The practice and challnges of school based supervision: the case of some selected public primary schools in Oromia National Regional State, Ethiopia

Mekonnen

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess the practices and challenges of school based supervision in public primary schools in Oromia National Regional State, Ethiopia. Descriptive survey research design was employed to carry out the study. The study participants were 147 respondents (75 instructional leaders and 72 teachers who were selected by using simple random and purposive sampling techniques respectively).An investigators adopted descriptive and inferential statistics to make interpretation of quantitative data sound *whereas qualitative data were analyzed thematically to substantiate quantitative data*. The results of the study indicated that the practices of school basedsupervision wasconducted sometimes due to shortage of time, limited input physical resources, negative attitudes of the teachers toward instructional supervision, and lack of commitment from both instructional leaders and teachers. It is suggested that educational officials and school community should give due attention to the school based supervision to improve the practice of school based supervision which resulted in students achievement.

Keywords: 1.Instruction, 2.Instructional leaders, 3.primary schools, 4.school based supervision, 5.supervision

Introduction

Primary education is base for juncture of education. Because of the fact, it remains the highest priority for most of developing countries and it receives the highest share from the total estimated expenditure of the education sector. Likewise, priority of all countries, particularly the developing ones, is to improve the quality of primary schools and students' learning outcomes (Olema, Atibuni & Birabwa, 2020; De Grauwe , 2007). Thefutureofanationisbylargedeterminedbythequalityofeducationthatitisabletoprovide education toitscitizens (Shibeshi,1999). M any countries around the globe including Ethiopia, nowadays, give due attention to the quality of primary education their youngsters. Rational behind is without quality education, sustainable growth and development of nations isunthinkable (Skapinaki& Salamoura, 2020).

Supervision has been a crucial tool to improve the required quality of education of any educational programs of the nations (Tadele & Bekele, 2017). Quality education is the result of an effective instructional process of educational leaders and all stakeholders (Leithwood, Harris & Hopkins, 2020). Above all, the effectiveness of the primary school is largely depend on the instructional leaders ability to supervise the teachers to clarify instructional goals and work collaboratively to improve teaching and learning. (Blase & Phillips, 2010; Smylie, 2009).

Moreover, Govinda and Tapan (1999) pointed out that supervision is a key factor for ensuring the proper functioning of teaching and learning process in the primary schools. So that to respond to the great need for a change in the quality of primary education at local and national level, strengthening the school supervision

practice is compulsory. The quality education provision cannot be realized simply by adding more input resources into the system at the absence of an effective school based supervision(Tahir, Ali, Junaidi & Samah, 2019).Similarly, De Grauwe (2007) in his study of trends of school supervision service in four African countries pointed out that supervisors provide in service training for the teachers; support curriculum development; hold conferences and meetings with school staff and monitor teachers' resource centers.

Many countries in Africa including Ethiopia, nowadays, have a serious concern for improving the quality of education since sustainable growth and development of nations depends on the quality of the education which they provide to their citizens (Tadele & Bekele, 2017). School based supervision, is considered as basic strategies for teaching and learning improvement , and it serve as a continuous assessment tools to assure quality, and allows teachers to continually expand their capacity to learn and help their students and colleagues. In line with this peretomode (1995), underlined school based supervision as a better means by which school administrators attempt to achieve acceptable standards of performance in their institution. Thus, an effective school based supervision brought better student achievement and creating valuable educational opportunities for the students(Koskei, Sang & Ngeno, 2020).

Glickman (1992) also described school based supervision as the action that takes place in the schools to enable teachers to improve the quality of instructional process and relationships among the school community. However, this can be achieved when the school leaders able to define the goals of school based supervision for their teachers and facilitating opportunities to empower the teachers and let them deliver their responsibility to the school (Kuljiš, & Lunić, 2016).Because school based supervision is a complex process that involves working with teachers and other educators in a collegial and collaborative approach to enhance the quality of instructional process within the schools and career development of the teachers. Likewise, (Pawlas & Oliva, 2007)stated that school based supervision is a means of offering to teachers specialized help in improving instruction.

As regards to challenges, primary schools are facing countless problems related with supervision(Afework, Frew & Abeya, 2017). Similarly, when teachers are not well supervised, effectiveness in instruction will be adversely affected and the instructional purposes may not be well realized. The negligence in the improvement of teaching learning process through improper instructional supervisory practices by school heads may go on without being detected. This may lead to low quality of instruction and invariably teachers' lack of commitment to their job (Nakpodia, 2011).

