

**PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES ON PRIMARY SCHOOL
INSPECTION IN KEMBATA TEMBARO ZONE**

By

MENGISTU FELEKE FELTAMO



**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING & MANAGEMENT**

JUNE. 2019

JIMMA, ETHIOPIA

**PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES ON PRIMARY SCHOOL
INSPECTION IN KEMBATA TEMBARO ZONE**

By

MENGISTU FELEKE FELTAMO

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING & MANAGEMENT**

ADVISOR: BEKALU FERERE (ASS.PROF)

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND
BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING & MANAGEMENT IN
PARTIAL FULFILMENT FOR THE REQUIREMENTS OF DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

JUNE, 2019

JIMMA, UNIVERSITY

Declaration

The researcher hereby declares that the thesis on the title, "*The Practices and Challenges on Primary school Inspection in Kembata Tembaro Zone*", is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university that all sources that have been referred to and quoted have been dully indicated and acknowledged with complete references.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as university advisor

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Place: _____

Date of Submission: _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my punctual Advisor Bekalu Ferede (Ass.Professor) for his undeserved comments and suggestions during this study. I really cannot put into words how incredibly grateful I am for everything he has done for me. For everything he has taught me and for his professional advice and constructive comments in my attempts to make this work a success, I sincerely thank him.

Next, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to Kembata Tembaro Zone Administrative Council for giving this post-graduate study chance and financial support.

I would like to express my profound gratitude to my dearly loved wife Selamawit Tadesse and My children Etsub Mengistu (*Enat*) and Ediget Mengistu (*Chuchu*) whose love, support and encouragement has been source of inspiration and shared all life burdens throughout my graduate study.

My acknowledgement is also extended to the following individuals for their moral and professional advice; Tembaro Woreda education Inspectors for providing inspection manuals, guides and statistical data. Other people who deserve particular mention include Mr. Mohammed Messesse, Mr. Abebe Adesse, Mr. Elias Erisido, Mr. Belete Bediru, Mr. Amanuel Abebo, Mr. Tadele Wondimu, Mr. Abate Moliso, Mr. Zeleke Gabriel and Mr. Melaku Beleyneh that some of them provided material resources while others assisted me during data collection and photo copy service. I truly admire each of them for what they do.

Moreover, I would like to give thanks for all teachers, school principals and woreda education inspectors for providing data required for this study.

Finally, I also wish to thank all my instructors and supporting staff at Edpm department for the best professional relationship I have experienced. I am sincerely grateful for the help I received.

All things were made through God, and without Him nothing was made, I thank Him!

Table of Contents

Contents	page
Acknowledgement -----	i
Table of contents-----	ii
List of Tables-----	vi
Abbreviations/Acronyms-----	vii
Abstract-----	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION -----	1
1.1. Background of the Study-----	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem-----	5
1.3. Objectives of the Study-----	8
1.3.1. General Objective-----	8
1.3.2. Specific Objectives-----	8
1.4. Significance of the Study-----	8
1.5. Delimitation of the Study-----	9
1.6. Limitation of the Study-----	10
1.7. Operational Definitions of Key Terms-----	10
1.8. Organization of the Study-----	11
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE -----	12
2.1. Definition and Concept of Inspection and Supervision -----	12
2.2. Historical overview of Educational inspection in the world-----	14
2.3. Inspection/supervision in Ethiopia-----	15
2.3.1. The First Period (1934-1954 E.C) – Inspection-----	15
2.3.2. The Second Period (1955-1973 E.C) – Supervision-----	16
2.3.3. The Third Period (1974-1986E.C) – Inspection-----	16
2.3.4. The Fourth Period (1987 E.C to the present) – Supervision-----	17

2.4. Inspection in the Case of South Nation Nationalities and Peoples	
Regional State-----	17
2.5. Models of Inspection-----	18
2.5.1. Classical Inspection Model-----	18
2.5.2. Central Control model-----	19
2.5.3. Close-to-School Support Model-----	20
2.5.4. The School-site Inspection Model-----	20
2.6. Empirical studies on school inspection-----	21
2.6.1. Studies on School Inspection Conducted in Europe-----	21
2.6.2. Studies on School Inspection Conducted in Africa outside Ethiopia-----	23
2.7. School Inspection in other Countries-----	26
2.8. The Intents of School Inspection-----	31
2.9. Principles for Effective School Inspection-----	32
2.10. The Role of School Inspection-----	35
2.10.1. School Inspection for Enhancing Quality of Education Provided-----	35
2.10.2. School Inspection for Better Informed Government on Education Practices-----	35
2.10.3. Reinforcing the Responsibility and Accountability in Education-----	35
2.11. Procedures/Practices of School Inspection-----	36
2.11.1. Gathering Evidence and Observing school Performance-----	36
2.11.2. Providing Feedback-----	37
2.11.3. Professional Follows up and Accountability-----	37
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY-----	39
3.1. Description of the Study Area-----	39
3.2. Research Method -----	39
3.3. Research Design -----	40
3.4. Source of Data-----	40
3.5. Primary Sources of Data-----	40

3.6. Secondary sources of data-----	40
3.7. Sample Size and Sampling Technique-----	41
3.8. Instruments of Data Collection-----	44
3.8.1. Questionnaire-----	44
3.8.2. Interview-----	45
3.8.3. Document Analysis-----	45
3.9. Procedures of Data Collection-----	46
3.10. Methods of Data Analysis-----	46
3.11. Validity and Reliability-----	47
3.12. Ethical Consideration-----	48
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION---	48
4.1. Introduction-----	48
4.2. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents-----	49
4.3. Analysis of the Way Inspectors Gather Evidence to Identify Strength and Weakness in Primary Schools-----	51
4.4. Analysis of the Extent to which Inspectors Give Feedback to Schools Based on Observations-----	57
4.5. Analysis of the Extent which Inspectors Take Follow-up Activities and Make Schools Accountable after Inspection-----	61
4.6. Analysis of Teachers' Perceptions towards School Inspection as a Facilitator of School Improvement in Primary Schools for Quality of Education-----	65
4.7. Analysis of Principals' Perceptions towards School Inspection as a Facilitator of School Improvement in Primary Schools for Quality of Education-----	69
4.8. Analysis of Major Challenges that Affect School Inspection Practice in Primary Schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone-----	73
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS-----	77
5.1. Summary of major findings-----	77
5.2. Conclusions-----	79
5.3. Recommendations-----	81
References-----	84

Appendix-A-----	89
Appendix -B-----	96
Appendix -C-----	103

List of Tables	page
Table 1: Summary of Sample Schools, Teachers and Techniques-----	43
Table2: Summary of Total Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques -----	44
Table3: Reliability Statistics-----	47
Table4: Respondents’ distribution by sex, age, wok experience, education level/qualification -----	50
Table5: Respondents View on inspectors’ effort in gathering evidence to identify the strength and weakness of primary schools-----	52
Table 6: Respondents View on Inspectors’ feedback given to schools based on observation--- -----	57
Table7: Respondents View on the extent of inspectors’ taking follow-up activities and making schools accountable after inspection-----	62
Table8: Respondents view on Perceptions on school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools-----	65
Table9: Respondents view on Perceptions on school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools-----	69
Table10: Responses view on the challenges for the implementation of school inspection----	74

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

CCIM: Central Control Inspection Model

CI: Classical Inspection

CSS: Close to School Site Inspection

EFA: Education for All

EFDG: Ethiopian Federal Democratic Government

ESDP: Education Sector Development Program

GEID: General Education Inspection Directorates

GEQIP: General Education Quality Improvement Program

KETB: Kebele Education and Training Board

KTZ: Kembata Tembaro Zone

MOE: Ministry of Education

OFSTED: Office for Standard in Education

PTA: Parent Teacher Association

QASO: Quality Assurance and Standard Offices

REB: Regional Education Bureau

SIES: School Inspection and Education Supervision

SNNPREB: South Nation and Nationalities Peoples Regional Education Bureau

SSE: School Self Evaluation

SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Sciences

UK: United Kingdom

UNESCO: United Nation Education Scientific and Cultural Organization

USAID: United States Agency for International Development

WEO: Woreda Education Office

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess the Practices and Challenges on school inspection in Kembata Tembaro Zone Primary Schools. To this end, mixed research approach was employed and Multistage sampling technique was used to select the sample Woredas, cluster centers, school principals and teachers. To this end, 6 Inspectors were selected through proportionally, 16 school principals were selected through census, and 128 teachers were selected through simple random method. Questionnaire, interview and document analysis were used to collect the data. Thus, 128 teachers and 16 school principals filled the questionnaires, and 4 inspectors were interviewed to enrich the quantitative data. The background of the respondents was analyzed by using frequency and percentage, the quantitative data collected through questionnaire was analyzed by using mean scores and standard deviation by using SPSS version 20. The data gathered through open-ended questions, interview and document analysis was analyzed in line with quantitative data by narration in words. Consequently, the main findings of the study indicated that: Inspectors were not collecting adequate data to give valid judgment; the feedback given by Inspectors was not clear, specific, feasible, constructive, relevant and accurate feedback as much as important that leads to performance improvement. Inspectors carrying out follow-up and accountability activities after inspection, to see implementation of recommendations and improvements made after feedback was insufficient. Additionally, teachers' and principals' perception towards school inspection as a facilitator of school performance improvement in schools for quality of education in the study area was low. On the other hand, lack of provision of adequate budget, lack of provision of adequate facilities, limited time schedule to carry out effective inspection, lack of effective feedback, non provision of effective follow-up system, lack of pre-service training for inspectors, irrelevance of some standards and poor description of inspectors job in the school inspection frame work were major challenges affecting school inspection practice in primary schools of the study area. Finally, the following recommendations were drawn: the Woreda education office inspectors are expected to collect all relevant data from schools to give valid judgment; also Woreda Education Office and Zone Education Department work together with Inspectors to promote feedback system of school inspection; similarly, Woreda Education Office also should create awareness regarding purpose of inspection to teachers and principals. Additionally, it is advisable that Woreda Education Office should report to Regional Education Bureau and Ministry of Education to amend Ethiopian General Education Inspection Framework, as it describes relevant standards for each education level and clearly showing job descriptions of inspectors; Woreda Education Office should create awareness regarding purpose inspection in line of giving effective inspection.

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter covers the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitations of the study, limitation of the study, operational definition of key terms, and organization of the study.

1.1. Background of the study

In any development process, education is the basic instrument and back bone to promote political, economic and social growth and provide skilled man power needed for the development of all the countries over the world (UNESCO, 2007; ESDP V, 2008E.C). This is because; education enables citizens to acquire knowledge, skill and attitude so that they can actively participate in and contribute to the development of country. But no educational system can play its pivotal roles in the development of countries without quality of it (World Bank, 2005).

School inspection is not a strange practice in most of the countries in the world. School inspection as a form of accountability started and traced back to end of 18th century in France under Napoleon Regime. Latter in the 19th century, it was practiced to other European counties countries like United Kingdom (UK), the Netherlands (Grauwe, 2007). Many African countries established education inspection after their independence and introduction formal public education (Grauwe, 2007; Matete, 2009; Alphonse Gobore, 2017; Frimatus, 2014). In this case, school inspection is a practices that supports the government and the stakeholders on understanding aspects in which the goals of education are attained and aspects that need to be improved in any education institution. All around the world schools are inspected and the assumption is that this in a positive way contributes to the quality of schools and education systems (Ehren & Visscher, 2006).

According to Ehren & Visscher (2008); Gaertner & wuster (2014) School inspection is a systematic, evaluative assessment of the conditions of work, working methods, and outcomes of individual schools performance based on standardized criteria. The criteria are laid down in frameworks for school quality by ministry of education. The frameworks consists quality

criteria for the domains of instruction, school culture, school leadership, school management, quality development.

An inspection is also the act of a monitoring authority administering an official review of various aspects such as administrative matters, pedagogical/instructional matters, facilities, records, documents and any other assets in the school. According to Gobore (2017) inspection is periodic, targeted examination of school performances, to check whether they are meeting national and local performance standards, legislative and professional requirements, and the needs of service users. School inspection is the process of observing work in schools, collecting evidences from schools and evaluating critically and reporting the judgments Office for Standard in Education (OFSTED, 2010). From this definition a person who inspects schools must be well equipped and interested to observe all what is really happening at school including school management/leadership, teachers' instruction, school environment, infrastructures/facilities and the whole process of teaching learning practices. Therefore, an inspector must collect the right information, provide the right feedback and conclude with the right and sound judgment for the school improvement and educational quality.

