Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., April-June 2021, 10(2), 53-67
DOI: https://doi.org/10.20372/star.v10i2.05
ISSN: 2226-7522 (Print) and 2305-3372 (Online)
Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal
Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., April - June 2021, 10(2), 53-67
Journal Homepage: https://journals.wgu.edu.et

Original Research

Effects of School Based Supervision on Teachers' Teaching Effectiveness in Secondary Schools of Horro Guduru Wollega Zone, Ethiopia

Fanta Wakwoya

Center for the Studies of Environment and Society, Wollega University, P.O. Box: 395, Nekemte, Ethiopia

Abstract

The researchers set out to find out how much of an impact school-based supervision had on the efficiency with which teachers completed their lessons. The research strategy employed in the study was a quantitative explanatory design. A questionnaire was used to gather the data. Using random sample techniques, 195 respondents were included in the study. Multiple regressions, standard deviation, and mean were used to analyze the data that was obtained. The study's results show that with pre-observation planning, observation conferences, and post-observation conference monitoring, school-based supervision practice is superior (M = 2.65, SD = 0.75). Lesson planning is an important part of a teacher's professional life, and when it comes to managing their classroom, teachers are experts. Respondents did, however, affirm continuous assessment's inadequateness. The teaching efficacy of instructors is positively and significantly impacted by school-based supervision (β =.21, p<0.05). The ability to adapt effective pedagogical techniques to classroom instruction is a key component of effective supervision. Administrators should take an active role in instructional leadership and work to foster conditions that are favorable to the adoption of school-based supervision.

Article Information

Article History:
Received : 18-04-2021
Revised : 23-05-2021
Accepted : 27-06-2021

Keywords:
supervision, teaching effectiveness, school based supervision

*Corresponding Author:

Fanta Wakwoya

E-mail:
fantawakoya@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordo (2004) define school-based supervision as an internal monitoring system that examines the quality of educational inputs, procedures, and outcomes in order to provide workable solutions for enhancing the efficacy of schools. The program is designed to help teachers enhance their instruction, ultimately benefiting the students. According to Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin (2000), school-based supervision practice helps instructors advance professionally by providing them with orientation, training, and support, all of which enhance the quality of instruction and student learning.

Inyamah (2011) argues that monitoring is useful for making sure teachers pay attention in class, which in turn increases the likelihood that students will make positive, long-lasting changes to their behavior. The point of supervision is not to point out where instructors went wrong but to provide them

feedback on how they may become better educators. According to Ambrita, Siburian, and Purba (2014), school-based supervision is a process that helps teachers improve their learning management skills so that learning goals can be efficiently and effectively accomplished. Thus, administrative considerations unrelated to the learning process are underrepresented in supervision objectives, which are primarily focused on technical matters.

Also, according to Marshall (2005), thorough instructional observation can help find out where teachers are strong and where they need improvement. According to Radi (2007), a supervisor and teacher should meet to talk about the supervisory process and get each other's opinions. Teachers can get insight into their own methods, strategies, and pedagogical instruments' strengths and limitations through the conversation process.

The purpose of school-based supervision is to assist educators in sustaining and enhancing classroom instruction for the benefit of students. The best way for supervisors to help teachers is to help them refine their own teaching methods. The ultimate purpose of supervision is to raise student achievement through enhancing educator conduct in the classroom. The goal of internal supervision is to help educators better satisfy the requirements of their students and their own organizations through strengthening connections and enhancing classroom instruction (Glickman et al., 2004).

Educational supervision can take several forms, including developmental, peer coaching, and clinical. As a form of therapy, clinical supervision is designed to help clients become more competent in their chosen fields. Professional colleagues engage in peer coaching supervision when they work together to reflect on their teaching practices, address issues that arise in the classroom, and support each other's professional growth through the exchange of ideas and guidance (Robbins, 1991). The goal of developmental supervision is to help educators gain more independence in their classroom practices. Teachers' personal and professional abilities, as well as their stage of development, make this an inapplicable generalization. According to Brunelle et al. (1988), the method ought to be modified according to the requirements of the educator.

When teachers lack competence, dedication, or developmental level, a supervisor practicing developmental supervision will resort to directive help. According to Nek et al. (2000), it is the supervisor's job to help teachers when they're having trouble. Collaborative support is added to the toolbox of teachers who are somewhat developed, knowledgeable, and dedicated. Together, administrators and educators tackle challenges in a collaborative setting. For educators who are highly invested in their work and operating at a high developmental level, a nondirective method works well. This form of support is available to educators who are able to address the challenges they encounter in the classroom (Brunelle et al., 1988).