Educational supervision is a continuous professional support process that aims at improving instructional process as well as the school management practices. It also encompasses responsibilities of schooling which includes administration, curriculum, professional development and instruction to improve the quality of education (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2012; Hidayat, Nurdyansyah, Ruchana, 2020). Although, school based supervision is an important activity that promotes effective teaching-learning process in schools by giving due attention to the improvement of instruction and professional development of school teachers. Many studies conducted around the world indicated that supervisors are not able to play the expected role from them due to many problems (De Grauwe, 2007). As result, there is mass dropout and failure of students in regional examinations and parents lost confidence in the ability of the public schools in providing quality education the students.

On the other hand, effective school based supervision requires the presence of necessary input like school infrastructure, quality teacher, qualified and motivated instructional supervisors, and conducive school working environment. In most case providing high quality education to the students is a common challenge which linked to the school teachers, school based supervision, teaching behavior and slow learner performance (Glanz & Behar-Horenstein, 2010). It has been also identified that the primary purpose of school based supervision process is to support and sustain all teachers in their goal of professional development, which

ultimately results in quality instruction service to the school (Ponciano, Linhares, Melo, Lima, & Travençolo, 2020).

Similarly, in Ethiopia despite some attempt has been undertaken to solve the problem associated with the quality of school based supervision practice in the primary schools is not effective , because of less attention is given to teachers professional development which a key to improve instructional process (Morki, 2010; Desalegn , 2012). Thus, assessing the current practices and challenges of school based supervision in primary schools is not something that would have given a time. Because the inadequate supervision and feedback on teaching-learning process by instructional leaders causes a lot of negligence among teachers in their work environment (Noor & Sofyaningrum, 2020; Glanz & Behar-Horenstein, 2010). Such negligence among the school teachers in providing appropriate service and support to the students most often leads to poor performances of the students during examinations which might lead to the development of low self-esteem and dropout from school at a very early stage in schooling.

Despite several studies has been undertaken to solve the problem associated with the quality of school based supervision, the problem of quality school based supervision in the Oromia National Regional State still persists due to largest landmass and school number with different climatic and landscape in the regions. Therefore, this investigation could contribute to understand about the current school based supervision and its challenges in the region and to recommend possible solution to the challenges in order to practice better school based supervision in the primary schools of the region. Having these in mind, the basic research questions to be answered by this study were the followings.

Research Questions
1. How often school based supervision is conducted per semester in the selected Primary schools?
2. How do the school communities perceive the purpose of school based supervision Primary schools?
3. What are the major challenges of school based supervision practice in the selected primary schools?

Hypotheses
Ho=There is no statistical significant difference between the supervisor team and teachers on school based supervision.
H1= There is statistical significant difference between the supervisor team and teachers on school based supervision.

2. Methods
This study employed a descriptive survey research design for the reason that the very purpose of the design is to describing behaviors of a given subject systematically and accurately, and gathering people's perceptions and thoughts about a current issue in education (Mills & Gay, 2016).This design adopted over the others is its usefulness and pertinent to explain the current practices without simplification or over exaggeration of authentic condition (Cohen, 1988).

This study was conducted in Oromia National Regional State, Ethiopia,in specifically target population of the study from five zones namely East Hararghe, East Showa, South West Showa, West Arsi, and West Hararghe. The target population for this study consisted of the primary school principals, vice principals, department heads and teachers. The participants of the survey of the study comprised 64 principals,11department heads, 72 teachers with the total of 147 were sampled via simple random, and purposive sampling techniques from 213 principals,11department heads, 168 teachers with total 392.

The summery of Sample size and samplingtechniques indicated hereunder in Table 1.

Table 1 : Sampling techniques and sample size

Categories	N	n	Sampling technique
Principals	213	64	Simple Random
Heads	11	11	Purposive
Teachers	168	72	Simple Random
Total	392	147	

As the above Table 1 depicted that participants who were sampled for survey is 75 supervision team(64 principals,11department heads), a n d 7 2 t e a c h e r s with the total of 147.

Furthermore, In addition to survey questions, 7 school principals and 11 teachers have participated in interview key informant groups who were selected randomly. Moreover, four participants from each three groups (principals, head of department and teachers) were participated on FGD who were selected randomization.