Essentially, there are three main premises that are put forward in both developed and developing counties regarding establishment of school inspections as external evaluation in education. First, it is argued that school inspection is the central frame through which the government can monitor and ensure the quality of education provided in the society. Second, it is also argued that there is no way that the governments can ensure the implementation of national goals and objectives in absence of external evaluation as the counter balance of teachers' accountability in teaching and learning. Third, it is further argued that for countries to prepare a competitive workforce to meet the challenges emerging due to globalization processes, school inspection as external control in education is indispensable and inevitable (Grauwe, 2007; Lyimo, 2015). However, Matete (2009); Mohammed (2015); Gaertner & Wuster (2014); John (2017) outlined that even though inspection has been supposed to lead to measure school performance, the current practice of school inspection in various education systems is facing challenges that curtail its credibility and usefulness in achieving the objectives for which it was established. Regarding this, recent research has identified some of the bottlenecks to inspection practice that hamper its credibility among principals, teachers and head teachers. These include poor inspectors' techniques leading to high levels of anxiety

and stress among teachers and head teachers, and the failure for external evaluation practice to improve school leadership, teacher classroom practice, and head teacher management practice.

Now a day, improving the quality of education has given priority throughout the world. As a result, all around the world schools are inspected and the assumption is that this in a positive way contributes to the quality of schools and education systems (Gaertner& Wurster, 2014; Ehren & Visscher, 2006). School inspections were not only introduced for monitoring purposes. Rather, the introduction of school inspections is linked to certain hopes and expectations, best summed up by the term “accountability” (Ehren & Visscher, 2008).

In Ethiopian, particularly school inspections started to be practiced since the beginning of 1930s with constant shift of its names “Inspection” and “Supervision” (Akalu and Tesfaw, 2014). In general historical development of inspection/ Supervision in Ethiopia can be classified in to four major periods. The first period covers from 1934-1954 E.C. inspection; the second period from 1955 -1973 E.C the inspection replaced by supervision. The third period during Dreg regime (1974-1986E.C) it was transferred to again to inspection. However, the reason was not clearly pedagogical. It was for administrative matters (Abebe, 2014).

The fourth period covers from 1987 E.C to the present time. It began with the introduction of the current education and training policy in 1987 E.C/1994, a shift from inspection to supervision. The Education and Training Policy has made the educational administration and management more decentralized. Accordingly, new departments of supervision of educational program have been established at federal and regional level with branches up to Woreda level. That is helping teachers for the improvement of educational achievement of students (MOE, 1987E.C/1994). The Education and Training Policy of April 1987E.C/1994 aggressively addresses the relevance, quality, accessibility and equity issues which have been outstanding problems of the educational system. However, the quality of education in Ethiopia is also under question (Ministry of Education, 2004). In line with this, the Ethiopian government under MOE, (2004) has now shifted its attention to improve quality of education.

Recently, in 2006E.C /2013 Ministry of Education (MoE) which is mandated by the Ethiopian Federal Democratic Government of Ethiopia (EFDG), established the General Education Inspection Directorate (GEID) to assure the quality of education and to develop

consistent national arrangements for the inspection of all schools throughout the country (MoE, 2006E.C/2013;WORLD BANK, 2010). The General Education Inspection Directorate established a Framework in 2006E.C/2013, which outlines five focus areas for inspection in relation to inputs (1 & 2), processes (3 & 4) and outputs (5). They include (1) school facility, buildings, human and financial resources and (2) the learning environment, (3) learning and teaching, (4) school engagement with parents and the community, and (5) student outcomes and ethics. From the above five focus areas, the four areas are similar with school improvement main domains (MOE, 2006E.C, p.4). From these five areas, 26 standards are derived, which are to be inspected every three years. After inspection, schools are then classified into four grades. To be at standard, a school must have a Grade 3, scoring at least 70%, or higher. If a school is classified as Grade 1 or Grade 2, i.e. is below the standard, then it will be inspected again one year later (MOE, 2013). At that time, if the required improvements have not been made, then according to the Framework the “relevant bodies will be held to account” (MOE, 2013, p.18). According to the frame work inspectors are responsible to spend their full time in the school gathering evidence to enable them to make an accurate judgment about each of the standards. According to (MOE 2006/2013) the inspectors are responsible/ expected to carry out the following functions/activities during actual inspection.

- spend at least half their time on classroom observation;
- observe students’ work; all physical plants found in the school compound;
- have discussions with the director, teachers and students;
- have discussions with parents and representatives of the community;
- look at the school’s results, records and other documentation
- Inspectors should offer to give feedback on classroom observations at a suitable time after the observation. The feedback should be constructive and focused on the students’ learning, the features of the teaching or other factors that affected it, and how it could be improved.

At the end of the inspection, the inspectors meet the school principals and teachers to provide a short and clear oral feedback on their findings for recommendations.

It is believed that the improvement of schools and quality of education would not be accomplished without improving school performance. The quality of teaching and learning is

determined by the provision of adequate supervision support and inspection control (ESDP V 2008-2012E.C). The realization of professional competence of teachers, school principals and inspectors for quality of education remains questionable unless due emphasis is given from different level education officials to implement school program effectively (MOE, 2006E.C). Therefore, to make schools accountable, responsible for the improvement of schools for quality of education, the inspection process implemented in a way that controls overall school performance (MoE, 2006 E.C).

From what has been discussed so far it is possible to say that, school inspection can play a great role in monitoring and assuring the quality of education and inspectors are responsible for inspecting overall performance of schools and to make schools accountable. Thus, it is significant to assess the practice and challenges of school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone.

In light of this fact, this study intended to examine practice of school inspection in primary schools of KTZ. Moreover, the study discusses to practices existed which the schools could have been used to enhance performance improvement in order to bring school improvement for quality of education.

1.2.Statement of the problem

Education has long been defined as a vital instrument for development. Providing quality education for all is the current agenda of the world. However, ensuring the quality of education and provision of quality education to its citizen has been the most challenging concern to developing countries (USAID, 2010).

Inspection is an indispensable aspect of any organization over the world; either it is developed or developing countries. It can be seen as a quality control mechanism to ensure standards. Different literature indicated that, inspection refers to the general assessment of quality and performance of the entire education program in the school in order to find solutions to the educational problems (Grauwe, 2007). A school inspection is a formal process of external evaluation which may aim to hold schools to account, and to drive school improvement and quality of education (Lyimo, 2015).

According to Ololube & Major (2014) school inspection is subsequent evaluation of schools as designated places of learning. It seeks to provide the necessary examination, control

schools and feedback to ensure school performance improvement which involves the measurement, testing, and evaluation of certain characteristics of system. The results are usually compared to specified requirements and standards so as to determine whether an activity is in line with set targets. School inspection is directing, controlling, reporting, commanding, and other such activities that emphasize the task at hand and assess the extent to which particular objectives have been accomplished system.

Regarding school inspection many studies have been conducted. A study in Zambia by Chanda (2011) revealed that teachers and head teachers viewed the school inspection practice negatively on account of the defective techniques used by inspectors and the absence of post inspection feedback. Similarly, in Kenya, a study by Mwinyimpembe (2011) also found that school inspections were not improving schools as expected due to poor inspection techniques on the part of the inspectors, lack of feedback and support for follow-up plans, and the lack of funds to facilitate the work of inspectors. Also, a study in Nigeria, by Ogoegbunam (2012) stated that majority of the items dealing on the extent inspectors carry out inspection functions were rated, to a great extent by the inspectors and head-teachers. Similarly, a study in Uganda by Sembirige (2009) examined the effects and impact of inspection primary schools. The study indicated that the inspection process was threatening and stressful to teachers, and judgmental in nature, district inspectors were deficient in fulfilling their designated role of offering constructive feedback, and the teachers perceived the district inspectors' presence in schools as an occasion of anxiety and emotional stress. These studies did not observe/measure the whole school performance which leads to school improvement for quality of education. On the same way, a study in Nigeria by Mohammed (2015) found that most of the teachers had a feeling that school inspectors were out to harass and victimize teachers and principals. The roles of school inspectors is to visit schools frequently and to assist with professional guidance, identifying problems in schools suggesting solutions and helping teachers to maintain the required and adequate standard through classroom observation, and organizing workshops. Mohammed (2015) in this study admitted that school inspectors are yet to fulfill this obligation of making class room observation so as to offer a support to teachers where they can detect the need to improve and the areas of weakness. The finding of this study also shows that there was a negative response in relation to school inspectors' negative interactive communication that could not help teachers to improve their performances.

There no study has done in any zone or region in Ethiopia on school inspection on overall school performance so as to facilitate school improvement in primary schools for quality of education. Ethiopian Ministry of Education (2010E.C) annual report and statistics indicated that schools were not showing progressive improvement in achieving expected standard. Specifically annual reports and statistics from Kembata Tembaro Zone Education Department and Woreda Education Office from 2010E.C indicated that there is a great gap on performance improvement of schools.

Additionally, at regional, zonal and woreda level in annual education performance report documents (SNNPREB, 2009 E.C; 2010 E.C), seminars and workshops repeatedly indicated that; implementation of primary school inspection is not performed as expected. The researcher personally participated in annual education performance evaluation works in woreda and zone and region. Moreover, the researcher has a personal experience as a teacher; principal one of primary school principal in one of the Woreda of Kembata Tembaro Zone since 2000E.C and by this the researcher believes that existing deficiency between what was demanded and what is really happening in schools' overall performance.

Besides, the current initiation for quality of education further rationalized the researcher to deal in the area under discussion, as inspection is a quality improving and monitoring tool and lack of study in Ethiopia regarding practices and challenges of primary school inspection. All these circumstances initiated the researcher to conduct study on the issue. As a result, this study focuses on assessing the current school inspection practices such as, gathering evidence to identify strength and weakness of schools, observing performances, giving feedback which shows limitation of schools to plan for improvement through follow up, identifying challenges affecting practice of school inspection, and to suggest the ways of improvements in the process of practice of school inspection (MOE, 2006E.C; ESDP V, 2012).

By examining the above contexts, and participating education office employees, school principals, teachers, cluster supervisors school improvement committee as stakeholders can better understand practice of school inspection for overall school performance and improvement and quality of education. Schools principals develop and understand the importance of school inspection as it promotes to school performance in order to achieve their goal by participating all stakeholders. Education head officers can plan to interventions to monitor and control towards implementation of school inspection to achieve goals of education. Therefore, the rationale for this study is to provide a critical examination of the

practices of school inspection in primary schools generally in Ethiopia and particularly in Kembata Tembaro Zone. Thus, this study intended to answer the following basic questions:

1. To what extent do inspectors gather evidence to identify strength and weakness in primary schools in Kembata Tembaro Zone?
2. To what extent do inspectors give feedback based on observations in primary schools in Kembata Tembaro Zone?
3. To what extent do inspectors carry out follow- up and accountability activities after inspection in primary schools in Kembata Tembaro Zone?
4. How do school principals and teachers perceive school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools in Kembata Tembaro Zone?
5. What are the challenges that affecting school inspection practice in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective

The overall objective of this study was to assess the extent to which primary school inspection is being implemented and to identify challenges that school inspectors face in Kembata Tembaro Zone in implementing inspection.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

Specifically, the study was attempted;

- To identify the way to which school inspectors identify the strength and weakness so as to make judgment on school performance.
- To assess the extent to which school inspectors give feedback based on observations so as to assist schools to improve their limitation.
- To assess the extent to which school inspectors carry out follow- up and make accountability activities after inspection so as to check implementation of proposed recommendation.
- To asses perception of principals and teachers on school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement.
- To identify the major challenges that affect school inspection practice.

1.4. Significance of the Study

Since the purpose of this study was to assess the practices and challenges on school inspection in Primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone, the results of the study will have the following potential contributions:

- The finding of the study may provide clear insight into the existing practices and challenges of school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. It may provide relevant information for education officials at Regional, Zonal, and Woreda level on the current practices of primary school inspection and help them to discharge their responsibilities to overcome schools from their problems.
- The finding of this research may assist those who are dealing with the design and development of training manuals to empower Woreda Education Office inspectors and school principals those experience challenges while practicing school inspection.
- The finding of this study may also encourage the establishment of necessary environment, structures as well as support mechanisms for escalating genuine participation and involvement in the practicing school inspection in Kembata Tembaro Zone.
- The finding of the research may also hope to establish opportunities for teachers, principals, supervisors and Woreda education office heads to know their status and to review their school inspection practice in relation to their school improvement with the view that other role players should participate in school inspection processes.
- In addition to above, it may also serve as a good benchmark for other researchers those who want to conduct research on the same or similar research title in Kembata Tembaro Zone

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

The study was delimited to Kembata Tembaro Zone which is found in South Nation Nationalities and Peoples Regional State. The zone comprises seven Woreda and three town administrations. These are Tembaro, Haderotunito, Qachabira, Doyogena, Angecha, Qadiadgamela and Demboya woreda; Hadero, Shinchicho and Durame town administrations.

