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**ABSTRACT**

This study was conducted to explore ‘L**ived experiences of teachers on supervision received from District Education Board office in the selected rural schools of Livingstone, Zambia.’** To conduct the study, qualitative methodology with a case study design were employed. In addition, a purposive sampling technique was employed to select the sample, cluster centres, school head teachers and teachers. An interview and Focus group discussion were the main research instructions used.

Consequently, the main findings come out from this study were: instructional supervisors attempt to identify strengths and limitations of teachers in the classroom in order to design appropriate intervention was insignificant; in addition, intervention of instructional supervisors so as to assist teachers improve their limitations was insufficient; teachers gained support from supervisors in order to improve their instructional skills was insufficient. Instructional supervisors‟ effort in liaising schools/clusters with various organizations, community groups and other interests in matters that affect quality education were also insufficient. The major challenges that primary school instructional supervisors come across while implementing instructional supervision was multiple. They were overburdened with other tasks, teaches the same credit like other teachers, teachers are challenged to accept recommendation and do not have financial allowances.

Finally, to minimize and if possible, to solve the problems, the following recommendations were drawn; the district standard officers should frequently monitor the performances of primary school teachers, noting the strengths and Limitations using benefiting and suitable techniques, it leads to high success rates amongst primary school pupils in rural Livingstone district. Furthermore, due to inadequate instructional supervision practices such as regular classroom visits ensure that district standard officers observed and act on pupils’ discipline, know the teaching learning methods used in teaching and checking teachers’ log-books and the use of feedback influence positively teachers’ work performances.
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**CHAPTER ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

## **Background of the Study**

Education is viewed as a very instrumental and an essential agent in national development. And as such, improving the quality of education, especially at the basic education level, has become the concern of all developing nations. Kotirde and Yunos (2014) substantiate this by indicating that the concern for quality has been at the core of the motivating forces for reforms in education, and achieving quality in education has increasingly become crucial in strategic improvement plans of developing countries. These reforms include Millennium Development Goals (MDG); Sustainable Development Goals (SDG); Education for All (EFA); and Education 2030 Agenda which reflects the fourth SDG (De Grauwe, 2016). It is for this reason that educational quality assurance is a matter of accountability and national interest (McLoughlin and Visser, 2003). Achieving educational aims and providing quality basic education greatly depends on the significant role played by teachers in determining the nature of education received in schools (Gwaradzimba and Shumba, 2010). This means that stakeholders of education need to ensure the performance of tasks by teachers to the best of their abilities in order to offer quality education to pupils.

One of the important aspects of educational management is instructional supervision which may be defined as the process of bringing about improvement in the teaching-learning process through a network of cooperative activities and democratic relationship of persons concerned with teaching and learning, and it is considered as an important activity to achieve an effective education system (Oyewole and Ehinola, 2014). It is mainly concerned with pupil learning in the classroom, and it is seen as a collaborative effort which involves a set of activities structured with the aim of improving the teaching and learning process (Aguba, 2009; Archibong, 2013). This means that instructional supervision is characterised by all those activities which are undertaken to help teachers maintain and improve their effectiveness in the classroom. However, it is not designed to find faults or punish, but rather, to see the teacher as a colleague and work together to enhance teaching and learning in schools. Instructional supervision is considered an essential activity in the management and administration of educational institutions because it ensures the quality of educational organizations, and draws together disconnected elements of instruction into whole-school actions (Glickman et al., 2009). Arong and Ogbadu (2010) share this view by commenting that instructional supervision provides opportunities for schools to be effective for improving professional development of teachers to effectively manage teaching and learning processes. Similarly, Okendu (2012) postulates that instructional supervision enhances teaching and learning through proper guidance and planning, and devising ways to improve teachers’ professional knowledge, skills and experiences to make them creative in instructional processes. From the foregoing, it could be said that the general consensus from literature is that instructional supervision aims at improving practice, improving student learning achievement, reflection, and improving the overall school and these goals can be achieved when teachers learn with and from one another (Harrison and Killion, 2007). It is therefore deduced that to promote quality teaching and learning in schools in Zambia, stakeholders need to pay attention to instructional supervision.

## **Statement of the Problem**

The provision of Quality education needs cooperative and jointed efforts of different stakeholders and communities. It is the responsibility of Senior teachers, Head of Departments, Deputy head teachers, head teachers, District Standards officers and governments; (MoE, 2008). Different literatures indicated that, instructional supervisors play critical and undeniable role for the success of school organization (Certo, 2006:3). Similarly, it is indicated that, the cluster supervisors were expected to play the great role in assuring the quality of education.

A research that was conducted by Gashaw (2008), on the practices of instructional supervision in primary schools of Asossa Zone shows that the current instructional supervision practices has exposed to multiple problems such as; lack of adequate professional support to newly deployed teachers; less frequent classroom visits to enrich teachers instructionally and peer coaching by instructional supervisor; focus of supervisors on administrative matters than on academic issues (supporting and helping teachers); and less mutual professional trust between supervisors and teachers.

In Zambia, Inspectors have a variety of professional responsibilities that relate to the quality and effectiveness of school education, MOE (1996). Standards Officers are frequently entrusted with other tasks that are administrative in nature and that are not closely related to actual school work. Essentially, Standards Officers have an advisory and an evaluative function in relation to educational provision. Their advisory function is to perform through school monitoring. On such visits, their principal focus is to improve teacher effectiveness and school organisation. As disseminators of good practices, they stimulate teachers to examine their lesson preparations and follow-through their teaching strategies, the way they develop or use curriculum materials, how they evaluate pupils, and how they organize the teaching session.

The evaluative function of the inspectorate is to assess the quality education and standard performance effectiveness of actual educational provision in individual schools and in the system as a whole, and reporting on this to the appropriate authority. At secondary school level, this involves developing a set of achievable indicators in the various areas of school operation and evaluating schools and individual teachers on performance in relation to these indicators, MOE (1996). The purpose of such evaluation is to determine how successful schools and teachers are in working towards prescribed educational objectives. The monitoring evaluation also provides occasion for taking necessary corrective measures.

MOE (1996) indicates that, the role of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers in improving quality and maintaining standards in education has been a major concern in most education systems of the country. Consequently, the effort by the government to provide quality education has been enhanced through regular supervision and monitoring of the educational institutions. UNESCO (2007) indicates that, the supervision service of curriculum implementation is in different ways, depending on the role and what was expected of it. Thus, the supervision services are supposed to offer regular advice and support to members of staff and schools at large. The organisation also highlighted that, similar supervision structures with education officers play a key role in monitoring of schools. However, despite the stated roles of Quality assurance and Standards Officers in the public secondary schools, attaining quality education and standard performance have been quite a challenge.

It is against this background that the researcher considered the need to assess the Perception of teachers in schools towards the supervision that they receive from District Education Board Office.

## **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to explore the L**ived experiences of teachers on supervision received from District Education Board office in the selected rural schools of Livingstone, Zambia**.

## **Objective of the Study**

The study was guided by the following objectives;

1. To describe instructional supervisors identified strengths and limitation.
2. To describe the effects of monitoring of primary school teachers by Standard Officers.
3. To explore how feedback is given to primary school teachers by District Education Board Officers based on the monitoring evaluation and how teachers apply it.

## **Research Questions**

The study was guided by the following research questions;

1. What are the strengths and limitations of instructional supervisors in Livingstone Districts?
2. What are the effects of monitoring of primary school teachers by Standard Officers?
3. How is feedback given to primary school teachers by District Education Board Officers based on the monitoring and evaluation and how teachers apply it?

## **Significance of the Study**

It was hoped that the findings of this study would be useful to the Government through the ministry of education, standards officers at all levels, Head teachers, teachers, community the Learners including the researcher. The stakeholders in Supervision and monitoring of teachers may use the findings of the study to prioritize supervision in order to curb poor performance by teachers.

The researcher may be helped to have a deeper understanding of the importance of frequent monitoring, effects of monitoring and prompt monitoring feedback.

## **Theoretical Framework**

This study was based on role theory which describes an individual’s behaviour within a group or an organization. Katz and Kahn (1978) and Huse (1980) provided a basis for understanding how and why a person behaves a certain way within a group or organization. According to Huse (1980), “Each individual within an organization has a unique set of characteristics and the role filled by the individual provides the building block, or link, between the individual and the organization”. Huse described behaviours as being the manifestation of a person’s response to both external and internal expectations. If a person does not understand the expectations of a role, a person experiences role ambiguity (Huse, 1980).

