

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS' INSTRUCTIONAL
SUPERVISION BY SUBJECT INSPECTOR, HEADTEACHERS,
HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND GRADE NINE PUPILS'
HISTORY ACHIEVEMENT IN LUSAKA PROVINCE

BY

MARY CHILUFYA MUSABA

238585

A Dissertation Submitted to the University of Zambia
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Education

C

MARY CHILUFYA MUSABA
1991

I Mary Chilufya Musaba do solemnly declare that this dissertation represents my own work and has not previously been submitted for a degree at this or another university.

Signed..... *MNgandwe*

Date..... *19-07-91*

This study is dedicated to my beloved children:
Kasalwe, Chibale, Kabwe and Bwalya.

APPROVAL

This dissertation of Mary Chilufya Musaba is approved as fulfilling part of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Education by the University of Zambia.

Signature of Examiners:

Chibweo aliah

Date: 25/10/88

[Signature]

Date: 20/3/89

[Signature]

Date: 20/03/89

[Signature]

Date: 20-3-89

ABSTRACT

The study advanced the thesis that effects of teacher instructional supervision include the improvement of teaching, learning and achievement. The purpose of the study was to find out (1) the relationship between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments and grade nine student achievement in history, (2) the degree of agreement between supervision of instruction by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments as rated by the teachers in Lusaka Province.

The study tested two null hypotheses. Null hypothesis one (Ho, One) was that there is no significant correlation between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers, heads of departments and pupil academic achievement at grade nine level in history in Lusaka Province. Null hypothesis two (Ho, Two) was that, there is no significant agreement between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments as rated by teachers in history at the grade nine level in Lusaka Province. The level of significance was 0.05.

Two statistical tests were used to test the two null hypotheses of the study. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was used to measure the relationship between teacher instructional supervision and pupil academic achievement. Kendall Coefficient of Concordance (W) was used to measure the

degree of agreement between teacher ratings on the three aspects of supervision.

The sample consisted of 30 teachers who fulfilled research inclusion criteria, 10 history heads of departments, and 2,064 out of 3,674 pupils enrolled in grade nine in 1986. Stratified random sampling was used to select the needed number of schools. The data collected for both grade nine history achievement and teacher instructional supervision were interval. The data collected on history achievement were derived from the final examination mark sheets. On teacher instructional supervision, the data were derived from a questionnaire consisting of Parts I, II, III and IV. The alpha reliability of the questionnaire was .71

The results of the study on hypothesis one showed a significant negative correlation between teacher instructional supervision and pupil academic achievement. Results on null hypothesis two indicated lack of agreement on teacher ratings between supervision provided by the subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments.

The study concluded that the extent and quality of instructional supervision provided to teachers was unsatisfactory. Lack of agreement on teacher ratings among the three aspects of supervision was probably due to lack of co-ordination and efficiency among supervisors.

On the basis of the findings of this study, it is recommended that further research should be conducted to find

out whether the results of a negative significant correlation would be supported. Clearer role definition of headteachers and heads of departments, fixing working loads of heads of departments, increasing frequency of visitations by subject inspector and encouraging in-service training of supervisors were also recommended.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author's sincere thanks go to the following people who greatly helped to make this dissertation possible.

Special gratitude goes to Professor E. K. Waddimba for his relentless support and advice throughout his course in Research methodology, who also supervised the dissertation.

Many thanks go to the Department of Education and the University Senate for having granted me enough time in which to finish my research. The Directorate of Manpower Planning and Training, for financing the study, deserves sincere appreciation.

Thanks go to the teachers, heads of departments and headteachers who participated in the study. MS. Mbulo who typed the first draft and my husband, Mr. Albert Ng'andwe, who processed the final copy, both deserve profound thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Declaration.....	i
Dedication.....	ii
Approval.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	vii
List of tables.....	x
 <u>CHAPTER ONE</u>	
<u>THE STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM</u>	1
-Introduction.....	1
-The problem.....	2
-The purpose of the study.....	3
-Hypotheses.....	4
-Implications of the hypotheses.....	5
-Assumptions.....	6
-Significance of the study.....	7
-Limitations of the study.....	8
-Definition of terms.....	9
 <u>CHAPTER TWO</u>	
<u>REVIEW OF LITERATURE</u>	11
-Socio-economic variables.....	11
-Family influence.....	12

-Pupil absenteeism.....	13
-Poor instruction.....	13
-Instructional supervision.....	14
-Supervisory roles.....	15
-Headteacher supervision.....	16
-Head of department supervision.....	18
-Summary of literature review.....	19

CHAPTER THREE

<u>PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY</u>	21
-Introduction.....	21
-Population.....	21
-Sample.....	22
-Sampling procedure.....	23
-Type of data collected.....	24
-Construction of research instruments.....	26
-Scoring procedure.....	26
-Collection of data.....	27
-Control of extraneous factors.....	28
-Pilot study.....	29
-Data analysis.....	30

CHAPTER FOUR

<u>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</u>	33
-Results.....	33
-Discussion.....	43

CHAPTER FIVE

<u>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</u>	50
-Summary.....	50
-Conclusions.....	55
-Recommendations.....	54

<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	55
---------------------------	----

<u>APPENDICES</u>	60
-Appendix A -The Pearson Product Moment Correlation(r) Formula.	61
-Appendix B -Kendall Coefficient of Concordance (W) Formula....	61
-Appendix C -Part I of the questionnaire for history teachers..	62
-Appendix D -Part II of the questionnaire.....	66
-Appendix E -Part III of the questionnaire.....	71
-Appendix F -Part IV of the questionnaire.....	74
-Appendix G -Heads of history department questionnaire.....	77

LIST OF TABLES

-Table 3.1 : Population of secondary schools.....	22
-Table 3.2 : Sample of schools, teachers and classes.....	24
-Table 4.1 : Average of average instructional supervision scores and pupil academic achievement average scores computed with (r).....	35
-Table 4.2 : Supervision average scores.....	38
-Table 4.3 : Ranks assigned to three types of supervision scores.....	38

-Table 4.4 : Teachers' ratings on head of department supervision.....	40
-Table 4.5 : Teacher ratings on headteacher supervision.....	41
-Table 4.6 : Teachers' ratings on supervision by inspector.....	42
-Table 4.7 : Types of in-service training and numbers of heads of departments attended.....	45

ABSTRACT

The study advanced the thesis that effects of teacher instructional supervision include the improvement of teaching, learning and achievement. The purpose of the study was to find out (1) the relationship between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments and grade nine student achievement in history, (2) the degree of agreement between supervision of instruction by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments as rated by the teachers in Lusaka Province.

The study tested two null hypotheses. Null hypothesis one (Ho, One) was that there is no significant correlation between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers, heads of departments and pupil academic achievement at grade nine level in history in Lusaka Province. Null hypothesis two (Ho, Two) was that, there is no significant agreement between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments as rated by teachers in history at the grade nine level in Lusaka Province. The level of significance was 0.05.

Two statistical tests were used to test the two null hypotheses of the study. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was used to measure the relationship between teacher instructional supervision and pupil academic achievement. Kendall Coefficient of Concordance (W) was used to measure the

degree of agreement between teacher ratings on the three aspects of supervision.

The sample consisted of 30 teachers who fulfilled research inclusion criteria, 10 history heads of departments, and 2,064 out of 3,674 pupils enrolled in grade nine in 1986. Stratified random sampling was used to select the needed number of schools. The data collected for both grade nine history achievement and teacher instructional supervision were interval. The data collected on history achievement were derived from the final examination mark sheets. On teacher instructional supervision, the data were derived from a questionnaire consisting of Parts I, II, III and IV. The alpha reliability of the questionnaire was .71

The results of the study on hypothesis one showed a significant negative correlation between teacher instructional supervision and pupil academic achievement. Results on null hypothesis two indicated lack of agreement on teacher ratings between supervision provided by the subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments.

The study concluded that the extent and quality of instructional supervision provided to teachers was unsatisfactory. Lack of agreement on teacher ratings among the three aspects of supervision was probably due to lack of co-ordination and efficiency among supervisors.

On the basis of the findings of this study, it is recommended that further research should be conducted to find

out whether the results of a negative significant correlation would be supported. Clearer role definition of headteachers and heads of departments, fixing working loads of heads of departments, increasing frequency of visitations by subject inspector and encouraging in-service training of supervisors were also recommended.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author's sincere thanks go to the following people who greatly helped to make this dissertation possible.

Special gratitude goes to Professor E. K. Waddimba for his relentless support and advice throughout his course in Research methodology, who also supervised the dissertation.

Many thanks go to the Department of Education and the University Senate for having granted me enough time in which to finish my research. The Directorate of Manpower Planning and Training, for financing the study, deserves sincere appreciation.

Thanks go to the teachers, heads of departments and headteachers who participated in the study. MS. Mbulo who typed the first draft and my husband, Mr. Albert Ng'andwe, who processed the final copy, both deserve profound thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Declaration.....	i
Dedication.....	ii
Approval.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	vii
List of tables.....	x

CHAPTER ONE

<u>THE STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM</u>	1
-Introduction.....	1
-The problem.....	2
-The purpose of the study.....	3
-Hypotheses.....	4
-Implications of the hypotheses.....	5
-Assumptions.....	6
-Significance of the study.....	7
-Limitations of the study.....	8
-Definition of terms.....	9

CHAPTER TWO

<u>REVIEW OF LITERATURE</u>	11
-Socio-economic variables.....	11
-Family influence.....	12

-Pupil absenteeism.....13
-Poor instruction.....13
-Instructional supervision.....14
-Supervisory roles.....15
-Headteacher supervision.....16
-Head of department supervision.....18
-Summary of literature review.....19

CHAPTER THREE

PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY.....21
-Introduction.....21
-Population.....21
-Sample.....22
-Sampling procedure.....23
-Type of data collected.....24
-Construction of research instruments.....26
-Scoring procedure.....26
-Collection of data.....27
-Control of extraneous factors.....28
-Pilot study.....29
-Data analysis.....30

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....33
-Results.....33
-Discussion.....43

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....50

-Summary.....50

-Conclusions.....55

-Recommendations.....54

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....55

APPENDICES.....60

-Appendix A -The Pearson Product Moment Correlation(r) Formula.61

-Appendix B -Kendall Coefficient of Concordance (W) Formula....61

-Appendix C -Part I of the questionnaire for history teachers..62

-Appendix D -Part II of the questionnaire.....66

-Appendix E -Part III of the questionnaire.....71

-Appendix F -Part IV of the questionnaire.....74

-Appendix G -Heads of history department questionnaire.....77

LIST OF TABLES

-Table 3.1 : Population of secondary schools.....22

-Table 3.2 : Sample of schools, teachers and classes.....24

-Table 4.1 : Average of average instructional supervision
scores and pupil academic achievement average
scores computed with (r).....35