The Zone was selected because of two reasons. The first was the study conceptually delimited to assess the efforts of inspectors showing gaps of school improvement so as to assist schools principals and teachers to reduce their limitation. The second was, the researcher worked as a teacher and principal for the last twelve years in the zone. This helps the researcher to get rich, relevant and in depth data from the participants easily to supplement the study. In Kembata Tembaro Zone there are 121 government primary schools. Conducting research on all primary schools of the zone would be advantageous in order to have a complete picture about practices and challenges of primary school inspection. However, due to time and finance constraints the study was also delimited to three Woreda namely, Tembaro, Hedero-tunito Zuria and Qachabira and Shinshicho town administration to assess practice and challenges of primary school inspection. Moreover, the study was conceptually delimited to the extent inspectors' gathering evidences, giving feedback; follow up and accountability system; teachers and principals perception and factors affecting primary school inspection in Kembata Tembaro Zone.

1.6. Limitation of the Study

When the researcher was conducting the study, the researcher encountered the following challenges: lack of cooperation of the respondents and their willingness to participate in the study and provide right information, financial constraints due to high prices in stationery and transport costs. Another limitation was lack of contemporary and relevant literature on the topic, especially on Ethiopian condition. There is acute shortage of books or shortage of updated related literature in the area. Therefore, these factors might affect the generalizations made in one way or another.

1.7. Operational Definitions of Key Terms

To insure consistency throughout the study, the following terms were explained briefly by the researcher to minimize confusion as the following:

Challenge: Are factors/ problems that affect the primary school inspection process and its practice in Kembata Tembaro zone Primary Schools.

Inspection: A range of activities carried out by inspectors for the purposes of accountability, ensuring the quality of educational standards, and school improvement

Inspectors: An external supervisor, who visits schools to ensure education standards set by the government are met by schools, whose functions are gathering evidence/ observing school performances, giving feedback, follow up and making schools accountable schools based on set standards.

Practice: To do something consequently in orders to improving performance through inspection.

Primary school: schools that provide primary education for eight years which include (1-4) first cycle and (5-8) second cycle prepare students for general education.

1.8. Organization of the Study

This research was organized into five chapters. The first chapter deals with background of the study, statement of the problem, general and specific objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study, operational definition of key terms and organization of the study. The second chapter provides relevant review of related literature to concepts of the problem area. The third chapter presents research design and methodology which included research method and design, population, sample and sampling techniques, sources of data, tools of data collection and procedures of data collection, data analysis and ethical consideration. Chapter four includes presentation, analysis and interpretations of data. The last chapter presents summary of major findings, conclusions and recommendations. Finally, appendixes and references have attached at the last part of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This part of the study presents the existing international, national and regional literature in the area of school inspection. It begins with briefing the concept of inspection and supervision, historical overview of inspection/ supervision, models of school inspection, empirical studies on school inspection, inspection on other countries, and inspection in Ethiopia, the intents of school inspection and principles of effective school inspection and practice and process of school inspection.

2.1. Definition and Concept of Inspection and Supervision

The word “Inspection” is from the Latin word “inspicere,” meaning to look closely and an official visit to an organization to check on standards of performance (Gaertner and Wuster, 2014). School inspection as a concept has been defined in different ways by different persons. It has sometimes been used interchangeably with school supervision.

Nelson & Ehren (2014) for example, defines the term school inspection as the process of “observing work in schools, collecting evidences from a variety of sources and reporting the judgments”. They also explained school inspectors are not simply equivalent to the value-free cameras and video recorders that randomly provide snapshots of schools and classrooms. They need to understand and not just report activities as not everything found in the school during inspection is necessarily inspected and reported. Nelson and Ehren thus, stressed that only the main features that are deemed relevant to the educational industry are to be examined.

School inspection defined as the process of assessing the quality and/or performance of the institutional services, programs or projects by those (inspectors) who are not directly involved in them. The definition indicates that school inspection is an external system of educational evaluation, and in reality school inspectors have no direct control of the teachers but, they influence their accountability to their work performance through the publication of the school inspection reports (Wilcox, 2000; Ehren & Visscher, 2006).

It is the vehicle which government drives to help bring order in schools and maintain standard. In fact, it is the totality of the government's check in schools to see that the goals and objectives of education are achieved. Inspection is an instrument with which the political and administrative authorities maintain necessary contact with schools, teachers, pupils and the community to ensure that the system is working satisfactorily and efficiently (Matete, 2009). To Matete, school inspectors are not simply recording and reporting that randomly provide snapshots of schools and classrooms. They need to interpret and not just report activities as not everything found in the school during inspection is necessarily inspected and reported. Matete, thus, stresses that only the main features that are deemed relevant to the educational performances are to be examined.

Inspection according to Gobore (2017); Sarah (2015) defined as the critical examination and subsequent evaluation of a school as a designated place of learning so as to make it possible for the necessary advice to be given for the purpose of improving schools.

School inspection is one of the mechanisms that governments use to ensure accountability to the public in terms of the value for money invested in the education systems, and to improve the education quality and in schools (Macharia & Nicholas, 2014). School inspections are widely used, and they are charged with a key role in the quest for quality. It is therefore of great importance to gain more knowledge about the in-school processes which may take place between the inspection and the ultimate goal, namely, the improvement of school performance for school improvement and quality of education (Ehren, et al., 2013).

According to John (2017); Grauwe (2008), inspection is the process of assessing the quality and/or performance of the institutional services, programs or projects by those (inspectors) who are not directly involved in them. The definition indicates that school inspection is an external system of educational evaluation, and in reality school inspectors have no direct control of the teachers but, they influence their accountability to their work performance through school inspection (Ehren & Visscher, 2006).

In general terms, both school inspection and supervision can be viewed as the process of assessing, examining, collecting information, and analyzing the performance of schools, so as to see if it meets the educational standards that the government intends to achieve educational quality, to ensure accountability and to ensure school improvement (Ehren and Visscher,

2008; Matete, 2009; Haule, 2012). Thus, they are used interchangeably; literature research studies indicated that they are different in practice.

Tyagi (2010) suggests that the difference between inspection and supervision can be understood on the basis of school functions which they cover (administrative, academic etc), purpose they seek to achieve; personnel conducting the evaluation are internal or external to the school. Inspection has been referred to the system-based assessment and evaluation of schools, teachers and students done by the local authority personnel, inspectors, and advisors. Supervision is a school based activity more concerned with the assessment of academic aspects of the institution for continuous school improvement by enhancing teaching-learning practices.

Moswela (2010) also differentiated inspection and supervision on the basis of their purpose. Supervision intends to help teachers improve instruction by directly assisting them whereas inspection aims to check the completion of the goals of curriculum by the teacher and in case of failure, caution them critically.

Inspection could be described as the critical examination and evaluation of a school as a place of learning (Ololube &Major, 2014). Through inspection, necessary and relevant advice may be given for the improvement of the school. Such advice is usually registered in a report. At the end of inspection visits, reports are usually written to detail identified strengths and weaknesses of the school with appropriate recommendations for improvement. On the other hand, supervision is distinct from inspection since it can be described as a constant and continuous process of personal guidance based on frequent to a school to give concrete and constructive advice and encouragement to teachers so as to improve the learning and teaching situation in the school.

2.2. Historical overview of Educational inspection in the world

Educational inspection is not a strange practice in most of the countries in the world. It has been in practice for several decades. According to Grauwe (2007) school inspections started back when public education started, especially when young nations used education to build a common language and culture. In those days school inspections were considered as a key tool to ensure that all education staff respected the same rules and regulations and followed a similar program. In France for example, the first public school inspections were set up at the end of the 18th century by Napoleon's regime while in other European countries it was noted

to be practiced in the 19th century (Grauwe, 2007). For example, in the United Kingdom (UK), the first inspection services were carried out by Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) in 1839 (Matete, 2009; Wilcox, 2000). The Dutch Inspectorate of Education, established in 1801, is one of the oldest operating Inspectorates in Europe. However, in many countries, the inspection system went through reforms and transitions in its organization, purpose, and processes. For example, in 1990 in England OFSTED replaced the famous Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) to broaden its focus to include the outcomes of school self-evaluation (SSE) and the development of a school's own action plan for improvement following an inspection (Rosenthal, 2004).

In many African countries' establishment of school inspection services accompanied the introduction of formal public education (Grauwe, 2007). Many of the developing countries expanded the inspection services after independence. Also, the increased number of schools accompanied relatively slower growth in number of supervisor/inspection officers (Grauwe, 2007; Matete, 2009; Haule, 2012).

2.3. Inspection/ Supervision in Ethiopia

In the Ethiopian education system, the supervisory/inspection services began to be carried out since the beginning of nineteen thirties with constant shift of its names "Inspection" and "Supervision." However, the reason was not clearly pedagogical (Akalu and Tesfaw, 2014). In 1934, educational inspection was practiced for the first time, and then it was changed to supervision in the late 1950s again to inspection in mid 1960s and for the fourth time it shifted to supervision in 1986 of Ethiopian calendar. In general, the historical development of supervision/ inspection can be classified in to four major periods as fallows.

2.3.1. The First Period (1934-1954 E.C) – Inspection

Educational inspection introduced into the educational system of Ethiopia about 35 years after the introduction of modern (Western) type of education into the country. As it is indicated in Ministry of Education supervision manual (MoE, 1987E.C/ 1994), for the first time, inspection was begun in Ethiopia in 1941/2. Among the forces that brought about the need for school inspection was the increasing number of schools and teachers in the country, the need for coordination of the curriculum and to help teachers in their teaching. Then, in 1943 E.C. the first program for training inspectors was started in Addis Ababa Teachers Training School because of the quantitative increment of schools, teachers, students, and the complexity of educational activities. Accordingly, a total of 24 inspectors were trained for six

months and graduated at the end of 1943 E. C. These trained inspectors were assigned to inspect educational programs and administration (MOE, 1987 E.C).

Starting from 1944/5, the office of the inspectorate established centrally, i.e. at the Ministry's head office was headed by a British national named Lt. Commander John Miller. He was appointed as Inspector General assisted by two Ethiopians. The major responsibilities of the inspectors were to collect and compile statistical data on number of students and teachers, number of classrooms available and class-size, conduct school visits in the capital and in the province and finally, produce reports to be submitted to the Ministry of Education as well as the emperor who at that time assumed the Ministry of Education portfolio (MoE, 1987E. C).

In addition, after the discontinuation of such training in 1946 E.C, another training program was reopened in Kokebe Tsebha School in 1948 E.C due to the increment of schools. Statistics reveals that a total of 124 inspectors and school directors were trained and graduated from 1948-1954 E.C. They also worked until the end of 1955 E. C. as inspectors (MoE, 1987E. C).

2.3.2. The Second Period (1955-1973 E.C) – Supervision

As more and more schools were opened, the number of teachers increased and student population grew up, the educational activities became more complicated and so it became necessary to train certain number of supervisors. Thus, in 1955 E.C the inspection program was changed in to supervision with the aim of focusing only in curriculum and educational programs so as to improve the teaching learning process by participating and supporting the teachers. In addition to the 51 supervisors trained by the Addis Ababa University, all inspectors who were active in the service were retrained as supervisors in 1956 E. C.

2.3.3. The Third Period (1974-1986E.C) – Inspection

The socialist ideology that was led in 1966E.C forced the education sector to shift supervision in to inspection so as to enforce socialist outlook in the education system. It is clear that this shift was made because it was envisaged that under the socialist principles of management, education demanded strict control of the fulfillment of educational policies, directives, plans and programs.

As stated by Tadele (2014) with the introduction of inspection into the educational system of the country, short-term training programs were arranged abroad to some individuals who

were serving as supervisors and to some selected school principals. For other individuals, in-service program was locally conducted during the Kiremt (winter season). Beginning from 1974 E.C, these individuals were assigned from the national offices to school levels (MOE, 1987 EC).

2.3.4. The Fourth Period (1987 E.C to the present) – Supervision

During the preceding political systems, the establishment of inspection/ supervision in Ethiopian education system was limited to national, regional/*Awraja* level. For that matter, supervisory /inspection activities could not able to provide close and sustainable support for school principals and teachers for school improvement (Abebe, 2014). As a result, Ethiopian Government, established New Education and Training Policy (NETP) of 1994 and inspection was shifted to supervision. The administration of education changed in to decentralized administration. Accordingly, new departments of supervision of educational program have been established at federal and regional level with branches up to Woreda level. That is helping teachers for the improvement of educational achievement of students (MOE, 1987 EC). In this respect, what is envisaged is, democratic supervision, which would seek the participation of all concerned in all spheres of the educational establishment in terms of decision-making, planning and development of objectives and teaching strategies in an effort to improve teaching learning process (MoE, 1994).

