

SCHOOL-BASED SUPERVISION AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF GURAGE ZONE SNNPR STATE

ETEKHA FEKADU DABESA, SHIREYE CHERAMLAK FEKADU

Department of Educational Planning and Management, College of Education and Behavioral Studies, Wolkite University, Wolkite, Ethiopia.
Email: fekadudabesa2017@gmail.com; fekaducheramlak@gmail.com

Received: 15 November 2023, Revised and Accepted: 28 December 2023

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess school-based supervision and school performance in secondary schools of Gurage Zone. To conduct this study, a correlational research design was employed. One Zonal and three District Education Office supervision coordinators were selected through the availability sampling technique. Among the 77 government secondary schools found in the Zone, 10 of them were selected randomly as sample schools. From these sample schools, 10 principals and 10 school-based supervisors (10 unit leaders and 50 heads of department) were also included as respondents using the availability sampling technique. Furthermore, 286 teachers have participated in the study through purposive and availability sampling techniques. Questionnaires and document analysis were tools for collecting data in the study. Frequency, percentage, mean, and t-test were utilized to analyze quantitative data gained through the questionnaires. The qualitative data gathered through document analyses were by narration. The results of the study indicated that teachers lack awareness and orientation on the activities and significance of school-based supervision, ineffectiveness of the practice of supervisory options matching with the individual teacher's developmental level, and the inability of supervisors to apply the necessary procedures for classroom observation properly. This all was due to the following factors influencing such as lack of relevant training programs for supervisors, scarcity of experienced supervisors in school-based supervision activities, lack of supervision manuals in the schools, and shortage of allocated budget for supervisory activities, and that also leads to low school performance. Finally, to minimize the problems of school-based supervision and low school performance in secondary schools, it is recommended to give relevant in-service training for supervisors to upgrade their supervisory activities, necessary resources such as supervision manuals, and an adequate budget for the success of supervision at the school level were suggested so that schools can perform in a good manner.

Keywords: School, School-based supervision, School performance, Secondary schools.

© 2023 The Authors. Published by Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22159/ijss.2024v12i1.48991>. Journal homepage: <https://innovareacademics.in/journals/index.php/ijss>

INTRODUCTION

As in many other developing countries, in our country – Ethiopia, education has been given great attention for it is the basic way of economic growth and all-rounded development of the society (MOE, cited in Abebe, 2014). This requires the effectiveness and commitment of stakeholders, particularly teachers, school leaders, and management (Aggarwal, cited in Abebe, 2014). Therefore, schools must improve their basic functions of teaching and learning process that aim at helping and empowering all students to raise their broad outcomes through instructional improvement, administration, instruction, and supervision are responsible for the highest performance of students in schools. Furthermore, the Ministry of Education (MoE, cited by Abebe, 2014), in its Education Sector Development Program (ESDP IV), has stressed the necessity of teacher supervision and support as a strategy to insure the quality of teaching and learning. Many researchers believe that supervision of instruction has the potential to improve classroom practices and contribute to student success through the professional growth and improvement of teachers (Blasé and Blasé, Musaaazi, Sergiovanni and Starratt, and Sullivan and Glanz, cited in Abebe, 2014). Supervision is viewed as a cooperative venture in which supervisors and teachers engage in dialogue for improving instruction which logically should contribute to student-improved learning and success (Hoy and Forsyth, Sergiovanni and Starratt, Sullivan and Glanz, cited in Abebe, 2014).

The overall objective of effective school-based supervision was to enable the individual teacher to become an implementer of effective teaching. Regarding the role of supervisors, they were part of the technical level in schools. As such, they were concerned primarily: With teaching and learning; they were first and foremost teachers' master teachers, not

administrators. Their area of expertise was curriculum and instruction; their job was to help their colleagues improve the teaching-learning process.

In Ethiopia, the educational inspection which was later replaced by supervision was started in 1941/2. The shifting from inspection to supervision (in 1962/3) was to improve the teaching-learning process through the strengthening of supervision by focusing on the curriculum, teaching content and methodology, and provision of professional assistance and guidance to classroom teachers. Again, with the change of the political system in the country, a shift from inspection to supervision was made as of 1994 (OREB, cited in Abebe, 2014).

According to MoE cited by Abebe (2014), school-based supervisors and external supervisors were responsible to carry out educational supervision. In this regard, the District, Zonal, regional, and central supervisory educators were structured under external supervisors. Furthermore, the supervisors and education experts of the above-mentioned external organizational bodies have been given the responsibility to assist teachers in school.

On the other hand, school principals, deputy principals, heads of the department, and senior teachers are categorized under the actors of school-based supervision (MoE, cited in Abebe, 2014). Since these school-based supervisors were within the schools, they were responsible to assist teachers closely and continuously for the improvement of the instruction.

To bring effective education through the improved teaching-learning process, school-based supervision should be democratic and cooperative and should get serious attention in the school. In light of this, it is quite

useful to assess the current practices of school-based supervision and school performance in government secondary schools of Guraghe zone. Several literatures have discussed the role of supervision to enhance teachers' performance, which contrasts with the current study. The previous studies found supervision enabling teachers to develop their professionalism and teaching performance (Mohd Zaki, Veloo *et al.*, Ayandoja *et al.*, Sullivan and Glanz cited in Kazi Enamul Hoque, 2020) also claimed that teachers need to have proper guidance to improve their teaching methods to ensure improvement in their performance.