-Table 4.2 : Supervision average scores.....38

-Table 4.3 : Ranks assigned to three types of supervision
scores.....38

-Table 4.4 : Teachers' ratings on head of department supervision.....	40
-Table 4.5 : Teacher ratings on headteacher supervision.....	41
-Table 4.6 : Teachers' ratings on supervision by inspector.....	42
-Table 4.7 : Types of in-service training and numbers of heads of departments attended.....	45

CHAPTER 1STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEMIntroduction

The quality of learning and relevance of education rather than quantity should be a major concern for educational policy in Zambia. Supervision of instruction is viewed as quality control of learning and teaching (Molotsi, 1975). Learning and teaching seem to have a mutual influence on each other. Several variables tend to facilitate or inhibit learning and or teaching. Early studies done in Zambia on factors that affect learning, teaching and pupil academic achievement have isolated the home-based factor (Kapambwe, 1980), and poverty of educational resources, overcrowded classrooms and poor teacher pupil ratios (Nyirenda, 1983; Siame, 1985). However, problems associated with learning, teaching and pupil academic achievement could be an interaction of several other factors. The complex dynamics include the home-based, school-based, and pupil-based factors (Schroeder, 1978; Englehardt, 1979). This view is also supported by learning theorists who have concurred that,

Education is affected by conditions and experiences within and outside the school situation and is conditioned by abilities and interests of the learner, the appropriateness of the learning situation and the efficacy of the teaching approach (Crow, 1961:1).

In this study teacher instructional supervision was viewed as one of the conditions within school situation which was

anticipated to have an influence on pupil academic achievement. This study was aimed at contributing to the already existing knowledge on factors which could contribute to educational improvement.

The problem

Partly, the problem relates to the apparent high failure rate at the Junior Leaving Examinations in Zambia. Although various interacting variables are associated with low quality of learning, teaching and pupil failure in Zambia, teacher instructional supervision have not been given due attention. If instructional supervision of teachers is supposed to help teachers perform better then lack of it would affect student performance. The same concern has been expressed by Molotsi (1975) who indicated that there was lack of supervision of teachers by inspectors of schools because of lack of transport. According to Molotsi, lack of transport compels the inspectors to spend more time in their offices than schools. However the Chairman of the Teaching Service Commission (Simukonda, 1987:4), alleged that,

It was not true that transport was to blame for their failure to inspect teachers...because buses can also be used. Some inspectors were too lazy and did not even bother to visit schools which are a stone's throw away from their offices.

In view of this problem of lack of regular supervision by inspectors of schools, Molotsi (1975) recommended the establishment of an internal system of supervision comprising

headteachers, deputy headteachers and heads of departments. This internal system of supervision was thought of as a more permanent means of providing professional supervisory services to the teachers. This research was designed to find out the extent to which instructional supervision affects student achievement since allegedly teacher performance is also affected.

Purpose of the Study

This study sought to investigate whether or not a significant correlation existed between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers, heads of departments on one hand and student performance in history at the junior level leaving examinations in Lusaka Province. In other words the study investigated the extent to which supervision of instruction is carried out in Lusaka Province by subject inspector, headteachers, and heads of departments and its influence on student history achievement. Furthermore, this study investigated the degree of agreement between teacher instructional supervision by the subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments as rated by teachers. The questions which needed to be answered were:

1. What is the quality, extent and influence of teacher instructional supervision carried out by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments on student achievement at grade nine level in history in Lusaka Province?
2. To what extent do history teacher ratings agree on teacher

instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments at grade nine level in Lusaka Province?

Hypotheses

The problem under study led to the formulation of the following hypotheses which were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

Hypothesis One

Null hypothesis One (H_0 One) was that there is no significant correlation between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers, heads of departments and pupil academic achievement at grade nine level in history in Lusaka Province.

Alternative Hypothesis One (H_1 One) was that there is a significant relationship between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers, heads of departments and pupil academic achievement at grade nine level in history in Lusaka Province.

Hypothesis Two

Null Hypothesis Two (H_0 Two) was that there is no significant agreement between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments as rated by teachers in history at grade nine level in Lusaka Province.

Alternative Hypothesis Two (H_1 Two) was that there is a

significant agreement between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments as rated by teachers in history at grade nine level.

Implications of the hypotheses

The acceptance of null hypothesis one was interpreted to imply that the extent of instructional supervision was not significantly related to pupil academic achievement. Whether or not inspectors of schools, heads of schools, heads of departments fulfill their advisory role, pupil academic achievement is not affected. That would be contrary to the theories advocating that teachers need advisory services to facilitate their professional functions anticipated to improve pupil learning and achievement. Another implication might be that either teachers do not implement suggestions or supervisors are ineffective. Possibly other factors and or interaction of factors could be at play.

If null hypothesis one was rejected, the extent of supervision would be related to pupil academic achievement. This implies that teachers should utilize guidance given to them by their supervisors. Otherwise essence of supervision would not contribute towards pupils main purpose of education and there would not be any justification for supervisors' jobs. As much as possible supervisors should be well trained, given necessary resources and urged to accomplish their roles effectively.

Acceptance of null hypothesis two was interpreted to mean a number of things. If there was no significant agreement between

teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments as rated by teachers, the first implication would be that there is no coordination in the supervision of teachers among the three types of supervisors. That would mean that each supervisor has his or her own way of supervising the teachers. That would be contrary to the theory that supervision of instruction works in an organized structure. On the other hand, while the three sources of supervision by the subject inspector, headteachers, heads of departments are considered to be extremely important in the improvement of teacher performance yet their ways of supervision may be inadequate or ineffective. Ineffective supervision may be due to roles which may not be clearly identified or due to different levels of supervisors.

If null hypothesis two was rejected the degree of agreement among the three aspects of supervision as rated by teachers would be interpreted to mean that the three types of supervisors has the same goals or perceptions about improving the quality of teaching. Another possible implication is that teachers also value being supervised and implement suggestions given to them by their supervisors. Not only this, teachers' attitude would be considered to be one that welcome change or innovation otherwise rigid norms of teachers or leadership would not contribute to effective supervision.

Assumptions

The assumptions to complement the theoretical framework

of this study are outlined below:

1. Supervision as an aspect of educational leadership has its main contribution to assist teachers to improve performance.
2. Improvement of teacher classroom performance should in turn improve pupil achievement unless adverse factors are at play.
3. Quality and the extent of teacher instructional supervision would be adequate or inadequate, effective or ineffective.
4. Teachers' attitudes towards certain supervisors could affect the effectiveness of the instructions given to them by their supervisors.
5. Agreement on teachers' ratings about teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers, heads of departments might imply that the three types of supervision are: effective or ineffective. Lack of agreement could imply that teachers' ratings on the three types of supervision differ. Reasons could be many. Policy, coordination, personality, academic background, professional expertise, leadership style, financial resources and many other factors could be involved.

Significance of the Study

Improvement of teacher performance and student achievement should be one of the concerns of the educational system in Zambia. A study of instructional supervision was deemed relevant for the purposes of ascertaining whether the extent of supervision could improve academic achievement and teaching. Results of research like this one would assist, more reliably, in establishing whether supervision has a role to play in educational improvement. Decisions by educational leaders to improve curriculum should not depend on intuition and speculation, but on valid scientific research data. Findings from this study might indicate inservice needs of teacher instructional supervisors. Some of the findings could be

incorporated among the criteria upon which supervisors are selected. Future post graduate programs for masters in education may use such findings when designing courses. The author is a secondary school history teacher in Lusaka Province. Lusaka Province comprises both urban and rural aspects of the educational system. A possibility was envisaged that generalisable findings on Lusaka Province might be testable on a larger scale in equivalent circumstances.

Limitations of the Study

Although the factor understudy is very important a comparative study of the extent various factors including supervision relate to pupil academic achievement would have been preferred. A sample comprising more than one province might have been more representative nationally than one province. However time and financial constraints confined this study to the design presented in this dissertation. Nevertheless, scientific sampling procedure was followed to select a sample of schools, teachers and history Grade nine classes of 1986.

The research design not being fully experimental would have lacked control of other variables. A control group with pupils whose teachers have never been supervised by the three supervisors might have shown differences in their performance which would be attributed to non-supervision. In a school setting this was impossible to get since there cannot completely be a lack of supervision let alone minimal supervision. This

fact would make laboratory type of experiment impossible.

The quality of the examination language used, questioning techniques and the content actually covered in the syllabus might also affect the performance of pupils.

Definition of Terms

In order to facilitate communication, the definitions of terms pertinent to the study are presented below.

Academic achievement:

In this study academic achievement refers to the performance of pupils at Grade nine level final examination prepared by the Ministry of General Education and Culture and the Zambia Examination Council. Class average scores based on this composite examination represent pupil achievement.

Teacher instructional supervision:

In this study teacher instructional supervision refers to professional guidance provided to teachers by their subject inspectors headteachers and heads of departments by evaluating teachers' schemes of work, lesson plans, notes and lessons, tests and other relevant factors.

Extent of supervision:

In this study extent of supervision refers to average scores on a five-point scale on questionnaire items under the various types of supervision.

Subject inspector:

This is the Ministry's chief professional representative on a subject area. This former classroom teacher and or lecturer, based at the Ministry of General Education and Culture Headquarters pays supervisory visits to classroom teachers.

Headteacher:

In this study the term, headteacher, is used interchangeably with principal/headmaster/headmistress to mean the overall supervisor of administrative and instructional work in the school, according to the policy within the system.

Head of department:

This is a teacher appointed by the headteacher to be in charge of supervising the work of other teachers in each subject area. The role incorporates responsibilities to improve learning and teaching.

Junior secondary:

In Zambia, Junior secondary refers to the first two years of secondary education which ends with the final selection examinations at Grade nine for admission to Grade 10.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A number of investigators have taken keen interest in trying to isolate which variables might be responsible for pupil academic achievement. Questions related to what variables could improve school results could have been left out. This study is a response to that question. Some variables identified to affect school achievement are summarized below under separate subheadings.

