THE CURRENT PRACTICE AND CHALLENGES OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION IN THE PRIMARY SCHOOLS

AYALEW ABERA[1*]

[1]Arbaminch College of Teachers Education, Arbaminch Ethiopia.

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION

Author AA has performed the methodology, literature review, result interpretation and validation, formal analysis, and investigation, data collection, writing original draft preparation, funding acquisition and prepared the manuscript text and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Original Research Article

ABSTRACT

The study aims to investigate the current practices and challenges of instructional supervision of some selected primary schools in Chencha Woreda, Gamo Gofa Zone Ethiopia. Attempts have been made to explore the extent to which cluster supervisors implement instructional supervision with regard to various instructional supervisory tasks, assessing the major challenges, views and attitudes of teachers and supervisors towards the current practice of the service with a Sequential explanatory mixed research design. Data were collected through questionnaires, document observation, interview and focus group discussion. The data gathered through questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively using SPSS. The data gathered through other instruments were analyzed qualitatively. The findings of the study indicated that majority of cluster supervisors were not trained and unskilled to carryout instructional supervision. Similarly, school-site supervisors were also found to be deficient in providing the expected support of the schools for the contributions to the improvement of the teaching-learning process. The current practices of instructional supervision in the study area was full of challenges and proper attention was not given by the teachers, school-site supervisors, and cluster in the Scholl system. Based on the findings and the conclusions drawn, possible recommendations were forwarded: woreda and zonal education offices together with regional education bureau should up-grade supervisors to the required qualifications and should facilitate working conditions and trainings for school-site supervisors. In addition, instructional supervision courses should be given for all trainees in teachers colleges and education faculties both in pre- and in- service trainings

Keywords: Challenge; instruction; practice; strategies; supervision.

1. INTRODUCTION

School supervisory services are supposed to contribute to the creation of a unified and standardized quality school system. This implies that school supervisors are expected to undertake three sets of tasks including, support, evaluation and liaison at schools to achieve the supposed unified and standardized school system. School supervisors must be able to facilitate both vertical and horizontal communications (work as liaison). They are expected to promote communications vertically informing schools with policies and rules and the ministry with the needs and realities in the schools; and horizontally facilitating interactions, net workings between schools" function. Realization of these all tasks of

---

Corresponding author: Email: ayalewab@gmail.com;

school supervisors, however, requires National Professional standards framework for the supervisors as an integral part of ensuring quality learning and teaching at all the schools [1].

In Ethiopia, as elsewhere, instructional supervision has evolved from a focus on inspection where a central or mid-level authority ensures that teachers observe school and classroom rules and maintain existing pre-determined standards (Haileselassie and Abraha, 2012). Many teachers will remember being evaluated on their performance on the blackboard rather than their teaching effectiveness [2].

An educational supervision has a greater potential force to enhance teachers' professional efficiency thereby contributing to the students' learning better. Similar [3] stated that supervision is the functions in schools that draw together the discrete elements of instructional effectiveness into the whole action. Furthermore, Glickman GD et al. [3] suggested that the long-term goal of supervision should be to foster teacher growth toward higher levels of development, expertise, and commitment.

Regarding the necessity of teachers' growth for the improvement of instructional process Ethiopian Ministry of Education (MoE) [4] stated as the quality of education to a great extent depends on the quality of teachers. This is particularly true of primary education, when children are not yet at stage of learning on their own … Moreover, teaching in lower primary schools has become an area of concern with regard to the professional competence of teachers. Thus, it seems clear that the issue of instructional supervision is unquestionably important to improve teachers' quality for quality assurance and enhancement of school education with special attention in primary schools. In this regard, organizing effective supervisory service in the management of education is essential to facilitate the system for instructional improvement.

In line with this view, Glickman GD et al. [3] stated as effective supervision requires knowledge, interpersonal skills, and technical skills. These are applied through the supervisory tasks of direct assistance to teachers, group development, professional development, and curriculum development and action research. This adhesive pulls together organizational goals and teacher needs and provides for learning. Similarly, Haileselassie W [5] further stated that supervisory role and function today requires people with better knowledge, ability and understanding on the field so as to be able to render effective and efficient service and professional guidance to teachers.

As to the Federal Ministry of Education supervisors professional competency standard draft guideline (December, 2012), School supervisors are responsible for ensuring that decisions about curriculum, instructional strategies, assessment, and professional development are based on sound research, best practices, appropriate data, and other contextual information. They should confirm that observations and collaborations are used to design meaningful and effective experiences that improve student achievement. School supervisors (instructional leaders) must also capitalize on diversity to create a school culture that promotes respect and success for all students. They must be able to identify, clarify and address barriers to student learning and communicate the importance of developing learning strategies for diverse populations.