 Katz and Kahn (1978) observed that others know people through their actions, which are dictated by the role they are currently fulfilling. Katz and Kahn (1978) described role conflict as a situation involving expectations that a person either has difficulty complying with or will not fulfil for some reason. When a role involves expectations that a person has difficulty fulfilling, role conflict results.

## **Definitions of Terms**

**Challenges:** Problems that affect the primary school instructional supervisors.

**Instruction**: Teaching in a particular subject or skills taught, the act, process or profession of teaching.

**Instructional Supervision:** The process of supervising a teacher in an instructional setting often involves direct assistance to improve the strategies of classroom practice through observation and evaluation of teacher performance.

**Practices:** To do something repeatedly in order to improve performance through instructional supervision.

**Primary School**: Schools that provide primary education for eight years (1-8), which include primary first cycle (1-4) and primary second cycle (5-8) to prepare pupils for further general education and training.

**School Based Supervision**: Refers to a supervision that is conducted at school level by head teachers, vice head teachers, school-based supervision committee members (department heads, senior teachers and unit leaders).

**School Based Supervisors**: Are internal supervisors i.e. head teachers, vice head teachers, and school-based supervision committee members (department heads, senior teachers and unit leaders)

**CHAPTER TWO**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

1.

## **Overview**

This chapter is a presentation of literature on inspection of schools in relation to the role of instructional supervisors, drawing from previous global, regional and national research and other related publications.

## **Empirical Literature Review**

# **Global**

Mabey (2011) argues that the government has the duty to promote the highest Standards of Education and Learning in the secondary schools. This means that it should pay particular attention to variety of interdependent factors including the quality of curriculum, teaching, assessment and the quality of teachers, institutional management planning process and Evaluation of the effectiveness of Education provision in schools. Mabey also stipulates that lack of basic factors, Community interference, teaching methods and administrative related factors and poor management of school resources are some of the contributing factors of poor results.

A study by UNESCO (2007) indicated that teachers had a lot to say on the role of Quality Assurance and Standards officers including other education officers in enhancing standards in schools. Many teachers were not happy with them because they never announce their coming and they were fault finders than professional advisors. UNESCO further indicated that, teachers had a lot to say on the role of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers and other educational officers, otherwise many teachers were unhappy with Standards Officers because of their conduct when in school for being more of fault finding than professional advisors. The teachers cited that Quality Assurance and Standards Officers intimidated them most of the time.

# **Africa**

Ndiso (2013) studied the Influence of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers‟ instructional supervision practices on curriculum implementation in public primary schools in Kenya. It was established that, the Quality Assurance and Standards Officers have not been felt to impact aspects of quality education on the implementation of the curriculum in public schools.

Orodho and Kombo (2006) observed that, Quality Assurance and Standards Officers ought to build trust by creating a rapport with the teachers so that they realise that it was important to be monitored for the betterment of the pupil and perceive as fair, honest and forth right. The supervision, regardless of their experience, the teachers would accept to be supervised or to be monitored to improve the standards in school. Therefore, questions and answers on honesty would give room for further investigation; such approaches might change the whole activity of supervision perception.

Wanjoli (2005) established that most Standards Officers are accused of being autocratic and authoritarian always insisting on maintenance and observance of departmental rules and that whenever they visit secondary schools, they focus on fault-finding instead of advising and encouraging teachers. When quality Assurance and Standards Officers visited a school, the atmosphere between the school members of staff and them was usually so tense that the later was not encouraged to improve work. Thus, the problem all along has been officially with the standards officer show that they went about with their duties, putting teachers on the defensive.

Wanjohi (2005) contends that, many Standard Officers go to schools not to make them better but to put teachers in their place. They only visited schools whenever there is a crisis and when their advice is least likely to be sympathetic to the plight of teachers. He further stated that, there was a time when the mention of Standard Officers was enough to make teachers panic. The officials cause terror as they are known of storming into schools where they harass, victimize and scare teachers by threatening to write negative reports about them. Wanjoli (2005) noted that, Standard Officers would go into a school without notice, carry out their usual monitoring work and not inform the head teacher of their findings. They wrote reports without consultations and would leave the school without a word. Hence, the result of mistrust those teachers had on the quality Assurance and Standard Officers. Many teachers viewed their role in enhancing standards in the education system with a lot of fear, suspicion and hostility. Thus, they perceived standards officers as fault finders who are only interested in reporting them to higher authorities instead of giving them advice to enable them improve their teaching techniques. This results in a poor relationship between them and Quality Assurance and Standard Officers.

Studies have established challenges associated with school inspection. Lack of vehicles for use as a mode of transport was cited by Standard Officers as a serious predicament to the directorate of Quality Assurance and Standard Officers’ operation. Transport at district level for Standards Officers is inadequate to facilitate their movement to schools. Quality Assurance and Standard Officers depended on schools, other departments in the Ministry of Education and other line Ministries for public vehicles. This is prohibited and inconveniencing thus restricting frequent supervisory visits. Challenges facing Quality Assurance and Standards Officers included impassable roads, resistance from teachers, inadequate personnel hostile environment and poor communication (Kinaiya 2010).

Umalusi (2005) suggested that, the role of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers is to ensure that everything in schools is done correctly and safely.

# **Zambia**

In Zambia studies on school inspection have been undertaken with varying results. A study of Isoka District secondary schools indicated that very little was being done in the area of public being monitored by District Standards Officers. Reports by Quality Assurance and Standards Officers revealed that teaching and learning materials were not easily available for use as the case for the revised curriculum by the government. Nevertheless, the study established that QASO’s supervision and monitoring had a positive impact towards enhancing quality education and standard performance in the education system. The study established that the exercise helped both head teachers and teachers to perform their duties more effectively and also became better educators (Mwandia, 2018).

A study in Zambia by Kambangu and Chiyeka (2013) concerning District Education Standards Officers’ Monitoring of Standards in High Schools found that supervision has not been adequately done even at school management level due to lack of qualified personnel and transport challenges. Similarly, Wasanga (2004) concluded that, Standard Officers were hampered by inadequate legal provision which limits enforcement of monitoring recommendations and inadequate budgetary allocations and tools.

The major roles played by QASOs during curriculum supervision (monitoring) were visiting teachers in the classroom to observe their teaching methodologies; checking lesson preparations and records and ensuring teachers have adequate teaching and learning materials. Regarding the extent to which QASO‟s activities addresses the challenges in the schools, the study concludes that the major activities that QASOs in Isoka district were engaged in monitoring and advising schools on academic performance, curriculum delivery and assessment. However, the results of the analysis revealed that majority of the QASOs were not engaging in monitoring and advising schools on environmental conservation and school provision of career guidance. The major challenges experienced by QASOs while carrying out their roles were poor transport system, inadequate directorate of quality assurance and standards staffs, lack of qualified personnel in the directorate and teachers‟ negative attitude towards the officers (Mwandia, 2018).

## **Instructional Supervision**

Previously different literatures define supervision and educational supervision in different ways, that supervision is the general term that includes all the others. But specifically, instructional supervision is designed to supervise, support and influence instructions of teachers in the classrooms instructional activities to develop pupils’ performance. Various scholars define Instructional supervision differently. To mention few, Sergiovanni and Starratt, (1998) define instructional supervision as a: “… set of activities and role specifications designed to influence instruction”. Ben Harris is quoted by (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1998) as saying that “… supervision of instruction is directed towards both maintaining and improving the teaching learning processes of the school”. Supervision is defined as the phase of school administration which focuses primarily upon the achievement of the appropriate instructional expectations of the educational system.

Thus, instructional supervision has become a key element in improving the quality of instruction at school. It involves ongoing academic support to teachers along with appraisals of the school‟s performance and progress. It is formative and interactive, as opposed to inspection which is summative, i.e. appraising the situation at one point in time. As (Glickman, 1990) views, instructional supervision, the actions that enables teachers to improve instruction with provision of quality education for pupils and as an act that improves relationships and meets both personal and organizational needs. Similarly, (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 2002) describe instructional supervision as opportunities provided to teachers in developing their capacities towards contributing for pupils’ academic success. In addition, as Yavuz cited in (Garubo and Rothstein, 2010) instructional supervision is a method of teaching staff to act in more conscious ways and its aim is to provide teachers and supervisors with more information and deeper insights into what is happening around them. This increases the options teachers have as they work with pupils. If the partnership between supervisors and teachers works, teachers learn to identify and resolve their problems, and supervisors get a better idea about what is happening in different classrooms. This provides supervisors with more opportunities to think about their actions and emotions and to adopt conscious plans to improve the learning situations. Similarly, the project monitoring unit, (MOE, 2005) defined instructional supervision as the management tool which is used to improve and monitor efficiency and quality of teaching and learning at all levels of educational system. Therefore, the effective functioning of schools is the result of effective school management that in turn is critically interdependent of quality supervision. In Ethiopia, instructional supervision has often been seen as the main vehicle to improve teaching and learning in schools, with the help of different stakeholders as instructional supervisors.

