HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS' SUPERVISORY ROLE AND TEACHER PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KABWE DISTRICT, ZAMBIA

BY

BIGGIE NACHIBINGA

A Dissertation Submitted to The University of Zambia in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Award of the Degree of Master of Education in Educational Administration and Management

UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

LUSAKA

2018

DECLARATION

I, Biggie Nachibinga, do solemnly declare that this piece of work represents my own, and that all the works of other persons have been duly acknowledged, and that this work has not been previously presented for any degree at this and indeed at any other University for similar purposes.

Signed: ……

Date: ……

COPYRIGHT

APPROVAL

This dissertation by Biggie Nachibinga is approved as fulfilling part of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Education in Educational Administration and Management.

Examiner 1: ……..…….. Signed: …… Date: ……

Examiner 2: ……..…….. Signed: …… Date: ……

Examiner 3: ……..…….. Signed: …… Date: ……

Chairperson Board of Examiners: …….……..……..

Signed: …… Date: ……..

Supervisor: ……..…….. Signed: …… Date: ……

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my lovely wife Leticia Musante Mwiinga Nachibinga, my mother Nalishebo Kabayo and my ‘three Hebrew boys’ Othniel, Jathniel and Salathiel who continue to be my inspiration in all spheres of life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks go to my supervisor Dr. Peggy Mwanza for her unprecedented and unparalleled guidance during the course of my research. I also sincerely thank all Head teachers, Heads of Department and Teachers in the selected public secondary schools of Kabwe District for participating in my study. Their valuable input brought this piece together. I wish to extend my deepest gratitude to my Head teacher Mr. Evans Ngosa whose kindness, wisdom and leadership I will forever appreciate. I also express my gratitude to all my classmates especially Ian Hamomba and Namuchana Maimbolwa for the support rendered to me when I needed it the most. My friends Steady Muzambalika and Cecilia Tembo provided the comfort and encouragement I needed. My special gratitude goes to my '*Kezelis*' Mulemba Ndonji and Memory Hankwa for editing my work. Lastly, my deepest gratitude goes to my lovely wife for her financial support and my children whom I often left in order for me to concentrate on my studies. Nasilele Kabayo, Queen Mulope, Diana Chilala and Betty Muzunga who took care of my sons during my absence and for their support and encouragement throughout my study deserve my heartfelt appreciation.

ABSTRACT

The study sought to investigate the supervisory role of Heads of Department and the performance of teachers in public secondary schools in Kabwe District, Zambia. A case study research design was used. Data were analysed thematically. Three head teachers, 15 Heads of Department and 30 teachers made up the sample and were selected using purposive sampling. Interviews, document analysis and observations were used to collect data. Findings of the study revealed that Heads of Department practiced inspection and evaluation, not any different from Education Standards Officers in the Ministry of General Education. Heads of Departments' supervision was strictly guided by instruments meant to control and keep standards. In addition, the research findings revealed that due to the supervision of Heads of Department, most teachers managed to prepare lesson plans, records of work and submitted their teaching files fortnightly, apart from attending to their classes. The research findings also revealed that Heads of Department faced a number of challenges in their supervision of teachers. Heads of Department lacked formal in-service training in supervision. The Heads of Department also lacked motivation as 12 out of the 15 Heads of Department interviewed were in their acting capacity. With regards to teachers, most of them failed to meet set deadlines; most of them failed to prepare lesson plans and most of them perpetually got permissions; thus put pressure on Heads of Department to find other teachers to teach in their place. The study recommended that Heads of Department should use more modern approaches to supervision that are democratic and fair; receive training in educational management; and that the Teaching Service Commission should confirm Heads of Department in their acting Position within six months of appointment.

Keywords: supervision, teacher performance, role

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CPD	Continuing Professional Development
ESO	Education Standards Officer
HoDs	Heads of Department
HoS	Head of Section
MoGE	Ministry of General Education
PEO	Provincial Education Office
SESO	Senior Education Standards Officer
TSC	Teaching Service Commission
UNZA	The University of Zambia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview

This chapter presents the background to the study and identified the problem that the study attempted to address. It states the purpose, objectives and research questions that needed to be answered. The chapter further reflects on the significance, scope, limitations, and operational definitions of the study.

1.2. Background to the Study

The need for adequate government guidance and supervision in the Zambian education system was pressed for during the colonial era starting from 1925. This was only achieved in January, 1964 when the Inspectorate was established (Snelson, 1974). The Inspectorate was responsible for the development and maintenance of professional and academic standards in schools. The Inspector's advisory role within the school was of even greater importance in enhancing educational quality. The advice of Inspectors centred on teacher effectiveness, teaching strategies, curriculum materials, student evaluation, in-service training, and classroom management (Ministry Of Education, 1992).

Currently, with little changes in responsibilities, the Inspectorate has been replaced by the Directorate of Standards and Curriculum and Inspectors of Schools are now called Education Standards Officers (ESO). What has only changed with the former status is the decentralisation that has taken place and the numbers of Education Standards Officers has increased as enshrined in the policy document on education

(MOE, 1996). Nevertheless, the numbers are not sufficient to provide the much needed supervision of public secondary schools (ibid). This is because there are more than one hundred and twenty (120) secondary schools in Central Province of Zambia. Currently, in the entire Central Province, there is only one subject Senior Education Standards Officer (SESO) per subject area. "With such numbers, it is not possible for Inspectors to visit schools frequently in order to monitor the quality of the teaching and learning" (MOE, 1996:151).This gap necessitates the implementation of a school-based supervision system. At the core of this system in public secondary schools are the head teacher, deputy head teacher and the Head of Department (HoD).

With the restructuring of the Ministry of Education that took place in the early 2000s, supervision of teachers in secondary schools by Heads of Department was supposed to be done as enshrined in their job description (MOE, 2015). Heads of Department were among other things supposed to monitor regularly the preparation of the schemes and records of work to ensure proper implementation of teaching programmes; ensure the availability of both teaching and learning materials in the subject group in order to facilitate effective teaching and learning; supervise effectively teachers and provide advice in the subject group; monitor the quality of classroom provision through observation, sampling students work with feedback to staff; coordinate the setting, administration, marking and analysis and dissemination of assessment results and check teaching files and ensure members stick to deadlines. What was not known was the role Heads of Departments' supervision played on the performance of teachers in public secondary schools and that formed the scope of this study.

1.3. Statement of the Problem

The performance of teachers in the classroom is very cardinal in the quest to provide quality education to learners. Chavula (2016:46) found that "the quality of education in Zambia has been demonstrated by low student achievement in national and international assessments. This is partly due to poor teacher performance in the classroom." Teacher performance can partly be improved through effective supervision of classroom instruction by supervisors; this includes Heads of Department in public secondary schools. Therefore, despite one of the principle accountabilities (main duties) of the Heads of Department being that of supervising teachers effectively, it was not clear whether Heads of Department actually practiced supervision and the extent to which they did so. We also did not know how helpful Heads of Departments' supervision had been to teachers. In Zambia, there was a dearth of research studies that have focused solely on the aspects of secondary school Heads of Department supervising teachers; this study sought to bridge the gap.

1.4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the supervisory role of Heads of Department and the performance of teachers in public secondary schools in Kabwe District, Zambia.

1.5. Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were to:

a) ascertain if supervision of teachers was regularly carried out by Heads of Department in public secondary schools in Kabwe District, Zambia.

b) establish the influence Heads of Departments' supervision had on the performance of teachers.

c) find out challenges, if any, faced by Heads of Department in their supervision of teachers.

d) suggest strategies that could be used to mitigate the challenges if any faced by Heads of Department in their supervision work.

1.6. Research Questions

The research questions were as follows:

a) How regular was supervision conducted by Heads of Department in public secondary schools?

b) What influence did Heads of Departments' supervision have on teachers' performance?

c) What were the challenges if any that Heads of Department faced in their supervision of teachers?

d) What strategies could be used to mitigate the challenges if any faced by Heads of Department in their supervision work?

1.7. Significance of the Study

The study was undertaken to determine whether or not supervision of teachers by Heads of Department in public secondary schools in Kabwe District influenced the performance of teachers in the classroom. This would in turn help Heads of Department reflect on their supervisory practices and help the Ministry of General Education to improve educational provision. It is further hoped that the study will

raise questions that would stimulate further theoretical and practical investigations in the way Heads of Department conduct their supervision work.

1.8. Scope of the Study

The study was limited to three urban public secondary schools in Kabwe District, Zambia. Kabwe, unlike other Districts in Central province, has a larger number of public secondary schools concentrated in the urban area which were in the grade one category, making it possible to study schools with similar characteristics.

1.9. Limitations of the Study

The findings of the study cannot be generalized due to the small sample size and the use of a purely qualitative approach.

1.10. Operational Definitions

Key terms which were used in the study had the following meanings:

Heads of Department (HoD): A position of leadership over an area of curriculum specialization in a secondary school. The term department chair was used synonymously as Head of Department.

Teachers' performance - refers to the extent to which teachers are able to deliver lessons effectively; plan lessons, follow the syllabi and schemes of work religiously and prepare records of work which represent what was actually covered in the classroom.

Supervision - refers to the process whereby Heads of Department and the entire management team in public secondary schools monitor what teachers do in

classrooms with a view of improving teaching for the benefit of the learner. This in essence was instructional supervision.

Role - set of societal responsibilities or expectations of behaviour that is based on situations Heads of Department encounter.

1.11. Organisation of the Dissertation

This dissertation has six chapters, references and appendices. Chapter One has generally given the introduction to the study on the 'Heads of Departments' Supervisory Role and Teacher Performance in Selected Public Secondary Schools in Kabwe District, Zambia.' The chapter provides the background to the study, the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, the research objectives and questions. The significance of the study, scope of the study, the study limitations and the operational definitions used in the study are also given.

Chapter Two presents the review of related literature. Related studies from both the international and local perspectives were reviewed. The dearth of literature in the Zambian context on the supervisory role of the Heads of Department helped in the identification of the research gap. Chapter Three has highlighted the methodology of the study particularly; the research design, research study area or site, study population, sample size, sampling techniques, data collection methods and instruments, trustworthiness, data analysis and ethical considerations.

Chapter Four presents the findings of the research study**.** The findings are presented according to research objectives. Chapter Five discusses the findings of the study using research objectives, related literature reviewed and themes that emerged from

the findings. Chapter Six gives the conclusions and recommendations based on the findings of the study. This chapter is followed by references and appendices.

1.12. Summary of the Chapter

The chapter presented salient features of the research study; the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study and the resultant research questions. It has further reflected the significance of the study, scope of the study, limitations of the study and operational definitions. The chapter further provided the road map for the entire study. The chapter that follows provides a review of literature related to the problem under discussion.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. **Overview**

This chapter presents a review of relevant literature on the Heads of Departments' supervisory role and the performance of teachers in public secondary schools. This section covers the definition, importance, purpose and principles of supervision. It also analyses related literature from United States of America, Malaysia, Kuwaiti, India, Ghana and Zambia on the supervision of teachers by Heads of Department. The scarcity of literature on school leadership and supervision is also discussed. An argument for Heads of Department supervision is pressed other than that of head teachers in secondary schools. The challenges faced by Heads of Department in their supervision work have also been exposed.

2.2. **The Concept of Supervision**

The concept of supervision has been defined differently by different scholars. Bamroongraks (1996:253) defined supervision, as "the instructional improvement of schools and teachers". While Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) view supervision as a set of activities and role specifications designed to influence instruction. The definition adopted for this study is one advocated by Nolan and Hoover (2008:6) who defined supervision as "an organizational function concerned with teacher growth, leading to improvement in teaching performance and greater student learning".

2.3. **Relationship of Supervision and Teachers' Performance**

For teachers to perform well in the classroom there is need for them to be supervised effectively. "Without supervision, teachers are most unlikely to deliver the desired level of service for the benefit of their pupils." (Alhassan, 2015:137). Many researchers believe that supervision of instruction has the potential to improve classroom practices and contribute to student success through the professional growth and improvement of teachers (Blasé and Blasé, 1998; Sergiovanni and Starratt, 2002; Sullivan and Glanz, 2000).

2.4. **Supervisory Approaches**

Supervisors use a number of approaches when supervising their subordinates; among them are clinical, formative and inquiry based. These kinds of supervision seem popular because "supervisors said they are developmental, non-judgmental and counselling oriented and are directed at improving teacher performance" (Yelkpieri and Namale, 2016:226). Informal supervision is another approach in supervision which other scholars dispute its helpfulness. Informal supervision takes the form of spot and random checks – walkthroughs were also part of informal supervision.

2.5. **Importance of Supervision of Teachers**

For any secondary school to perform effectively and efficiently the role of teacher leadership cannot be downplayed. Effective schools do not just occur; they are a result of good school managers that are able to direct and support their teaching staff. Supervision is believed to be the adhesive that pulls together organizational goals and teachers needs for improved learning (Glickman, 2004). Blasé and Blasé (1998) found that when teachers were monitored and given feedback on the teaching and

learning process by their superiors, there were increases in teacher reflection, lessons were planned more carefully and teachers used greater variety in teaching strategies. Teachers also indicated positive effects on motivation, satisfaction, confidence, and sense of security. Glickman (1992) found that an effective school is unlikely to result in the absence of a strong, effective and adequately staffed program of supervision.

Other reasons for supervision of schools as noted by Ogunsaju (1983:14-20) include; to improve effectiveness of teachers so that they can contribute maximally to the attainment of the schools goals; it helps to enhance the quality of instruction in schools and it also helps to maintain minimum standards in schools; assess the overall climate of the school and identify some of its most urgent needs; identify sources of needs of the school; Supervision helps in deciding the nature and content of curriculum, the learning materials that will enhance educational growth of both students and teachers; Supervision helps to "checkmate" the activities of staff, the newly recruited both the old to see their performance in teaching and learning; it helps in appropriate expenditure of funds in schools; supervision determines whether a teacher should be transferred, retained, promoted retired or dismissed based on the performance of the teacher and supervision helps to discover special abilities or qualities possessed by teachers in the school. This can be used as a guide for staff development.

2.6. **Basic Principles for Effective Supervision**

The following are the basic principles of supervision as adapted from Obiweluozor, et al. (2013:589): There should be a healthy atmosphere free from pressure and stress; staff must be given orientation about the quality of work expected from them.

New staff must be given orientation concerning the job; there should be room for constructive criticism, that is poor work should be criticized, advice should be given to the affected party; staff should be given opportunity to prove their capability, they should be allowed to use their initiative when performing certain task or taking decision in some crucial areas; and staff should be motivated and encouraged to work, to increase their productivity that will enhance organizational goals.

2.7. **Head Teacher versus Head of Department Supervision of Teachers**

Literature abounds that indicates that secondary school head teachers were the ones responsible for ensuring that educational strategies that support effective teaching and learning for all pupils in their schools were in place (Alig-Mielcarek, 2003; Hanna, 2010). According to the Ministry of Education the following are some of the most important roles of the secondary school head that are related to teacher performance and supervision: "Supervise school work of Heads of Department and other teachers...Monitoring and evaluating regularly the delivery of academic programmes..." (MOE, 2015: 47). However, the study by Kabeta et al. (2015:1882) conducted in selected Basic schools of the Central Province of Zambia revealed that "head teachers rarely supervised and evaluated the teaching and learning in their schools because they were mostly busy with office work..." Other scholars for example argue that the Heads of Department were better placed to supervise their teachers. Their argument was based on the fact that, "the department chair has easier access to teachers and classrooms than the principal; she or he is better able to have meaningful, immediate pedagogical discussions with teachers" (Heckert, 2015:30; Wettersten, 1992). This provides an opportunity for the Heads of Department to facilitate the connections between teachers and students. Also "because they are

teachers as well, department chairs usually have credibility among their teaching colleagues" (Callahan, 1971; Mayers and Zepeda, 2002, Wettersten, 1992). All of these points imply that Heads of Department work closely with teachers. Their closeness however, cannot be assumed to work well for effective supervision of teachers.