Socio-Economic Variables

Findings of research studies done in the 'West' concurred that certain variables particularly those concerned with social class can affect pupil academic achievement (Niles, 1981). Certain studies indicated that, particular aspects of social class that affect pupil academic achievement need to be identified (Swift, 1968). In this direction, Burt (1937:105) specified that, "Poverty, population density, family size, poor health and inadequate general knowledge were aspects of low social class which prevented children from advancing in school". However, although the relationship between social class and academic achievement have been found to exist, the extent has been found to be modest (Jencks, 1979). Similar results were found by Heynman (1981) in his studies in Uganda; which revealed

that children from wealthy families did not do better than children from impoverished families. However, Kapambwe's findings (1980) in the Copperbelt of Zambia and Magsuds' research (1980) in Nigeria contradicted these findings. Contradictions between various studies call for more research in this area particularly in Zambia where Kapambwe's findings were confined to Luanshya a small town in the Copperbelt Province.

Family Influence

While socio-economic variables seem to have some effect on pupil academic achievement, certain writers (Wiseman, 1967; Bielawski, 1972; Baldwin and Breece, 1945) suggested that other factors were equally important in influencing pupil academic achievement. Variables like family interest, warmth, emotional and marital instability have been listed by these writers as some factors which would affect pupil academic achievement. Bielawski (1972:3), observed that, "The relationship between parent and child and parental attitudes towards academic achievement are of greater importance than more gross environmental factors acting upon the family." Bielawski (1972) has provided scientific research studies of Peaker and Wiseman(1967) on family influence and pupil academic achievement. According to Bielawski (1972); the studies of Peaker and Wiseman (1967) showed, how closely tied parental interest in the child, and even more, specific concern with achievement, were to the educational response of a child.

Both studies also indicated that the variation in the effect of parental attitudes accounted for significantly more of the variation in the child's achievement than did variations in socio-economic status. These studies on family influence reveal important factors affecting pupil academic achievement which in the past had not received due attention.

Pupil Absenteeism

Results of various studies may not however account for all the differences in pupil academic achievement. Other studies showed that persistent school absenteeism affected pupil academic achievement (Tyerman, 1968; Reid, 1982). The factors associated with school absenteeism in these studies have been linked to factors that prevail in social backgrounds. However Renolds *et al.* (1976), criticised such studies for failing to examine institutional factors in school absenteeism. In agreement with this view, Ruttler and Ouston (1979:23) strongly argued that, the schools were able to influence the behaviour and attainment of their pupils regardless of personal and family problems.

Poor Instruction

While other factors are assumed to contribute to pupil failure, Hackney and Reavis (1968) singled out poor instructions as the real cause for school failure. According to their view, teachers are expected to motivate the interest of pupils through

encouragement during classroom activities. Whereas teachers are expected to provide the necessary guidance for the improvement of classroom performances, Lucio (1967) emphasized that teachers need professional assistance in order to improve instruction. If therefore, the performance of teachers is likely to affect pupil learning, then instructional supervision of teachers could contribute to educational improvement. An operationalisable definition of poor instruction requires due attention.

Instructional Supervision

Literature review highlighted some factors which could contribute to pupil failure. This part of review concentrates on the role of supervision in educational improvement.

Research studies in educational theory agree that supervision exists for the primary purpose of improving instruction (Savory, 1957; and Neagley et al., 1970). This view is shared by Williams (1970:326) who stressed that, "Though supervision was concerned with many aspects of education, its most profitable effort...was that which was vested in teacher improvement." Kimball (1967) argued that supervisors should be able to contribute to more effective learning otherwise their existence in the offices could not be justified. Although supervision of teachers has been widely believed to improve teaching and learning and hence pupil academic achievement, this has not been empirically demonstrated. This observation is supported by McDonald (1966:2) who pointed out that, "We acted

essentially upon faith that supervision was effective. This faith arose from our experiencing of supervision and not essentially from research sources." The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) also revealed that, "There was very little research in this area" (Raths, 1966:vii). Research findings on the practice of instructional supervision in Tennessee showed that, "More than eighty percent of the teachers reported no observations by or special supervisor" (Lovell and Phelps, 1977:226). However, this study did not show whether the non-supervision of the more than eighty percent of teachers led to any differences in performance of pupils whose teachers were supervised and pupils whose teachers were not supervised. The reports of McDonald and Raths (1966) therefore showed increased need in more research studies in teacher supervision and its influence. Since there seemed to be no readily available research in Zambia, this study was designed to narrow that gap by providing some empirical evidence.

Supervisory Roles

In the past, supervision of instruction in Zambia was vested in the hands of the school inspector and was in the form of inspection. However, some writers have argued that supervision should include other persons such as headteachers, heads of departments in the provision of supervisory services to the teachers (Dettman, 1969; Molotsi, 1975). Current literature shows a general agreement that supervision should not be

instituted for the primary purpose of inspection (Townsend, 1984). Supervision should be seen as a total effort to stimulate, coordinate and guide the continued growth of teachers (Krajewski, 1977). Other studies suggest that a team approach to instructional supervision is a more realistic method for improving secondary school education (Allan and Norma, 1984). The principal is seen as a major factor in influencing teachers to change and therefore cannot escape the role as an instructional leader (Schmuck and Runkel, 1977). Similarly, the head of department has been given the responsibility to run the work of the department and that should include the supervision of teachers (Gweynn, 1965). This implies that other persons in the school hierarchy from the subject inspector to the head of department, should be held partly accountable for the performance of teachers in schools. Literature revealed agrees on the sharing of supervisory roles.

Headteacher Supervision

Tremendous literature on the roles of headteachers showed that, the headteachers are both instructional leaders as well as administrators in their schools (Savory, 1957; Pape, 1971; Kwakwa, 1973). Coulson (1976:245) conducted a study to determine the various roles of headteachers and their deputies. His findings revealed that, of the various roles examined, supervision and evaluation of teachers was also placed in the headteacher's hands and, "School articles of government normally

held him responsible for curriculum and teaching." Therefore, headteachers are urged to balance the time between supervision and other administrative functions. Supervision of teachers by the headteacher is considered to be very important to both the teachers and the pupils as this brings the headteacher into close relationship with the learning process. Simuchoba (1972), specified that the main purpose of the headteacher is to improve the learning process of the children so as to improve results in the school. This assertion remained to be scientifically researched.

While abundant literature stress the importance of supervision by headteachers, Kwakwa (1973) pointed out that, there is lack of supervision by headteachers in schools. Nevertheless, without the availability of research data, the assertion by Kwakwa cannot be generalized to all countries and may therefore be difficult to accept.

Basing on the assumption that the headteacher supervision is important, and assuming that the headteacher may not be knowledgeable in some of the subjects taught in the school, and given that the head of department is regarded as being knowledgeable in his or her subject area (Gweynn,1965), the headteacher can work in close co-operation with the head of department in the supervision of instruction.

Head of Department Supervision

Marland (1971) contended that, the success of schools is

partially attributed to the role the head of department plays. Even if the post of a head of department is necessary in schools, Lambert (1975:37), argued that heads of departments are, "Far from agreed among themselves as to what are the role functions of their office." His argument emphasized that there is need to make their role functions much clearer. Supporting this view, Chibesakunda (1983:68) pointed out that, "In Zambia the Ministry of Education had not in most cases outlined what each head of department was required to do and how much power he has apart from keeping examinations safe." Contrary to this view, the Zambia Ministry of Education Inspectorate Guide Lines (1973) clearly specified what heads of departments should do to run their offices efficiently. The duties of the heads of departments also include the inspection of teachers schemes and records of work. The guidelines do not however say anything about other forms of supervision like observing teachers' lessons or insisting on lesson planning. Even assuming that there were no clearer roles defined for the head of department, (Gweynn, 1965:232) stated that,

The head of department might be defined as director and supervisor of all the work which is carried on in his department. [Therefore] the very fact that a head of department is selected for it, implies that the administration delegates some supervisory responsibilities to this department head.

Bloomer (1980) conducted a study to investigate what sort of functions a head of department should have. The findings of this study indicated that the head of department had the duty to

evaluate the work of the staff by inspecting schemes of work but discouraged the head of department from 'sitting in' on lessons. On the contrary, Neagley et al. (1970:8) argued that, "There can be no real understanding of the curriculum in action unless those responsible for supervision visit classrooms regularly." Inspection of schemes and records of work may not reveal problems that teachers and pupils face in the classroom. Moreover a teacher may not be honest enough to indicate in the records of work that lessons were not progressing properly or the fact that he or she lacked the knowledge of a particular subject area. Classroom visitation if done on regular basis could reveal weaknesses and strengths of certain teachers and corrective measures could be instituted before much damage is done. Literature review is however very clear on this point that the head of department just like the headteacher should supervise the teachers otherwise there would not be any justification for the creation of a post of head of department in schools.

Summary of Literature Review

Literature review highlighted the influence of various factors on pupil academic achievement. The factors are associated with the pupils themselves, home backgrounds and schools attended. Another emphasis was the role of supervision in education improvement. Dire need was expressed for research data to verify attributes of teacher instructional supervision, specification of job description for the head of department was

advocated and included classroom visitation to evaluate classroom learning and teaching. Assertions that classroom supervision by headteachers and heads of departments is important for the improvement of quality of education require verified findings.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The various aspects of the methodology are summarised under separate subheadings of population, sample, sampling procedure, type of data collected, instruments, scoring procedure, collection of data, control of factors, pilot study and data analysis.

Population

The population consisted of all history grade nine teachers, history heads of departments, headteachers, subject inspector and history pupils who sat for their Junior Leaving Examinations in 1986 in Lusaka Province. The Junior Leaving Examination is a national examination prepared by the Ministry of General Education and Culture in conjunction with the Zambia Examination Council. Although the Junior Secondary Level lasts for only two years, it was hoped that the influence of teacher instructional supervision on pupil academic achievement might be reflected. Table 3.1 below shows the population of secondary schools in Lusaka Province that constituted the population.

Table 3.1 POPULATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN LUSAKA PROVINCE

BOTH BOARDING AND DAY SCHOOLS			DAY SCHOOLS		
BOYS	GIRLS	COED.	BOYS	GIRLS	COED.
KAFUE	ROMA	-	KABULONGA	KABULONGA	KAMWALA
DAVID KAUNDA		-	LIBALA	STMARY'S	NABOYE
LUANGWA		-	MATERO	MATERO	ARAKAN-
MUNALI		-			BARACKS
CHONGWE		-			
TOTAL	5	1	0	3	3

TOTAL POPULATION: 15 SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

Note: COED. means coeducation.