In contrast, Goldhammer's ground-breaking research was the inspiration for the clinical supervision paradigm (1969). According to Paba (2017), Goldhammer analyzed the CSM in three stages: group

planning, classroom observation, and individual feedback sessions. Creating a teacher who is capable of critically evaluating their own work is the overarching goal of clinical supervision. A key tenet of clinical supervision is the idea that a structured relationship between a supervisor and a teacher can only lead to better classroom instruction. The primary goal of clinical supervision, according to Goldhammer (1969), is to foster professional development and enhance teaching through direct, in-person communication between supervisors and their supervised teachers. Consequently, the model's primary goal is to direct practice through the gathering of descriptive data derived from in-depth observation of the teaching process. Information gathered includes classroom activities, both those of instructors and students, that contribute to the learning process. After the developmental supervision process is over, the supervisor and the supervised professional evaluate the lesson's effectiveness (Paba, 2017).

Academic supervision is positively associated with teacher performance, according to research (Olivia & Pawlas, 2004). Academic supervision is an integral part of a teacher's performance management of learning (Gordon & Ross, 2007). If academic supervision is done well, it will improve teachers' careers (Olivia & Pawlas, 2004). Teachers are supposed to receive feedback from supervisors in order to improve their performance.

Clinical supervision improves classroom instruction and student achievement, according to research on the topic, however evaluating a teacher through this method is time-consuming (Borich, 2008). Teachers can benefit greatly from direct assistance in identifying areas for improvement in their teaching through school-based supervision. It can also help educators grow professionally and do a better job in the classroom (Zepeda, 2007). Visiting classes, evaluating, and attending workshops or seminars are all examples of supervisory activities that can speed up the process of improving teachers' effectiveness (Obi, 2004). The principal or other school-appointed instructors serve as supervisors, and they are responsible for running the school.

Research has shown, however, that school monitoring is far from perfect and faces numerous obstacles in the field. Some educators feel anxious, uncomfortable, or stressed out when they are observed in the classroom (Aubusson et al., 2007). In addition, while enhancing teachers' professional growth is the primary goal of classroom observation, the practice mostly centers around evaluating rather than developing. Due to its increased subjectivity, judgment, and imprecision, it is seen as both incompetent and dangerous (Mercer, 2006). Neither the school management team nor the principal give adequate thought to supervision (Nek et al., 2000), and the principal in particular often disregards his or her responsibilities in this area. The entire practice of supervision can be severely affected by a lack of attention, which in turn affects the school, the students, and the instructors.

Statement of the Problem

Inadequate supervisory skills are just one of several issues. Teachers are still not informed, supported, or happy. In favor of administrative tasks, supervisors fail to adequately attend to their supervisory responsibilities (Wanzare, 2001). Since they do not receive any substantial assistance from their managers, teachers do not hold their job in high esteem. Unless the instructor gives them permission, an internal supervisor will not visit the classroom ahead of time or make an appointment with them (Moyo, 2014). According to Moyo's research, administrators also fail to share the outcomes of their observations with instructors. Therefore, internal supervisors and teachers do not trust each other.

Teachers are said to be more efficient and productive when they are well-supervised. But principals display irregularities and neglect in carrying out their responsibilities of school-based oversight, according to Sharma (2018). This evaluation is conducted once a semester for administrative reasons.

Additionally, the goal of school-based supervision is not achieved because teachers are careless in their supervision-related activities (Osibanjo, Akinbode, Falola, & Oludayo, 2015). Furthermore, school-based supervisors were typically appointed from outside the school, which could hinder teachers' ability to engage in self-directed professional development. Traditional methods of oversight are still in use. Due to current human, material, and budgetary limitations, traditional supervisory approaches centered on inspector-conducted inspections are no longer viable. In order to provide high-quality supervision, educational institutions need supervisors who are proactive and willing to use professional staff supervision methods.

