

Attitude of Teachers Towards School-Based Instructional Supervision at Secondary Schools of Wolaita Zone

Aleta Kurka¹ Endale Berhanu²
1. Wolaita Sodo
2. Wolaita Sodo University

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitude of teachers towards school-based instructional supervision in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone. To conduct the study, a descriptive survey research design was employed and concurrent type of mixed research method was used to enrich data. The study was carried out in 9 selected secondary schools of Wolaita Zone using simple random sampling technique. 200 randomly selected teachers and 30 principals (9 main and 21 vice) were filled questionnaires. From 200 teachers, 18 (9%) were not properly filled the questionnaire. All the available 4 woreda quality assurance heads and 9 supervisors were also included for the interview. Questionnaire was the main data gathering instrument for this study. Quantitative data collected through questionnaire was analyzed by using mean scores, standard deviation, frequency, percentage and independent sample t-test and SPSS version 20 was used for the analysis. Interview and document analysis were also used to substantiate the data gathered through questionnaires. Findings of the study revealed that, teachers had negative attitude towards school-based instructional supervision and they were not satisfied with the function of school-based instructional supervision and the way they behave to realize the function of school-based instructional supervision is different. The finding of the study also revealed that, teachers believe that their supervisors were incompetent to carryout effective school-based instructional supervision and they feel dissatisfied with the approaches of school-based instructional supervision used in their schools. The finding of the study confirmed that, the major factors that negatively affect teachers attitudes towards school-based instructional supervision were: inappropriate approaches of supervisors; lack of basic skills and knowledge in supervisors to carry out effective school-based instructional supervision; lack of awareness of teachers to the importance and usefulness of school based supervision; low trust between teachers and supervisors; lack of pre and post observation conference and inadequate feedback from supervisors; influence on age and gender; poor communication among teachers, principals and supervisors; lack of motivation and commitment in experienced teachers to work collaboratively with conduct of school based supervision. The findings of the study indicated that teachers have negative attitude towards school-based instructional supervision. To solve this, school-based instructional supervisors should encourage teachers and principals to participate actively in school-based instructional supervision by: motivating them to work in groups to solve instructional problems; initiating them to engage in professional activities like mentoring and coaching; assisting them in the evaluation and production of instructional and curricular material and conducting action research to solve instructional problems. In order to mitigate the above problems, the Woreda Officials and school supervisors must have strong relationship and use appropriate approach in the process of instructional supervision to identify the gaps of teachers, principals and supervisors that affect all activities of the schools and how to solve and minimize those gaps.

Keywords : Attitude; teacher; School; instruction and supervision

DOI: 10.7176/RHSS/9-15-05

Publication date: August 31st 2019

1. Background of the Study

School-based instructional supervision is one of the functions of education that offers opportunities for schools to be effective and for increasing the professional development of teachers as a means of effectively managing the teaching-learning process (Ari & Sipal, 2009). School-based instructional supervision is an interactive process that depends on the source of supervision, the supervisor, and the teacher (Zepeda, 2007).

The concept of school-based instructional supervision differs from school inspection in the sense that the former focuses on guidance, support, and continuous assessment provided to teachers for their professional development and improvement in the teaching-learning process, whereas the latter gives emphasis on controlling and evaluating the improvement of schools based on stated standards set by external agents outside the school system (Tyagi, 2010). School-based instructional 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 & Starratt, 2007). Various authors stated that school-based instructional supervision has clear connection with professional development (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007; Zepeda, 2007).

School-based instructional supervision has existed in all countries for many decades and occupies a pivotal position in the management of education, which can be understood as an expert technical service most importantly concerned with scientific study and improvement of the conditions that surrounds learning and pupil

growth (Atiklt, 2008). According to Vashist (2004), supervision is leadership and development of leadership within groups, which cooperatively assess educational product in light of accepted educational objectives, studying the teaching-learning situation to determine the antecedents of satisfactory and unsatisfactory pupil growth and achievement, and improving the teaching learning process (Ayse, 2002).

Attitudes are function of what we think and what we feel. That is, attitudes are the product of related belief and values. In discussing attitude, it is externally important to remember that from the point of view of attitude measurement. It is not easy to measure attitude. It cannot be observed directly. Attitude of teachers is very essential for the effect of supervision to develop the quality of education. Effective school-based instructional supervision can improve the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom (Gregory, 2011). Modern school-based instructional supervision is positive democratic action aimed of the improvement of instruction through continual growth of all concerned. The function of school-based instructional supervision is the improvement of instruction (Glanz, 2005) and improvement of teaching (Zepeda, 2007).

Therefore attitude determine performance of the concerned bodies. The way teachers view the school-based instructional supervision is one of the functions of education that offers opportunities for schools to be effective and for increasing the professional development of teachers as a means of effectively managing the teaching-learning process (Adeolu, 2012). It is an interactive process that depends on the source of supervision, the supervisor, and the teacher. The way teachers view school-based instructional supervision, their acceptance of and interaction with the supervisory practice as well as their attitude towards the classroom supervision not only provide the catalyst for any supervisory success but also will determine the outcomes of the supervision process (Ajzen, 2001). Understanding the teachers' opinions and expectations about the school-based instructional supervision is crucial to ensure successful supervision.

Currently in Ethiopia principals, vice-principals, department heads and senior teachers, take the major responsibility of supervisory practices with in their schools. Through regular observation of teachers, organizing workshops and meetings so as to enhance the professional competence of teachers and improve the quality of education in their school. However, the success of school-based instructional supervision depends on how the teachers view the practices of school-based supervision and on the level of participation for the realization of the aim of supervision. In this line Kerio (2004) states that unless teachers perceive school-based instructional supervision as a process of promoting professional growth and student learning, the supervision exercise will not have a desired effect. Despite the implementation of school-based instructional supervision, very little is known about how school-based instructional supervision is perceived and accepted by teachers (Kapfunde, 1990).

In light of this background information, the researcher was interested in conducting this research investigate the attitudes that teachers have on school-based instructional supervision, the contribution of these attitude on school-based instructional supervision, quality of supervisory practices and identify the factors associated with attitudes of teachers towards school-based instructional supervision. The purpose of this study was therefore, to examine the attitude of secondary school teachers, which comprises their beliefs and feelings towards school-based instructional supervision and the factors associated with attitude of teachers towards school-based instructional supervision in selected secondary school of Wolaita Zone (WZED, 2016/2017).

2. Statement of the Problem

The critical issue for education sector in Ethiopia is to improve the quality of education. Thus, the main objective of school-based instructional supervision is to improve instruction by helping school principals, teachers and different stakeholders through promoting, understanding the cooperation between the school and the community at large (Keiro, 2004). Hence the main role of any school supervision system is to monitor the quality of education. As such supervision forms the quality monitoring and improvement system which include examination, achievement test and self-acceptance practices in school (Zepeda, 2007).

School-based instructional supervision aims at improving the overall teaching-learning process through promoting teachers' professional development and growth (Sullivan & Glanz, 2009). But teachers may perceive classroom supervision differently. They regarded traditional supervisors as inspectors, who visit a classroom on a fault-finding mission, hence, it was noted that less experienced teachers have more negative attitudes toward the practice of supervision than more experienced teachers (Zepeda & Ponticell, 1998). In contrast, some teachers appreciate the merit of the modern supervisory program if the supervisors are democratic and fair. Teachers' perspective of the overall process of supervision emphasizes cooperative work amongst peers, constructive dialogue, mutual trust and shared expertise between the supervisor and the teacher (Patrick & Leonard, 2012; Zepeda, 2007). In spite of radical change, the traditional views of supervision still dominate the scene (Pawlas & Olive, 2008).

There are a number of studies on instructional supervision carried out in Addis Ababa and other regions of Ethiopia by Haile (2006), Philipos (2001), Chanyalew (2005), Getachew (2001), Atiklt (2008), and Million (2008) with the focus of supervisors' techniques, supervisory procedure, supervisory leadership style and skill, major functions of supervision, and an assessment on the status of school based instructional supervision. These

studies found that the Ethiopian supervisory system exposed with multiple problems. Among these, the most important are: irrelevant of training programs to the teacher's development need, absence of adequate opportunities that help to improve teaching and learning process, improperly designed support system and lack of systematic follow up.

School-based instructional supervision is a supervision that takes place at the school level to solve problems that teachers encountered during instruction and fulfill the need of the learners to improve quality of education (Millon 2010). School-based instructional supervision emphasizes the continuous assessments, guidance and support to teachers for their professional development and improvement in the teaching learning process. Following pre-service and induction professional training, each Ethiopian teachers and instructor has a professional, personal and civic responsibility to undertake continuous professional development through his or her career.

School-based instructional supervision is designed to meet this professional development need in order to maintain effective education and provide sufficient resource for teacher (MoE, 2009).

In Ethiopia school-based instructional supervision within the school currently is delivered by the school principals, vice principals, department head and senior teachers. These school-based instructional supervisors expected to lead curriculum improvement practices, assist teachers in the production of instructional and curricular material, increase attitudes and commitment to the profession and help teachers improve their teaching methods.

Supporting this Million (2010) indicated that, supervisors have to work effectively for effective implementation of the school-based instructional supervision. Further Million noted that, school-based instructional supervisors need to know how supervision at school level best be implemented, by whom it will be carried out, its purpose and effect on teaching learning process.

