International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development
Online ISSN: 2349-4182, Print ISSN: 2349-5979; Impact Factor: RJIF 5.72
Received: 09-01-2019; Accepted: 11-02-2019
www.allsubjectjournal.com
Volume 6; Issue 3; March 2019; Page No. 45-55

The roles of internal school supervision in improving teaching and learning process in East Wollega Zone

Tadesse Regassa Mamo[1]*, Getahun Nigussa[2]
[1,2] Department of Educational Planning and Managment, Jimma University, Ethiopia

Abstract
The purpose of this study was to establish supervisory activities undertaken by supervisors in improving the instructional activities in schools. The study adopted mixed method research design whereby descriptive survey design was used to collect both quantitative and qualitative data from the appropriate sources. The participants of this study were Zonal supervision expert, Woreda education officers; supervision expert, educational leaders (secondary school supervisors, principals, deputy-principals, department heads) and teachers were the participants of the study. From all of the Woredas secondary Schools, a total of ten (10) secondary schools were selected by availability sampling. Then from each ten (10) sample schools 64(100%) education leaders (10 school principals, 10 deputy school principals,4 secondary school supervisors and forty (40) department head teachers) were selected by available sampling techniques. Questionnaire, interview and document analysis were used as data gathering instruments. In addition, the researcher consulted relevant reference books; internet sources and supervision manuals to support the findings of the study and document analysis. Data was using mean score and t-test whereby the qualitative data was narrated to triangulate the qualitative data. The finding of the study revealed that internal supervisors were not playing the roles they have given as they are overloaded by teaching assignment. Moreover, they were not improving their instructional skills as they were not getting any professional support from the school based supervisors. On top of these the finding also revealed that the major challenges for internal supervisors were: teaching burden on supervisors, internal supervisors were few in number, lack of instructional support skills on supervisor side, attitude of both supervisors and supervises as well as less attention given to school based supervision. Therefore, it can be said that the actual practices of school based supervision was not as per the intension. Hence, the education offices at various levels need to give due attention to enhance the skills of internal supervisors through rigorous pre- and in-service training program. It is also better to reduce the teaching load of internal supervisors so that they can get time to support teachers in the classroom as per the intention to have school based supervision.

Keywords: supervision, supervisory role, internal supervision, instructional supervisors, education leaders, teaching load

1. Introduction
Improving the quality of education has been given priority throughout the world and hence, most nations in the world have been establishing and implementing internal school supervision as an important tool to monitor and enhance the quality of education provided by schools (Carron, G., De Grauwe, A. and Govinda, 2001) [1]. Accordingly, many countries across the globe have attempted to restructure their school supervision services to enhance educational quality. In Netherlands, for instance, one of the aims of internal supervision is to improve the quality of education.

Similarly, in California the main use of internal supervision is a critical factor in achieving educational excellence and has a positive learning experience for all students (Cheryi F. Fischer, 1991). As in many other developing countries, in Nigeria, internal supervision is the main focus on transformation of school and to improve the quality of education (Orenaiya *et al*, 2014). In Ethiopia too, the mission of internal school supervision is for implementing and strengthening teaching learning process through providing professional support and creating conducive situation for the improvement of students learning (MOE, 2006).

According to MOE (1994) [8], internal supervisors and external supervisors are responsible to carry out educational supervision provided for each secondary school. External supervision refers to the services given by supervisors, education experts and other concerning bodies for teachers on client and ethical issues reflected on their work. It is essentially, a duty of putting educational policies into practice, and ensuring that these policies and practices conform to policies and regulations approved by the government through the Ministry of Education (MOE) being residing outside the school. Internal supervision on the other hand was assigned from experienced teachers, department heads, principals and deputy principals. It is also to improve the teaching learning process through strengthening supervision by focusing on the curriculum, teaching content and methodology. Besides, provision of professional assistance and guidance to classroom teachers and assessing the practices and challenges of internal supervision is important in implementing successful internal supervision (Abdulkareem, 2001).

To improve teacher's instructional performance, the internal supervisors should also work with teachers in fixable and collaborative style; internal supervisors should be democratic and cooperative and should get serious attention in the school. Researches by (Beach and Reinhartz, 2000) emphasized that the importance of the collaborative effort of all participants involved in the supervisory process. The concept of internal supervision is focuses on guidance, support, and continuous assessment provided to teachers for their professional development and improvement in the teaching-learning process. Internal supervision is mainly concerned with improving schools by helping teachers to

reflect their practices; to learn more about what they do and why; and to develop professionally (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 2007).

Internal school supervision is the cycle of activities between a supervisor and a teacher with the objective of improving classroom performance and to improve student achievement. At school level, Internal supervisors should be professionally support teachers by identify the strengths and limitations of teachers in the classroom, their other role is to play in identifying and spreading new ideas and good practices between teachers and internal supervisors greatly responsible to link between teacher needs and school goals so individuals can improve and work together towards the vision of the School (Glickman, 1990).

MOE, (2003), mentioned that the main focus of internal supervision is providing support for teachers and enhances their role as key professional decision makers in practice of teaching. To achieve this aim, supervisors usually employ several supervisory practices. But MOE, (2002) mentioned that, the internal supervisors who were assigned to supervise at school level were not able to solve teacher's problems by identify the strengths and limitations of teachers in the classroom. Sometimes they went to the class room and simply observed the teaching-learning process and gave feedback for teachers ineffectively.

As a result, teachers did not gain professional support from internal supervisors for improvement of their instructional limitations. The realization of professional competence of teachers and the quality of education remains questionable unless due emphasis is given from different levels of education officials to implement internal supervision program effectively. However, as all teachers are not qualified enough, they need support from internal Supervisors (Giordano, 2008:11). Accordingly, this study was aimed to assess the practices and challenges of internal supervision in secondary schools of East Wollega Zone.