Instructional Supervision is a critical examination and evaluation of a school as a designated place of learning so as to make it possible for necessary advice to be given for the purpose of school improvement. Supervision of instruction is that process which utilizes a wide array of strategies, methodologies and approaches aimed at improving instruction and promoting educational leadership as well as change.

Taking this reality in mind, practices of instructional supervision has genuine significances for the improvement of teachers‟ pedagogical skills and methodological skills. Therefore, identifications of teachers‟ strength and limitations; based on the limitations to arrange induction training for beginner teachers and to prepare various intervention to assist teachers improve their limitation; supervisors provide professional support to teachers in order to improve their instructional skills and supervisors liaise schools with different community groups and organizations have cumulative impact on the achievement of quality education and for the growth of pupils‟ performance.

What is more, “Instructional supervision is a behaviour system in school operation with distinct purpose, competences and activities which is employed to directly influence teaching behaviour in such a way as to facilitate student learning‟‟ (Lovell and Wiles, 1983). A comprehensive definition of supervision offered by (Robert and Peter, 1989), as supervision is instructional leadership that relates perspectives to behaviour, clarifies purpose, contributes to and support organizational actions, coordinates interactions, provides for maintenance and improvement of instructional program, and assesses goal achievement. Furthermore, this concept with reference to dictionary of education “All efforts of designated school officials, toward providing leadership to teachers and other education workers in the improvement of instruction; involve stimulation of professional growth and development of teachers; the selection and version of educational objectives; material of instruction and methods of teaching and the evaluation of instruction.

Schools are institutions were the actual instruction takes place. As instruction is a continuous process, the functional of supervision at school level should also be a continuous responsibility. In this respect, with in the school system, school head teachers, deputy head teachers, department heads and senior teachers are supposed to be active participants of school based instructional supervision. Hence, the contribution of each and every responsible personnel of the school can make the educational endeavour worthwhile and productive for the successful achievement of educational objectives.

## **Effects of Monitoring on Primary School Teachers**

Education remains the biggest instrument for academic progress, social mobilization, political survival and effective national development of any country, it constitutes the largest enterprise/industry in Zambia that is why, the government continues to ensure that funds, school facilities, instructional materials, teaching personnel and a beneficial learning environment are made available to teachers. The Government has also continuously encouraged schools by adopting a Free education in primary schools and reduced social demand approach towards planning the education sector by subsidizing the school fees. Archibong’s (2013) is of the view that quality education does not just occur miraculously but can be achieved through continuous improvement efforts by the stakeholders in the education enterprise.

## **Feedback Provided Instructional Supervision Monitoring and Evaluation**

The quality of student learning is directly related to the quality of classroom instruction. Therefore, one of the most important aspects of instructional leadership is to provide the necessary climate to promote ongoing instructional improvement. Supervisor is responsible to identity the training needs of the teachers and organize in-service programs in the form of work shop, seminars, conference, faculty meeting, intra school and inter school visits and other services are useful to be utilized, so as to realize effective staff professional development and supervision manual (MOE,1994). According to (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1998) stated, “since teachers often will not know-how to do what needs to be done, it is important for a supervisor to identify their needs and then to in-service them in some ways”. According to, (Travers, 1995) proposed the name of training is staff development, which primarily aim to increase the knowledge and skills of teachers and staff members and thereby increase the potential of the school to attain its goals and objectives. On the other hand, staff development programs must be predicted on the beliefs that; the school system delivers quality education through quality of its staff and Teacher in a continuous learning process. What is more, (Travers, 1995) lists benefits that staff development programs can offer to the teacher, which are as follows; to update skills and knowledge in a subject area, to keep abreast of societal demands, to become acquainted with research on new methods of teaching and to become equipped with the advances in instructional materials and equipment.

To accomplish the instructional improvement, the instructional supervisors must be able to plan and deliver effective staff development programs. The supervisor needs to ensure that staff development efforts have the appropriate financial resources; adequate time set aside to plan, conduct, and implement the programs; and time for staff to practice the new skills. Further, teachers need the verbal support and physical attendance at sessions by the supervisors to verify their commitment. Teachers should be involved in the identification of their own staff development needs. They must be involved in the planning and delivery of staff development activities to gain the greatest acceptance. Collaboration of teachers and supervisors will enhance the staff development program and lead to improved student learning. Staff development programs need to be comprehensive and continuous programs that are carefully designed for personal and organizational growth.

The activities should be founded upon strong theoretical, conceptual, or research bases. The information must be related to practice with ample opportunities provided for modelling and coaching. Professional training sessions developed for teachers must be consistent with adult learning theory. A well-planned and administered staff development program may be one of the most critical factors in the improvement of instruction and subsequently in the increase in student learning are carefully designed for personal and organizational growth.

Taking this reality in mind, there is almost an agreement among those researchers and educators that staff development is a main component of the supervisory practices. The instructional supervisor’s guide represents the view of instructional supervision, state that; “developing teachers‟ educational competences” is the main aims of supervision. According to, (MoE, 2008) staff development lists as one of the major functions of instructional supervision. Accordingly, any experience that enlarges teachers‟ knowledge, skills, appreciation and understanding of his/ her work falls under the domain of staff development.

In general, at school level teaching Staff development should meet the need of both the individual teacher and the educational system. Staff development at school level is highly important. The main reason is that pre-service training has become an introduction to teaching profession. The complete teacher is developed through experience.

## **Research Gaps within the Literature Reviewed**

#  **CHAPTER THREE**

# **METHODOLOGY**

1.

## **Overview**

This chapter incorporates the methodological aspects of the study. This includes the research design, location of the study; target population; sample selection; research instruments; data collection techniques, data analysis; trustworthiness and ethical considerations.

## **Research design**

This study adopted a qualitative research method model and employ a case study approach to explore the Perception of Teachers towards the Supervision that they receive from District Education Board Office in the selected Rural Schools of Livingstone Districts. Orodho and Kombo (2002). revealed that a case study can be used observe the state of affairs as it exists and can be used when collecting information about peoples’ attitudes, opinions, habits or any of the variety of education or social issues.

## **Location of the Study**

The study was conducted in Livingstone district

## **Target population**

The target population of this study comprised of all head teachers, deputy head teachers, senior teacher and teachers all the rural primary schools of Livingstone district in Southern Province.

## **Sample Selection**

The sample selection employed both purposively and simple random to ensure that specific groups were represented according to the researcher’s discretion. This method will help target a group of respondents who are suitable to bring out appropriate information related to the central issue being studied for in-depth analysis (Black, 1999; Kombo and Tromp, 2009).

## **Research Instruments**

Considering the nature of the proposed study, a case study approach was employed, the researcher collected data through three instruments: Focus group discussion, semi Structured interviews and Observation. For the sake of obtaining unbiased data, books, official records and reports for the District were consulted as well.

## **Data Collection Techniques**

Primary data was collected through Questionnaire, face to face interviews and Focused Group Discussion with the key informants. During the data collection phase, the researcher used of a phone recorder to capture all the information from the conversation between the researcher and the respondents. During the interviews and Focused Group Discussion were used to get views from the stated respondents on the Perception of Teachers in School towards the Supervision that they receive from District Education Board office in the Selected rural Schools of Livingstone Districts. The questionnaire was also administered to get data from teachers and those in management on the state of affairs in the schools. Secondary data was obtained from official records, reports, internet, dissertations, and books available in the libraries.

## **Data Analysis**

The qualitative data was analysed thematically using content analysis, as emerging themes and sub themes from the data. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 20.0) will be used to enhance the analysis. The researcher hopes that the responses will provide proper conclusion and recommendations.

## **Trustworthiness**

The aspect of trustworthiness of qualitative content obtained from the respondents was assessed in terms of its credibility, dependability, conformability, transferability, and authenticity. This was achieved by including in the study, those officials of the Ministry of Education who were directly affected by the inspectorate function. Credibility was attained by using interviews, FGDs and observations to establish for truthfulness. Dependability was achieved by having the research instruments reviewed by an expert from the University of Zambia in the process of design and implementation. Confirmability was done by ensuring that all the findings were based on none other than the responses obtained from the respondents without any bias. Transferability was achieved by focusing on those attributes of supervision that could be applied to other setups in the education sector. The research remains credible on the basis that it addressed a real problem obtaining in the education sector.