They must be learners who model and encourage lifelong learning, too. Besides, they are expected to establish a culture of higher expectations for themselves and other school community members. Different researchers in the field also found that the instructional supervisor's use of direct controlling strategies to influence teachers' instruction-related behaviour results in teacher compliance and/or resistance; in contrast, the use of supportive and empowering strategies was linked to teacher commitment and compliance [6]. Therefore, the role of supervisors is crucial in the process of instructional supervision function thereby creating an environment in which teaching learning function proceed effectively. Thus, the supervisor acts as coordinator, consultant, group leader, and evaluator to assist teachers in the improvement of instruction, curriculum planning, and personal and professional growth and development. In doing so, the supervision must bring to bear a wide repertoire of knowledge and skills.

Although principals and supervisors have responsibility for the curriculum and instruction of the school, supervision of those aspects is only one of their main tasks. Unfortunately, instructional supervision is often a secondary, or totally a neglected part task for many school principals and supervisors, who commonly lament that they do not have time to devote to curriculum and instructional leadership because they are too busy with the day-to-day operation of the school and other related activities. According Poirier DO [6] the principal's function in a school is a complex one consisting of managerial, political, instructional, institutional, human resource, and symbolic leadership roles in schools. The end result of balancing these tasks is that certain tasks do not receive the appropriate time and attention. However, "effective instructional leaders can find many ways to encourage teachers to form collegial relationships that can promote professional growth'' [7].

Like many other Africa countries, Ethiopia has attempted to reform her supervision service by decentralizing the system close-to-school at cluster level and structuring the school-site supervision at school level to improve instruction by improving the quality of teachers and the achievement of learners [8]. However, the existing reality of supervision in the primary schools does not seem to reveal a positive impact of supervision services on instructional improvement as much as expected. On the other hand, there are also many complaints which have been heard from supervisors with regard to the current practice of instructional supervision provision. Some of the complaints are related to the management of supervision services, working conditions, and the daily functioning of supervision services. Therefore, the general objective of this study is to investigate the current practices and challenges of instructional supervision in the primary schools of Chencha Woreda, Gamo Gofa Zone Ethiopia. Thus, based on the general objective the following specific objectives are stated.

- To explore the extent to which cluster supervisors implement instructional supervision as specified in the current education system with respect to different instructional supervisory tasks.
- To find out the views and attitudes of teachers and supervisors towards the current practice of instructional supervisory service.
- To investigate the extent to which school-site supervision service is practiced in the primary schools.
- To identify the major challenges that affects the current practice of instructional supervision in the primary schools.

2. METHODS

Sequential explanatory mixed research design, was used i.e., Concurrent Nested Model. This model involves the collection and analysis of quantitative data first and followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data at the second place. Relevant information and data were gathered from supervisors, school-site supervisors, teachers and woreda education officials. The target population included teachers, principals, vice principals and department heads of all the fifty-eight government primary schools in the study area. Out of fifty-eight government primary schools which are found in the study area, the researcher selected twenty schools, and half of the teachers in each selected schools using simple random sampling due to their homogeneity; which is 104 teachers (56 males and 48 females), And all of the 20 principals (19 males and 1 female), 4 vice principals (2 males and 2 females), 62 department heads and other school-site supervisors(SSS) (43 males and 19 females), all 10 supervisors (9 males and 1 female), and four top officials from the Woreda Education Office (all are males) . using purposive sampling due to their manageablity.

Data collection instruments used was questionnaire, semi-structured interview, and document analyses. Thus, one of the instruments was used in this study is self-developed questionnaire. A pilot study of the Questionnaire was carried out at school before conducting the actual research. The purpose of the pilot study was to verify the reliability of the questionnaire. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the reliability of the instrument and to determine the correlation of individual items to the survey total and tested as high, with an average of over .70. Hence, the test conducted confirmed that the instruments were reliable as statistical literature recommend a test result of .65 (65% reliability) and above as reliable [9]. Quantitative data analysis approach was used to analyze close-ended questions; whereas, qualitative data analysis approach was used to analyze the data collected from open-ended, semi-structured interview, and document analysis.

