Research on Humanities and Social Sciences
ISSN 2224-5766 (Paper) ISSN 2225-0484 (Online)
Vol.16, No.1, 2026

The Contribution Of Instructional Supervision To The Improvement Of Instructional Practices In Governmental Secondary Schools Of Wolaita Zone, South Ethiopia Regional State

YOHANNES MATHEWOS SUMAMO

Abstract
The study was to investigate the contribution of instructional supervision in improving teaching practices in governmental secondary schools of Wolaita Zone, South Ethiopia Region. The research design employed in this study was descriptive survey research design and the methods employed were qualitative and quantitative methods. The data were generated from both primary and secondary sources. 248 teachers and 154 supervisory teams (12 main principals, 12 academic vice principals and 120 department heads) were selected through simple random sampling techniques. Total sample size of the study was 248 for questionnaires and 7 respondents for interview. The instruments for data collection used were questionnaire and interview. Quantitative data analysis was done using descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation besides independent sample t-test whereas qualitative data were analyzed and interpreted qualitatively. The pilot study was conducted on Lera Secondary School and the reliability coefficient was found to be 0.825 Cronbach's Alpha for teachers' questionnaire hence it was regarded as good, reliable and valid questionnaire. The finding of the study had revealed that the extent to which instructional supervision employed in secondary schools was at low level. Thus, without effective implementation of instructional supervision in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone, the expected improvements in instructional practices cannot be enhanced. The actual instructional supervisory practices were not aligned with the expected standards of instructional supervision. The challenges that affect the contribution of instructional supervision practices were lack of relevant training programs for instructional supervisors and lack of support from Woreda education office. The study findings showed that majority of principals do not make visits to classrooms in order to observe teachers' lessons or give feedback to teachers after class observations. The practices of supervisors in supporting teachers in practice of instructional supervision were unsatisfactory to improve teachers' classroom instructional practices. It is advisable for instructional supervisors to give technical support for teachers by identifying decencies of teachers. Woreda education officers needed to lay emphasis on development and application of technical skills by principals in order to ensure they effectively motivate teachers to respond positively to various instructional activities in their schools.
***Key words**: Contribution, Instructional supervision, Instructional practices*

DOI: 10.7176/RHSS/16-1-01

Publication date: February 28th 2026

1. Introduction

Instructional supervision is defined by Chidobi (2015) as a set of activities which are carried out with the purpose of making the teaching and learning purpose better for the learner. The key goal of instructional supervision is to encourage teachers to improve teaching by improving their behavior (Cruz et al., 2015). In the American set up, instructional supervision is conceived as the process of enhancing the professional growth of the teachers, the curriculum and improving the techniques of teaching in the classroom through democratic interactions between the teacher and the supervisor (Daniel & Namale, 2015). In the current era, instructional supervision focuses on the betterment of teaching learning situation for the benefit of both learners and teachers. In addition, it helps identify areas of weaknesses and strengths among the teachers as well as follow-up activities that ought to be directed in improving the pinpointed areas of weakness (Ebele & Olofu, 2018).

Egwu (2015) in India notes that instruction supervision has helped improve the process of teaching and learning as well as the professional development of the teachers. The government and the schools in India place much emphasis on provision of instructional supervision for the teachers. The focus on instructional supervision in a

school is engineered to ensure improvement of teaching and learning for both teachers and learners (Ekpoh & Eze, 2015). Basically, instructional supervision is concerned with assisting and supporting teachers to improve instructions through the transition of their behavior. Instructional supervision has been a crucial tool to improve the quality of education of any educational programs of nations in the world, in Africa and in Ethiopia. The goal of cluster supervision is mainly ensuring quality of teaching and enhancing student learning. It fosters improvement in instruction, enhances learning outcomes, and promotes professional development of teachers (Glickman et al., 2017).

Zepeda (2015) aptly contend that education systems should ensure the practice of instructional supervision as a key strategy to improve the quality of teachers and the quality of teaching and learning. For the three gurus of educational change, instructional supervision is an indispensable means of ensuring teachers' professional development which in turn contributes to effective teaching and learning whose outcome is improved students' academic achievement. Fundamentally, the concept of instructional supervision refers to overseeing instruction to support teachers and to ensure effective teaching learning process. Instructional supervision focuses on teachers working with learners to bring about improvement in the teaching- learning process. Usman (2015) regarded instructional supervision as a process that focus on instruction and provides teachers with information about their teaching so as to develop instructional skills to improve performance. The focus of this improvement according to Zepeda (2015) may be on teacher's knowledge, skills, and ability to make more informed professional decisions or to solve problems better or it may be to inquire into teaching. Such a focus on the teachers' instructional improvement permits achievement of higher quality of learning.

MoE (2010) indicated that the provision of quality based supervision is important to improve the quality of education. This is why the General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) which was launched in 2008 and become an integral part of ESDP IV took leadership and management of school/cluster supervisors as one of the major components to improve the quality of education in Ethiopia. Kassahun (2014) also pointed out that instructional supervision is a key factor for ensuring the good functioning of education schools.

The importance of improving teaching and learning quality through practices of instructional supervision is appropriately documented. For instance, Zepeda (2017) asserts that the instructional supervision of teachers should enable them to grow as well as improve their basic teaching skills. Therefore, the researcher has got a good opportunity to visit secondary schools due to exercising supervisory services. Indeed, these and his own experience inspired the researcher to look into the problem closely. Therefore, this study was mainly focused on the contribution of instructional supervision to the improvement of instructional practices in governmental secondary schools of Wolaita Zone, since instructional supervision is assumed to provide closer and stronger assistance to secondary schools of Wolaita Zone so as to bring the expected level quality of instructional practices and student academic achievement.

Statement of the Problem

Instructional supervision in the modern era centers on the improvement of the teaching-learning situation for the benefits of both the teachers and learners (Cruz, Carvalhob & Sousa, 2015). Hence, it is believed that instructional supervisors expected to provide constructive professional supports to teachers and to make follow-up the learners' achievement towards develop the teaching-learning process of schools. However, the existing reality in in governmental secondary schools of Wolaita Zone shows: the supervisors did not provide accurate professional assistances to the teachers; they did not offer flourish encouragement of teachers' professional growth and also they could not create conducive learning environment (WZED, 2022/2023).