Obanor (2009), indicated that some senior teachers resistance to change and negligence about the school-based instructional supervision service by showing to remain minimally competent in the system, beginning teachers fear of criticism and comment on classroom observation of their teaching practice and unwillingness to ask for help because of fear that a request for assistance will call in to question to their professional competence; and some teachers commitment to go through the usual method of instruction that is teacher centered to make their work load easy are some of negative attitude hold by teachers towards school-based instructional supervision service.

If teachers who are the direct beneficiaries of school-based instructional supervision have a negative attitude towards the practice, the whole process was not yield the desired result.

The researcher in the course of this duty has observed that, many teachers view supervision in contempt feeling, sometimes rightly and sometimes wrongly. Some view that they are more capable that supervision has nothing of vague to offer them (MoE, 2009).

The others simply ignore supervisors, choose not to ask for their help and avoid opportunity to work with them. Many of them do not conduct action research to solve instructional problems; do not revise curricular materials and prepare supplementary teaching materials; they are not seek to participate in professional development activities like induction courses, mentoring and CPD programs. This behavior of teachers, that they do not make effective use of supervisory support arose the researcher's curiosity to conduct research on teacher's attitudes towards school-based instructional supervision to affect their behavior in terms of using supervisory support available to them. The researcher also investigates the attitude of teachers' over supervisors. The researcher did not identify the contribution of supervision on attitude, the attitude of teachers in secondary schools, and not give recommendation about the teaching learning process (WZED, 2017).

The mechanism exists to this end is supervision. It is, therefore improve that teacher should be evaluated correctly, effectively and fairly in order to determine the areas where they need for their development and the improvement of their skills.

According to UNESCO (2007), more than 80% of principals and teachers believe that supervision has positive impacts. However, when the researcher consider, the attitude of most secondary school staff members are different towards school-based instructional supervision. In Wolaita Zone most of the teachers have negative attitude towards school-based instructional supervision activities (WZED, 2016). When the researcher observes the attitude of teachers, most of the respondents were negative. If the teaching learning process became not attractive then the interest of students decrease time to time and it affect the achievement of students. This problem was widely faced in the zone. Therefore, the researcher was initiated to investigate and to give necessary recommendation based on findings regarding the attitude of teachers towards school-based instructional supervision in the selected secondary school of Wolaita Zone.

In addition to the researcher long years work experience which has helped for this observation, teachers were not satisfied with the supervisory services given in the selected secondary schools and school achievement do not show significant change. Hence, this initiates the researcher to select this as the research topic. The researcher has been teaching for fifteen years in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone. Due to this reason, the

researcher feel that, there was a gap which needs in depth investigation about the status of the school-based instructional supervisory practices such as proper implementation of supervisory options and classroom observation, the proper implementation of school-based supervisors' responsibilities in line with the issues mentioned in the supervision manual of Ministry of Education in secondary schools of the study area and to suggest the ways of improvements in the process of implementation of school-base instructional supervision.

In order to achieve the objective of the research, the study answered the following basic questions.

1. What are the current attitudes of teachers and principals towards school-based instructional supervision in the secondary schools of Wolaita Zone?
2. What are the factors that affect the attitude of teachers towards school-based instructional supervision?
3. To what extent do the attitudes held by the teachers determine the quality of supervisory practices in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone?

3. Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were presented as general and specific objectives.

3.1. General Objective

The main objective of this research is to investigate the attitude of teachers towards school- based instructional supervision in the context of Wolaita Zone.

3.2 Specific Objectives

The specific research objectives were formulated as follows

1. To identify the current attitude of teachers and principals towards school-based supervision in secondary school of Wolaita Zone.
2. To assess the factors that affect attitude of teachers and principals towards school-based instructional supervision in secondary school of Wolaita Zone.
3. To assess the extent of the attitudes held by the teachers and principals determine the quality of supervisory practices in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone.

4. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter focuses on the methodology used to conduct the study. It discusses the research design, population of the study, source of data, data collection instruments, procedure of data collection, sampling design and sample size, method of data analysis and ethical issue.

4.1. Research Design and Method

The design of this investigation was descriptive survey research design, and it explored the attitude of teachers towards school-based instructional supervision. Because descriptive survey research design was used to describe the current situation of secondary school teachers' attitudes towards school-based instructional supervision. Moreover, teachers behavior of secondary school in their performance, compare its existing condition with the reviewed research finding of the past and to draw general conclusion of the study (Zena, 2012).

The study employed quantitative and qualitative research method. The researcher used mixed research type concurrently. Quantitative research use for summarizing large amount of data and reaching generalization based on statistical estimation whereas qualitative research used to take the story from the participant viewpoints providing the rich, descriptive data that sets quantitative results in to their human context (Trochim, 2005). These methods used because the strength of both quantitative and qualitative research can provide the best understanding.

4.2. Sources of Data

This particular study employed primary and secondary sources of data. The primary source of data for this study was collected from selected secondary school teachers, supervisors, woreda education office quality assurance heads and principals and the secondary data source was collected from document analysis of each secondary school, like school rules and regulations, feedback of principals and supervisors, portfolio. The primary data was generated through questionnaires (closed and open-ended) and interviews.

Secondary data generated through document analysis by preparing checklist. These sources are believed to have adequate information and knowledge about the attitude of teachers towards school-based instructional supervision because they are optimized to run the education system and are responsible to create smooth supervision relation to promote student achievement.

4.3. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

The target population of the study was 58 secondary schools, 399 teachers, 30 principals, 9 supervisors and 9

Woreda Education Office quality assurance heads. In this study, the researcher believes that they are the right source of information on the attitude of teachers towards school-based instructional supervision in Wolaita Zone.

In this Zone, there are 58 secondary schools. For this study, from 12 Woredas and 3 city/town administration, six woredas and 3 city/town administration were selected, namely Sodo town administration Damot Pullassa woreda, Boditi town administration, Damot Gale woreda, Areka town administration, Sodo Zuria Woreda, Damot Sore woreda, Humbo woreda and Kindo Koyssha woreda were selected by using simple random sampling techniques which is the best way to get representative samples and to have every subject equal chance to be selected. In the selected Woredas there are 12 secondary schools out of which 9 schools were selected randomly for this study. To determine the sample size of teachers from the total population (399), the researcher selected 200 teachers as representative for this study by using Cochran and Taro Yemane (1996) formula. The researcher believes that these are representative sample, manageable and sufficient to the study. Therefore, the sample size for this study was 200 teachers.

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

n = Sample size

N = total population of sampled education offices.

e = 0.05

Table 1: Summary of Woredas and their Respective Sampled Secondary schools

No.	Name of woreda	Name of school
1	Damot Pullasa	Shanto
2	Damot Galle	Gacheno
3	Damot Sore	Gununo
4	Sodo Zuria	Shola kodo
5	Humbo	Tabala
6	Kindo Koyssha	Bale
7	Boditi City Administration	Boditi
8	Areka City Administration	Areka
9	Sodo City Administration	BogaleWalelu

Table 2: Summary of Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

No.	Types of respondents	Target population	sample	Sample in percent (%)	Sampling techniques	Data gathering tools
1	Supervisors	9	4	44.4	Purposive	Interview
2	Principal	9	9	100	Availability	Questionnaire
3	Vice principal	21	21	100	Availability	Questionnaire
4	Woreda education quality assurance heads	9	4		Purposive	Interview
5	Teachers	399	200	50.12	Simple random	Questionnaire

The researcher believes that these are representative sample, manageable and sufficient to the study. Therefore, the sample size for this study was 9 secondary schools, 200 teachers, 30 principals, 4 supervisors and 4 woreda education quality assurance heads.

4.4. Data Collection Instruments

This study was mainly employed questionnaires, interview and document analysis.

4.4.1 Questionnaire

Questionnaire was used as a main source of data gathering instruments in this study, because questionnaire offer greater anonymity of respondents and appropriate for collecting factual information (Kothari, 2004:30). In addition, it helps the respondents to choose one option from the given scales that best aligns with their views. In this study questionnaires administered for teachers and principals. The questionnaire is prepared in English language, because all of the sample teachers and principals can have the necessary skills to read and understand the concepts that are in the questionnaire.

4.4.2 Interview

Interviews were used as a source of data gathering tools. Interviews were useful for collecting in-depth information allows opportunity for explanation of questions and can be applied to any type of population (Kumar, 2005). Data from interviews can be supplemented with other responses (Kothari, 2004:24). Interview is important to find out what is in someone else's mind (Best & Khan, 2005). Kothari (2004) also stated that interview is useful instrument to generate often important and crucial information. Semi-structured interview was prepared on issues related to the attitude of teachers towards school-based instructional supervision. The

interview questions are prepared in English. The interview is dealt with woreda education quality assurance heads and supervisors.

4.4.3. Document Analysis

The documents that were analyzed for this study are to check whether instructional supervisors have classroom observation plan, written feedback, whether the school have a teacher development plan and the common problems observed on teachers' feedback checklist. The documents are analyzed in order to get more information on the content of feedback, supervision checklist, plans of classroom visit and if any possible recommendation given to the teachers to improve the area need to improve.