2.8. **Heads of Departments' Supervision in the United States of America**

In a study done in the United States of America, Heckert found that unlike head teachers, however, the role of Heads of Department has been studied minimally, especially in regard to supervision. She further argues that "even with the increase in qualitative studies focused on this position, the daily experience of the department chair and her potential to influence the teaching learning experience in classrooms is not well understood" Heckert (2015:28). Peacock (2014) agreed with the assertion above and added that the case was so partly due to the historical ambiguity of the position.

Kruskamp (2003) conducted a case study of three department chairs' views of instructional supervision. He found role conflict, role ambiguity, and time constraints as barriers to department chairs' success. However, even given these limitations, the participants perceived themselves as instructional supervisors and who acted in deliberate ways to support teachers' growth and student learning (Heckert, 2015:32). This study, like most studies on the secondary school Heads of Department had traditionally been confined to the duties and responsibilities of the Heads of Department (Anderson, 1987; Engroff, et al., 1976; Orris, 1988). The views captured in the study were only of three Heads of Department in one school. This study got

experiences of fifteen Heads of Department from three schools together with their head teachers and thirty teachers; ten from each school. Also the study sought to find out whether the supervision by Heads of Department in public secondary schools was helpful. This study is similar with the former in terms of desiring to know the challenges these Heads of Department faced in supervising their teachers. Further, the current study was rather specific as it only looked at supervision, unlike the former which encompassed all aspects of the roles of Heads of Department.

Wettersten's (1992) study of four department chairs in the United States of America found their success was partly due to the trust and credibility provided by the teachers, their ability to support collegiality, and their capacity to bridge administration and teachers "by perceiving the visions and needs of both…and by communicating and interpreting information between both groups"(Heckert, 2015:31). This study, wanted to check whether collegiality as a supervision approach existed in the public secondary schools under study and whether its presence could bring about success in the Heads of Departments' supervision.

2.9. **Heads of Departments' Supervision in England**

Muijs and Harris (2007) found that a department head's leadership can indirectly affect school improvement and student achievement. This study was done in England. However, there is a gap in the literature regarding the effect their leadership role has on teachers as educators, leaders, and as individuals (Clarke, 2009:19). This study, strongly agreed with the two studies. The study was an effort to actually bridge the gap in the Zambian context as there was a dearth of literature.

2.10. **School-based Supervision in India**

School-based supervision of teachers is being advocated for the effective delivery of educational programmes to learners. Tyagi (2010) noted that there was a worldwide trend to reinforce school site supervision and concluded that more research studies could be carried out to find its effectiveness in the Indian context. This study found it fit that the same be investigated in the Zambian context. This was because school-based supervision by Heads of Department in Zambia was not documented; much of what was known had to do with external monitoring by officials from the district and provincial offices.

2.11. **Heads of Departments' Supervision in Kuwaiti**

A study conducted in Kuwaiti 'determining the effects of supervision on teachers' professional performance' found that, "supervision had a positive effect on the professional performance of teachers; supervisors' notes and observations helped teachers in identifying their shortcomings and modifying their behaviour accordingly" (Aldaihani, 2017:25). While the researcher in the previous study limited it to get the viewpoints of six Heads of Department and six teachers in two high schools using structured interviews as the only research instrument; the current study differs with it in that the sample included three head teachers, fifteen Heads of Department and thirty teachers drawn from three secondary schools; semi-structured interviews, document analysis and participant observation was used as research instruments to foster triangulation. The sample and instruments used were crucial in checking the validity and trustworthiness of the data collected. Further, the current study was based on understanding the influence Heads of Departments' supervision had on teachers' performance. The former study did not single out Heads of

Departments' supervision as a determining factor in teachers' performance; rather it was broad in its approach.

2.12. **Heads of Department Supervision in Malaysia**

A study similar to the current one was done in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia by Ghavifekr and Ibrahim. "More specifically, the study was conducted to obtain an understanding on how the Head of Department supervisory role is perceived, and how it affects the instructional development and job performance of private secondary school teachers" (Ghavifekr and Ibrahim, 2014:45). The study found that there was a significant relationship between teacher's perception on the instructional supervision role of the Head of Department and improving teachers' job performance from various aspects including teaching practices, professional competencies and motivation.

This study differed with the one done in Malaysia in the following ways; the former was based on private secondary schools while this one focused on public secondary schools. There is a sharp difference between private-owned schools and public-owned schools. For instance, private-owned schools hire and retain teachers and managers based on one's performance. This study has a qualitative orientation unlike the former which had a quantitative bias. Qualitative research allows the researcher to uncover the processes that leads to an outcome unlike quantitative research that focuses on control and prediction (Maxwell, 1996). The former study was based on teachers' perceptions; the current study gathered data from head teachers, teachers and Heads of Department themselves. In fact, this was the weakness that was seen in most studies to do with the supervision of teachers; many researches done had to do

with perceptions of teachers. It was the researcher's view that to understand this topic very well, one needed to take an all-round approach, that is, get the views of both supervisors and subordinates.

2.13. **Supervision of Teachers in Ghana**

This study done in Ghana indicated that there were widespread and on-going debates centred on the influence of effective supervision on academic performance in their academic institutions (Ankoma-Sey and Maina, 2016:73**).** Some researchers have concluded that effective supervision can improve pupils' academic performance. This conclusion is made while ignoring the School Effectiveness Research which is not resolved on what contributes to learners' academic performance; the school effects versus the home background. In the researchers' view, the conclusion that effective supervision influences pupils' academic performance is misplaced when other factors were not controlled.

A study done by Osae-Apenteng (2012) found no effect of supervision on performance once staff members were dissatisfied. The problem with this researchers' study is its limitedness, as she only focused her study on the "Effect of Supervision on Staff Performance in one of the Municipal Directorate of Education".

A study done in Ghana found no significant difference between effective supervision and gender in a study looking at the "elements of effective supervision from Ghanaian graduate students' perspective" Azure (2016:163). It was not known whether the current study could reach the same conclusion.

2.14. **Scarcity of Studies on School Leadership in Zambia**

In a review of studies done in Zambia, Kalabo (2017:36) concluded "that research on school leadership in Zambia has not been enjoying scholarly inquiry." Over the past 51 years, he found that there were relatively a small number of studies that had been done or published on school leadership. This research mainly reviewed the institutional repository of the University of Zambia and journals that were published on school leadership. Further of the twenty studies reviewed, Kalabo (2017:37) found that "all except three (15%) had school head teachers as part of the sample while only two studies had just teachers as the sample. Eleven (55%) studies had samples that included head teachers' supervisors in the sample." School leadership studies in Zambia from the review of this literature showed that the contribution of Heads of Department as middle managers in secondary schools was somewhat neglected. This knowledge gap in the researchers' view begged for answers. Heads of Department were crucial to the realization of quality education in public secondary schools. This was because Heads of Department were the immediate supervisors of their teachers and they were subject specialists.

2.15. **Related studies in Zambia on the Supervision of Teachers**

In a study done to establish whether instructional leadership was being practiced in the selected Basic schools of the Central Province of Zambia, Kabeta et al. (2015) found that "head teachers who participated in the study were not practicing much instructional leadership and that this negatively affected the teaching and learning outcomes. Further, the majority of the head teachers who participated in this study did not receive any training that prepared them for this role." This study concentrated on Basic schools and espoused a broad concept of instructional leadership. Unlike

the former, the current study concentrated on secondary schools and Heads of Department instead of head teachers. Further, the concept of supervision which is a subset of instructional leadership formed the scope of this study.

Similar disparities noticed in Kabeta's study above were also observed by the researcher in the study done in the Mufumbwe District of Zambia by Kapaya (2013). His focus was on primary school teachers' perceptions of their head teachers' instructional leadership and how these perceptions affected teachers' own particular experiential factors, such as school location, school size, teachers' gender, work experience and age. The study concluded that "school location, school size and gender influenced teacher perceptions of more characteristics of primary school head teachers' instructional leadership behaviour than teacher's age and teacher's work experience. This study showed that head teachers from rural (urban) schools and those from large schools in Mufumbwe District were found to be demonstrating instructional leadership behaviours more frequently than those from remote (rural) schools and smaller schools" Kapaya (2013:55). The current study's context was urban unlike the former.

In a study whose objective was to ascertain the extent to which monitoring and evaluation had improved upper primary teachers' performance in selected schools in Mbala District of the Northern Province in Zambia, Namfukwe (2016:iv) concluded that, "monitoring and evaluation influences the performance of upper primary school teachers towards improving teaching and learning." This study focused on primary schools and dwelt with external supervision; school-based supervision was out of sight in this research study. The current study differed with the former as it focused

on secondary schools and further looked at school-based supervision by the Head of Department in public secondary schools who were immediate supervisors of teachers. Research by Yelkpieri and Namale (2016:225) revealed that some teachers were asked to express their opinion on the type of supervision they preferred in an interview, majority of the teachers who responded preferred internal supervision to that of external supervision.

On the challenges faced by external monitors or Education Standards Officers the former study did not bring out any new information apart from presenting data that were already acknowledged by the policy document of the Ministry of General Education dubbed 'Educating our Future'- "Administrators faced challenges such as inadequate teaching/learning materials, poor staffing levels, lack of transport and poor funding" (ibid). The current research study partially agreed with the recommendation made in the previous study that further research in the entire country is carried out "to establish the impact of Monitoring and Evaluation on the performance of upper primary school teachers so as to have more conclusive and reliable evidence..."(Namfukwe, 2016:iv). Such a study could act as a resource base in this important aspect of school management. Further than that a study as the current one could help inform scholarly writing regarding the effect of school site supervision in public secondary schools. Without this study, the Heads of Departments' supervisory work in the public secondary school would remain undocumented in the meantime.

Banda (2015:vi) did a study which "sought to investigate the relationship between management supervision and teacher performance in the secondary schools of Kafue

District," Zambia. "...It emerged from the study that there was a relationship between management supervision and teacher performance" (Banda, 2015:54). However, the study did not indicate whether the relationship between management supervision and teacher performance was positive or negative. Further, "the study findings revealed that Head teachers rarely observed lessons due to their busy schedules." This was in agreement to Kabeta et al. (2015) findings regarding head teachers in primary schools of Central Province. Banda (2015) recommended that the head teacher should delegate this responsibility to the deputy head teacher and Heads of Department. The current study argued that for effective supervision to be prevalent in secondary schools, the Heads of Department as specialised instructional supervisors should lead the way. This was because the secondary school, unlike the primary school had departments and teachers were specialised to teach one or two subjects. The head teachers and deputy head teachers in this vein were limited to effectively supervising subjects they were specialised in.

As regards to external supervision by District Education Standard Officers in secondary schools in the Southern Province of Zambia; Kambunga (2013) found that very little, if any was done in the area of high school inspection by District Education Standards Officers. In the absence of external supervision, the current study argued that school-based supervision done by Heads of Department complemented a great deal. "From all indications, internal academic supervision is the sure best for improving the present quality and also maintaining higher standards because of its ease of access, cordial relationship to teachers for monitoring, correction and entrenchment of ideas and innovations" (Adewala, 2014:608).

Kambunga (2013:1) further revealed that "teachers were unwilling to be monitored by District Education Standards Officers who they felt have the same qualification as theirs. In some schools, teachers reported that the standards officers inspected subject areas that they were not trained in." To this, the study recommended that, the "Ministry of Education should ensure that officers trained in respective subject areas should monitor such subjects" (Kambunga, 2013:2). The current researcher strongly agreed with this recommendation; and further supported Kruskamp (2003) view that, departmental heads by virtue of their subject area expertise were in a solid and credible position to make classroom observations to supervise the instructional programme as it unfolded in classrooms than head teachers to whom the role of supervision was highly esteemed. Yelkpieri and Namale (2016) found that most teachers preferred to be supervised by Heads of Department. Heads of Department were viewed by teachers as subject specialists and colleagues. As such Heads of Departments were popular with teachers and most teachers wanted to deal with them. Teachers also welcomed supervision done in the right spirit and with the aim of improving the learning process and promoting teacher growth.

2.16. **Challenges faced by Heads of Department in their Supervision of Teachers**

According to Marshall (2005), there were five reasons why traditional clinical supervision systems were not effective; the micro evaluations of individual lessons did not carry much weight, lessons which principals observed were not typical lessons conducted by the teacher, the observation of isolated lessons gave an incomplete picture of instruction, teacher isolation was reinforced by supervision practices and most principals were too busy to do a good job on supervision.

When it comes to Heads of Department, the challenges discussed in literature were often out of their control: lack of time due to teaching load, school schedule (Callahan, 1971; Hord and Murphy, 1985; Zepeda and Kruskamp, 2007; Heckert, 2015) number of staff to supervise geography of the school, lack of authority (Hord and Murphy, 1985).

The Heads of Department lack of training in supervision is another challenge cited in literature; this has left many Heads of Department unprepared to manage the complexity and demands of the position (Aducci, 1990; Callahan, 1971; Deroche, Kujawa, and Hunsaker, 1988; Horde and Murphy, 1985; Pellicer and Stevenson, 1983; Valverde, 1982; Weaver and Gordon, 1979; Weller, 2001; Heckert, 2015). The study wanted to find out whether the challenges drawn from research were equally true in the Zambian context. The researcher strongly felt that the 'all-size-fits-all' approach to the challenges faced by Heads of Department in their supervision work was not the best; rather the challenges were supposed to be context bound.

2.17. **Effect of Supervision of Teachers**

While literature focusing upon school effectiveness and the determinants of school quality (Raynolds, 1985; Mosha, 1988) is in abundance, little of it isolates the supervision of teachers as a variable in the process, concentrating instead upon resources, expenditures, class size, text-books, examinations, physical infrastructures and buildings, teachers, teacher education, among others (Fuller, 1986). As a result, there is little or no empirical evidence available on which to judge the effect of supervision of teachers; especially by Heads of Department in secondary schools.

2.18. **Summary of the Chapter**

This section reviewed related literature on the supervision of teachers by Heads of Department. Literature reviewed has shown that Head of Departments' supervision is necessary for secondary schools to be effective. This was because secondary schools were departmentalised for specialization purposes. Studies done overseas and abroad are slowly encompassing Heads of Departments' supervision in secondary schools as evidenced by literature above. A literature review on Zambia has revealed a scarcity of scholarly writing on Heads of Departments' supervision; what has been located are studies on primary school head teachers as instructional leaders and one study on secondary school managers supervising their teachers. No sole aspects of Heads of Department supervising teachers in secondary schools were located in the available literature. The challenges Heads of Department faced in their supervision work as revealed in literature were; lack of time, role ambiguity, lack of authority and lack of formal training in supervision. The next chapter discusses the research methodology that shaped the study.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. **Overview**

This chapter describes the methodology that was used in the present study. The research methodology includes research design, target population, sample size and sampling techniques. It further explains the data collection instruments, procedures and analysis. Ethical considerations and trustworthiness of the research study are equally covered.