- To what extent do internal supervisors identify the strengths and limitations of teachers in the classroom?
- Do internal supervisors design various interventions to assist teacher's professional improvement?
- What types of professional support do teachers gain from supervisors in order to improve their instructional skills?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Specifically, the study was attempted:

- To identify the extent to which internal school supervisors identify the strengths and limitations of teachers in the classroom in order to design appropriate intervention.
- To assess the extent to which internal school supervisors design appropriate intervention through observation to assist teachers improve their professional improvement.
- To assess the roles and professional support, teachers gained from internal school supervisors in order to improve their instructional skills.

1.4 The Scope of the Study

Since there are large number of schools (42 schools in the Zone), it was unrealistic and impractical to attempt to study on the practice and challenges of internal school supervision in all the schools. Therefore, the study was delimited to 10(24%) governmental secondary Schools, 134 (10%) teachers, 64(100%) educational supervisors (40 (100%) department head 10(24%) school principals, 10(24%) deputy principals) (4(24%) Secondary School Supervisors), 1(100%) ZEO supervision expert, 4(24%) WEO Supervision Experts, and also, the study was delimited to 4 (24%) Woredas of East Wollega Zone. These are Wama Hagalo, Wayu Tuka, Nunnu kumba and Ebantu Woredas were selected. The study also, conceptually delimited to assess, the practice and challenges of supervisors to point out instructional limitations /gaps of the teachers/ by identifying their strength, the various interventions designed by supervisors so as to assist teachers reduce their teaching profession.

2. The Research Design and Methodology

2.1 The Research Design

The research design used for this study was descriptive survey method with both the qualitative and quantitative research approaches. This design helped the researcher to describe the current situation regarding roles of internal school supervision in the school both quantitatively and qualitatively whereby it allows drawing valid general conclusions. A survey, according to Kothari (2004) [5], is a method of securing information concerning an existing phenomenon from all or selected number of respondents of the concerned universe. The qualitative approach was incorporated in the study to validate and triangulate the quantitative data.

2.2 Participants of the Study

In this Zone, there were 42 government secondary schools organized in to four clusters. Hence, the participants of this study include Zonal supervision expert, Woreda education offices; supervision expert, educational leaders (secondary school supervisors, principals, deputy-principals, department heads) and teachers were the participants of the study. This group of participants was appropriate for this study, because, they were among front line actors for internal school supervision and help the researcher to get reliable and first-hand information about the issues in focus.

Data for this research was collected from both primary and secondary sources. The primary sources of data were secondary school educational leaders, secondary school teachers, ZEO and WEO supervision experts. The secondary sources were school internal supervision recorded documents, action researches, feedbacks, supervision books and reports are the main source of data.

2.3 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

Sample selection was done at three levels using multi-stage sampling technique i.e at Woredas, schools and individuals levels. The researcher referred this technique as it helps to get more representative sample from geographically scattered population. According to Levy, Yalew Endawok and Lim show among the total population 10- 30% can fulfil the sample sizes. Currently there were a total of forty two (42) government secondary schools in the Zone. In East Wollega Zone, there are 17 Woreda each Woreda was grouped in to four (4) clusters according to the administrative strategy of the government considering geographical location. Thus, Gidda Ayana, Jimma Arjo, Nakemte and Sibu Sire clusters.

Then, from each cluster four 4(24%) Woreda (Wama Hagalo, Wayu Tuka, Nunu kumba and Ebantu) were selected by simple random sampling technique. Finally, ten (10) secondary schools were selected by availability sampling technique. Then from each ten (10) sample schools 64 (100%) education leaders, (10 school principals, 10 deputy

school principals),4 secondary school supervisors and forty (40) head teachers were selected by using availability sampling techniques. Four (4) WEO supervision experts and one (1) ZEO supervision experts were also taken as a sample of the study based on availability sampling techniques. To determine the sample size of teachers, for each of the selected secondary schools, the following stratified formula of William (1977) was utilized.

$$nd = \frac{Ndn}{N}$$

Where
nd = simple size of school d.
Nd = population of school d.
n = total sample size of selected school teachers (for this study 134)
N = total population of selected school (for this study was 268)

The aim of the calculation was to determine an adequate sample size to estimate the population prevalence with a good precision. Based on the calculation of the above mathematical formula, the total sample size of teachers for this study was 134. Accordingly, 32 teachers from Wama Hagalo (Mote 15, Kasso 11, Bata Wenni 6), 26 from Wayu Tuka (Gute 15, Burka Jimata 11), 32 from Nunu kumba (Nunnu 21, Adare 11,) and finally 44 from Ebantu (Hinde 22,Birbirsa Wajo 11,Qello 11) woreda secondary schools were selected. Finally, out of 268 teachers in ten (10) sample secondary schools of East Wollega Zone, 50% (134) of them were selected through stratified simple random sampling technique. In addition, the researcher believed that the sample of 50% is sufficient to secure the validity of the data obtained from teacher respondents. The number of sampled teachers from each selected secondary schools was determined by the proportion of teachers in each secondary school.
After determining the sample size from the total population, simple random sampling technique (lottery method) was used based on teachers' proportion found in each sample school because this technique gives independent and equal chance to the participants to be selected in the samples. Therefore the subjects of the study include 134 secondary school teachers, 64 educational leaders (10 principals, 10 vice principals, 40 department heads, 4 secondary school supervisors) 4 WEO and 1 ZEO supervision experts.

2.4 Data Gathering Instrument
Questionnaire, interview and document analysis were used as data gathering instruments. In addition, the researcher consulted relevant reference books; internet sources and supervision manuals to support the findings of the study and document analysis. Questionnaire and interview were used as data gathering instruments. In addition, the researcher consulted relevant reference books; internet sources and supervision manuals to support the study and document analysis.

2.4.1 Questionnaires
The researcher used questionnaires to collect data from educational leaders (secondary school supervisors, internal supervisors) and teacher respondents. Questionnaires were believed to be the best to get large amount of data from large number of respondents in a relatively shorter time with minimum cost. In this study, two sets of questionnaire items were used. The first set of items dealt with the general background of the respondents. The second set of questionnaires, which was prepared in English, was administered to teachers, internal supervisors and secondary school supervisors. The questionnaire had five Likert scales (strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree). Likert scale was preferred because it enable the respondents to choose one opinion from the given scales that best aligns with their views(Koul,1984) The scale consists of five scales, 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = undecided, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree.