Moreover, the supervisors were lacked in assessing students' achievement continuously. Yet, according to Zepeda (2015) teachers prefer direct assistance from their supervisors to improve the learning opportunities of students. Furthermore, instructional supervisors expected to ensure the responsibility that decisions about academic enhancements are based on and directed by sound research, best practice and appropriate data used to design meaningful and effective experiences that improve students' achievement (Dali, Daud, Mohd & Fauzee, 2017).

However, to point out the manifestation of supervisors' lacking in supporting teachers and other staffs to conduct action researches, Egwu (2015) noted that one of the most embarrassing explanations for the current poor reputation of schools, and the presumed failure of many excellent innovations is that teachers have not had adequate, well informed, and direct supervision to help understand and implement new practices. Moreover, MoE (2016) ESDP-V confirmed that the problem that teachers and instructional supervisors face in improving school quality is knowing what inputs and actions will lead to the results that they seek. There is little

understanding of how to convert additional resources into improved learning outcomes for students. So that, this is clear that there is a disrespect of teachers' collaboration in problem solving activities and it could influence ensuring the consistencies of the school services.

Besides, according to the study carried out by Ekpoh and Eze (2015), Glanz and Heinmann (2018) depicted the major problems found to frustrate the practices of instructional supervision were those associated with supervision practices, instructional supervisors' feedback and teachers' attitudes towards supervision. Thus, teachers may perceive classroom supervision differently. They regarded traditional supervisors as inspectors, who visit a classroom on a fault-finding mission, if supervisors could not provide collaborative, appropriate, constructive feedback to improve teacher performance. In line with this, to be real in the continuation of the problem MoE (2016) reported that neither principals nor supervisors currently have the capacity to conduct informed classroom observation, provide appropriate and constructive feedback to improve teacher performance.

Moreover, Mohammed (2014) says that one of the most important factors that affect supervision effectiveness is the unclarified and ambivalent relation of teachers to supervisors. In the other hand, Nwambam and Eze (2017) limited supervisors experience and a lack of skills as being problems in teacher supervision. Hence, the teachers' low attitude, commitment & interest towards supervisory practices influence the supervision effectiveness. On the other hand, the school as an organization cannot be divorced from its environment and this is the reason why the school managers have to develop and administer a culture for the participation of parents and the community in school affairs (Sullivan & Glanz, 2014). In entitle to this, one of the most facing challenges of supervision is lack of resources (Kiiru, 2015).

Moreover, according to Zepeda (2015) the materialistic and administrative hindrances are obstacle the educational supervisors' performance on his/her way to achieve the objectives of his/her supervisory programs that are clear in improving and developing the teaching-learning process. Therefore, the supervisors' poor motion of linking schools with other community groups may limiting the community and other organizations in providing an external supports towards reduce resource scarcity in the schools and may affects successful implementation of supervision.

Moreover, the researcher has reviewed various previous research findings related to the contribution of instructional supervision in improving teaching learning process. In this regard, for instance, Atinafu (2020) in his study on the practices and challenges of secondary school instructional supervisors in Kaffa Zone had find out that the benefits teachers gained from instructional supervisors practice was insignificant; the contribution of instructional supervisors for the improvement of the school's management was insufficient; school visits by instructional supervisors were irregular; instructional supervisors were not well prepared to give the required service and the working conditions were unfavorable for instructional supervisors.

Kashun and Mitiku (2010) investigated the practices of cluster supervision in Jimma town secondary schools. Consequently, they revealed that the cluster resource center supervisors were not effective in promoting teachers' professional development and instructional skills. They were not also able to frequently visit schools and classroom for closer support. Even though cluster supervisors support the schools' management in ensuring good governance and providing timely information, they were not able to adequately enhance the school principals' planning, decision making and internal management capacity. Both studies identified that cluster supervisors are not effective in providing support to teachers to improve their profession and fail to contribute to the improvement of teaching and learning in the schools with a close concern.

Moreover, the contribution of instructional supervision in Wolaita Zone secondary schools have been continuously reported to fail to provide adequate support for the teachers and school principals in providing professional development trainings, pedagogical skill improvement trainings as well as administrative capacity building to improve the quality of teaching and learning. However, to the researchers' knowledge and experience in the issue, no adequate and systematic study has been conducted on the contribution of instructional supervision in improving teaching learning process. As the researcher's best knowledge, there was no study addressed prior on the topic in government secondary schools of Wolaita Zone. However, in other places of the region and the country level a number of researches conducted on the practices of instructional supervision in different schools by different researchers like (Atinafu, 2020; Kassahun & Mitiku, 2010) and others.

So their researches findings related to instructional supervision indicated that there were some problems with its practice. In light with this study, the researcher was looked in to the gaps in detail and other challenges that face instructional supervision practices in ensuring the improvement of teaching-learning. Therefore, this study is to

investigate the contribution of instructional supervision to the improvement of instructional practices in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone. This inspires the researcher to find out the reason why schools showed less interest in instructional supervision activities in their respective schools. Therefore, to fill this research gap, the researcher is motivated to do on the contribution of instructional supervision to the improvement of instructional practices in governmental secondary schools of Wolaita Zone.

Research Questions

1. To what extent is instructional supervision employed in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone?
2. To what extent is instructional supervisors provide professional and pedagogical support for teachers to improve the instructional practices in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone?
3. What challenges are faced by instructional supervisors in conducting instructional supervision in the study area?

Objectives of the Study

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

General Objective

The general objective of this study is to investigate the contribution of instructional supervision to the improvement of instructional practices in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone.

Specific Objectives

In order to fulfill the above mentioned broad aim, some specific objectives were needed to be addressed. Specifically; therefore, the specific objectives of this study were:

1. To examine the extent to which instructional supervision employed in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone.
2. To examine the degree of instructional supervisors' provision of professional and pedagogical support for teachers to improve the instructional practices in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone.
3. To determine the challenges faced by instructional supervisors in conducting instructional supervision in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone.

Significance of the Study

This study expected to have the following contributions.