Even though this study found that teachers were aware of the role of supervision in their professional development, their view on observation as a platform for supervisors to find mistakes in them causes the teachers to be negative toward supervision (Beach and Reinhartz, Tshabalala, cited in Kazi Enamul Hoque, 2020).

Local-level educational performance can be measured using an inspection framework or by analyzing dimensions such as access, efficiency, quality management, educational finance, etc. Much of the school performance literature draws on educational production functions or school productivity traditions (Hanushek Meyer, cited in Abebe, 2014). Underlying many of the models used in this type of research is the basic assumption that causal claims can be made about school performance. In other words, by evaluating school performance, we assume that it was possible to measure a school's quality or effectiveness, and the causal effect of a school's practices on a student's achievement.

The findings of different research conducted on the practice of instructional supervision in secondary schools of different regions and zones of our country have shown that there was a lack of awareness on utilizing various supervisory options, a lack of relevant continuous training for department heads and senior teachers who were supposed to carry out supervisory activities at school level, and there is inadequate classroom observation to monitor teachers instructional improvement (Chanyalew, Getachew, Million, cited in Abebe, 2014).

Hence, this research was carried out to investigate whether there is a significant correlation between the school-based supervision and school performance in secondary schools. Hence, the study was intended to explain how the practice of school-based supervision and its relation with school performance in the study area looks like.

METHODOLOGY

The research design

This segment of the paper presents for readers the details of the research designs employed, the population of the study, sampling techniques, key tools used for data collection, sources of data, and best methods used for analysis. In this study, correlation design was applied as the primary purpose of the study is to study secondary school's practice of school-based supervision and the relationship with school performance was investigated.

Study site and population

This study was conducted in government secondary schools of Guraghe Zone. The population of the study comprises school-based supervisors (i.e., principals, unit leaders, and heads of department) and teachers of the 10 sampled schools, District Education Office experts, and Zonal supervision coordinators. Accordingly, 10 principals, 10 unit leaders, 50 heads of the department, 426 teachers, three DEO experts, and one Zone Education Office supervision coordinator were the population of the study.

Sample size and sampling techniques

To obtain reliable data for the study, multistage sampling method, stratified sampling method, and cluster sampling method were selected. Accordingly, due to their responsibility to provide supervision activities for teachers and a direct and close relationship within the schools, the Zonal supervision is selected by a purposive sampling technique. As a result, among the 15 districts found in the Zone; one Zonal and five

DEO supervision coordinators were selected. Consequently, among the 77 government secondary schools found in the Zone, 10 of them were selected by random sampling technique. Then, 10 principals of the school were selected through availability sampling due to their responsibility to follow-up the overall activities of the school and to provide supervision services for teachers. Since school-based supervisors are responsible to carry out supervisory activities in their school, all school-based supervisors of the 10 schools were taken through availability sampling technique. Accordingly, 10 school-based supervisors (50 heads of the department and 10 unit leaders) were taken as a sample. In this study, there were 14 vice-principals.

Since the sampled schools' teachers number is too many; the researcher has used the availability sampling technique to include all 10 school teachers'. In addition to this, to increase the validity of the study, all 426 teachers (i.e., 129 teachers from Koter geder secondary school and 23 teachers from Agena secondary school, 19 teachers from Yewahny Secondary school, 10 teachers from Aklile secondary school, 61 teachers from Teklehymanot secondary school 17 teachers from Dakuna Secondary school 26 teachers from Gurda secondary school 20 teachers from Gunchera secondary school 112 teachers from Gazanch secondary school, and 20 teachers from Holle secondary school) were included in the study using availability sampling technique.

In this study, a questionnaire and document analysis was used to collect information regarding the practices of school-based supervision in secondary schools and their performance.

Methods of data analysis

After obtained all the data, descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analysis the data. Data description of principals, practice, and school performance percentage, mean, and standardization were used. The data were presented in table. Inferential statistics were used to examine differences and relationships. Analysis of variance (one-way analysis of variance [ANOVA]) was conducted to see differences at 95% confidence interval. The person momentum correlation coefficient was computed to examine the relationship and its strength (as direction).

Ethical consideration

According to Best and Khan as cited in Furi (2016) in involving participants in the research work, it is important considering the ethical principles laid down to protect them. Moreover, all participants of the study were verbally informed about the purpose and benefit of the study just to secure their permission. Any data and information given by them kept confidential so that no one has the opportunity to relate the response to anyone of them and the data and information they provided would not be used for anything other than this study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part of the paper gives the detail understanding of the study based on the data collected both through quantitatively and qualitatively from the study area. The purpose of this research was to investigate the practices of school-based supervision and school performance in government secondary schools of Guraghe Zone of the SNNPR Region. The data obtained from questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively and that of through document analysis were presented and analyzed qualitatively to substantiate the data collected through the questionnaires and to validate the findings of the study.

Teachers' understanding toward school-based supervision

The overall mean of 3.30 shows the uncertainty of the majority of respondents on the issue. Thus, it can be said that teachers were not satisfied with supervisors' response regarding orientation of teachers toward school-based supervision; it is possible to conclude that the orientation of teachers toward school-based supervision was not implemented properly in the schools. The significance value (p-value) is 0.20 is >0.05 showing there is no significance difference between the two groups.