## **Ethical consideration**

Ethical issues need to be anticipated and dealt with by the researcher (Gawel, 1997). To start with, clearance was sought from the ethical clearance of the University of Zambia. Then an introductory letter was collected from the Assistant Dean Post Graduate, School of Education, and then permission was gotten from the District Education Board Secretary to conduct research in the five mission schools of Southern Province. Furthermore, informed consent was sought from the respondents after indicating to them the study and its importance to the education sector. In addition, participants were assured of data confidentiality and that data would only be used for the academic purposes. The researcher also assured respondents that their names and those of the schools would be concealed unless permission was sought from them to have their identity disclosed as a show case for certain achievements made in their school.

## **Chapter Summary**

This chapter outlined the research methodology. This includes the research design, location of the study; target population; sample selection; research instruments; data collection techniques, data analysis; trustworthiness and ethical considerations.

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**RESEARCH FINDINGS**

1.

## **Overview**

This chapter presents the findings from the interviews conducted with the head teachers and teachers at the selected schools. Qualitative data analysis was employed to reveal the emerging themes from each research objective. These have been presented with verbatim statements on particular findings. The chapter is divided into three main sections according to the research objectives. The first section is an analysis and interpretation of the results from assessing how instructional supervisors identified the strengths and limitations of teachers within Livingstone Districts. The second section is an analysis and interpretation of the results of the interviews conducted on the effects of monitoring of primary school teachers by Standard Officers. The third section is an exploration of how feedback was given to primary school teachers by District Education Board Officers based on the monitoring and evaluation by Standard Officers. An analysis of the field-notes made during the observations is also analysed and interpreted within each section.

## **Instructional Supervisors Identify the Strengths and** **Limitations of Teachers**

The first objective of the study was to identify the extent to which instructional supervisors identified the strengths and limitations of teachers in Livingstone District. To achieve this, a set of questions were posed to the respondents. They were to provide responses appropriate with the statements.

## **Instructional Supervisors Identify the Strengths**

The qualitative data gathered through interviews indicated that, instructional supervisors did not continuously encourage and facilitate school self-evaluation but sometimes perform the activities. Instead, much of the interview respondents answered:

*“the standard education officers scheduled to evaluate the schools and support different ways for effectiveness of their work once per year for the purpose of placing the school and filling the efficiency of the head teacher but not for encouraging and facilitating school self-evaluation”.*

The study inquired to establish what effect the monitoring visits by standards officers had on teachers. The themes that emerged showed that supervisory monitoring by standards officers was useful.

## **Supervisory Monitoring Rekindles Teachers’ Desire to Work**

According to the data, the informants expressed that without classroom visits they would not feel the impact of school inspection or monitoring. The findings reflect the views that classroom visits by Quality Assurance and Standards Officers is a boost in raising quality in teaching and learning because apart from the aforementioned, inspection of classrooms provide information on the type of methods and materials a teacher is adopting or adapting during teaching thus helps to know whether they are appropriate for the lesson. At the same time data showed that the reports after inspection or monitoring exposes the level of performance of the teachers in class and in school and enables one to know whether a school is performing well or not. The feedback report also helps in knowing the needs of the school, in terms of instructional materials, teachers, and instructional facilities; while the school monitoring can also be used as a yardstick for promoting the school from one status to another.

## **Teachers Perform their Duties without Support**

It was found that the teachers were executing their duties without much support from the inspectorate. The interviews with teachers found that there was less support received from the inspectorate. The inspectors were only seen during the supervisory visits to the schools. They were not available for any other consultation or technical support. Teachers claimed they lacked materials including textbooks, educational policy documents, updated syllabi, specimen papers and other items which the inspectors could ensure schools were provided with in adequacy. At school level, teachers were using a lot of initiatives to provide teaching aids, files and other materials. There was less supervision even at school level by the administrators. Therefore teachers were left doing things on their own for most of the time. By the time the standards officers were visiting, the unmonitored teachers may have strayed in their work.

*“Inspection should be about what the teachers have been adequately oriented on. However, the prevailing scenario is that some of the things the inspectors demand for, the system has not provided. For example, they have printed thousands of textbooks for learners but nothing for teachers. Even the syllabi copies, we have to photocopy from other teachers elsewhere, the school does not have…..Then the inspector would criticise me for not having such items in place.”*

## **Supervisory Monitoring Helps Standards Officers Learn about the School**

The findings also revealed that when school inspection or monitoring is done, QASOs get the opportunity to learn about schools for example; to identify some of the discipline problems encountered in schools; infrastructure meant to cater for all the learners, the teachers, head teacher, the curriculum and then indicate which way forward. Thereby, as one respondent puts it that school monitoring was a potential learning experience for those involved because it provides useful information for the parents in their choice of schools.

In addition to this, the study revealed that there were no written reports and records regarding school self-evaluation by Head teachers except for the signed school log books on issues of evaluation done by the standard education officers.

## **Effects of Monitoring on Primary School Teachers**

The second research objective was to assess the effects of monitoring on primary school teachers. To achieve this, a set of questions were posed to the respondents on the effects of monitoring on primary school teachers. They were to provide response appropriate with the statements.

## **Improvement in Access to Teaching and Learning Materials**

Data obtained from the interaction with the respondents indicated that instructional supervision identified gaps in the provision of instructional materials and made provision to have such provided for the affected schools.

## **Identified and Intervened on Instructional Limitations of the Teachers**

The qualitative data gathered by interview also indicated that instructional supervisors identified specific instructional limitations that the teachers were facing and made appropriate recommendations and interventions to minimize the challenges. The respondents indicated the Absence of specific mechanisms to identify instructional limitations of teachers in the classroom. One of the respondents said that:

*“Despite the inspectors identifying the limitations faced by the teachers, they did not provide sustainable and specific intervention plans to address such limitations. Thus they found the same challenges year-in-year-out.”*

## **Influence on Improving Teachers’ Competence**

The research findings from the interviews indicate that although instructional limitations were found among the teachers, there was inadequate support and strategies to improve competence among the teachers. The support provided was not adequate at improving the day-to-day classroom instruction competencies and enhance professional growth. It was found that there were not focused staff development strategies based on what the instructional supervisors had established on the ground. This was stressed by one of the respondents:

*“We have Continuous Professional Development and Teacher Group Meetings; but there are no special staff development programmes organised by the inspectorate. The instructional supervisors have never facilitated professional growth programs at our school – not any I have heard of at another school.”*

The data gathered through document analysis similarly indicated that, instructional supervisors do not arrange seminars and workshops but sometimes provide training for teachers to develop their pedagogical skills. In most schools, teacher pedagogical issues were addressed at department level.

The respondents indicated their perceptions regarding the supervision by the standards officers. The emergent themes are outlined below.

## **Supervisory Visits Helped to Monitor Problems**

The study revealed that the supervisory visits by the standards officers were not targeted at particular teachers with serious teaching problems. In this regard, one of the teacher exclaimed:

*“There are teachers here who have serious challenges with teaching and their performance is poor. Yet year, after year, they are not specifically targeted or monitored. When the inspectors come, they never get to know the real individual performance of the teachers…..they see on the surface and do not address the deeper individual problems faced by the teachers.”*

## **Supervisory Visits Undertaken on Presentation of a Problem**

It was found that some of the supervisory visits by the standards officers were to follow up particular problematic concerns reported about a school. The respondents agreed that there were common situations, especially during examinations when the inspectors would storm a school because there have been emerging reports such as mal-practice. In other instances, standards officers visited a school to assess the extent of a particular occurrence such as a health and sanitation problem; disease outbreak; theft, riot, fire, and other academic and non-academic concerns reported to the higher offices.

## **Concentration on Teachers’ Professional Documents**

It was perceived by the teachers that the standards officers concentrated most on checking the teachers’ professional documents such as teaching files. This included whether the teachers were using lesson plans and maintaining files containing evidence of planning, teaching and assessment. The teachers were concerned that in most cases, standards officers merely asked for these documents and did not do anything more than critique the utilisation of the professional documents and make comments basing on what they found on the ground.