1. It may help woreda educational officers of the study area to be aware of the influence of instructional supervision in improving quality teaching-learning process.
2. It may serve as reference for different levels of educational experts i.e. WEO to know the current contribution of instructional supervision in secondary schools.
3. It may help instructional supervisors adjust their supervisory practice in line with teachers' and principals' interest to improve students' performance.
4. The findings of this study may be important in that they have the potential to contribute to practical knowledge of the duties and responsibilities associated with instructional supervision.
5. It may also add to the existing body of literature on the contribution of instructional supervision, particularly secondary school instructional supervision.
6. This study may serve as a spring board for other researchers who want to conduct further research in the area of instructional supervision for effective teaching and learning process in schools.
7. This study may inform institutions training supervisors to have information regarding problems in the level of awareness of supervisors on major supervisory activities to be carried out at the secondary schools and provide training to them accordingly.
8. The study may also encourage other researchers to conduct study on the problem at large.

Delimitation of the Study

In order to make the study more manageable and feasible within the given time, it was, geographically, delimited to Wolaita Zone. The study was, conceptually, focused on the contribution of instructional supervision in improving teaching and learning process. For the sake of manageability and depth, the study was also delimited to secondary schools of Wolaita Zone. The study may produce good result if it included all the secondary schools in Wolaita Zone. However to make the study manageable and to complete within the time frame, it was delimited to 12 secondary schools in Wolaita Zone. Furthermore, in order to make the research more manageable, the population of the study was delimited to teachers and principals, of the sample schools and instructional supervisors and supervision coordinator was included in the study. This study was conducted and completed within September 2023-June 2024 time frame.

2. Method

The research design that was used in this study is a descriptive survey research design. It is commonly used to collect data from a larger population. The design was considered to be suitable in this study because it enabled the researcher to collect information on the contribution of instructional supervision to the improvement of instructional practices. Quantitative and qualitative research methods are used concurrently. Therefore, the use of qualitative and quantitative research method helped the researcher to dig up an in-depth information and deep understanding by collecting first and second hand information from the respondents about the contribution of instructional supervision to the improvement of instructional practices in secondary schools. Both primary and secondary sources of data were used in this study. The primary data sources are teachers, principals, vice-principals and cluster supervisors while secondary data sources are supervision plan and minutes that help to facilitate instructional practices. Regarding sampling, 12 secondary schools were selected by simple random sampling technique while 12 main principals, 12 academic vice principals, 6 cluster supervisors and 1 WEO supervision coordinator were selected by purposive sampling technique. 12 main principals, 12 academic vice principals, 6 cluster supervisors and 1 WEO supervision coordinator were selected by Gay (1996) 100%. To determine the sample size of teachers from the total population of teachers (534), the researcher selected 228 teachers as representative for this study by using Taro Yemane (1967) formula. Therefore, the sample size for this study was 228 teachers. Data collection instruments used were questioner and interview. Thus, one of the instruments was used in this study is self-developed questionnaire. A pilot study of the questionnaire was carried out off sample schools before conducting the actual research. The purpose of the pilot study was to verify the reliability of the questionnaire. Cronbach‘s alpha was used to determine the reliability of the instrument and to determine the correlation of individual items to the survey total and tested as high, with an average of over .825. Thus, the computed reliability of the instruments were .790, .846 and .840 for items prepared to examine the contribution of instructional supervision to the improvement of instructional practices in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone by secondary school teachers. Hence, the test conducted confirmed that the instruments were reliable as statistical literature recommend a test result of .825 (82.55% reliability) and above as reliable (Kothari, 2013). Quantitative data analysis approach was used to analyze close-ended questions; whereas, qualitative data analysis approach was used to analyze the data collected from open-ended and semi-structured interview. Finally the data‘s were interpreted, tabulated and analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively, and then conclusion and recommendations were drown.

3. Results and Discussion

The purpose of this part of the study was to assess the contribution of instructional supervision to the improvement of instructional practices in line with the extent to which instructional supervision employed, the degree of instructional supervisors’ provision of professional and pedagogical support for teachers to improve the instructional practices and the challenges faced by instructional supervisors in conducting instructional supervision in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone. Lastly the data taken from the questionnaires and interview results were analyzed in line with the objective seated.

3.1. The extent to which instructional supervision employed

The analysis was done below.

Table 1: The extent to which instructional supervision employed

No	Items T=220, ST=140		Descriptive		t-value	Sig.
			$\bar{X}$	SD		
1	Supports teachers in preparation of lesson plan.	T	1.73	1.10	8.20	0.00
		ST	1.86	1.45		
2	Supports teachers to use modern teaching methods.	T	1.72	1.23	12.9	0.02
		ST	1.43	1.43		
3	Helps teachers to develop skills of applying different assessment techniques through training.	T	1.68	1.05	4.24	0.04
		ST	2.36	1.27		
4	Encourage teachers in using of appropriate teaching aids.	T	1.68	1.01	3.76	0.01
		ST	1.83	1.34		
5	Help teachers in identifying instructional problems.	T	2.51	1.04	17.8	0.76
		ST	2.84	1.30		
6	Supports teachers to use different techniques of classroom management.	T	1.46	1.00	3.16	0.00
		ST	1.99	1.48		

Key: Interpretation of aggregated mean 1.0-1.49 = very low, 1.5 -2.49=low, 2.5-3.49= moderate, 3.5-4.49=high and 4.5-5.0=very high, $\bar{X}$=Mean score, SD=Standard Deviation and T=Teachers, ST=Supervisory Teams, t=t-test

As observed in Table 1 item 1, respondents were asked to rate their response on the support of supervisors in preparation of lesson plan. The mean value of teachers and supervisory teams were respectively (mean=1.73, SD= 1.10) and (mean=1.86, SD= 1.45), was at low level. Teachers and supervisory teams believed that supervisors do not support teachers in preparation of lesson plan. This shows that supervisors did not properly support teachers in preparing lesson plan. The researcher further looked at the responses of cluster supervisors through interview results also indicate that cluster supervisors lost most of their time by filling checklist, by concerning administrative issues, and also the WEO call them for meeting most of the time, so they are very busy to visit and provide professional support to teachers. So it is difficult to say cluster supervisors are supporting teachers with this regard. This implies that instructional supervisors fail to help teachers to improve their instructional practices through demonstrating and modeling teaching techniques and methods in the process of classroom and school visits.