Table1. Subjects by cluster and schools

Cluster	Schools per cluster	Teachers& SSS per Cluster			Teachers &SSS per sample schools			Sample Teachers &SSS			
		M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	%
C1	7	76	41	117	55	29	84	25	18	43	51.2
C2	5	39	14	53	31	8	39	20	5	25	64.1
C3	5	20	10	30	10	7	17	8	4	12	70.6
C4	5	23	14	37	14	8	22	8	5	13	59.1
C5	6	36	14	50	21	11	32	10	8	18	56.3
C6	6	15	10	25	5	6	11	2	4	6	54.5
C7	6	44	15	59	24	11	35	13	6	19	54.3
C8	6	40	25	65	26	15	41	14	7	21	51.2
C9	4	24	11	35	15	8	23	7	6	13	56.5
C10	8	36	33	69	20	15	35	13	7	20	57.1
Total	58	353	187	540	221	118	339	120	70	190	56.04

3. RESULTS

3.1 Roles of Supervisors in Promoting Instructional Supervision in the Primary Schools

In order to investigate the degree of cluster supervisors' support in promoting instructional supervision in the primary schools, 104 teachers and 86 school-site supervisors were asked and duly responded. Their responses were analysed and displayed in the following table.

According to the ratings, significantly large number of respondents, i.e., 48 teachers and 37 school-site supervisors, rated the level of instructional supervision support of cluster supervisors at teachers level as low or very low ($\chi^2 = 37.9$, p<.01 & $\chi^2 = 25.5$, p < .01, respectively). This indicates that there is statistically significantly large number of respondents in both groups were of the opinion that teacher level support rendered by cluster supervisors was found unsatisfactory at 1% level of significance.

The other factor labelled in the table as school level support was identified as the second low level support of cluster supervisors in promoting instructional supervisory services in the primary schools with the percentage of explained variance 25.9. According to the ratings, significant large number of respondents, i.e. 34 teachers and 29 school-site supervisors, endorsed that instructional supervisory support of cluster supervisors at school level was low or very low ($\chi^2 = 61.9$, and $\chi^2 = 26.5$, p<.01 respectively). This indicates that there is statistically significant number of beneficiaries of cluster supervisors' support was inadequate. However, the mean values of both level supports show that there is a better school level support as compared to that of teachers.

3.2 Perceptions of Teachers and School-site Supervisors about Instructional Supervision

To find out the views and attitudes of teachers and school-site supervisors towards the current practice of instructional supervisory services in the primary schools, 104 teachers and 86 school-site supervisors were asked and duly responded. Their responses were analysed and displayed in the following Table 3.

As it has been shown in Table 3, the factor labelled as satisfaction on the current practices of the service was identified as the first component with the percentage of explained variance 34.0%. According to the ratings, significant majority of respondents, i.e. 38 teachers and 35 school-site supervisors rated the level of satisfaction on the current practices of the service as high or very high. The obtained Chi-square values ($\chi^2 = 60.9$ for teachers and $\chi^2 = 47.9$ for school-site supervisors, p < .01) showed that there is statistically significant mass among both group respondents (with the mean values 3.24 for teachers and 3.22 for school-site supervisors), said that satisfaction on the current practices of instructional supervision services was found at a high or very high level.

The second loading factor in Table 3 deals with perceptions of teachers and school-site supervisors labelled as an understanding about working conditions of instructional supervision. The factor was identified as the second component with the percentage of explained variance 15.5%. According to the ratings, significant majority of respondents, 44 teachers and 24 school-site supervisors, showed their low or very low level of understanding about the working conditions of instructional supervision in the current status. The obtained Chi-square values ($\chi^2 = 61.0$ for teachers and $\chi^2 = 82.5$ for school-site supervisors, p < .01) showed that there is statistically significant proportion among both group respondents (with mean values 2.61 for teachers and 3.45 for school-site supervisors) said that understanding about working conditions of instructional supervision in the current practice was low or very low.

The third factor in Table 3 deals with the perceptions of teachers and school-site supervisors concerning the importance of the service for the improvement of instructional supervision process in the schools. As shown in the table, the factor was identified as a third component with the percentage of explained variance 11.4%. According to the ratings, significant majority of respondents, 87 teachers and 51 school-site supervisors, agreed that the degree level of importance of the service for the improvement of instructional process in the school was high or very high ($\chi2 = 73.9$, $\chi^2 = 57.9$, P < 0.01). This indicates that there is statistically significant mass among both group respondents, (with the mean values 4.4 for each group respondents), said that the importance of the service for the improvement of instructional process in the school was high or very high.