In brief, 147 participants were involved in survey questionnaires and 18 participants were involved in the interview as a key informant and 12 individuals involved in FGD for this study with the overall subject of the study *(n=177).*

Self-generated a structured and semi structured 27 questionnaires employed to gather data on the practice and challenges school based supervision in primary schools. The questionnaire items are 5 Point Likert-scales in nature (ranging from 1 to 5). Face validated of the instruments was checked byarea expertise from Department of Educational Planning and Management, and Department of Psychology at Haramaya University, Ethiopia. The pilot test was conducted on twenty (20) respondents; 15 teachersand 5 principals in model School of Haramaya University and Bate primary school.The result of the pilot test revealed that the reliability computed by Cronbach alpha was 0.81 which is an acceptable range (Vanderstoep & Johnson, 2009).

Key informant interview was conducted with seven principals and eleven teachers to gather data by using five guiding question regarding practices and challenges of school based supervision. Data also collected from FGD individuals.

Quantitative data were filled by using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 20). To interpret data sound, the researchers used both descriptive (frequency count, percentage, mean score and standard deviation) and inferential statistics (independent t- test was used for analyzing the hypothesis of the study). The formulated hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of statistical significance. Top of the results, above mean score of 2.50 was accepted null hypothesis otherwise it would be rejected.

Moreover, for analysis of qualitative data collected from key informant interviews and FGD, the researcher used combination of content and narration methods of data analysis. Besides, thematic analysis was used in the interview data of the qualitative method. Accordingly, for the thematic analysis, the data were understood by repeatedly reading into the transcript.

3. Results

This section consists of two parts. The first section of this part discusses the demographic characteristics (sex, educational qualification and work experiences) of study participants. The second part of this section presents analysis and interpretation of the collected both quantitative and qualitative data.

Table2 :Demographic characteristics of the respondents

SN	Variable	Category	No	%
1.	Sex	Male	104	70.7
		Female	43	29.3
		Total	147	100
2.	Educational qualification	Diploma	5	3.4
		Bachelor Degree	140	95.2
		Master's Degree	2	1.4
		Total	147	100
3.	Current position	Principal	64	43.5
		Department head	11	7.5
		Teachers	72	49.0
		Total	147	100
4.	Work experience	1-5 years	12	8.2
		6-10 years	49	33.3
		11-15 years	63	42.9
		16-20 years	11	7.5
		Above 20 years	12	8.1
		Total	147	100

It can be seen on Table 2, the distribution of participants' sex indicatedas 104(70.7%) males and 43(29.3%) females. This implies that majority of study respondents are males. Also, as Regards to educational qualifications of the total respondents, 140(95.2%) bachelor degree holders, whereas, the remaining 5(3.4%) and 2(1.4%) are diploma and master'sdegree holdersrespectively. Furthermore, the last variable indicates 75(51%) supervision team(principals and department heads)and 72(49%) teachers. This indicates that almost equal proportion of supervision team to teacher. Moreover, the pertaining to distribution of work experience of theparticipants indicated as 12 (8.2%) 1-5years,49(33.3%) 6-10 years, 63(42.9%) 11-15years, 11(7.5%) 16-20years, and12(8.2%) above 20 years.

Table3 :The Practice of School Based Supervision in Primary Schools

SN	Item	Supervisors		Teachers		Both		
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	*P*
1.	How often school based supervision conducted in the school as per the policy guideline	3.53	1.18	3.08	1.17	3.31	1.19	.02
2.	How oftenenough time is allocated to supervise the teachers lesson in the classroom	3.72	1.13	3.31	1.19	3.52	1.18	.03
3.	How often supervision team practice pre-informed school based supervision	3.44	1.17	3.01	1.28	3.23	1.24	.04
4.	How often the school supervision team gives a feedback immediately after supervision session	3.83	1.01	3.08	1.52	3.46	1.33	.00
5.	How often teachers appreciate every negative feedback given by supervision	3.25	1.42	2.88	1.21	3.24	1.14	.03

	team						
6.	How often supervision team make their services in the schools more supportive than evaluative	3.47	1.08	3.13	1.14	3.30	1.12	.06
7.	How often supervision team uses well-done check lists for instructional observation	3.56	1.03	3.19	1.16	3.38	1.11	.05

Note: P-value was calculated at α=0.05 levels, and df 145; Scales; Scales; ≤1.49=Never (N), 1.5-2.49=Rarely(R), 2.50-3.49=sometimes (S), 3.50-4.49=Often (O), 4.50-5.00=always (A)

Concerning item 1 Table 3, the mean responses of principals was 3.53 and teachers, was 3.08 which rated in often and sometimes respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.31 which rated as sometimes. This showed that school based supervision in the primary school is practiced sometimes than as per the national educational education policy guideline. The p-value of the item was 0.02 < 0.05 proved that the presence significant difference between the two groups response on the item.