2.4.2 Interview
Semi-structured interview was designed to gather data from 1 ZEO and 4 WEO supervision experts involved in interview question. The interview was conducted in English, The selection based its position to effectively describe the reality in the study area and it had detailed information about the practices and challenges of instructional supervision.

2.4.3 Document Analysis
The overall internal school supervision records of sample schools, supervision plans, portfolio documents of the supervision practice, written reports on supervision and feedback were assessed.

2.5 Techniques of Data Analysis
Before the analysis, the items were checked to identify missing parts and for accuracy. Then the scores of each item was statistically organized and imported into SPSS V.20 to obtain Sum, Mean Value and the t-test to see the mean difference and similarities between the responses of the two groups of respondents (Teachers and Educational Leaders). The interpretations were made for all five point scale measurements based on the following mean score results: 1. 0.00 – 1.49 = strongly disagree, 2. 1.50 – 2.49 = Disagree, 3. 2.50 – 3.49 = undecided, 4. 3.50 – 4.49 = Agree, and the score of 5. 4.50 – 5.00 = strongly agree.

3. Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation
As depicted in table 1, item 1, 101(75.37%) of teachers and 58(90.62%) of the educational leaders were males. On the other hand, 33(24.63%) of teachers and 6(10%) of education leaders were females. From this, it is possible to conclude that most of the education leader's position was held by males. Similarly, a study made by Carron and De Grauwe (1997:30) indicated that, the supervision staff is still dominated by the males.

Table 1: The Characteristics of the Respondents

No	Items		Respondents					
			Teachers (n=134)		Edu. leaders (n=64)		Total (n=198)	
			No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Sex of respon.	Male	101	75.37	58	90.62	163	82.32
		Female	33	24.63	6	9.38	35	17.68
		Total	134	100	64	100	198	100
2	Work Experience	1-5 years	14	10.45	-	-	45	22.7
		6-10 years	54	40.3	15	23.44	71	35.9
		11-15 years	55	41.05	29	45.31	46	23.2
		16-20 years	8	5.97	20	31.25	22	11.1
		21-25 years	3	2.23	-	-	14	7.1
		26-30 years	-	-	-	-	-	
		31 and above	-	-	-	-	-	
3	Educational background	Diploma	-	-	-	-	-	-
		First degree	132	98.5	64	100	198	100
		MA	2	1.5	-	-		
		Total	134	100	64	100	198	100

Regarding the experience of teachers, the majority 55(41.05 %) and 54(40.3%) of teachers had work experience between 11 -15 years and 6-10years respectively while 14(10.45%) of teacher respondents had a experience of 1-5 years. In addition, 29(45.31%) of educational leaders had work experience between 11 - 15 years. The remaining 20(31.25%) of teachers and 15(23.44) educational leaders had work experience between 16 - 20 and 6-10 years respectively.

Regarding the educational background of the respondents, no diploma holder while 132 (98.5 %) of teachers were first degree holders and the remaining 2(1.5%) of teachers were MA holders. Concerning educational leaders, all of them were first degree holders. From this, it is possible to conclude that almost all respondents in the sample Woreda had a similar qualification.

3.2 Identification of the Strengths and Limitations of Teachers

The extent to which internal supervisors identify the strengths and limitations of teachers was presented in a five point scales ranging from strongly agree (SA) = 5, Agree (A) = 4, undecided (U) = 3, Disagree (DA) = 2, strongly disagree (SD) = 1 and respondents were required to rate their response according to their level of agreement or disagreement.

As indicated in item 1 table 2, the respondents were asked whether the internal supervisors regularly identify any instructional limitations of teachers in the classrooms and proposed solutions, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$ =2.44, SD=1.015) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.39 SD= 1.163) mean scores respectively reported that, internal supervisors were insufficiently identify any instructional limitations of teachers in the classrooms and did not regularly forward solutions. This implies that the education leaders are not playing their roles to the expected level.

Similar to this finding, the interview conducted with WEO and ZEO supervision experts revealed that:

> *Majority of the internal supervisors did not regularly identify any instructional limitations of teachers in the classrooms. They simply conduct the clinical supervision techniques per semester and in many of the secondary schools per year, but did not regularly identify teachers' strength and limitation on instructional matters.*

In this regard, the t-test result was t (27) = -1.468, p >0.05 which shows there is no significant opinion difference between the two group of respondent. The implication is that, internal supervisors had an opportunity to identify instructional limitations of teachers in the classroom but they did not regularly identify the limitations of teachers and hence failed to indicate appropriate solutions.

Table 2: Respondents View on Identification of the Strengths and Limitations of Teachers

No	Item	Response	Position		Overall mean	T test		
			Teacher n=134	Educational leader n=64		df	t-value	Sig(p)
1	Supervisors regularly identify any instructional limitations of teachers in the classrooms	Σ	327	153	2.415	27	-1.468	.176
		$\bar{X}$	2.44	2.39				
		S.D	1.015	1.163				
2	Supervisors identify the lack of abilities to manage students in the classroom	Σ	323	157	2.431	27	-2.096	.006
		$\bar{X}$	2.410	2.390				
		S.D	0.982	1.1631				
3	Internal supervisors identify the teachers skill gaps of teachers	Σ	328	157	2.45	27	-2.364	.060
		$\bar{X}$	2.447	2.4531				
		S.D	1.030	1.097				
4	Internal Supervisors encourage and facilitate school self evaluation on instructional matters	Σ	328	153	2.419	27	-.107	.949
		$\bar{X}$	2.447	2.390				
		S.D	1.0154	1.163				
5	Facilitate the availability of instructional materials and encourage teachers to use it appropriately	Σ	316	150	2.398	27	-.308	.092
		$\bar{X}$	2.358	2.343				
		S.D	1.0215	1.1015				

6	Supervisors support teachers in setting instructional goals and objectives	Σ	321	148	2.338	27	-.590	.791
		$\bar{X}$	2.395	2.281				
		S.D	1.069	0.806				
7	Supervisors can advise teachers to use active learning in the classroom	Σ	328	148	2.38	27	-1.70	.235
		$\bar{X}$	2.447	2.3125				
		S.D	1.0518	1.245				
8	Supervisors design appropriate intervention to minimize the identified limitations of teachers in the classrooms	Σ	328	147	2.37	27	-1.53	.439
		$\bar{X}$	2.4478	2.2969				
		S.D	1.0518	1.2303				

NB: * indicates that there is a significant difference at α=0.05, Σ=Sum = $\bar{X}$= mean score, S.D=Standard Deviation, sources: Field Data

Therefore, from the results quantitative data and from the interview, one can conclude that internal supervisors were not able to identify the strengths and limitations of teachers by conducting classroom observation.