Table2. Ratings on instructional supervisory supports of cluster supervisors

Factor	No of Items	Respondents	N	Ratings					χ^2(df)	M	SD	α	Explained V%
				1	2	3	4	5					
Teacher level support	11	Teacher	104	10	38	45	11	-	37.9**(4)	2.57	.74	.91	37.5
		SSS	86	10	27	38	11	-	25.5**(3)	2.57	.74	.91	
School level support	4	Teacher	104	9	25	48	21	1	61.9**(4)	2.92	.88	.83	25.9
		SSS	86	9	20	41	16	-	26.5**(3)	2.92	.88	.83	
Cumulative variance%													63.4

**P <.01, df in parenthesis, and α is Cronbach's alpha; 1= very low seriousness, 2= low, 3= moderate, 4= high, 5= very high

Table3. Ratings on perceptions of teachers and school-site supervisors about instructional supervision

Factor	No of Items	Respondents	N	Ratings					χ^2(df)	M	SD	A	Explained V%
				1	2	3	4	5					
Satisfaction on the current practice of the service	6	Teachers	104	1	24	41	34	4	60.9**(4)	3.24	.80	.83	34.0
		SSS	86	_	9	42	32	3	47.9**(3)	3.22	.80	.82	
Understandings about working conditions of instructional supervision	3	Teachers	104	3	41	50	10	_	61.o**(3)	2.61	.70	.52	15.5
		SSS	86	3	21	56	6	_	82.5**(3)	3.45	.69	.50	
Importance of the service for the improvement of instructional process in the school	1	Teachers	104	_	2	15	26	61	73.9**(3)	4.4	.81	_	11.4
		SSS	86		3	32	45	6	57.9**(3)	4.4	.84	_	
Cumulative variance%													60.9

**P <.01, df in parenthesis, and α is Cronbach's alpha; 1= very low seriousness, 2= low, 3= moderate, 4= high, 5= very high

3.3 The Current Practices of School-based Instructional Supervision in the Primary Schools

To investigate the extent to which school-based instructional supervision service is practiced in the primary schools, 104 teachers and 86 school-site supervisors were asked and duly responded. Their responses were analysed and displayed in following table.

As shown in Table 4 below, the factor labelled as the daily functioning of the service in the school was identified as the first component with percentage of explained variance 31.2%. According to the ratings, significant majority of respondents, 26 teachers and 24 school-site supervisors agreed that degree level of daily functioning of instructional supervision service in the primary schools was low or very low ($\chi^2 = 92.9$, $\chi^2 = 61.3$, p < .01). This indicates that there is statistically significant ratings of both group respondents (with the mean value 3.0 for each group) showed that the daily functioning of instructional supervision services in the primary schools was found at low or very low level.

The other factor in Table 4 deals with the current practice of school-based instructional supervision labelled as impact of the service on improving the relationship between supervisor and supervisee. The factor was identified as the second component with the percentage of explained variance 22.4%. As indicated in Table 4, significant majority of respondents, i.e., 43 teachers and 34 school-site supervisors agreed upon the high or very high level impact of the service on improving the relationship between supervisor and supervisee. The obtained frequencies Chi-square values ($\chi^2 = 49.6$, $\chi^2 = 40.3$, P < .01) showed that there is statistically significant mass among both of group respondents (with the mean values 3.2 for teachers and 3.22 for school-site supervisors), said that the current practice of instructional supervision service has a high or very high impact on improving the relationship between supervisors and supervisee at the school.

3.4 Challenges of Instructional Supervision

To identify the major challenges that affect the current practice of instructional supervision in the primary schools 104 teachers and 86 school-site supervisors were asked and duly responded. These responses were analysed and displayed in the Table 5.

The first factor in Table 5 below deals with challenges of instructional supervision labelled as lack of basic skills of supervisor including five loaded items with explained variance percentage of 13.1. This was identified as the first major challenge of instructional supervision in the primary schools. According to the ratings, significant majority of respondents, 66 teachers and 59 school-site supervisors, agreed that degree level of influence of lack of basic skills of supervisors on the current practices of instructional supervision was high or very high ($\chi^2 = 31.9$, and $\chi^2 = 30.6$, p < .01 respectively). This indicates that there is statistically significant proportion of each group respondents (with the mean values 3.8 for teachers and 3.87 for school-site supervisors) thought that lack of basic skills of supervisors significantly affected the current practice of instructional supervision in the primary schools.

It has been shown in Table 5 that the factor labelled as negative attitude of teachers towards the instructional supervision service was identified as the second major challenge of the service in the current practice with the percentage of explained variance 10.9. The Chi-test ($\chi^2 = 39.8$, $\chi^2 = 36.5$, p < .01) showed that majority of respondents, 51 teachers and 43 school-site supervisors, showed their agreement on the degree of the factor influence on the current practices of the service at a high or very high level respectively. This depicts that there is statistically significant mainstream users (with the mean values 3.45 for teachers and 3.49 for school-site supervisors) rated that the negative attitude of teachers towards instructional supervision highly affected the current practice of the service in the primary schools. This may mean that they either have low awareness about benefits of instructional supervisory support or not sufficiently supported by supervisors.