4.5. Procedure of Data Collection

Both the questionnaire and interview were prepared based on the basic questions and review of related literature. Before administering the questionnaire to respondents, a pilot test was conducted at Anchucho secondary schools with twenty-two teachers and one supervisor. This school was excluded from being involved in the final data gathering. From the experience gained in the pilot test, improvement was effected and modifications were made depending on the comments collected during the tryout. At last, the questionnaire is set in its final form. Consequently, the questionnaires are administered to respondents after a brief orientation about the purposes of the study is given to them. To maximize the quality of the responses and the rate of return, respondents take the questionnaires to their home and fill it and finally, the completed questionnaires are collected from the respondents with the help of assistant data collectors.

On the other hand, the interview schedule is conducted in English as the researcher assumed that the interviewees could understand the language clearly. For eliciting the desired information, the researcher discusses with the interviewees to arrange a suitable time and place so that they might be at ease during the interview period. Supporting this idea, scholars in the field such as Kothari (2004) stated that knowing some of the daily routines of the interviewees is essential so that convenient time and place was created. Besides, the purpose of the interview was explained and all possible efforts were made to establish proper rapport with the interviewees because people were motivated to communicate when the atmosphere is favorable. Finally, document analysis was carried out.

4.6. Pilot Testing

Validity refers the extent to which the research instrument measures what it is supposed to measure (Creswell, 2012). On the other hand, the reliability of the research instrument is the extent to which the instrument yields the same results on repeated measures (Kothari, 2004). This study incorporated the content and face validity. To ensure validity of instruments, initially the instrument was prepared by the researcher and then senior colleagues' secondary school English teachers and instructor of Wolaita Sodo University was personally consulted to provide their remark. The participants of the pilot test was also taken as firsthand informed about how to evaluate and give feedback on the relevance of the contents, item length, and clarity of items and layout of the questionnaire. Based on the reflections, the instruments were improved before they were administered to the main participants of the study so that irrelevant items were removed, lengthy items were shortened and many unclear items were made clear at the end developed and approved under close guidance of the advisor.

To this end, the reliability of the instrument was maintained through conducting a pilot test on schools before it was used for the actual data collection purpose. *Regarding the reliability, on the other hand, the researcher pilot tested the instrument and applied Cronbach's Alpha coefficient to ascertain the internal consistency of the questionnaire.* The questionnaires were distributed to twenty-two teachers and one supervisor who is later excluded from the actual data collection purpose. *The purpose of the pilot study was to test the appropriateness of the instruments to be used to conduct the study, to find out whether additions or modifications are important on the basis of the pre-test experience and also to find out whether the items in the questionnaires are clear enough to enable the respondents to complete them accurately.*

Finally, the responses of the participants were entered into SPSS software and Cronbach's Alpha was calculated for each of the category scales regarding supervision. This process yielded internal reliability alpha coefficients that ranged from .704 to .871, as such, the research instrument was found reliable to be used to gather data.

4.7. Data Analysis Techniques

On the basis and types of data were gathered and the instrument used techniques of data analysis was employed. To get the collected data ready for analysis, the questionnaires were checked for completion, and then was classified and tallied by the researcher himself. First, to determine the personal characteristics the respondents of teachers' and supervisors' frequency and percentage were used. And then to measure the attitude of teachers towards school-based instructional supervision, information collected through close-ended questionnaires are analyzed around the subtopic related to the research questions by using mean, weighted mean and standard deviation. Also independent sample t-test was used to check whether there is a significant difference in the

distribution of preferences between groups of respondents in terms of a given items of school-based instructional supervision.

All the data were computed with the help of computer using SPSS version 20. Then based on the five point Likert type rating scales from very high to very low or strongly agree to strongly disagree, the mean and weighted mean values less than 1.49 as very low, 1.50-2.49 as low, 2.50-3.49 as moderate, 3.50-4.49 as high and more than 4.50 as very high in implementation of the items were used for the sake of analysis and interpretation. For the case of analysis very high and high indicate effective implementation of each item, and moderate presents neither positive nor negative agreement and similarly very low and low indicate ineffective implementation of items in the schools. Finally, both the data were gained from the questionnaire (open-ended) and semi-structured interview was compared with the data obtained from document analysis was analyzed and reported through narrative description.

4.8. Ethical Considerations

Since academic writing does not occur in a vacuum, researchers are frequently interacting with a dynamic and demanding socio-political environment that influences their research decisions both formally and informally. To cope with such influences, the researcher followed a number of guidelines in research, which are ethically sound. Initially, the researcher obtained a formal approval to conduct the study from the Wolaita Sodo University.

Similarly, before starting data collection and analysis, approval was sought from the advisor using the standard application format. The researchers also got consent of the respondents and made it known to them that their participation was indeed voluntary. All provisions were made to offer anonymity and confidentiality to all participants in this study. After the completion of the interviews, participants were given opportunity to review their responses and to make any changes to their statements. The integrity of the researchers was safeguarded by protecting the respondents from harm, either emotional or physical and by the manner in which the research questions and report the findings were presented.

5. Discussions and Findings

5.1. Characteristics of Respondents

Two-hundred-thirty questionnaires were distributed to teachers and principals in nine secondary schools of Wolaita Zone, SNNPRS. The return rates of the questionnaires were 91% from teachers and 100% from principals. But 18 (9%) of the questionnaires were not collected from teachers due to the fact that they were not filled the questionnaire properly. In addition, 4 supervisors and 4 woreda education office quality assurance heads were interviewed.

Table 3: Characteristics of the Respondents

No	Characteristics		Respondents							
			Teachers (N=182)		Principals (N=30)		Supervisors (N=4)		Quality Assurance Heads N=4	
			F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Gender	Male	127	69.7	26	86.6	4	100	4	100
		Female	55	30.2	4	13.3	--	--	--	--
		Total	182	100	30	100	4	100	4	100
2	Age	18-25	35	19.2	3	10	--	--	--	--
		26-33	86	47.2	1	3.3	--	--	--	--
		34-41	44	24.1	18	60	3	75	3	75
		above 42	17	9.3	8	26.6	1	25	1	25
		Total	182	100	30	100	4	100	4	100
3	Educational status	1 st degree	117	64.2	24	80	3	75	3	75
		2 nd degree	65	35.7	6	20	1	25	1	25
		Total	182	100	30	100	4	100	4	100
4	Work experience in year	0-5	51	28	8	16.6	--	--	--	--
		6-10	35	19.2	18	60	1	25	1	25
		11-15	49	26.9	2	6.6	1	25	1	25
		16-20	30	16.4	1	3.3	2	50	2	50
		Above 20	17	9.3	1	3.3	-	-	-	-
		Total	182	100	30	100	4	100	4	100

As shown in Table 3 above, 127(69.7%) of teachers were male and 55(30.2%) of teachers were female. This shown, the number of male teachers dominated the number of female teachers. This imply on the research area, the sample of female teachers were limited. Regarding gender of school principals, supervisors and woreda education office quality assurance heads 26(86.6%) and all quality assurance heads and supervisors (100%) were

male while 4(13.3%) were female principals. All selected secondary schools dominantly occupied by male principals. This reveals limited role of women in educational leadership in the study area. Moreover, one can understand that the number of females in the teaching profession was much lower and the participation of females in supervisory position was very low compared to males in secondary schools of Wolaita zone in SNNP Regional State.

Regarding to the age composition of teachers 35(19.2%) were between 18-25 years, 86(47.2) were between 26-33 years, 44(24.1%) were between 34-41 years and 17(9.3%) were 42 and above. This data indicates that majority 35(38%) of teachers were at their young age between 18-25 years. From this data the researcher observed that most of the teachers' age was young. As indicated age of principals, supervisors and quality assurance heads, 3(10%) of principal was between 18-25 years, 1(3.3%) of principal was between 26-33 years, 18(60%) of principals between 34-41 years and 8(26.6%) of principal was between above 42 years while 3(75%) of supervisors and woreda education office quality assurance heads was between 34-41 years and 1(25%) of supervisor and woreda education office quality assurance heads was above 42 years. From this data majority 18(60%) of principals and 3(75%) supervisors and woreda education office quality assurance heads were at their middle age between 34-41 years.

Regarding educational status, most of teachers 117(64.2%) were first degree and 65(35.7%) was second degree holders. This shows that teachers were unqualified for the job specification.

As can be seen in Table 3 of item 3, the academic qualification of principals was first degree 24(80%) and second degree holders 6(20%). The education and training policy requires as a standard of master's degree holders for secondary schools. The qualification of school principals and related professional skill and knowledge was against the intended plan of Ethiopian Ministry of education. It was against what was stipulated in the blue print that claims, "secondary school principals need to have second degree in Educational leadership." Whereas, almost all school principals have first degree in subject area. Here, lack of professionally capable principals was still found to be greatly influencing performances of schools in general and assisting teachers in professional development. Therefore, it is possible to suggest that practices of educational supervision was highly influenced by the miss match between their qualification and educational levels that were rated to be below the standard set by Ethiopian Ministry of Education.

Concerning supervisors and quality assurance heads qualification, 3(75%) supervisors and quality assurance heads were first degree and 1(25%) of supervisors and quality assurance heads was second degree holders. From this data, the majority of supervisors and quality assurance heads 3(75%) were unqualified for the job of secondary school and 1(25%) supervisors and quality assurance heads was qualified for the job specification. According to Ethiopia context, secondary schools teachers, principals and supervisors should have 2nd degree (SNNPREB, 2008).

