to have enough time to effectively supervise instruction. It was also apparent that newly appointed heads (prospective supervisors) were not provided pre-service training about ways to supervise instruction effectively. A further potential barrier to good practice in instructional supervision is that the UES recruits and appoints personnel, primarily with managerial experience, to head supervision at the national level without considering their professional qualifications and experience in instructional supervision.

Finally, there was insufficient and irregular allocation of funds to provide in-service training for capacity building among regional, district and school level supervisors. For example, the mobility of circuit supervisors to visit schools to provide teachers and heads with instructional support was hampered by insufficient funds.

6.1 CONCLUSIONS

This section presents a number of conclusions and recommendations based on the study’s findings regarding participants’ conceptions about instructional supervision, the status of instructional supervision in the schools, teachers’ and headteachers’ expectations about instructional supervision and challenges to supervision.

Supervision of instruction experienced and practiced in public primary schools in Ghana is currently characterized by a combination of both “traditional” and contemporary supervision practices. Both teachers and headteachers agreed on this. Teachers and headteachers in public primary schools in Kyegegwa are conversant with the contents of the UES policy guide on instructional supervision. Teachers are, therefore, aware of the duties they are expected to perform, and which headteachers are expected to monitor. These aspects of instructional supervision in the policy guide are mostly monitoring teaching-related duties and checking teachers’ attendances, which are considered traditional supervision practices.

Based on evidence from the study, therefore, it seemed highly likely that supervisors’ practices were largely guided by the contents of the UES policy guide on instructional supervision. However, the evidence gathered also showed that supervisors employed some aspects of contemporary supervision practices such as occasionally visiting classrooms, occasionally observing lessons, and providing some guidance and feedback to teachers about ways to improve instruction.

Teachers’ and headteachers’ conceptualizations of instructional supervision are similar to how they experienced and practiced it in their schools. In other words, their conceptualizations of instructional supervision are also characterized by a combination of both “traditional” and contemporary models of instructional supervision. When asked about their conceptualizations of instructional supervision, teachers and headteachers listed aspects and practices that are similar to those found in the GES policy guide on instructional supervision.

The policy guide emphasizes aspects of instructional supervision that are related to monitoring of instructional activities and ensuring maximum use of instructional time. Both groups of participants used almost the same statements as found in the guide to describe aspects of instructional supervision. Most of the statements in the policy guide are preceded by words/phrases such as “ensuring that”, “making sure that”, and “seeing to it that”, which the participants also used to describe their conceptualization of instructional supervision. For example, “ensuring that” teachers perform their duties effectively. However, teachers and headteachers also noted that supervisors should pay regular visits to classrooms to provide direct assistance and guidance to teachers, and give suggestions and feedback about lessons observed. Teachers, in particular, thought that involving them in pre-observation planning would be a desirable feature of instructional supervision.

The nature of supervision of instruction desired by both teachers and heads can be characterized more contemporary than currently experienced.

Teachers and headteachers overwhelmingly wanted supervisors to practice all aspects of contemporary instructional supervision as described in the literature and included in the questionnaire. Even teachers and heads who had not been trained in or exposed to contemporary instructional supervision practices expressed their views in their responses.

While teachers and headteachers only mentioned a few contemporary instructional supervision practices when asked to describe how they conceptualize instructional supervision in the interviews and open-ended survey items, a large majority (over 85%) indicated that they wanted to practice all aspects of contemporary supervision listed in the survey.

Some features of the system supporting instructional supervision in Kyegegwa negatively affect instructional supervision in public primary schools. First, the study revealed that headteachers’ administrative, managerial and teaching responsibilities prevent them from having enough time to supervise instruction. Evidence from the study showed that headteachers in Kyegegwa perform numerous administrative and managerial roles and, in addition, some are fulltime classroom teachers. Second, UES has not put in place sustained training programmes to upgrade and develop the skills of personnel involved in supervision of instruction. Similarly, UES does not have a sustained budget allocation for the training of personnel responsible for supervision at the regional, district, and school levels. Finally, UES either could not find personnel who have the necessary qualifications and experience to head the Inspectorate Unit or hold the view that individuals with managerial experience also have the knowledge or experience necessary for effective instructional supervision. For example, a major selection criterion for the position of Chief Inspector of the inspectorate Unit of the UES is management experience of seven years or more. However, experience or expertise in instructional supervision is not a major selection criterion.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Given the evidently prominent role of the UES policy guide, the UES could consult with teachers and headteachers to revise the contents of the guide on instructional supervision to include more aspects of contemporary supervision practices.