3.2. **Research Design**

The study adopted a case study research design. Case study research is concerned with systematic inquiry into an event or a set of related events which aims to describe and explain the phenomenon of interest (Nieuwenhuis, 2007:75), in a social setting to permit the researcher to understand how it operates or functions (Berg, 2001:225). The study used a purely qualitative approach.

3.3. **Study Area**

The study was be conducted in Kabwe District, the provincial headquarters of Central Province, located 135 kilometres north of Lusaka, the capital city of Zambia.

3.4. **Study Population**

The study included all the twenty-one secondary school head teachers, all the one hundred and forty-seven secondary school Heads of Department and all the secondary school teachers in Kabwe District, Zambia.

3.5. **Study Sample**

Fifteen secondary school Heads of Department out of twenty one, thirty secondary school teachers out of two hundred and forty and three head teachers drawn from three schools participated in the study. The study had a total of forty-eight respondents.

3.6. **Sampling Techniques**

Purposive sampling technique was used to get respondents. Maxwell (2005:88) indicates that "the most important factor in determining the participants of a qualitative study is to select people who would give satisfying answers". Thus only teachers who had served as subject teachers under the incumbent HoDs for over two years were included in the sample. This was done to allow teachers who have an informed view point on the study under investigation; since they observed their Heads of Department over a considerable period of time. HoDs and head teachers were included in the sample by virtue of their position. All head teachers from the three selected schools, five Heads of Department from each of the three schools and two teachers from each selected department in each school were interviewed. The Heads of Department and teachers were drawn from the following departments; Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Literature and Languages, Social Sciences and Practical Subjects. Due to the absence of the Head of Department for Natural Sciences at one secondary school, the Department of Business Studies was substituted.

3.7. **Data Collection Instruments**

A blend of data-gathering techniques was used for obtaining the data for the study. These included: semi-structured interview schedule, observation checklist, and document analysis guide to ensure triangulation of methods. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with all respondents at different times. A total of forty-eight interviews were tape-recorded and later transcribed. In addition to interviews, participant observation was used. Patton (2002:264) writes that this type of observation is used to take advantage of "the opportunity to move beyond the selective perceptions of others." Selected documents in the custody of the Head of Department, pupils' note and exercise books were also analysed. Heads of Department and teachers were first interviewed and on the same day documents in their custody analysed. All respondents were later observed for a period of one month.

3.8. **Data Collection Procedure**

Data were collected during the second term of the 2018 secondary school calendar for a period of one month. Before collecting data, the researcher obtained a letter of introduction from the School of Education of the University of Zambia *(See Appendix B);* thereafter the researcher obtained permission from the Provincial Education Officer in Central Province and respective public secondary school head teachers (*Refer to Appendix C*). During the visits to the public secondary schools, head teachers were informed about the nature and importance of the study and how their participation and that of their Heads of Department and teachers would help achieve the objectives of the study. The researcher conducted interviews in person,

analysed documents in the custody of the Heads of Department and observed the day to day supervision work of Heads of Department.

3.9. **Data Analysis**

Data collected through interviews, document analysis and participant observation were coded and analysed thematically. The thirty teachers who participated in the study were assigned codes T1 up to T30; that is T1 up to T10 from Musante, T11 up to T20 from Shakutoka and T21 up to T30 from Saint secondary schools, the fifteen Heads of Department were assigned codes HoD1 up to HoD15; HoD1 up to HoD5 from Musante, HoD6 up to HoD10 from Shakutoka and HoD11 up to HoD15 from Saint secondary schools, and the Head teachers were assigned codes by the pseudonym of their school and numbers 1 up to 3. The analysis of data from the different research instruments were done concurrently as presented in the research findings. Later, data collected were grouped, organised and categorised to establish emerging themes and sub-themes. Themes that emerged formed the structure of the research findings of this study.

3.10. **Ethical Considerations**

Ethical clearance was sought from the Humanities and Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee of The University of Zambia. Permission was sought from the Provincial Education Officer for Central Province and Head teachers of the concerned schools before administering the research instruments. Participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity, voluntary participation, security of data and of their right to privacy. The researcher declared to respondents that there were no anticipated risks and direct benefits as a result of their participation in the study.

For interview data the researcher asked for permission to record it using a digital voice recorder. The researcher further informed the participants about the use of participant observation and document analysis as research tools and sought their consent. All respondents were asked to read the informed consent form and only signed it after agreeing to participate in the study. Respondents were further informed of their freedom to withdraw at any point of the study without any consequences. Pseudonyms were created for the three sampled schools and individuals under study for easy of reference and ensuring that their identities were protected. The sampled public secondary schools were assigned the names; Musante, Shakutoka and Saint.

3.11. **Trustworthiness**

Data triangulation was used to ensure the trustworthiness of the findings. Data triangulation are a type of triangulation in which the researcher investigates whether the data collected with one procedure or instrument confirm data collected using a different procedure or instrument (Tavakoli, 2012). Data from interviews, participant observation and document analysis were analysed concurrently. Interviews were the main data collection method. Participant observation and document analysis were used to confirm or disconfirm the findings from interviews. Convergence and divergence were both achieved due to data triangulation.

3.12. **Summary of the Chapter**

The study adopted the descriptive research design. A purely qualitative approach was used in this study. Fifteen Heads of Department, thirty teachers and three head teachers were purposively sampled from three secondary schools of Kabwe District

of Zambia. Semi-structured interview guide, observation checklist and document analysis guide were used to collect data to ensure triangulation. All interviews were tape-recorded and later transcribed. Data obtained were coded and common patterns that emerged formed the themes in the presentation of research findings. All ethical considerations as prescribed by the Humanities and Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee of the University of Zambia. The next chapter presents research findings of the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1. **Overview**

The chapter presents research findings based on the analyses of the schools under investigation. The leadership profiles and competencies of Heads of Department in the studied schools were presented first. A thematic approach to presentation of findings was adopted for the study.

4.2. **Leadership Profiles and Competencies of Heads of Department**

The sampled secondary schools have been in existence for well over ten years. The findings revealed that out of fifteen Heads of Department in these public secondary schools, only three were confirmed by the Teaching Service Commission, ten had letters of appointment from the Provincial Education Office (PEO) and two did not have any letter from the PEO but were acting at the instruction of head teachers. All the Heads of Department had a minimum qualification of first degree as required. The sampled Heads of Department had experience ranging from two to ten years. None of them had a certificate in supervision. None of the Heads of Department went for a formal in-service training programme to prepare them for their post of responsibility. The form of training they underwent ranged from no orientation, but learnt from other Heads of Department, to one day orientation at a workshop organized by the PEO; where roles of Heads of Department were discussed. Document analysis revealed that one Head of Department out of the fifteen had a document of the Ministry of General Education (MoGE) called Standards and Evaluation; this document is very key in Heads of Department understanding their

supervisory role. The rest of fourteen Heads of Department had no guidelines on their post of responsibility, though all of them during interviews claimed to have excerpts of workshop materials which were equally not located.

4.3. **Description of the Heads of Departments' Role**

Supervision of teachers at Musante and Shakutoka secondary school was done at different levels as the structure of the school management foretold. The head teacher at Musante Secondary School when asked how supervision was carried out in her school responded as follows;

> Here at our school, supervision is at different levels; just as the structure is, the organizational structure the Head, Deputy, HoDs, HOSs and teachers in that way, in that manner that is how supervision is carried out. The head teacher will directly supervise the deputy head teacher, the deputy head teacher will directly supervise the HoDs, and the HoDs will directly supervise the teachers and heads of sections (Head teacher 2, Musante, 2018).

Supervision at the named secondary schools was done hierarchically; the head teachers supervised deputy head teachers who later supervised Heads of Department who supervised their heads of sections and teachers. Heads of Department at these two schools unlike Saint secondary school, supervised all teachers regardless of the department they belonged to.

Supervision also took the form of checking the presence of teachers in classrooms and observing their lessons, checking their lesson plans, finding teachers to stand-in for absent teachers and checking the coverage of the syllabus as presented by one informant below when asked to describe what she actually did during the course of the term as a Head of Department;

> Plan for the term. On a daily basis I have to ensure that my teachers are around. Take registration. Ensure that my teachers are teaching. I have to ensure that whether the teacher is around or not the pupils are attended to,

> make arrangements where teachers are absent. On a daily basis I have to check the lesson plans for my teachers, to ensure that they are teaching according to the schemes of work and are all moving almost at the same pace in terms of covering the material (HoD6, Shakutoka, 2018).

The Head of Department for Business Studies at Shakutoka secondary school further indicated that she checked teachers' records of work fortnightly and also checked the tests prepared by teachers, whether they conformed to examination standards together with accompanying marking keys. The HoD ensured that once the tests were written by pupils, teachers marked scripts and recorded the results. Apart from her supervisory role, the HoD also taught her classes. The two teachers interviewed in the department confirmed that the Head of Department performed what she claimed to have done. Document analysis and observation data also confirmed the fact that the Head of Department did check lesson plans for her teachers on a daily basis and took registration of teachers.

In the following section the researcher singled out the findings of what Heads of Department did in their supervision work and how that helped teachers perform well.

4.4. **Block Monitoring as a Supervision Strategy**

The findings of the study revealed that Heads of Department at Musante and Saint secondary schools conducted block monitoring; Shakutoka secondary school on the other hand had no such a school monitoring policy for Heads of Department. At the two secondary schools, Heads of Department were assigned blocks to monitor. One respondent in describing the practice of block monitoring conducted at Musante secondary school commented as follows;

> ...as HoDs we are given the blocks to man. Like I am the Head of Department Social Sciences, that block where my office is, so am in-charge of the grade twelve block, so I make sure that from period one up to prep time, I have to make sure that teachers are in class, I have to make sure that pupils are in class as well (HoD2, Musante, 2018).

The Head teacher for Musante secondary school also confirmed that by indicating that, "Heads of Department have been allocated blocks which they man, apart from their departments – they check the presence of teachers in classrooms and ensure that teaching is taking place." Observation data also confirmed the practice at the named secondary schools.

4.5. **Lesson Plan Checking**

Part of the main duty of Heads of Department is to ensure that teachers deliver the right content to the learners. That can partly be done if there is effective lesson plan checking by the Heads of Department. Ideally teachers were not supposed to go to class without a thoroughly checked and approved lesson plan by the Heads of Department. The practice at Musante secondary school revealed that there were weaknesses in implementing that strategy. Most teachers went to class with unchecked lesson plans and some did not even prepare them. One Head of Department admitted to the failure in checking lesson plans everyday in the verbatim below;

> It [lesson plan checking] is supposed to be [done] every day, but there is inconsistence, teachers will bring [lesson plans] may be after a week, that's when they bring a bunch of lesson plans, but the ideal situation is supposed to be before they go to class I am supposed to check that lesson, but sometimes we are overwhelmed with work, sometimes it is not teachers that will fail you but as HoD you give an excuse, I think am so busy why don't you submit these maybe after two days when am free, [be]cause I also have classes (HoD1, Musante, 2018).

Observation and interview data revealed that Heads of Department had myriad challenges in implementing that strategy ranging from their subordinates to themselves. Some teachers failed to present their lesson plans due to their laziness and deviance. Heads of Department on the other hand failed to check lesson plans of their teachers sometimes due to them being found teaching at the times teachers brought their lesson plans for checking; subsequently some teachers stopped presenting their lesson plans.

Though Musante secondary school had a policy of auditing lesson plans every term; based on individual work plans of teachers, document analysis found that the Heads of Department were not using this strategy accordingly for the achievement of desired results. They did not have an instrument that recorded the teachers' presentation of lesson plans each time they brought their lesson plans for checking to the HoD. Out of the five Heads of Department only one Head of Department had an instrument to check that. The practice was that teachers came to count the number of lesson plans with the supervisor at the end of the term. Interview data revealed that there were possibilities of teachers backdating lesson plans before the day of the lesson plan audit. Some teachers interviewed were of the view that lesson plan checking was not in a way helpful as revealed in the following excerpt:

> If it's lesson plan it's worse. Me I don't even use it, you know what? We teach almost the same things, those steps we write on the lesson plan I think they are just there for formality, when you go there to teach we don't even follow them ... So that thing I will just write it for the sake of (writing). So at times you would find that teachers who do not write lesson plans they perform better than those who write. Some teachers they just write lesson plans, they don't even go to class to perform (T6, Musante, 2018).

The aspect of lesson plan checking at Shakutoka secondary school was strong. The practice in the school was that teachers went to class on a daily basis with checked lesson plans; duly signed and date stamped. The Head teacher at Shakutoka secondary school, Heads of Department and teachers interviewed, document analysis and observation confirmed that the school had a strict adherence to lesson planning and checking. Different respondents on that said the following:

> ...each teacher is supposed to go to class with an already checked lesson plan by the HoD which is part of supervision, to make sure that teachers are prepared before they enter the class (Head teacher 1, Shakutoka, 2018).
>
> Yes. That one actually, the nature of our subject demands that you go to class with a lesson plan... for us going to class without a lesson plan is not there (HoD10, Shakutoka, 2018).
>
> The policy of the school is to have them checked before going to class... The policy we have is the same as that of student teachers... The practice is to submit the lesson plan a day before (T14, Shakutoka, 2018).

The case at Saint secondary school was different as Heads of Department adopted a laissez faire attitude towards the checking of lesson plans. Document analysis found that all Heads of Department checked lesson plans fortnightly at the time of submission of records of work. The other four Heads of Department of the five interviewed admitted to have failed implementing the ideal due to challenges ranging from teachers to themselves. Mostly, lesson plans in this school were checked fortnightly during submission of records of work. This was evident by what was reported by Heads of Department themselves;

> Lesson plan checking is supposed to be on daily basis; that is the ideal. But we've had a challenge, you see there is this syndrome especially in permanent teachers that they know and they don't see the need to continue writing you know those lesson plans (HoD11, Saint, 2018).

The other Heads of Department just indicated that the lesson plans were checked at the time of submission of the teaching file. One informant from the Department of Literature and Languages at Saint secondary school concluded that, "the current scenario is probably ninety percent of lesson plans that go to classes are not checked" (T23, Saint, 2018).

4.6. **Effectiveness of Lesson Plan Checking**

Though the lesson plans were checked on a daily basis at Shakutoka secondary school, six teachers indicated that the checking was not effective as it was mostly bent on just date stamping, signing and writing to say 'checked'. Observation of two Heads of Department revealed that Heads of Department actually did not take their time to go through and help guide their teachers in that regard. Three Heads of Department confirmed that they just date stamped, while two Heads of Department disputed that. For the two Heads of Department who argued that they thoroughly checked lesson plans, their teachers confirmed it. The Head of Department for Practical Subjects at argued by saying, "we are few, I have the time to check them" thoroughly; and one of her teachers confirmed it by saying, "she goes through...Yes, and on that one she is very particular. You find that sometimes she does not even mark, she will call you, and say what about this one?" The Head of Department for Practical Subjects supervises three teachers while her Business Studies counterpart supervises six teachers. Two respondents answered in the following manner as to whether the checking of lesson plans was thorough and helpful;

> On that one, I check at times, let me be honest, sometimes I check, sometimes teachers bring two minutes before they go to class, can you sign for [me] please! ... I will just date stamp and then it goes ... but for student teachers we are very strict ... but for permanent teachers I exercise a bit of leniency because it is not the lesson plan that teaches, it is just a framework, it's just a

> guide. What teaches is the human being. If I have a guide, ok, and a very well prepared guide, then in class I can't deliver, then those are problems, but if I have a guide may be which is not properly done, it's rough, but my delivery is well (HoD10, Shakutoka, 2018).
>
> Those [lesson plan checking] are just date stamping, not checking, like what I did, I just date stamped, you had even seen, did you see me going through? I didn't, I just saw this is a lesson plan, I couldn't even check the mistakes that are there, just say this person has already written the lesson plan, let me just date stamp, then sign, off, normally that's what has been happening (T18, Shakutoka, 2018).