Instructional supervision practices have yield in some positive out comes in terms of improving school management and in terms of teacher attendance and accountability (Giordano, 2008). These outcomes are achieved due to the regular visits of schools made by the cluster supervisors coupled with the improvements in the monitoring and training of principals and teachers (Giordano, 2008). The significance t- value (p-value 0.00) was less than 0.05 showing that there was significance difference between the two groups. There was no difference in the opinion of respondent groups. Supporting this, Roul (2015) indicated in his study that the provision of assistance to teachers to plan their lesson was found below the expected performance. It is possible to suggest that cluster supervisors were not qualified enough to give the required service.

As can be seen in Table 1 item 2, respondents were asked to rate their response on cluster supervisors' support of teachers to use modern teaching methods. The mean value of teachers and supervisory teams were respectively (mean=1.72, SD= 1.23) and (mean=1.43, SD= 1.43), this means the scale of respondents lie on the range of low level and teachers and supervisory teams believed that cluster supervisor did not support teachers to use modern teaching methods. In modern teaching method, the students participate in the teaching-learning process, especially in planning, organizing and performing the different tasks under the guidance of their instructor(s) is very high. However, in the study area this situation was not appeared because supervisors did not encourage teachers to use modern teaching method instead of traditional teaching method.

Similarly, the informants during interview indicated that, cluster supervisors are not supporting teachers to use modern teaching methods and appropriate instructional materials. This shows that cluster supervisors do not help teachers to use appropriate instructional materials. The significance t- value (p-value 0.02) was less than 0.05 showing that there was significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that cluster supervisors were not supporting teachers to use modern teaching methods and appropriate instructional materials.

As shown in Table 1 item 3, respondents were asked to rate their response on cluster supervisors' help of teachers to develop skills of applying different assessment techniques through training. The mean value of teachers and supervisory teams were respectively (mean=1.68, SD= 1.05) and (mean=2.36, SD= 1.27), this means the scale of respondents lie on the range of low level. This shows that instructional supervisors were not appropriately assisting teachers to develop skills of apply different assessment and measurement techniques through training. The analysis shows that the instructional supervisors and teachers were not in a position of performing activity in a sufficient way. Therefore, it needs more effort of supervisors to organized in-service training for support teachers on the above issue. According to Zepeda (2010) classroom visitation is a procedure by which the educational leader who possesses wisdom can be of great assistance in aiding the teacher to improve both his instructional techniques and the learning process of the student. The main purpose of the cluster supervisors' classroom visitation according to the definition is for the improvement of the teaching/learning process.

The significance t- value (p-value 0.04) was less than 0.05 showing that there was significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that cluster supervisors were not provided supportive feedback to teachers based on class observation. From the result it can be say that the cluster supervisors do not give feedback to teachers for instructional improvement. The researcher further looked at the responses given through interview results with CS2 revealed that cluster supervisors do not providing objective feedback to teachers

based on classroom observation. This implies that teachers do not get objective feedback which helps them to reflect on what actually took place in the teaching-learning process and for future improvement.

With regard to Table 1 item 4, respondents were asked to rate their response on cluster supervisors' encouragement of teachers in using of appropriate teaching aids. The mean value of teachers and supervisory teams were respectively (mean=1.68, SD= 1.01) and (mean=1.83, SD= 1.34), this means the scale of respondents lie on the range of low level. This implies that teachers were not properly getting the benefits of instructional supervision in using teaching aids. Therefore, instructional supervisors required more effort in order to helping teachers in using teaching aid. The significance t- value (p-value 0.02) was less than 0.05 showing that there was significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to say that cluster supervisors were not encouraged teachers in using of appropriate teaching aids. Teachers, principals and cluster supervisors believed that instructional supervisors were not helping teachers in using teaching aids as expected. The claim of this study is consistent with the finding of Nakpodia (2011) noted that majority of teachers do not use teaching aids because they are not available in the school. Even though teaching aids are essential in teaching and teachers' tasks as they will definitely help teachers to perform well.

Regarding to Table 1 item 5, respondents were asked to rate their response on the cluster supervisors' help of teachers in identifying instructional problems. The mean value of teachers and supervisory teams were respectively (mean=2.51, SD= 1.04) and (mean=2.84, SD= 1.30), reported at medium level. Hence, based on this result it is possible to say that instructional supervisors did not effectively supporting teachers in identifying instructional problems. The data obtained from the interview indicated that, instructional supervisors do not always support teachers to solve instructional problems faced. The significance t- value (p-value 0.076) was greater than 0.05 showing that there was no significance difference between the two groups. To sum up, the above finding indicates that instructional supervisors did not effectively encourage teachers to identify and to solve instructional problems.

As can be shown in Table 1 item 6, respondents were asked to rate their response on cluster supervisors' support of teachers to use different techniques of classroom management. The mean value of teachers and supervisory teams was respectively (mean=1.46, SD= 1.00) and (mean=1.99, SD= 1.48), this means the scale of respondents lie on the range of low level. This indicates that instructional supervisors did not support teachers to use different techniques of classroom management. As results, instructional supervisors were not able to play their role to identifying causes of behavioral problems of students. These low performances were indicators of low practice of instructional supervisors to help teachers in classroom management. The significance t-value (p-value 0.00) was less than 0.05 showing that there was significance difference between the two groups. The statistical test indicates that the teachers, principals and cluster supervisors believed that similar on instructional supervisors did not support teachers to use different techniques of classroom management.

Furthermore, the data obtained from interview and open ended question indicate that, the respondents understand instructional supervision as to serves in assisting teachers for instructional improvement but the current practice of instructional supervision was only limiting for appraising of teacher's performance rather than helping teacher in instructional improvement in study area. One of interviewee said that instructional supervisors rarely discuss with and informs teachers to prepare lesson plan, evaluate it and provide feedback. As well as they did not discuss with their teachers on how to apply different assessment techniques, preparing and selecting instructional aid. Consistent with this findings, Sintayehu (2011) and Roul (2015), showed in his study that, school based supervision didn't focus on and facilitates instruction, provide teachers with up to date methods of enhancing their classroom instruction support teachers to identify and solve instructional problems by undergoing preventive and corrective measures. Based on the above evidence, it possible to say that, in instructional improvement rather than appraising teacher's performance in the study area.