In addition to this, Ethiopian government also established different initiatives/mechanisms for school improvement and quality of education such as, General Education Inspection Directorates (GEID), General Education Quality Improvement (GEQIP) since 2006E.C (ESDPV 2008;WORLD BANK,2010).

2.4. Inspection in the Case of South Nation Nationalities and Peoples

Regional State

With the introduction of decentralization in Ethiopia, the administration and management of the education system was also decentralized from the central Ministry of Education (MOE) to Regional Education Bureau (REB) and Woreda Education Office (WEO) level. Of course, the practice of inspection/supervision that has been practiced in S.N.N.P. Regional State cannot be seen separately from the experiences observed in the country. This is because the inspection and supervision that has been implemented in different times in Ethiopia includes the regions, zones and woreda level (MoE, 2006E.C). The decentralization gives the region and lower level education structures an authority for planning, managing, evaluating and

supervision or inspection in accordance with the activity required (SNNPR Education Bureau, 2009).

As it is stated in the inspection frame work/ manual of SNNPREB the school inspection approach has been introduced since the beginning of 2007E.C as component of improving schools performance for school improvement and quality control in education in the region's schools. The task force composed of educational inspectors from regional, zonal education Department and Woreda Education office of the region had organized.

2.5. Models of Inspection

Scholars have tried to study and understand the way school inspection/supervision is done. One of the scholars who have written on the models of school inspections is Grauwe (2008). These scholars have identified four models of school inspection namely; Classical Model, Central Control Model, The Close to School Model and School Site Model. These four models will guide the researcher.

2.5.1. Classical Inspection Model

Classical inspection model is type of control is the oldest bureaucratic type of monitoring; checking that rules and regulations are respected. The classic inspectorate system combined with several forms of administrative self-reporting by schools (filling out forms) is the main device on which this type of monitoring and control relies (Scheerens & Ehren, 2015).

According to Grauwe (2008), the Classical Inspection (CI) model is the traditional model that is used by developed colonial powers, particularly by British and French colonies. Under this model, Ministry of Education (MOE) is responsible for developing inspection policies, planning for national inspection, training and system control. The CI model has two strengths namely that the supervisory services cover all the schools, that each school has an equal chance of being inspected, and that inspection is comprehensive because the inspectors accompany their control role with support and advice (de Grauwe, 2008). However, the strengths of the CI model are more of principles than practice and there was over-emphasis on control/administrative than support during school inspection (Chapman, 2002). The weakness of this model is failure to balance control and support to promote school improvement. This model also lacks activity of follow up which is intended to carry out checking implementation of recommendations.

Hence, there is a knowledge gap that needs to be filled in terms of how school inspection practice can be managed to support school improvement especially through overall school performance evaluation, feedback, follow up and support (Nicholas 2013; Frimatus,2014).

2.5.2. Central Control Inspection model

According to de Grauwe (2007), in the Central Control (CC) model the responsibility is concentrated in the center/ ministry of education. The practice is also on control without mixing it with support. This model also avoids regional and district offices, and inspection visits aim at activating the schools to take full responsibility in developing improvement plans that will encourage them into adding value to the functioning of the school. School inspection under the CC model is implemented by an autonomous body through time-to-time school visits every three to five years, and takes on the form of an audit of all the aspects of the school functioning with a published report at the end.

In this model of inspection, the role of the inspectors is to control the over all aspects of school performance such as, pedagogical, administration and management without having to offer advice/support and follow up every two or three years. Research has indicated that the over-emphasis of control at the expense of support has not brought change in school administrators, teacher and head teacher practice MacNab, (2004) cited in Nicholas (2013). This central control inspection model does not offer advice or support to school administrators and teachers. This is weakness of this model. Under the CC model, inspection visits are so critical that if the inspection report casts/places the school in bad light there is a risk of further deterioration in the school unless the school shows improvement.

Further to this, it is assumed under the CC model that offering autonomy to school management to initiate and implement plans for school improvement after inspection is the best practice. However, this can only be achieved where school managers, teachers and head teachers possess highly developed managerial and leadership skills. Empirical evidence has shown that teachers and head teachers need a balance of both support and control for school inspection to be meaningful (Nicholas, 2013; Chapman, 2001).

2.5.3. Close-to-School Support Inspection Model

The Close-to-School Support (CSS) model believes different schools have different contexts according to their locality. So, schools are very different in terms of their needs of their students, teachers, parents, resources and environments, hence the supervision/inspection

process must consider the specific characteristics and diverse needs of each school. So, schools require consistent support for improvement. In this model, inspection officers at the district level are responsible for intensive training and for implementing support-oriented inspection for schools (Grauwe, 2007).

The fact that inspection under the CSS model essentially focuses on offering support to the school and adapts itself to the school circumstances makes it potentially effective in laying a foundation for school improvement. However, that the CSS model focuses only on weak schools that are at falling. But large number of schools that are not very weak to need maximum support and also those that are not very effective to do without support. All schools need control to meet the requisite educational quality standards and support to make the necessary improvement for optimal performance. Research has also shown that labeling some schools as weak by such a service as school inspection is counterproductive especially in lowering teachers' and students' morale for improvement (Matete, 2009). Further to this, the CSS model does not single out a specific area for school support such as overall performance in strategizing for improvement. Hence, the knowledge gap still remains regarding the practice of school inspection for school improvement.

2.5.4. The School-site Inspection Model

According to Grauwe (2008), this model was not developed in reaction to the inefficiencies of the 'classical' model. It is to some extent typical of countries with the following characteristics: great homogeneity, a society with few disparities, well motivated teachers, and public trust in their professionalism and strong parental interest in education. In such a context therefore the teachers and the community can efficiently monitor the school without being monitored by an external evaluators and therefore can have a direct impact on the teaching process. This model tells internal supervision within school by principals, vice principals and departments heads. This model more emphasizes instructional supervision than overall performance of school performance (Nicholas 2013).

A fore mentioned inspection models are being implemented from central to school level in different parts of the world in the education system. As mentioned above, in the models of inspection, the model practiced in the Woreda level to inspect schools is close to school model (Grauwe, 2008). Concerning to the Ethiopian Education system, education Inspectorates are organized from Federal/Ministry of Education to Woreda Education Level.

School inspection practice is being carried out by education office inspectors (MOE, 2006E.C). So, in this concept close to school inspection model is being in Ethiopia.

2.6. Empirical Studies on School Inspection

The reviews of empirical studies presented in this section are in two categories including studies conducted in Europe and studies conducted in Africa. Three of the studies were carried out in Europe; Eight studies were conducted in Africa particularly one study in Kenya, one study in Zambia, three studies in Tanzania, one study in Nigeria and two studies in Uganda.

2.6.1. Studies on School Inspection Conducted in Europe

This subsection presents the review of studies conducted on school inspection, school improvement in Europe. The studies available to the researcher were carried out in England and the Netherlands.

Chapman (2000) explored the connection between school inspections by OFSTED in England, school improvement and teacher self-review through reviewing related literature. The findings of Chapman's explorative study indicated that there were concerns that OFSTED's snap-shot classroom observations of teacher competence and the quality of education teachers delivered provided limited evidence upon which to make concrete judgments about their performance. The findings by Chapman also point at the deficiency of OFSTED's inspection practice in contributing to the improvement of teacher classroom practice.

Recent research suggests that to improvement classroom practice, it is more important assessing the overall performance of (Jensen, 2010). However, school inspection practice which would inform school improvement practice was still deficient in this regard. A knowledge gap regarding the effectiveness of school inspection practice in overall school performance for school improvement remained unfilled.

In another study by Chapman (2002) investigated teachers' views toward OFSTED inspections as a mechanism for improving secondary schools in challenging contexts in England, which were described as having some of the lowest student attainment levels and high numbers of children from disadvantaged social-economic backgrounds. Chapman used a case study approach in ten recently inspected schools that were identified by OFSTED as facing challenging circumstances. The study revealed that the head teachers and senior managers held the most positive perceptions on external inspection practice while teachers'

had negative perceptions toward it due to the draining and stressful effects in the process. The study also showed that the inspection process had only marginal influence on teachers' classroom practice and middle managers' non-teaching practice to the extent that teachers found it very difficult to identify areas of their practice that had changed as a result of previous OFSTED inspections.

A knowledge gap remained regarding what must be done to increase the potential for school inspection to inform and commit principals, head teachers and teacher to school improvement through overall performance inspection. There was limited evidence regarding how school inspection should encourage school improvement especially in contexts of developing nations like Ethiopia.

In another study Ehren & Visscher (2008) investigated the impact of school inspections on school improvement in the Netherlands. The findings of the study revealed that all schools started to improve six months after a school visit using the feedback inspectors had given them. However, it was found that the innovation capacity of the school and the school environment did not seem to contribute to school improvement. The findings of the study further revealed that the quantity of feedback and the number of improvement suggestions did not explain why some schools initiated a higher number of improvement processes than others.

Further to this, also the found that the manner in which inspectors communicated feedback to the schools and the consequences they attached to the feedback played a role in school improvement. It was revealed that feedback presented only as something the school should attend to but without combining it with further follow-up appointments contributed dismally to school improvement initiatives. However, feedback given about the poor performance aspects of a school and simultaneously making appointments with the school for the improvement of those aspects seemed to make a difference.

The characteristics of school inspection practice in the Netherlands may be very different from those in Ethiopia. There was no empirical evidence that answered school inspection practice in Ethiopian context. Therefore, the current study assessed the practice and challenges on primary school inspection in Kembata Tembaro Zone.

2.6.2. Studies on School Inspection Conducted in Africa outside Ethiopia

In this section studies conducted in Kenya, Zambia, Tanzania, Nigeria and Uganda were reviewed.

A study in Kenya by Barrow (2011) carried out a study to assess the contribution of the quality assurance and standards officers/inspectors (QASOs) to educational quality in secondary schools in the Mombasa District in Kenya. The study aimed at finding out the impact of QASOs in enhancing quality education in secondary schools and the challenges they faced. Barrow employed the cross-sectional survey design for this study. The participants included 5 QASOs, 15 principals and 75 teachers. Questionnaires were used to collect data.

The findings in the study indicated that principals and teachers viewed QASOs as relevant in enhancing the quality education in secondary schools. The findings also revealed that QASOs faced a number of challenges including teachers' perception of them as fault-finders, inadequate finances and other resources to facilitate their work, inadequate personnel and lack of motivation, inhospitable teachers and transport limitations. The study also revealed that QASOs had not visited schools regularly but only when there was perceived need.

Another study in Kenya by Mwinypembe (2011) was conducted to examine the role of QASOs in the performance of secondary schools in national examinations in Nakuru District in Kenya based on the national results of students for the years 2003-2008. A total of 82 teachers from 9 schools and 5 QASOs participated in the study. Data was collected through the use of an interview schedule for QASOs, a questionnaire for head teachers and a questionnaire for teachers. The findings of the study revealed that the head teachers had not acted upon the recommendations of QASOs even though they had high expectations in the process in improving institutional performance. Such a discrepancy points at a deficiency within the school inspection process to commit principals and teachers to implementing improvement strategies. Hence, this study investigated the practice and challenges of school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone.

A study conducted in Zambia by Chanda (2011) revealed that teachers and head teachers' viewed the school inspection practice negatively. The reasons for the head teachers' and teachers' negative views on school inspection practice included the fault-finding attitude of the inspectors, the defective techniques used by inspectors and the absence of post inspection

feedback. This study revealed the same problems, as highlighted in earlier studies, facing inspection practice that threaten its credibility and usefulness especially the failure to provide feedback to highlight good practice and areas of weakness for improvement. A gap that was yet to be filled here was the way in which school inspection must be managed meaningfully for school principals, head teachers and teachers, and commit them to planning and implementing overall performance inspection as a school improvement strategy.

A study in Tanzania by Sivonike (2010) studied on teachers' and pupils' perception on secondary school inspection, the study revealed that school inspection as a feedback to schools was inadequate as they contained criticism than professional advice. The study concludes that some improvement needs to be made here and there in order to assist teachers so as to improve their skills instead of criticizing them all the time.