With regard to item 2 of table 2, the two groups of respondents rated whether internal supervisors identify teacher's abilities to manage students in the classroom or not. Accordingly, teachers with ($\bar{X}$=2.410, SD=0.9826) and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$=2.453, SD=1.139) mean scores respectively indicated that, internal supervisors failed to identify teachers abilities to manage students in the classroom during teaching-learning processes and a total mean score ($\bar{X}$= 2.431) indicate that teachers and educational leaders replied internal supervisors were not continuously identify teachers' ability to manage students in the classrooms. The t-test also revealed that the significant level is t(27) =-2.096, p<0.05 showing the difference between the two groups respondents was not significant. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that, internal supervisors seem failed to identify teachers' ability to manage students in the classroom.

Item 3 of the same table, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement on the extent to which internal supervisors can identify teacher's skill gaps. Thus, teachers and educational leaders gave a quick response to the problem encountered in the identification of teachers skill gaps during teaching– learning process in the class-room, with ($\bar{X}$=2.447, SD=1.03) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.4531 SD=1.09732) respectively, indicating the in school supervisors weakness to identify the teachers skill gaps in the classroom. In this regard, the t-test result revealed that the significant level was t(27) =-2.364, p>0.05 showing the absence of statistically significant difference of responses. The woreda education office and the Zonal education office supervision experts reported that internal supervisors were not in a position to identify teacher's skill gaps. Hence, one can say that internal supervisors were not discharging their roles of improving the teaching learning process.

In item 4 of table 2, the respondents were asked whether internal supervisors encourage and facilitate school self-evaluation on instructional matters or not. Accordingly, teachers and educational leaders with low mean scores of ($\bar{X}$=2.447, SD= 1.015) and ($\bar{X}$=, 2.3906, SD=1.16315) respectively replied internal supervisors were not adequately encourage and facilitate school self-evaluation. In this view, the t-test revealed that the significant level t (27) =-107, p>0.05. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. Similarly, much of the interview respondents answered;

> *",,,the woreda and Zone education officers scheduled to evaluate the schools and support different ways for effectiveness of their work once per semester for the purpose of ranking the school and filling the efficiency of the principal but not for encouraging and facilitating school self-evaluation".*

In addition to this during document analysis there is no any written and documented reports on the issues of school self-evaluation. But there are documented materials on the issues of evaluation scheduled by the woreda education officers. In item 5 of the same table, the respondents asked whether internal supervisors facilitate the availability of instructional materials and encourage teachers to use it appropriately during the teaching-learning process or not. In this case, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$=2.358, SD=1.015) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.343 SD=1.101) mean scores respectively indicated that internal supervisors insufficiently facilitate the availability of instructional materials and do not encourage teachers to use it appropriately. The qualitative data gathered from interview also indicated that internal school supervisors were insufficiently facilitated the availability of instructional materials. The t-test revealed that the significant level t (27) = -0.308, p>0.050). This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses.

In item 6 of the same table, the three groups of respondents rated differently concerning the degree to which internal supervisors support teachers in developing instructional goals and objectives. In this case, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$=2.395, SD=1.069) and ($\bar{X}$=2.2812, SD=0.8061) mean scores respectively indicated that internal supervisors less support teachers in developing instructional goals and objective. The t-test revealed that the significant level was t (27) = -.590, p>0.05). This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. The qualitative data gathered through interview also disclosed that internal supervisors do not support teachers in developing instructional goals and objective

In item 7 of the same table, the respondents asked whether internal supervisors advice teachers to use active learning in the classroom as a mechanisms to motivate students or not. In this case, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$ =2.447, SD=1.051) and ($\bar{X}$=2,312, SD=1.2456) mean scores respectively indicated that internal supervisors less advised teachers to use active learning and did not show the mechanisms on how they can motivate students. The t-test result revealed that the significant level is t(27)=-1.70, p>0.05. This shows there was no statistically significant difference of responses. The qualitative data gathered by semi structured interview also indicated that internal supervisors expected to advice teachers to use active learning and indicate the mechanisms on how to motivate students as expected. This indicated that internal school supervisors have not done what they are expected to do on giving the advisory services of teachers.

In item 8 of the same table, the respondents were asked whether internal supervisors design appropriate intervention

mechanism to minimize the identified limitations of teachers in the classrooms or not. In this case, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$=2.447, SD=1.051) and ($\bar{X}$=2.296, SD= 1.230) mean scores respectively indicated that internal supervisors do not efficiently design appropriate intervention mechanisms to minimize the identified limitations of teachers in the classrooms as expected. In this regard, the t-test revealed the significant level of t (27) =-1.53, p>0.05. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. The interview also participants also disclosed that internal supervisors were weak to design appropriate intervention to minimize the identified limitations of teachers in the classrooms because of the lack of budget and experience.

3.3 Interventions of Internal Supervisors to Assist Teachers

Table three presented issues related to the roles played by internal supervisors to enhance the professional development of teachers.