The third challenge of instructional supervision was labelled as lack of adequate resources and conducive working environment for the provision of effective instructional supervision in the primary schools. It was identified as the third major challenge of the service including the five composed items with the percentage of explained variance 10.6. As indicated in Table 5 above, majority of the respondents i.e., 59 teachers and 50 school-site supervisors, agreed upon the high or very high degree influence of the factor in the current practice of instructional supervision. The obtained chi-square values ($\chi2 = 62.6$ for teachers and $\chi^2 = 49.2$ for school-site supervisors, p < .01) showed that there is statistically significant mass among both group respondents (with the mean values 3.67 for teachers and 3.70 for school-site supervisors), said that lack of adequate resources and conducive working environment highly or very highly affected the current practice of instructional supervision in the primary schools.

Table 4. Ratings on the current practice of school-site instructional supervision in the primary schools

Factor	No of Items	Respondents	N	Ratings					χ^2 (df)	M	SD	α	Explained V%
				1	2	3	4	5					
The daily functioning of the service in the schools	7	Teacher	104	1	25	55	21	2	92.9** (4)	3.0	.73	.80	31.2
		SSS	86	1	23	40	20	2	61.3** (4)	3.0	.73	.80	
Impact of the service on improving the relationship b/n supervisor & supervisee	3	Teacher	104	3	22	36	37	6	49.6** (4)	3.2	.89	.73	22.4
		SSS	86	2	18	32	28	6	40.3** (4)	3.22	.89	.73	
Cumulative variance %													53.6

**P <.01, df in parenthesis, and α is Cronbach's alpha; 1= very low seriousness, 2= low, 3= moderate, 4= high, 5= very high

Table5. Ratings on challenges of instructional supervision

Factor	No of Items	Respondents	N	Ratings					χ² (df)	M	SD	α	Explained V%
				1	2	3	4	5					
Lack of basic skills of supervisors	5	Teacher	104	_	5	33	44	22	31.9**(3)	3.80	.76	.80	13.1
		SSS	86	_	3	24	39	20	30.6**(3)	3.87	.75	.82	
Negative attitude of teachers towards the service	5	Teacher	104	_	12	41	43	8	39.8**(3)	3.45	.78	.72	10.9
		SSS	86	_	8	35	36	7	36.5**(3)	3.49	.78	.74	
Lack of adequate resources & conducive working environment	5	Teacher	104	1	8	36	43	16	62.6**(4)	3.67	.79	.82	10.6
		SSS	86	1	7	28	36	14	49.2**(4)	3.70	.82	.80	
Inappropriate approach of instructional supervisors	4	Teacher	104	3	7	33	61	_	83.2**(3)	3.77	.87	.76	10.4
		SSS	86	1	7	24	35	19	42.6**(4)	3.66	.85	.78	
Inadequate awareness of teachers on the role of the service	4	Teacher	104	1	11	40	44	8	74.9**(4)	3.60	.78	.72	9.1
		SSS	86	1	9	37	38	6	63.8**(4)	3.55	.78	.74	
Low quality feedback	4	Teacher	104	1	7	26	52	18	76.5**(4)	3.91	.76	.72	8.5
		SSS	86	_	7	23	39	17	25.1**(3)	3.86	.77	.73	
Cumulative variance %													62.5

**P <.01, df in parenthesis, and α is Cronbach's alpha; 1= very low seriousness, 2= low, 3= moderate, 4= high, 5= very high

It has been shown in Table 5 that the factor labelled as inappropriate approach of instructional supervisors was identified as the fourth major challenge of instructional supervision in the current practice with the percentage of explained variance 10.4%. According to the ratings, significant majority of respondents i.e., 61 teachers and 54 school-site supervisors, agreed that degree level of influence of the inappropriate approach of instructional supervisors on the current practice of instructional supervision was high or very high ($\chi^2 = 83.2$, $\chi^2 = 42.6$, p < .01 respectively). This indicates that there is statistically significant proportion of each group respondents (with the mean values 3.77 for teachers and 3.66 for school-site supervisors) thought that inappropriate approaches of instructional supervisors significantly affected the instructional supervision services in the primary schools.