Regular review of the contents of this guide is necessary to meet the changing needs of teachers. Of course, consideration should also be given to retaining some of the existing instructional supervision practices in the policy guide. The Ugandan context, whereby some teachers frequently absent themselves from school and/or report to school lat e (Oduro, 2008; World Bank, 2011), is such that those aspects of instructional supervision in the policy guide which are likely to increase students’ time-on-task should be retained. The revision could include adding aspects of contemporary instructional supervision that are described in the literature and that were supported by the teachers and headteachers in this study. Such a revision would likely improve supervisory practices in the schools and, consequently improve student outcomes and better meet the needs of teachers.

Teachers (including head teachers) could be exposed to desired aspects of contemporary instructional supervision through pre-service and in-service training programmes. First, aspects of contemporary instructional supervision could be incorporated into the teacher training programmes at both the diploma and degree levels to sensitize teachers’ awareness about contemporary instructional supervision practices. Second, prospective head teachers could be given pre-service training in instructional supervision as part of their induction process. Finally, periodic in-service training programmes about new developments in the education system could be provided to head teachers to keep them abreast with current trends and practices. Every professional teacher (including head teachers) would then be conversant with, and more likely to practice these desired aspects of contemporary supervision, which may consequently improve instruction and student learning. Providing pre-service and in-service training programmes to teachers, and especially head teachers, about contemporary instructional supervision practices is likely to develop the knowledge and skills of supervisors, which in turn may improve teaching and learning in schools.

In conclusion 3, some support systems of the UES were identified as potentially having a negative impact on the conduct of instructional supervision in public primary schools in Gulu. It is, therefore, recommended that some support systems be revised to improve instructional supervision in the schools and, consequently, teachers’ instructional practices. First, it is recommended that UES considers either reducing or separating administrative and managerial duties from instructional supervision, as suggested by Carron and De Grauwe (1997). Supervisors would, therefore, be able to more regularly supervise instruction to improve teachers’ instructional practices/strategies and, consequently, raise student learning. Further, it would seem appropriate for UES to put in place sustainable training programmes to better equip personnel at the regional, district and school levels with the knowledge and skills to improve instruction in schools, than is currently the case. It is also been recommended that UES, in conjunction with the Ministry of Education, plan a long-term budgetary allocation for such programmes to build the capacity of personnel in charge of supervision at the primary school level. These steps would ensure regular training programmes for supervision to improve instructional practices, and improve student outcomes. It is further recommended that UES reconsider its method of recruiting and selecting instructional supervisors and Chief Inspectors. UES could make it a priority to groom personnel for internal recruitments to this position. It is likely that a professional educator, especially one with expertise in instructional supervision, would be in a better position to lead the introduction of periodic changes that respond to the needs of the education system.

6.3 AREAS FOR FURTHER STUDIES/RESEARCH

This study sought to examine how teachers and head teachers in public primary schools in Kyegegwa perceived and practiced instructional supervision. The literature and findings call for further research studies in the field of supervision.

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’ behaviour 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.

Proponents of clinical supervision such as Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969) suggest several activities involved in pre-observation lesson observation and post-observation conferencing. The current study did not delve deeply into how these activities are conducted. I suggest that future researchers could use case studies to examine how supervisor behavior during lesson observations influences teachers’ instructional practices. Case studies could also be conducted to determine how supervisor characteristics (practices and behaviour) translate into student learning. I suggest the use of interviews, observation (observer as participant), and document analysis. These approaches would help researchers understand how supervisors observe lessons and their potential effects on instructional improvement and help researchers to determine whether supervisors observe lessons with pre-determined standards of their own or use procedures agreed upon by both supervisors and teachers at pre-observation conferences. Findings from these studies could be used to improve supervisors‟ instructional practices.

**6.4 SUMMARY**

This concluding chapter has summarized the major findings of the study and provides empirical evidence about how aspects of contemporary instructional supervision described in the literature can improve teachers’ instructional practices. Further, the chapter presents conclusions based on the findings, and provides recommendations for improvement. It concludes with possible limitations to the study and suggestions for further research.