Table 3: Respondents view on interventions of internal supervisors to assist teachers

No	Item	Response	Position		Overall mean	T test		
			Teacher n=134	Educational leader n=64		df	t-value	Sig(p)
1	Instructional supervisors arranging induction training for beginner teachers	Σ	322	157	2.428	27	-.477	.097
		$\bar{X}$	2.403	2.453				
		S.D	0.989	1.082				
2	Internal supervisors in the school assist teachers in lesson planning	Σ	312	159	2.406	27	-.760	.169
		$\bar{X}$	2.3284	2.484				
		S.D	0.9793	1.0539				
3	Internal supervisors facilitate experience sharing programs between teachers	Σ	320	154	2.397	27	3.384	.06
		$\bar{X}$	2.388	2.406				
		S.D	0.964	1.164				
4	Internal supervisors assist teachers in developing/selecting instructio nal materials	Σ	328	158	2.455	27	.400	.521
		$\bar{X}$	2.442	2.468				
		S.D	0.992	1.167				
5	Internal supervisors spread best practice te aching methodologies among school and t eachers	Σ	325	147	2.36	27	-.965	.84
		$\bar{X}$	2.425	2.296				
		S.D	0.999	1.108				
6	Internal supervisors facilitate professional growth of teacher trough short term training	Σ	322	158	2.435	27	.326	.035
		$\bar{X}$	2.403	2.468				
		S.D	0.989	1.023				
7	Internal supervisors support teachers in doing action research	Σ	328	153	2.418	27	-.273	.594
		$\bar{X}$	2.447	2.390				
		S.D	1.0154	1.121				

NB: * indicates that there is a significant difference at α=0.05, Σ=Sum = $\bar{X}$=mean score, S.D=Standard Deviation, Source: Field Data

Item 1 of table 3 was about whether the internal supervisors arrange induction training for beginner teachers or not. From the results obtained it can be seen teachers and education leaders with ($\bar{X}$= 2.403, SD=0.989) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.453, SD= 1.082) mean scores respectively replied internal school supervisors insufficiently arrange induction training for beginner teachers. The opinion deference between the two group was t (27)= -.477, (p>0.05) not statistically significant. Furthermore, from the interview with the WEO and ZEO supervision experts it was found that supervisors were not arranging induction training for instructional improvement of the beginning teachers. The reason mentioned for this was mainly due to lack of knowledge and skills on how to arrange induction training. Taking this reality in mind, (MoE, 1987 E.C) underscored that internal supervisors are expected to provide induction training for beginner teachers.

Item 2 of the same table presented whether internal supervisors in the school assist teachers in lesson planning or not. Accordingly, teachers and education leaders with ($\bar{X}$= 2.328, SD= 0.979) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.484, SD= 1.053) mean scores respectively indicated that internal school supervisors were less assisted teachers in lesson planning. Similarly, t-test result shown the absence of significant deference between teachers and education leaders with t (27) = -.477, p>0.05 concerning the lower level of assistance in schools.

In the same table item 3, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$= 2.388, SD= 0.964) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.406, SD= 1.164) mean scores respectively and t (27) = -.384, (p > 0.05) revealed internal supervisors less facilitated experience sharing programs for teachers. Therefore, experience sharing between teachers and schools as one of the key to improve the performance of the school as well as the performance of individual teachers was missed. Instructional skills, assessment skills, evaluation skills and giving and receiving feedback skills of teachers can be improved when internal supervisors and more experienced teachers practice experience sharing programs. The mean scores indicated, from teacher and educational leader's respondents, the practice done inefficiently but there were trying to facilitate experience sharing programs. Experience sharing between teachers helps to identify their limitations and their good work, so, it is very important to improve the teachers' instructional limitation. Moreover, highly experienced teachers should volunteer to share their work and instructional skills for less experienced teachers, and also less experienced teachers should encouraged and motivated to received and obtained their good experience. For this purpose, the MoE planned CPD/Continuous Professional Development program. However, during interview the internal supervisors informed that, even though they repeatedly asked the WEO to arrange experience sharing, there is a little experience sharing. However, facilitating the experience sharing at Woreda, Zonal and regional level was written in the primary and secondary schools instructional organization document (Oromia, 1994 E.C).

As shown on the same table item 4, the respondents asked

whether internal supervisors assist teachers in developing/selecting instructional materials or not. Accordingly, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$= 2.442, SD= 0.992) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.468, SD= 1.167)) mean scores respectively indicated that, internal supervisors ineffectively assist teachers in developing /selecting instructional materials. The qualitative data obtained from interview support this idea that, internal school supervisors do not assist teachers in developing /selecting instructional materials to teaching learning process. While as they were insufficiently assist teachers to prepare materials by themselves. MOE (2000),

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

At the same table item 5, the respondents asked whether the internal supervisors spread best practice on teaching methodologies among teachers and schools or not. Accordingly, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$= 2.425, SD=0.997) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.296, SD= 1.108) mean scores respectively indicated that, internal school supervisors inadequately spread best practice on teaching methodologies among teachers and schools as expected, the t-test revealed that the significant level t(27) = - 0.965, p > 0.05). This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. Similarly, during interview the respondents informed that, internal supervisors inefficiently spread best practice on teaching methodologies among teachers and schools. This concluded, as best practice on teaching methodologies especially student centred methods are highly preferable that teachers should use and internal supervisors should encourage teachers to use active learning methods in the day to day teaching-learning process.

At the same table item 6, the respondents asked whether the internal school supervisors facilitate professional growth of teachers' through short term training, workshops and seminars or not. Accordingly, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$=2.403, SD=0.989) and ($\bar{X}$ = 2.468, SD= 1.023) and mean scores respectively reported that, internal school supervisors inefficiently facilitate professional growth of teachers' through short term training, workshops and seminars. The t-test revealed that the significant level t(27) = -0.326, p > 0.05. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. Similarly, during interview the respondents informed that:

> *Internal supervisors do not highly facilitate professional growth of teachers' through short term training, workshops and seminars. The data gathered through document analysis similarly indicated that, internal supervisors do not arrange seminars and workshops but sometimes provide training for teachers to develop their pedagogical skills.*

Bray (1987:136) indicated that, information is important to make good decision. Having this in mind, the respondents were asked whether the internal supervisors were providing information in the form of training and workshops for teachers' or not. So that, still with the luck of budget allocated by the woreda education office and the school management, internal supervisors did not perform short term training, seminars and workshops for teachers' professional growth.