The other factor in Table 5 which was labelled as inadequate awareness of teachers on the role of the service was identified as the fifth major challenge of instructional supervision in the current practices of the service in the primary schools with the percentage of explained variance 9.1%. Regarding the rational equivalence reliability of the four items composed in the factor, the employed test alpha values $\alpha = .72$ of teachers and $\alpha = .74$ of school-site supervisors identified the internal consistency of the items. According to the ratings, significant majority of respondents i.e., 52 teachers and 44 school-site supervisors rated degree level of influence of inadequate awareness of teachers on the roles of the service on the current practice was high or very high($\chi^2 = 74.9$, $\chi^2 = 63.8$, P < .01 respectively). This indicates that there is statistically significant majority of each group respondents (with mean values 3.60 for teachers and 3.55 for school-site supervisors), said that inadequate awareness of teachers on the role of instructional supervision highly affected the current practices of the service in the primary schools.

The sixth factor in Table 5 which was labelled as low quality feedback was identified as the least challenge of instructional supervision in the current practices of the service in the primary schools with the percentage of explained variance 8.5%. The employed Cronbach's alpha, $\alpha = .72$ of teachers' and $\alpha = .73$ of school-site supervisors' responses determined the internal consistency reliability of the four composed items of the factor. As to the ratings, significant majority of respondents, 70 teachers and 56 school-site supervisors, agreed that degree level of influence of low quality feedback on the current practices of the service was high or very high ($\chi^2 = 76.5$,

$\chi^2 = 25.1$, p < .01 respectively). This indicates that there is statistically significant majority of each group respondents (with corresponding mean values 3.91 for teachers and 3.86 for school-site supervisors) said that low quality feedback of the service highly affected the current practices of the services in the primary schools.

4. DISCUSSION

In order to investigate the degree of cluster supervisors' support in promoting instructional supervision in the primary schools 104 teachers, 86 school-site supervisors, 10 cluster supervisors and four officials from woreda education office were asked to respond on the issue individually and in group. As it can be seen from the results, the degree of support at teacher level by cluster supervisors in promoting instructional supervision tends to fall low. The result obtained about school level support was the cumulative effect of low level support on each of the identified roles. Hence, discussion on each item of the component may help addressing the overlooked roles of cluster supervisors in relation to the promotion of instructional supervision services. "The extent cluster supervisor stimulates school-site supervisors to assess the training need of teachers in the school context" was identified as principal component which means the majority of teacher respondents agreed upon the low level support of cluster supervisors in this service area. Similarly, the results of school-site supervisors' responses in the same table indicated that the cluster supervisors' support at teacher level was also low. However, as to the policy direction of the reform of the service, cluster supervisors are highly expected to stimulate school-site supervisors to assess the training needs of teachers in their school context.

The other expected roles of cluster supervisors such as facilitating trainings for school-site supervisors with regard to approaches to instructional supervision, organizing in-service trainings for teachers, and advising teachers when they conduct action research were again found at a lower level of support. Nevertheless, they were part of the main focus areas of the reform of the service to alleviate related challenges which had existed for a long time in the system. Similarly, initiating teachers to share their experience through classroom observation, encouraging the school-site supervisors to promote motivational practice for best performing teachers with regard to instructional supervision supportive service improvement, and coordinating teachers to work cooperatively towards curriculum development are another areas of the service which were recognized by majority of both group respondents as they had not got due attention by cluster supervisors.

According Ware H et al. [10] a growing body of research in educational psychology suggests that teachers' quality of performance and commitment to work is related to his/her level of motivation to influence student learning. Furthermore, Certo SC [11] stated that a means of assessing one's level of motivation is the construct of teachers efficiency, which refers to the extent to which a teacher feels capable to help students learn, can affect teachers instructional effort in areas such as choice of activities, level of effort and persistence with students.

In addition to the above less performed roles, efforts which have been made by cluster supervisors to provide teachers with ways to evaluate their own teaching to improve instruction, intensify the school-site supervision service, facilitate one-to-one feedback procedures with teachers, and initiate teachers for changes in teaching content, and instructional materials to improve instruction were also categorized at low level of support. Later on MOE launched educational quality improvement packages such as, Teachers Development Program (TDP), Continues Professional Development (CPD), and Induction Courses(IC) at all levels of schooling. Thus, if properly and carefully implemented, such practices will reinforce the instructional supervision programs and can bring the desired changes in the sector of education. In line with this, cluster supervisors are mainly responsible to organize the programs in each of their cluster schools with respect to the promotion of effective instructional supervision supportive services.