As for the last response, the researcher witnessed the teacher date stamp a lesson plan from a student teacher on behalf of the Head of Department for Mathematics. She confirmed that what she did was actually what transpired even with the Head of Department.

Saint and Musante secondary schools had similar challenges as Shakutoka secondary school regarding the effectiveness of lesson plan checking.

4.7. **Usefulness of Lesson Planning**

Respondents interviewed expressed mixed feelings on the usefulness of lesson planning, of the thirty teachers interviewed, five were of the view that lesson planning was useful and the twenty-five were against the idea, as for the Head of Department for Mathematics at Shakutoka secondary school, he felt that most teachers did that for formalities sake; a view that was supported by most teachers. Some teachers indicated that with experience it was possible to have a successful lesson without a lesson plan, others felt lesson notes were an easy guide rather than a lesson plan. Others felt that it was possible to have a well elaborate lesson plan and yet one could still fail to deliver. Those who supported the view that lesson planning

was useful argued that it acted as a guide and while preparing the lesson plan, one did the necessary research. The following were their sentiments expressed:

> A lesson plan is a guide. It helps, as you are writing, you are researching (T20, Shakutoka, 2018).
>
> ...Then sometimes others will plan, but the delivery is something else. You will find a teacher [with a] well written lesson plan, you know, nicely written but when you go to observe such a one, you discover that it's something else coming out, failing to deliver to the pupils. So lesson planning sometimes could be likened to something like formality to say... And some teachers would say it is not the lesson plan that teaches... it's me the teacher (T16, Shakutoka, 2018).
>
> ... I think, there are some that do it [lesson planning] just for the sake of satisfying the system, it's very true, am able to say this because they don't actually do the preparation... (HoD10, Shakutoka, 2018).

4.8. **Checking of Pupils' Note and Exercise Books**

One effective way of checking whether teachers were doing their work of teaching was through the checking of pupil's note and exercise books. Document analysis revealed that only four of the fifteen Heads of Department from the sampled secondary schools checked books for pupils. Though the other six Heads of Department claimed to have been in that habit, document analysis of pupil's books and interview data proved otherwise. Only the Head of Department for Mathematics at Shakutoka secondary school admitted to having not checked the books for pupils. Interview data reported other Heads of Department to have checked the books when they went for lesson observation. Heads of Department in that practice mainly date stamped the books and did not necessarily check for compliance; that is whether what was in pupils' note books was in tandem with the schemes of work, records of work and lesson plans. This implied that the school did not benefit from that control measure aimed at counter checking whether what had been planned was what was

actually implemented. Some informants expressed the following sentiments on the issue of checking books for pupils;

> I have never seen any book for pupils checked by my HoD. I have never seen her check books in the departmental stockroom we sit. Instead she encourages us to do that (T3, Musante, 2018).
> She checked at the time of observation. She doesn't do that usually (T6, Musante, 2018).
>
> I have an instrument I have designed myself. I pick three classes in a term. I go to sample books randomly, just to check work coverage. I will make comments on the same instrument and communicate to the teacher what I observed. Later I make follow-up. Sometimes I see improvements but others no (HoD6, Shakutoka, 2018).
>
> I think that's one area that I have not done well (HoD9, Shakutoka, 2018).

4.9. **Lesson Observation**

Supervision of teachers at Musante and Shakutoka secondary schools was done by the management team. That included the head teacher, the deputy head teacher and Heads of Department. Teachers were actually not interested in being observed as evidenced by interviews from all teachers and Heads of Department. Document analysis located an observation schedule for school-based monitoring where Heads of Department were assigned to observe teachers who did not belong to their departments. The observation schedule was not availed to teachers at Musante secondary school while the schedule at Shakutoka secondary school was stuck in the staffroom. Though the observation schedule at Musante secondary school indicated that observation was supposed to be done in weeks one to three and week eight of every term, interdepartmental observation was done throughout the term by all Heads of Department; this happened without the knowledge of the head teacher. This was evidenced by the head teacher's sentiment that was in tandem with the schedule located in the custody of the Heads of Department. However, what was prevailing on

the ground was different from what was documented. The teachers because of not having sight of the lesson observation schedule also concluded that the prevailing practice at their school was interdepartmental supervision. So far departmental observation was very rare in both secondary schools as Heads of Department opted for interdepartmental supervision. Two respondents commenting on the strategy that was used to observe lessons in the two schools had the following to say;

> Here at our school we normally come up with a monitoring tool for the term ... where starting from the head, we give them teachers to monitor, to supervise and monitor per week until we close. So now apart from me being the Head of Department for Social Sciences, we also do interdepartmental, so am also able to supervise the teachers in other departments (HoD2, Musante, 2018).

> ...now the Heads of Department are not restricted to only observe or monitor lessons in their departments... so they can come in any time, there is a list of course which has been put there, you know this person will observe me. So those they come at random, they don't need to announce their arrival, they will just come, sit behind, you present your lesson, then they will ask for a lesson plan, then you will sit and discuss (T14, Shakutoka, 2018).

Saint secondary school conducted departmental lesson observation. Information obtained indicated that on average five teachers were observed in a term. Some departments like Social Sciences had twenty-eight teachers. This implied that on average the Head of Department could not observe all his members of staff in a year. The school mostly practices informal supervision. Teachers to be observed were mostly not informed. The Head of Department for Social Sciences at Saint secondary school described what he did in this way:

> I would simply go to a class, I will look at my time table and look at which teacher is teaching may be period three when I am free then I will go to that class and enter the class and then sit behind. So in a number of situations teachers you would find a teacher has no lesson plan. In some situations teachers have followed me to beg not to be observed (HoD12, Saint, 2018).

The foregoing indicates that lesson observation done in the department of social sciences at Saint secondary school and other departments in the school was very

casual and was mainly bent on gate keeping and not hinged on teacher growth and guidance.

The Head of Department for Mathematics at Saint secondary school understood supervision of teachers to actually mean teacher observation. He was also very quick to mention that sometimes he had not managed to do lesson observation due to his teaching load. His teachers dispelled his lack of time due to the teaching load; they were of the view that his teaching load allowed for effective supervision. Two of the teachers interviewed in the department, agreed that the Head of Department observed teachers in the department except one teacher observed that his observation was targeted to those he noticed that they had weaknesses, the teacher had this to say; "the Head of Department has come to know his teachers, to say this one has got some weaknesses, this one is like this, so what he does is he will specialize in those teachers who are still new, who still has some problems, yes" (T25, Saint, 2018).

Document analysis at Saint secondary school showed that very little was done in the area of lesson observation. Unfortunately, the Head of Department for Literature and Languages was completely on the quiet side as both interviewed teachers in the department revealed that they were last observed by the Head of Department's predecessor who left seven years ago. "The two past HoDs did that, but in the current, I think in the past five years I have not been observed. I have not seen others also being observed" claimed one of the teachers in the department of Literature and Languages. The teacher interviewed in the department of Practical Subjects revealed that observation done in her department was usually for formalities sake, just for the record as she was the only member in the department; "she observes me maybe once

in a term for record purposes" (T29, Saint, 2018). She said so because she did not receive any feedback from the Head of Department and because she was more qualified than the Head of Department; the teacher had a degree in Home Economics and the HoD had a degree in Social Sciences and a diploma in Home Economics.

4.10. **Rationale of Interdepartmental Supervision**

The strategy for interdepartmental lesson observation was introduced at both Musante and Shakutoka secondary schools the previous year. Members of the management team at both schools were not resolved on the rationale for the presence of interdepartmental observation as their responses were different. At Musante secondary school, one Head of Department felt that teachers needed to know that they could observe anyone as they were in management, another Head of Department felt it was in a way meant to settle the school and assist their colleagues who had challenges in supervising teachers in their department and the Head teacher felt it was meant to check the preparedness of the teachers to teach.

At Shakutoka secondary the case was not any different as two Heads of Department said that the practise was introduced to allow for objectivity, the head teacher agreed to that but added that they wanted teachers to know that their Head of Department was not the only manager. One Head of Department said some Heads of Department did not actually observe their teachers and wanted to see whether the information they were getting was consistent. Another Head of Department distanced herself from the introduction of interdepartmental lesson observation. The following excerpts from interview data provide evidence of their responses;

> We want to make these teachers understand that an HoD is not restricted to that area of specialization, he is in management and can observe any teacher just as DEBS or PEO may observe any lesson not necessarily that they are specialized in that field, he can have a general picture about a lesson... (HoD1, Musante, 2018).
>
> We look at preparation, is this teacher prepared? Have they done all the preparation? (Head teacher 2, Musante, 2018).
>
> To swap the HoDs so that they don't observe people they directly supervise to ensure objectivity (HoD8, Shakutoka, 2018).
>
> I am not sure why administration came up with that idea, but when we tried to explain to them they said the teaching methodologies are the same, whether in mathematics or English or whatever... I just found myself on this particular day I was given teachers to monitor, then I was saying but these are not from my department" (HoD10, Shakutoka, 2018).

All the teachers who participated in the study from the two secondary schools remained speculating on the rationale for the introduction of interdepartmental lesson observation as they were not consulted; the school management team simply made an announcement.

4.11. **Usefulness of Interdepartmental Observation**

The teachers and Heads of Department in both schools where interdepartmental lesson observation was conducted pointed out some weaknesses and strengths of the practice. Generally most of the teachers interviewed showed that the practice was not very helpful as it mainly focussed on methodology than the actual content. When the Head of Department for Natural Sciences at Musante secondary school who seemed to be a strong proponent of this type of monitoring was asked how it could be if he were observing a teacher of Chinese he conceited defeat by saying, "maybe that's the disadvantage of interdepartmental observation ... you cannot really comment on the content."

Asked whether effective lesson observation could be there with the system of interdepartmental observation, eighteen out of twenty teachers indicated that there could not be effective lesson observation with that system. The reason for their argument was that a specialized teacher in a particular subject was the best person to advise another professional. The teachers thought it were better to have a person who had knowledge of the subject content. Short of that they thought it was an academic exercise bent on fulfilling a formality. Their sampled responses below indicate that effective lesson observational through interdepartmental lesson observation was not appreciated;

> It [effective lesson observation] cannot be there, because mainly like I have seen, they concentrate more on lesson plan, teaching aid, so if these two are there, regardless of the content that you have offloaded to the learners, they will not even pay attention ... (T1, Musante, 2018).

> If they were observing effectiveness of content delivery then I think there is a bit of a mishap there, because I feel HoDs in the same field, rather department, are better able to assess the success of a lesson (T17, Musante, 2018).

> So I think it goes beyond the [teaching] methods, because the methods are ours as teachers, but the content is for the pupil. So the pupil must know more, because the pupil in fact does not even know about the methods... (T16, Shakutoka, 2018).

> I don't think it [interdepartmental lesson observation] is really very helpful, because as for my HOD here she has all the content, she knows exactly what am delivering and she will be able to point here you forgot this point, here you didn't mention this, you are supposed to mention ABCD, but maybe for the HOD from the other side maybe she will see that the information is flowing systematically, they won't really say you left out this, you left out this... (T2, Musante).

4.12. **Teacher Reaction to Interdepartmental Supervision**

Teachers reacted differently to Heads of Department's lesson observation, others complied while others resisted. One teacher reported accepting to be observed but

refused to be given feedback on her performance arguing that the Head of Department who observed her lesson knew nothing in the subject. One teacher chased the Head of Department who came to observe her. Some experiences were as shared below;

> In fact they [teachers] have complained bitterly over this thing [interdepartmental lesson observation]...There are some that are observed just because the system demands so... (HoD9, Shakutoka, 2018).
>
> Some teachers are very resistant in being observed. Some teachers refuse to be observed (T13, Shakutoka, 2018).
>
> Immediately after being observed, I have never sat with anyone like we discuss, how the lesson was, where I didn't do well, where I had done well, maybe the reason is, honestly someone who is observing me is not of from the Mathematics department, how are we going to discuss? (T18, Shakutoka, 2018).
>
> ...Someone was supposed to observe me, but with me I wasn't observed, last term, yes. But someone came, now the reason why I did not accept that person to observe me, she didn't inform me that she was coming and the day I was going to class, I just found her seated and then she was pretending as if she was a pupil, you see, so I wasn't comfortable. Then I didn't allow her to observe me... I refused because I know my rights. That's how she went to report to the deputy head (T19, Shakutoka, 2018).

4.13. **Informal Supervision by Heads of Department**

Most Heads of Department when going to observe lessons never informed their teachers; coupled with this, teachers did not even understand the motive of their observation. Teachers felt it was important they knew about the coming of Heads of Department to observe lessons. Most Heads of Department on the other hand felt that that was a good practice to ensure teacher preparedness at all times. Very few Heads of Department informed their teachers about their going to observe lessons. The following sentiments were expressed by Heads of Department;

> I am not into the idea of arranging observations. For fear that they will prepare adequately because of the HoD's presence...I inform them a few minutes say 10 minutes before the lesson (HoD11, Saint, 2018).

That kind of observation had proven successful to the Heads of Department as they found the real classroom situation. Sometimes they found teachers teaching without lesson plans and other teachers were found with all the requisites for effective teaching. One Head of Department recounted her experience in the following manner;

> Sometimes I do receive the 'shock of my life', where I find a teacher has no lesson plan. Then if one has no lesson plan then it means one has not prepared for the lesson ... there are instances where you just go in you find some teachers are well prepared they have everything; they have lesson plans, organised teaching file, they teach nicely and they teach effectively (HoD2, Musante, 2018).

The interview data obtained from all teachers under study were showing that the system of observation made teachers very uncomfortable and they were not in support of it. One respondent from the department of Literature and Languages at Saint secondary school claimed that, "this has seen a lot of rigidity among the teachers...no I was not informed" (T25, Saint, 2018).

4.14. **Feedback on Lesson Observations**

Interview data revealed that most Heads of Department gave immediate feedback to their teachers after lesson observation in all the three sampled secondary schools. Feedback was given in form of a discussion where the supervisor and the teacher dialogued and exchanged ideas on how the lesson was. Teachers were equally given chance to evaluate themselves. Areas of improvement were pointed out and areas where teachers performed well were highlighted and appreciated. The HoD for Social Sciences at Saint secondary school commenting on feedback after lesson

observation had this to say; “that’s the time the HoD find out why the teacher used only one teaching method, why they were late for the lesson, why they do not have a lesson plan. They will explain.” Only one teacher reported having not been given chance to talk during the review meeting with the Head of Department. Few Heads of Department failed to give immediate feedback; this was due to their own challenges and sometimes teacher unwillingness to receive feedback on the observed lesson. One Head of Department also reported his failure to give immediate feedback as he said, “not always, when you are busy you call the teacher maybe after five days, that’s when you discuss the lesson, because I also have lessons to teach”(HoD1, Musante, 2018).