Another study in Tanzania by Haule (2012) leaders tends to be somehow positive towards school inspections. School teachers seem to reject school inspections findings and recommendations while on average school leaders seem to accept school inspection findings and recommendations. Haule also concluded that poor funding, limited time for inspection and inadequate resources are constraints affect school inspection. Regarding this, Nicholas (2013); Frimatus (2014) lack of funds creates a problem in the school. Nicholas, Frimatus recommended that there is need for government to provide adequate funds, for the development of the personnel and supervision/inspection of schools for this goal to be achieved. Akindele (2012) also suggested that for inspection to achieve its intended purpose, time and frequency need to be considered and adequate resources. For example, Akindele (2012) recommends that school inspection in actual sense is supposed to be carried out regularly due to the fact that many issues manifest in schools daily. Therefore, limited time for conducting inspection in schools has become superficial and formalities since the inspections are carried out periodically.

A study in Uganda by Jawoko (2003) investigated the practice of collaborative supervision of instruction in primary schools in Nebbi District, Uganda. The study found that teachers did not practice collaborative planning for supervision, there had been no analysis done on the post-inspection feedback offered, the supervision of instruction was not being done, the supervision had focused on compliance to policy practice, and the inspection process had mainly focused on the judgmental spot check of quality for accountability to external authorities. Jawoko in his finding also concluded that non implementation of inspection

reports and non provision of feedback and follow up on inspection affects quality of inspection process. Supporting this, Ololube &Major (2014), outlined s lack of adequate feedback and follow up in the inspection exercise as a challenge in school inspection, for example, the results of school inspection are not effectively communicated to various stakeholders, rendering little opportunity for the discussion of findings. As (Ololube & Major, 2014) agrees with this statement, and he claims that lack of feedback from inspectors frustrates teachers and their ability in the bid to strive for improvement and renders the whole inspection inappropriate because of lack of proper appropriate and uniform structure. Because school inspection tends to focus on school building and administrative systems rather than on teaching and learning and giving collective feedback that leads to effective change (Frimatus, 2014). There is a research gap concerning inspecting overall performance of school for school improvement.

A formative evaluation on the performance of school inspectors in the management of primary schools was conducted by Kagambe (2004) in Kabarole District, Uganda. The findings of the study revealed that inspectors had ensured that proper account of government grants to schools had been made, that teacher salaries had been disbursed, and that the provident fund and retirement benefits had been accounted for. The findings in this study also showed that recruitment and appointments of teachers had been made in time as per school requirement, those procedures for promotions and discipline proceedings had been duly followed and that there was proper maintenance and development of the schools. The study by Kagambe also identified the following challenges that hinder effective practice of school inspection. Supporting this Frimatus (2014) suggested that acceptance or rejection of school inspection depends upon the way teachers perceive the inspection process. As John (2017), noted the improvement of schools is dependent upon principals and teacher attitudes towards inspection unless principals and teachers perceive inspection as a process of promoting professional growth and student learning, the inspection exercise will not have the desired effect. Thus, this study was aimed to assess the current practice and challenges on primary school inspection in Kembata Tembaro Zone.

2.7. School Inspection in Other Countries

As stated earlier, school inspection as external evaluation in education has been a feature of many governments of the world. In this study only few countries are selected so as to illustrate how other countries differ from Ethiopia in practicing school inspections. This based on the view that lessons can be drawn from one country to another. This study

concentrates on England and Wales, The Netherlands, from the Europe world and Tanzania and Zimbabwe for the African countries.

England and Wales

In England and Wales school inspection was introduced in the Education (school) Act of 1992 which set up OFSTED (Learmonth, 2000; Sammons, 2004). Since 1993, all schools in England have been inspected on two or more occasions. School inspections have been conducted by teams of inspectors who are independent of Ofsted, who have no connection with the school being inspected, and who are expected to be impartial. Inspection procedures are intended to be transparent and all inspection reports are published, with a summary of the report issued to parents (Sammons, 2004). It is a non-ministerial/independent government agent committed to control inspection of schools. OFSTED has its roots in the Parents' Charter of 1991 (Learmonth, 2000). In this England and Wales school inspection parents have access to see school inspection reports so that their choice of schools for education of their children could be informed by clear up-to-date information. The government in both countries believed that standards in schools would be raised by parents using their choices in an open market system (Learmonth, 2000). School visits take place once in four years to allow time for recommendations to be implemented (OFSED, 2017).

The main purpose of introducing independent school inspection Ofsted in England and Wales was to inspect all schools regularly by independent inspectors; public reporting, with summaries of reports for parents as users; an annual report to parliament, and the provision of advice to ministers. The scope of Ofsted's work has been expanded substantially since 1997 as a result of legislation school improvement through inspection (OFSTED, 2012). The school inspectors carry out the systematized and timetabled classroom observation and the inspection findings are published on the Internet for the public consumption (Ehren & Visscher, 2008). This helps the public to identify the schools with poor performance initially termed as failing schools later, termed schools that require special measures or schools with serious weaknesses (Sammons, 2006). Accordingly, the identification of weaker schools and publications of performance tables/ feedback reports lead to considerable pressure to improve the weaker schools.

In the inspection system of England and Wales, the preparation of action plans are obligatory and schools are encouraged to plan for an appropriate range of measures to improve teaching and learning (Ehren & Visscher, 2008). The education authority should prepare an action plan indicating how they would address the main points for action identified in the inspection

report. More interventions and close follow ups are targeted for weaker schools after inspection (Ehren, et al., 2005; Sammons, 2006). If the school does not improve within a specified period, the sanction of closure is applied. It has been argued that the practice has helped to narrow the gap between the school at the top and bottom of the achievement distribution (Sammons, 2006).

Schools are evaluated on criteria including exam results and the quality of teaching observed during inspection. A risk-based approach is taken. For example, a school judged to be 'outstanding' will be inspected on the basis of a risk assessment of its subsequent performance; while 'inadequate' schools placed in special measures will be given a monitoring inspection within three months and may receive up to five monitoring inspections within 18 months. School Visits last for around two days (Sammons, 2006).

In England and Wales after inspection, schools are judged to be 'good', which schools fit standard while a school not yet deemed 'good' nor 'inadequate' are described as a school that requires improvement (OFSTED, 2012).

The Netherlands

As in England and Wales, school inspections in The Netherlands are accorded a special status. In the Netherlands, when a school is deemed to be under performing the school inspectors have a legal basis to take actions but this is only possible if the school does not comply with the legal regulations (Ehren & Visscher, 2008). This is contrary to what is practiced in England and Wales where the responsibility is left in the hands of the education authority. As in England, school inspection reports, in The Netherlands are published on the Internet.

Accordingly, in The Netherlands system of inspection, weaker schools are to be visited more intensively and more frequently than other schools like what is practiced in England (Ehren et al., 2005; Ehren & Visscher, 2008). Moreover, as indicated by Ehren & Visscher (2008) school inspectors should draw up written agreement with the schools about the improvement required. The school may also be requested to describe how they will attempt to implement the school improvement action plans and these plans are to be monitored by school inspectors. This implies that in The Netherlands, action plans are optional unlike in England where it is obligatory. The approach is hoped that it will enable the schools to learn about their strengths and weaknesses, and if they are under performing, to improve (Ehren & Visscher, 2008).

Tanzania

According to Haule (2012); Matete (2009) school inspection in Tanzania was in the year 1903. This period was the colonial rule of Germany in Tanzania. During this time the education guidelines required the people to have discipline and work diligently following the German culture, traditions and the needs (Haule, 2012). However, school inspectors had little power to implement their duties and their responsibility. Furthermore, in 1919 Britain started again school inspections in Tanzania when they took over as new colonial rulers from Germany. Up to 1961 Tanzanian school inspection system was mainly focused on needs of colonial powers of Germany and Britain. After independence in 1961 until the present time, the Government efforts are to improve education system through proper education policy, distribution and equalization of educational opportunities through the expansion of systems at all levels. The emphasis is now on the improvement of the quality of education, expansion of education and training opportunities to meet the ever-increasing demand of these services (Kambuga & Dadi, 2015). In this case, the government of Tanzania passed the education act of 1962 to regulate the provision of education in the country as well as abolished the racial discrimination in the provision of education and streamlined the curriculum, examinations as well as the financing of education to be provided with evenness (Matete, 2009).

The government took several steps and enacted several laws in order to improve education between 1967 and 1978. These laws and steps are included in the education act of 1969 and 1978, the Decentralization program of 1972; the National examination Act No 21 of 1973. The Education Act No 25 of 1978 included the establishment of the school inspectorate unit (Haule, 2012).

According to (Kambuga & Dadi, 2015), the purpose and obligations of school inspection in Tanzania is to advise the ministry of education and vocational training on the best way of implementing education policy. In this aim, the inspectors are used as insiders on the part of the ministry of education and as outsiders on the part of the school, to provide expertise on the organizational and curriculum issues by doing the followings:

- To inspect all schools and write a report with the purpose of advising the chief education officer on matters which require decision making for further improvement.
- To inspect, educate and advise owners, managers, school boards or committee and teachers on the best implementation of school development plans.

- To initiate and conduct education, research and disseminate the information for the purpose of improving the teaching standards in schools.
- To act as a link between school, other intuitions and the Ministry of education
- To take part in book writing, book review and production of handouts and articles for various academic subjects
- To pursue personal, professional and academic development
- To conduct in-service training for teachers
- To carry out supervisory visits to improve quality of teaching in schools.

From the analysis of these roles, one can say that school inspectors have three major roles. These are: inspection role, advisory role and development role. In the inspection role, the school inspectors play the following activities, i.e. Monitoring, assessing and evaluating the quality of school instruction, school organization and management and school environment.

The Tanzania inspectorate model is divided into subdivisions for primary schools, secondary schools, teacher training and adult education inspectors. The primary and adult education inspectors are organized on the district levels. The inspectors for primary and adult education are former primary education teachers with at least eight years experience of teaching. The inspectors for secondary and teacher education are organized in a zonal level(Kambuga & Dadi, 2015).

They are specialized in a certain subject and must have had at least eight years of teaching experience in secondary schools. In the same vein, before being appointed, an inspector is obliged to take a three month course on educational management and administration, curriculum development and evaluation and techniques of inspection (Garauwe, 2001). The inspectorate structure in Tanzania is based on specialization function, range of tasks of the individuals, hierarchy of influence and responsibility, and formal rules and regulations. This is an instrument of both the legislature and executive to obtain feedback through investigations and reports on school organizational matters such as discipline, morale, supply and account.

According to (Kambuga and Dadi, 2015), the process of inspection in Tanzania requires the inspector to conduct inspections at various earmarked schools. Before carrying out inspection, heads of the schools are to be informed in advance about the inspection whenever

possible so that they can make available all necessary information for successful inspection exercise. The inspection process is:

The Pre- inspection meeting: The school inspectors meet the school administration for introduction and outlining of the purpose of their inspection visit. The inspectors are briefed by the school administration on the school general status and performance. The school inspectors are required to meet teachers and other staffs. Even students are subjected to inspection regarding attendance, performance and academic development.

The real inspection stage: At this stage, the inspectors collect data about school management and administration, quality of teaching and learning and also the physical infrastructures of the school. During the inspection, the headmasters of the school usually play the role in facilitating inspection on the matters involving the administration. Teachers also have a role of ensuring that professional due care is adhered to in the course of their work.

Third and last Stage: The school inspector is to write and deliver a report to the relevant stakeholders. Members of the school board have to be acquainted with the results as well as school owners, i.e. The Permanent Secretary of the Ministry, Education agency, managers and administrators at the zonal, regional and district level. The former handbook for the school inspectors (which is the frame of reference and, the content of the work) is normally used and this has basically been the same for the last ten years. Only minor changes have been made. This means that, the inspection has a rather standardized format regardless of progress and needs and regardless whether certain issues, even stronger important ones related to government policies are more or less complied with by schools.

Zimbabwe

As in Botswana, in Zimbabwe, the recruitment of school inspectors had been also transparent. They use system advertisement of vacant posts and interview of candidates (Grauwe, 2001). The convening of a promotion committee involves all regional directors (Grauwe, 2007). At least there is more transparency including the announcement of the school inspection vacancies in the press. In Zimbabwe, all head teachers of both primary and secondary schools receive training in school management (Grauwe, 2007).

Like Tanzanian inspection system, in Zimbabwe each school has a board with members of the administration and teacher representatives. Also, the concept of cluster schools has been introduced in Zimbabwe, consists of ten to fifteen schools, where teachers are provided with pedagogical support and administration supervision (Matete, 2009). Also, in Zimbabwe the

Ministry of Education receives a copy of all supervisory visits reports carried out by the district (Matete, 2009). The school board in Zimbabwe has to supervise, assist, assess and recommend promotions for teachers. This is not a practice in Tanzanian supervision system. In Zimbabwe civil societies and school community are gradually being given an increased role in monitoring the functions of the school (Grauwe, 2001). Tanzania follows the same trend where school boards/Committees are encouraged to make follow up visits for the school development activities (Galabawa, 2001; Sumra, 2005). Also, school inspectors in Zimbabwe are employed as resource persons in training, and they participate in writing tests items, marking examinations, and they participate in preparing evaluation reports (Grauwe, 2007).