3.2. Provision of Professional and Pedagogical Support to Teachers

This objective was analyzed below.

Table 2: Instructional supervisors' provision of professional and pedagogical support for teachers to improve the instructional practices

No	Items	T=220 ST=140	$\bar{X}$	SD	t-value	Sig.
1	Arranging induction training for beginner teachers	T	2.02	0.97	7.85	0.45
		ST	2.14	1.15		
2	Assist teachers in lesson planning	T	1.72	1.00	13.67	0.00
		ST	2.30	1.14		
3	Facilitate experience sharing programs between teachers	T	1.79	1.22	3.89	0.39
		ST	2.36	1.12		
4	Assist teachers in developing instructional materials	T	2.20	1.40	3.89	0.003
		ST	2.16	1.17		
5	Spread best practice teaching methodologies among school and teachers	T	1.59	1.19	9.07	0.84
		ST	1.83	0.98		
6	Facilitate professional growth of teacher trough short term training	T	1.80	1.04	23.4	0.04
		ST	2.10	1.11		
7	Support teachers in doing action research	T	1.43	1.06	12.7	0.70
		ST	2.31	1.14		
	Overall mean and standard deviation of teachers	1.79	1.12	t= 4.57 df=358		.000
	Overall mean and standard deviation of supervisory teams	2.17	1.11			

The respondents were asked whether the cluster supervisors were arraigning induction training for beginner teachers or not. Thus, teachers and supervisory teams with ($\bar{X}$= 2.02, SD= 0.97) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.14, SD= 1.15) mean scores respectively reported that, cluster supervisors were not arranging induction training as expected. This is because; the mean scores are in the low or disagreement level. Similarly, during interview the CS9 respondents informed that, cluster supervisors were not arranging induction training for teachers. Even though the cluster supervisors were not arranging induction training for teachers, Zepeda (2010) indicated that, supervisors are expected to provide induction training for beginner teachers. The significance t- value (p-value 0.45) was greater than 0.05 showing that there was no significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that cluster supervisors were not arranged induction training for beginner teachers.

Item 2 of Table 2 dealt with whether cluster supervisors in the school assist teachers in lesson planning or not. Accordingly, teachers and supervisory teams with mean score of ($\bar{X}$= 1.72, SD= 1.10) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.30, SD= 1.14) respectively indicated that, cluster supervisors in the school failed to assist teachers in lesson planning as what was expected. The significance t- value (p-value 0.00) was less than 0.05 showing that there was significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that cluster supervisor was not assisted teachers in lesson planning.

In the same Table item 3 the result was low with mean score of ($\bar{X}$= 1.79, SD= 1.22) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.36, SD= 1.12) respectively revealing cluster supervisors were weak to facilitate experience sharing programs between teachers and supervisory teams. The significance t- value (p-value 0.39) was greater than 0.05 showing that there was no significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that cluster supervisor was not facilitated experience sharing programs between teachers.

As shown on the same Table item 4, the respondents were asked whether cluster supervisors assist teachers in developing/selecting instructional materials or not. Accordingly, teachers and supervisory teams with ($\bar{X}$= 2.20, SD= 1.40) and ($\bar{X}$= 2.16, SD= 1.17) mean scores respectively replied that, cluster supervisors less assisted teachers in developing /selecting instructional materials. The qualitative data obtained from interview (CS6) support this idea that, cluster supervisors do not assist teachers in developing /selecting instructional materials for teaching- learning process. This is not in line with what was stipulated by MoE (2000):

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

The significance t- value (p-value 0.003) was less than 0.05 showing that there was significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that cluster supervisor was not assisted teachers in developing/selecting instructional materials.

In Table 2, item 5 was whether the internal supervisors share best practice on teaching methodologies among teachers and schools or not. Accordingly, teachers and supervisory teams disagreed with mean scores ($\bar{X}$= 1.59, SD=1.19) and ($\bar{X}$= 1.83, SD=0.98) respectively indicating cluster supervisors inadequately spread best practice on teaching methodologies among teachers and schools to the required level. Similarly, the interview made shown supervisors were not doing what they have to do to share best practice on teaching methodologies among teachers and schools. The significance t- value (p-value 0.84) was greater than 0.05 showing that there was no significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that cluster supervisor was not spread best practice teaching methodologies among school and teachers.

In the same Table item 6, the respondents were asked whether the cluster supervisors facilitate professional growth of teachers using various strategies and teachers and supervisory teams with mean scores ($\bar{X}$=1.80, SD=1.04) and ($\bar{X}$ = 2.10, SD= 1.10) respectively reported cluster supervisors were not facilitating professional growth of teachers through short term training, workshops and seminars. Similarly, the interviewee addressed that the attempts made so far to build the professional capacity of teachers by internal supervisors was not meaningful. The significance t- value (p-value 0.04) was less than 0.05 showing that there was significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that cluster supervisor was not facilitated professional growth of teacher trough short term training.

Table 2 item 7 was whether the cluster supervisors are supporting teachers in doing action research and develop supportive materials or not where teachers and supervisory teams with mean score of ($\bar{X}$ =1.43, SD=1.06) and ($\bar{X}$ = 2.31, S.D=1.14) respectively replied cluster supervisors did not support teachers in doing action research and develop supportive materials. Similarly, CS3 interviewee stated that cluster supervisors inadequately support teachers in doing action research and supportive materials. Furthermore, the information obtained from both CS and WCC through interview revealed that these activities were implemented on the department level, not on an individual teacher basis. In addition, the interview assured that cluster supervisors were not capable enough to shoulder their responsibilities in assisting the day to day instructional activities of teachers in the schools. This is due to time constraints and large number of teachers in the schools. The significance t- value (p-value 0.70) was greater than 0.05 showing that there was no significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that cluster supervisor was not supported teachers in doing action research.