One teacher felt that the feedback given on many occasions did not help, he argued as to what the use was for a critique that did not offer solutions, in his words he said:

> The other challenge I have noticed is that weaknesses may be mentioned after the observation, but so far I have been observed several times, maybe over five times, but not a single Head of Department, or head, because I have even been observed by heads, and [personnel] from PEO and the like, Inspector, not a single [Education] Standards Officer or Head [teacher] or supervising officer has ever, recommended any books, any resources where to get the information to improve in a particular area, people will just tell you no, this area you are bad and the likes, I don’t think that helps us in any way (T5, Musante, 2018).

The foregoing shows that most Heads of Department in the sampled secondary school gave feedback to their subordinates immediately after observation. The feedback given was mostly superficial as it mainly emphasized on the methodologies employed and not on the actual content. Coupled with this was the failure by most supervisors to provide solutions for teacher development.

4.15. **Follow-Up Observations**

Observation and interview data revealed that the system of observation used in all the secondary schools under study had no component of follow-up observation. This was because supervisors at Shakutoka and Musante secondary schools were sharing teachers to observe every term. This meant that in the succeeding terms a teacher would not be observed by the same member of the management team. This did not allow for continuity and connectedness of observations and meant that every observation was routine. In fact, document analysis revealed that every observation was a routine one. At no time did the researcher find another reason for observation on observation instruments other than 'routine monitoring for effective teaching and learning'. Even at Saint secondary school where departmental lesson observation was conducted, most teachers and Heads of Department indicated that each lesson observation was not connected to the other. The arguments presented were that observation should be meant to help teachers grow professionally and not just insist on controls. The arguments presented below press for the need to have follow-up observation:

> No, that one is not helpful in that way, [be]cause after being observed you make some amendments, then there is supposed to be a follow-up, has this person improved in this or not (T4, Musante, 2018).

> Fresh observations, even where you make corrections here should have done ABC, there is no follow-up, to go and ensure that the teacher is adhering to what you discussed. There has to be follow-up, as long as there is no consistence there. Like I said, you will just be doing it for the sake of records. Records should show that you did ABC (HoD1, Musante, 2018).

> I don't think it does [help]. Because there is supposed to be a connection...maybe let one person be observing you so that they are able to see if you are improving or not, now if someone observes you, the weaknesses that were pointed out will not be [followed up], will not reflect in the next one that will be observed (T13, Shakutoka, 2018).

The interview data from all teachers and Heads of Department in the study showed that Heads of Department's observation was a one-off activity which had no follow-up. The teachers felt this was not helpful as it seemed to be an academic exercise. One teacher suggested as follows;

> Because what I know is that the Head of Department can easily walk in a lesson, and observe a lesson, but should make sure that you are informed of the merits and demerits of the lesson, and next time that he wants to come to observe a lesson he should clearly state to say I want to see that these are met. The demerits which were pointed out in the first lesson they have been worked on, the better so that you are preparing with that in mind (T26, Saint, 2018).

4.16. **Submission of Teaching Files**

Teachers were also required to submit their records of work or teaching files. The records of work were meant to check the progress of learning in relation to the schemes of work. At all the three sampled secondary schools, submission of the teaching files was done fortnightly. The checking of records of work at the schools was done by Heads of Department and later passed on to either the deputy head teacher or the head teacher depending on the schedule for the term. The teaching file submitted contained vital documents such as records of work, schemes of work, lesson plans and many other such documents as used in teaching. The times of submission witnessed by the researcher were a serious hive of activity. Observation and interview data revealed that most teachers panicked to submit those documents as they were found updating their records on the material day of submission. Few teachers failed to submit those vital documents at Musante and Shakutoka secondary school while most teachers failed to submit the same documents at Saint secondary school. Of the ones who managed to meet deadlines, most of them indicated that they were intrinsically motivated, and did not want to land themselves into trouble and

none indicated that they did it because they were motivated by their supervisors. The following sentiments were expressed by some Heads of Department and teachers regarding the submission of teaching files:

> No, there are times when we have challenges [in receiving teaching files]. Of course a few of them hand-in in time but others you find that on that very day when you are submitting that's when one is trying to scribble indicating that they don't actually do their records on daily basis... they actually do the records at the eleventh hour (HoD9, Shakutoka, 2018).

> Again there it depends on an individual. Most of them panic on the day of hand over (HoD6, Shakutoka, 2018).

> Like we are handing-in these records of work today, you will find that, go round you will find most of the teachers busy writing because they know that [it is time for] handing-in, they have not done that work, so they are putting more energy in writing than in the actual things they are supposed to do (T18, Shakutoka, 2018).

At Saint secondary school observation data, document analysis and interviews of teachers revealed that there was a challenge in this area. The practice was that very few teachers submitted their teaching files on time, and others never submitted at all. One teacher of mathematics showed that he never had a teaching file and did not submit any teaching file to the Head of Department, he said, "so it's not really in form of a teaching file like I had during TP, yes. So I have the records of whatever I teach, kept by myself throughout." Another teacher from the Department of Literature and Languages claimed not to be submitting his teaching file due to the inefficiency in checking of the Head of Department, and said,

> ...if I submitted my documents this weekend for example, it's Friday, for me to see them, it will take maybe another three weeks or four. Which means it is not by design that the other fortnightly when I will fail to submit my instruments, it's not me, for the files, the instruments have been kept elsewhere. So how do I keep track of my work... (T25, Saint, 2018).

Most teachers felt the submission of teaching files was just an academic exercise as they did not receive tangible feedback from their superiors. Mostly the comment located on the documents found in the teaching files by document analysis was 'checked' apart from the date stamp and signature of the Heads of Department and deputy head teachers. In some instances, lesson plans were not submitted along with the records of work, making it difficult to compare what was schemed, with what was taught and what was actually covered. Observation data also revealed that these documents were not thoroughly checked by Heads of Department as they were seen just date stamping them, in fact even interview data revealed the same. Two informants expressed the following views regarding the ineffectiveness of the feedback received as a result of the submission of teaching files;

> ...There [is] no feedback coming and if the feedback comes it will only be quantitative, not qualitative, quantitative - meaning that they will tell you that I think you were supposed to have four records, not that your records are not up to standards (T8, Musante, 2018).

> But as a system[submission of records of work], you find that it's more of a routine, for me it doesn't serve its purpose, I mean, at times if you are not careful teachers will just be writing even things they are not teaching in class, because, this is the way we have made it, it is a routine; bring records of work, we check, make a programme and then teachers are doing that, and they normally do it maybe the time they are supposed to make submission (HoD4, Musante, 2018).

The Head of Department for Mathematics at Musante secondary school owing to the weaknesses aforementioned suggested that it was better that records of work were filled after every lesson and presented to the Heads of Department each time the teacher brought a lesson plan for checking. He further suggested that each time the teacher did that the Head of Department should have had a checklist where he/she would tick to indicate that the teacher was on course. He was of the view that such a

system would make it easy to monitor whether things planned were the ones taught in class.

When the Head of Department for Practical Subjects at Musante secondary school was asked at what point she checked for lesson evaluations after teaching, her comment was as follows;

> ...I find it to be very awkward, maybe because after teaching it's very rare again to say may I see the evaluation, but sometimes when you are checking the records, that's when you go to evaluation of a lesson plan and sometimes you would find that the lesson was not even evaluated and you even write a comment can you evaluate...the lesson. That's why in my case I was thinking maybe if the lesson plan may be brought maybe twice, when going, you check and after teaching, you check for the evaluation. Sometimes you would even go straight to the records, then you find that it's the deputy [head teacher] who would write a comment can you evaluate the lesson (HoD5, Musante, 2018).

Observation data revealed that on the day teachers submitted their teaching files, all the Heads of Department that participated in the study concentrated on the records of work and did not compare it with other records. Document analysis also confirmed this anomaly; some teaching files were found with the 2004 syllabus instead of the current 2013.

When the researcher asked as to what was done to those who never submitted teaching files, most Heads of Department indicated that they talked to them, others later submitted and others still never did so. But for some departments the teachers interviewed indicated that nothing was done to them and that it was actually normal. Some Heads of Department further indicated that the office of the Deputy Head teacher had been very relaxed on that issue. The Head of Department for Practical Subjects on the step taken on those that never submitted their teaching file

commented as follows, “I caution them because one day they will be required to submit to someone higher than me.”

4.17. **Disparities between the Recorded and Covered Work**

During their checking of teaching files, most Heads of Department claimed that their supervision had been very helpful in noticing lapses in the documents presented to them. Some teachers tended to record things they did not cover and that appropriate assistance was given by Heads of Department. Most of the Heads of Department in the study confirmed that allegation. Heads of Department that reported that, recounted their experience as follows:

> There are disparities [noticed in records of work]. Other components are not taught but the records of work show that they were covered. Some wrong concepts are also taught (HoD9, Shakutoka, 2018).
>
> They are there for those who are lazy. It is done in an effort to make sure that what is on the scheme is tallying with the records (HoD6, Shakutoka, 2018).
>
> There are actually disparities; I won’t say that what is actually alleged to have been taught is always what is there. There have been situations where I called teachers to explain why certain pupils are not in line with what they have alleged to have taught, and the answer I have been given is that some of the pupils are not regular in attendance... (HoD12, Saint, 2018).
>
> Yes, because it is very easy for a teacher to write anything. But checking reveals these disparities. When we find such we call the teacher (HoD15, Saint, 2018).

A number of teachers also indicated that some teachers were in the habit of recording things they did not actually implement in the classroom. One teacher cited a colleague who would copy what he recorded on the records of work and submitted it to the Head of Department as his work.

4.18. **Demonstration Lessons**

On strategies to improve teacher performance in secondary schools, demonstration lessons had been advocated by most respondents. In the schools under study, demonstration lessons were done only under continuing professional development (CPD) programmes. This was confirmed by all participants in the study. Outside that there had been no deliberate programmes to develop teachers on a one-to-one basis.

When the Head of Department for Practical Subjects at Saint secondary school was asked how often demonstration lessons were done in her department, she responded by saying, "yes we do that, we have a programme of CPD, we have to do that three times in a term. So we submit our programmes every term, for that specific term, the CPDs we are going to do, and we make sure that every term we cover the work for that term." Her Natural Sciences counterpart added, "We have had a lot of CPD programmes. And mostly we have dealt with an aspect of lesson study. A complete teacher is supposed to have the correct content and methodology. In terms of teacher improvement lesson wise, I think the lesson study circle has greatly assisted." Though all Heads of Department at Saint secondary school claimed to have conducted CPDs, the truth on the ground confirmed by document analysis was that in the Department of Practical Subjects, there were no demonstration lessons conducted in the past two years and the Department of Literature and Languages had last had such the previous year. As for the Department of Mathematics, one teacher interviewed openly stated that CPDs were not conducted. This is evidenced in the following verbatim;

> …we have not had quite well done CPDs. Because we can talk about it and later on the person maybe assigned to carry it on doesn't fully present it (T21, Saint, 2018).

Generally, Saint secondary school had a CPD schedule stuck in the office of the Deputy Head teacher which was not followed religiously.

Document analysis for Shakutoka and Musante secondary schools revealed that demonstration lessons were equally conducted in the schools in form of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programmes. During the CPDs, Heads of Department participated, though mostly teachers were the ones who made presentations. That was done as part of the lesson study circle. In departments such as Social Sciences and Literature and Languages, demonstration lessons were spearheaded by heads of sections. Document analysis done in all departments located lesson plans for demonstration lessons conducted in the previous terms and years. Minutes of CPD meetings were also located. Findings of the study revealed that the strategy of demonstration lessons had greatly helped the schools as difficulties teachers faced with some topics were handled. That built the capacity of teachers and led to improvement in their performance. The Head of Department for Mathematics at Shakutoka confirmed that by saying, "we do that under CPDs, especially to do with difficult topics and new topics... This has been helpful." And his Literature and Languages counterpart indicated that, "it [CPD] has proved very handy in helping teachers with difficulties."

4.19. **Results of Heads of Departments' Supervision**

Interview data from fifteen Heads of Department and most teachers revealed that Head of Department supervision was helpful. Most HoD and teacher respondents argued that Heads of Department supervision helped teachers develop professionally; teachers were able to teach correct subject content, attend to their classes, prepare

lesson plans and teach some topics which used to be difficult to them. Teachers that came from primary schools were able to handle senior classes in the secondary school. Some of their sentiments expressed were as below;

> There are times when as a teacher when I am not comfortable with the topic I call her [HoD] to demonstrate as I observe. Sometimes we swap classes...Even her when she is not comfortable she does the same (T20, Shakutoka, 2018).

> There is a lesson I observed, this teacher is new I think in the system, she should be less than a year. She was doing a demo [demonstration lesson] with children and the teacher did not know how to fold the filter paper, she simply got the whole filter paper and forced it into the fun. So after the lesson I called her, you mean you don't know how to fold the filter paper? She openly confessed that she didn't know. Where were you trained? She told me she was at college B (pseudonym)...then I got the filter paper, this is how we fold, and from then on I have been seeing this teacher folding the filter [paper] the correct way, and I was happy as a supervisor that I contributed (HoD1, Musante, 2018).

> Yes, there have been positive improvements. Because so far I am able to, like last term I was able to make some follow-ups on some teachers that I had observed, I will not want to mention one particular example but I was able to see a positive change because I saw a change in terms of punctuality, lesson planning and also a variety in terms of teaching techniques (HoD7, Saint, 2018).

4.20. **Motivation of Teachers by Heads of Department**

Heads of Department had limited ways of motivating their teachers. Their forms of motivation were verbal commendation of those that performed well, recommendation of teachers who were awarded on Teachers' Day and Labour Day and recommending teachers to the head teacher to attend workshops. All the teachers talked to valued the attendance of workshops other than any other form of motivation; most of the teachers indicated that workshop attendance in their departments was a challenge. Those teachers revealed that Heads of Department in some instances attended workshops all the time leaving out teachers in their departments while some indicated that Heads of Department had teachers they

favoured most and these always attended workshops, and that there was also no definite rota that was followed by Departmental Heads to ensure fairness. Most teachers argued that apart from the monetary gain accompanied with attending a workshop, the knowledge gained was of greater importance to their improvement in performance. Heads of Department also indicated that they talked to teachers who did not perform well and advised them accordingly. The responses of what Heads of Department did to those who performed well were as follows:

> Such [teachers] are recommended for awards during teachers' day at times. We equally encourage them to continue doing what is right (HoD9, Shakutoka, 2018).

> We encourage them verbally; we award them on May Day and Teachers' Day. There is no good work that goes unnoticed. Sometimes the head teacher writes to them (HoD10, Shakutoka, 2018).

Responses of what Heads of Department did to those who did not perform well included the following among others;

> They are talked to, if they don't adhere, they are charged and later transferred (HoD10, Shakutoka, 2018).

> "I can't push somebody to bring a lesson plan for marking, an adult! if that adult is not ready, because we can start fighting..." (HoD8, Shakutoka, 2018).

One informant bemoaned her non-attendance of workshops in the following manner;

> [workshop] attendance in our department, there I cannot hide, we are not happy, [be]cause you always find it's the HoD going,...these other teachers, they don't...In the three years she [HoD] has been there I have never gone for a workshop (T12, Shakutoka, 2018).