However, as deduced from the data, and explored from observations, both of the programs were not well organized and functioning at the cluster schools level to attain the intended objectives. Most of the staff in first cycle primary schools of rural areas was beginner teachers with hardly any mixed senior teacher for mentoring novice teachers in their induction courses of the first two years. On the other hand, senior primary schools in the town areas were occupied by senior teachers without having a single novice teacher to be mentored. In such conditions, it is the responsibility of the cluster supervisor to mobilize the human resources among the cluster schools as required since this facilitates not only the practice of instructional supervision but also cooperation between the schools and experience sharing among the teachers. This is what the reformed education system encourages at present.

In addition to the above results, the FGDs held with the school-site supervision leaders (school principals), the cluster supervisors and officials from woreda education office assured that the cluster supervisor

instructional supervisory supportive service both at the school and the teacher level was considered as low due to various challenges which were discussed in the next section of this research. Similarly, the data obtained from observation check list also confirmed their low level pedagogic support.

To find out the views and attitudes of teachers and supervisors towards the current practice of instructional supervisory services in the primary schools, the majority of respondents have shown agreement on the issues like instructional supervisors' competency, commitment to their job and their effectiveness in managing businesses at high level ratings. The implication here seems that both teachers and school-site supervisors have good perceptions about the instructional supervision services. However, the result of this factor seems contradictory with the results of the previous section. The discussion held in the previous section confirmed the existence of perceived challenges in the current practices of instructional supervision services in the primary schools. Hence, the factor labelled as lack of basic skills of supervisors was recognized by both group respondents and other supplementary evidences as the first major challenge of instructional supervision service in the primary schools. This controversy questioned the respondents' perception towards the service. The results of all other perceived challenges have shown the existence of high level influence on the current practices of the service. Regarding this Lucio WH et al. [12] stated that "the satisfactions of teachers with the school system have been found to depend up on the extent to which they perceive that roles of their supervisors meet their expectations".

On the other hand, in FGDs supervisors explained their dissatisfaction on the current practices of the services because of different challenges related to working conditions such as office equipment, availability of transport facilities, place of residence, location of office, service staff, and financial conditions; and daily functioning of the service such as planning, work load, school visit, reporting, and follow-up including use of reports. It is evident that the identified high level influence of the challenges on the current practices of the service may highly affect the perceptions of supervisors. In relation to this, Haileselassie W [5] stated that whatever attempts made at the various levels outside the school regarding supervision, the attempt will be meaningless unless supervisory activities are strengthened at the school level, where in the mission centres of the actual teaching learning process. Hence, the response of the subjects regarding their perceptions about the service seems biased and needs further investigation.

To investigate the extent to which school-based instructional supervision service is practiced in the primary schools, teachers and school-site supervisors were asked to respond on the issue under discussion individually and in group. As it can be seen from the results of the table, the daily functioning of instructional supervision services in the primary schools was implemented at low or very low level. In line with this, the current practices of teachers and supervisors with regard to sharing equally the responsibility for resolving instructional problems in the classroom was identified as principal component and found at low level of implementation. Similarly, teachers' initiation to identify and clarify instructional problems and attempts they made to develop solutions with the help of supervisors was still found at low level. Regarding this, Spears H [13] pointed out that teachers want classroom visit, criticism, and helpful suggestion from instructional supervisors. However, as suggested by Carron G et al.[14] the supervisors' infrequent visit create an image of distant, inaccessible, administrator type and lead to a loss of credibility with teachers.

To identify the major challenges that affect the current practice of instructional supervision in the primary school teachers, school-site supervisors, supervisors and officials from Woreda education office were asked to respond on the issue individually and in group. As it can be seen from the results of the table, challenges related to lack of basic skills of supervisors highly affect the instructional supervision in the current practice of the services. According to the results of the responses of teachers and school-site supervisors, inefficiency of school-site supervision leaders, professional incompetence of supervisors to organize in-school conference, and lack of a clear guide for instructional supervision service provision were components of this major challenge of instructional supervision service in the primary schools. According to the data from FGDs, not only school-site supervisors lack basic skills of instructional supervision but also cluster supervisors is victims of such kinds of challenges. As a result, these incapable cluster supervisors could not provide adequate support to both school-site supervisors and teachers. Because of this and other challenges, the service was not uniformly implemented in all clusters and schools. Due to this reason, it is possible to say that all other challenges of instructional supervision were interrelated by-products of this major challenge.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

It has been found out that the extent cluster supervisors implement policy directions of instructional supervision services in the primary schools was determined to be low. This was because of the following major problems. Firstly, cluster supervisors do not assess the training needs of teachers in their school context and they do not facilitate training for school-site supervisors and teachers concerning instructional methodology improvement. Secondly, they are not motivated to encourage the school-site supervisors to promote motivational practices for best performing teachers. Thirdly, CPD and Induction Courses are not properly implemented. Generally, cluster supervisors do not play their expected roles in intensifying instructional supervisory services and in providing the necessary support to teachers and school-site supervisors. Instead of their main tasks, they are overburdened by routine inspection, administrative activities and liaison functions.