## **Supervisory Visits for Fault Finding**

The teachers in the study indicated that standards officers presented themselves as fault finders, concentrating on the negative aspects rather than taking time to thoroughly analyse the teachers individually and make comments on merit. In this regard, one of the teachers argued that:

*“In the presence of a standards officer, I am meant to feel intimidated as if I do not know what I do. I have never had or heard of a positive comment from the standards officers. In fact their coming is more of a demotivation than a motivation.”*

To the contrary, another teacher said that:

*“Inspections are helpful and the teachers actually benefit a lot. By the mere announcement that the inspectors would be coming, every teacher puts things in place and ensures they are ready before such inspections. Sometimes they do not even come at all……but the teachers take opportunity to prepare. Perhaps what is needed is to find a way of having teachers ready all the time to avoid providing made-up records just to please the inspectors. No wonder they criticise what they find because we are not always ready for them.”*

The respondents also agreed that school inspection and monitoring helps the standards officers to diagnose the problems and shortcomings in the implementation of the curriculum and to identify whether the curriculum is harmonized to cater for all the learners. Further data gathered from the informants revealed that there are several indicators that lead to the improvement of inclusive education in which school inspection plays a major role. For example, a teacher testified;

*“When monitors visit us, we try to be conscious in our planning for the lesson and to ensure our lessons cater for individual difference and the slow learners”.*

## **Neglect of Other Important Challenges Facing Teachers**

The study found that the standards officers did not pay attention to other areas that constrained the teachers. The teachers submitted that the class size is an important aspect of any quality education and if the class size is not enough to accommodate all the pupils then learning becomes a problem for the learners. Additionally, the introduction of day secondary schools came with an increase of the numbers of children attending school including children with disabilities yet the government is very slow in building more classes and when the inspectors come for inspection they are basically interested in the lesson plans, schemes of work and the attendance registers for the pupils yet they do not dwell on more serious issues that affect teaching and learning which if they did then they would be making reports about the school structures and follow up for the government and ministry’s action. For example the class size ratio pupil/ classroom ratio was 90:1 as opposed to 45:1 which was the national ratio and desks ratio is 9:1 as opposed to 3:1

## **Unannounced Visits and Sneaky Tendencies**

The study found that the standards officers visited schools without announcing, catching everyone unawares. The teacher said:

*“When officers come to monitor schools, they try to use a friendly and polite language. For example, some of them can tell you I have not come to look for faults but to see possibly where you need guidance”.*

Another teacher commented that:

 *“Standards Officers sometimes do not announce their coming but on arrival, they would first begin with an apology and kindly request you that he wants to see your lessons or the class in generally.”*

## **Feedback Provided Instructional Supervision Monitoring and Evaluation**

The third objective of the study was on feedback relating to instructional supervision, monitoring and evaluation. To achieve this, a set of questions were posed to the respondents on feedback, instructional supervision monitoring and evaluation. They were to provide response appropriate with the statements.

The frequency of teacher monitoring was assessed in order to establish the basis for any feedback that would be required.

## **Frequency of Teacher Monitoring by Standards Officers**

To establish the frequency of teacher monitoring by standards officers, the respondents were asked to indicate the number of times their schools had been visited since in the past year. The average number of visits was determined at three.

Interviews with the teachers further revealed that most teachers had not been monitored or supervised by standards officers in the past year. Those teachers who had been supervised claimed that the visits were helpful but that it was unlikely that the standards officers would come through to make a follow-up on what they had previously observed.

The head teachers indicated that the infrequent supervisory visits by standards officers had performance implications on teachers. The common claim among the head teachers was that the lack of supervision by the standards officers means the teachers could be using improper methods of teaching which may affect student’s academic performance.

Teachers that were inspected recently seemed to have better ways of teaching which leads to improved student’s academic performance. Hence the findings revealed that teachers had not been supervised more than two times in the past year.

The respondents indicated that there was more frequent local school-based monitoring and supervision of teachers, which was better than the standards’ officers. One head teacher asserted that he encourages good performance through assessing what teachers deliver to the pupils. He identifies areas where the teacher needs to improve and guides the teachers. He said:

*“I assess my teachers particularly to see how they implement the curriculum, how they handle individual differences in class then I conference with the teachers, draw the way forward and offer solutions.”*

## **Significance of Instructional Supervision and Monitoring**

Basing on the responses from the interviews, it was established that instructional supervisors did not check or require teachers to conduct action researches, but concentrated on the pedagogical skill gaps of teachers without providing recommendations for strategies that can be employed to improve the status quo*.* As one of the respondents went on record to state that:

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

During the interview, the Standard Education Officer informed that, even though they were repeatedly asked to arrange experience sharing programs, there was no any experience sharing successfully facilitated. One of the Standard Education Officers answered that:

*“The experience sharing programs are not facilitated by instructional supervisors but they simply asked the education offices about their salary improvement and other allowances and benefits that they obtain. Teachers in primary schools are not interested to share their experiences even those high service holders but the school head teachers and vice head teachers always visit us in the classroom and sometimes request feedback whereas others do not like to give and receive their experiences”.*

## **Usefulness of Feedback**

The findings revealed that teachers perceived the advice and feedback given through inspection and monitoring reports and recommendations useful for making improvement in their work performance. They acknowledged that inspectors give them both positive and negative feedback and perceived the feedback as useful. However, they also mentioned that sometimes they do not realize the importance of the monitoring reports as one respondent noted that:

*“Although the school inspectors endeavor to visit schools and later make recommendations, the reports and recommendations are hardly acted upon”*

## **Lack of Written Feedback**

The interviews with the teachers revealed that the standards officers provided no written feedback to indicate the findings or areas to improve upon. Whenever they conducted their monitoring of teachers, the standards officers left and never returned to establish whether the areas of concern they had raised had been addressed by the particular teachers. The closest the standards officers provided feedback was verbally, usually after observing a teacher’s lesson and checking the file. Such feedback is usually verbal and was found to be helpful although the teachers thought a written feedback would carry more weight and be less biased as it would be based on a standard form. Unlike this general viewpoint, one teacher indicated strong preference for the verbal immediate feedback:

*“I am personally okay with the verbal feedback on the spot. It provides an opportunity for the teacher to engage with the standards officer and agree or disagree; share personal opinions and seek clarification and guidance on the spot. A written feedback may have particular biases and misunderstandings which the teacher may not be able to correct. In fact, when an inspector asks you to put it in writing is because you have to exculpate yourself on a disciplinary basis, not advisory.”*

From the findings it was revealed that most teachers did not take the recommendations by the standards officers seriously. This was mainly because they were verbal and their strength of reference was lost immediately they left. Failure to follow the recommendations meant that teachers continued using the practices that were against the standards’ officers, leading to consistently low performance of the teachers as no improvement was assured. However, one teacher submitted that they adhered to the verbal feedback:

*“After receiving advice from the inspectors I try to do my part, take care of all learners in the class, support the slow learners and those with special needs by giving them extra exercises but the biggest challenge is that most of the children live very far away from school for example most children have to walk 6 kilometres daily to school, yet there is no lunch for them and they cannot go back home for lunch. For the case of children with disabilities they do not come to school regularly. These factors have affected the performance of our learners and the teachers as well”.*

It was also found that feedback from the inspectors would often not yield any change as much was with the structure of the sytem. For example, one teacher observed that:

*“Inspectors come here, make their reports but even if they make a follow up they always find very little change. For example the classrooms will always remain with their problems of big class sizes and we teachers cannot do much to change the situation unless the government comes in to address this issue. Despite these challenges, we teachers continue working hard because we love our job”*

Similarly, another respondent noted that she had not realized the value of school inspection and monitoring as she had not realized its results from the reports made by the inspectors as she explained:

*“I don’t know the use of school inspection or monitoring. I thought inspection or monitoring was meant to build us teachers and our school holistically but to my surprise these inspectors visit school make recommendations and there seems to be nothing done because when the inspector visits the same school the second time or third time he/ she always finds the same issues as identified on the first visit”*

## **Lack of Consistency among Standards Officers**

It was found that the standards officers did not have a uniform approach to monitoring the teachers and supervisors. Each successive officer had their own way of addressing issues. Inconsistencies were observed in areas such as formats of lesson plans and schemes of work. Teachers claimed that certain practices that had been adopted and accepted by immediate supervisors were rubbished by some standards officers, yet others had nothing against them or made no comment.

**CHAPTER FIVE**

**DISCUSSION OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS**

1.

## **Overview**

In this chapter, the researcher discusses the major findings from the analysis presented in Chapter four and consider their significance by returning to each research question that has guided this study. Finally, the researcher points out the strengths and weaknesses of the current research study. The discussion of findings brings out the implications of the findings to research and practice and makes comparisons with studies conducted elsewhere. The discussion is based on the objectives of the study stated in chapter one.