4.21. **Challenges Faced by Heads of Department in their Supervision Work**

Heads of Department at the three sampled secondary schools faced a number of challenges in their supervision work ranging from personal to the teachers they supervised. Findings of the study were that Heads of Department lacked motivation

as twelve out of the fifteen of them were in their acting capacity; the extreme form of de-motivation was that of the Head of Department for Social Sciences at Shakutoka secondary school that was getting a salary of a diploma holder despite him having a Bachelor's degree in education. Ten out the fifteen Heads of Department interviewed revealed that teacher permission was a very serious challenge which they faced with teachers; each day that came they had to struggle to look for replacements. Findings of the study also revealed that none of the Heads of Department received formal in-service training on their post of responsibility; that posed a challenge to their effectiveness. Most Heads of Department bemoaned their lack of training. Others were of the view that HoDs were faced with challenges of familiarity with their members of staff. Heads of Department also reported failure by some teachers to stick to deadlines as a challenge in their supervision work. There were also fewer cases of rebellion; as the case was with the teacher in the department for Practical Subjects at Shakutoka secondary school who chased a Head of Department who came to observe her. Excerpts here below support the allegations above;

> Others [teachers] are full of excuses, permissions to an extent where as a supervisor sometimes you struggle to find a replacement. And this disturbs learners. Sometimes the person asked to stand in sometimes will just go to entertain the pupils (HoD6, Shakutoka, 2018).

> Lack of incentives – we are not confirmed. Sometimes we are not motivated due to lack of pay. Teachers even look down on us. We are not secure, what if someone takes over [Headship of the department] (HoD10, Shakutoka, 2018).

> One of the major ones [challenge] is familiarity especially if the HoD has been in that school for a long time and the teachers have been there for a long time, so they tend to compromise, that is the major weakness, there are few that would really stand out and rise above familiarity, there are few (Head teacher 3, Saint, 2018).

> Training is very important... Because as a HoD I don't know exactly what I am supposed to do or what I am not supposed to do. If I am just asked to do this I just have to follow. But if I was trained I would say ah, but sir or

> madam, I think, this is not part of my duty with confidence. But as long as I don't know exactly what I am supposed to do as a HoD, I just have to follow the instructions (HoD3, Musante, 2018).

4.22. **Mitigation of Challenges Faced by Heads of Department**

Top on the list of suggestions made by most teachers was that interdepartmental lesson observation conducted at Musante and Shakutoka secondary schools be reversed; lesson observation could be limited to individual departments. Most teachers also suggested that they be informed before the coming of the Head of Department to observe their lessons. Some of the sentiments expressed were as follows;

> Interdepartmental supervision – it is not very okay, though our two supervisors insist that we do it (HoD9, Shakutoka, 2018).

> Let them inform teachers when they come to observe. Sticking to departments is better (T20, Shakutoka, 2018).

Training of Heads of Department in management was also supported by most Heads of Department and teachers. The Head of Department for Business Studies at Shakutoka secondary school on the aspect of training said that "training in management – even a certificate. In-service training well tailored for HoDs. It will help you handle your staff. Sometimes us as HoDs we have problems, not because of our teachers, may be because we do not know what to do."

On the aspect of motivation most respondents were agreed that if Heads of Department were motivated that would account for their effectiveness. A teacher of mathematics at Musante secondary school said, "...it's a question of motivation; [be] cause if you are motivated, then these people will work well. Unlike you are just

acting, getting the same salary, so I think it's not a good idea, so, if the government can work on their appointments, then the better."

Two Heads of Department at Shakutoka secondary school appealed that, "the Head teacher and Deputy Head teacher should take up certain issues seriously regarding what we report. A difficult teacher should receive the same message from all members of the management team." They said this in view of the way administrators favoured some teachers who were supposed to be disciplined.

Most teachers were of the view that Heads of Department should be objective and all-embracing for their work to be easy. One teacher from the Department of Social Sciences at Shakutoka secondary school said, "Conflict of personal interest can present as a challenge. HoDs should embrace everyone as leaders. Professionalism should take precedence. Leave personal things aside."

Most teachers were of the view that in the supervision equation, heads of section were very useful and suggested that the Ministry of General Education could recognise the position since it was of value in the school; especially in the Department of Social Sciences. They also appealed to the Teaching Service Commission to expedite the process of confirming Heads of Department.

The head teacher of Saint secondary school recommended that for Heads of Department to be effective they should equally be rotated as head teachers were;

> So, really for me I would want a situation where these HoDs are rotated time and again the same way head teachers are rotated; so that when they go into a place it's just business of work...They have a challenge especially if they are,

> they have risen from the same ranks, then today they are there so even when they go to see their colleagues they still take them as colleagues so that has weakened the system (Head teacher 3, Saint, 2018).

The Head of Department for Mathematics at Saint secondary school was of the view that there was nothing Heads of Department could do if they did not enjoy any autonomy. He also bemoaned the prevailing situation where even a disciplinary charge letter given to a teacher who perpetually failed to comply with rules and regulations carried no weight. The decisions of Heads of Department never counted.

4.23. **Summary of the Chapter**

This chapter presented findings of the research study on Heads of Departments' supervision in public secondary schools in Kabwe District of Zambia. The findings of the study revealed that Heads of Department in public secondary schools practised both portfolio supervision and lesson observation. Portfolio supervision included the checking of lesson plans, schemes of work, records of work, and pupils' note and exercise books. It also took the form of monitoring of blocks. Lesson observation was done interdepartmentally in two schools while one of the three schools used a departmental approach. Most respondents were uncomfortable with interdepartmental lesson observation. They argued for subject based lesson observation. Findings of the study also revealed that collaboration and collegiality were absent among teachers and their supervisors. Some aspects of collaboration were only seen during demonstration lessons done through CPD activities. Heads of Departments' supervision did not mostly influence the performance of teachers as it was bent on controls and did not develop the teacher. The teachers' arguments were based on the type of feedback that they received from HoDs which was deemed

superficial, lack of follow-up observations and teachers' lack of knowledge on what their supervisors came to check for during lesson observations. Regarding challenges faced by Heads of Department; their lack of formal in-service training was top on the list while their lack of motivation due to their acting in appointment for a long time ranked second. Further, failure by some teachers to meet set deadlines and prepare lesson plans and replacing absent teachers due to perpetual permissions posed a challenge to Heads of Department. To mitigate some of the challenges highlighted in the study, research findings revealed that Heads of Department needed formal in-service training in supervision and be confirmed in appointment within six months to motivate them. Where interdepartmental lesson observation was conducted, over three quarters of the teachers called for its reversal. Recognition of the position of Head of Section in secondary schools was highly supported by most teachers. The next chapter presents the discussion of research findings.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

5.1. **Overview**

The previous chapter presented the study findings on Heads of Departments' supervisory role and teacher performance in selected public secondary schools of Kabwe District, Zambia**.** The chapter presented the research findings in themes generated from the four research questions of the study. This chapter presents the discussion of the research findings of the study. Discussion of study findings was guided by the research objectives.

5.2. **Portfolio Supervision**

Heads of Department in the three sampled secondary schools practised portfolio supervision. Portfolio supervision conducted included the review of the teacher's artefacts such as schemes of work, lesson plans, records of work, note and exercise books of pupils and results of tests for learners. Portfolio supervision done in the sampled secondary schools was bent on just signing and date stamping documents without checking their relatedness. For instance, most Heads of Department never managed to compare what was in the pupils' books with such documents as schemes of work, lesson plans and records of work. Inspection of pupils' books in the sampled secondary schools was not done as planned on the programme of work of HoDs. HoDs rarely checked pupils' books and if they did, it was done in a casual manner during the time for lesson observation. Heads of Departments simply date-stamped the pupils' books as a way of showing their supervisors that they fulfilled what was planned for the term; when in fact not. This is in agreement with the

findings of Malunda et al. (2016:185) who found that "head teachers and subject heads rarely check students' note books to determine relatedness of what was being taught with what was planned in the schemes of work." Monitoring the relatedness of students' notes to the schemes of work and coverage of instruction form a basis of purposeful guidance and support to teachers' classroom teaching (Orenaiya, 2014).

Findings of several studies revealed that portfolio supervision significantly explained teacher effectiveness in the classroom (Peretomode, 2001; Sule et. al., 2015; Usman, 2015). Findings of the current study contrasted these studies and were in congruence with the findings of Malunda et al. (2016) that supervision of artefacts such as schemes of work and lesson notes is done mainly as a ritual to comply with the Ministry of General Education requirements rather than as a practice to improve teaching and learning. Further, the study agreed with the counsel given by Orenaiya (2014) and Musaazi (2006) that it was imperative for supervisors to review teaching artefacts that included among others: schemes of work, lesson plans, teachers' notes and students' work to establish relatedness, completeness of task and syllabus coverage.

As regards lesson plan checking, Shakutoka secondary school was very consistent with the practice; Heads of Departments checked lesson plans for their teachers on a daily basis. Teachers were not allowed to go to class without a checked lesson plan. Ideally that is how it was supposed to be in every secondary school. This was attributed to the nature of head teacher at the time as the situation was not like that before his advent.

At Musante and Saint secondary school, lesson plan checking by Heads of Department was a challenge; it only remained a requirement that teachers should never go to class without a checked lesson plan. Musante secondary school had a policy of auditing lesson plans at the end of each term. The practice was aimed at checking the lesson plans a particular teacher made in a particular term in relation to the number of periods they had in a term and the teachers' individual work plan. The school had a meeting at the end of the term where the performance of each teacher regarding lesson planning was beamed and analysed. Though the practice of lesson plan audit at the end of the term was prevalent, it was not effective as it allowed teachers to update their files before the day of audit. This was because each time the teachers brought their lesson plans for checking, Heads of Department never took a record. Only one Head of Department at Musante secondary school was found with a register for lesson plan submission; though the practice was not as effective as it should have been – the Head of Department admitted that some teachers chose to have their lesson plans checked by Heads of Sections (HoS) who never kept a record of their submission of lessons instead of the HoD who did. Teachers used that as a scapegoat and thus submitted an updated file at the end of the term. This implied that some teachers wrote lesson plans of lessons they never delivered to learners and did that for the sake of the record.

Saint secondary school did not have a localised school policy on lesson plan checking unlike the other two secondary schools. Most teachers at this school exhibited relaxation regarding lesson planning. The submission of lesson plans at this school was done by very few teachers during their submission of teaching files; by that time the teacher would have had already taught; thus defeating the very purpose

of that monitoring strategy. The study done by Musaazi (2006) established that several teachers were not making lesson plans and regarded the practice as a waste of time. The findings of this study were in consonance with Musaazi (2006) regarding teachers perceiving the practice of lesson planning as a waste of time though most of the teachers still planned their lessons at Musante and Shakutoka secondary schools.

Most of the teachers interviewed in the three schools did not like the idea of preparing lesson plans. At Shakutoka secondary school where the practice was enforced, teachers did it for the sake of satisfying the system and not necessarily as a measure that accounted for their effectiveness. Some teachers interviewed indicated that they never followed their lesson plans in class. Further most teachers and Heads of Department interviewed confirmed that lesson plan checking was mostly an academic exercise as Heads of Departments were in the habit of just date stamping and signing the lesson plans. This agreed with the findings of Malunda et al (2016:185) whose study results also revealed that supervision of artefacts such as schemes of work and lesson notes is done mainly as a ritual to comply with the Ministry of Education policy rather than as a practice to improve teaching and learning. Observation data also confirmed that. Experienced teachers did not report any help rendered to them by heads of departments regarding lesson planning. Lesson plan checking by heads of departments had been helpful to student teachers and teachers who were just starting their teaching career.

5.3. **Weaknesses in the Block Monitoring Strategy**

Musante and Saint secondary schools used the block monitoring strategy for supervision. The practice was for the Head of Department to check the presence of

teachers every period in each class, and fill in the instrument; ticking were they found teachers present and submit that instrument to the head teacher on a weekly basis. Each Head of Department in the respective schools was given a block to man. Most Heads of Department monitored their blocks. Observations revealed that this practice was not effective as the Heads of Department collected information from class monitors and pupils; they did not check physically for themselves as they were sometimes found to be teaching. Some teachers were also in the habit of conniving with class monitors to indicate that they taught the class when in fact not. Most Heads of Department admitted to the aforementioned weaknesses in the block monitoring strategy. Document analysis also confirmed this as some instruments located in the offices of Heads of Department had blank spaces indicating that sometimes they never filled in the forms. Because of this practice period by period registers which used to be filled in by class monitors were scrapped off. The use of these registers would have made for this inconsistence.

5.4. **Interdepartmental Lesson Observation**

Two of the sampled secondary schools used a lesson observation strategy that was interdepartmental in nature. Heads of Department were allowed to observe lessons of teachers who did not belong to their departments. Heads of Departments were simply assigned teachers to observe during the term. This schedule of observation in one of the schools was stuck in the staffroom while the case in another school was different. The teachers knew quite well that someone would come to observe them during the course of the term, but the schedule of observation was not availed to them. The rationale for not availing the observation schedule to the teachers was that of wanting

them to be ready for observation at all times and this would in turn compel teachers to always prepare the lesson plans.

The practice of interdepartmental lesson observation was not favoured by most teachers in the study; several teachers argued for subject specialist-based observation. This finding is in line with (Milanowsik, 2011; Malunda et al., 2016), who counselled that for classroom observations to influence teacher performance, the supervisors should have an in-depth understanding of the subject being taught. This is different from Sule, et al. (2015) finding that indicated that classroom observations positively contributed to teacher effectiveness in a secondary school. Teachers perceived interdepartmental lesson observation not to influence teacher performance. This was because the system concentrated on teaching methods and not the actual subject content.

Manas (2012:59) noted that, "indeed in secondary schools the nature of instructional supervision is constrained by the subject specialization of the supervisor. Supervisors who have been teachers of languages cannot assess the students' performance in mathematics, nor offer teachers of mathematics the kind of professional support they need." Lesson observation done by a subject specialist was beneficial in fostering teacher growth and performance. In some departments such as social science, natural science and practical subjects, heads of section were better placed to conduct lesson observation. This is because there was no Head of Department who was a specialist in all subjects taught in the department. Aldalhani (2017:27) also found that, "teachers felt that they weren't being sufficiently challenged, and that the observation and feedback were only superficial." Teachers in this study expressed

similar sentiments as in Aldalhani (2017). The teachers argued that most Heads of Departments who observed them commented mostly on their possession of lesson plans; physical appearance, methods employed in the lesson and on very minor mistakes such as not writing the date. Heads of Department rarely provided solutions to the inadequacies noticed in the subject knowledge.

5.5. **Departmental Lesson Observation**

Saint secondary school used a departmental approach to lesson observation. Heads of Department strictly observed teachers in their departments with the exception of the head teacher and deputy head teacher who were free to observe any teacher. Lesson observation was not coordinated properly as Heads of Department had no observation schedule but simply observed teachers as and when they were free. Their observation was informal as they just checked the time table and found out which teacher was free and went to observe such teachers without pre-informing them. Most teachers were not comfortable with this kind of supervision; opting to be informed before the coming of the supervisor. Findings of this study agreed with Malunda (2017:185) who found that effective instructional supervision can be enhanced through classroom observations that were collaboratively planned by both the supervisors and teachers followed by feedback that is communicated in a collegial and supportive manner. Collaboration between the supervisor and supervisee in lesson observation did not exist. Supervisors never met with their subordinates to agree and plan on what was going to be taught. The departmental lesson observation approach was meant to find out what teachers did in their classrooms.

5.6. **Feedback after Lesson Observation**

After every lesson observation most Heads of Department gave feedback to their teachers. The teacher and the Head of Department would engage themselves in a dialogue. Teachers at this time were allowed to evaluate themselves and their lessons with the Head of Department pointing out areas of possible improvement. Teachers would also be allowed to justify their actions such as choice of methods, their failure to manage the class and many other issues that may arise from the lesson observation.