The overall mean of 2.37 shows the disagreement of the majority of respondents on the issue. Therefore, based on the majority of teachers' respondents; it can be concluded that teachers were not well aware of the significance of supervision in the study area. The significance value (p-value) is 0.36 and is >0.05 showing there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups.

The overall mean of 2.65 shows the uncertainty of the majority of respondents on the issue. From this one, it can be concluded that teachers in the study area were not satisfied with school-based supervision that contributed to their continuous professional improvement. The significance value (p-value) is 0.33 is >0.05 showing there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding school-based supervision contributing to their continuous professional improvement.

The overall mean of 2.89 shows the uncertainty of the majority of respondents on the issue. From this one, it can be concluded that the necessity of group effort for supervision is not well practiced in the study area. The significance value (p-value) is 0.68 and is >0.05 showing there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding the necessity of group effort for supervision.

The overall mean of 2.41 shows the disagreement of the majority of respondents on the issue. From this one, it can be concluded that classroom observations did not enable teachers to use a variety of teaching techniques. The significance value (p-value) is 0.20 and is >0.05 showing there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding classroom observation enabling teachers to use a variety of teaching techniques.

The overall mean of 2.89 shows the uncertainty of the majority of respondents on the issue. From this, one can be concluded that school-based supervision was not contributing as expected to the results of improvement of student's learning in their school. The significance value (p-value) is 0.71 is >0.05 showing there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding school-based supervision results and the improvement of student's learning in their school.

Supervisory options practiced in the school

Therefore, it can be concluded that the opportunities for experienced and competent teachers to practice self-directed supervision were unsatisfactory in the study areas. The significance value (p-value) is 0.75 is >0.05 showing there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding the opportunity for experienced and competent teachers to practice self-directed supervision. With respect to the application of supervisory options, the interview with school principals explained that they had no deep knowledge regarding the existence and application of various options of supervision.

However, sometimes teachers were familiarized with sharing their experiences through observing each other's classes in addition to classroom observations that can be conducted by their school-based supervisors.

The research findings on supervisory options indicated in Glickman *et al.* (2004) stated that teachers' preferences on supervisory approaches differ. As the study revealed, some of the teachers preferred a supervisor to work with them non-directive; while others preferred a supervisor to work with them collaboratively; whereas the remaining teachers preferred other choices. Therefore, matching the best supervisory approach for the teachers' current developmental levels is very crucial in promoting some degree of teacher development.

Procedures of classroom observation

The purpose of supervision is to assist teachers to contribute more effectively toward the improvement of student achievement. Thus, supervision of teachers while they are teaching in the classroom is

among the better strategies for helping them. As Jones (1993) indicates, a classroom observation is a way of gathering data concerning teaching learning activities in the class by taking into account improving teacher effectiveness, then looking at what is actually happening in the classroom.

Classroom visit enables supervisors not only to identify any shortcomings of teachers and the problems encountered by them but also to understand what leads to better performance of the teaching-learning process (MoE, 1994). In respect to the procedures of classroom observation, respondents were asked whether or not the procedures have been implemented appropriately in their school. The results obtained are presented as follows.

Pre-observation conferences

The overall $X=3.88$ indicates the agreement on the point. The significance level (p=0.52) is >0.05 , this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of supervisors and teachers. From the result, it is possible to conclude that the lesson plan of the supervised teachers was evaluated before the classroom visit.

The data gathered through an interview sessions with the school principals also support the above findings. As a result, almost all (3 of 5) principals stated that the school-based supervisors did not make mutual agreements with each supervisee on the purpose of classroom observation, or for a suitable time; nor for the data which was to be collected during the observation. Rather, they entered the class taking the prepared observation format. Moreover, the documents available in the school showed that the schedules for classroom observations were prepared by the school-based supervisors and approved by the school principal without participation or individual supervisee involvement.

As stated clearly in the supervision manual of the Ministry of Education (MoE, 1994), every classroom observation should be implemented based on a clearly stated certain criteria and should be known by the supervisee before the supervisors carry out classroom observation. These criteria were formulated on the basis of the purpose of the observation and in relation to the way of recording necessary classroom information and how to analyze the recorded information easily.

Observation phase

The overall $X=3.87$ indicates the agreement on the point. This implies that the majority of respondents agreed with the issue. The significance level (p=0.26) is >0.05 , this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of supervisors and teachers. From the results, it is possible to say that most supervisors chose the strategic location which enabled them to observe the activities performed in the classroom while conducting class observations.

As indicated in the guidelines of the Ministry of Education (MOE, 1994), during classroom observations, the supervisor should sit at a strategic location in the classroom to watch every teaching-learning activity properly. Hence, it is better for the supervisor to sit at the corner of the classroom. Similarly, Gurnam and Chan (2010) in their study revealed that, in most cases, the supervisors sat at the back of the class so that they could get a good view of both the teacher and students in action.

Therefore, based on the overall $X=2.23$ disagree on the point, it can be said that supervisors did not follow-up the lesson attentively from the beginning of the period up to the end of the period while the actual presentation is going on. The significance level (p=0.40) is >0.05 , this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of supervisors and teachers.