Regarding item 2 Table 3, the mean responses of principals was 3.72 and teachers, was 3.31 which rated in often and sometimes respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.52 which rated as often. This showed that school based supervision team often allocates ample time for school based supervision practice in the primary school. The p-value of the item was 0.03 < 0.05 which proved that the presence significant difference between the two groups response on the item.

As it can be seen item 3 Table 3, the mean responses of principals was 3.44 and teachers, was 3.01which rated in often and sometimes respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.23 which rated as sometimes. This showed that school based supervision team of the selected primary practiced sometimes used pre informed supervision. The p-value of the item was 0.04 < 0.05 proved that the less significant difference between the two groups responses on the item.

Concerning item 4 Table 3, the mean responses of principals was 3.83 and teachers, was 3.08 which rated in often and sometimes respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.46 which rated as sometimes. This showed that school based supervision team sometimes gives feedback immediately after supervision session. The p-value of the item was 0.00 < 0.05 proved that the presence significant difference between the two group response on the item.

As it can be seen from item 5 Table 3, the mean responses of principals was 3.25 and teachers, was 2.88 which rated in sometimes. The overall mean of the two groups was also 3.24 which rated as sometimes. This showed that every negative feedback given by school based supervision team sometimes appraised teachers. The p-value of the item was 0.03 < 0.05 proved that the less significant difference between the two group responses on the item.

Concerning item 6 Table 3, the mean responses of principals was 3.47 and teachers, was 3.13 which rated in sometimes respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.30 which rated as sometimes. This showed that school based supervision in the primary school is practiced sometimes than as per the plan and less supportive than for evaluation purpose. The p-value of the item was 0.06 > 0.05 proved that no significant difference between the two group response on the item.

Regarding item 7 Table 3, the mean responses of principals was 3.56 and teachers, was 3.19 which rated in often and sometimes respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.38 which rated as sometimes. This showed that instructional supervisor team sometimes prepare and used checklist for school based

supervision practice in the primary school. The p-value of the item was 0.05 =0.05 which proved that the no significant difference between the two group response on the item

Generally the school based supervision was practiced in almost all selected primary schools once per semester which mean half of their plan. Hence, the data obtained via interview substantiated this view. One of the respondents from school teacher: "Yes, our school has a plan to conduct school based supervision twice per semester but in reality we have been practicing only once per semester due to shortage of resources and over loaded supervisory team with administrative and academic*(Interviewee #1).* On top of that the supervision process was not compressive and follows the formal classroom supervision procedure rather they simply go to classroom to see the staff instructional process.

Table4 :The Purpose of School Based Supervision as Perceived Respondents

S N	Item	Supervisors		Teachers		Both		
		M	SD	M	M	SD	M	P
1.	Supervision team work hard with teachers to solve their instructional input problems	3.59	1.00	3.01	1.20	3.31	1.14	0.00
2.	Supervision team identify the teachers gap in managing students learning	3.68	1.07	3.13	1.31	3.41	1.22	0.01
3.	Supervision team encourage the school teachers peer supervision practice	3.72	1.11	3.19	1.19	3.39	1.31	0.01
4.	The supervision team advice teachers to use active learning methods	3.84	1.13	3.26	1.27	3.56	1.23	0.00
5.	The supervision team provide enough professional support for the teachers	3.61	0.91	3.25	1.40	3.44	1.19	0.07
6.	The supervision team design appropriate intervention for identified limitations	3.57	1.10	3.13	1.32	3.35	1.23	0.03
7.	Providing supervision service improves instructional process in the classroom	4.03	0.96	2.71	1.28	3.38	1.31	.00

Note: P-value was calculated at α=0.05 levels, and df 145; Scales; ≤1.49=Strongly Disagree (SD), 1.5-2.49=Disagree (D), 2.50-3.49=Undecided (U), 3.50-4.49=Agree (A), 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree (SA)

Concerning item 1 in Table 4, the mean responses of principals was 3.59 and teachers, was 3.01 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.31 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team is not regularly identifying the instructional process input gap of the teachers in their classroom. The p-value of the item was $0.00 < 0.05$ proved that the presence significant difference between the two group response on the item.