Regarding perceptions of teachers and supervisors, the study indicated that both teachers and school-site supervisors have developed positive perceptions toward the current practice of instructional supervision. In line with this, teachers and school-site supervisors expressed high level satisfaction on the current practices of the service and also they have shown their agreement on the importance of the service for the improvement of instructional process in the school at a very high level. Although the study justified that teachers and supervisors developed positive attitudes towards instructional supervision, this was not manifested in their actual performance. Regarding their understanding about the working conditions of instructional supervision, it has been found out that school-site supervisors have developed a better concept than teachers. On the other hand, cluster supervisors reflected their dissatisfaction on the current practices of the service because of different challenges related to working conditions and daily functioning of the service.

Concerning the current practices of school-based instructional supervision in the primary schools, the study revealed that there are some gaps in the process. This was particularly regarding classroom observation, the design of the checklists, inappropriate items that consisted of pedagogic and administrative issues, the feedback system, the purpose of the observations, the administering system of observations, level of teacher involvement and attention given for the service by every school which are all with problems and have no uniformity even among the same cluster schools. Thus, none of the schools under the study was properly functioning the service in order to improve instructional process in the schools.

On the other hand, regarding the challenges of the service it has been found out that there are many challenges that affect the current practices of instructional supervision in the primary schools with regard to cluster supervisors, school-site supervisors, teachers, and the organization and its management system. Regarding this, all challenges such as lack of basic skills of supervisors, negative attitude of teachers towards the service, lack of adequate resources and conducive working environment, inappropriate approach of instructional supervisors, inadequate awareness of teachers on the roles of the service, and low quality feedback were identified as the major challenges that affect the current practices of instructional supervision. Based on the findings of the study and the conclusions made so far, the following possible recommendations have been forwarded.

- The woreda education office should make joint effort with zonal education department and regional education bureau to up-grade all supervisors to the level of the required in long-term in-service professional trainings, and organize short-term training to capacitate supervisors interpersonal and technical skills towards instructional supervision.
- Supervisors should base their services more on developmental pedagogic supportive aspects such as classroom observation, advising, helping, and training school-site supervisors and teachers in order to facilitate experience sharing among the teachers in the cluster schools.
- The woreda education office in coordination with local administrative bodies and other stack holders should facilitate the working conditions such as the provision of residences, offices, the necessary budget and the like for cluster supervisors for proper daily functioning of the service.
- The woreda education office and schools should facilitate regular short-term trainings for school-site supervisors and teachers by coordinating with partner teacher colleges, universities, government organizations, NGOs and other stack holders.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Author has declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. MoE. Revised Educational supervision manual. Addis Ababa: EMPDA; 2015.
2. Haileselassie Woldegerima, Abraha Asfaw. Improving quality of primary education program (USAID/IQPEP) in Ethiopia: A Training Module for Principals and Supervisors; 2012.
3. Glickman GD, Gordon SP, Ross-Gordon G. The basic guide to supervision and instructional leadership. USA: Pearson Education, Inc; 2005.
4. Mo E. School improvement program. Addis Ababa: EMPDA; 2006.
5. Haileselassie W. Educational supervision. A Teaching Material for the Course Supervision (EDPM 301). Addis Ababa: AAU; 2007.
6. Poirier DO. A Principal's and teachers' perceptions and understandings of Instructional Leadership: A case study of one school. University of Saskatchewan; 2009.
7. Powell ND. Supervision and evaluation of instructional personnel: A guide for principals and supervisiors.3rd ed. La Sierra University; 2004.
8. MoE. Decentralized management of education: a reference manual, god printing and Packing Program. Addis Ababa; 2010.
9. Sergiovanni TJ, Starratt R.J. Supervision: A redefinition (8th New York: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc; 2007.
10. Ware H, Kitsantas A. Teacher and collective efficacy beliefs as predictors of professional commitment. The Journal of Educational Research. 2007;100(5):303.
11. Certo SC. Supervision: Concepts and Skill Building (5ed), McGraw-Hill /Irwin, United Sates; 2006.
12. Lucio WH, McNeil JD. Supervision: A synthesis of thought and action. New York: McGraw. Hill, Inc; 1979.
13. Spears H. Instructional Supervision: A Dichotomy. Educational Leadership. Educational Journal. 1979;41(8);585-587.
14. Carron G, DeGrauwe A. Supervision: A Key Component of Quality Monitoring System; 2007.