The result indicated that supervisors were not as such effective to stay for the entire period in the class while observing the teacher. In contrast to this result, the research findings of Gurnam and Chan (2010) showed

that the supervisor was punctual and observed the whole lesson during classroom observation.

The purpose of classroom observation is improving the quality of teaching-learning activities in the classroom. Hence, the supervisor should stay in the class from the beginning to the end of that period. Because, if a supervisor observes some parts of the class activity and leaves the class, the supervisee teacher may suspect the supervisor to judge his or her activity in a negative way and the supervisee may feel unhappy. Moreover, since the teaching-learning process is continuous and holds various activities; observing specific parts of the classroom observation cannot enable to know the detailed performance of the supervised teacher (MoE, 1994).

Regarding the frequency of classroom observations provided for the individual teachers, the obtained data from the open-ended items of the questionnaire and the interviewees' school principals revealed that classroom observation was carried out once per semester for each teacher. In relation to this, the District Education Office supervision coordinator also explained that even if the office had a plan to visit schools and support teachers 3 times/year (at the beginning of the year, at the end of the first semester and at the end of the academic year), due to various constraints they could not support the schools adequately, As a result, they visit the secondary schools twice a year.

In light of the above analysis, the findings of the study conducted in Ukraine showed that teachers were observed at least 5 times per year (Benjamin, 2003). Conducting classroom observation cannot lead to identify the teachers' appropriate implementation of teaching-learning activities in the class. In relation to this, as the Ministry of Education (MoE, 1994) in its supervision manual indicated, the necessity of continuous classroom observation is enabling teachers to evaluate their routine tasks and helps to improve their poor performance. Similarly, by supporting the above idea, Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) revealed that a continuous observation or formative observation should be undertaken for teachers before a final assessment was made.

Post-observation conference

The overall $X=3.76$ of item 1 shows the agreement of respondents with this point. The p-value also indicates that there is no significance difference between supervisors and teachers (0.13, >0.05). Therefore, based on the majority of respondents, it can be concluded that supervisors provide immediate feedback for the supervised teacher as soon as the classroom observation has been occurred.

The overall $X=3.77$ of item 2 shows the agreement of respondents with this point. The p-value also indicates that there is no significance difference between supervisors and teachers (0.25, >0.05). Therefore, based on the majority of respondents, it can be concluded that supervisors discussed with the supervised teacher on the collected data during the class observation.

The overall $X=3.64$ of item 3 shows the agreement of respondents with this point. The significance level ($p=0.69$) is >0.05 , this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of supervisors and teachers.

As observed from the above table for items 1, 2, and 3, it is possible to conclude that after classroom, observation school-based supervisors were giving feedback immediately and discussed on the feedback with the supervised teacher for that specified class observation.

Therefore, based on the overall $X=2.11$ of item 4 disagree on the point, it can be said that supervisors emphasize to give comments for the supervised teachers through face-to-face interaction rather than to read from the format of the observation. The significance level ($p=0.30$) is >0.05 , this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of supervisors and teachers.

From the above table result analysis, one can realize that after classroom observation, school-based supervisors practiced to discuss with the supervisee as soon as the observation program finished on the collected data by focusing on the performances that enable teachers to improve the teaching-learning process on the basis of that particular period.

Responsibilities of school-based supervisor practice in the schools

Supervisors are expected to work effectively for the success of implementation of school-based supervision in their respective schools. As it has been indicated in the review of related literature, supervisors have the responsibility to help teachers in improving the professional development of teachers and instruction through various activities such as conducting a classroom visits, organizing and providing short-term training programs at the school level, and facilitating the exchange of model experiences among teachers. To this end, respondents were requested to report whether or not school-based supervisors perform their responsibilities effectively to assist teachers. Tables 1-3 present the results on the basis of a rating scales ranging from strongly disagree=1 to strongly agree=5 as follows:

Supervisory responsibilities of department heads implemented in schools

Thus, teacher respondents with a mean score of 2.18 reported that they were not satisfied. From this mean value, it can be stated that the efforts of department heads in practicing regular meetings with other teachers among the respective department members to evaluate issues related to teaching-learning activities of teachers were ineffective (low).

From the similar table item 2, the computed mean score of teacher respondents regarding the endeavor of department heads in providing an orientation programs for newly assigned teachers to the respective department was 2.167. From this mean value, it can be stated that the department heads rarely practiced such activities.

As it can be seen from the above table (item 3), concerning arranging workshops, conferences, and seminars for teachers in their department, respondents with a mean value of 2.43 portrayed their disagreement. This revealed that the efforts of the department heads in organizing workshops, conferences, and seminars for teachers to solve instructional problems were low (ineffective).

As depicted in Table 1 (item 4), the mean score of respondents 2.43 confirmed that the department heads were not well devoted in organizing model teaching programs from senior teachers to inexperienced teachers. From this mean score, it can be stated that the department heads had low experience of organizing such practices.

Concerning item 5 in the same table, the effort of department heads in encouraging teachers to use appropriate teaching materials was rated by the respondents. Accordingly, the computed mean score was 3.38 which demonstrates the moderate practice of department heads in encouraging teachers to utilize suitable teaching materials to make clear their teaching activities for students.