A cursory look at item 2 in Table 4, the mean responses of principals was 3.68 and teachers, was 3.13 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two group was 3.41 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team is not in a position to identify the teachers' gap in managing students learning. The p-value of the item was $0.01 < 0.05$ proved that the presence significant difference between the two group response on the item.

Regarding item 3 in Table 4, the mean responses of principals was 3.72 and teachers, was 3.19 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.39 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team is not regularly identifying the instructional process input gap of the teachers in their classroom. The p-value of the item was $0.01 < 0.05$ proved that the presence significant difference between the two group response on the item.

Concerning item 4 in Table 4, the mean responses of principals was 3.84 and teachers, was 3.26 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two group was 3.56 which rated as agree. This showed that school based supervision team advice teachers to use active learning methods in their classroom to improve the students' achievement. The p-value of the item was 0.00 < 0.05 proved that the presence significant difference between the two group response on the item.

A cursory look at item 5 in Table 4, the mean responses of principals was 3.61 and teachers, was 3.25 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.41 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team is providing enough professional support to the teachers in the schools. The p-value of the item was 0.07 > 0.05 proved that the absence significant difference between the two group response on the item.

Regarding item 6 in Table 4, the mean responses of principals was 3.57 and teachers, was 3.13 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.35 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team is not in position to design appropriate intervention mechanism for the identified limitation of instructional process. The p-value of the item was 0.03 < 0.05 proved that the presence significant difference between the two group response on the item.

Regarding item 7 in Table 4, the mean responses of principals was 4.03 and teachers, was 2.71 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.38 which rated as undecided. This showed that the current school based supervision team practice is not in position to improve the practice of instructional process in the classroom. The p-value of the item was 0.00 < 0.05 proved that the presence significant difference between the two group response on the item.

As indicated in Table 4 both supervisory team and teachers' team of respondents agreed on the necessity of school based supervision for the education quality delivery realization and students' progress. To strengthen the above fact, the data obtained by interview substantiated this view. One of the respondents from school teacher reported:

> *School based supervision is too important for the performance of the teachers as well as the students, if it is conducted with capable supervisory team and the teachers are willingness and ready to take the support that given to them by their supervisory team. Some of the purposes of the activities are: improve communication between the school management team and the teachers; improve performance of the teachers; performance of the students and performance of the school at wider level(Interviewee #2).*

Further, focus group discussion team further confirmed that "leave alone per semester; we couldn't conduct school based supervision twice per year" (*FGD #1).* Since it is conducted instructional team (principal, vice principals, department heads and unit leader) of the school who are over loaded in different school administrative and teaching tasks. Above all in rural areas the school principals forced to take additional political and social responsibilities in the community from the ruling political party.

Table5 : The Major Challenges of School based supervision in Primary Schools

SN	Item	Supervisors		Teachers		Both		
		M	*SD*	*M*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*P*
1.	School based supervision team are overloaded with many school tasks	3.67	1.15	3.04	1.22	3.36	1.22	.00
2.	School based supervision team have necessary resource to support teachers	3.64	1.11	2.78	1.14	3.22	1.20	.00
3.	School based supervision team are not getting support from the education office	3.37	1.14	2.85	1.08	3.12	1.14	.00

4.	School based supervision team have enough time to support teachers in the classroom	3.60	1.13	2.90	1.26	3.26	1.24	.00
5.	School based supervision team have no harmonized l guidelines and checklist	3.41	1.20	2.83	1.22	3.13	1.24	.00
6.	School based supervision team unable create smooth relationship with teachers	3.67	0.96	3.29	1.20	3.48	1.10	.04
7.	Teachers develop anxiety and frustration against school based supervision team	3.46	1.22	3.19	1.21	3.33	1.22	.19

Note: P-value was calculated at α=0.05 levels, and df 145; Scales; ≤1.49=Strongly Disagree (SD), 1.5-2.49=Disagree (D), 2.50-3.49=Undecided (U), 3.50-4.49=Agree (A), 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree (SA)

Concerning item 1 in Table 5, the mean responses of principals was 3.67 and teachers, was 3.04 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.36 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team is overloaded with many responsibilities to conduct regular school based supervision to support the teachers. The p-value of the item was 0.00 < 0.05 proved that the presence significant difference between the two group response on the item.