2.8. The Intents of School Inspection

School inspection and educational supervision (SIES) is widely concerned as a critical source of competitive advantage in the ever changing environment of the education sector (Ololube, 2014). According to educational management scholars (Ehren & Visscher, 2008), school inspection and supervision capability is the most important determinant of school education performance and school productivities for quality of education. In fact the main objective of inspection is the improvement of instruction (Quality Control) and general school operations (Garuwe, 2008).

The sudden increase in school enrollment coupled with the attendant increased complexity of the school management and organization generally in the world and particularly in Africa. In most countries in the world, there is a feeling that the rapid expansion and mass production of education has led to the deterioration of quality. Consequently, quality improvement has become a top priority of policy makers, which has in turn reinforced their preoccupation with quality control (Garuwe, 2008). This policy interest in quality improvement was endorsed and amplified by the Education for All (EFA) world conferences of 1990 and 2000. At the same time, various studies have shown that one important determinant of the deterioration of the quality of schools precisely relates to the weakening of quality monitoring devices, including the professional inspection/supervision and support services (UNESCO, 2007). The situation becomes even more fear-provoking when products and services of education becoming worse and worse due to deterioration of quality (Ololube and Major, 2014). This explains that inspection/supervision services should be assessed for school improvement and quality of education. In line with this, (MoE, 2006E.C) indicated that, inspection is important

for monitoring and controlling quality of education through critically examining and supporting overall school performances.

In line with this, (Matete, 2009), suggested that every nation decides what the society should learn. This means that the objectives and goals of the nation are communicated to people through school. Putting the goals and objectives into schools is done through various educational policies, seculars and directives. According to (Ehren and Visscher, 2006), school inspection for informs better education practices. They also noted that school inspection is an external entity that plays indirect role of improving school performance by identifying strengths and weakness. Inspection is also important to increase accountability on school performance. One of the most important aspects of school inspection is to increase accountability among stakeholders (Grauwe, 2007). An inspection is also important for maximizing the potential of pupils and promoting commitment of teachers (UNESCO, 2007).

In conclusion, according to Ololube & Major (2014) intentions of school inspection are:

- To acquire an overview of the quality of education;
- To ensure minimum standards;
- To offer purposeful and constructive advice ;
- To supervise the implementation of Curriculum;
- To identify discipline problems;
- To monitor and improve Teaching and Learning; and
- To stimulating and providing Guidance

2.9. Principles of Effective School Inspection

School inspection is concerned as form of accountability in education that accounts for the work performed by those responsible for the task of raising standards in education (Gurawe, 2007). Accountability can be defined as the obligation through which one part gives an account on the work performed to the other (OFSTED, 2010). Thus, accountability in education aims at making the providers of education accountable to the people who pay for the education of their children (Ehren & Visscher, 2006). In order to be meaningful and thus yield required results and expectations, school inspectors has to follow some principles which are the building blocks. Thus school inspection is principle oriented. According to Nicholas, (2013); Frimatus (2014); (John, 2017), the following are the principles of effective school inspecti

1. Healthy Atmosphere

This is very important if at all inspections are to be meaningful and effective (Jhon, 2017). Healthy atmosphere guarantees relationship between the inspectors and the inspected (Matete, 2009). The healthy atmosphere leads to cooperation between the inspectors and the inspected. Nicholas (2013) puts that school inspectors treat teachers very rudely and as such they perceive school inspection as an activity that threatens them and as a result they do not accept the recommendations wholeheartedly. Arguing that (MOE, 2006 E.C) stated that it is important that there is a healthy atmosphere if inspections are to be efficient and effective.

2. Staff Orientation

Many personnel that are involved in inspection cannot see beyond their noses, being deficient in the required skill, pedagogy, and orientation for the task (Nicholas, 2013). This means that the inspectors have to be very knowledgeable so that they can play their role very effectively and efficiently. For inspections to be meaningful, inspectors should be aware of the issues that can cause some problems especially when they are administering their duty. They are supposed to know better the areas that they are due to inspect.

The quality and quantity of the work must be specified in clean clear terms. Staff should be made to understand clearly what are or not expected of them. New staff must be given the necessary orientation. Being sensitive to that there leads to gaining respect and cooperation from the teachers and other stakeholders who are involved in the whole process of inspection and hence making the recommendations accepted and worked upon.

3. Immediate Recognition of Good Work

Good work should be recognized. This implies that the acknowledgement of any good work done must be immediate and made public to others which will then serve as inspiration to others. Incentive of merit, recommendation for promotion, and improve performances (Frimatus, 2014).

4. Constructive Criticisms

Poor work done should be constructively criticized. Advice and personal relationship should be given to the affected staff. It needs be stated here that such criticisms should be made private and with impartial mind. If a teacher is found with some weakness, the inspector should not stress him but instead they should advice and show the best way to perform the duty so that at the end of the day the performance improves and the students who are also affected may achieve well and satisfactorily (Nicholas, 2013).

5. Opportunity to Improve

Staff should be given opportunity to prove their worth and for aspiring higher. They should therefore be allowed to use their initiatives in performing their jobs and taking decision .It will give them the motivation to work much harder (John, 2017).

6. Motivation and Encouragement

This is another very important principle of school inspection. Staff should be motivated and encouraged to work to increase their productivity. They should be encouraged to improve their ability to achieve organizational goal (Ogoegbunam, 2012).

Regarding this, Ethiopian Ministry of Education (MOE (2006E.C) stated that, if an inspectors put the basic principles into practice with good understanding, inspectors can successfully realize the intended results. Accordingly, Ethiopian inspectors are expected to know and follow at least the basic principles which are stated in the country's inspection frame work (MOE, 2006E.C/2013). These are:

- i. Inspection is conducted by education inspectors who are not part of the school community;
- ii. Evaluation of the overall performance of a school is conducted based on concrete, consistent and continuous information;
- iii. Evaluation of all schools is made based on clearly defined standards and criteria. It should not reflect personal opinion of inspectors:
- iv. Inspection is an activity which is constructive and gives emphasis to priority areas. It celebrates successes but identifies shortcomings and gives recommendations to those responsible bodies
- v. Inspection is conducted by giving respect to the school community:
- vi. Evaluation is done based on the performance of the school as an institution, not on the performance of individuals.

2.10. The Role of School Inspection

This section discusses the role of school inspection in enhancing quality of education, better informed government on education practices, reinforcing the responsibility and accountability in education, controlling the environment in which education is provided, controlling the environment in which education is provided, tracking the educational goals and objectives and maximizing the potential of pupils.

2.10.1 School Inspection for Enhancing Quality of Education Provided

Any government in this world has its own unique goals and objectives that have been rooted to the philosophical foundations of the nation (Frimatus, 2014). What the nation wants to

transmit to its people, it has to be put in schools. This is done through various educational policies and directives and secular. School inspectors are to ensure such educational policies, directives, secular and the societal goals and objectives are properly implemented (Matte, 2009). School inspection is designed for quality assurance in education. The major aim is to track the education quality provided in schools by the guidance of some quality benchmarks that will facilitate learning at the same time reinforcing stakeholders' satisfaction (UNESCO, 2007).

2.10.2. School Inspection for Better Informed Government on Education

Practices

In general terms, in all parts of the world and in Ethiopia in particular school inspectors have no direct control over the entire process of school improvements (Ehren & Visscher, 2006). They are external agents and instruments of accountability (Gaerter & Wuster 2014). But, they provide the feedback to the school and to the government. They also induce some of the interventions through the publication of school reports that are expected to lead into school improvements in teaching and learning (Ehren & Visscher, 2006).

2.10.3. Reinforcing the Responsibility and Accountability in Education

School inspection has to do with holding those responsible for education to account on their work performance (Lyimo, 2015) and that they are doing a good job and indicating shortcomings/shortfalls. This is so because, it is believed that every pupil should be encouraged to learn what is basically necessary for her /him. As argued by Nicholas (2013), and Frimatus (2014), the type of education provided to the individual pupil is what can lead into a worthwhile personal life and to be a good citizen. It is assumed that school inspection as a vehicle for accountability in schools has to do with checks that pupils are receiving this basic education potential for their role in their society. Thus, the providers of education must therefore, be answerable and accountable (UNESCO, 2007). Accountability systems with (public) performance indicators are based on the ideas that (a) schools have to give account, (b) parents are informed more effectively and can challenge schools as regards weaknesses, (c) the performance indicators can be used by pupils and parents for school choice (so-called 'voting with their feet') and (d) the school can use the performance indicators as benchmark information. This information on quality is meant to bring about the active involvement of other stakeholders, particularly parents and pupils, in ensuring education quality at schools. It is also assumed that this public information on quality or public performance indicators will,

in itself, have a positive effect on the quality of education at schools (Wolf & Janssens, 2007).

2.11. Procedures/Practices of School Inspection

This section discusses the role of school inspection in improving teaching and learning. The role of school inspection in improving teaching learning comprises the following roles. These are: gathering evidence/ observing school performance, providing feedback role and professional follows up and accountability.

2.11.1. Gathering Evidence and Observing school performance

Observing seems simple that anyone with normal vision appears to be observing every moment his/her eyes are open. But, observation according to (OFSTED, 2012) is two-part process that involves first describing what has been seen and then interpreting what it means. Since the goal of inspection is enhancing teachers tough and commitment about improving the classroom and the school practice, observation should be used as base of information (Grauwe, 2007). To sum up inspectors should have required observation skill competency that help them to measure what is happening in the classroom and instructional practice, to understand teachers perception toward the practice and finally to judge as well as to infer those happenings and practices.

It is a normal trend that during school inspection school inspectors has to both administrative and academic performances of schools such as, leadership, different documentation on performances of schools, principal teachers as well as students relationship physical plant, visit classroom instruction, achievement of pupils and observe how the teaching takes place(UNESCO, 2007). Since teaching and learning are the school's main function, the school inspectors should focus to inspect what takes place in the school, and also what takes place in the classroom mainly. It is argued by Grauwe (2008) that it is meaningless for school inspectors to visit schools without observing what is going on inside the classroom setting and outside the class room. Inspectors have to ensure that what principals and teachers are doing a right job and that the pupils are receiving what they ought to acquire as learning experiences. Therefore, it is the responsibility of all those in charge of education to ensure that pupils are provided with the best education and hence school inspection should be a source of information on how successfully this objective should be achieved (Frimatus, 2014).

2.11.2. Providing Feedback

Inspectors normally assess schools with respect to standards, usually defined within a wider quality framework, and give feedback on the strong and weak points of the performance of schools based on given standards. Feedback is an important inspection characteristic for schools improvement (Ehren et al., 2013; Jhon, 2017). High quality feedback to schools, and how feedback is provided, is important if the feedback is to lead to improvement in student outcomes. Inspection feedback is given to all schools/stakeholders in an open forum and agreements are made to create a shared agenda for change (Ehren et al., 2014).

Feedback takes place after observation and identification of strength and weakness of school's performance. According to (Frimatus, 2014) school inspectors have a responsibility of providing feedback to both the government and school stakeholders. They assess schools with respect to the standards within the quality framework and point out on the strong and weak points based on performance. Ehren & Visscher, (2008) have viewed that feedback schools receive from school inspection to improve their functioning perform better. In addition, Ehren and Visscher, argue that the theories on schools as learning entities and school improvement support the role of performance feedback in effecting change. Therefore, feedback can work towards improvement of teaching and learning if schools have insights in their own strengths and weaknesses. That is why Ehren, Leeuw & Scheerens (2005) advocate for the self-assessment and evaluation for the schools as a mechanism to provide feedback.

2.11.3. Professional Follows up and accountability

According to John (2017) follow-up inspection is basically an inspection that takes place after a full inspection has been carried out in a school. It is during such visit that inspectors keep track of the actions taken by a school in regards to the recommendations that were made during full inspection. The inspectors try to find out the extent to which the actions taken by the school have achieved the desired results.

According to Haule (2012) inspection follow up is checking of previous visits is to see on progress of inspected schools. The inspector investigates whether the suggestions, corrections and recommendation he or she made during the previous visit have been carried out by affected schools. He or she also ascertains to what those corrections and suggestions are helping in achieving the school objectives. In this regard, professional mutual respect and trust is very important in inspection process. Mutual respect and trust between school

inspectors and schools is considered to be a foundation for the development of improvement actions in schools. Also, the fact that results of school inspections are communicated to stakeholders creates a sense of obligation for schools to take improvement actions (Nicholas, 2013).