## **Instructional Supervisors Identify the Strengths and Limitations of Teachers**

The first objective of the study was to identify the extent to which instructional supervisors identify the strengths and limitations of teachers Livingstone Districts. The qualitative data obtained from interview indicated that, supervisors did identify the strengths of teachers during ongoing teaching learning process. This indicated that, instructional supervisors did consult and advice teachers how best they can improve their instructional delivery and further more how best they can manage their pupils in the classroom and how can they control and handle the misbehave pupils in the classroom. The focus group discussions also support this idea, that instructional supervisors did identify the strengths of teachers during ongoing teaching learning process. This can affect the stable teaching-learning process in the classrooms. Furthermore, the teachers thought the idea of instructional supervisory helps in improving and consolidating the whole process of the learning and teaching process. The findings of this study also prove to be the same with that of other studies (Nolan, 2004; Habimana, 2008; Gongera, 2013) which states that the ultimate aim of supervision is improving on instruction for providing better education.

The qualitative data obtained from the interview indicated that, supervisors did not continuously identify the limitations of teachers that have skill gaps on some aspects of the learning and teaching process and classroom management and they did not consult them how they can manage the classroom during ongoing teaching learning process. This indicated that, there was a gap between instructional supervisors and the teachers in that, supervisors did not consult and advice teachers on how best they can manage their pupils in the classroom and how can they control and handle the misbehave pupils in the classroom. The focus group discussions also support this idea, that instructional supervisors do not accepted by teachers when they advise them how they can manage the classroom during teaching learning. This can affect the stable teaching-learning process in the classrooms

The qualitative data gathered through interview on this issue similarly indicated that, instructional supervisors did not continuously encourage and facilitate school self-evaluation but sometimes perform the activities. Instead, much of the interview respondents answered:

In addition, during document analysis there is no any written documented materials on the issues of school self-evaluation encouraged by Head teachers. But there are documented materials in the school log book on issues of evaluation done by the standard education officers. According to, (Carron and De Grauwe, 1997:3) and (UNESCO, 2007:19) indicated that, support instructional instruments such as manuals and guide lines are important for supervisors. They prepare themselves for school visits using these instruments.

The findings of this study also prove to be the same with that of other studies (Nolan, 2004; Habimana, 2008; Gongera, 2013) which states that the ultimate aim of supervision is improving on instruction for providing better education. When district standard officers frequently monitor the performances of primary school teachers, noting the strengths and Limitations using benefiting and suitable techniques, it leads to high success rates amongst primary school pupils in rural Livingstone district.

It was found that the supervisory visits to schools by standards officers for monitoring purposes had an impact on the teachers. Such impact was either positive or negative depending on how the process was done at any particular time. It was found that when teachers were monitored by standards officers, their desire to teach was rekindled. It therefore raised the quality of teaching around the school as teachers obtained additional advice, cautions and approaches to teaching.

These findings are in line with the suggestion given by Wilcox (2000) that school monitoring should develop teachers‟ pedagogical skills. Barrett (2005) who studied teachers‟ perceptions of the local community and education administrators in Tanzania concurs with the findings that teachers also viewed guidance provided by school inspectors to contribute towards professional development and keeping teachers up- dated with the curriculum reforms. This shows that school inspection also known as an external evaluation is aimed at leading to school improvement. Therefore, the role of school inspection should not be overlooked but it should be looked at in a direction that ensures accountability to the government.

The study established that the process of standards officers monitoring the teachers was not a regular activities. In fact, the teachers performed most of their duties alone without significant support. The inspectors did not always recognise that teachers used their own initiatives and materials for executing their teaching functions. Teachers lacked necessary materials that the administrators and officials at the district were mandated to provide. These include textbooks, educational policy documents, updated syllabi, specimen papers and other items which the inspectors could ensure schools were provided with in adequacy. Thus it was found significant that the teachers claimed the standards officers made an unjustifiable demand when they did not consider the conditions under which the teachers performed.

This finding resonates the requirement that any monitoring process should set benchmarks and involve the subjects at every level. This requires that management and policy makers do not just make pronouncements of rules and regulations to be followed or procedures, tasks and responsibilities; but to also provide the requisite knowledge and materials for performance. There is no need in monitoring when the workers have not been provided with the materials necessary to perform effectively. This is what Hughes, (2017) in their study observed – that monitoring tools should be shared with the workers so that they know the specific areas of assessment.

The study found that standards officers learnt about a school better when they were actually involved in supervisory visits. It was during such activities that the teachers and standards officers would interact to share some of the challenges and opportunities existing among the schools in the district. Some of the identified aspects were discipline, teacher-head teacher relationships, infrastructure, curriculum, utilities and other special services and facilities.

These findings are in line with XXXX who found that school inspection played a significant role in teaching and learning. Teachers acknowledged the feedback that inspectors gave. However, school inspection also had a negative impact on teaching and learning; for instance, it forces some schools to show activities they have never done before. Moreover, the school inspection reports and recommendations, in some cases, are superficial and are not related to the school context. They often do not show teachers how they can respond to criticism in the reality of their teaching practice. Nevertheless, the relationship between inspectors and teachers is not always positive.

Alkutich, M. (2016) Examining The Impact of School Inspection On Teaching and Learning. Dubai Private Schools as a Case Study.

## **Effects of Monitoring on Primary School Teachers**

The second objective of the study was to assess the effects of monitoring on primary school teachers. To achieve this, a set of questions were posed to the respondents on the effects of monitoring on primary school teachers. They were to provide response appropriate with the statements.

The qualitative data gathered from interview indicated that instructional supervisors helped the schools in increasing the availability of instructional materials and even helped teachers in preparing and making use of the Learning and teaching material during the course of the lessons. As they indicated that in addition, the standard education office would give a plus on the availability and use in the school.

The qualitative data gathered by interview also indicated that instructional supervisors expected to recommend the appropriate intervention to minimize the identified limitations of teachers in the classrooms as expected but still they inefficiently recommend appropriate intervention to minimize the identified limitations of teachers in the classrooms because of the lack of budget.

The semi-structured close-ended questions indicated that, majority of the respondents agreed on the absence of specific mechanisms to identify instructional limitations of teachers in the classroom can was identified as the major challenge in helping improve the quality of instruction given to the learners. Because of those instructional supervisors did not have specific and tangible plan to specify and identify the limitations of teachers.

In general, the compiled result indicates that instructional supervisors did identify teachers‟ instructional limitations, the teachers had not got enough support to be competent enough in improving the day to day classroom instruction as well as enhance their professional growth. Thus, this might reduce the effectiveness of pupils, teachers‟ initiation as well as the schools goal achievement.

Furthermore, from the interview, it was found that supervisors were not arranging for training for instructional improvement for teachers irrespective of the availability of Continuous Professional Development or Teacher Group Meetings. The reason mentioned for this was lack of knowledge and skills of how to arrange instructional improvement training. Taking this reality in mind, (MoE, 1987 E.C) indicated that, supervisors are expected to provide instructional improvement training for teachers.

Similarly, during interview the respondents informed that, instructional supervisors do not highly facilitate professional growth of teachers‟ through short term training, workshops and seminars. The data gathered through document analysis similarly indicated that, instructional supervisors do not arrange seminars and workshops but sometimes provide training for teachers to develop their pedagogical skills.

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

Furthermore, the information obtained from the standard education officers through interview reveals that these activities are implemented on the department level, not on an individual teacher basis. In addition, the interview assured that instructional supervisors are not capable enough to shoulder their responsibilities in assisting the day to day instructional activities of teachers in the schools. This is due to time constraints and large number of teachers in the schools.

 Similarly, (MOE, 2002) indicates instructional supervisors are not engaged in solving school problems, because they went to school only to collect information from the hands of teachers. But they do not give necessary support for the school personnel. As Singhal et al. cited in (Gashaw, 2008) pointed one of the most embarrassing explanations for the current poor reputation of schools and the presumed failure of many excellent innovations is that teachers have not had adequate, well informed and direct supervision to help, understand and implement new practice.

In general, the compiled result indicates that, instructional supervisors do not design various interventions so as to assist teachers improve their limitations. As a result, the teachers had not got enough professional support to improve the day to day classroom instruction and instructional skills. Hence, it might reduce the effectiveness of pupils, teachers‟ initiation as well as the schools goal achievement. The findings of this study also prove to be the same with that of other studies (Nolan, 2004; Habimana, 2008; Gongera, 2013) which states that the ultimate aim of supervision is improving on instruction for providing better education.