As can be seen from item 2 in Table 5, the mean responses of principals was 3.64 and teachers, was 2.78 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two group was 3.22 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team is not equipped with necessary resource to support the teachers in the classroom. The p-value of the item was 0.00 < 0.05 proved that the presence significant difference between the two group response on the item.

Regarding item 3 in Table 5, the mean responses of principals was 3.37 and teachers, was 2.85 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.12 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team is not getting enough support from the above education management offices to provide the necessary support for the teachers to improve instructional process. The p-value of the item was 0.00 < 0.05 proved that the presence significant difference between the two group response on the item.

Concerning item 4 in Table 5, the mean responses of principals was 3.60 and teachers, was 2.90 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two group was 3.26 which rated as agree. This showed that school based supervision team has enough time to identify and plan to support the school teachers' in line with their gap in instructional delivery. The p-value of the item was 0.00 < 0.05 proved that the presence significant difference between the two group response on the item.

A cursory look at item 5 in Table 5, the mean responses of principals was 3.41 and teachers, was 2.83 which rated in undecided. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.13 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team has no well established local or national guideline at hand to properly conduct school based supervision in the school. The p-value of the item was 0.00 < 0.05 proved that the presence significant difference between the two group response on the item.

Regarding item 6 in Table 5, the mean responses of principals was 3.67 and teachers, was 3.29 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.48 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team is unable to create smooth relationship with the school teachers. The p-value of the item was 0.04 < 0.05 proved that the presence less significant difference between the two groups response on the item.

Regarding item 7 in Table 5, the mean responses of principals was 3.46 and teachers, was 3.19 which rated in undecided. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.33 which rated as undecided. This showed that the two

groups failed to decided whether the teachers developed anxiety and frustration against school based supervision team practice in the classroom or not. The p-value of the item was 0.19 >0.05 proved that no significant difference between the two groups response on the item.

Generally, both teams of respondents were agreed on the presence serious challenges to practice an effective school based supervision in the primary schools.. For instance FGD participants reported that:

> As school we are trying our level but due to lack trained professional, lack of standardized checklist, lack of developed and experienced team of subordinates, shortage of resource, dissatisfaction of teachers with their teaching profession, shortage of time and other input resources, in the school it is challenging to properly support the teacher in their classroom.(FGD #2).

Table 6 : The Professional Support from Supervision Team to the Teachers

S N	Item	Supervisors		Teachers		Both		
		M	SD	M	M	SD	M	P
1.	Supervisors support teachers on local instructional support preparation and use	3.63	1.08	3.29	1.20	3.46	1.15	.08
2.	Instructional supervisors facilitate short term training for their school teachers	3.45	1.22	3.04	1.30	3.25	1.28	.05
3.	Instructional supervisor helps teachers to practice effective teaching methods	3.57	1.13	3.25	1.18	3.41	1.16	.09
4.	Instructional supervisors encourage collaborative work among staff members	3.65	1.19	3.10	1.13	3.38	1.19	.00
5.	The supervision team gives induction training and experience sharing programs for teachers	3.56	1.22	2.79	1.26	3.18	1.24	.00
6.	The supervision team support teachers to solve their problems by action research	3.37	1.15	2.79	1.11	3.09	1.16	.00

Note: P-value was calculated at α=0.05 levels, and df 145; Scales; ≤1.49=Strongly Disagree (SD), 1.5-2.49=Disagree (D), 2.50-3.49=Undecided (U), 3.50-4.49=Agree (A), 4.50-5.00=Strongly Agree (SA)

As it was indicated in the Table 1 of item one, the mean responses of principals was 3.63 and teachers, was 3.29 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.46 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team less committed in encouraging staff to prepare and use instructional aids from local materials. The p-value of the item was 0.08 >0.05 proved that no significant difference between the two groups response on the item.

As can be seen from item 2 in Table 6, the mean responses of principals was 3.45 and teachers, was 3.04 which rated both in undecided. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.25 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team was not good in facilitating on service short term trainings for the teachers to initiate them. The p-value of the item was 0.05 = 0.05 proved no significant difference between the two groups' responses on the item.

Regarding item 3 in Table 6, the mean responses of principals was 3.57 and teachers, was 3.25 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.41 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team was not supporting teachers well to practice effective teaching methods. The p-value of the item was 0.09 >0.05 proved that no significant difference between the two groups response on the item.