In the above table (item 6), respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement concerning the attempt of department heads in supporting teachers to conduct action research. As a result, according to the views of teacher respondents, department heads were rated as having low practice in assisting teachers to conduct action research to solve problems that they encountered with the mean value of 2.37.

Supervisory responsibilities of vice-principals implemented in schools

As indicated in the above table of item 1, respondents were asked whether or not vice-principals of their school evaluate the lesson plan of teachers. Consequently, teacher respondents with a mean value of 2.38 confirmed their disagreement. From the result, it can be observed that vice-principals were rated as having low performance in evaluating teachers' lesson plan.

Regarding the views of teacher respondents on the vice-principals' level of practice to conduct classroom observation to ensure the application of the lesson plans, respondents rated school vice-principals as they have low performance with the mean value of 2.45.

In Table 2 (item 3), respondents were asked whether or not the vice-principal of the school organized training programs at the school level. Hence, according to teacher respondents, vice principals were rated as having low performance in arranging training programs for teachers which might negatively contribute to teacher professional development, with a mean value of 2.43. According to the views of teacher respondents for item 4, vice-principals were labeled under moderate performance in encouraging teachers to evaluate the existing teaching texts for further improvement, with a mean value of 3.12.

Supervisory responsibilities of principals implemented in the schools

From the data in Table 3 of item 1 above, teacher respondents with a mean value of 2.48 confirmed their agreement to rate their school principals as having low performance in creating a conducive environment to facilitate supervisory activities in the school.

As it is observed in the above table item 2, teacher respondents were asked on the effort made by school principals in coordinating regular programs with the school community to evaluate the teaching-learning process and outcomes. Hence, respondents with a mean value of 2.35 rated the school principals as having low performance in exercising such practice.

In the last item of the above table, teacher respondents were requested to give their opinion concerning the competence of school principals in providing adequate professional assistance for teachers. As a result, respondents with a mean value of 2.29 reported their disagreement that the practice of principals in this respect was ineffective (low performance).

Challenges to school-based supervision

Here under the statistical findings of the study present the challenges against the implementation of school-based supervision that were reported by teachers and school-based supervisors of the study area.

The overall X=4.26 of item 1 shows the agreement of the total respondents with the point. Therefore, based on the overall score

value, school supervisors were not capable enough to assist teachers. The significance level (p=0.10) is >0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors.

The overall X=2.07 of item 2 above shows the disagreement of the total respondents with the point. Therefore, based on the overall score value, school supervisors not have high experience with the practice of school-based supervision to carry out their responsibilities effectively. The significance level (p=0.74) is >0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors.

The overall X=4.00 of item 3 above shows the agreement of the total respondents with the point., based on the overall score value, relevant training is not provided for school-based supervisors to undertake their responsibilities in a proper way. The significance level (p=0.40) is >0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors. Concerning with this, the finding of Alhammad (cited in Rashid, 2001) indicated that the absence of in-service training for supervisors adversely influenced the practice of instructional supervision.

Similarly, the responses collected from the interviewed school principals also confirmed that there were no organized training programs for school-based supervisors. In the same way, the 0-interview District Education Office supervision coordinators revealed that due to financial constraints and lack of vehicles, they could not offer relevant training programs and sufficient support for supervisors at the school level. Moreover, three of the supervision coordinators declared that the equal status in the educational level of district supervisors with secondary school-based supervisors and teachers also made them lack of confidence to assist teachers.

The response from the Zonal supervision coordinator revealed that there were no adjustments made to train school-based supervisors at Zonal level, rather facilitating conditions such as selecting participant trainees, and acting as a bridge to handover letters to the concerned bodies when the Regional Education Bureau organizes training programs. As mentioned by the same interviewee, the lack of skilled manpower and inadequate number of experts, lack of budget, and

Table 1: Views of respondents toward the extent to which department heads discharge, their responsibilities

No	Items	No of respondents	Mean	Standard deviation
1	Conducting regular meetings with teachers of the department to evaluate their activities.	286	2.18	1.243
2	Arranging on the job orientation program to newly assigned teachers in the respective departments.	286	2.67	1.255
3	Organizing workshops, conferences, and seminars to tackle instructional problems identified by the department members.	286	1.43	1.356
4	Organizing model teaching programs for inexperienced (junior) teachers from their senior staff members among the department.	286	2.43	1.292
5	Encouraging teachers to use appropriate teaching materials.	286	3.38	1.279
6	Assisting teachers to conduct action research to solve problems that they encountered	286	2.37	1.259

Key: Scale range of mean score, 0–2.49: Lower performance, 2.50–3.49: Moderate performance, 3.50–5.00: Higher performance

Table 2: Responses to the responsibility of vice-principals practiced in schools

No	Items	No of respondents	Mean	Standard deviation
1	Evaluating the lesson plan of teachers.	286	2.38	1.289
2	Conducting the classroom observation regularly to ensure the application of the lesson plan.	286	2.45	1.366
3	Organizing training programs at school level for the sake of teachers' professional development.	286	2.43	1.133
4	Encourages teachers to evaluate the existing teaching texts for further improvement.	286	3.12	1.166

Key: Scale range of mean score, 0–2.49=Lower performance, 2.50–3.49=Moderate performance, 3.50–5.00=Higher performance