In terms of the work experience 51(28%) of teachers were found in the service range of 0-5 years, 35(19.2%) of teachers in the service range of 6-10 years; 49(26.9%) of teachers in the service range of 11-15 years; 30(16.4%) of teachers in the service range of 16-20 years and 17(9.3%) of teachers in the service range of above 20 years while 8(16.6%) of principals were found in the service range of 0-5 years, 18(60%) of principals in the service range of 6-10 years; 2(6.6%) of principals in the service range of 11-15 years; 1(3.3%) of principals in the service range of 16-20 years and 1(3.3%) of principals in the service range of above 20 years whereas 1(25%) of supervisors and 1(25%) of quality assurance heads were found between 6-10 service years, 1(75%) of supervisors and 1(25%) and 1(25%) of quality assurance heads were found in the range of 11-15; 2(50%) of supervisors and 2(50%) of quality assurance heads found 16- 20 service year. This information indicate that, majority 51(28%) of teachers were less experienced and work experiences between 0-5 service years. This implies that they need support from their principals, supervisors and experienced teachers to improve their teaching skills and knowledge. As a result they lack competences to provide effective school based supervision.

Table 4: Teachers and Principals Attitude towards School-Based Instructional Supervision

NO	Items	T=182 P=30	Scale			X̄	SD	T-V	Sig.	
			A 5	U 3	D 1					
1	I feel school-based instructional supervision is used to evaluate teachers	T	f	120	28	34	4.04	1.03	9.80	0.98
			%	65.9	15.3	18.6				
		P	f	23	4	3	4.26	1.12		
			%	76.6	13.3	10				
2	I feel happy with school-based instructional supervision in that it meets my professional needs	T	f	46	37	99	2.32	1.21	5.50	0.14
			%	21.7	10.9	67.4				
		P	f	10	4	16	2.05	0.58		
			%	33.3	13.3	53.3				
3	I do action research as an activity of school-based instructional equipment to develop my skill	T	f	38	46	98	2.50	1.41	2.43	0.35
			%	20.8	25.2	53.8				
		P	f	9	8	13	2.14	1.03		
			%	30	26.6	43.3				
4	Supervisors are faultfinder from teachers, So I am hesitated to work with them	T	f	112	16	54	4.70	1.17	5.78	0.06
			%	61.5	8.7	29.6				
		P	f	21	4	5	4.58	0.82		
			%	70	13.3	16.6				
5	My supervisors encourage me to develop my own teaching strategies in classroom	T	f	31	15	136	2.72	1.32	1.96	0.37
			%	17	8.2	74.7				
		P	f	7	4	19	2.17	1.19		
			%	23.3	13.3	63.3				
6	I want to inter supervisor in my classroom to observe my teaching	T	f	59	29	94	2.59	1.41	2.72	0.17
			%	32.4	15.9	51.6				
		P	f	8	6	16	2.35	1.58		
			%	26.6	20	53.3				

As indicated in Table 4 item 1 majority of teachers 65.9% (n=120) responded agree on the item and very few respondents 15.3% (n=28) responded undecided, few respondents 18.6% (n=34) responded disagree on the item. Similarly the principals 76.6% (n=23) responded agree on the item and very few respondents 13.3% (n=4) responded undecided, few respondents 10% (n=3) responded disagree on the item. Accordingly, the teacher and principals with the (Mean=4.04, SD=1.03) and (Mean=4.26, SD=1.12) respectively indicated that the mean value of the respondents lie on the range of agree and teachers and principals believe school-based instructional supervision is used to evaluate teachers. Moreover, the independent sample t-test result (0.98) at 0.05 significance level revealed that there was no statistically significance difference between the responses of the respondent groups and which was greater than 0.05.

This indicated that there was similar understanding both the respondents concerning the importance of school-based instructional supervision to evaluate teachers in the study area. In the open-ended questions for teachers, most of the respondents described that supervisors use school-based instructional supervision as a system to evaluate teachers in their school activity and teachers believed that school-based instructional supervision is used to evaluate teachers. In addition to the open-ended question responses by the respondents, interview of principals and supervisors had confirmed and strengthened the above idea. Furthermore they raise different information about practices of supervisors in their schools. Most quality assurance heads said that, supervisors try to show superiority over the teachers and most of supervisors use supervision for evaluating teachers.

As shown in Table 4 item 2, very few respondents 10.9% (n=37) responded undecided and few respondents 21.7% (n=46) agree and majority of respondents 67.4% (n=99) responded disagree on the item. Similarly the principals 33.3% (n=10) responded agree on the item and very few respondents 13.3% (n=4) responded undecided, few respondents 53.3% (n=16) responded disagree on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=2.05, SD=0.58) and (Mean=2.50, SD=1.41), this means the scale of respondents lie on the range of disagree and teachers and principals have negative feelings to school-based instructional supervision because it did not meet their individual professional needs

The independent sample t-test result (0.14) at 0.05 significance level revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between the responses of the respondent groups and which was greater than 0.05. This means they had similar understanding between them. Furthermore according to the interview of quality assurance heads and supervisors responses conducted with this idea and pointed out the activities of supervisors could be cornerstone to promote teachers negative feelings to school-based instructional supervision. The

school-based instructional supervision practices were not related to the professional needs of teachers and most supervisors did not check the supervision practices which are related with professional needs of teachers or not.

As indicated in Table 4, item 3 few teacher respondents 20.8% (n=38) responded agree, very few respondents 25.2% (n=46) responded undecided and majority of respondents 53.8% (n=98) responded disagree. Similarly the principals 30% (n=9) responded agree on the item and very few respondents 26.6% (n=8) responded undecided, few respondents 43.3% (n=13) responded disagree on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=2.50, SD=1.41) and (Mean=2.14, SD=1.03), this shows the scale of respondents lie on the range of disagree and many teachers and principals did not participate in doing action research in the school to solve instructional problems. The independent sample t-test value is ($t=0.35$); this shows there is no significant difference between respondents that means they have similar understanding on the item. In the open-ended questions, all respondents described that most teachers make action research for school efficiency and only put in the document.

They did not use it for their day-to-day teaching activities and they did not develop skill through practices. The action research is not meet the daily teaching strategy and not influence over the teachers and students academic performance. From these concept teachers did not participate in action research exactly and frequently by their wants. Moreover interview of quality assurance heads and supervisors responses fit with this idea. Most supervisors saw the teachers' action research roughly and they do not gave constructive idea about it. They didn't support and guide how to prepare and practice action research by using different approaches with teachers. Therefore teachers and principals did not participate in school-based instructional supervision conducting effective action research in the school to solve teaching learning problems.

As indicated in Table 4 item 4 majority of respondents 61.5% (n=112) agree. Few respondents 29.6% (n=54) responded disagree and very few respondents 8.7% (n=16) responded undecided. Similarly the principals 70% (n=21) responded agree on the item and very few respondents 13.3% (n=4) responded undecided, few respondents 16.6% (n=5) responded disagree on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=4.7, SD=1.17) and (Mean=4.58, SD=0.82), this indicates the scale of respondents lie on the range of agree and majority of respondents are hesitated to work with their supervisors. Because they believe that supervisors are fault finders. The independent sample t-test value is ($t=0.06$); this shows there is no significant difference between respondents that means they have similar understanding on the item. That means significant number of them agreed that supervisors are fault finders. Interview of quality assurance heads and supervisors had confirmed and strengthened the above idea. Furthermore they raise different information about practices of supervisors in their school such as supervisors try to show superiority over the teachers by finding silly mistakes in classroom teaching and they collect these faults and report them by exaggerating in different meetings.

As indicated in Table 4, item 5 few teachers 17% (n=31) responded agreed, very few respondents 8.2% (n=15) responded undecided and the majority of respondents 74.7% (n=136) responded disagreed. Similarly the principals 23.3% (n=7) responded agree on the item and very few respondents 13.3% (n=4) responded undecided, few respondents 63.3% (n=19) responded disagree on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=2.72, SD=1.32) and (Mean=2.17, SD=1.19), this showed the scale of respondents lie on the range of undecided (almost disagree) and majority of teachers and principals do not feel happy with supervisors in that they did not encourage them to develop their own strategies and solution to improve teaching process. The independent sample t-test value ($t=0.37$), this indicates there is no significant difference between the teachers and principals. That means large number of teachers and principals disagreed on the item.

As indicated in Table 4, item 6 few respondents 32.4% (n=29) responded agreed, very few respondents 15.9% (n=29) responded undecided and majority of respondents 51.6% (n=94) responded disagree. Similarly the principals 26.6% (n=8) responded agree on the item and very few respondents 20% (n=6) responded undecided, few respondents 53.3% (n=16) responded disagree on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=2.59, SD=1.41) and (Mean=2.35, SD=1.58), this shown that the scale of respondents lie on the range of disagree and they dislike enter supervisor in their classroom teaching. The independent sample t-test value ($t=0.17$), this shows that there is no significant difference between the respondents and they have similar understanding and large number of teachers disagreed on the item. In the open-ended questions for teachers, most of the respondents described that, they dislike supervisors enter their classroom because they assume supervisors are fault finders, not give constructive idea and they did not have knowledge more than teachers. Moreover interview of supervisors describe teachers didn't want to enter supervisor in their classroom during the teaching time. They described when supervisors try to enter the class most of the teachers do not happy. From this view some supervisor did not enter the classroom but they write report as they enter the class and support teachers for their office.