Pertaining to item 4 in Table 6, the mean responses of principals was 3.65 and teachers, was 3.10 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.38 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team did not create a strong collaborative work sprit among the staff. The p-value of the item was $0.00 < 0.05$ proved that the presence significant difference between the two groups response on the item.

A cursory look at item 5 in Table 6, the mean responses of principals was 3.56 and teachers, was 2.79 which rated in undecided. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.09 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team has no well established induction and experience sharing culture in the schools. The p-value of the item was $0.00 < 0.05$ proved that the presence significant difference between the two groups response on the item.

Regarding item 6 in Table 6, the mean responses of principals was 3.37 and teachers, was 2.79 which rated in agree and undecided respectively. The overall mean of the two groups was 3.09 which rated as undecided. This showed that school based supervision team was not properly supporting teachers to solve their classroom problem with action research. The p-value of the item was $0.00 < 0.05$ proved that the presence significant difference between the two groups response on the item

As it can be seen from this table the professional support from the school supervision team to the teachers is below their expectation. On the other hand the effectiveness of school based supervision in the school is highly depends of the capacity of the school's team of supervisor. Thus, the schools which have competent supervisory team could properly observe the teachers instructional process, assessment, personality, sound, methodology against what is already stated on daily lesson plan and then provide appropriate feedback immediately after observation session. But most school did not practice school based supervision which would benefit both teachers and students in the school.

When our school became serious in practicing school based supervision in such manner every teacher get ready and well prepare to conduct the their classes to the expectation of the school.

Although, school based supervision has many advantage for the progress of students, parents' satisfaction and nation building it is over looked by the school leadership due to shortage of time and resources.

5. Discussion and conclusion

The main purpose of this study was to examine the practice and challenges of school based supervision in some selected public primary schools in Oromia National Regional State, Ethiopia to do so, three research questions guide the study. #1. How often school based supervision is conducted per a semester in the selected Primary schools? #2. How do the school communities perceive the purpose of school based supervision Primary schools?#3. What are the major challenges of school based supervision in the selected primary schools?

The first key finding was that school based supervision was conducted in the primary schools of the study areas was once per a year. This is equivalent to one-fourth of expected frequency of supervision as per the guideline of the school supervison. However, single attempt per a year couldn't improve the instructional process in the classroom. Likewise, FGD team conformed that "indicated that planning, implementing and monitoring stages of the school based supervision process were not carried out as per the school annual plan".*(FGD #3)*. In contrast, the school based supervision that conducted in the school has significant effect on the pedagogical practice of the teachers and the students' achievement (Malunda, Onen, Musaazi, and Oonyu, 2016). If we think about school improvement we need to have and develop strong culture of supervision practices (Burden, 2020).

At beginning of each academic year, most of the primary schools call for school supervision.Most of the teachers frustrated and then they start to look in to the tasks that they planned, accomplished and failed to accomplish. Instead to lookingfor solution with the team for the ill practice of teaching learning process in the school, they debate on their fault. we should know that school based supervision is not be an optional in education system rather a must to all school community (Arar & Taysum, 2018).Because inadequately carried out school based supervision in primary schools allowed teachers to employ ineffective pedagogical practices which highly affect the students' learning particularly in primary schools. In this level the teachers are expected to be role model and takes lion share for the performance of the students.Various studies around the globe identified the low practices of school based supervision in the schools (Chanyalew, 2005; Morki, 2010; and Desalegn, 2012).In support of this scheme, one of school based supervision team member of the interviewees disclosed;

> *My school trying its utmost level to practice school based supervision once per semester although we face many problems such as a shortage of time, teachers, initiative training and experienced supervisors team members. We as team of supervisor, we are creating awareness to the staff how can school based supervision improves teachers' and students' performance in their particular classroom and the school (Interviewee #3)*

The second key finding of Independent t test indicated that there is no significant mean difference between supervisor team and teacher perceive on understanding purpose of school based supervision.Both groups are perceivedin right way about school based supervision. But supervisors lack commitment to properly implement school based supervision in their school to achieve the expected goals of schooling. In line with this (Glanz &Behar-Horenstein, 2010) pointed out as supervision of classroom instruction and continuous support to teachers are some of the most effective ways to improve and sustain the quality of instruction.