Research though suggests that feedback after lesson observation is often not a common occurrence in schools (Zatynski, 2012); on the contrary the findings of this study showed that most Heads of Department gave immediate feedback to their supervisees after every lesson observation. The feedback though, was rather superficial, confirming the findings of Moradi, et al. (2014) and Aldaihani, (2017). The feedback given after lesson observation to teachers by Heads of Departments was mainly based on minor mistakes on procedures and teaching methods and rarely on the subject content.

5.7. **Lack of Follow-up Observation**

Lesson observation in all selected secondary schools lacked a component of follow-up. Teachers were each time observed in a manner that was not connected to the previous observation. HoDs never went to teachers' classrooms to check whether there was improvement from the previous observations or to follow-up certain issues raised in the earlier observations. Every lesson observation done by HoDs was routine and not planned to foster the effectiveness of lesson delivery. It was hoped

that school-based supervision should have been different from external supervision by SESOs, which was a one-off activity lacking follow-up. Observation of teachers was not done in an effort to groom or mentor teachers. The lack of follow-up lesson observation by HoDs did not benefit the teachers. Heads of Department were only interested in showing their superiors that they fulfilled their obligation for the record.

5.8. **HoD Supervision Vis-a-vi Role Ambiguity**

Heads of Department in this study observed lessons of their teachers without them being confused that this was not their role; they understood that that was part of their job description; this disagreed with Kruskamp (2003) who revealed that HoDs were confused about their role of observing lessons of their teachers.

5.9. **Teacher Supervision Approaches**

On approaches to teacher supervision, Heads of Department mostly used informal supervision contrary to Yelkpieri and Namale (2016) whose findings indicated that, most educators used clinical supervision and formative supervision followed by inquiry based supervision. They further argued that these kinds of supervision seemed popular because "supervisors said they are developmental, non-judgmental and counselling oriented and are directed at improving teacher performance" (Yelkpieri and Namale, 2016:226). Most teachers at the sampled schools wished that their supervisors used more modern approaches to supervision that encouraged their participation in decision making.

5.10. **Heads of Departments' Teaching Load**

As regards challenges Heads of Department faced, previous research work found that the teaching load for Heads of Department did not allow for effective supervision (Kruskamp 2003; Peacock, 2014; Banda, 2015). These findings were contrary to the findings of the current study. Heads of Department at the sampled schools had an average of one to two classes; which translated to less than twelve periods a week. The teaching load for Heads of Department allowed for sufficient time to supervise their teachers. Some Heads of Department who failed to effectively supervise their teachers did it out of their laziness and at times due to the overwhelming delegated responsibilities by head teachers.

5.11. **Heads of Departments' Lack of Formal In-Service Training**

All the Heads of Department in the sampled secondary schools lacked formal in-service training in supervision and did not have any certificate in supervision. They relied on the knowledge gained from pre-service training programmes. While there was a component of educational management at their undergraduate programmes, it was insufficient to help them in their role of being teacher leaders and subject specialists. Most HoDs also attended a one day orientation workshop organized by their respective SESOs from the PEO on their post of responsibility. Other HoDs were not oriented at all but learnt departmental headship from their colleagues and their respective head teachers. The form of training HoDs underwent hampered their effectiveness in supervising their subordinates. This finding agrees with Ahmed (2011) and Kruskamp (2003) who observed that Head of Departments' lack of training in supervision was challenge that left many of them unprepared to manage the complexity and demands of their position. Heads of Department at the sampled

secondary schools were promoted without prior formal training and neither underwent any formal in-service training; their training comprised of orientation by SESOs.

5.12. **Attendance of Subject Association Workshops**

One challenge Heads of Department faced in their supervision of teachers was selecting who to attend subject association workshops. Most of the teachers who participated in the study bemoaned the unfairness of HoDs in the attendance of subject association workshops; they argued that it was either the Heads of Department or their favourite teachers who attended the workshops. Most teachers were not motivated by this practice. This left the knowledge shared at workshops with a selected few; most teachers and HoDs who attended workshops did not share the knowledge gained. Most teachers though wanted to attend these workshops only for monetary gain (Daily Subsistence Allowance) and not the knowledge shared. This was evidenced by the failure or unwillingness of teachers to attend workshops organised at school level to share the knowledge gained from workshops done outside the district. Calls by teachers to make attendance of subject association workshops outside the district rotational did not receive support from HoDs and head teachers.

5.13. **Leadership Style of the Head Teacher**

Heads of Departments' supervision of their teachers was mostly dictated by the leadership style of the head teacher; where the head teacher was autocratic, the teachers and Heads of Department were compliant, and where the head teachers were democratic and laissez faire there was an insignificant level of compliance. For

instance, Shakutoka secondary school was consistent with lesson plan checking unlike the other two sampled secondary schools; Heads of Department checked lesson plans for their teachers on a daily basis. Teachers were not allowed to go to class without a checked lesson plan. Submission of teaching files fortnightly was not a challenge at Musante and Shakutoka secondary schools. The findings of this study were in congruence with the study conducted by Malunda et al. (2016) who, concluded that teachers' pedagogical practices were dependent on the manner in which they were supervised, other factors notwithstanding.

Further Kruskamp (2003) found that Heads of Department did not receive encouragement from head teachers to supervise their teachers. To the contrary, all HoDs in the sampled schools received encouragement from the head teachers to supervise their teachers. In some schools, head teachers went ahead to encourage interdepartmental supervision; this was in a quest to make teachers understand that all Heads of Department were their supervisors regardless of the department teachers belonged to.

5.14. **Lack of Guidelines on their Post of Responsibility**

The document of the Ministry of General Education (MoGE) called Standards and Evaluation is very important in Heads of Department understanding their supervisory role. The document was not availed to the Heads of Department by the structures in the ministry. An analysis of documents in the custody of the Heads of Department in the sampled secondary schools revealed that only one Head of Department out of the fifteen had the said document obtained from his mother-in-law who was a District Education Board Secretary somewhere. Though all Heads of Department claimed to

have excerpts of workshop materials on their post of responsibility; these materials were equally not located. In the absence of guidelines on their post of responsibility, Heads of Department did their work according to their experience, head teacher leadership style and consultations with other Heads of Departments. This implies that Heads of Department supervised their teachers not according to a prescribed standard but it rested on their judgement and experience. This was a very serious anomaly on the part of the MoGE.

5.15. **Collaboration and Collegiality**

Most teachers found continuing professional development activities beneficial to a great extent as they shared knowledge on how to tackle certain topics which were challenging to them. This was done through the lesson study cycle. These activities were more collaborative and collegial in nature. There were very scanty cases of collaboration among teachers in the studied secondary schools initiated by Heads of Department outside CPDs. The relationship between supervisors and supervisees was also not collegial; this distanced most of the teachers from their Heads of Department. The study agreed with the assertion made by Zepeda (2010) that classroom observations could only positively influence teacher effectiveness when supervisors focussed on strengthening the relationship between themselves and teachers. Teachers viewed their Heads of Department as gate-keepers who were just there to uphold required standards.

5.16. **Supervision or Inspection**

Heads of Department in all the three secondary schools practiced inspection and evaluation; not any different from SESOs in the Ministry of General Education.

Inspection is described as a top-down approach that concentrated on the assessment and evaluation of school improvement based on standards that were set, while supervision involved providing guidance, support and continuous assessment to teachers for their professional growth and improvement of job performance (Tyagi, 2010).

HoD supervision in the sampled secondary schools was strictly guided by instruments meant to control and keep standards. This is in agreement with the findings of scholars such as Ozdemir and Yirci (2015:57) who found that supervision was "carried out in order to eliminate present or possible failures in the educational system, determine whether educational workers are mastering their professional duties and responsibilities, and to prevent educational workers to do wrong" and Sergiovanni (1992:203) who referred to supervision as a "non-event—a ritual they [supervisors and teachers] participate in according to well-established scripts without much consequence." Wanzare (2003) also found that, school supervision was merely there to ensure strict adherence to rules and regulations, and allegiance to head teachers. The findings of this study, also agree with Acheson and Gall (1997) who noted that this kind of supervision of teachers was perceived by teachers as not helpful for teaching and professional growth.

5.17. **Summary of the Chapter**

This chapter discussed the findings of the research study. The findings were discussed thematically and were compared with studies available on the supervision of teachers. The supervision conducted by Heads of Department in public secondary schools of Kabwe District in Zambia was some form of inspection that was bent on

ensuring that teachers were controlled. The study agreed with available previous literature that indicated that portfolio supervision was mainly done as a ritual to comply with the requirements of the Ministry of General Education. This kind of supervision did not influence teacher performance positively. The teachers simply met deadlines for fear of landing themselves into trouble. Pupils' books were not checked to ensure relatedness of the covered work to that which was schemed. The study agreed with previous research that advocated that for lesson observation to be effective, it needed to be done by someone who was specialized in the subject content. It further dispelled assertions that interdepartmental lesson observation was useful. Heads of Department unlike in other studies done in the past understood that they needed to supervise their teachers. The teaching load of Heads of Department in the sampled secondary schools never hampered their effectiveness, contrasting previous research. Most teachers valued Heads of Department supervision when it was administered in a collaborative manner as evidenced by the teachers' appreciation of demonstration lessons. Heads of Department supervision in the studied schools depended heavily on the leadership style of their head teachers. The chapter that follows presents conclusions and recommendations of the research study.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1. **Overview**

The previous chapter presented the discussion of the major findings of the study. Chapter six of the study draws the conclusions of the study and provide recommendations on Heads of Departments' supervisory role and teacher performance in public secondary schools of Kabwe District, Zambia based on the research findings.

6.2. **Conclusions**

The study made the following conclusions:

Both portfolio and classroom supervision was carried out regularly by Heads of Department in two of the three sampled public secondary school. Portfolio supervision included the review of the teacher's artefacts such as lesson plans, test results for pupils, schemes of work and records of work. While portfolio supervision was conducted in the said secondary schools, its effectiveness was not guaranteed. There was a lot of insistence on controls rather than building teachers to improve classroom instruction.

Supervision of teachers by Heads of Department was done mainly to satisfy the needs of the system and not as a strategy to improve teacher performance. Most teachers complied with their Heads of Department for fear of getting into trouble. This meant that Heads of Department in public secondary schools in Kabwe District of Zambia practised inspection and evaluation rather than supervision.

Most teachers and Heads of Department in the study benefited from demonstration lessons done through continuing professional development activities; this was because they were collaborative and collegial in nature.

Lack of formal in-service training of Heads of Department hampered their effectiveness. This was because Heads of Departments' effectiveness in the current was dictated by the head teachers' leadership style and the experience Heads of Department had in their post of responsibility. Reliance on intuition and experience was not sufficient for this important position.

Interdepartmental lesson observation conducted at Musante and Shakutoka secondary schools was disliked by most teachers. Most teachers opted for their Heads of Department to observe them as they were well vested in the subject content. The feedback that resulted from interdepartmental lesson observation was deemed superficial by most teachers.

6.3. **Recommendations**

Based on this study, the following recommendations were made:

a) The government of the republic of Zambia through the Ministry of General Education must restructure school-based supervision to include modern approaches to supervision that are collaborative and collegial in nature; this can help improve teacher performance and bring about teacher professional growth.

b) Heads of Department should undergo formal in-service training to prepare them for their post of responsibility.

c) As a way of motivating Heads of Department, the Teaching Service Commission should expedite the process of confirming Heads of Department within six months of their appointment.

6.4. **Areas of Further Research**

The study suggests the following areas for investigation:

1. A correlation study on the role of Heads of Departments' supervision in improving teacher performance in public secondary schools.
2. A study on how relationships that exists between Heads of Department and their teachers influenced learning.

REFERENCES

Acheson, K.A. and Gall, M.D. (1997). ***Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers: Pre-service and In-service Applications*** (4th Ed.). New York: Longman.

Adduci, L.L., Woods-Houston, M.A. and Webb, A.W. (1990). ***The Department Chair: Role Ambiguity and Role Strain***. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Adewale, O.S. (2014). ***Instructional Improvement of Secondary School Teachers through Effective Academic Supervision by the Vice-Principals.*** Journal of Education and Human Development, 3(2), 607-617.

Aldaihani, S.G. (2017). ***Effect of Prevalent Supervisory Styles on Teaching Performance in Kuwaiti High Schools.*** Asian Social Sciences; 13(4), 25–36.

Alhassan, A.J. (2015). ***An Evaluation of Head Teachers Performance in Supervision of Instruction and Involvement of Staff in Decision-Making in the School***. International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies, 2(7), 129-142.

Alig-Mielcarek, J. (2003). ***A Model of School Success: Instructional Leadership, Academic Press and Student Achievement***. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University).

Allemann, J. (2006). ***Links between Teacher Evaluation/Supervision and Student Achievement: A Case Study of a Successful Urban Elementary School***. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California).

Anderson, C. S. (1987). ***Instructional Leadership Behaviors in High School Principals, Assistant Principals and Department Chairpersons: A Comparison***. High School Journal, *70*(2), 115-123.

Ankoma-Sey, V.R. and Maina, B. (2016). ***The Role of Effective Supervision on Academic Performance of Senior High Schools in Ghana***. Journal of Arts and Humanities, 5(4), 73-83.

Azure, J. A. (2016). ***Students' Perspective of Effective Supervision of Graduate Programmes in Ghana***. American Journal of Educational Research, 4(2), 163-169.

Bamroongraks, W. (1996). ***'The Role of the Thai Inspectorate in the Management, Monitoring and Supervision of the Teachers'.*** In: ACEID, op. cit., pp. 252-254.

Banda, K.E. (2015). ***The Relationship between Management Supervision and Teacher Performance in the Secondary Schools of Kafue District.*** (Unpublished Masters Dissertation, University of Zambia).

Berg, B. L. (2001). ***Qualitative Research Methods for Social Sciences***. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Blase, J. and Blase, J. (1998). ***Handbook of Instructional Leadership: How Really Good Principals Promote Teaching and Learning.*** Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Callahan, M. (1971). ***The Effective School Department Head***. New York: Parker.

Chavula, J. (2016). ***The Practice and Challenges of School Based Continuous Professional Development (SBCPD) Through Lesson Study in Zambia Secondary Schools.*** Asian Journal of Education and e-Learning, 4(2), 46–51.

Clarke, A.K. (2009). ***Secondary School Department Heads as Teacher Leaders: A Study in Suburban Ontario.*** (Unpublished Masters Dissertation, Brock University).

DeRoche, E. F., Kujawa, E., and Hunsaker, J. S. (1988). ***Department Chairs: A***

School's Untapped Resource. The High School Journal, 71(3), 135–137.

Engroff, D., Shanklin, P., and Shea, T. (1976). ***Multi-unit High School***. Annandale, NJ: North Hunterdon Regional High School District.

Fuller, B. (1986). ***Raising School Quality in Developing Countries: What Investments Boost Learning?*** (World Bank Discussion Paper No 2, Washington: The World Bank).

Ghavifekr, S. and Ibrahim, M.S. (2014*).* ***Head of Departments' Instructional Supervisory Role and Teachers' Job Performance: Teachers' Perceptions***. Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Management Studies, 1(2), 45-56.

Glickman, C.D. (1992). ***Supervision in Transition***. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., and Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2004). ***Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach*** (6th Ed.). New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Glickman, C., Gordon, S., and Ross-Gordon, J. (2007). ***Supervision and Instructional Leadership - A Developmental Approach***. Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.