Item 1 and 4 in Table 4 indicate that teachers and principals have positive belief on the items that means they feel supervision is used to evaluate teachers and supervisors are fault finders, supervisors are evaluators than supporters and school-based instructional supervision help them to share different experience about

instructional issue.

Item 2 and 6 in Table 4 indicate that, teachers had negative beliefs and feelings towards school-based instructional supervision. In addition, when answering open-ended questions majority of teachers write their belief and feelings to the school-based instructional supervision as follows:

School-based instructional supervision is made only for formality i.e. for the sake of accomplishment of school plan. It simply carried out for the sake of reporting and to tell someone who asks them about the condition of school based supervision. So, in our school it has no value of assisting teachers as well as promoting teaching learning process. Therefore teachers and principals had negative attitude to it.

The researchers believe that school-based instructional supervision is important to support teachers in teaching learning process and also it helps teachers to develop positive attitude towards co-operative works. But most of the time in study area, it is not implemented well. From this most of teachers have negative attitude towards school-based instructional supervision. If school-based instructional supervision properly implemented throughout the school it motivates teachers to work hard, help teachers get more knowledge from assistance given from supervisors and help to identify strength and weakness of teaching system.

Scholars' like (Glickman, 1998) teachers are in the front of successful instruction; supervision in the background providing the support, knowledge and skills that enables teacher to succeed. The long term goal of school based supervision is to develop teachers towards a point in which teachers facilitated by supervision on assume full responsibility for instructional improvement.

The response to item 3, 4,5 and 7 indicated that majority of teachers are not participated in action research to develop their skill, they believe supervisors are fault finder, not encourage them to develop their own teaching strategies, not give useful immediate feedback for their supervision, teachers do not freely discuss with their supervisors in post-observation conference to express their though including disagreement, they assume supervisors are fault finder and dissatisfy by working as a mentor with less experience teachers collaboratively to improve classroom teaching.

Furthermore, the information obtained from the interview of quality assurance heads and supervisors revealed that, teachers' participation in school-based instructional supervision is less than expected. In schools teachers are not voluntary to participate in school based supervision because they are not committed to do so. Teachers participate in action research simply for fulfillment of performance appraisal to pass their career development.

Generally, the information presented in Table 4 shown that teachers have negative beliefs and feelings towards school-based instructional supervision. However majority of teachers do not participate in school-based instructional supervision by: working in group to solve instructional problem, evaluating curriculum material and conducting action research in the school to improve instructional problems, freely discusses in post-observation conference. Supervisors do not encourage teachers to develop teaching strategies; do not give immediate feedback to the teachers when they see and observe during classroom observation, do not support teachers to improve teaching problem, do not give professional assistance.

Document analysis also shown that, all selected secondary schools were not implementing effective school-based instructional supervision. Most schools and the departments do not have full document with supervisor and teachers agreement and did not follow the procedures how supervision was implemented. This shown that the attitudes of teachers and principals have negative views towards school-based instructional supervision.

Table 5: Attitudes Held By Teachers and Principals Determine Supervisory Practices in Classroom

NO	Items	T=182 P=30	Scale			X̄	SD	T-V	Sig.	
			A 5	St 3	N 1					
1	School-based instructional supervision is used to assist teachers whenever there is a need	T	f	54	99	29	2.67	1.23	7.82	0.84
			%	29.6	54.3	15.9				
		P	f	8	19	3	2.65	1.16		
			%	26.6	63.3	10				
2	I participate in school-based instructional supervision by engaging in professional activities like mentoring and coaching	T	f	36	117	29	2.82	1.05	13.5	0.61
			%	19.7	64.2	15.9				
		P	f	7	17	6	2.64	1.48		
			%	23.3	56.6	20				
3	I participate on group activities in my school to promote school-based instructional supervision	T	f	45	102	35	2.68	1.45	6.45	0.64
			%	24.7	56	19.2				
		P	f	9	20	1	2.59	1.03		
			%	30	66.6	3.3				
4	I participate in school-based instructional supervision practices by evaluating curriculum material	T	f	22	106	54	2.73	1.04	7.93	0.14
			%	12	58.2	29.6				
		P	f	7	18	5	2.57	0.91		
			%	23.3	60	16.6				
5	Supervisors in my school promote different teaching strategies which help me apply them to instructional practice	T	f	31	125	26	2.72	1.32	1.96	0.98
			%	17	68.6	14.2				
		P	f	2	19	9	2.83	1.19		
			%	6.6	63.3	30				
6	Supervisors in my school encourage experienced teachers and principals to develop their skills in different way	T	f	35	99	48	2.91	1.46	2.72	0.12
			%	19.2	54.3	26.3				
		P	f	6	16	8	2.85	1.58		
			%	20	53.3	26.6				
7	Supervisors in my school work together with teachers and principals supports in decision making	T	f	14	144	24	2.84	1.71	9.64	0.89
			%	7.6	79.1	13.1				
		P	f	4	18	8	2.79	1.61		
			%	13.3	60	26.6				

As indicated in Table 5 item number 1, the majority of teachers 54.3% (n=99) responded sometimes. Few teachers 215.9% (n=29) responded never, very few teachers 29.6% (n=54) responded always. Similarly the majority of principals 63.3% (n=19) responded sometimes on the item and very few respondents 10% (n=3) responded never, few respondents 26.6% (n=8) responded always on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=2.67, SD=1.23) and (Mean=2.65, SD=1.16), this indicates the scale of the respondents lie on the range of sometimes and respondents believe that school-based instructional supervision is not used to assist teachers whenever there is a need. The independent sample t-test value (t=0.84). This shows that there is no significant difference between the respondents and the understanding and information of major respondents are not different. Large number of respondents responded that school-based instructional supervision is not used to assist teachers whenever there is a need. In the open-ended questions for teachers and principals, most of the respondents described that supervisors use supervision as control and evaluate teachers in their school activity and teachers believed that school-based instructional supervision is not used to assist teachers.

As shown in Table 5 item 2, very few respondents 15.9% (n=29) responded never and few respondents 19.7% (n=36) always. Majority of teachers 64.2% (n=117) responded sometimes. Similarly the majority of principals 56.6% (n=17) responded sometimes on the item and very few respondents 20% (n=6) responded never, few respondents 23.3% (n=7) responded always on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=2.82, SD=1.05) and (Mean=2.64, SD=1.48), this shown that the scale of the respondents lie on the range of sometimes and teachers and principals have negative feelings to participate in school-based instructional supervision by engaging in professional activities because supervisors do not work with them like mentoring and coaching. The independent sample t-test value is (t=0.61). This means there is no significant difference between the mean values of respondents and they have similar understanding on the item.

As indicated in Table 5, item 3 very few respondents 19.2% (n=35) never, few respondents 24.7(n=45) responded always and majority of teacher respondents 56% (n=102) responded sometimes. Similarly the

majority of principal respondents 66.6% (n=20) responded sometimes on the item and very few respondents 3.3% (n=1) responded never, few respondents 30% (n=9) responded always on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=2.68, SD=1.45) and (Mean=2.59, SD=1.03), this indicates that the scale of the respondents lie on the range of sometimes and many teachers and principals do not participate in school based supervision on group activities to solve instructional problems.

The independent sample t-test value is ($t=0.64$). This means there is no significant difference between respondents and respondents have similar understanding about the item. In the open-ended questions, all respondents described that most teachers and principals do not participate on group activities freely and clearly. They do not use it for their day-to-day teaching activates and they do not developing skill through practices. From these concept teachers do not participate in group activity exactly and frequently by their wants. Moreover interview of principals and supervisors responses fit with this idea. Experienced teachers don't support and guide how to participate and practice group activity by using different approaches with fresh teachers. Therefore most teachers do not participate in school based supervision to promote effective group activities in the school to solve teaching learning problems.

As indicated in Table 5 item 4 majority of respondents 58.2% (n=106) responded sometimes and very few respondents 29.6% (n=54) responded never and few respondents 12% (n=22) responded always. Similarly the majority of principal respondents 60% (n=18) responded sometimes on the item and very few respondents 16.6% (n=5) responded never, few respondents 23.3% (n=7) responded always on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=2.73, SD=1.04) and (Mean=2.57, SD=0.91), this shown the scale of the respondents lie on the range of sometimes and majority of teachers and principals are not participate in supervision by evaluating curriculum material. The independent sample t-test value is ($t=0.14$). This shown that there is no significant difference between respondents and majority of respondents have similar understanding about the item.

As indicated in Table 5, item 5 very few respondents 14.2% (n=26) responded never, few respondents 17 % (n=31) responded always and majority of teachers 68.6% (n=125) responded sometimes. Similarly the majority of principals 63.3% (n=19) responded sometimes on the item and very few respondents 30% (n=9) responded never, few respondents 6.6% (n=2) responded always on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=2.72, SD=1.32) and (Mean=2.83, SD=1.19), this indicates the scale of the respondents lie on the range of sometimes and majority of teachers do not feel happy with supervisors in that they do not encourage them to develop their own strategies and solution to improve teaching process. The independent sample t-test value is ($t=0.98$). This means there is no significant difference between respondents and large numbers of teachers and principals have similar understanding on the item.