Sample

The sample used consisted of 30 out of 55 teachers which is 54.5 percent of teachers who had answered the questionnaire. Another source of data were 10 history heads of departments and 10 headteachers representing the various 10 schools in the sample. A total number of 2064 pupils out of the 1986 Grade nine enrollment of 3674 which is 56.2 percent in Lusaka provided another source of data¹.

The actual number of all pupils who sat for their Junior Leaving Examinations in the country was not available at the Ministry of Education nor at the Computer Center at the University of Zambia.

1. Enrollment Grade nine 1986 figure was derived from the statistical section Ministry Headquarters.

Sampling procedure

The sample of 10 secondary schools out of 15 secondary schools which is 66.7 percent in Lusaka Province was selected by proportional random stratification. The schools in the sample consisted of two categories. The first category comprised five, both boarding and day boys schools, one, both boarding and day girls school, and zero, co-education schools, out of which, three boys and one, girls schools were taken. The second category consisted of day schools: three boys, three girls and three co-education schools: two boys, two girls, and two co-education schools were selected. Since differences in pupil academic achievement might differ or be affected by the type of school, a variety of categories helped to control sex and types of schools. Using Table 3.1 population figures, ballot papers were used, to select from each stratum 50 percent of the needed number of schools. Where only one school appeared, that one school representing a second category was picked.

The sample of teachers was selected on the basis of their length of stay in the same school. Since teachers change schools and classes from time to time, questionnaires were used to select teachers who had been in the same school for two years or more and had been teaching the same junior history classes for two years consecutively from Grade eight to Grade nine. The length of teaching the same class for two consecutive years was

important because cumulative influence of teacher instructional supervision might be reflected.

Since the number of classes that each teacher taught for two consecutive years were few, 100% of classes that a teacher taught in each class was taken.

Table 3.2 SAMPLE OF SCHOOLS, TEACHERS, AND CLASSES.

NAMES OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	NUMBER OF CLASSES
ARAKAN BARACKS	2	4
LIBALA	4	8
KAMWALA	3	3
KABULONGA GIRLS	4	4
ROMA	1	2
KABULONGA BOYS	5	12
KAFUE	2	4
CHONGWE	4	6
MUNALI	2	4
MATERO GIRLS	3	8
TOTAL	30	55

Type of data collected

The independent variable was teacher instructional supervision while the dependent variable was achievement in history at the Grade Nine Level Leaving Examinations. The data that were collected on history achievement were interval. Total percentage marks which all pupils got in each particular class of the sample were summed up and averaged to give an average achievement score for that class.

The data collected on teacher instructional supervision were also interval. The scores were derived from averages based on a

five-point Likert-type scale from a questionnaire prepared on the practice of instructional supervision. The average supervision scores were derived from three parts of the questionnaire, part II, III and IV on head of department, headteacher, and inspector supervision. These average scores were combined and then averaged to give one average supervision score for each teacher in the sample. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was calculated using the raw score formula (Tuckman, 1978:261).

To measure the degree of agreement among the three average supervision scores, Kendall Coefficient of Concordance (W) was used. The three average supervision scores which each teacher got on the three parts of the same questionnaire were turned into ordinal scores. Kendall Concordance W uses ordinal data or ranks. The three average supervision scores which each teacher got on the questionnaire was raw data. Ordinal scores were obtained by converting the three average supervision scores which each teacher got on the questionnaire into ranks. The researcher assigned ranks to the three average supervision scores ranging from (1) being the highest average supervision score to (3) being the lowest average supervision score for each teacher (refer to Table 4.2). Except for tied observations for teachers numbers 4, 13, 18, 22, and 26, this procedure of assigning ranks to supervision average scores was followed throughout Table 4.2. For tied observations on the three average supervision scores, the procedure from Siegel (1956) was followed. In this

procedure, "Tied observations are given the average of ranks which they would have received had there been no ties" (Siegel, 1956:217).

Construction of research instruments

The questionnaires were constructed after the researcher sought advice from the supervisor, various lecturers at the University of Zambia, fellow teachers and the Deputy Chief Inspector of Schools at the Ministry of General Education and Culture. A Likert-type scale was constructed with responses ranging from the least to the highest score. Since the study centred on instructional supervision, teachers had to tick (✓) the appropriate box on various aspects of supervision by the head of department, headteacher and the subject inspector. A likert-type questionnaire was also constructed for heads of departments about some general information on their duties.

Scoring procedure

The questionnaire on teacher instruction supervision was in four parts and contained a Likert-type scale. Part I was general information on teachers. Parts II, III, and IV contained aspects of supervision which were under investigation. For all the parts of the questionnaire a five-point numerical scale was used for each question. Respondents were asked to give one score in each question. The ratings ranged from (1) considered least to the highest score (5). For parts II and III of the questionnaire the

following scores were applied:

Always occurs	5
Often occurs	4
Sometimes occurs	3
Rarely occurs	2
Never occurs	1

In part IV of the questionnaire, the following words carried these ratings:

Very comprehensively	5
Comprehensively	4
Superficially	3
Only glance	2
Nil	1

The format for writing questionnaire items in part II and III was adopted from Tuckman(1978:205). The scores for each part were combined and averaged to get an average supervision score for each teacher in each part of the questionnaire.

Collection of data

Collection of data took three months being interrupted by teacher strikes in schools in Lusaka Province. The researcher personally delivered, administered and collected questionnaires. On the spot investigation was also conducted to scrutinise teaching files for schemes, record of work, lesson plans and records of tests. There was no resistance observed in filling the questionnaires as well as producing files by the teachers. A few heads of departments however seemed reluctant to produce files containing minutes of meetings. Moderated mark sheets were

also readily available at each deputy headteachers' offices. What took much time was computation of pupils average marks.

Control of extraneous factors

Since pupil achievement is allegedly affected by many factors control of extraneous ones was very important. Stratified random sampling of schools helped to control for the type of school whether boarding or day, girls, boys or co-education. Urban and rural characteristics were similarly controlled. The prevalence of absenteeism in day schools was neutralised by the inclusion of boarding schools in the sample.

The pupils in the sample came from various home backgrounds. The average score which was computed represents all groups whether rich or poor. Among schools selected, there was no school that was dominated by pupils from rich families. Randomization helped to control the home background factor since all pupils had a chance to be included.

The teachers were selected on the basis of their length of stay in the school. This eliminated teachers who had been in the school for less than two years. However, this selection included teachers of all teaching abilities, strong or weak. Teacher influence on pupil academic achievement was controlled by picking teachers who had been teaching the same class for two years consecutively.

The influence of intelligence and pupil academic achievement

was controlled by Grade Seven Final Examination Results recognized by the Ministry of General Education and Culture. Matthews (1973) specified that wide scale failing in Zambia was not because of lack of intelligence since the secondary schools get the best 10 percent intake after Grade Seven examinations. This examination is therefore a very reliable measure of intelligence.

Pilot Study

The pilot study was conducted at Matero Boys and St. Mary's Secondary schools. The two schools used in the pilot study were randomly picked from Table 3.1 described earlier on. The names of all the secondary schools in Lusaka Province were written on small pieces of papers (ballot papers) and folded. They were then put in an empty tin and shuffled by shaking the tin. The schools used in the pilot study were later picked from the tin.

Written questionnaires designed to investigate aspects of teacher instructional supervision were given to history teachers who taught history Junior level and to their respective heads of departments. Respondents remained anonymous. Only the names of secondary schools had to be written. To ensure prompt return of the questionnaires, the researcher had to wait for the subjects to complete the questionnaires. Responses were checked for clarity and specificity of questionnaire items. In cases where responses to the questionnaire differed from intended ones the

respective items were modified accordingly.

Regarding the reliability of the measuring instrument, coefficient alpha (α) (Cronbach, 1951) which is recommend for Likert-type and essay questions was used. The generalized formula is:

$$\alpha = \frac{n}{n-1} \left[1 - \frac{\sum S^2_j}{S^2_X} \right]$$

where:

n = the number of items in the questionnaire,

S^2_j = the variance of a single item from the mean of n ,

\sum = summation of variance over all the questionnaire items,

S^2_X = the variance of the total questionnaire.

The reliability of the measuring instrument is very important in research because this reflects the consistency of the results (Borg et al, 1983:209). Scientific research data are supposed to be reliable in order to serve useful purposes. The reliability coefficient computed for the questionnaire was .71 and was considered high enough to yield reliable results.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was based on two null hypotheses. Null Hypothesis One (H_0 One) which stated that there is no significant correlation between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers, heads of departments and pupil academic achievement was tested by using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r).

The level of significance was alpha = 0.05.

Null Hypothesis Two (Ho Two) which stated that there is no significant agreement on ratings between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, head teachers and heads of departments as rated by teachers in history at Grade nine-level in Lusaka Province was tested by the Kendall coefficient of concordance: W.

Correlation coefficients, do not give the cause and effect relationship but give a degree and direction of association between distribution of scores on variables. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient uses interval scores and gives a degree as well as direction of association between two variables.

In this case the two variables were teacher instructional supervision and pupil academic achievement. Pupil average academic achievement was the mean score of percentage marks of all pupils in each class. Average of average supervision score for each teacher was arrived at by combining the three supervision average scores of each teacher and averaging them.

The formula for Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient² is:

$$r = \frac{N \sum (XY) - (\sum X) (\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N(\sum X^2) - (\sum X)^2] [N(\sum Y^2) - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

2. For the explanation of symbols referring to the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) formula refer to appendix A.

When testing the significance of r with degrees of freedom (df) $N - 2$, the statistical hypothesis is rejected when the calculated value exceeds the r in the table at a specific p level, Tuckman(1978:261). To find the degree of agreement among the three supervision scores Kendall Coefficient of Concordance (W) was used. The composite average scores were ranked. Kendall Coefficient of Concordance (W) as a tool, determines correlation among k sets of rankings.

The formula for Kendall (W)³ is:

$$W = \frac{S}{\frac{1}{12}k^2 (N^3 - N)}$$

For tied observations the formula used is:

$$W = \frac{S}{\frac{1}{12}k^2 (N^3 - N) - kT}$$

In this study the research data collected called for the formulation of tied observations.

When testing the significance of W with small samples Table R of the appendix in Siegel (1956:286) is used. That is for k from 3 to 20 and N from 3 to 7. If the value computed is equal to or greater than tabulated value at a particular level of significance then the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected.