The consideration that inspectors were fault-finders was similarly established by Tunf, Inandi and Gunduz, (2015) that teachers presume that inspectors are fault-hunters, accusatory and coercive. Moreover, inspections divert teachers’ focus from their core role of teaching, in order to collect and present superficial work to impress the inspector or their supervisors

**5.4 Feedback Provided Instructional Supervision Monitoring and Evaluation**

The third objective of the study was to provided instructional supervision monitoring and evaluation. To achieve this, a set of questions were posed to the respondents on the instructional supervision monitoring and evaluation. They were to provide response appropriate with the statements.

This was cross-checked by the data gathered through interview. As the participants of the interview indicated, instructional supervisors do not inform teachers to conduct action researches, but they inform to identify the pedagogical skill gaps of teachers to conduct training. However, they did not show how to do it.

As the (BGREB, 2007 E.C), indicated that, action research help to adopt the curriculum to fit the local needs on teacher’s skill gaps. Teachers are an important medium to achieve the teaching and learning. They are also the heart of the quality of education (UNESCO, 2007: 22). However, all teachers may luck certain aspects of the whole learning and teaching process as a result they need support from instructional supervisors how to conduct action research, (Giordane, 2008).

The qualitative data obtained from the respondents indicated that, because of the lack of budget instructional supervisors do not facilitating and coordinating short term training for teachers but different kinds of continuous professional development programs were conducted by teachers to develop their own methodological skills by the CPD focal persons in the schools. Therefore, (MOE, 1987 E.C) indicated that, instructional supervisors are responsible to provide training to solve various instructional problems that teachers face

However, during the interview, the Standard education office informed that, even though they repeatedly asked them to arrange experience sharing programs, there was no any experience sharing successfully facilitated.

The other basic function of instructional supervision is promoting teachers‟ professional development in schools. Therefore, since the competent and skilful teachers are a key component of successful school, staff development is a major function of instructional supervision. In this the role of instructional supervisors are helping teachers to grow and to develop in their understanding of teaching and learning process and improving their teaching skill (Pajak, 2002). As the researcher conclude that, instructional supervisors were not facilitating experience sharing programs between teachers to their pedagogical skill improvement. The researcher concludes that, facilitating experience sharing between teachers is the main duties of instructional supervisors because they might have more experience and they develop different instructional skills through experience and then they should facilitate experience sharing but still the study indicated that there were not done as expected. The findings of this study also prove to be the same with that of other studies (Nolan, 2004; Habimana, 2008; Gongera, 2013) which states that the ultimate aim of supervision is improving on instruction for providing better education.

The views expressed in this study validate those reported in the literature about the negative experiences of external inspection and point towards ways in which these might be reduced. The use of face-to-face interactive tools proved to be a particularly powerful means of eliciting respondents’ perceptions, experiences and behaviours. A study by Gray and Gardner, (2000) suggests that most school principals in Northern Ireland consider the inspection programme to be professional and supportive. However, there are clear reservations about the extent of anxiety induced by the process, the amount of time necessary to prepare for the inspection and the inclusion of lay persons in the inspection team.

The findings of this study fit in with the theoretical framework of Role Theory. Instructional supervisions in primary schools often encounter role conflict and ambiguity, largely due to the failure of school systems to produce clear job descriptions for the positions they supervise. As an instructional Supervisor, the Education Standards Officers are in charge of overseeing Quality Assurance in the respective schools and ensure that learning is taking place at all levels of the school. The Education Standards Officers however face obstacles in the sense that teachers do have perception that either support or contradict the head teachers’ supervisory roles.

**CHAPTER SIX**

**SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

## **6.1 Overview**

This chapter deals with the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study. The general objective of the study was to assess the Perception of teachers towards the supervision that they receive from district education board office in selected schools of Livingstone.

## **6.2 Summary of the Study Findings**

Several studies have found supervision to be of value in improving teaching-learning. The findings of this study also prove to be the same with that of other studies (Nolan, 2004; Habimana, 2008; Gongera, 2013) which states that the ultimate aim of supervision is improving on instruction for providing better education. When district standard officers frequently monitor the performances of primary school teachers, noting the strengths and Limitations using benefiting and suitable techniques, it leads to high success rates amongst primary school pupils in rural Livingstone district. Furthermore, due to adequate instructional supervision practices such as regular classroom visits ensure that district standard officers observed and act on pupils’ discipline, know the teaching learning methods used in teaching and checking teachers’ log-books and the use of feedback influence positively teachers’ work performances.

## **6.3 Conclusion of the Study**

Considering the above the findings of this study that District Standard Officers’ instructional supervision practices impacts teachers’ performances positively in rural Livingstone district through classroom visits and checking of records during instructional supervision by head teachers. It would be realized that if these practices are carried out regularly by, District Standard Officers, head teachers, teachers’ work performances will be enhanced and the teaching-learning process will be ameliorated and yield high pupils’ success rates in rural Livingstone district. To foster head teacher’s and the teachers’ cooperation, the District Standard Officers should see to it that teachers are involved in major decisions affecting the life of the learners. District Standard Officers cannot plan for effective instructional supervision practices since they spend more time on administrative issues at the expense of supervision instructions. Regular monitoring of professional documents is the most critical area that District Standard Officers should lay emphasis on. Professional documents include the schemes of work, lesson plans, lesson notes and class registers. These documents reflect the plan for syllabus coverage and the progress towards achieving full syllabus coverage. They also assist in monitoring the progress on syllabus coverage. District Standard Officers should be keen on discipline management. Additionally, the District Standard Officers should address adequacy of learning and teaching resources, encourage and motivate the teachers.

## **6.4 Recommendations of the Study**

The following recommendations were made based on the findings and conclusions of the study:

1. The head teachers should be exposed to training on instructional supervision rather than assuming that their academic qualifications were sufficient in running their schools.
2. Head teachers should reinforce the concept of teacher group meetings (**TGM**) and teachers to attend educational workshops and seminars to gain new knowledge, upgrade themselves for arising opportunities and improvement of performance.
3. Head teachers should consult teachers when developing school rules and regulations for effective implementation.
4. The ministry should further adhere to recommended number of pupils per class so as to reduce overcrowding and high pupil-teacher ratios.
5. The Ministry of General Education should also determine minimum levels of experience of teachers before appointment to leadership position.

## **6.5 Suggestions for Further Research**

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher recommends that further studies be done in the following areas.

1. Head teachers’ instructional supervision practices in private secondary schools in Livingstone.
2. Further research could be done to investigate training needs in curriculum supervision of deputy heads and senior teachers.

# **REFERENCES**

Annunziata J (1997). *Linking teacher evaluation and professional development*. In stronge JH (Eds) Evaluating Teaching: *A guide to current thinking and best practices Sage*, thousand Oaks CA, pp 288- 301

Armstrong, T.R. (2006). Revisiting the Johari’s window: Improving communications through self- disclosure and feedback. *Human Development*, 27(2), 10-14.

Beach, D. M. and Reinhartz, J. (2000). *Supervisory Leadership: Focus of Instruction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Blasé, J. & Blasé, J. (1999). Head teachers’ instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers’ perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35, 349- 378.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2004). *Handbook of Instructional Leadership: How Successful Head teachers Promote Teaching and Learning (2nd Ed.).* Thousand Oak, California: Corwin Press.

Brennen, A. M. (2008). Clinical Supervision and Case Study. *Articles and Resources on Educational Administration*. Retrieved from http:/www.soencouragement.org/clinical supervision case study.

Burke, K. and Sutherland, C. (2004). Attitudes toward inclusion: knowledge vs. experience. *Education,* 125(2), 163-172.

Dale, M. N. (1984). *Disability, Liberation and Department,* London: Open University press.

DeGrauwe, A. (2001). Supervision in four African countries: *Challenges and Reforms* Vol.1 Paris: IIEP/UNESCO.

Edmunds, A. L., & Edmunds, G. A. (2008). *Special Education in Canada*. McGraw-Hill Ryerson: Toronto, ON.

Fernald DH, Coombs L, Deleuze L, West D, & Parness B. (2012). *An Assessment of the Hawthorne Effect in Practice-Based Research,* Department of Family Medicine, Denver: University of Colorado

Frankel, L. & Wallen, N. (2000). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (4th Ed),* New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company

Gitonga D. W. (2012). *Influence of Teachers’ Motivation on Pupils’ Performance in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education in Public Secondary Schools in Imenti South District Kenya*, Unpublished M. Ed Project, Nairobi: University of Nairobi.

Glanz, J., Shulman, V., & Sullivan, S. (2007). *Impact of Instructional Supervision on Student Achievement: Can We Make A Connection?* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, CA

Glickman, C. D. (1990). *Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach (2nd Ed*.). Boston: Allan and Bacon.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2004). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach (6th ed.)*. New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Glickman, C.C., Gordon. S.P., & Ross-Gordon, J.M. (2005). T*he basic guide to supervision and instructional leadership*. Pearson Education.