The merits and shortcomings of individual educators can be better understood by systematic observation of classroom instruction (Thomas, 2008; Zepeda, 2007). Research has mostly concentrated on determining what kinds of processes, practices, and obstacles exist in school-based supervision. Accordingly, this research aims to find out how much of an impact school-based supervision has on instructors' ability to actually teach. In an effort to accomplish the study's goal, we sought to address the following fundamental questions:

How well do secondary schools in the research region carry out the essential components of school-based supervision?
In the area under investigation, how effective are the teachers?
How well does school-based supervision forecast how effective a teacher will be?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design and Approach

This research employed an explanatory research design based on a quantitative research approach. According to Creswell (2012), explanatory research was used to define and supplement research topics by providing the role of independent variables in dependent variables. Research Design, Number of Participants, and Sample Size. There are 1,710 educators and 73 principals

in the Horro Guduru Wollega zone. To choose the districts and schools, a multistage sampling method was used. To begin, the zone is divided into five equal groups. The cluster's several schools in various locations share many commonalities, making it an ideal setting for inclusive education. In the last round, two schools were chosen at random from each district. Ten schools, or 15% of the total, are now involved. In the schools that made up the sample, there are 650 educators. The researcher employed the sampling principle of "rule of thumb" to decide on the sample size. When conducting research with a smaller population (less than 1000), it is considered representative to take a sample that is thirty percent of the overall population (Lawrence, 2007; Schreiber & Asner-Self, 2011). The result was a proportional selection of 195 educators, or 30% of the total, from each school.

Tools for Study

In order to gather information, a questionnaire was utilized. Acheson and Gall (2003) created a questionnaire to gather data for the purpose of evaluating school-based supervision. In order to characterize methods of school-based monitoring, the questionnaire included sixteen closed-ended questions. Furthermore, the 24-item questionnaire measuring the efficiency of teachers' lessons was independently developed using existing literature and research. On a scale from 1 (very low) to 5 (extremely high), the objects were scored.

Validity and Reliability Evaluation

To characterize the instrument's internal consistency, the Cronbach alpha reliability testing approach was used. An alpha reliability coefficient of 0.80 was determined from the results. Each scale's internal consistency was satisfactory across the board. A correlation value between 0.70 and 0.81 is considered to be a good measure of the instrument's reliability according to Cronbach's (1951) rule of thumb (Table1).

Table 1

Reliability report by items

No.	Dimension	Number of items	Coefficient (Cronbach alpha)
1	School based supervision		
1.1	Pre-observation planning	5	0.79
1.2	Observation implementation	5	0.76
1.3	Post-observation monitoring	6	0.88
2	Teachers Teaching Effectiveness		
2.1	Lesson plan preparation	6	0.88
2.2	Effective student assessment	6	0.78
2.3	Participation in co-curricular activities	6	0.76
2.4	Class room management	6	0.77
	Total	40	0.80

Methods of Data Analysis

The data was analysed using quantitative data analysis techniques. The data was tabulated and processed using SPSS version 24.0. Accordingly, the mean, standard deviation, and linear regression models were used.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

School based supervision practice through Observation Implementation

Table 2 shows that school-based supervisors most often discuss the goals or significance of classroom visits (item 5) during the planning phase of supervision. This feature has a modest mean score of 3.32 and a standard deviation of 0.85. In terms of pre-observation planning, school-based supervisors adhere to the fourth and least stringent factor, which is item one, which states that they "reviewed the lesson to ensure that all parts are fully written" (M = 1.84, SD = 0.77). Results showed a modest mean for pre-observation planning (M = 2.30, SD = 0.78).

Table 2

Teachers' perceptions on school based supervision practice through pre-observation planning (N=195)

No.	Factors	Mean	Standard deviation
1	Reviewed the lesson to ensure that all parts are fully written	1.84	0.77
2	Discuss the proper teaching objectives	2.02	0.87
3	Guiding the proper teaching methods to the teachers follow the lesson content	1.99	0.77
4	Discuss the suitable teaching aid that can be implemented by teachers	2.34	0.68
5	Discussions on objectives/importance of class room visit	3.32	0.82
	Average pre-observation planning	2.30	0.78

According to Table 3, the most common practice among school-based supervisors is to observe classroom teachers' teaching methods. This element has the highest mean value of 3.78 and the lowest standard deviation of 0.94. Item 5, which states to "treat every student question thoughtfully," is second most common with a mean value of 3.34 and a standard deviation of 0.85. In the pre-observation conference, supervisors rarely practiced the second element (creating the questions depending on the level of difficulty), with mean values of 2.56, the lowest possible score. Results showed that, on average, school-based monitoring practice was moderate (M = 3.13, SD = 0.78) throughout the class.