Table C in Siegel (1956:246) is used on large samples when N is larger than 7 with degrees of freedom (df) $N - 1$. The formula

3. For the explanation of symbols referring to Kendall formula, see Appendix B.

used is $X^2 = k (N - 1) W$. If the chi square computed is equal to or greater than tabulated value at a particular level of significance the null hypothesis (H_0) that the k rankings are unrelated is rejected. Since k represents 30 raters (teachers) and N represents three sources of supervision this did not permit the use of these two formulae for either small or large samples; but only assumptions, were drawn from Siegel (1956:286) Table R.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data collected were tested using two statistical tests: the Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) and the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance (W) which were discussed in chapter three. The results of this research study are presented and discussed below.

Results

Null Hypothesis One (H_0 One) was that there is no significant correlation between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, Headteachers, heads of departments and pupil achievement in history at Grade nine-level in Lusaka Province.

Table 3 shows average of average instructional supervision scores (ISAAS) marked (X) and pupil academic achievement average scores (PAAAS) marked (Y). Using the statistical test, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient r the calculated value for r was, $-.380$ showing a significant negative correlation. The results are significant at the $.05$ level for a two-tailed test with 28 degree of freedom. The tabled value is $r = .361$ (Snedecor, 1956:174). Since the calculated value is greater than the value in the table, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative is accepted because there is a significant negative correlation between teacher instructional supervision and pupil academic achievement.

TABLE 4.1 AVERAGE OF AVERAGE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION
SCORES (ISAAS) AND PUPIL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT
AVERAGE SCORES (PAAAS) COMPUTED WITH (r)

TEACHER NUMBER	ISAAS	PAAAS			
	X	Y	XY	X ²	Y ²
1	2.3	49	112.7	5.29	2401
2	2.6	51	132.6	6.76	2601
3	2.1	45	94.5	4.41	2025
4	3.9	51	198.9	15.21	2601
5	2.0	52	104.0	4.0	2704
6	3.0	41	123.0	9.0	1681
7	3.5	51	178.5	12.25	2601
8	2.3	57	131.1	5.29	3249
9	3.0	50	150.0	9.0	2500
10	3.2	59	188.8	10.24	3481
11	3.0	54	162.0	9.0	2916
12	3.5	57	199.5	12.25	3249
13	2.8	52	145.6	7.84	2704
14	2.0	37	74.0	4.0	1369
15	2.2	48	105.6	4.84	2304
16	2.0	62	124.0	4.0	3844
17	1.6	60	96.0	2.56	3600
18	3.4	60	204.0	11.56	3600
19	2.9	58	168.2	8.41	3364
20	2.6	60	156.0	6.76	3600
21	2.0	48	96.0	4.0	2304
22	1.9	82	155.8	3.61	6724
23	2.0	77	154.0	4.0	5929
24	3.1	68	210.8	9.61	4624
25	1.9	83	157.7	3.61	6889
26	3.4	43	146.2	11.56	1849
27	2.8	44	123.2	7.84	1936
28	3.3	42	138.6	10.89	1764
29	3.4	42	142.8	11.56	1764
30	4.2	41	172.2	17.64	1681
N =30	$\Sigma X=81.9$	$\Sigma Y=1624$	$\Sigma XY=4346$	$\Sigma X^2=236.99$	$\Sigma Y^2=91858$

Null Hypothesis Two (Ho Two) was that there is no significant agreement between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments as rated by teachers in history at Grade nine-level in Lusaka Province. Table 4.1 shows supervision average scores by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments. Table 4.2 shows the ranks of Table 4.1 figures. Kendall Coefficient of concordance (W) was used to measure the degree of agreement among the three aspects of supervision. The calculated value for (W) was 0.09 with the sum of squares of observed deviations from the mean of R_j (S) equal to 171.5.

When testing the significance of (W) with small samples Table R of the appendix in Siegel (1956:286) is used. Table R is used with k rankings from 3 to 20 and N from 3 to 7. Since k for this study was 30 judges (teachers) and N = 3 types of supervision (ISAS, HTSAS, HDSAS) but Table R stops at k = 20 the tabled value of S for the significance of W with k = 30 is none-existent. With k = 30, N = 3, S = 171.5 with W = 0.09, this cannot be concluded at what level S is significant. However, with k = 20 and N = 3 the required value for the significance of W at 0.05 level is 119.7 and 177.0 at 0.09 level. By observation, where N = 3, the required value of S increases from k = 8 on wards. By assumption with regard to this observation, since k = 30 and N = 3 the required value of S for the significance of W = 0.09 at 0.05 level, should be greater than

119.7 and greater than 171.5. Since the calculated value for W with $N = 3$ and $k = 30$ is 0.09, the significance of the results cannot be at 0.05 level. as a consequence of the above finding, the null hypothesis two is accepted. The alternative hypothesis is therefore rejected.

TABLE 4.2

TABLE 4.3

SUPERVISION AVERAGE SCORES				RANKS ASSIGNED TO THREE TYPES OF SUPERVISION AVERAGE SCORES			
TEACHER NUMBER	HEAD OF DEPARTMENT AVERAGE SUPERVISION SCORE (HDAS)	HEADTEACHER AVERAGE SUPERVISION SCORE (HTAS)	INSPECTOR AVERAGE SUPERVISION SCORE (ISAS)	HDAS	HTAS	ISAS	
1	2.5	3.3	1.1	2	1	3	
2	1.6	3.0	1.0	2	1	3	
3	1.6	1.9	2.3	3	2	1	
4	3.9	3.9	4.0	2.5	2.5	1	
5	1.9	2.0	2.1	3	2	1	
6	2.1	2.6	4.3	3	2	1	
7	2.9	3.8	3.9	3	2	1	
8	1.6	2.9	2.3	3	1	2	
9	3.2	3.1	2.8	1	2	3	
10	2.6	3.4	3.6	3	2	1	
11	2.4	2.9	3.8	3	2	1	
12	4.5	2.6	3.4	1	3	2	
13	2.5	3.0	3.0	3	1.5	1.5	
14	2.9	2.1	1.1	1	2	3	
15	2.1	1.8	2.8	2	3	1	
16	2.4	2.6	1.0	2	1	3	
17	1.4	2.5	1.0	2	1	3	
18	2.9	3.6	3.6	3	1.5	1.5	
19	1.7	3.1	4.0	3	2	1	
20	2.4	3.0	2.6	3	1	2	
21	2.1	2.4	1.4	2	1	3	
22	2.3	2.3	1.1	1.5	1.5	3	
23	2.6	2.3	1.1	1	2	3	
24	2.9	4.0	2.6	2	1	3	
25	2.3	2.4	1.0	2	1	3	
26	2.3	4.0	4.0	3	1.5	1.5	
27	2.3	2.6	3.4	3	2	1	
28	3.9	3.3	2.6	1	2	3	
29	3.1	3.6	4.5	3	2	1	
30	3.1	3.8	2.4	2	1	3	
				R _f = 69	50.5	60.5	

Frequency tables were also constructed on parts II, III and IV of the questionnaire to determine whether instructional supervision provided to teachers by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments is adequate. Tables 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 show scores of teachers responses on various aspects of supervision. The scores range from one to five. The scores were defined thus 1 = never occurs /almost nil, 2 = rarely occurs/ very unsatisfactory, 3 = sometimes occurs/ unsatisfactory, 4 = often occurs/ satisfactory, 5 = always occurs/ very satisfactory. The average of average scores was, headteacher supervision 2.9, head of department 2.5 and inspector of schools 2.6. Generally, supervision by inspector of schools, head of department as well as headteacher was each rated to be very unsatisfactory. The average of averages of 2.9, 2.5 and 2.6 show no significant difference among the three types of teacher instructional supervision by inspector of schools, headteachers and heads of departments. In Tables 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 the nature and extent of teacher instructional supervision in the column of average supervision by rows (X) is mostly very unsatisfactory.

TABLE 4.4 Teachers Ratings On
Head of Department Supervision N=30

Type of variable	Frequency					X	\bar{X}	Summary comment
	Never occurs	Rarely occurs	Sometime occurs	Often occurs	Always occurs			
1. Inspection of records of work	0	1	0	23	6	124	4.1	Satisfactory
2. Inspection of lesson plans	16	0	3	10	1	70	2.3	Very unsatisfactory
3. Calling departmental meetings	1	9	9	11	0	90	3.0	Unsatisfactory
4. Demonstration of lessons	23	2	3	1	1	45	1.5	Almost nil
5. Observing teachers lessons	21	5	3	1	0	44	1.5	Almost nil
6. Assistance in instructional materials	6	3	14	3	4	86	2.9	Unsatisfactory
7. Assistance in setting and assessing assignments	9	4	12	1	4	77	2.6	Very unsatisfactory
8. Assistance in pupil evaluation reports	16	6	3	2	3	60	2.0	Very unsatisfactory
9. Assistance in applying new methods of teaching	15	5	5	2	3	63	2.1	Very unsatisfactory
10. Assistance in setting termly Examinations	3	5	5	12	5	101	3.4	Unsatisfactory
11. Inspection of pupils home work and note books	11	9	7	2	1	63	2.1	Very unsatisfactory
12. Giving professional encouraging comments	4	6	9	8	3	90	3.0	Unsatisfactory
13. Demonstration of model scheme of work	9	10	6	4	1	68	2.3	Very unsatisfactory
14. Soliciting from staff professional agenda items	8	4	12	4	2	78	2.6	Very unsatisfactory

\bar{TX} = Total average scores for all teachers from each question

\bar{AX} = Average of average scores on supervision by head of department as

rated by 30 teachers on all variables.

X = Total scores for all teachers in each question.

$\bar{TX}=35.4$

$\bar{AX}= 2.5$

Very unsatisfactory

TABLE 4.5 Teacher Ratings on
Headteacher Supervision N = 30

Type of variable	Frequency					X	\bar{X}	Summary comment
	Never occurs	Rarely occurs	Sometime occurs	Often occurs	Always occurs			
1. Headteacher observation of lessons	15	6	5	3	1	59	1.9	Almost nil
2. Inspection of records of work	0	1	3	15	11	126	4.2	Satisfactory
3. Inspection of lesson plans	8	8	5	6	3	78	2.6	Very unsatisfactory
4. Giving professional comments to teachers work	4	6	6	12	2	92	3.1	Unsatisfactory
5. Soliciting from staff professional agenda items	0	3	9	12	6	111	3.7	Almost satisfactory
6. Encouragement of staff seminars or Inservice Training	19	9	1	1	0	44	1.5	Almost nil
7. Professional guidance to teachers	5	6	5	9	5	93	3.1	Unsatisfactory
8. Consulting teachers on professional matters	4	7	13	5	1	82	2.7	Unsatisfactory

$\Sigma X = 22.9$

$\bar{X} = 2.9$ Unsatisfactory

\bar{X} = Total average scores for all teachers from each question
 \bar{X} = Average of average scores on supervision by headteacher as rated by the 30 teachers on all variables.