As indicated in Table 5, item 6 very few respondents 26.3% (n=48) responded never, few respondents 19.2% (n=35) responded always and majority of teachers 54.3% (n=99) responded sometimes. Similarly the majority of principals 53.3% (n=16) responded sometimes on the item and very few respondents 26.6% (n=8) responded never, few respondents 20% (n=6) responded always on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=2.91, SD=1.46) and (Mean=2.85, SD=1.58), this means the scale of the respondents lie on the range of sometimes and supervisors in their school did not encourage experienced teachers and principals to develop their skills. The independent sample t-test value is ($t=0.12$), this indicates that there is no significant difference between teachers and principals that means large number of teachers and principals responded sometimes on the item. Moreover the open-ended question of teachers and principals response that, supervisors don't want encourage experienced teachers in their classroom during the teaching time. In addition to the open-ended question responses by the respondents, interview of quality assurance heads and supervisors responses meet with this idea. They describe when supervisors try to encourage experienced teachers; they do not happy and not accept them. Most experienced teachers are careless to school-based instructional supervision. They assume themselves have enough skills, knowledge and there are no one above them.

Responses for item 7 in the same table shows few respondents 7.6% (n=14) responded always, very few respondents 13.1% (n=24) responded never and majority of teachers 79.1% (n=144) responded sometimes. Similarly the majority of principals 60% (n=18) responded sometimes on the item and very few respondents 26.6% (n=8) responded never, few respondents 13.3% (n=4) responded always on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=2.84, SD=1.71) and (Mean=2.79, SD=1.61), this indicates that the scale of the respondents lie on the range of sometimes and majority of supervisors do not work together with teachers and principals in decision making. The independent sample t-test significant value is ($t=0.89$). This means there is significant difference between respondents and principals and teachers have the same understanding about the item. In the open-ended questions for teachers, most of the respondents described that supervisors do not work together with teachers and principals in decision making. Furthermore interview of quality assurance heads and supervisors responses relate with this idea. They had confirmed and strengthened the above idea and pointed out most teachers do not like work together with supervisors in decision making and supervisors not invite them.

Item 1 in Table 5 indicated that, most teachers assume school-based instructional supervision is not used to assist teachers whenever there is a need and is not improve teachers' classroom performance by considering the practices of supervisors. These show that supervisors do not have knowledge and skills how to supervise teachers systematically. In addition, when answering open-ended questions majority of teachers write their belief and feelings to the school based supervision as follows: Based on the actual goal and aim of school-based instructional supervision, it assists and improve teachers' performance in classroom teaching. But, in the school case the school-based instructional supervision is not practicing by considering its goal and aims. It simply carried out for the sake of reporting and to tell someone who asks them about the condition of school-based instructional supervision. So, in the sample school it has no value of assisting teachers as well as promoting teaching learning process. Therefore teachers had negative attitude on school-based instructional supervision practices.

The researchers believed that school-based instructional supervision has great importance to assist teachers in teaching learning process and it also helps teachers to develop positive attitude towards co-operative works. But most of the time in the school, it is not implemented well. The quality of supervisory practice is less over school-based instructional supervision practices. If school-based instructional supervision is properly implemented and managed it will be put great value for the teachers and for the teaching learning process. It can assist and support teachers in teaching methodology and supervisor's gate acceptance then they can develop their quality.

Moreover the responses' to item 2, 3 and 4 indicate most teachers were not participate in school-based instructional supervision by engaging in professional activity like mentoring , on group activities to promote school-based instructional supervision and evaluating curriculum materials. The other response to item 5, 6 and 7 most teacher and principals believe supervisors did not promote different teaching strategies, not encourage experienced teachers to develop their skills, and not work together in decision making and had not one-to-one relationship with teachers.

In addition, where answering open-ended questions majority of teachers write their beliefs and feelings to the quality of supervisory practices as follows; supervisors had lack knowledge and skills to carry out effective school-based instructional supervision. School-based instructional supervisors are not competent to carry effective supervision because principals and supervisors are not selected by their professional skills. They selected by who have friendly relationship with leaders or who is member of nation. Most of principals and supervisors are not qualified to secondary school standard and they do not take short and in service training then they lead without skills and knowledge. From this result, teachers' belief and feeling become negative towards school-based instructional supervision.

Furthermore, during the time of interview quality assurance heads and supervisors said that, in some cases teachers ask who supervise me? They complain that I and you have equal degree holders. Why you supervise me? This is the major question. There is a question on a supervisor's quality on supervising teachers effectively. Therefore the practices of school-based instructional supervision become difficult.

Some scholars write constructive idea which related to the above information as follows; According to Zepeda (2007) supervisors are part of the technical level in schools. They are expertise in curriculum and instruction; their job is to help colleagues improve the teaching-learning process. As such they are concerned primarily with teaching and learning; they are first and for most teachers-master teachers, not administrators.

Table 6: Factors That Affect Teachers' and Principals' Attitude towards School-based Instructional Supervision

No	Items	T=182 P=30	Scale			X̄	SD	T-V	Sig.	
			H 5	M 3	L 1					
1	Supervisors in my school act like a boss	T	F	114	29	39	4.81	0.97	8.68	0.36
			%	62.6	15.9	21.4				
		P	F	20	4	6	4.85	1.06		
			%	66.6	13.3	20				
2	Supervisors in my school use administrative control than providing pedagogical support to affect teachers instructional practices	T	F	125	20	37	4.88	1.62	13.5	0.82
			%	68.6	10.9	20.3				
		P	F	19	7	4	4.64	1.69		
			%	63.3	23.3	13.3				
3	Inappropriate approaches of supervisors (such as evaluative than supportive, fault finding and bureaucratic nature)	T	F	118	22	42	4.58	1.51	6.45	0.14
			%	64.8	12	23				
		P	F	18	4	8	4.69	1.08		
			%	60	13.3	26.6				
4	Lack of basic skills and knowledge of supervisors on school based supervision	T	F	134	30	18	4.78	1.74	8.27	0.53
			%	73.6	16.4	9.8				
		P	F	17	6	7	4.97	1.61		
			%	56.6	20	23.3				
5	Low trust between teachers and supervisors	T	F	131	31	20	4.77	1.28	8.75	0.16
			%	71.9	17	10.9				
		P	F	18	9	3	4.86	1.48		
			%	60	30	10				
6	Supervisors influence on age, gender, and work experience between teachers and principals	T	F	135	19	28	4.94	1.36	8.63	0.55
			%	74.1	10.4	15.3				
		P	F	17	8	5	4.84	1.58		
			%	56.6	26.6	16.6				
7	Awareness of teachers and principals about the importance of school-based instructional supervision	T	F	142	14	26	4.82	1.16	14.6	0.72
			%	78	7.6	14.2				
		P	F	16	8	6	4.68	1.83		
			%	53.3	26.6	20				

As indicated in Table 6 item 1 majority of teachers 62.6% (n=114) responded high, few respondents 15.9% (n=29) responded medium and 21.4% (n=39) responded low. Similarly the majority of principals 66% (n=20) responded high on the item and very few respondents 13.3% (n=4) responded medium, few respondents 20% (n=6) responded low on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=4.81, SD=0.97) and (Mean=4.85, SD=1.06), this shown that the scale of the respondents lie on the range of high and most supervisors act like a boss in school- based instructional supervision. The independent sample t-test significant value is (t=0.36). This shown there is no significant difference between the respondents that means there is significant similar understanding between respondents and large number of respondents' response was high about supervisors in their schools act like a boss.

In the open-ended questions for teachers, most of the respondents described that supervisors use school-based instructional supervision as control and evaluate teachers in their school activity and teachers believed that school-based instructional supervision is not used to assist teachers and they act like a boss. In addition to the open-ended question responses by the respondents, interview of quality assurance heads and supervisors' responses agreed with this idea. Furthermore they raise different information about practices of supervisors in their school. Quality assurance heads said that most of supervisors try to show superiority over the teachers and principals and also most of supervisors do not have knowledge of effective supervision system. Therefore teachers assume that school-based instructional supervision do not assist teachers. Supervisors said that most of teachers do not accept supervisors' idea and tell opposite answer.

As shown in Table 6 item 2, majority of respondents 68.6% (n=125) responded high, and few respondents 10.9% (n=20) responded medium. Very few respondents 20.3% (n=37) responded low. Similarly the majority of principals 63.3% (n=19) responded high on the item and very few respondents 23.3% (n=7) responded medium, few respondents 13.3% (n=4) responded low on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=4.88, SD=1.62) and (Mean=4.64, SD=1.69), this indicates the scale of the respondents lie on

the range of high and supervisors in school use administrative control than providing pedagogical support to affect teachers' instructional practices. The independent sample t-test significant value is ($t=0.82$). This shown there is no significant difference between the respondents response which is positive idea on the item. In the open-ended questions for teachers, most of the respondents described that supervisors use administrative control style in school based supervision.

Furthermore interview of supervisors' responses conducted with this idea. They had confirmed and strengthened the above idea and pointed out the activities of supervisors could be cornerstone to promote teachers negative feelings to school-based instruction supervision. In our school most supervisors promote administrative control because, they do not have knowledge about practices of effective supervision.