Table 3

Teachers' perceptions on school based supervision practice through observation implementation (N=195)

No.	Factors	Mean	Standard deviation
1	Observing in the form of questions that stimulate the students' thinking	2.85	0.79
2	Develop the questions based on the level of difficulty	2.56	0.69
3	Examine the results of students' work	2.99	0.67
4	Examines the teaching methods performed by class room teachers	3.78	0.94
5	Treat every student question thoughtfully	3.34	0.79
6	Guide in developing and executing questioning techniques	3.25	0.85
	Average	3.13	0.78

School based supervision practice through Post- Observation Monitoring

Table 4 shows that instructional supervisors most often use item 4 in their post-observation conferences. Item 4 has a mean of 3.33 and a standard deviation of 0.75. Additionally, respondents noted that both teachers and supervisors talk about the problems with teaching (M = 2.65, SD = 0.55). Mean scores of 2.08 and 2.22 for supervisors' involvement in analyzing the supervision approach, bolstering effective activities, and listening to teachers' ideas and suggestions, respectively, indicate poor practice. As a result, post-observation conference monitoring revealed a generally low level of school-based supervision practice (M = 2.42, SD = 0.69).

Table 4

Teachers' perceptions on school based supervision practice through post- observation monitoring (N=195)

No.	Factors	Mean	Standard deviation
1	Discuss the shortcomings of teaching	2.65	0.55
2	Help to analyze the supervision method and strengthening the successful activities	2.08	0.72
3	Supervisors listen to my opinion and suggestions	2.22	0.89
4	The principal does not interfere with the teaching or take over classroom while teaching session is going on	3.13	0.75
5	Closing the session positively by giving support and encouragement	2.02	0.64
	Average	2.42	0.69

Teachers Teaching Effectiveness

If we want to know how effective secondary school teachers in our study area are in the classroom, we may look at Table 5 for an analysis that answers our second research question. Table 5 shows that teachers place a high value on the duty of creating lesson plans. As a profession, they are able to carry out lesson preparation with success (M = 3.43, SD = 1.01). However, they failed to make use of their lesson plans when instructing. Additionally, educators in the research region noted that lesson plans that incorporate instructional aids and take into account students' learning requirements were not commonly used.

Table 5

Respondents Response on lesson plan preparations (N=195)

No	Lesson plan preparations	Mean	Standard deviation
1	I prepare lesson plan for every lesson I teach	3.70	1.04
2	The structure of lessons is logically well-constructed	3.95	0.95
3	I always come to class with my lesson plan	2.12	1.11
4	lesson plan is prepared by considering student needs	3.72	1.11
5	Plan is made for the use of instructional aides	3.04	0.99
6	Teaching-learning plan is completed within given time	4.05	0.81
	Average	3.43	1.01

With an average score of 2.04 (Table 6), the majority of the teachers who took the survey stated that continuous assessment practice is inadequate when it comes to gathering information about successful student assessment. Along with this, the investigator looked into a student's "mark list. The results of "assignment work, class participation, midterm, and final exam" are displayed to students in what teachers refer to as continuous assessment. Having said that, it is only a compilation of students' grades and not a tool for monitoring their ongoing development or for determining where they may benefit from intervention, remediation, or follow-up in order to enhance their learning.

Table 6

Respondents response on effective student assessment (N=195)

No	Factors	M	Standard deviation
1	Written continuous assessment is conducted timely	2.18	1.22
2	Every student assessment is marked and recorded	2.02	1.04
3	Students assessment progress is reported to concerned body	2.06	1.18
4	Students learning achievement or progress is checked	2.08	1.12
5	Adequate feedback is given for every student assessment	1.89	1.10
6	Students are encouraged to ask questions	2.01	1.19
	Average perception of teachers	2.04	1.14

According to Table 7's statistics (M = 4.15, SD = 0.84), instructors carry out a variety of tasks when planning and implementing extracurricular activities. Participating in extracurricular activities presents opportunities to connect with students outside the classroom, gain a better understanding of them outside of the classroom setting, and highlight their strengths outside of the classroom.