Hanna, P. (2010). ***Instructional Leadership and the Impact on Student Achievement***. Ed.D Dissertation, Alberta: University of Calgary.

Heckert, W.G. (2015). ***How Department Chairs Support Teacher-student Relationships.*** (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Boston University).

Hord, S. M., and Murphy, S. C. (1985). ***The High School Department Head: Powerful or Powerless in Guiding Change***? Presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association (pp. 31–72).

Kabeta, R.M., Manchishi, P.C. and Akakandelwa, A. (2015). ***Instructional Leadership and Its Effect on the Teaching and Learning Process: The***

Case of Head teachers in Selected Basic Schools in the Central Province of Zambia. International Journal of Science and Research, 4(4), 1876-1884.

Kalabo, O.M. (2017). ***Studies on School Leadership in Zambia: A Review.*** African Research Review: An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal, 11(4), 30-44.

Kambunga, A. (2013). ***An investigation into District Education Standards Officers'Monitoring of Standards in High Schools: A Case of selected High Schools in Southern Province of Zambia.*** University of Zambia: Lusaka.

Kapaya, G. (2013). ***Teacher Perceptions of Primary School Head Teachers' Instructional Leadership Behaviour: The Case of Selected Primary Schools of Mufumbwe District.*** (Unpublished Masters dissertation, University of Zambia).

Kruskamp, W. H. (2003). ***Instructional Supervision and the Role of High School Department Chairs.*** (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Document ID: 764822981).

Kruskamp, B. and Zepeda, S.J. (2007). ***High School Department Chairs: Perspectives on Instructional Supervision***. The High School Journal, 90(4), 44-54.

Malunda, P., Onen, D., Musaazi, J.C.S. and Oonyu J. (2016). ***Instructional Supervision and the Pedagogical Practices of Secondary School Teachers in Uganda.*** Journal of Education and Practice, 7(30), 177 – 187.

Manas, R.P. (2012). ***Implementation of Instructional Supervision in Secondary School: Approaches, Prospects and Problems***. Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal, 1(3), 59-67.

Mandell, E. D. (2006). ***Supervisory Practices and their Effect on Teacher's***

Professional Growth. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh).

Marshal, C. (2005). ***The Assistant Principal: Leadership Choices and Challenges.*** Newbury Parks: Corwin.

Maxwell, J. A. (2005). ***Qualitative Research Resign: An Interactive Approach*** (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Mayers, R. S., and Zepeda, S. J. (2002). ***High School Department Chairs: Role Ambiguity and Conflict during Change***. NASSP Bulletin 86(632), 49-64.

Milanowski, A. (2011). Measuring Teacher Performance for Strategic Human Capital Management. In: A. Odden (ed.). ***Strategic Management in Education***, (pp.67-90). New York, NY: Routledge

Ministry of Education (1992). ***Focus on Learning: Strategies for Development of School Education***. Lusaka: Government Printers.

Ministry of Education (1996). ***National Policy on Education: Educating our Future***. Lusaka: Zambia National Publishing House.

Ministry of Education (2015). ***Standards and Evaluation Guidelines***. Lusaka:

Moradi, K., Sepehrifar, S., and Khadiv, T. P. (2014). ***Exploring Iranian EFL Teachers' Perceptions on Supervision***. Proceedings of the International Conference on Current Trends in ELT, (98), 1214–1223.

Mosha, H.J. (1988). ***A Re-assessment of the Indicators of Primary Education Quality in Developing Countries***. International Review of Education.

Muijs, D. and Harris, A. (2007). ***Teacher Leadership (in) Action: Three Case Studies of Contesting School.*** Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 35(1), 111-134.

Musaazi, J.C.S. (2006). ***Educational Planning: Principles, Tools and Applications in the Developing World***. Kampala: Makerere University Printery.

Namfukwe, I. (2016). ***The Impact of Monitoring and Evaluation on the Performance of Upper Primary School Teachers in Mbala District of the Northern Province in Zambia.*** (Unpublished Masters Dissertation, University of Zambia).

Nolan, J.F., and Hoover, L.A. (2008). ***Teacher Supervision and Evaluation: Theory in to Practice*** (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Obiweluozor, N., Momoh, U. and Ogbonnaya, N.O. (2013). ***Supervision and Inspection for Effective Primary Education in Nigeria: Strategies for Improvement***. Academic Research International 4(4), 586 – 594.

Ogunsaju, S. (1983). ***Educational Supervision: Perspective and Practice in Nigeria.*** Ile-Ife: University of Ife Press.

Orenaiya, S. A. (2014). ***School Inspection or, and Supervision Effects in Public Secondary Schools in Ogun State, Nigeria: Where are we and Where do we go?*** International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Invention, 3(6), 74-80.

Orris, A.B. (1988). ***The Role of High School Department Chairs in a Large Suburban School System.*** (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 0044.

Osae-Apenteng, J. (2012). ***The Effect of Supervision on Staff Performance in Ga South Municipal Education Directorate***. (Doctoral dissertation).

Ozdemir, T.Y. and Yirci, R. (2015). ***A Situational Analysis of Educational Supervision in the Turkish Educational System***. Educational Process: International Journal, 4 (1-2), 56-70.

Pajak, E. (2010). ***The History and Future of Instructional Supervision in the United States***. International Participatory Congress on Educational

Supervision, 23-25 June, 2010. Dumlupinar University and Temsen, Kutahya.

Peacock, J. S. (2014). ***Science Instructional Leadership: The Role of the Department Chair***. Science Educator, 23(1), 36–46.

Peretomode, V.F. (2001). ***Introduction to Educational Planning and Supervision***. Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers Ltd.

Niewenhuis, J. (2007). *Qualitative Research Design and Data Gathering*. In K. Maree, (2007). **First Step in Research.** Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Raynolds, D. (1985). ***Studying School Effectiveness***. London: Falmer.

Sergiovanni, T. J. and Starratt, R. J. (1993). ***Supervision: New Human Perspectives.*** New York: McGraw-Hill Company.

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

Siskin, L.S. (1991). ***Departments as Different Worlds: Subject Subcultures in Secondary Schools***. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 27*(2), 134-160.

Snelson P.D. (1974). ***Educational Development in Northern Rhodesia, 1883 – 1945***. Lusaka: NECZAM.

Sule, M.A, Ameh, E., Egbai, M.E. (2015). ***Instructional Supervisory Practices and Teachers' Role Effectiveness in Public Secondary Schools in Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State, Nigeria***. Journal of Education and Practice, 23(6), 43-47.

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

Tavakoli, H. (2012). ***A Dictionary of Research Methodology and Statistics in Applied Linguistics***. Tehran: Rahnama Press.

Tyagi, R.S., 2010. ***School-based Instructional Supervision and the Effective***

Professional Development of Teachers. A Journal of Comparative and International Education, Special Issue: Globalisation, Educational Governance and Decentralisation, 40(1), 111-125.

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

Veloo, A., Komuji, M.A. and Khalid, R. (2013). ***The Effects of Clinical Supervision on the Teaching Performance of Secondary School Teachers***. Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences, (93), 35-39.

Wettersten, J. A. (1992). ***High School Department Chairs as Instructional Leaders: Four Case Studies***. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.

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

Zatynski, M. (2012). **Revamping Teacher Evaluation.** Principal, 91(5), 22-57.

Zepeda, S. J. (2003). ***Instructional Supervision: Applying tools and concepts***. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Zepeda, S.J. (2010). ***Instructional Supervision: Applying Tools and Concepts*** (3rd ed.). New York: Eye on Education.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A INFORMED CONSENT

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY STUDIES

REFERENCE TO PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET:

1. Make sure that you read the Information Sheet carefully, or that it has been explained to you to your satisfaction.
2. Your permission is required if tape or audio recording is being used.
3. Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary, i.e. you do not have to participate if you do not wish to.
4. Refusal to take part will involve no penalty or loss of services to which you are otherwise entitled.
5. If you decide to take part, you are still free to withdraw at any time without penalty or loss of services and without giving a reason for your withdrawal.
6. You may choose not to answer particular questions that are asked in the study. If there is anything that you would prefer not to discuss, please feel free to say so.
7. The information collected in this interview will be kept strictly confidential.
8. If you choose to participate in this research study, your signed consent is required below before I proceed with the interview with you.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT

I have read (or have had explained to me) the information about this research as contained in the Participant Information Sheet. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about it and any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction.

I now consent voluntarily to be a participant in this project and understand that I have the right to end the interview at any time, and to choose not to answer particular questions that are asked in the study.

My signature below says that I am willing to participate in this research:

Participant's Name…...……

Participant's signature:……

Consent Date: …….....

Researcher Conducting Informed Consent (Printed) …….

Signature of Researcher:……..……..

Date: ……

APPENDIX B INTRODUCTORY LETTER FROM UNZA

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Telephone: 291381
Telegram: UNZA, LUSAKA
Telex: UNZALU ZA 44370

PO Box 32379
Lusaka, Zambia
Fax: +260-1-292702

Date 28TH MARCH, 2018

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: FIELD WORK FOR MASTERS/ PhD STUDENTS

The bearer of this letter Mr./Ms. NACHIBINGA BIGGIE ....Computer number..2016145512.....is a duly registered student at the University of Zambia, School of Education.

He/She is taking a Masters/PhD programme in Education. The programme has a fieldwork component which he/she has to complete.

We shall greatly appreciate if the necessary assistance is rendered to him/her/.

Yours faithfully

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA
ASSISTANT DEAN (PG)
28 MAR 20
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
P.O. BOX 32379, LUSAKA

Emmy Mbozi (Dr)
ASSISTANT DEAN POSTGRADUATE STUDIES - SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

cc: Dean-Education
Director-DRGS

APPENDIX C INTRODUCTORY LETTER FROM THE PEO – CENTRAL PROVINCE

All Communications should be addressed to the provincial education officer telephone: 05 – 222535/8

In reply please quote
No.....
TS/816137

REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA
MINISTRY OF GENERAL EDUCATION

REGIONAL HEADQUARTERS
P.O BOX 80197
KABWE

12th April, 2018

To: All Head Teachers
Secondary Schools
KABWE DISTRICT

FIELD WORK FOR MASTERS: MR. BIGGIE NACHIBINGA

This minute serves to introduce Mr. Nachibinga, a student at the University of Zambia, School of Education, doing Masters of Education in Educational Administration and Management.

He wishes to conduct his research titled "Role of Head of Departments Supervision in Improving Teacher Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Kabwe District, Zambia".

Any assistance rendered in this regard will be highly appreciated.

Jennipher Chishimba Banda
PROVINCIAL EDUCATION OFFICER
CENTRAL PROVINCE

APPENDIX D INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HEADS OF DEPARTMENT

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY STUDIES

TOPIC: HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS' SUPERVISORY ROLE AND TEACHER PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KABWE DISTRICT, ZAMBIA

1. What is your academic qualification (education level)?
2. What is your field of study?
3. How many years have you served as a Head of Department?
4. Did you attend any in-service programme to prepare you for this responsibility?
5. Do you have any certificate in Supervision?
6.
    a. Has the Ministry of General Education provided you with guidelines of your post of responsibility?
    b. Do you have the document spelling out those guidelines?
7. How many teachers do you supervise?
8. In a typical 'actual' term at your school what preoccupies you mostly as Head of Department?
9. What supervision approaches do you employ in supervising teachers in your school? Like collegial supervision, self directed supervision, informal supervision, mentoring and clinical supervision?

10. How do you help your teachers improve their teaching in classroom develop professionally?
11. Do you ever see any positive change in teachers as a result of your supervision?
12. Do teachers present their schemes of work, lesson plans and record of work in time when asked?
13. Is what is alleged to have been covered in class in tandem with what was actually covered?
14. Do your teachers show interest in being observed in class?
15. What do you do after supervision for a teacher or teachers who perform well? And how about teachers who do not perform well as indicated during supervision?
16. Are there any challenges you face in supervising your teachers?
17. Do you receive encouragement in your supervision role from the head teacher?
18. Does your teaching load allow you to supervise your teachers effectively?
19. What steps can be taken to avert the challenges faced by you Heads of Department in your supervision work?

APPENDIX E INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HEAD TEACHERS

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY STUDIES

TOPIC: HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS' SUPERVISORY ROLE AND TEACHER PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KABWE DISTRICT, ZAMBIA

1. How is supervision carried out in your school?
2. Do you encourage your Heads of Department to supervise their teachers?
3. Do the Heads of Department actually supervise their teachers or that is your preserve together with the deputy head teacher?
4. Do your Heads of Department observe teachers teach in classrooms?
5. Do your Heads of Department give immediate feedback to teachers after observing them?
6. Do you ever see any positive change in teachers as a result of the supervision of Heads of Department?
7. Are there any challenges Heads of Department face in their supervision role?
8. What steps can be taken to avert the challenges faced by Heads of Department in their supervision work?

APPENDIX F INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY STUDIES

TOPIC: HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS' SUPERVISORY ROLE AND TEACHER PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KABWE DISTRICT, ZAMBIA

1. What is your highest educational attainment completed?
2. What is the length in years of your teaching experience?
3. How many years have you taught under your current Head of Department?
4. In a typical 'actual' term at your school what preoccupies your Head of Department mostly?
5. Are you able to meet deadlines? If so, what motivates you?
6. Does your Head of Department inform you earlier before coming to observe you in class?
7. Do you agree with the Head of Department on what he/she is going to check for during classroom observation? Does the Head of Department stick to what has been agreed upon?
8. Do you receive immediate feedback from the Head of Department after classroom observation?
9. Has supervision by your Head of Department brought any positive change in your teaching career so far? Give examples.
10. How helpful has supervision of teachers by the Head of Department been in improving teacher performance?

11. Are there any challenges the Head of Department faces in supervising teachers?
12. Does the Head of Department receive encouragement in his/her supervision role from the head teacher?
13. Does the Head of Departments' teaching load allow him/her to supervise teachers effectively?
14. What do you suggest Heads of Department can do to improve supervision of classroom instruction?

APPENDIX G DOCUMENT ANALYSIS GUIDE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY STUDIES

TOPIC: HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS' SUPERVISORY ROLE AND TEACHER PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KABWE DISTRICT, ZAMBIA

1. Check files of 3 teachers per department for the following

a. Schemes of Work

b. Records of Work

c. Current Syllabus

d. Lesson plans and comments on them

e. Test scores of pupils

f. Time table

g. Classroom observation report

h. Any written document in relation to supervision,

2. Check for the following documents in the Head of Department's office

a. Schedule for classroom observation,

b. Classroom observation report,

c. Results analysis bank for the past five years

d. Continuing Professional Development reports

e. Any supervision reports,

3. Check the exercise and note books of pupils for the following

a. Compliance – whether what is indicated in the records of work agrees with what is in the pupils' exercise and note books.
b. Head of Department's comments.

APPENDIX H OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY STUDIES

TOPIC: HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS' SUPERVISORY ROLE AND TEACHER PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KABWE DISTRICT, ZAMBIA

1. How are teachers within the department interacting with each other? – Check for collegiality.
2. What relationship exists between teachers in the department and the Head of Department?
3. Does the Head of Department observe lessons in classrooms?
4. Do teachers stick to deadlines? For example do they hand-in their teaching files to the Head of Department at the agreed time?
5. Observe what happens on the day of handing-in teaching files; that is whether teachers panic and simply update them for the sake of handing-in or the environment is relaxed because it represents what actually transpired during their course of duty.
6. Is there team-teaching in the department?
7. Are School-based Continuous Professional Development programmes conducted as scheduled?