This study is unique in two ways. First, it sought the views/opinions of three groups of key stakeholders involved in instructional supervision: teachers, head teachers (internal supervisors) and external supervisors. Previous studies have targeted one or two of these groups at a time. It is envisaged that opinions from all the three groups will enrich the credibility of the results. Second, the study has also attempted to approach the topic holistically by examining the relationships among three aspects of teachers’ and head teachers’ views (experiences, conceptualizations and desires). It sought to examine how teachers and head teachers experienced instructional supervision in their schools, their conceptualizations of instructional supervision, and aspects of instructional supervision they want to practice.

Previous studies have tended to investigate only leadership characteristics or the practice of instructional supervision in schools without taking into consideration the views of teachers at “the coalface”.

In summary, this study has attempted to reverse the top-down trend of decision-making process about policies affecting the education system. Education policies affecting teachers in Kyegegwa have always been formulated at the top and handed down to teachers and head teachers for implementation. This study has recommended the involvement of teachers and head teachers in decisions about instructional supervision to improve instruction and, by extension, the environment for learning in the schools. When the inputs of those affected by policies are considered, they feel that they are respected, and that their opinions count. They might also have ideas that no one at the top would have even thought of. Going to the coalface can be a rich source of innovation and creativity, and doing so is likely to increase teachers’ commitment to the effective implementation of education policies, which may improve the school system. More so, bottom-up initiatives are more likely to be implemented/pursued by those who contributed to their enactment than those imposed from outside.
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**APPENDIX I**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**A: Questionnaire**

**Dear Participant**,

The purpose of this study is to collect information on “Impact of Support Supervision in Promoting Quality Education inPrimary Schools in Kyegegwa District”, how teachers and head teachers in primary schools perceive supervision and its impact. 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.

**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.

**Background information:**

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

**Sex:** Male/Female

**Age:** Up to 29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60+

**Your Location:** Rural/Urban

**Your highest qualification**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Your professional status:** Trained/Untrained

**Your position: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Number of years you have served in your current position:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Questionnaire**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Please tick whichever is appropriate for your circumstance. | | | | | Please respond to the scales on both sides of the statement | Please tick whichever matches your understanding. | | | | | |
| How I experience supervision of instruction in my current school. I have been: | | | | |  | How I think supervision of instruction should be. Supervision means: | | | | | |
| Always | Sometimes | | Rarely | Never |  | Strongly Agree | | Agree | | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|  |  | |  |  | 1. Suggesting to teachers how they should teach. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 2. Using control to affect teachers' instructional practices. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 3. Inspecting teachers' instructional practices for errors. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 4. Helping teachers find solutions to problems they encounter in their instructional practices. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 5. Readily availing himself/herself for advice and instructional support. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 6. Evaluating teachers' classroom instructional  practices. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 7. Assessing teachers' content knowledge. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 8. Ensuring that teachers make good use of instructional time. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 9. Engaging teachers in mutual dialogue about ways to improve teaching. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 10. Offering useful suggestions to improve instructional practices. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 11. Praising teachers for specific teaching behavior. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 12. Ensuring that teachers have adequate teaching- learning materials to teach. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 13. Providing teachers with articles on research findings about instruction. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 14. Demonstrating teaching techniques. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 15. Making informal visits to classrooms. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 16. Formally observing teaching and learning. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 17. Conferencing with teacher to plan for lesson observation. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 18. Providing objective feedback about classroom observations. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 19. Encouraging teachers to observe other teachers' classrooms and programmes. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 20. Providing opportunities for teachers to meet and share ideas about instruction. |  | |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  | 21. Providing in-service workshops to teachers to develop their skills |  | | |  |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 22. Establishing open and trusting relationship with teachers. | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 23, Treating teachers professionally with a sense of caring and respect. | |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  | 24. Implementing the use of Action Research in the school. | |  |  | |  |  |

25. What ways do you think supervision of instruction could be improved in this school?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

26. Suggest any support to improve supervision of instruction in your school.

……………….………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

27. Briefly describe problems you face in supervision.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

28. Any other comments

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Thank you for completing this survey. Your participation is very much appreciated.