As indicated in Table 6, item 3 majority of respondents 64.8% ($n=118$) responded high, few respondents 12% ($n=22$) responded medium. 23% ($n=42$) responded low. Similarly the majority of principals 60% ($n=18$) responded high on the item and very few respondents 13.3% ($n=4$) responded medium, few respondents 26.6% ($n=8$) responded low on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=4.58, SD=1.51) and (Mean=4.69, SD=1.08), this indicates the scale of the respondents lie on the range of high and many teachers feel and believe on inappropriate approaches of supervisors that develop the negative attitude of teachers because they use evaluative, fault finding and bureaucratic nature of school-based instructional supervision. The independent sample t-test significant value is ($t=0.14$). This indicates there is no significant difference between the respondents. From this value we can see large numbers of respondents' response inappropriate approaches of supervisors develop the negative attitude of teachers.

As indicated in Table 6 item number 4 majority of respondents 73.6% ($n=134$) responded high and. Few respondents 16.4% ($n=30$) responded medium and 9.8% ($n=18$) responded low. Similarly the majority of principals 56.6% ($n=17$) responded high on the item and very few respondents 20% ($n=6$) responded medium, few respondents 23.3% ($n=7$) responded low on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=4.78, SD=1.74) and (Mean=4.97, SD=1.61), the scale of the respondents lie on the range of high and majority of respondents responded that lack of basic skill and knowledge of supervisors is one of the factors of attitude of teachers and principals. The independent sample t-test significant value is ($t=0.16$). This indicates there is no significant difference between the respondents and that majority of respondents respond lack of basic skill and knowledge of supervisors is one of the factors of attitude of teachers and principals. In the open-ended questions for principals and teachers, most of the respondents described that supervisors have not basic skills and knowledge on school-based instructional supervision. In addition to the open-ended question responses by the despondences, interview of supervisors' responses conducted with this idea. Furthermore they raise different information about skills and knowledge of supervision practices. Supervisors not gate short training or course about supervision.

As indicated in Table 6, item 5 majority of respondents 71.9% ($n=131$) responded high, 17% ($n=31$) responded medium, 10.9% ($n=20$) responded low. Similarly the majority of principals 60% ($n=18$) responded high on the item and very few respondents 30% ($n=9$) responded medium, few respondents 10% ($n=3$) responded low on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=4.77, SD=1.28) and (Mean=4.86, SD=1.48), this shown that the scale of the respondents lie on the range of high and majority of teachers believe and feels low trust between teachers and supervisors develop negative attitude on school based supervision. The independent sample t-test significance value is ($t=0.16$). This means there is no significance difference between the respondents and large numbers of teachers believe and feels low trust between teachers and supervisors develop negative attitude on school-based instructional supervision.

As indicated in Table 6, item 6 few respondents 15.3% ($n=28$) responded low, majority of respondents 74.1% ($n=135$) responded high, 10.4% ($n=19$) responded medium. Similarly the majority of principals 56.6% ($n=17$) responded high on the item and very few respondents 26.6% ($n=8$) responded medium, few respondents 16.6% ($n=5$) responded low on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=4.94, SD=1.36) and (Mean=4.84, SD=1.58), this means the scale of the respondents lie on the range of high and majority of respondents response shows that supervisors influence on age, gender and work experience between teachers and principals. The independent sample t-test significance value is ($t=0.55$), this means there is no significance that large number of respondents response shows high about the problem pointed out in the item.

Responses for item 7 in the same table shows majority of respondents 78% ($n=142$) responded high, few respondents 7.6% ($n=14$) responded medium, 14.2% ($n=26$) responded low. Similarly the majority of principals 53.3% ($n=16$) responded high on the item and very few respondents 26.6% ($n=8$) responded medium, few respondents 20% ($n=6$) responded low on the item. The mean and standard deviation value of teachers and principals (Mean=4.82, SD=1.16) and (Mean=4.68, SD=1.83), this shown that the scale of the respondents lie on the range of high and their response awareness of teachers and principals is factor of attitude towards school based supervision. The independent sample t-test significance value is ($t=0.72$). This shown that there is no significant differences between the respondents and majority of respondents' response that awareness of teachers and principals about the importance of school-based instructional supervision develop negative attitude of

teachers.

6. Accordingly, the major findings of the analysis made were organized here under.

Findings from characteristics of the Respondents

- ❖ There were 13.3% female principals found in selected secondary schools.
- ❖ There was no female quality assurance heads and supervisors in all selected schools.
- ❖ Among the teaching staff the majority of teachers were male.
- ❖ In terms of qualification, majority of the participants were first degree and unqualified for the job specification.
- ❖ With regard to the qualification of the school principals no one was qualified in the school level.
- ❖ In terms of age, majority of teachers were between 18-33 (almost young) whereas majority of principals and supervisors were between 34-41 years old (middle age).
- ❖ In terms of service year, majority of teachers had short service and were less experienced whereas majority of principals and supervisors had long service.

Findings from closed and open-ended questionnaires, Interviews and document analysis

Teachers Attitude on the Practices of School-based Instructional Supervision

- ❖ Concerning the teachers attitude in their school-based instructional supervision practices, majority of teachers' response: school-based instructional supervision is used to evaluate teachers, school-based instructional supervision did not meet their professional needs, did not make action research as an activity of school-based instructional supervision, supervisors were fault finder from teachers and they hesitated to work them, their supervisors did not encourage them to develop their teaching strategy, they did not want to inter supervisor in their classroom, supervisors did not give immediate feedback, they did not discuss freely with their supervisors in post-observation conference, they did not participate in school-based instructional supervision in their department, they did not feel happy for the advice of supervisors, they feel supervision did not help them to share different teaching experience, they did not satisfied by working as a mentor collaboratively and the attitude of teachers were not positive. Majority of the respondents in the open-ended questions and interviews described that, supervisors try to show superiority over the teachers, most of supervisors were evaluator than supporter, most teachers make action research for school efficiency, supervisors find silly mistakes from the teachers in classroom teaching and collect these faults and report them in different meeting, teachers did not want inter supervisor in their classroom, supervisors did not give immediate feedback for supervised teachers, post-observation conference was not known in their school.

Attitude held by teachers and principals

- ❖ Concerning the attitude held by teachers and principals, majority of teachers did not apply different teaching strategies and learning styles in to their instructional practices; work collaboratively in pairs and small teams to observe each other's teaching to improve classroom instruction; working as a mentor and work collaboratively with their supervisors both one-to-one relationship and in group; participate in supervision practices by evaluating curriculum material; school-based instructional supervision sometimes used to assist teachers whenever there is a need; supervisors did not encourage experienced teachers; school-based instructional supervision provides appropriate professional support to teachers; did not treating teachers professionally with a sense of caring and respect; did not work together with teachers and principals in decision making; majority of the respondents in the open-ended questions and interviews described that supervisors had not implemented motivation system, most of supervisors had no knowledge of effective supervision technique, teachers did not participate in group activities freely, teachers were not accept the supervisor, most experienced teachers were careless to supervision.

Factors that Affect Teachers and Principals Attitude

- ❖ Regarding to the majority of respondents' response, the following are the major factors that affect negative attitude of teachers and principals. These are: in appropriate approaches of supervisors such as: evaluative than supportive, fault finding and bureaucratic nature; lack of basic skills and knowledge in supervisors to carry out effective school-based instructional supervision; lack of awareness of teachers to the importance and usefulness of school-based instructional supervision; low trust between supervisors and teachers; lack of pre-and post-observation conference and inadequate feedback from supervisors; supervisors act like a boss, administrative control than providing pedagogical support during school-based instructional supervision; influence on age, gender and work experience between teachers and principals, poor communication between supervisors, teaching staff and school principals.

The effect of negative attitude of teachers and principals

- ❖ According to the majority of respondents, the following are major contributions are suggested. These are dominate supervisors work; decline cooperative work between teachers and supervisors; create gaps on teaching learning process; teachers and supervisors don't talk generously; limit the novice teachers to get experience from experienced teachers; makes difficulty to identify strong and weak side after supervision. It

affects the school vision, mission and goal; limit updating activities in the teaching learning process; the supervisors feel inferiorities.

- ❖ The finding of the study from document analysis indicate that, majority of schools: had not teachers supervision report document, teachers and supervisors agreement document, had not full document which are related to school based supervision; did not have school-based instructional supervision report in different department; the number of school-based instructional supervision that occurred in each school was limited; had less percent to contain comment ensured by teachers and supervisors sign.

7. Conclusions

School-based instructional supervision is the most necessary agent to bring quality education in any school. To run effective school-based instructional supervision the teacher's attitude is under considerable for school leaders and supervisors. Based upon the findings of the study the following conclusions were made.