TABLE 4.6 Teacher Ratings On Supervision by Inspector N = 30

Type of variable	Frequency					Σ X	\bar{X}	Summary comment
	nil	Only glance	Superficially	comprehensively	Very comprehensively			
1. Inspection of lesson plans and notes	1	2	3	4	5	X	2.9	Very unsatisfactory
2. Inspection of records of work	10	3	3	9	5	86	2.6	Very unsatisfactory
3. Inspection of pupils exercise books	12	3	3	8	4	79	2.3	Very unsatisfactory
4. Observing classroom lesson performance	11	8	3	6	2	70	2.3	Very unsatisfactory
5. Discussing written report with teacher	10	2	3	9	6	89	3.0	Unsatisfactory
6. Making follow up visits to teachers	9	0	5	7	9	97	3.2	Unsatisfactory
7. Discussion of professionals issues with teachers	20	0	6	3	1	55	1.8	Almost nil
	13	1	5	10	1	75	2.5	Very unsatisfactory

\bar{TX} = Total average scores for all teachers from each question. $\bar{TX} = 18.6$
 \bar{AX} = Average of average scores on supervision by inspector as rated by 30 teachers on all variables. $\bar{AX} = 2.6$ Very unsatisfactory

Discussion

The first finding of the study was that there is a significant negative relationship between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers, heads of departments and pupil academic achievement. Such a finding in this study did not support the theory that teacher supervision positively influences pupil academic achievement. A negative correlation of $-.38$ is significant; but does not show that an increase or decrease in supervision by subject inspector, headteachers, heads of departments would be associated with good or poor academic achievement by pupils in history in Lusaka province. The results of the study did not turn out as anticipated and there could be many reasons why a significant correlation was found.

Simply providing teacher instructional supervision is not enough. The quality of supervision, adequacy, methods, outcomes, consequences of the three different types of supervision should correspond to specified goals and objectives. Otherwise, results of some supervision could be counter active. Credibility of supervisor, leadership style of supervisor, relevance of supervisor's views, knowledgeability and personality of supervisor and similar variables could make supervision positive or negative. Supervisors' job descriptions should be clarified, specified and disseminate and should be incorporated in evaluation instruments. Lack of inservice training of supervisors

could affect their capability of supervising adequately and this could have negative effect on pupil performance. On the other hand, teachers non-implementation of supervisors' suggestions could render supervision ineffective. Negative attitudes of teachers towards supervision could also produce negative effect on supervision.

Additional data analysis on Tables 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 showed inadequate supervision provided by the subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments. Table 4.4 on heads of departments supervision showed an average of average supervision score as 2.5 which is very unsatisfactory supervision. Looking at the average scores in the last column, inspection of records of work gets the highest score of 4.1 but the 13 remaining variables fall under varying degrees of unsatisfactory supervision. The Ministry of Education Inspectorate Guide Lines for Heads of schools (1973) place great emphasis on the inspection of records of work by the head of department and seems to put little emphasis on other aspects of supervision. In fact inspection of lesson plans, demonstration of lessons by the head of department are totally ignored by the guide lines. Table 4.4 shows that 16 out of 30 teachers (53.3 percent) reported that heads of departments had never inspected their lesson plans, 21 teachers out of 30 (70 percent) had never had their lessons observed by the head of department and 23 teachers (76 percent) reported seeing no demonstration lesson by their heads of departments. Out of 30 teachers in the sample, none had a lesson

plan at hand when this research was conducted. This confirms Siame's (1985) finding, "teachers hardly planned their lessons."

Heads of departments might not see it as their duty to do all these other aspects of supervision without reinforcement from the Ministry of General Education and Culture. On the other hand, teachers felt that most heads of departments were academically and pedagogically unqualified to do their jobs. According to the teachers, heads of departments lacked training to facilitate their supervisory functions. In this way teachers indicated that they did not see any proper reason for the heads of departments to sit at the back of the classroom to observe a lesson or to demonstrate a lesson. In line with this rejection, 10 history heads of departments were asked what sort of training was provided to prepare them for their duties. Table 4.7 shows the responses of the heads of departments.

Table 4.7 Types of Inservice Training and Numbers of Heads of Departments who Attended

TYPE OF INSERVICE TRAINING	NUMBER
Up grading course	0
Curriculum studies	0
Examination and evaluation	0
Subject area course	0
Re-training for new roles	0
No training provided	10

Table 4.7 shows a professionally static situation in which

heads of departments are placed. If some sort of training were provided to them, this could raise the credibility of heads of departments by teachers as their supervisors. This fact of non-training may also prevent the heads of departments from supervising their teachers adequately and this could contribute to low supervision.

Generally the arguments that heads of departments are overloaded with periods of teaching needed to be substantiated.

Table 4.8 presents the various teaching loads of the 10 history heads of departments in the study.

Table 4.8 Teaching Load for 10 History Heads of Departments in a Week

Rating	5	4	3	2	1
Periods	40-50	30-40	20-30	10-20	0-10
Frequency	0	1	7	2	0

Table 4.8 shows seven heads of departments which is 70 percent have weekly periods ranging from 20 to 30 or four to five periods daily. Two heads of departments which is 20 percent had weekly rate ranging from 10 to 20 periods or two to four periods daily. One head of department indicated a load of 30 to 40 periods a week which is over seven periods daily.

The above finding for the majority of heads of departments shows that history heads of departments are overloaded with periods of teaching. Heavy teaching loads may not allow heads of departments to have extra time to supervise teachers. What is

interesting to note is that even in the absence of sufficient guidelines from the Ministry, heads of departments are able to perform some supervision. Unfortunately teacher instruction supervision by heads of departments is very unsatisfactory. Perhaps, heads of departments might supervise their teachers more efficiently if the Ministry placed greater emphasis on all aspects of supervision. In chapter II it was argued that inspection of records of work alone cannot reveal the real classroom situation nor distinguish a bad teacher from a good teacher. Therefore the heads of departments must direct their attention to classroom supervision as well.

Table 4.5 shows teachers ratings of headteacher supervision. The average of average supervision score derived was 2.9 on a five point scale. Just like in the case of heads of departments, the table shows minimal supervision by headteachers. Again inspection of records of work gets the highest score than any other variables measured. The roles of headteachers in the Ministry of Education Inspectorate Guidelines for heads of schools (1973:3) are much more elaborate than those of departmental heads. The Ministry of Education Inspectorate Guidelines describes the head of a school as : "The responsible expert in charge of the school, the chief executive, chief supervisor, coordinator and educational appraiser."

Although the duties of a head are many, supervision of teaching should not only end at inspection of records of work, other aspects of supervision should be efficiently done. The

headteachers' guidelines emphasize that the head of a school should constantly be aware of what is going on in classrooms. Table 4.5 shows headteachers average score for observing lessons as 3.0 which is unsatisfactory. From Table 4.5 it seems as if headteachers do not implement what is required of them by the Ministry of General Education and Culture in the same way headteachers cannot enforce supervision of instruction effectively on the heads of departments. This could be another reason why heads of departments do not supervise their teachers efficiently. On inspector supervision Table 4.6 shows the average of average supervision score as 2.6. Here again this score indicates very unsatisfactory supervision by the subject inspector. On all the various aspects of supervision, the subject inspector does not seem to inspect satisfactorily. Supervision on the rest of variables in Table 4.6 is very unsatisfactory. If the subject inspector does not supervise heads of departments and teachers adequately the heads of departments might not do a good job either. This study seems to confirm Molotsi's (1975) allegation that there is lack of adequate supervision in schools.

The extent of supervision by heads of departments with an average score of 2.5 in Table 4.4 is very unsatisfactory on the five point scale used in this study. Headteacher supervision had 2.9 average of average scores in Table 4.5 is below 3.0 score which is unsatisfactory. Supervision by subject inspector which is at 2.6 in Table 4.6 is very unsatisfactory by average of

average scores. The significant correlation of -0.38 between teacher supervision and pupil academic achievement implies that in this study, teacher supervision and pupil academic achievement went in opposite directions. This finding is contrary to what was expected to be positive correlation. Further research should find out why the correlation can be negative.

The second finding indicated that there is no significant agreement between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments as rated by teachers. If there was agreement the calculated Kendall coefficient of concordance (W) would have been higher. In chapter I this finding was interpreted to imply that the three aspects of supervision vary in efficiency and there is generally lack of co-ordination among the three types of supervisors. Supervision activities should aim at improving instruction, lack of agreement among teachers on the three aspects of supervision would have adverse effects on teaching and pupil academic achievement. Assumptions may also be drawn on the performance of pupils in Table 4.1 for teachers number 22, with 82 as the average percentage mark for pupils, teacher number 23, with 77 as the average percentage mark for pupils, and teacher number 25 with 83 as the average percentage mark for pupils. Besides teachers' efforts to make their pupils perform better, some pupils belonged to boys schools that had a number of boys apprehended with examination scripts. Examination leakage may have pushed the result higher where these culprits belonged.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Presented below are the summary, conclusions and recommendations based on the findings of the study.

Summary

The study advanced the thesis that effects of teacher instructional supervision include the improvement of teaching, learning and achievement. The purpose of the study was to find:

1. the relationship between teacher instructional supervision (by subject inspector, headteachers, and heads of departments), and Grade nine academic achievement in history;
2. and the degree of agreement between supervision of instruction by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments as rated by teachers in Lusaka Province.

This study was partly prompted by apparent massive failures at Grade Nine-Level Leaving Examinations. The study was also prompted by allegations of lack of supervision of teachers in Lusaka Province (Molotsi, 1975). While a number of research has been conducted world wide on factors that contribute to pupil failure, this research emphasised the need to improve the quality of instructional supervision provided to teachers in order to improve teaching and pupil performance.

Two null hypotheses were tested in the study. Null

hypothesis one was that, there is no significant correlation between teacher instructional supervision by the subject inspector, headteachers, heads of departments and pupil academic achievement at the Grade nine Level in history in Lusaka Province. Null hypothesis two was that, there is no significant agreement between teacher instructional supervision by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments at Grade nine level as rated by teachers.

The 15 schools in the population were divided into two categories. The first category consisted of six schools; out of that, five were both boarding and day boys' schools; and one was, both boarding and day girls' school. The second category consisted of day schools: three boys, three girls and three co-education schools. The subjects constituting the population in each school comprised: all history teachers of grade-nine pupils, the history head of department, the headteacher, and all registered junior secondary grade-nine pupils of 1986 in the school.