Ehren & Visscher (2006) contend that, if the primary aim of school inspection is school improvement, the school inspectors are more likely to act as critical friends, getting to know well and offering advice and strategies for development. The challenge as well is to what extent school inspectors provide the constructive recommendations and not just mere comments. Their credibility and acceptance to teachers will heavily be dependent upon their reliable and attainable comments (Matete, 2009).

This is in agreement with John (2017) who asserts that school inspection is conducted to offer a purposeful and constructive advice for the purpose of improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools. In support of raising teachers' effectiveness, John suggests that school inspectors need to conduct continuous assessment, monitoring, and reviewing the performance and progress of pupils as well as reviewing methods of instruction delivery to yield desired impact on school improvement. This therefore, suggests that school inspectors need to provide continuous professional support to teachers in order to ensure that teachers have knowledge, skills and confidence to encourage pupils to be independent and creative learners (Sarah, 2015).

Generally, school inspection provides a critical examination, feedback and follow up to schools to improve their performance for quality of education. It is based on a range of evidence available to inspectors that is evaluated against a national framework. Inspection provides stake-holders with an expert and independent assessment of how well schools are performing. It also provides information to stake-holders at different levels of education administration the extent to which an acceptable standard of education is being provided. This provides assurance that minimum standards are being met, provides confidence in the use of public money and assists accountability, as well as indicating where improvements are needed, promote the improvement of individual schools and the education system as a whole (OFSTED, 2013; Gaertner & Wuster, 2014).

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

3.1. Description of the Study Area

The study was carried out in South Nation Nationalities and Peoples Regional State (SNNPRS); in selected primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. Kembata Tembaro Zone (KTZ) is found at 127 KM from Hawassa, and 350KM from Addis Ababa. The relative location of KTZ is north Hadiya Zone, east Aleba Special Woreda, South Wolyita Zone and west Dawro Zone and Oromia Regional State. The zone has seven woredas and three Town Administrations. Those are Tembaro Woreda, Hederotunito Zuria Woreda, Qachabira Woreda, Doyogena Woreda, Qadidagamela Woreda, Angacha Woreda and Demboya Woreda. The three town administrations are Hadero, Shinshicho and Durame Town administrations. The physical topography of the zone is high lands, plateaus and lowlands. Agriculture which accounts more than 97% is the most dominant income sources of the population. Among these, the study sites were, Tembaro, Hederotunito Zuria and Qachabira Woreda selected primary schools and Durame town administration. Since the researcher has twelve years of work experience, specifically in Kembata Tembaro Zone, particularly in Tembaro Woreda. This zone is purposively selected to obtain relevant and tangible data on the issues of primary school inspection.

3.2. Research Method

In this study both quantitative and qualitative research approaches were used with assumption that using mixed research method could neutralize the biases of any simple method; the more dominant approach used in the research was quantitative. But the qualitative data obtained from interviews and document analysis was applied to support quantitative data. It was used as a means for convergence and integrating qualitative and quantitative data (Creswell, 2012). The quantitative research approach was used for summarizing large amount of data and reaching generalization based on statistical estimation whereas qualitative approach to validate and triangulate the quantitative data. The researcher preferred this approaches because the approaches help to identify and measure the variables that influence school inspection practice and obtaining information concerning the current status of the practice and challenges of school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone and it also helps the researcher to describe what he observes concerning the issue.

3.3. Research Design

In this study, cross-sectional descriptive survey research design was employed with the assumption that it is helpful to obtain sufficient information from large number of respondents and to describe and explain the prevailing/current situations and practices. It also helps to describe the attitudes, opinions, behaviors, or characteristics of the population on the issue. Moreover, the cross-sectional descriptive survey research design also helps to gather data at a particular point in time with the intention of describing the nature of existing condition or identifying standards against which existing conditions can be compared. Because the major purpose of this study was, to describe the prevailing situations in schools and opinions related to the ongoing practice of school inspection. It also helps to draw valid general conclusions on practice and challenges of school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone (Abiy, 2009; Creswell, 2012). Additionally, the design is also preferred because of its being economical in terms of time and money in as far as a lot of credible data could be collected from a large population in a comparably short time with minimal resources (Best & Kan, 2006).

3.4. Source of Data

In this study, both primary and secondary data sources were used to obtain adequate and reliable information about practices and challenges of school inspection in the primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone.

3.5. Primary Sources of Data

The primary sources of data were primary school principals, primary school teachers and Woreda and town administration education office inspectors who have direct and indirect involvement in school inspection practice, in the randomly selected Woreda, town and primary schools. The rationale that the researcher selected these populations as primary sources of data is that due to they were directly or indirectly involved with the practices of school inspection, adequate exposure to research title and representative of school population.

3.6. Secondary Sources of Data

The secondary sources were sources used to strengthen the primary sources of data. These sources are school inspection recorded documents, feedbacks and reports on inspection.

3.7. Sample Size and Sampling Technique

The study was conducted on school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. There are seven woredas and three town administrations in the zone. To get manageable sample size, the researcher preferred multi- stage sampling technique because the

population is large, not easily identified and it helps to get more representative sample from geographically scattered participants, comparatively less time consuming, less expensive and makes the researcher to get final representatives by using two/three or four stages of sampling (Creswell, 2012; Taherdoost, 2016; Alvi, 2016). As stated in rule of thumb that sample size of 30% and above is appropriate for a population of thousand and less in number (Koul, 2005). Similarly, (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003) suggested that among the total population 10-30% can fulfill the sample sizes for descriptive survey. Thus, in this study four successive multi-stage sampling and simple random techniques were used to select sample woredas, cluster centers, schools, principals and teachers.

In the first stage, 3(42.85≈43%) Woredas (Tembaro, Hederotunito Zuria and Qachabira) were selected among seven woredas found in Kembata Tembaro Zone because of their scattered location, through simple random sampling technique, particularly lottery system to get representative sample. That is way three woredas were selected to easily manage the sample population. From the three town administrations (Durame, Shinshicho and Hadero), the Shinsicho town administration was selected through simple random sampling technique.

On the second stage, there are many cluster centers and many primary schools in the above selected three woredas and one town administration. There are six clusters in Tembaro Woreda, five clusters in Hederotunito Zuria Woreda and six clusters in Qachabira. Among these cluster centers 2(33%) selected from Tembaro Woreda; 2(40%) from Hederotunito Zuria Woreda and 1(33%) from Qachabira Woreda. Therefore, 5(31%) clusters were selected from total of 16(100%) cluster centers from the three sample woredas by using simple random sampling technique, particularly lottery method to easily manage population. In Shinsicho town administration there is one cluster. So, 1(100%) is selected through census. So doing this, Fenekera, and Gidansonga primary school clusters from Tembaro Woreda, Tunito-01 and Meskelchora cluster from Hederotunito Zuria Woreda and Mino cluster from Qachabira Woreda and Shinshicho cluster from Shinshicho Town administration were selected as sample.

In the third stage, all sample schools 16(100%) grouped under 6 cluster centers were taken as census. Accordingly, 6(100%) schools were taken from 2 cluster centers containing a total of 6 schools in Tembaro Woreda; 6(100%) schools taken from 2 cluster centers containing a total of 6 schools in Hederotunito Zuria Woreda and 3 (100%) schools were taken from 1 cluster center containing a total of 3 schools in Qachabira Woreda through census. From

Shinshicho Town, 1(30%) school was taken as sample. Therefore, 16(100%) schools were taken as sample through census.

Among 8(100%) Woreda and Town education office Inspectors from the three sampled Woreda and one town administration, 4(50%) were selected through proportionality. Here, one Woreda and one Town Education Inspectors selected from each Woreda. The purpose of selecting these inspectors was for interview to get more critical information about the practices and challenges of school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. These inspectors were selected because of their responsibility to carry out school inspection due to their current position in Woreda and town education offices.

Finally, 16(100%) primary school principals were taken through census sampling. 128(50%) out of 263 teachers working in the sample schools were selected through proportionality technique from each school and simple random technique from one school.

Totally, 16(100%) principals, 128(50%) teachers, 3(50%), woreda education office inspectors and 1(50%) town administration inspector respondents were taken as participants of this study.

Table 1: Summary of Sample Schools, Teachers and Techniques

Woredas	Sample cluster	Sample school	Total teacher	Sample teacher	%	Sampling Technique	
Tembaro	Fenekera	1 Fenekera	18	9	50	Simple Random from one school & Proportional from each school	
		2 Geber	15	8	53.3		
		3 Kona	16	8	50		
	Gidansonga	4 Gidansonga	16	8	50		
		5 Waro	17	8	48		
		6 Wagisa	13	6	46.2		
			95	47	49.5		
Hederotunito Zuria	Tunito-01	1 Tunito-01	19	9	49	Simple Random from one school & Proportional from each school	
		2 Oricha	14	7	50		
		3 Adancho	13	7	51.3		
	Meskel chora	4 Meskel chora	16	8	50		
		5 Mekerunja	17	8	50.5		
		6 Mugunja	11	5	49.5		
			90	44	49		
Qachabira	Mino	1 Mino	19	10	51.5	Simple Random from one school & Proportional from each school	
		2 Lesho	14	7	50		
		3 Buge-wallana	14	7	50		
			47	24	51.5		
Shinshicho Town	Shinshicho	1 Shinshicho	25	13	50.5	Simple Random	
Total	-	-	16 schools	257	128	49.8≈50	Simple random

Table 2: Summary of Total Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

No	Respondents	Population size	Sample size	%	Sampling technique
1	Woreda and town education inspectors	8	4	50	Proportionality
2	Primary school principals	16	16	100	census
3	Teachers	257	128	50	Simple random and Proportionality
5	Total	281	148	52.66≈53	Census and proportionality and simple random

3.8. Instruments of Data Collection

Questionnaire, interview and document analysis were used as data gathering instruments. In addition, the researcher used relevant reference books, journals, articles, internet sources and inspection manuals to support the findings of the study.

3.8.1. Questionnaire

The researcher used questionnaires to collect data from, school principals and teacher respondents. Questionnaires were believed better to get large amount of data from large number of respondents in a relatively shorter time with minimum cost. Hence, questionnaires were prepared in English language and administrated to all school principals and teacher participants with the assumption that they can understand the language to gather data concerning the issue assessing practice and challenges of school inspection in selected primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone.

In the study both close-ended and open-ended items were used. The close-ended questionnaires were prepared in the form of 4 points Likert type scale to collect the required data in relation to the practices and challenges of primary school inspection and from the sampled respondents because Likert scale mostly used in survey research and easy to construct, the simplest way to describe opinion, suggestion and frequency of respondents and also provide more freedom to respondents as (Best & Kan, 2006). The scale type consists of four scales 4=strongly agree, 3 = agree, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree and the

researcher can get a greater uniformity of responses of the respondents that would help him to make it easy to be processed.

In addition to this, few open- ended type of items were used in order to give opportunity to the respondents to express their feelings, perceptions, problems and intentions related to practice and challenges of school inspection in primary school of Kembata Tembaro Zone.

The questionnaire also consisted of two parts. The first part deals with the general background of the participants. The second and the largest part contained the whole number of closed- ended and few open- ended question items that address the basic questions of the study.

3.8.2. Interview

The interview permits greater depth of response of respondents' opinion and perception from respondents. In quantitative survey interviews, the researcher used a structured interview consisting of mostly closed-ended questions, provides response options to interviewees, and records their responses (Creswell, 2012). Thus, the interview is to collect supplementary information so as to stabilize the questionnaire response on practices and challenges of school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. For the purpose of this, structured interview were prepared for Woreda and town administration education office inspectors. The selection was on the basis of their position to effectively describe the reality in the study area, and they can have detailed information about the practices and challenges of school inspection. The interview guide question set for respondents and has one part, which targeted to obtain information related to the basic research questions. The interview sessions was conducted in the Amharic language to make the communication easier and subsequently translated to English Language.

3.8.3. Document Analysis

Documents like file containing school inspection frameworks, plans, checklists and feedback given for schools in relation to the practice of school inspection available at the sampled schools were assessed for the study.

3.9. Procedures of Data Collection

To get accurate and relevant data in order to answer basic research questions raised, the researcher had taken series of data gathering procedures. The expected data was collected by using questionnaires and interview from sample units. After having letter of authorization from Jimma University, the researcher went to Zonal Education Department for additional

letters to Woreda Education Office and schools for getting permission. Then the researcher directly went to three sampled Woreda and town education offices and principals of respective schools for approval and agreement. After making agreement, the researcher introduced his objective and purpose. Then the questionnaires were administered to sampled school principals and teachers. The participants were allowed to give their own answers to each item independently as needed by the researcher. They were closely assisted and supervised by the researcher himself. Finally, the questionnaires were collected and offered to the researcher.