In table 3 item 1, the respondents were asked whether the internal supervisors are supporting teachers in doing action research. Thus, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$ =2.447, SD=1.015) and ($\bar{X}$ = 2.390, S.D=1.121) mean scores respectively reported that, internal supervisors insufficiently support teachers in doing action research and in providing supportive materials. The t-test revealed that the significant level is t(27) = -0.275, $p > 0.05$. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. Similarly, during interview the respondents informed that,

> *Internal supervisors inadequately support teachers in doing action research and supportive materials. Furthermore, the information obtained from the woreda and Zonal education officers through interview reveals that these activities are implemented on the department level, not on an individual teacher basis. In addition, the interview assured that internal supervisors are not capable enough to shoulder their responsibilities in assisting the day to day instructional activities of teachers in the schools. This is due to time constraints and large number of teachers in the schools.*

As Singhal *et al*. cited in (Gashaw, 2008) [3] pointed one of the most embarrassing explanations for the current poor reputation of schools and the presumed failure of many excellent innovations is that teachers have not had adequate, well informed and direct supervision to help, understand and implement best practice. In general, the compiled result indicates that, internal school supervisors do not design various interventions so as to assist teachers improve their limitations. As a result the teachers had not got enough professional support to improve the day to day classroom instruction and instructional skills. Hence, it might reduce the effectiveness of students, teachers' initiation as well as the schools goal achievement.

4.4 Teachers Professional Support from Supervisors

This part deals with the discussion of the data gathered from respondents with regards to the types of professional support teachers gained from internal supervisors in order to improve their instructional skills was presented to respondents through questionnaires that they were required to rate the level of effects on the basis of a five point Likert scales. These five point scales range from strongly agree (SA) = 5, Agree (A) = 4, undecided (U) = 3, Disagree (DA) = 2, strongly disagree (SD) = 1. For ease of analysis, the mean value range from 1.00 to 2.49 were (insufficient) low, from 2.50 to 3.49 were moderate and greater than 3.50 were rated as high (adequate). As shown in table 4 items 1, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$ =2.388, SD=1.068) and ($\bar{X}$=2.281, SD=1.105) mean scores and standard deviations respectively indicated that, internal school supervisors insufficiently support teachers to prepare different instructional materials for teaching learning

effectiveness as expected. The t-test revealed that the significant level is t(27)= -0.230, p > 0.05. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. Similarly, during interview the participants reported that internal school supervisors insufficiently support teachers to prepare different instructional materials as expected. However, internal supervisors indicated practical problems like lack of instructional materials for the preparation of different teaching aids and other supporting materials and lack of teachers' commitment to prepare different instructional materials that can support teaching-learning effectiveness.

Table 4: Respondents View on Teachers professional support from supervisors

No	Item	Response	Position		Overall mean	T test		
			Teacher n=134	Educational leader n=64		Df	t-value	Sig(p)
1	Supervisors support teachers to prepare different instructional materials to teaching-learning	Σ	320	146.00	2.334	27	-.230	.081
		$\bar{X}$	2.3881	2.2812				
		S.D	1.0684	1.1051				
2	Internal supervisors advice teachers to conduct action research	Σ	329	148.00	2.383	27	-.899	.070
		$\bar{X}$	2.4552	2.312				
		S.D	1.0157	1.021				
3	Internal supervisors facilitate short term training about different new teaching methodologies	Σ	316	153.00	2.374	27	-1.98	.059
		$\bar{X}$	2.3582	2.390				
		S.D	1.0142	1.190				
4	Internal supervisor advice teachers to use model effective teaching methods	Σ	324	147.00	2.356	27	.879	.936
		$\bar{X}$	2.4178	2.296				
		S.D	1.0498	1.018				
5	Internal supervisors create competition among teachers on pedagogical skills	Σ	325	153.00	2.407	27	-1.031	.662
		$\bar{X}$	2.4254	2.390				
		S.D	1.01401	1.063				
6	Internal supervisors facilitate experience sharing programs between teachers	Σ	332	149.00	2.402	27	-.499	.870
		$\bar{X}$	2.4776	2.3281				
		S.D	1.03848	1.155				

NB: * indicates that there is a significant difference at α=0.05, Σ=Sum = $\bar{X}$=mean score, S.D=Standard Deviation, Source: field data

In table 4 item 2, respondents needed to show the level of response of the main problems that internal school supervisor's advice teacher's to conduct action research. The teacher and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$=2.455, SD=1.015) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.312, SD= 1.021) mean scores and standard deviation respectively confirmed internal supervisors insufficiently advice teachers to conduct action research on pedagogical skill improvement as expected. Different literatures shows that the teachers' pedagogical skill improved can lead the achievement of quality education. However, the t-test revealed that the significant level t (27) = - 0.899, p > 0.05. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. This was cross-checked by the data gathered through interview. As the participants of the interview indicated, internal school supervisors do not inform teachers to conduct action researches, but they inform to identify the pedagogical skill gaps of teachers to conduct training. However, they did not show how to do it. As one of the WEO experts indicated, internal supervisors:

> *just counting the performed and not performed activities in the school, but not give professional advice to each and every teacher, how action research conducted in the school, how teachers learn from their limitations and the like.*

As the (OEB, 1997 E.C), indicated that, action research help to adopt the curriculum to fit the local needs on teacher's skill gaps. Teachers are an important medium to achieve the teaching and learning. They are also the heart of the quality of education (UNESCO, 2007: 22). However, all teachers are not qualified enough and as a result they need advice from internal supervisors how to conduct action research, (Giordane, 2008).