Table 7

Respondents Response on teachers' participation in co-curricular activities (N=195)

No	Participation in co-curricular activities	M	Standard deviation
1	Teachers participate in co-curricular activities	4.06	0.80
2	I mobilize students to participate in CCA	4.09	0.81
3	I encourage female students club	4.17	0.74
4	I mobilize students to have appropriate ethics	4.05	0.80
5	I supervise students to solve their problems	4.35	0.81
6	social problems are solved by co-curricular activities	4.18	1.1
	Average	4.15	0.84

According to Table 8, there is an environment that is good for learning and teaching (M = 3.68, SD = 0.90) that the respondents have reported. The average number of pupils present to class is 3.09, with a standard deviation of 0.61, indicating that teachers are somewhat knowledgeable about this topic. Additionally, they confirmed that students follow the class regulations (M = 4.35, SD = 0.71) and that professors make sure students are ready to study (M = 4.05, SD = 0.85). Teachers, then, have excellent strategies for managing their classrooms and put them into practice well (M = 3.66, SD = 0.76). Therefore, it's possible that educators in the target region possess the knowledge and abilities necessary to carry out effective classroom management strategies. The majority of newly deployed teachers have an instructional language deficit (English language), according to data obtained through open-ended questions, even though they have effective classroom management.

Table 8

Respondents' response on teachers' class room management

No	Factors	Mean	Standard deviation
1	Teachers ensure that there is an atmosphere that is conducive to teaching and learning (e.g. classroom and furniture arrangement in accordance with the activity)	3.68	0.90
2	Teachers' ensure attendance of students to learn	3.09	0.61
3	Teachers' ensure student readiness to learn	4.05	0.85
4	Teachers' establish and utilize the corner of subjects	3.17	0.72
5	Teachers' ensure the students comply with the class rules	4.35	0.71
6	Students participation in the class room	3.14	0.83
	Average	3.66	0.76

Effect of School-Based Supervision on Teachers Teaching Effectiveness

The multiple regression summary output for predicting teachers teaching effectiveness is shown in Table 9. The complete model yields an *R* value of.789, which implies the dependent and the predictors have developed a strong positive linear relationship. The *R* square value (R2 =.623) explains 62.3% of the variance.

Table 9

Multiple regressions output summery on effects of predictor variables

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.789 [(a)]	0.623	0.603	0.120

a. predictors: (constant), school based supervision dimensions

The study was supposed to test whether misspecification problems occurred due to the model specification by using the ANOVA test. Table 10 indicates that the regression model predicts the dependent variable significantly well. Because the statistical significance of the regression model (p = 0.00) is less than 0.05, it indicates it is a good fit for the data.

Table 10

ANOVA Table of regression analysis

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	50.293	3	16.764	8.329	.000
	Residual	6.038	191	0.017		
	Total	56.331	194			

a. Predictors:(Constant), School based supervision b. Dependent Variable: Teachers teaching effectiveness

The impact of school-based supervision was found to be statistically significant (p<0.05), as shown in Table 11, which is the outcome of the regression analysis. The efficiency of teachers' lessons is greatly affected by the explanatory variables.

Table 11

Multiple regressions on effects of predictor variables: Analysis of variance and coefficients (N=195)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5.83	0.530		10.788	0.000*
	Joint effect of independent variables	0.32	0.16	0.21	3.22	0.000*

a. Dependent Variable: teachers' teaching effectiveness

Each variable's impact on the model is displayed in the standardized beta coefficient column. Where all other independent variables remain constant, the beta weight is the average amount by which the dependent variable increases when the independent variable increases by one standard deviation. The predictor's contribution increases as t grows larger and the significance level decreases.

The findings from the regression analysis showed that the efficacy of teachers' teaching is greatly influenced by school-based supervision activities including arranging for observations, carrying them out, and reviewing their progress afterward ($R2 = 0.62$, $F = 8.33$, $\beta = 0.21$, $p = 0.05$). The effect of the independent variable on the efficacy of teachers' lessons is displayed in the table of coefficients. The teaching effectiveness of teachers is significantly affected by the β value. There was a statistically significant (p 0.05) correlation between the dependent and predictor factors for these variables. Thus, we accept the null hypothesis. This means that, everything else being equal, there is a 21% increase in teachers' teaching efficacy for every 1% increase in school-based supervisory activities.