Table 3: Views of respondents on the responsibility of principals practiced in schools

No	Items	No of respondents	Mean	Standard deviation
1	Creating a conducive environment to facilitate supervisory activities in the school.	286	2.48	1.427
2	Coordinating regular programs with the school community to evaluate the teaching-learning process and outcomes.	286	2.35	1.047
3	Providing sufficient professional assistance for teachers.	286	2.29	1.402

Key: Scale range of mean score, 0–2.49=Lower performance, 2.50–3.49=Moderate performance, 3.50–5.00=Higher performance

Table 4: Five-year inspection report on input inspection results for meeting input standard

No.	School	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total school	Average
1.	Koter gedera	14.5	-	15	14	15	58.5	14.65
2.	Agena	12.5	-	13	13.5	14	53	13.25
3.	Yewahny	11.7	-	13	14	13.5	63.2	15.80
4.	Aklile	13.2	-	15.2	15.5	17	60.9	15.22
5.	Teklehymanot	13.5	-	14	14	15	56.5	14.13
6.	Dakuna	13.3	-	14	14.3	15	56.6	14.15
7.	Gurda	12.6	-	14.1	13.6	15.6	58.3	14.56
8.	Gunchera	13.4	-	13.1	14.1	14.2	55.2	14.68
9.	Gazanch	12.3	-	13.2	14.2	16	62	14.52
10.	Holle	12.4	-	14	13.4	15.2	56.8	15.61
	Total average	13.11	-	14.03	14.21	14.9	58.11	14.53

Table 5: Meeting process standard one-way ANOVA

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	2626.285	5	525.257	11.235	0.000
Within groups	8415.677	180	46.754		
Total	11041.962	185			

p < 0.05

Table 6: Meeting Teacher's and principal's responses toward With regard to outcome in schools

No	Items	Koter gedera	Agena	Yewahny	Aklile	Teklehymanot	Dakuna	Gurda	Gunchera	Gazanch	Holle	Total			
												N	M	SD	
1	The school has successfully met the national educational access, internal efficiency and educational sector development programs goals.														
	M	3.32	2.68	2.13	3.10	2.03	2.58	2.65	3.34	3.41	2.42	286	2.64	1.14	
	SD	1.04	1.27	1.08	1.01	0.98	0.88	0.97	1.03	1.23	0.95				
2	The student class room, regional, and national examination results have improved in relation to regional and national expectation of the performance of their age groups														
	M	3.16	2.65	2.16	3.10	2.29	2.48	2.54	3.23	2.32	3.32	286	2.64	1.14	
	SD	1.19	1.25	1.18	1.01	0.93	0.92	0.89	1.23	1.23	1.24				
3	Student demonstrate responsible behavior, ethical values, cultural understanding, and protection of their environment														
	M	3.32	2.65	2.23	3.16	2.29	2.48	2.69	2.46	2.32	1.68	286	2.45	1.32	
	SD	1.07	1.27	1.14	1.03	1.03	0.96	1.25	1.08	1.06	1.23				
4	There is good communication and interaction among the schools teachers, leaders, and support staff, there is also a sense of accountability and fighting rent-seeking														
	M	3.26	2.68	2.19	3.19	2.52	2.23	3.24	2.35	2.64	3.21	286	2.72	1.19	
	SD	1.09	1.27	1.19	1.04	1.23	2.48	1.24	1.37	1.26	1.32				
5	The school has secured support due the strong relation, it has created with parents, local community, and partner organization														
	M	3.23	2.68	2.16	3.10	2.26	2.48	2.72	3.24	2.72	3.12	286	2.65	1.14	
	SD	1.14	1.27	1.15	1.01	0.93	0.96	1.21	0.95	1.02	1.22				
	Total averages														
	M	3.24	2.668	2.17	3.13	2.28	2.50	2.52	3.22	2.68	2.32	286	2.66	1.15	
	SD	1.10	1.266	1.148	1.02	1.02	0.93	1.95	1.56	1.65	1.23				

lack of in-service training for themselves in turn to assist others were among the hindrances made the Zonal experts incapable to train school-based supervisors and provide adequate assistance for secondary schools.

The overall X=3.58 of item 4 above shows the agreement of the total respondents with the point. Based on the overall score school-based supervisors were overloaded with various tasks. The significance level (p=0.38) is >0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors.

Concerning the willingness of teachers toward the activities of supervision, on item 5, the overall X=4.06 shows the agreement of the total respondents with the point. Based on the overall score value, supervisors and teachers were on the supervisory activities. The significance level (p=0.58) is >0.05, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors.

The overall X=4.03 of item 6 above shows the agreement of the total respondents with the point. Based on the overall score value, teachers perceived school-based supervisors as fault finders. The significance

level ($p=0.26$) is >0.05 , this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors.

Thus, from the above analysis, it could be concluded that the negative perception of teachers towards school-based supervision adversely affects the practice of supervision in secondary schools of Guraghe Zone.

The overall $X=3.84$ of item 7 shows the agreement of the total respondents with the point. Therefore, based on the overall score value, the school had no sufficient supervisors to assist teachers properly. The significance level ($p=0.26$) is >0.05 , this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors.