The sample consisted of 30 history teachers who fulfilled research inclusion criteria, 10 history heads of departments, the subject inspector, headteachers of 10 secondary schools and 2,064 out of 3,674 pupils enrolled in grade-nine in 1986 in Lusaka Province. From the first category of secondary schools in the population, a sample of three boys', and one girls' schools was taken. From the second category a sample of two boys', two

girls' and two co-education schools was selected. Stratified random sampling using a ballot system was used to select the 10 secondary schools that comprised the sample. Stratification of the population was based on five strata that were identified:

1. both boarding and day boys' schools;
2. both boarding and day girls' schools;
3. boys-only day schools,
4. girls-only day schools, and
5. both boys' and girls' day schools (co-education schools).

There was no boys and girls boarding school from the population.

Since it is alleged that pupil academic achievement is affected by many factors, there was need to control extraneous factors. Stratified random sampling helped to control for the type of school, learning facilities and geographical characteristics of the schools. Similarly, pupils of various home backgrounds were represented. Selection of teachers on the length of stay in a particular school helped to eliminate teachers who had been in the school for a short time. The influence of intelligence on pupil academic achievement was controlled by Grade Seven Final Examination. Two statistical tests were used to test the two null hypothesis of the study. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was used to measure the relationship between teacher instructional supervision and pupil academic achievement.

Kendall Coefficient of Concordance (W) was used to measure the degree of agreement between teacher ratings on the three aspects

of supervision.

The results of the study on hypothesis one showed a significant negative correlation between teacher instructional supervision and pupil academic achievement. A number of reasons were given in order to explain why a significant negative correlation was found. These included the quality of supervision, adequacy, methods and outcomes of the three types of supervision. Results on hypothesis two indicated lack of agreement on teacher ratings between supervision by subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments. Additional data analysis on the quality and extent of teacher instructional supervision as measured by average scores was included.

Conclusions

From the findings of the study, the following conclusions were made:

1. The extent and quality of instructional supervision provided by the subject inspector, the headteachers and heads of departments in history in Lusaka Province was inadequate but negatively related to pupil academic achievement.
2. Although the Ministry of General Education and Culture has placed greater responsibility on subject inspectors as instructional supervisors of teachers, little emphasis has been placed on headteachers and heads of departments as permanent internal supervisors in schools.
3. Teachers seemed to welcome supervision by headteachers and

subject inspector but had reservations about supervision by heads of departments who were suspected to be ill-prepared for the task of supervision.

4. There was generally lack of agreement on teacher ratings between supervision provided by the subject inspector, headteachers and heads of departments probably due to lack of co-ordination and efficiency among supervisors.

Recommendations

In accordance with the findings of the study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Another study probably on a larger scale should be conducted to find out whether the finding of a negative correlation would be supported.
2. Subject inspectors of schools should take an active part in the supervision of teachers regularly and efficiently to encourage active participation of teachers and heads of departments in improving instruction and teaching.
3. In-service training of all heads of departments and other supervisors should be encouraged to raise the credibility of supervisors among teachers.
4. The teaching load of all heads of departments should be fixed to a minimum so as to give them time to supervise the teachers. Perhaps another study should be conducted to find out what would constitute a reasonable minimum load for a head of department to function effectively.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allan, A. and Norma, A. 1984. "A team approach to instructional leadership." Educational Leadership Vol. 41 (5): 60-63.
- Bail, P.M. 1947. "Do teachers receive the kind of supervision they deserve?" Journal of Educational Research Vol. 40 (9):713-716.
- Baldwin, A. L., Kalhon, J. and Breece, F. 1945. "The appraiser of parent behaviour." Psychological Mimeographs (3): 58.
- Bielawski, R. 1972. "A study of perceived and reported parental attitudes and their effect on boys and girls achievements." Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Toronto.
- Bloomer, R.G. 1980. "The role of a head of department." Journal of Educational Research Vol. 22 (2): 83-85.
- Borg, R.W. & Gall, M.D. 1983. Educational Research An Introduction. Longman, New York: Longman, Inc.
- Burt, C. 1937. The Backward Child. London: The University of London Press.
- Chibesakunda, G.A. 1983. "The problems of teaching science in Zambia, with special reference to the language of instruction." Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of London, Chelsea College.
- Coulson, A.A. 1976. "The attitudes of primary school Heads and Deputy Heads to Deputy Headships." British Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 46 (3): 244-252.
- Cronbach, L.J. 1951. "Coefficient alpha and the international structure of tests." Psychometrika. XVI: 297-334.
- Crow, L.D. 1961. Educational Psychology. New Jersey: Little Adams & Co.
- Dettman, H.W. 1969. "Changes in schools supervision in Western Australia." Australian Journal of Education. Vol. 13 (2): 147-166.
- Dodd, W.A. 1968. Primary school Inspection in new Countries. London: Oxford University Press.
- Dunham, J. 1978. "Change and stress in the head of the departments role." Educational Research. Vol. 21 (1): 44-47.

- Eaker, R. 1974. "A clinical approach to classroom observation American view." Trends in Education. No. 34: 42-43.
- Engelhardt, M.I. 1979. "Problems of pupil learning motivation and their participation in the teaching process." Education: ABI-Annual Collection of recent German Contributions to the Field of Educational Research. Vol.20: 39-55.
- Glenys, G.U. 1977. "Instructional Supervision: Trends and issues." Journal for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Vol. 34 (8): 563-664.
- Garvey, B. 1975. "A comprehensive attitude to secondary school teaching." The Educator Magazine of the Educational Association. Vol.i (1): 1-8.
- Guss, C. 1961. "How is supervision perceived?" Educational Leadership. Vol. 19 (2): 99-102
- Gweynn, M.J. 1965. Theory and Practice of Supervision.
New York: Dodd, Mead and Co.
- Hackney, B.H. and Reavis, A. 1968. "Poor instruction - the real cause of drop outs." The Education Digest. Vol. 33 (6): 39-40
- Harnes, H.M. 1959. "Improving teaching through supervision. How is it working?" The Educational Administration and Supervision. Vol.45: 169-172.
- Heynman, S.P. 1981. In "Social class and academic achievement: a Third World interpretation." By Niles, F.S. Comparative Education Review. Vol. 25 (3): 420.
- Hottleman, G.D. 1974. "The accountability Movement." Education Digest. Vol. XXXIX (8): 17.
- Jencks, C. 1979. Who Gets Ahead: Determinants of Economic Success in America. New York: Basic.
- Kapambwe, M.G. 1980. "An investigation into the relationship between home background and scholarstic achievement of a group of junior secondary school pupils in Zambia. Unpublished M.Ed. dissertation, University of Zambia.
- Kimball, W. 1967. Supervision for Better Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Krajewski, R.J. 1977. "Instructional supervision: dollars and sense." Contemporary Education. Vol. 49 (11): 5-15.

- Kwakwa, M. 1973. "The school principle an educational leader or an administrator." Ghana Journal of Education. Vol.4 (1):9-13.
- Lambert, K. 1975. "The role of head of department in schools." Educational Administration Bulletin. Vol. 3 (2): 27-37.
- Lucio, W. H. 1967. Supervision Perspectives and Propositions: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lovell, J.T. and Phelps, M.S. 1977. "Supervision in Tennessee as perceived by teachers, principals and supervisors." Educational Leadership. Vol. 35 (3): 226-228.
- MacDonald, J.B. 1966. "Helping teachers change." The Supervisor Agent for Change in Teaching. The ASCD 11th Curriculum Research Institute. Eds. Raths, J. and Leeper R. Washington D.C. ASCD Publications. 1-10.
- Magsuds, M. 1980. "Relationship of locus of control to self esteem, academic achievement and prediction of performance among Nigerian secondary schools." British Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 53: 215-221.
- Marland, M. 1977. Head of Department. London: Heinman Publishers.
- Meyer, J.C. 1974. "Steps for revitalizing schools." NASSP Bulletin. Vol. 58 (379): 89-92
- Miller, G.W. 1970. "Factors in school achievement and social class." Vol. 61 (4): 260-268.
- Ministry of Education Inspectorate Guide Lines for Heads of Secondary Schools. 1973. Lusaka, Government Printers.
- Molotsi, S. 1975. "Organisation and supervision in Lusaka, Zambia." Ministry of Education Special Investigation Reports. 25-33. Lusaka, Government Printers.
- Morris, L. and Swich, J. 1975. "A historical overview of classroom teacher observation." Education Digest. Vol. 40 (8): 39-42.
- Neagley, R. and Dean, E.N. 1970. Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction. N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc.

- Ngulube, J.H. 1980. "The complexity of the task of an inspector of schools in our education system." Zambia Educational Journal. Vol. 1 (7): 26-29.
- Niles, F.S. 1981. "Social class and academic achievement: a Third World interpretation." Comparative Education Review. Vol. 25 (3): 419-430.
- Nyirenda, J.E. 1983. "Distance education at the secondary level: a Zambian study." Zambia Educational Review. Vol. 4 (2):95.
- Pape, G.V. 1971. "The changing role of the primary head." Trends in Education. Vol. 21: 18-23.
- Peaker, Wiseman. S. 1967. "The Manchester Survey." In Children and Their Primary Schools. Central Advisory Council for Education, London. 347-400.
- Raths, J. and Leeper, R. 1966. "The supervisor agent for change in teaching." The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Eleventh Curriculum Research Institute. Washington ASCD Publications. 1-10.
- Reid, K. 1982. "The self concept and persistent school absenteeism." British Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 52 (2): 179-187.
- Reynolds, D., Jones, D., and Legers, S.T. 1976. "Schools do make a difference." New Society. Vol. 37 (720): 223-225.
- Robinson, H.F. 1968. "School practices that cause failure." Education Digest. Vol. 33 (6): 1-5.
- Ruttler, B.M. and Ouston, R. 1969. "Fifteen thousand hours." Trends in Education. No. 4: 18-24.
- Ryan, D.W. & Hickcox, E.S. 1980. Redefining Teacher Evaluation. Toronto, Ontario; OISE Press.
- Savory, H.J. 1957. "Supervision of teaching in secondary schools." West African Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 1 (3): 74-5.
- Schroeder, H. 1978. "Requirements and problems in achievement at school." Education A Bi-annual Collection of Recent German Contributions to the Field of Educational Research. Vol. 18:106-120
- Schnuck, R. & Runkel, P. 1984. "The role of the principal." In Teacher Evaluation in Secondary Schools. Alberta Planning Services, Edmonton.