This finding fits with Gashaw (2008) who identified one of the most embarrassing explanations for the current poor reputation of schools and the presumed failure of many excellent innovations is that teachers have not had adequate, well informed and direct supervision to help, understand and implement best practice. In general, the compiled result indicates that, cluster supervisors do not design various interventions so as to assist teachers improve their limitations. As a result the teachers had not got enough professional support to improve the day to day classroom instruction and instructional skills.

Finally, as Table 2 above reveals that overall mean score teachers is 1.79 with a standard deviation of 1.12 indicates disagreement level and that of school leaders, is 2.17 with standard deviation of 1.11 showed the disagreement level. From this one can imply that teachers and school leaders had indicated that cluster supervisors were not adequately provide professional and pedagogical support to staff development. The independent sample t-test result (t= 4.57, df=358, p= .000) revealed that there was statistically significant difference between the responses of the respondent groups. In this regard, the professional support given in the study area was found to be inconsistent and unsatisfactory.

Moreover, the supervisors' involvement in the provision of induction training to new teachers to familiarize them with the environment and help them improve their instructional practices by demonstrating and modeling teaching techniques and methods was not to the expected level. The cluster supervisors hardly arranged workshops and seminars, and providing objective feedback for teachers on classroom observation. This finding

is in agreement with Gashaw (2008) who pointed out that many teachers complain that conferences and workshops at grassroots level are nonexistent.

According to Mbabo (2009), to ensure learning in all disciplines need to provide individual teacher and school with opportunities for continuous inquiries, training, meetings and workshops. On top of this, empirical studies in the US and Africa revealed that providing objective feedbacks on lessons positively affects teachers' reflective behavior and encourage try out of a variety of strategies to improve instruction (Baffour-Awuah, 2011). Paulos (2013) indicated that the performance of cluster supervisors is low in giving constructive feedback. Similarly, the findings of this study revealed that the supervisors were not able to give timely and constrictive feedbacks to help teachers improve their instruction.

It is generally believed that cluster supervisors play significant role in enhancing the professional competence of teachers. However, due to various reasons, these supervisors were found to be ineffective. Ozyildirim and Aksu (2016) in this study of public secondary schools did reveal that teachers benefit little from the supervisory service. In line with this, the results of the study agree with UNESCO (2007) that most teachers believe that they are not benefited from the support by cluster supervisors. As the finding of the study showed, cluster supervisors' classroom visit and comments did not successful in improving teachers' presentation, lesson planning and classroom management practices.

Teachers and principals benefit a lot by sharing experiences of colleagues working in the different schools. Shedefat and Alqaderi (2008) state that when teachers get together to discuss and interpret syllabuses, and draw common schemes of work, they benefit a lot. Given the views expressed by the above scholars, the findings of the current study conclude that the cluster supervisors' support is far from the classroom practices and less successful min benefiting teachers in terms of promoting teachers' professional development at least in the major areas like lesson presentation, selection and use of instructional materials and teaching methods to improve the classroom practices and the quality of education.

School supervision is also expected to support school principals or leaders to improve their management practices. Giordano (2008) pointed out that facilitating and assisting local planning in more logical scale is among the objectives of school clustering. Evidence based decisions change schools (Starratt, 2008). In line with these findings, this study showed that cluster supervisors were not providing need based training to improve planning skills of school management. They also failed to provide evidences to strengthen school decision making. The cluster supervisors were not sufficiently consulting the school management on how to use resources efficiently.

3.3. Challenges affecting in the contribution of instructional supervision

There are a number of problems that affect the effective instructional supervision in schools. Among them are the problems listed in the Table below. Teachers and supervisory teams were asked to what extent they reflect the instructional supervision problems in improving instructional practices, teachers' development and students' academic achievement.

Table 3: The challenges affecting the contribution of instructional supervision

No	Items	T=220 ST=140	$\bar{X}$	SD	t-value	Sig.	ranking
1	Supervision focuses only on the weakness of institutions, professionals, principals, and teachers	T	4.42	0.12	3.93	0.32	5
		ST	3.98	1.30			
2	Supervisors lack the capacity and skill in applying supervisory activities	T	4.56	0.80	34.87	0.00	3
		ST	4.10	1.18			
3	Supervisors lack commitment for their work and are not supporting teachers and schools as expected	T	4.86	1.22	3.89	0.00	2
		ST	4.36	1.12			
4	Teachers see supervision as external imposition	T	4.46	1.21	2.78	0.45	6
		ST	3.86	1.64			
5	Supervisors have no decision making capacity on problems identified through their supervisory roles	T	4.56	1.19	3.89	0.18	4
		ST	3.87	0.98			
6	There is lack of budget for implementation of supervision activities	T	4.82	1.04	14.6	0.00	1
		ST	4.78	1.11			
	Overall mean and standard deviation of teachers	4.61	0.93	t= 2.32		.000	
	Overall mean and standard deviation of supervisory teams	4.15	1.22	df=358			

As indicated in Table 3, item 1, with mean scores of teachers and supervisory teams ($\bar{X}$ =4.42, SD= 0.12) and ($\bar{X}$ =3.98, SD= 1.30) respectively reported that supervision focuses only on the weakness of institutions, professionals, principals, and teachers. Therefore, it could be possible to understand that supervision was not supportive as it focuses on weaknesses. This might weaken the relation between supervisors and the supervisee. The significance t- value (p-value 0.32) was greater than 0.05 showing that there was no significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that cluster supervision focused only on the weakness of institutions, professionals, principals, and teachers. Moreover, in this table the finding of the study had revealed that among six challenging factors item 1 ranked in fifth stage and indicates that the focus of supervision on teachers and supervisory teams' weakness were not most challenging factor.

As revealed in Table 3, items 2, with mean scores of teachers and supervisory teams ($\bar{X}$ =4.56, SD= 0.80) and ($\bar{X}$ =4.10, SD= 1.18) respectively indicated that supervisors lack the capacity and skill in applying supervisory activities. This might imply that, the supervision activities are performed by those supervisors who lack supervisory knowledge and skill to run their functions to the level expected. The significance t- value (p-value 0.00) was less than 0.05 showing that there was significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that supervisors lacked the capacity and skill in applying supervisory activities. In this regard, in the table 7 item 2 the finding of the study had revealed that among six challenging factors item 2 ranked in 3stages and indicates that cluster supervisors were lacked skill and knowledge while doing various supervision activities and it was also the most challenging factor.