As the same table item 3, the respondents requested whether the internal school supervisors facilitate short term training about different best practice on teaching methodologies or not. On this issue, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$=2.358, SD= 1.014) and ($\bar{X}$=2.390, SD=1.190 mean scores and standard deviation respectively depicted that, internal school supervisors insufficiently facilitate and coordinating short term training to teachers continuously. The qualitative data obtained from the WEO supervision expertise indicated that, because of the lack of budget internal supervisors do not facilitating and coordinating short term training for teachers but different kinds of continuous professional development Programs were conducted by teachers to develop their own methodological skills by the CPD focal persons in the schools. Therefore, (MOE, 1987 E.C) indicated that, internal school supervisors are responsible to provide training to solve Various instructional problems that teachers face. However the t-test revealed that the significant level t (27) = -1.98, p > 0.05.This indicated that there was no statistically significant between the two groups of respondents.

As the same table of item 4, indicates teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$ =2.417, SD=1.049) and ($\bar{X}$=2.298, SD= 1.018) mean scores and standard deviation respectively confirmed that, internal supervisors insufficiently advice teachers to use model effective teaching methods and ineffectively encourage them to motivate students in the classroom. The t-test revealed that the significant level is t(t) = -0.879,p > 0.05 which indicated that there was no statistically significant difference. This was cross checked by the data gathered through interview. As the participants of the interview (WEO and ZEO supervision expertise) indicated that, internal supervisors do not advice teachers to use model effective teaching methods and did not encourage them to motivate students in the classroom.

On the same table item 5, indicated that, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$= 2.425, SD= 1.014) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.390, SD= 1.063) mean scores and standard deviation

respectively indicated that internal school supervisors ineffectively trying to create competition among teachers on pedagogical skill improvement, As (MoE, 2000) indicate that internal supervisors should have skills of evaluation on pedagogical aspects of teachers and this can create positive competition among teachers As the qualitative data obtained from interview indicate that, the evaluation of teacher's to create competition do not prepared by internal supervisors but the efficiency of teachers filled per semester symbolically, However, The t-test revealed that the significant level t(27) = -1.031,p> 0.05. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses.

On the same table item 6, the respondents requested whether the internal school supervisors facilitate the experience sharing programs between teachers or not. The teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$ =2.477, SD= 1.038) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.328, SD= 1.155) mean scores and standard deviation respectively indicated that, internal supervisors ineffectively facilitate experience sharing programs between teachers to their pedagogical skill improvement. The t-test revealed that the significant level (t) = - 0.499, p > 0.05. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. However, during the interview, the WEO and ZEO supervision expertise informed that, even though they repeatedly asked them to arrange experience sharing programs, there was no any experience sharing successfully facilitated. One of the WEO experts answered that:

> *The experience sharing programs do not facilitated by internal supervisors but they simply asked the woreda education offices about their salary improvement and other allowances and benefits that they obtain. Teachers in secondary schools are not interested to share their experiences even those high service holders but the school principals and vice principals sometimes visit us in the classroom and sometimes request feedback while as others do not like to give and receive their experiences.*

The other basic function of internal supervision is promoting teachers' professional development in schools. Therefore, since the competent and skilful teachers are a key component of successful school, staff development is a major function of internal supervision. In this the role of internal supervisors are helping teachers to grow and to develop in their understanding of teaching and learning process and improving their teaching skill (Pajak, 2002). As the researcher conclude that, internal supervisors were not facilitating experience sharing programs between teachers to their pedagogical skill improvement. The researcher conclude that, facilitating experience sharing between teachers is the main duties of internal supervisors because they might have more experience and they develop different instructional skills through experience and then they should facilitate experience sharing but still the study indicated that there were not done as expected.

The Extent to Which Supervisors Link Schools to External Community

As shown in item 1 of table 5 respondents were asked whether internal school supervisors link the schools with the school community to discuss on the problems they face on teaching learning process and solve problems on the ways of teaching methods of teachers in view of students achievement to ensure education quality or not. Accordingly, teachers and educational leaders with mean scores and standard deviation of ($\bar{X}$=2.462, SD=1.023) and ($\bar{X}$=2.359, SD=1.145) respectively indicated that, internal supervisors insufficiently linked the schools with the community to solve different academic problems observed from the ongoing teaching learning processes. The t-test result also revealed that the significant level of t (27) = -0.459, p > 0.050). This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. This result was supported by the data obtained from the interview.

Table 5: Respondents View on Internal Supervisors' Link School with Others

No	Item	Response	Position		Over all mean	T test		
			Teacher n=134	Leader n=64		Df	t-value	Sig(p)
1	Internal supervisors link the schools with the community to discuss on the problems that face on teaching-learning process	Σ	330	1.51	2.410	27	-.459	.650
		$\bar{X}$	2.4627	2.359				
		S.D	1.02346	1.145				
2	Supervisors link the schools with parents to solve material and financial problems.	Σ	329	152.00	2.415	27	-.613	.545
		$\bar{X}$	2.4552	2.3750				
		S.D	0.90625	1.10554				
3	supervisors regularly report instructional problems to all stakeholders	Σ	329	160.00	2.477	27	-.485	.632
		$\bar{X}$	2.4552	2.5000				
		S.D	1.01578	1.28483				
4	supervisors organize different commits from different stakeholders	Σ	325	152.00	2.312	27	-.867	.394
		$\bar{X}$	2.4254	2.375				
		S.D	1.00657	152.00				
5	Internal supervisors encourage model parent for their active participations in the school	Σ	330	149.00	2.395	27	-.094	.925
		$\bar{X}$	2.4627	2.3281				
		S.D	1.04527	1.002				
6	Internal Supervisors play roles in community mobilization	Σ	329	146.00	2.368	27	-.731	.471
		$\bar{X}$	2.4552	2.2813				
		S.D	0.96258	.99950				

NB: * indicates that there is a significant difference at α=0.05, Σ=Sum = $\bar{X}$=mean score, S.D=Standard Deviation, Source: Field Data

Item 2 of the same table 5 was about whether internal supervisors link the schools with parents to solve material and financial problems. On this regard, teacher and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$=2.455, SD= 0.906) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.38, SD= 1.105) mean scores and standard deviation respectively indicated that, internal supervisors insufficiently link the

schools with the parents to solve schools material and financial problems as expected. The t-test revealed that the significant level t (27) = -0.613, p > 0.05. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. This can be cross checked by the data obtained from interview that indicated, internal supervisors were not link their schools with the school community and the parents as expected. The researcher concludes that, internal supervisors were not linking the schools with the school community and the parent as expected.