- ✚ Teachers and principals of the selected sample schools would have negative attitude towards the school-based instructional supervision. However, teachers not satisfied with the function of school-based instructional supervision and the way they behave to realize the function of school-based instructional supervision is different. Majority of teachers did not act in a way that reflects their beliefs and feelings.
- ✚ The finding of the study also revealed that, teachers believe that their supervisors were incompetent to carry out effective school-based instructional supervision and they feel dissatisfied with the approaches of school-based instructional supervision used in their school. It confirmed that, the attitude held by teachers and principals' faced in different way. Majority of teachers did not feel happy with the way classroom observation carried out in their school. The beliefs and dissatisfaction of teachers towards the competences of supervisors and the approach of supervision used in their school was clearly manifested in their behavior. School-based instructional supervisors are not competent to carry effective supervision because principals and supervisors are not selected by their professional skills. They selected by who have friendly relationship with leaders. Most of principals and supervisors are not qualified to secondary school standard and they do not take short and in service training then they leads without skills and knowledge. In some cases teachers ask different questions for supervisors with relate qualification. They complain that I and you have equal holders, why you supervise me. This is the major question. Therefore the practices of school based instructional supervision become difficult.
- ✚ Moreover the finding of the study confirmed that, the major factors that negatively affect teachers attitudes towards school-based instructional supervision were: inappropriate approaches of supervisors; lack of basic skills and knowledge in supervisors to carry out effective school-based instructional supervision; lack of awareness of teachers to the importance and usefulness of school based supervision; low trust between teachers and supervisors; lack of pre and post observation conference and inadequate feedback from supervisors; influence on age and gender; poor communication between teachers, principals and supervisors; lack of motivation and commitment in experiences teachers to work collaboratively to conduct school based supervision.
- ✚ The contributions of these factors on negative attitude of teachers towards school based supervision can decline cooperative work between supervisors and teachers; it damages classroom observation between teachers i.e. teachers and supervisors did not accept generously; it limits novice teachers to get experience from experienced teachers whenever they need; it makes the teachers do not create different teaching methods; it decreases the students skills and results; it makes difficulty to identify strong and weak side after school-based instructional supervision.
- ✚ Moreover, the finding shown that the documents of all selected secondary school were not full regarding to school-based instructional supervision. Schools did not give value to run effective school-based instructional supervision because the necessary files are not arranged properly and effectively in the schools.

8. Recommendations

- The finding of this study revealed that teachers have negative attitude towards school-based instructional supervision. To solve this, school-based instructional supervisors should encourage teachers and principals to participate actively in school-based instructional supervision by: motivating them to work in groups to solve instructional problems; initiating them to engage in professional activities like mentoring and coaching; assisting them in the evaluation and production of instructional and curricular material and conducting action research to solve instructional problem. School principals and supervisors strengthened sharing experience from school to school; department to department and coordinate special experience from different bodies and practice through the school.
- Woreda/Town Administration Officials and Zone Education Bureau should give short-term trainings to school-based instructional supervisors through seminars and workshops so as to help school-based instructional supervisors to develop their skills and knowledge to carry out effective school-based instructional supervision and follow the training practices should be effective.

- School-based instructional supervisors should be: supportive and provides alternative suggestions for novice teachers from which the teacher can choose, instead of telling the teachers what actions to take; develop collaborative culture of supervision that promotes learning and growth for everyone involved, encouraged, provided and requested materials and resources for senior and experienced teachers to develop their own strategies and solution to improve teaching process.
- School-based instructional supervision should include conducting pre-observation conference with teachers before classroom observation held; made classroom observation according to the points agreed up on pre-observation conference; analyzed and interpreted the data resulted from classroom observation collaboratively with teachers and held post-observation conference with teachers and principals after classroom observation to discuss on the strong and weak sides. School-based instructional supervision needs cooperative efforts of the entire staff in the study of educational problems of the school. Therefore, all teachers and principals must know that they have the responsibility of working together with their supervisors and should actively engage in the provision of school-based instructional supervision in their school. Teachers also have responsibility of students result to develop their internal performance, skills and knowledge of subject matters.
- Additionally the finding revealed that, many factors negatively affect the attitudes of teachers towards school-based supervision in the selected secondary schools. These factors were factors of all secondary schools through Wolaita Zone. Therefore, to solve these problems:
 - ✓ Specially, Woreda Officials and school supervisors must have strong relationship and appropriate approach around instructional supervision to identify the gaps of teachers, principals and supervisors that affect all activities of the schools and how to solve and minimize those gaps with a short period of time.
 - ✓ School-based instructional supervisors should be more qualified and should have better skill and knowledge than teachers they supervise or give support. Therefore, Federal Ministry of Education should continue to give in service training to teachers, school principals and instructional supervisors on academic subject and school leadership and management to improve their quality by giving more emphasis to supervision practices.
 - ✓ School-based instructional supervisors should use the result of classroom observation for the improvement of classroom instruction by developing pre and post observation conferences, rather than for other purpose like teachers' appraisal, show their superiority, act like a boss, and their politics. This increase the trust between teachers and supervisors.
 - ✓ All the responsible bodies should work hand-in-hand and strengthened commitment with the schools and used unreserved effort to minimize the gaps between the concerned bodies on the one hand increase effectiveness of school-based instructional supervisors.
 - ✓ Regular supervision of schools by the education officials should be strengthened and give adequate feedback for supervisors, secondary schools teachers and principals in order to develop the trend of frequent assessment and supervision on schools, and adequate budget should be allocated to schools.
 - ✓ Woreda official set well trained and qualified supervisors to school and greater attention should be given by the concerned education authorities to the assignment of supervisors on the basis of commitment and devotion to work.

References

- Adeolu, A.J. (2012). **Assessment of principals: supervisory Roles for quality Assurance In Secondary Schools in Ondo state, Nigeria.** World Journal of Education , vol.2.No.1
- Ajzen, (2001). **Nature and Operation of Attitudes: Annual Review. Journal of Psychology, 52. 27-58.**
- Ari, M., & Sipal, R. F. (2009). **Factors affecting job satisfaction of Turkish special education professionals: predictors of turnover. European Journal of Social Work, 12(4), 447-463.**
- Atiklt Desta. (2008). **The Status of School in Built Instructional Supervision in Government Secondary Schools of Mekele Town.** Unpublished MA thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Ayşe B. C. (2002). **School-based supervision at private Turkish school: A model for improving teacher evaluation. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 1 (2), 172-190. doi: 10.1076/lpos.1.2172.5397.**
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2005). *Research in education*(10th ed.). Allyn and Bacon Publishers.
- Getachew Gezahegn, (2001). **School-Based Instructional Supervision in Selected Secondary Schools of Addis Ababa.** Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Glanz, J. (2005). **Action research as instructional supervision: Suggestions for principals. NASSP Bulletin, 89(643), 17-27.**
- Gregory, C.F. (2011). **Institutional supervision: A descriptive study focusing on the observation and evaluation of teachers in cyber schools, Pennsylvania.** Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, USA.
- Haile Abbay. (2006). **Practices and Problem of School-Based Supervision in Selected Secondary Schools of Central Zone of Tigray.** AAU (Unpublished MA Thesis).

- Kapfunde, C.L. (1990). **Clinical Supervision in the Zimbabwean context**. Harare: Zimbabwe.
- Kerio, C.M. (2004). **An analysis of principals effectiveness in selected supervisory practices and teachers attitudes towards the practices in public primary schools of Kericho District**. Unpublished M.Ed. project in Nairobi.
- Kochar, S.K. (2004). **Secondary School Administration**. New Delhi: Staring Publishers private Ltd.
- Million Morki (2010). **An assessment on the status of school based instructional supervision in Secondary Schools of West Arsi Zone of Oromia Region**. M.A. Thesis, A.A.U. unpublished.
- MoE (2009). **Continuous Professional Development for primary and secondary School Teachers, Leaders and Supervisors in Ethiopia: the Framework, Ministry of Education, Ethiopia**.
- Obanor, E. R. (2009). **Attitude of secondary school teachers towards external supervision of instruction**. APGDE Project University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
- Patrick E. & Leonard C. (2012). **Effective supervision of Instruction in Nigerian Secondary Schools: Issue in Quality Assurance**. *Journal of Qualitative Education*. Vol. 8 No. 1.
- Paul, N. M., (1998). **A Study of Teachers' Attitudes towards Supervision in Primary Schools in Bahati Division of Nakuru District, Kenya**. A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment for the Degree of MA, University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Pawlas, G. E. & Olive, P. F. (2008). **Supervision for today's school (8th ed.)**. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York
- Philipos Paulos, (2001). **A study on the Practice and Problems of Instructional Supervision in the Primary schools of Kembata Alaba Tembaro zone**. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Taro Yamane. (1996). *Elementary Sampling Theory*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Trochim M.K. (2005). **The Research methods: The concise Knowledge Base**. Atomic Dog Publishing. U.S.A.
- Tyagi R. S. (2011). **Academic supervision in Secondary Schools: school-based approach for quality management**. New Delhi, INDIA.
- UNESCO, (2007). **Prospects, Challenges and Policy options of Ethiopian Educational System in the Achievement of EFA Goals**. Report on the Development of Education in Ethiopia, www.ibe.unesco.org/International/ICE47/English/Natreps/reports/ethiopia_scan.pdf.
- Wolaita Zone Education Office Annual Report Hand Book of principalship and school performance, (2016-2017).
- Zepeda, S. J., & Ponticell, J. A. (1998). **At cross purposes: what do teachers need, want, and get from supervision**. *Journal of curriculum and Supervision*, 14(1), 68-87.
- Zepeda, S. J. (2007). **Instructional Supervision: Applying tools and concepts (2nd ed.)**. NY: Eye on Education.
- Zena Tesfaye (2012). **Practice and Prospect in school-site supervision in Dawuro Zone Public secondary school**. M.A thesis, HU (Unpublished).