- Sergiovanni, T.J. and Starrat, R.J. 1977. Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Siame, E.K. 1985. "Relationship between geography achievement and selected school characteristics." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis University of Zambia.
- Siegal, S. 1956. Non parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York McGraw-Hill.
- Simuchoba, P.G. 1972. "An effective head teacher." Zambia Educational Journal. Vol. 1 (2): 11-13.
- Simukonda, L. 1987. Zambia Daily Mail Tuesday August: 4.
- Snedecor, G.W. 1956. Statistical Methods. Ames, Iowa University Press.
- Swift, D.F. 1968. "Social class and educational adaptation." In Educational Research in Britain. (Ed.) Butcher, H.J. London; University of London Press.
- Townsend, D. 1984. Teacher Evaluation in Secondary Schools. Alberta Planning Services; Edmonton.
- Tuckman, B.W. 1978. Conducting Educational Research. New York. Harcourt, Brace Johanvovich. Inc.
- Tyerman, M.J. 1968. Truancy. London; University of London Press.
- Williams, J.C. 1970. "School supervision in Australia an emerging concept." Australian Journal of Education Vol. 14 (3): 326-328.
- Wiseman, S. 1964. Education and Environment. Manchester; Manchester University Press.

APPENDICESAppendix ATHE PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION (r) FORMULA

$$r = \frac{N\Sigma(XY) - (\Sigma X)(\Sigma Y)}{\sqrt{[N(\Sigma X^2) - (\Sigma X)^2] [N(\Sigma Y^2) - (\Sigma Y)^2]}}$$

Where:

ΣX = Sum of X scores

ΣY = Sum of Y scores

ΣXY = Sum of product of paired X and Y scores

ΣX^2 = Sum of squares for each X scores

ΣY^2 = Sum of squares for each Y scores

$(\Sigma X)^2$ = The square of the total sum of X scores

$(\Sigma Y)^2$ = The square of the total sum of Y scores

N = Number of cases involved or pairs.

APPENDIX B

KENDALL COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE (W) FORMULA

$$W = \frac{S}{\frac{1}{12} k^2 (N^3 - N)}$$

Tied observations:

$$W = \frac{S}{\frac{1}{12} k^2 (N^3 - N) - k \sum T}$$

Where:

S = Sum of squares of observed deviations from the mean of R_j

K = Number of sets of k rankings

N = Number of individuals ranked

$\frac{1}{12} k^2 (N^3 - N)$ = Maximum possible sum of the squared deviations

T = Number of observations in a group tied for a given rank

\sum = Summation of all groups of ties in k rankings

R_j = Sum of ranks in jth column

W = Is computed by finding the sum of ranks (R_j) in each column of a K x N table. Summing the R_j and dividing by N gives the mean value of R_j. Summation of R_js in each column are used to subtract the mean to give deviations.

APPENDIX C

PART I OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HISTORY TEACHERS

General Information:

Name of School:

Please tick (✓) one box for each item below to indicate your answer to the item.

1. What is your highest educational attainment completed?

5	4	3	2	1
M.A. Education	B.A. Education	Diploma Education + Certificate	Diploma Education with Grade 12	Certificate Education with Grade 12

TICK ONE BOX

2. What is the length in years of your teaching experience?

5	4	3	2	1
16-20 Yrs.	11-15 Yrs	5-10 Yrs	2-4 Yrs	1 Year

TICK ONE BOX

3. How many years have you been teaching History in this School?

5	4	3	2	1
Over 11 Years	8-10 Yrs	5-7 Yrs	2-4 Yrs	1 Year

TICK ONE BOX

4. How many years have you taught under your current Head of History Department?

5	4	3	2	1
Over 11 Yrs	8-10 Yrs	5-7 Yrs	2-4 Yrs	1 Year

TICK ONE BOX

5. How many years have you taught under your current Headteacher?

5	4	3	2	1
Over 11 Years	8-10 Yrs	5-7 Yrs	2-4 Yrs	1 Year

TICK ONE BOX

6. How many History Grade 9 classes did you teach in 1986?

5	4	3	2	1
Over 5 classes	4 classes	3 classes	2 classes	one class

TICK ONE BOX

7. Write one class code per box to indicate all Grade 9 classes you taught History in 1986 e.g. 9K, 9G, 9M etc.,

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>							

8. Which of these Grade 9 History classes did you teach both in Grade 8 and 9?

Please write their code names in the boxes provided below as shown in example on page 2.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

9. Indicate which ones of your 1986 Grade 9 History classes could be grouped under (a) poor ability streams

(b) bright streams

Please write their code name in boxes provided.

Poor ability
Streams

Bright
Streams

10. How often do you prepare the scheme of work?

5	4	3	2	1
Termly	Monthly	Fortnightly	Weekly	Never
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

TICK ONE BOX

11. How often do you prepare your records of work?

5	4	3	2	1
Weekly	Fortnightly	Monthly	Termly	Never

TICK ONE BOX

APPENDIX DPART II OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

Please tick (✓) one box for each item below to indicate your answer to the question.

1. How often does your History Head of Department inspect your records of work?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

2. How often does your History Head of Department inspect your lesson plans?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

3. How often does the History Head of Department call staff meetings to discuss Departmental issues and plans?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

4. How often does the History Head of Department conduct demonstration lessons for the teachers?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

5. How often does the History Head of Department observe your classroom lesson teaching performance?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

6. How often does the History Head of Department give you professional help to prepare instructional materials?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

7. How often does the History Head of Department give you help to set and assess classroom assignments?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

8. How often does the History Head of Department give you help to prepare pupil evaluation reports?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

9. How often does the History Head of Department help you to apply new methods of teaching?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

10. How often does the History Head of Department help you to set termly tests?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

11. How often does the History Head of Department inspect pupils exercise books and notebooks?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

12. How often does the Head of History Department give you encouraging professional comments about records of work, pupils books, and lesson preparation notes?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

13. How often does the History Head of Department demonstrate model scheme of work through staff meeting discussion?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

14. How often does the History Head of Department solicit from staff academic and professional agenda items for discussion at staff meetings?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	Often occurs	Sometime occurs	Rarely occurs	Never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

APPENDIX EPART III OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please tick one box (✓) for each item below to indicate the best response to the question.

1. How often does the Headteacher observe classroom teachers' lesson performance?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	often occurs	sometime occurs	rarely occurs	never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

2. How often does the Headteacher inspect your records of work?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	often occurs	sometime occurs	rarely occurs	never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

3. How often does the Headteacher inspect your lesson plans and lesson preparation notes?

5	4	3	2	
Always occurs	often occurs	sometime occurs	rarely occurs	never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

4. How often does the Headteacher give you encouraging professional comments after inspecting lesson plans records of work, pupils exercise and notebooks?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	often occurs	sometime occurs	rarely occurs	never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

5. How often does the Headteacher include on agenda for staff meeting to discuss academic and professional issues?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	often occurs	sometime occurs	rarely occurs	never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

6. How often does the Headteacher consult staff then invite to the school external resource persons for staff seminar or in-service training or pupils learning

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	often occurs	sometime occurs	rarely occurs	never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

7. How often does the Headteacher welcome teachers who freely go to seek professional guidance from him?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	often occurs	sometime occurs	rarely occurs	never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

8. How often does the Headteacher consult a teacher on professional matters?

5	4	3	2	1
Always occurs	often occurs	sometime occurs	rarely occurs	never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

APPENDIX FPART IV OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please tick one box (✓) for each item below to indicate your best response to the question.

1. How many times did the subject Inspector of Schools visit you between 1984-1986?

5	4	3	2	1
Over Three	Thrice	Twice	Once	Nil

TICK ONE BOX

2. To what extent does the subject Inspector of Schools inspect all lesson plans and lesson preparation notes?

5	4	3	2	1
very comprehensively	comprehensively	superficially	only glance	Nil

TICK ONE BOX

3. What extent does the subject Inspector of Schools inspect your records of work?

5	4	3	2	1
very comprehensively	comprehensively	superficially	only glance	Nil

TICK ONE BOX

4. What extent does the subject Inspector of Schools inspect pupils exercise books?

5	4	3	2	1
very comprehensively	comprehensively	superficially	only glance	nil

TICK ONE BOX

5. To what extent does the subject Inspector of Schools observe teacher classroom lesson performance?

5	4	3	2	1
very comprehensively	comprehensively	superficially	only glance	nil

TICK ONE BOX

6. To what extent does the subject Inspector of Schools discuss his written report with each teacher observed?

5	4	3	2	1
very comprehensively	comprehensively	superficially	only glance	nil

TICK ONE BOX

7. To what extent does the subject Inspector make a follow-up visit and discuss both previous and follow-up report with teachers?

5	4	3	2	1
very comprehensively	comprehensively	superficially	only glance	nil

TICK ONE BOX

8. To what extent does the subject school Inspector discuss professional issues with members of staff?

5	4	3	2	1
very comprehensively	comprehensively	superficially	only glance	nil

TICK ONE BOX

APPENDIX G

Heads of History Department

General Information

Name of School:

Please tick one box (✓) for each item below to indicate your best response for each question.

1. What is your highest educational attainment completed successfully?

5	4	3	2	1
M.A. Education	B.A. Education	Diploma Education + Certificate Education	Diploma Education	Certificate Education

TICK ONE BOX

2. How long is your teaching experience in years?

5	4	3	2	1
Over 20 yrs	16-20 yrs	11-15 yrs	6-10 yrs	1-5 yrs

TICK ONE BOX

3. How many periods do you teach per week?

5	4	3	2	1
40-50 periods	30-40 periods	20-30 periods	10-20 periods	0-10 periods

TICK ONE BOX

4. How long have you held the post of head of history department?

5	4	3	2	1
over 10 yrs	7-8 yrs	5-6 yrs	3-4 yrs	1-2 yrs

TICK ONE BOX

5. What In-Service Training were you provided to prepare you for your headship?

Upgrading Course	
Curriculum Studies	
Examinations and Evaluation	
Subject Area Course	
Re-training for new roles	
No Training provided	

PLEASE TICK THOSE YOU ATTENDED

6. To what extent does the Ministry of General Education and Culture provide you with guidelines for your duties?

5	4	3	2	1
very frequently occurs	often occurs	sonetime occurs	rarely occurs	never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

7. To what extent are appropriate books available for teachers and pupils?

5	4	3	2	1
very frequently occurs	often occurs	sonetime occurs	rarely occurs	never occurs

TICK ONE BOX

END

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO_OPERATION

UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA LIBRARY

D 238585 THESIS
Mus