The overall $X=3.70$ of item 8 shows the agreement of the total respondents with the point. Therefore, based on the overall X score value, there was a lack of supervision manuals in their schools. The significance level ($p=0.85$) is >0.05 , this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors.

The overall $X=3.61$ of item 9 shows the agreement of the total respondents with the idea. Therefore, based on the overall X score value, a sufficient budget has not been allocated for supervisory activities in the school. The significance level ($p=0.89$) is >0.05 , this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors.

From the result findings, it is possible to say that resources such as lack of supervision manuals and lack of adequate allocated budget adversely influence the proper implementation of school-based supervision in secondary schools of the study area.

The overall $X=3.57$ of item 10 shows the agreement of the total respondents with the idea. Therefore, based on the overall X score value, supervisors and teachers agreed that there was a lack of follow-up teacher activities by the supervisors in their school. The significance level ($p=0.64$) is >0.05 , this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of teachers and supervisors.

School performance

The degree to which schools are functioning; as determined by checking whether schools are meeting the input, process, and output standards. Teacher's views and inspection reports are combined to get the full picture.

Teachers' view of meeting input standards

All schools are required to have sufficient class rooms, school facilities that meet the minimum standards, have qualified teachers and principals, have a clear mission vision plans, and create a conducive and safe learning environment. Teachers were asked to rate their views.

The overall average for meeting the input standards for all ten schools was found to be average ($M=2.66$, $SD=1.8$) so that the schools were not meted the standard performance with this aspect.

Whether the 10 sampled schools differ statistically in terms of meeting the input standards, the null hypothesis was stated and tested at a 95% of confidence interval. The null hypothesis stated: There is a statistical significance difference between schools in meeting the input standards. Alternative hypothesis claims the existence of difference.

To check whether a statistical significance difference exists in meeting input standards in 10 sample schools, one-way ANOVA with *post hoc* was computed.

The result of one-way ANOVA showed the existence of difference ($F(1, 185)=3.477$; $p=0.005$).

It can be understood that meeting the input standards differ.

As shown in Table 4, 5-year average inspection report for the ten sampled schools was 14.53 present out of 25%, indicating that the school performance in terms of meeting the input standards is average.

In general, regarding process, the average for meeting process standards was found to be almost at the average level ($M=2.25$; $SD=1.16$).

Whether the ten sampled schools differ statistically in terms of meeting the input standard, the null hypothesis was stated and tested at a 95% confidence interval. The null hypothesis stated that: there is a statistical significance difference between schools in meeting input standards.

One-way ANOVA with *post hoc* was conducted. Computing one-way ANOVA was appropriate as the group means to be compared are more than two (actually, they are six) (Gay and Airasian, 2009). Alternative hypothesis claims the existence of difference.

The result of one-way ANOVA showed the existence of difference ($F(1, 185)=11.24$; $p=0.000$). It can be understood that meeting process standards differ.

This items that assess teaching - learning and administrative processes were considered in evaluating the performance of schools. Teachers rated statements regarding them. As shown in Table 5, the assessment process was found to be higher than others ($M=2.70$, $SD=2.44$), indicating that the school-improving performance was found to follow it ($M=2.61$, $SD=0.99$) in the teaching process. The leadership of the school and teachers use appropriate and modern teaching methods that help were found to be the lowest ($M=2.55$, $SD=1.03$). In general, then regarding process, the average for meeting process standards was found to be almost at the average level ($M=2.57$; $SD=1.01$).

Whether the 10 sampled schools differ statistically, interims of meeting the input standard the null hypothesis was stated and tested at a 95% confidence interval. The null hypothesis stated: There is a statistical significance difference between schools in meeting input standards.

The null hypothesis tested was that there is a statistically significant difference between the ten schools. One-way ANOVA with *post hoc* was conducted. Computing one-way ANOVA was appropriate as the group means to be compared are more than two (actually, they are six) (Gay and Airasian, 2009).

Alternative hypothesis claims the existence of difference.

The result of one-way ANOVA showed the existence of difference ($F(1, 185)=6.38$; $p=0.000$). It can be understood that meeting process standards differ.

Focuses on learning and teaching and the school's engagement with parents and the community.

Meeting process standard is marked out of 35% present. The 4-year school performance with respect meeting process standard was found to have been within the range between 17.62 for Gunchera and 27.38 for Yewahny.

The total average for all ten schools was found to be 19.84 out of 25% showing that it is at the average level.

The result of one-way ANOVA showed the existence of difference ($F(1, 185)=11.24$; $p=0.000$). Yewahny showed better performance with respect to meeting the process standards.

As shown in Table 6, there is good communication and interaction among the schools teachers, leaders, and support staff there is also a sense of accountability and fighting rent-seeking in the study area showing more integrity than others measures ($M=2.72$; $SD=1.19$); followed by student class room, regional and national examination results have improved in relation to regional and national expectation of the performance of their age groups and school has secured support

due the moderate relation it has created with parents, local community and partner organization ($M=2.65$; $SD=1.14$).

In general, the study area is regarding outcome in school level moderate ($M=2.66$; $SD=1.15$). Whether the ten secondary schools showed differences in their outcome in schools; the null hypothesis was stated and tested. The null hypothesis tested was that there was a statically significant difference between the ten secondary schools in outcome.