As revealed in Table 3, items 3, with mean scores of teachers and supervisory teams ($\bar{X}$ =4.86, SD= 1.22) and ($\bar{X}$ =4.36, SD= 1.12) respectively indicated that supervisors lack the commitment and were not supporting teachers and schools. This might imply that, the supervision activities were performed by those supervisors who lack the commitment. Lack of commitment with lack of competence may affect the supervisors to perform their tasks effectively and efficiently. The significance t- value (p-value 0.00) was less than 0.05 showing that there was significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that supervisors lacked commitment for their work and were not supporting teachers and schools as expected. Moreover, the finding in the table 7 item 3 had showed that cluster supervisors lacked commitment to support teachers and school leaders which was ranked in the second stage and relatively most challenging factor.

Among the respondents in Table 3, item 4, with mean scores of teachers and supervisory teams ($\bar{X}$ =4.46, SD= 1.21) and ($\bar{X}$ =3.86, SD= 1.64) respectively that teachers see supervision as external imposition. From this data, one can infer that the attitude of teachers towards supervision was not clear and teacher's position in this regard

is not vivid. For supervisors to have the teacher's cooperation, they need to be clear with their supervisory practices and work in cooperation.

The significance t-value (p-value 0.45) was greater than 0.05 showing that there was no significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that teachers saw supervision as external imposition. However, in the finding this challenging factor was ranked in the last stage and due to this fact it was relatively less challenging factor for the effective implementation of supervision.

With regard to item 5 of Table 3, with mean scores of teachers and supervisory teams ($\bar{X}$ =4.56, SD= 1.19) and ($\bar{X}$ =3.87, SD= 0.98) respectively depicted that supervisors have no decision making capacity on problems identified through their supervisory roles. The mean and standard deviation score deduced that, supervisors couldn't able to solve the problems they identified through their supervisory functions as they were not decision makers over these matters and/or they couldn't make their decisions clear to the implementers, it was hard for them to win the cooperation of supervisees. The significance t- value (p-value 0.18) was greater than 0.05 showing that there was no significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that cluster supervisors had no decision making capacity on problems identified through their supervisory roles. The finding in the Table 6 had ranked the challenging factor in fourth stage and which indicates that lack of decision making capacity in supervisors were not most challenging factor in the effective implementation of supervision.

As indicated in Table 3, item 6, with mean scores of teachers and supervisory teams ($\bar{X}$ =4.82, SD= 1.04) and ($\bar{X}$ =4.78, SD= 1.11) respectively expressed their agreement on the lack of budget for implementation of supervision activities. From this, one can infer that supervisory practices have no the required budget to run the supervision functions. The significance t- value (p-value 0.00) was less than 0.05 showing that there was significance difference between the two groups. It is possible to suggest that cluster supervisors lacked of budget for implementation of supervision activities. Moreover, as table 7 and the finding of the study had indicated that lack of budget to implement supervision activities effectively revealed as the most challenging and critical factor in the study area.

Zepeda's point of view (2010), the instructional supervision is characterized as follows: it is a technical process which aims to improve teaching and learning through the care, guidance and simulation of continued development for not only teachers but also any other person having an impact on the educational context. The qualitative and quantitative data sets indicated that, the focus on the weakness of supervisee; the knowledge and skill gaps of the supervisors; the lack of commitment of supervisors to support schools; and the fact that supervisors are not considering the positive achievements of the supervisee forced the teachers to see supervision as non-supportive to their job and this has negatively affected supervision practices in education. The lack of decision making power by the supervisors and lack of budget to run supervisory activities were challenges that supervision in the general education system faced.

Finally, as Table 3 above reveals that overall mean score teachers is 4.61 with a standard deviation of 0.93 indicates agreement level and that of supervisory teams, is 4.15 with standard deviation of 1.22 showed the agreement level. From this one can imply that teachers and supervisory teams indicated that cluster supervisors were affected by different factors in the study area. The independent sample t-test result (t= 2.32, df=358, p= .000) revealed that there was statistically significant difference between the responses of the respondent groups.

One of the supervisors replied that:

"Supervisors were not getting training to update themselves and supporting schools and teachers to the expected level is then challenging to them. They were busy with tasks out of their plan and schedule, as a result they are not performing own plan as expected. Most of the supervisors were not motivated and committed to the tasks they are performing. They are not decision makers over the issues that they identified as strength and weaknesses. There is no way for them to reward good performances and punish those who are not performing. They have claimed that, supervisory activities have no independent budget of their own for supervisory functions and this is a challenge to the effectiveness of supervision. The second supervisor indicated that supervisors observe teachers in the classroom, but couldn't critically comment on the positive achievement and problems of the teaching and learning. They mostly focus on classroom management and student- teacher relations, and most of them left class in 10 to 15 minutes time and this could affect their perception of the teachings of the teachers and that is why they failed to support teachers in academic matters. Supervisors lack commitment and their comments are mostly on the weakness they observed, however teachers need to know both strength and weakness to improve their lessons (CS1, 23 March, 2023)".

4. Conclusions and recommendations

4.1.1. The extent to which instructional supervision employed

Based on the summary of the findings the following conclusions were drawn. The study was aimed to investigate the contribution of instructional supervision to the improvement of instructional practices in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone. From findings of both the quantitative and qualitative data had indicated that the implementation of instructional supervision did not contribute much for the improvement of instructional practices. More specifically, it was indicated that instructional supervision practices did not help teachers in formulating appropriate instructional objectives; did not assist teachers in identifying locally available teaching and learning resources; did not assist teachers in selecting teaching which enhance learning; did not help teachers in the organization of co-curricular activities; did not improve teachers skill of managing students and it did not assist teachers to conduct action research. Hence, teachers and supervisory teams in the sample schools had believed that instructional supervision did not enable them improve their teaching techniques. Therefore, it can be concluded that the implementation of instructional supervision in sampled secondary schools were not effective in supporting instructional practices.