Discussion

Three supervisory procedures that are supervised by clinical professionals were the primary focus of the investigation. A descriptive study indicates that the use of pre-observation preparation, observation conferences, and post-observation conference monitoring in school-based supervision practice proved to be more effective. Most educators hold the view that, in the majority of cases, having a supervisor present makes them a better teacher. Teachers' ability to effectively instruct their students is influenced by school-based supervision, according to this study. Additionally, school monitoring can increase the level of teaching effectiveness, according to Holland and Adams (2002). The instructor is able to adjust their pedagogical approach with the help of competent supervision. Formative supervision can also aid educators in honing their pedagogical practices and expanding their pedagogical horizons (Zepeda, 2007). This study's results corroborate those of another that found that clinical supervision improved teachers' effectiveness in the classroom (Thomas, 2008; Murphy, 2004). Findings from this study stress the significance of supervisor-teacher conversations and the requirement of soliciting instructors' perspectives on school-based supervision as a whole. This is due to the fact that the merits and shortcomings of instructors' pedagogical strategies, techniques, and resources can be conveyed through these types of meetings.

However, these results also go counter to what Inyamah (2011) discovered, which is that the clinical supervision method is ineffective. Furthermore, it contradicts what we know from Baharom (2002), who found that school administrators bungled the monitoring procedure. But there's a lot of writing about how school-based supervision affects instructors' efficacy. Because teachers still haven't mastered the art of engaging and proactive instruction, school-based supervision is necessary (Baharom, 2002; Radi, 2007; Zepeda, 2007).

Lesson plan preparation is a highly valued duty among educators, according to the survey. As a professional, they are able to carry out lesson preparation with ease. According to Callahan and Clark (1988), good educators are those who prepare lessons in advance. According to the research, staying up-to-date with one's field's textbooks, resource materials, and advancements is an important part of any good plan. As part of class preparation, teachers can review course materials, including textbooks and other reference resources, to ensure they cover all the bases. The essence of good teaching, according to Clark and Starr (1986), is a lesson plan in which the instructor specifies the goals of the class, the content that will be covered, and the strategies that will be used to reach those goals.

The majority of the participating educators in the survey on successful student assessment agreed that continuous assessment practice is inadequate. While teachers do keep track of student assessments and work, they seldom provide students with useful comments that could help them learn more. In addition to keeping track of performance, continuous assessment should be used to support students, especially those with below-average scores, by various ways such as providing tutorials, remedial instruction, re-evaluation, etc.

Educators play a multi-faceted role in planning and directing extracurricular activities. As a teacher, you know how crucial it is to help your students develop an understanding of themselves, and extracurricular activities provide them with great opportunities to do just that. Students discover their own abilities via the value they get from participating in extracurricular activities. Improving students' feeling of agency is a cornerstone of constructivist pedagogy. The incorporation of social constructivist ideas into extracurricular activities is a logical extension of teachers' collaborative work, since these activities foster knowledge transfer.

It follows that instructional development is aided by supervisors and individual teachers working together to organize classroom visits. The supervisor and teacher collaborated to assess the conference's format and processes, identify areas for improvement, and establish a plan to start the cycle. Consequently, better outcomes are achieved through the use of school-based supervision, which permits objective feedback. As an added bonus, it gives useful information for identifying and fixing instructional difficulties. The results of this study can be used to improve supervision practices, which in turn can assist teachers in improving their teaching methods and the quality of their teaching profession as a whole.

CONCLUSIONS

Findings from this study indicate that school-based monitoring has a favorable and substantial impact on teachers' ability to effectively teach their students. This shows how a teacher can improve their classroom instruction by modifying effective approaches with the help of competent monitoring. Teachers can be more effective in the classroom when they are overseen by school administrators. A formalized procedure for collaboration between supervisors and teachers during classroom visits would enhance instruction. In addition to more

general educational goals like problem-solving, critical thinking, teamwork, and civic engagement, good instructors help their pupils reach more targeted learning objectives. Consequently, school management should work to foster an atmosphere that is supportive of implementing supervision in schools and should lead instruction at the school level. The study's limitations and the many models of supervision should be taken into account for future studies that aim to evaluate school-based supervision and teachers' effectiveness using other variables. This should provide more general and trustworthy results.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Wollega University for financing data collection expenses for this research.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There is no conflict of interest among the authors regarding this research.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All necessary data are available from the corresponding author upon request.

REFERENCES

Acheson, K. A., & Gall, N. D. (2003). *Clinical supervision and teacher development* (5th ed.) Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Son.

Ambarita Biner, Siburian Paningkat, & Purba Sukarman. (2014) Development of an Academic Supervision Model Based on Educational Management International Journal of Sciences. *Basic and Applied Research, 18*(1), 304–314.