The result showed that there was a statically significance difference ($F(1, 185)=6.38$, $P=0.000$). It can be understood that teacher's and principal's responses toward the with regard to outcome in schools. All school principals were differing.

Meeting outcome standards evaluated out of 40% present. The average inspection report for outcome ranged from 22 present for Holle to 30.80, for Dakuna. The result for meeting the outcome standards for all ten sampled schools was found to be 27.196 out of 40% average.

The result showed that there was a statically significance difference ($F(1, 185)=6.38$, $P=0.000$). It can be understood that teacher's and principal's responses toward the With regard to outcome in schools. All school principals were differing.

The overall average performance of ten schools out of 100 ranged between 56.25 and 68.35 with an average of 62.42, and this shows that the performance level of the school what is called Level 2 indicates the schools are improving, but are not meeting standards.

Relationship between school-based supervision and school performance

To check whether relationship exists; (and to what agree) between schools based supervision and school performance, a null hypothesis was stated and tested. The null hypothesis stated was that there is no relationship between these two variables.

Pearson product momentum correlation coefficient was computed and the result showed the existence of weak positive correlation. The third objective of this study was to describe the relation existing between school-based supervision and schools' performance in the study area.

Accordingly, it is significant at ($\gamma=0.072$, $p=0.33$, $N=286$), meaning that there is no significant difference in the level of school-based supervision and school performance. It can be said that there is a weak relationship between schools-based supervision and school performance.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

- The main purpose of supervision is professional and curriculum development for creating a better learning condition for students. This requires the positive attitude of teachers toward school-based supervision. Unless teachers perceive supervision as a process of promoting professional growth and student learning, the supervisory exercise will not have the desired effect. However, the findings show that teachers were not well oriented to the potential benefits supervision could bring to themselves or to the teaching and learning process where they lacked awareness of the activities of school-based supervision. From this, it can be concluded that teachers in secondary schools of Guraghe Zone have limited understanding about the significance and purpose of school-based supervision.
- The supervisors employed various supervisory options by selecting and coordinating these tools, focusing on the individual teacher's needs and problems and the issues of teaching learning that can enhance teachers' professional development and improve their instructional efficiency. However, as shown in the above finding,

implementing various supervisory options in the sample schools was not as such effective in their application that properly suited to each teacher's interest and level of development. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that teachers were not motivated to work through the implementation of various supervisory options. Thus, the contribution of supervisory options for teachers' professional development and the improvement of instruction were insignificant.

- The findings of this study showed that the school-based supervisors were not following the procedures of classroom observation appropriately. Particularly, the supervisors did not make an agreement with the supervised teachers on the purpose of observation, on the data to be collected, and the time of observation. There was no post-conference while conducting the classroom observation. The supervisors also did not stay in the class during the entire class period for observation. As a result, teachers were less supported by school-based supervisors for the effectiveness of classroom performance.
- The findings of this study revealed that the school supervisors were ineffective in providing professional assistance for teachers through organizing workshops, and training programs at the school level; conducting regular meetings with teachers to identify teaching-learning problems and then to find solutions to these deficiencies
- Moreover, the results of the study discovered that school-based supervision was negatively affected by many problems; such as: The incapability of school-based supervisors; the absence of in-service training programs to update supervisors; non-availability of a supervision manuals at school; an insufficient allocation budget to carry out supervisory activities; the unavailability of experienced supervisors in schools and the heavy workload of school-based supervisors. As a result, school-based supervision was less supportive for an effective teaching and learning process.
- Finally, the study shows that there is a weak relationship between school-based supervision and school performance. Hence, there are areas that have high influence on the school performance than that of school-based supervision that needs high attention to be focus up on in school activity.

REFERENCES

- Abebe, T. (2014). *The Practices and Challenges of School-Based Supervision in Government Secondary Schools of Kamashi Zone of Benishangul Gumuz Regional State*. Unpublished Masters of Arts' Thesis, Jimma University at Jimma.
- Benjamin, K. (2003). *Instructional Supervision: Perceptions of Canadian and Ukraine Beginning High School Teachers*. Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis, Saskatchewan University at Saskatoon.
- Furi G. (2016). *Practices of Principals in Enhancing Participatory Decision-Making in Secondary Schools of West Arsi Zone, Oromia Regional State*. MA Thesis (p. 39).
- Gay, L. R., and Airasian, P. (2009). *Education Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application* (6th ed). New Jersey, USA: Merrill.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., and Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2004). *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach*. USA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Gurnam, K. S., and Chan, Y. F. (2010). Formative supervision of teaching and learning: Issues and concerns for the school head. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 39(4), 589-605.
- Hoque, K. E., Kenayathulla H. B., Vili, S. M., Islam R. (2020). Relationships between supervision and teachers' performance and attitude in secondary schools in Malaysia. *Sage Open*, 10(2), 215824402092550.
- Jones, J. (1993). *Appraisal and Staff Development in Schools*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- MoE. (1994). *Educational Supervision Manual*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- Rashid, A. (2001). *Supervision Practices as Perceived by Teachers and Supervisors in Riyadh Schools*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Ohio University. Retrieved September 15, 2006, from <https://www.faculty.ksu.edu.sa/dr.rashid/documents/my20%disertation.doc>
- Sergiovanni, T. J., and Starratt, R. J. (2002). *Supervision* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.