Item 3 of the same table, respondents asked whether internal supervisors regularly report school problems to all stakeholders or not. Here teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$ =2.45, SD= 1.015) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.5, SD= 1.28) mean scores and S.D respectively indicated that, internal supervisors insufficiently report school problems to all stakeholders most of the time internal supervisors report to Woreda education office simply the command posts and the statistical data. The t-test revealed that the significant level t(27) = -0.485, p > 0.05. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. The qualitative data obtained from the Woreda education officers support the ideas of teachers and principals that internal supervisors irregularly report school problems to all stakeholders.

As the same table items 4, the respondents asked whether internal supervisors organize different committees from different stakeholders or not, teacher and education leaders with ($\bar{X}$= 2.42, SD= 1.006) and ($\bar{X}$ =2.37, SD= 1.52) mean scores respectively indicated that, internal supervisors ineffectively organize different committees from different stakeholders. This indicated that internal supervisors insufficiently create awareness about the importance of different commits organized in the school. The t-test revealed that the significant level t (27) = -0.865, p > 0.05. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. The data obtained from interview and document analyses support this idea that internal supervisors formally on the paper organize different school committees but each and every committee are not functional. Like that document analysis indicates, Technique committee, PTA, KETB and String Committee are documented in each school but it is not functional. This is because of the internal supervisors does not create awareness about the new educational policy of the country.

Item 5, of the same table states that, internal supervisors encourage model parents to improve their participations on the teaching-learning effectiveness or not, on this regard teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$= 2.462, S.D= 1.045) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.328, S.D= 1.002) mean scores and S.D respectively indicated that, internal supervisors inadequately encouraged and recognized model parents to improve their participations. This indicated that, those internal supervisors in the school simply biased by other works like planning while as they were not encourage model parents to solve different school problems. The t-test revealed that the significant level t(27) = -0.094, p > 0.05. This indicated that there was no statistically significant difference of responses. As the researcher obtained from the interview the parents are not interested to participate in different meetings conference and they also insufficiently involved paying something to improve the school but they simply send their children to school.

At the same table of item 6, teachers and educational leaders with ($\bar{X}$=2.455, SD= 0.962) and ($\bar{X}$=2.281, SD=0.999) mean scores respectively indicated that, internal supervisors insufficiently play a roles in community mobilization to solve financial problems of the schools. The t-test revealed that the significant level t (27) = -0.731, p > 0.05 and this indicates there is no statistically significant difference of responses.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the practices of internal supervision was not in a position to improve classroom instruction. In the same vein, teachers were not getting what they are expected to gain from their immediate supervisors. The findings of the study shown that internal supervision practices were challenged by both teachers and schools related problems. Therefore, it can be concluded that both teachers and school principals have not clearly articulated the primary essence of internal school supervision. Hence they school environment was instead of playing supportive role become a challenge to the development of school based supervision.

Therefore, in order for the internal supervision play the central roles of improving classroom instruction and school performance, teachers need to be convinced internal supervisors are there to build their skills by identifying weakness and strengths. It is also good to consider the workload of internal supervisors in a way they can get time to support teachers and work on improving their instruction.

School principals need to do their best to liaise the relation between teachers and school based supervisors in a way teachers develop positive attitude towards supervisors and the supervision system in schools. If internal supervisors are to play their active role in improving school performance, schools need reconsider the teaching load they can handle effectively and efficiently.

The school community need to internalize that internal supervision was meant to increase the school autonomy whereby schools can regularly monitor their teacher performance and student outcome and hence internal supervisors remain of crucial importance for continued improvement of education. As most of the challenges of school based supervision were school related principals need to take for granted that internal supervision influences what happen in the core business of the school i,e teaching and learning.

Declaration

Here we confirm that this research paper is our original work funded by Jimma University Research office and it was neither published nor submitted for publication in any other journal. Furthermore, we declare that there is no conflict of interest concerning this manuscript.

Acknowledgement

First of all, we would like thank Jimma University for supporting us in financing this research undertaking. There are also colleagues who deserves appreciation for their moral support and motivation while data collection and analysis. We are also indebted to our respondents; teachers, supervisors principals and vice-principals for they gave us all the required information for conducting the study.

References

1. Carron G, De Grauwe A, Govinda R. Supervision and Support Services in Asia. Volume I: A Comparative

Analysis Paris: UNESCO/International Institute for Educational Planning, 2001.
2. Creswell JW. Research design, quantitative and mixed approaches (2nd Ed): London, Sage Publication Inc, 2006.
3. Gashsw Debassu. Supervisory Practice of Cluster Primary School Supervisors Promoting Teachers Professional Competences in West Gojjam Administration Zone: Unpublished Masters of Arts‟ Thesis, at AAU, 2008.
4. Goble N, Porter J. The changing role of the teacher. Paris: NFER Publishing Co. Ltd, 1977.
5. Kothari CR. Research methodology: Methods and techniques. (2nd revised Ed.). New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd, 2004.
6. Koul L. Methodology of an Educational Research. Vikas Publishing, India, 1984.
7. Lilian CM. Perception of classroom supervision by secondary school teachers in the Harare region. Unpublished Masters of Arts‟ thesis, Tshwane University of technology, 2007.
8. MOE. The new education and training policy. Policy Document of the Ethiopia Ministry of Education, Addis Ababa University, 1994.
9. MOE. Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP IV): Program Action Plan, Federal Ministry of Education, and Addis Ababa, 2010.
10. UNESCO. Quality education through school-based supervision and support, 1999. trieved fromunesdoc. unesco.org /images/0011/001174/117472e.January 5, 2006.
11. UNESCO. Teachers and educational quality: Monitoring global needs for 2015. Montreal: Succursale Center-Ville, 2006.
12. UNESCO. Reforming school supervision for quality improvement, 2007. Retrieved from www.iiep.unesco. org/filedmin/.../Supervision/SUP_Mod8.pdf October 16, 2006.