4.1.2. Instructional supervisors' provision of professional and pedagogical support for teachers to improve the instructional practices

Based on the findings professional support given to teachers and supervisory teams in the study area was found to be inconsistent and unsatisfactory. In this regard the supervisors' involvement in the provision of induction training to new teachers to familiarize them with the environment and help them improve their instructional practices by demonstrating and modeling teaching techniques and methods was not to the expected level. The cluster supervisors hardly arranged workshops and seminars, and providing objective feedback for teachers on classroom observation.

Therefore, it can be concluded that teachers were not professionally benefited from the current instructional supervisory practices of the instructional supervisors in the way that they could help them to improve the quality of the teaching and learning and the education in general. The supervisors were not promoting staff development to the expected level. The actual performance of the instructional supervisors did not meet the needs of teachers and the goals of bringing the supervision service closer to the schools. The evidences allow us to conclude that teachers in Wolaita Zone are not benefiting much from cluster supervisory practices.

4.1.3. The Challenges Affecting the contribution of Cluster Supervision

The findings of the study had revealed that supervisors lack adequate qualification and competence to provide the supervisory service although they have diploma or degree. Lack of practical skills for good performance in providing supervisory support is the main challenge. Cluster supervisors have long year work experience, but lack commitment and current professional competence. In this regard Kiiru (2015) revealed in his study supervisors are frustrated for they lack authority to take actions. Zepeda (2017) indicated that support from cluster coordinators support from the district level helps a lot. Cluster supervisors' lack of adequate training, motivation and interest from the side of supervisors were identified additional challenges in cluster supervision. Therefore, it can be concluded that, the work of cluster supervisors were challenged with lack of practical competence and preparation of cluster supervisors on one hand and the poor working conditions of supervisors on the other hand.

In conclusion, the overall practice of instructional supervision and the improvements gained from supervisors were not to the expected level. Most of the major aspects of the instructional supervision domains were not fully implemented or only partly implemented and consequently the very objectives of supervision were compromised. Thus, without effective implementation of instructional supervision the expected improvements in quality of education and students' academic achievement cannot be enhanced.

4.2. Recommendations

In relation to the major findings and conclusion drawn in this study, the following recommendations are proposed to improve the instructional practices in secondary schools.

- The principals had better change the trend of using more time for administrative than teaching learning activities. It is possible to delegate routine administrative activities to subordinates.
- Principals, supervisors and the woreda education office had better employ pre-observation, during observation and post observation by preparing checklist for teachers.

- Cluster supervisors need to conduct frequent classroom visits and classroom observation in order to find out the impacts to teachers' teaching and pupils' learning.
- Woreda Education Office need to organize training programs for principals as well as teachers on the need for effective instructional supervision.
- Supervisors had better give constructive feedback after supervision for supervisee to make teachers to perceive supervisory practice as supportive.

References

Chidobi, R. (2015). Instructional Supervision as a key for effective teaching and learning in Enugu state of Nigeria secondary schools: Relevance and challenges. *Scientific Research Journal* (SCIRJ) 3, (6) 37- 42.

Cruz, S., Carvalhob, A.L., & Sousa, P. (2015). Instructional supervision and emotional intelligence capabilities: excellence in clinical practice. *Procedia–Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 171, 153-157.

Dali P.D., Daud Y., Mohd S., & Fauzee O. (2017). Teaching and Learning Supervision by School Management, Attitude of Teachers and Competency of Teaching. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 6(10), 1367-1381.

Daniel Y., & M. K. Namale, (2016). Challenges of Instructional Supervision of Senior High Schools in the Techiman Municipality in the Brong Ahafo Region of Ghana. Asian *Journal of Social Sciences and Management Studies, Asian Online Journal Publishing Group*, 3(3), 222-228.

Ebele, U., & Olofu, P. (2018).Enhancing the standard of teaching and learning in the 21st century via qualitative school-based supervision in secondary schools in Abuja municipal area council (AMAC). *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 9(6), 79-83.

Egwu, S.O. (2015). Principals' performance in supervision of classroom instruction in Ebonyi state secondary schools. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6 (15), 99 -105.

Ekpoh, U.I., &Eze, G.B. (2015). Principals' supervisory techniques and teachers' job performance in secondary schools in Ikom education zone, Cross River State, Nigeria. *British journal of education*, 3 (6) 31-40.

Glanz, J., & Heinmann, R. (2018). *Encouraging reflective practice in educational supervision through action research and appreciative inquiry*. The Wiley handbook of educational supervision. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Glickman, C.D., Gordon, S.P., & Ross-Gordon, J.M. (2017). *Supervision and instructional leadership*: A developmental approach (10th ed.). New York: Pearson.

Kassahun Merga. (2014). The Practices and Challenges of Instructional Supervision in Government Preparatory Schools of Addis Ababa City Administration (Thesis). Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa.

Kiiru, M.W. (2015). *Influence of head teachers' instructional supervision practices on pupils' performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Kiambu sub-county, Kenya*. Unpublished Med Projects: Nairobi University.

MoE. (1994). The New Education and Training Policy. Policy Document of the Ethiopia Ministry of Education. Addis Ababa University.

MoE. (2010). ESDP IV Version 1 for internal discussion. Unpublished educational sector Development program document, Addis Ababa.

Mohammed, T. (2014).Effects of educational supervision on students' academic performance in Nadowli District in the Upper West Region of Ghana. *The International Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, 2(6), 326-341.

Nwambam &Eze (2017). Place of Instructional supervision in enhancing public secondary school teachers' effectiveness. Educational Research and Reviews, 12(7), 467-472.

Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2014). *Supervision that improves teaching and learning: Strategies and techniques* (4th ed.).Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Usman, Y. D., (2015). The Impact of Instructional Supervision on Academic Performance of Secondary School. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(10), 160-167.

Wolaita Zone Education Department (WZED) (2022/2023). Annual Education Abstract of Wolaita Zone. Wolaita Sodo.

Zepeda, S.J. (2017). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Zepeda, S.J. (2015). *Job-embedded professional development: Support, collaboration, and learning in schools*. New York, NY: Routledge.