Gray, C. and Gardner, J. (2000) The Impact of School Inspections. The Queen's University of Belfast.

Griffins, G., (1994). *School Mastery: Straight Talk about Boarding School Management in Kenya*, Nairobi: Lectern Publishers,

Heyneman, S. P. (1976a). A Brief Note on The Relationship Between Socio-Economic Status and Test Performance Among Ugandan Primary School Children. *Comparative Education Review*,20 (1), 42–47.

Huse, E.F. (1980). *Organization Development and Change Management 2nd Edition*, Virginia: West Publishing Company

IIEP/UNESCO (2007). *Reforming School Supervision for Quality Improvement: Roles and Functions of Supervisors. (Module 2).* Paris: UNESCO.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The* *Social Psychology of Organizations (2nd Ed.),* New York: Wiley

Kenya Institute of Education (1990). *Formative Evaluation of Primary Education Curriculum* (No.52). Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.

Kenya Institute of Education (1995). S*ummative Evaluation of Primary Education Curriculum (No.28)*. Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.

Kenya Institute of Education (1999). *Report on the Needs Assessment Survey on Primary Education. (No.63).* Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.

Kenya Institute of Education (2004). *Monitoring of the Implementation of the Second Phase of the Revised Primary Education Curriculum. (No.74).* Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.

Kenya Institute of Education (2005). *Monitoring of the Third Phase of the Implementation of the Primary Education Curriculum. (No.79).* Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.

Kenya Institute of Education (2006). *Monitoring Report of the Fourth Phase of the Implementation of the Primary Education Curriculum. (No.84).* Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.

Kimsop, M. K. (2002). *A study of the role of the headteacher in instructional supervision in Kabaranet and Salawa Division of Baringo District*, Unpublished MED Thesis. Kenyatta University.

Kinayia, D (2010).Secondary Teachers’ perceptions towards supervision by quality assurance and standards officers. Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, 2(5): 71-76.

King K. (2005). Current Trends and Issues in Lesson Study in Japan and the United States. *Journal of Japan society of Mathematics Education*, 82 (12), 15-21.

Kombo, D., & Tromp, D. (2006). *Proposal and Thesis Writing: An Introduction.* Nairobi: Pauline’s Publications Africa.

Lockesh, K. (1984). *Methodology of Educational Research*, New Delhi: Vani educational books.

Macharia G.W. (2012). *Head Teachers’ Characteristics Influencing Instructional Supervision in Public Primary Schools in Kasarani District Kenya*, University of Nairobi Unpublished M. Ed Thesis.

Martin and Acuna, C., (2002). *SPSS for Institutional Researchers,* Buckhell Lewisburg, Pennsylvania: University press

Mbiti, D. (1974). *Foundations of Schools Administration*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press

Miller, R. and Miller, K. (1987). Clinical Supervision: History Practice Perspective. *NASSP bulletin*, 71 (18)18-22

Mulusa, T. (1998). *Evaluation Research for beginners: A practical study guide*. Nairobi university press.

Musaazi, J. C. S. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Educational Administration*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Publishers.

Mutie, K.E (1995). Facet and Overall Satisfaction of Secondary School Administrations and Teachers in Kitui District Kenya. M.Ed Thesis University of Sasketchwan, Saskataon.

Mwandia, C. (2018) THE ROLE OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND STANDARDS OFFICERS IN ENHANCING QUALITY EDUCATION AND STANDARD PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF ISOKA DISTRICT. University of Zambia in collaboration with Zimbabwe Open University.

Mwenda, G. (2016). An Assessment of the role of head teacher as Instructional managers in selected primary schools of Livingstone District Zambia. Unpublished M. Ed Thesis University of Zambia/Zimbabwe Open University.

Njagi, I. N. (2013). *An Investigation into Some of the Factors Which Influence Pupils' Performance in Embu District, Embu County, Kenya*: Unpublished Master’s Thesis, Kenyatta University.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory (3rd ed.).* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oduro, G. (2008, September). *Increased Enrolment Does Not Mean Quality Education*, Ghana News Agency.

Oghuvbu, E. P. (2001). De*terminants of Effective and Ineffective Supervision in Schools: Teacher Perspectives.* Abraka, Nigeria: Delta State University

Okumbe, J.A, (1992). *Levels of Job Satisfaction Among Graduate Teachers in Secondary Schools, in Siaya District*, PhD. Thesis University of Nairobi.

Olembo, J. O. (1977). *Education Management and Supervision in Kenya Schools*. Nairobi: Kenyatta University.

Orodho A and Kombo D (2002).Research Methods. Nairobi Kenyatta University.

Orodho, A. J. (2008). *Techniques of Writing Research Proposals and Reports in Education and Social Sciences*. Maseno: Kanezja Publishers.

Orodho, J. A. (2004). Techniques of Writing Proposals and Reports in Education in Social Sciences. Nairobi: Masola Publishers.

Republic of Kenya. (2002). *Handbook for School Inspection*. Nairobi: Government Printer.

Rous, B. (2004). Perspectives of Teachers about Instructional Supervision and Behaviour That Influence Pre-School Instruction, *Journal of Early Intervention*, 26 (4), 266-283. doi: 10.1177/105381510402600403

Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R. (2002). *Supervision: A Redefinition (7th Ed.),* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sergiovanni, T. J. and Starratt, R. (2002). *Supervision: A redefinition (7th Edition),* New York: McGraw-Hill

Subban, P. & Sharma, U. (2005). Understanding Educator Attitudes toward the Implementation of Integrated Education, *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 25(2). Retrieved October 14, 2007, from Ebscohost Research Database.

Sullivan, S. & Glanz, J. (2000). *Supervision That Improves Teaching: Strategies and Techniques*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press Inc.

Talmor, R., Reiter, S., & Feigin, N., (2005). Factors Relating to Regular Education Teacher Burnout in Integrated Education [Electronic Version], *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 20(2), 215-229.

Thiongo, M. W. (2000)*. An Analysis of Teachers Perception of Supervisory Practices Used by Primary Schools Head Teachers in Westlands Division of Nairobi*. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis University of Nairobi.

Thorndike, R. M. (1997). Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Umulusi/Centre for Education policy and Development Series (2005).How can Quality Assurance Improve Quality? Pretoria: Umulusi/Centre for education policy and development.

UNESCO (2007) Enhancing learning from access to success. Paris 26th March, Report of the 1st meeting defining area action.

Wang H. L. (2009). Should All Pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN) Be Included in Mainstream Education Provision? - A Critical Analysis, *International Education Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 4

Wanjohi, S.M (2005), Teachers and Principals attitude towards school inspection in Kenya. Egertim University: Njoro.

Wannock Report. (1978). *Special Education Needs Report of The Committee in Inquiry into The Education of Handicapped Children and Young People*, HTMSO: London.

Wasanga, P. M (2004). Kenya Quality Assurance in Basic Education 6-8 Dec 2004 Kenya. Position paper prepared for UNESCO Nairobi Cluster Constitution.

Webster A. (1986). *The Hearing-Impaired Child in the Ordinary School*, London: Croon Helm ltd.

# **APPENDICES**

**Guides to interview**

The purpose of this interview is to investigate issues related to the perception of teachers in schools towards the supervision that they receive from District Education board office in the selected rural primary schools of Livingstone**.** The information obtained from the respondents will help to improve the primary school instructional supervisory practice. I would like you assure that data obtained will be used for research purpose only.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

Part I: General information

1. School \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. Sex\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3.Qualification\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

4. Current position\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

5.Experiences as: Teacher \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

School head teacher\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Part II: Give your responses for the following questions.

1. How can instructional supervisors identify the strengths and limitations of teachers in the classroom in order to design appropriate intervention? Can you give examples from your experience?
2. What are the two major advantages of present instructional supervision practices?
3. --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
4. --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
5. What are the two major problems associated school-based instructional supervision practices?
6. --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
7. --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
8. What changes should be made in the present instructional supervision practices to make them more effective? Explain why you want these changes
9. --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
10. --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
11. What are the effects of monitoring of primary school teachers by Standard Officers?
12. What feedback has been given to primary school teachers by District Education Board Officers based on the monitoring and evaluation and how teachers apply it?
13. How can those instructional supervisors design various interventions so as to assist teachers improve their limitations? If so on what major areas?
14. What is your expectation about instructional support gained from supervisors in order to improve teachers‟ instructional skills in the school?
15. What practical problems are affecting the instructional supervisory practice?
16. What do you suggest to overcome the problems?

Sincerely,