In line with this, FGD team confirmed that "educational leaders could have great contribution in assisting the teachers to improve both their teaching learning techniques and the students achievement"*(FGD #1).* Because school based supervision is one of the best approach used by instructional leaders to reflect on the pedagogical practice of the teachers which help them to identify their weakness and strength on spot as a profession (Dambrauskienė & Liukinevičienė, 2017).As Glanz and Behar-Horenstein (2010) indicated in their study school based supervision is a process of involving teachers in instructional dialogue aim at improving instructional process and student achievement. Similar to this teachers who are properly supervised while they are conducting their class room perform more effectively than their counterpart teachers (Ekaette and Eno 2016).

The fourth key finding was indicated that school based supervision in the schools are infective and bellow the standard. These obviously negatively affect the teacher's job performance and leads students' poor academic performance. However, both supervision team and teachers blaming one another plus pointing to others about the cause of the unsuccessful practice of their school based supervision in their schools. For instance, the teacher respondent team described that lack of awareness and incompetency of the supervision team as the major challenge for the ill practices school based supervision in the schools. Whereas, the supervision team claimed as a shortage of resources and negative attitude of the teachers towards school based supervision in the schools are major challenges.The findings of the study portrays that the school heads rarely support teachers to choose appropriate teaching-learning process resources for lesson delivery (Ampofo, Onyango & Ogola, 2019).

The focus group discussion of both team indicated that although the school planned every year to conduct school based supervision twice per semester no school has conducted even once per semester with the whole teachers in the school than simply conduct with some teachers as a sample and then generalizing feedback to the whole school staff on general post conference school based supervision. Not only that the supervision team underline on the general meeting the incompetency of some teachers in practicing good instructional process

in their class as it is the only problem of the teachers without providing proper professional support and resource input form their side as instructional leaders.

Conclusion

Based on the result and discussions above, the researcher drew the following conclusions and recommendations:
First, it is possible to conclude that school based supervision was conducted in the primary schools is once per a year which is below the standard by 75%.Thus, it is recommended that school supervisors team should give due attention to improve the practice of school based supervision to enhance the quality education at primary schools of Oromia regional states. The effectiveness of class room teaching-learning process can be only realized as a the result of implementing an optimum regular and systematic school based supervision in the schools.

Secondly, there was no statistical mean significant differencebetween supervisor team and teacheron understanding purpose of school based supervision. Hence it is possible to conclude that schools' communities realized the primary purpose of school based supervision as plays a key role on instructional improvement of schools. But in some extent supervisors lack commitment to properly implement school based supervision in their school and teachers have negative attitude towards supervision. Therefore, it is suggested that Oromia regional state education bureau should encourage supervisors to manage supervision and work on attitudinal changes of teachers. The study revealed that the most of the schoolswere not conducting school based supervision frequently as per their school plan-twice per semester. As main problems for this is shortage of input resource and time, lack of commitment of the supervisors and negative attitudes of the teachers towards school based supervision practices. It can be concluded that, the school based supervision is not properly conducted as per standard in the primary schools. If schools improperly perform school based supervision, the possible consequences will benegatively affectingstudents' academic achievement on the future. Most of supervision team (principals, vice principals, section heads and subject heads) gave less attention to school supervision Overburdened by administrative workloads and lackof formal training. In teachers' side, negative attitudes of towards school based supervision and lack of pedagogical knowledge.

Thirdly, it concluded that school based supervision in the primary schools are encountering countless problems and this causes to deteriorating education quality. The major problems of school based supervision are most of the schools were not conducting school based supervision as per standard, lack or recourse to run supervision, lack of commitment of the supervisors and negative attitudes of the teachers towards school based supervision practices. It is recommended that Oromia regional state education bureau advised to reduce supervisors' team workload, provide on the job and off the job training for supervisors to improve the professional qualifications, and provide more budget to schools to fulfill the necessary school-facilities.
Finally, one of the respondents from school principal suggested to overcome current challenges of school based supervision as:

> To alleviate the ill practice of school based supervision in today's school, I suggest both supervisory team and teachers should deal together to improve the school based supervision practice through sharing vision and effective communication with all stakeholders than externalizing and justifying the problems. Because I myself is a witness how much the school community can solve their school instructional process gap when they cooperate each other. On top of that an effective instructional leadership of the schools can play a great role to alleviate problems like empowering teachers in school based supervision, create awareness on the necessity of supervision, indicate the professional gap via condction action research and maximize resources utilization to improve the instructional-related inputs(Interviewee #4)..