Aubusson, P., Steele, F., Brady, L., & Dinham, S. (2007). Action learning in teacher learning community formation: informative or transformative? *Teacher Development, 11*, 133–148.

Baharom, M. (2002). *Perceptions of teachers towards teaching leadership in computer literacy in Johor state schools* (doctoral dissertation), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Selangor.

Borich, G. D. (2008). *Observation skills are essential for effective teaching*. Prentice Hall.

Brunelle, J., Drouin, D., Godbout, P., & Tousignant, M. (1988). *Supervision of the physical activity intervention.* Montreal: Gaetan Morin Publisher

Callahan, JF, & Clark, L.H (1988). *Teaching in the middle and secondary schools. Planning for Competence.* Macmillan Publishing Company, New York.

Clark, L, & Starr, I.S. (1986). Secondary and Middle School Teaching Methods. Macmillan publishing Company, USA. [9]. Cohn, L and Marion, L, (1995). *Research method in education* (4th ed.) London: Rout ledge.

Creswell, J. W.(2012). *Educational research includes planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Pearson Education: University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Cronbach, L. (1951). *Coefficient alpha and the interval structure of tests Psychometrika, 16*, 297–334.

Glickman, C., Gordon, S., & Ross-Gordon, J. (2004). *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach*

(6th Ed.). New York: Pearson Education. Hall.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision: special methods for the supervision of teachers*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston

Gordon S. & Ross, G.J. (2007). *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach.* Pearson Allyn & Bacon

Holland, P. E., & Adams, P. (2002). Through the horns of a dilemma between instructional supervision and the summative evaluation of teaching. *International Journal of leadership in Education*, *5*(3), 227-247.

Inyamah, C. K. (2011). *Educationally, the 7-point agenda for national development addresses some critical issues. The paper was presented at the 12th annual national conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Knowledge (NAFAK).* Held at Kaduna Polytechnic, Kaduna, March 15–19, 2010.

Lawrence, N. (2007). *Basics of Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (2nd ed.) Pearson Education.

Marshall, K. (2005). It's time to rethink teacher supervision and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*(10), 727–735.

Mercer, J. (2006). Appraising higher education faculty in the Middle East: Leadership lessons from a different world. *Management in Education, 20*(1), 17–18

Moyo T. (2014). *Supervision for effective teaching and learning.* Harare, Zimbabwe: College Press.

Murphy, N. W. (2004). *Orientations to higher-degree supervision: The interrelatedness of beliefs about supervision, research, teaching, and learning* (doctoral dissertation), Griffith University, Australia.

Nek, K. Y. Y., Jamal, N. Y., & Salomawati, I. (2000). The school principals' roles in teaching supervision in selected schools in Perak, Malaysia. *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences, 1*(2), 50–55.

Obi, E. (2004). *Law and education management.* Enugu: Empathy International.

Olivia, P. F., & Pawlas, G. E. (2004). *Supervision for today's schools*. U.S.A.: Wiley.

Osibanjo, A. O., Akinbode, J. O., Falola, H. O., & Oludayo, A. O. (2015) Work ethics and employees' job performance. *Journal of Leadership*, *Accountability, and Ethics, 12*(1), 107

Paba, L.A. (2017). Clinical supervision is a proposal for ensuring the effectiveness of English language teaching at public universities in Colombia. *English Language Teaching, 10*(9), 171–180. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n9p171

Radi, Y. (2007). *Practice of supervising teaching by science teachers in Muar district secondary school, Johor* (master's project paper), Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Johor.

Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heeding New Voices: Academic Careers for a New Generation. Inquiry# 7. Working Paper Series.* New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century.

Robbins, P. (1991). *How to plan and implement a peer coaching programme*

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Schreiber, J., & Asner-Self, K. (2011). *Educational research: the interrelationship of questions, sampling, design, and analysis.* John Wiley & Sons,

Sharma, U. (2018). Preparing to teach in inclusive classrooms. In, *Oxford research encyclopedia of education*.

Thomas, T. (2008). Fixing teacher evaluation. *Journal of Educational Leadership, 66*(2), 32–37.

Wanzare, Z. & D.A., Costa, J. (2001). Rethinking the instructional leadership roles of the school principal: challenges and prospects. *Journal of Educational Thought, 35*(3), 269–295.

Zepeda, S. J. (2007). Cognitive dissonance, supervision, and administrative team conflict. *International Journal of Educational Management, 20*(3), 224–232.