The interview was held with Woreda and town administration education office inspectors after agreement made. While interview was being conducted, to minimize loss of information, the obtained data was carefully recorded with audio recorder. Finally, the data collected through various instruments from multiple sources was analyzed and interpreted.

3.10. Methods of Data Analysis

The analysis of the data was done based on the responses collected through questionnaires; interview and document analysis. The goal of data analysis is to describe accurately what happens in the data which was gathered from respondents. Based on nature of item and variables used, descriptive statistics like frequency, mean and standard deviation were computed by using SPSS version 20 to determine the existing practice and challenges of school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. In addition to this, the respondents' background such as sex, service years and educational qualification was analyzed by using tabulation in terms of frequency and percentage. Moreover, the study employed with mean score for the analysis of questionnaires.

The interpretations were made using four point Likert types scale ranging from strongly agrees (4) to strongly disagree (1). The percentage, mean value, standard deviations of teachers and principals were used for the sake of interpretation as follows: For the simplicity of interpretation the mean value 3.50-4.00 is high performed, 2.50-3.49 is moderately performed; 1.50-2.49 poor performed / low practiced and 0.1-1.49 very poor/low. Data gathered through open-ended questions, interview and document analysis from different sources were analyzed by narration and description by words.

3.11. Validity and Reliability

Checking the validity and reliability of data collecting instruments before providing to the actual study subject was the core to assure the quality of the data. To ensure validity of

instruments, initially the instrument is prepared by the researcher and developed under close guidance of advisors, who were involved in providing their inputs for validity of the instruments. The internal consistency reliability estimate was calculated using Cronbach's Coefficient of Alpha for the questionnaires.

The table below indicates the computed internal reliability coefficient test.

Table 3: Reliability Statistics

No	Variables/items	No of items	Cronbach's Alpha
1	To what extent do inspectors gather evidence to identify strength and weakness in primary schools	10	.96
2	what extent do inspectors give feedback based on observations in primary schools	8	.97
3	To what extent do inspectors carry out follow-up and accountability activities after inspection in primary schools	7	.93
4	A. Teachers perception How do school teachers perceive school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools	8	.98
	B. Principals perception How do school principals perceive school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools	16	.99
5	What are the challenges that school inspectors faces during school inspection in primary schools	19	.98
6	Total Reliability Coefficient /average	67	.97

In the table 3 above shows that the values of Cronbach's Alpha for each set of basic questions and the entire questionnaire. As it can be seen from the table for each field the value of Cronbach's Alpha ranges between 0.93 – 0.99. This range is considered as acceptable to ensure the reliability of each set of questionnaire. The researcher found that Coefficient of Alpha (α) to be 0.97 which is regarded as strong correlation Coefficient Pallant, J., (2013) suggested that, the Cronbach's Alpha result >0.9 excellent, >0.8 good, >0.7 acceptable, $\alpha < 0.6$ questionable, and < 0.5 poor.

3.12. Ethical Consideration

In order to collect the data, first the researcher has received an official letter written by Jimma University Department of Educational Planning and Management to inform the issue to Kembata Tembaro Zone Education Department. Then, the researcher has also received letter of entry from the zone to the sampled woredas education office. After this, the researcher took permission and explained the objectives of the study for sampled schools. Based on the letter the researcher secured permission and begin collecting data with the concerning bodies for the successful accomplishment of the study. Moreover, the cover page of the questionnaire has adequate information as to the purpose of the study and the procedures to be followed in filling out the questionnaire clearly indicated.

CHAPTR FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1. Introduction

This chapter deals with presentation, analyses and interpretation of data gathered from the respondents through questionnaire, interview and documents. The study tried to assess the practices and challenges of school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone.

Thus, the quantitative as well as qualitative analysis of data was incorporated in this chapter. The qualitative part was supposed to be complementary to the quantitative analysis.

The chapter consists of two major parts. The first section deals with the characteristics of the respondents (background of the respondents) and the second section presents the analysis and interpretation of the main data. The primary data were collected from the total of 148 respondents. To this effect, a total of 1052 copies of questionnaires were distributed to 132 teachers and 16 principals. The return rates of the questionnaires were 128(97%) and 16(100%) from the teachers and principals respectively. The rest 4(3%) of teachers' responses were rejected because their responses were incomplete. Besides, woreda education inspectors were interviewed to stabilize the questionnaire responses. The documents analyzed for this study were woreda education office's annual reports, feedbacks, inspection suggestion records and minutes which are related to school inspection practice were used. Finally in this chapter the major findings of the study were analyzed and discussed in line with the stated basic questions that lead to draw conclusions and recommendations.

4.2. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Before discussing the data related to the major questions, a summary of characteristics of the respondents was presented below. Description of the characteristics of the target population gives some basic information about sex, age, education qualification and job experience of sampled population involved in the study. Thus, the following table describes the general background of respondents involved in the study.

Table 4: Respondents' Distribution by Sex, Age, Work experience, Education and Level/qualification

No	Items	Category	Respondents					
			Teachers		Principals		Inspectors	
			No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Sex	Male	74	57.8	12	75	4	100
		Female	54	42.2	4	25	-	-
		Total	128	100	16	100	4	100
2	Age	21-25	11	8.5	-	-	-	-
		26-30	29	22.7	-	-	-	-
		31-35	22	17.2	4	25	1	25
		36-40	48	37.5	6	38	2	50
		41-45	13	10.2	1	6	-	-
		46 and above	5	3.9	5	31	1	25
		Total	128	100	16	100		
3	Service year/work experience in years	1-10	41	32	1	6		
		11-20	60	46.9	8	50	3	75
		21-30	27	21.1	7	44	1	25
		31-40	-	-	-	-	-	-
		41 and above	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Total	128	100	16	100	4	100
4	Educational level and Background	Certificate	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Diploma	52	41	-	-	-	-
		Degree	73	57	15	94	4	4
		MA/MSC	3	2	1	6	-	-
		Total	128	100	16	100	4	100

Source: field survey (2019)

From the table 4 above, in the study area, it is possible to deduce the following facts. The majority of the teachers respondents were 74 (57.8%) and 54(42.2%) males and females respectively. Among 16 principals, 12(75%) and 4(25%) were males and females respectively. In addition, all the inspectors 4(100%) were males.

From this, one can realize that the number of females in the teaching profession and the position of principals and inspection are much lower than males in the sampled woredas and schools.

Another description pointed out in the table 4 above, is that the age interval of the respondents. In this regard, the majority 112(87.5%) of the teachers respondents in the selected schools were found in the age interval of 26-45 years which signifies that the

teachers have mature and well experienced staffs who have productive and potential prospects. Following 5(3.9%) of the teachers respondents were found in the age of above 46 and the rest 11(8.5%) of the respondents were fall under the age category ranging between 21-25 years. Concerning to the age of principals, the all 11(68.75%) were found in the age interval of 31-45 years. The remaining 5(31.25%) age of principals falls above 46 years. Regarding the age of inspectors, all 4(100%) were found above 31 years. This implies that the majority of the respondents have the age interval of 26-45 years which enables them mature and well experienced to perform well.

Table 4, also depicts that the work experience of the respondents. In this regard, 41(32%) and 60(46.9%) of the teachers respondents have service of 1-10 and 11-20 years respectively. The rest 27(21.1%) have service of 21-30 years. On the other hand, only 1(6%) principal has service of 1-10 years of experience and the majority 8(50%) and 7(44%) of principals have service of 11-20 and 21-30 years respectively. This implies that the majority of the respondents have service times of above 11 years experiences, which enable them to have better working skills.

Concerning to the educational background /level of teachers, 52(41%), 73(57%) and 3(2%), of teachers were diploma, first degree and MA/MSc degree holders respectively. Regarding principals, 15(94%) of principals respondents were first degree holders. The remaining 1(6%) of principals respondents was MA degree holder. As illustrated in the above table, all the interviewee/Woreda and town education inspectors 4(100%) were first degree holders. Supporting this idea, MOE (2006E.C) indicated that, the Woreda education inspectors should hold at least fist degree. Therefore, one concludes that inspectors could enable to implement practice of school inspection. From this, one can understand that there is no much difference between teachers, principals, and inspectors regarding their level of education. Majority of study participants in the study areas were degree holders. In general, the results of the demographic characteristics of the respondents indicate that they can clearly understand and respond to the questions provided to them to gather the primary data.

4.3. Analysis of the extent which Inspectors Gather Evidence to Identify Strength and Weakness of Schools

The main purpose of this part is to assess the inspectors' practice of gathering evidence/data during actual inspection time in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. Then, respondents were asked to fill ten items by using four alternatives Strongly disagree (1),

Disagree (2), Agree (3) and Strongly agree(4) which represents the inspectors in educational offices as follows.

Table 5: Respondents view on inspectors' effort to gather evidence to identify Strengths and weakness of schools.

No	Items	Respondents				Over all mean
		Teachers(n=128)		Principals (n=16)		
		M	SD	M	SD	
1	Inspectors give adequate orientation to schools before actual inspection	2.32	1.1	2.31	.94	2.31
2	Inspectors make discussion with school director about purpose of the inspection during actual inspection time	3.05	.662	3.06	1.12	3.05
3	Inspectors make discussion with teachers and students during actual inspection time	2.21	.69	2.06	.77	2.13
4	Inspectors make discussion with parents and representatives of the community	2.15	.69	2.06	.77	2.10
5	Inspectors invite the director to give a short presentation about the school, describing its context, its strengths; its priorities for development.	3.05	.65	3.00	1.09	3.02
6	Inspectors use school's self-evaluation report to get information	3.41	.70	3.19	1.10	3.3
7	Inspectors check whether the school self-evaluation report has properly done or not to get real information	2.99	.67	2.81	.98	2.9
8	Inspectors make classroom observation when they visit your school to gather data about students interaction in the classroom	2.08	1.05	1.50	.51	1.79
9	Inspectors obtain data from different documents about students' performance such as attendance, roster, continuous assessment form, timetable, lesson plan, annual plan to make valid judgment	3.46	.68	3.19	1.04	3.32
10	Inspectors observe physical plants of the school such as leaning rooms, library, pedagogical center, toilet rooms about their functionality	3.35	.705	3.13	1.14	3.24
Over all mean						2.82

Key* n= number of respondent, M = mean, SD = standard deviation ; Mean value 3.50-4.00 high performed, 2.50 - 3.49 moderate performed, 1.50-2.49 low/poor performed and 0.1-1.49 very poor/low performed

As one can notice from the table 5, item 1, regarding to the inspectors effort of gathering evidence, to identify strength and weakness of schools, the mean score and standard deviation of teachers response (M=2.32, SD=1.11) and principals response (M=2.31, SD=.94) and with overall mean (M=2.31) indicates that they were disagreed on the practice providing adequate

orientation. Therefore, it is possible to conclude teachers and principals have not enough awareness about school inspection. Similarly, the data obtained from interview indicated that inspectors did not provide adequate orientation to schools. Instead, much of the interview respondents answered:

“Most of the time, orientation is given to school teachers and principals by writing letters. Sometimes one day orientation is given when there is time and budget.”

Thus, it can be concluded that teachers and principals were not satisfied with orientation given by inspectors towards school inspection. It is also possible to conclude that orientation towards school on inspection was not implemented properly. According to MOE (2006E.C) school inspection begins with providing adequate orientation schools to make self evaluation report. The implication is that unless the inspectors are providing adequate orientation on school inspection for teachers and principals that it would be difficult to collect real evidence/data on school performance.

As indicated in table 5, item 2 deals with the extent which inspectors make discussion with school directors the purpose of school inspection during actual inspection time. Accordingly, the mean scores and standard deviation of teachers and principals ($M=3.05$, $SD=.662$); ($M=3.06$, $SD=1.12$) respectively indicated that both teachers and principals as inspectors discuss with school directors about the purpose of school inspection during actual inspection time at moderate rate. Additionally, the overall mean ($M=3.05$) shows the agreement of the majority of respondents with the issue. Also, the information gathered through the interview and document analysis show that the inspectors discuss with principals during actual inspection time. Therefore, based on the majority of respondents; it can be concluded that teachers and principals have moderately awareness of the significance of school inspection in the study area.

As it can be seen in table 5, item 3, respondents were asked their agreement level regarding the extent which inspectors discuss with teachers and students during actual inspection time. To this end, the mean score and standard deviation of teachers ($M=2.21$, $SD=.69$) and ($M=2.06$, $SD=.77$) principals show that the practice of discussing with teachers and students during actual inspection time is insufficient. The overall mean also ($M=2.13$) shows the disagreement of the majority of respondents with the issue. Besides, as interview response

from inspectors indicated that they could not discuss with teachers and students at school inspection time due to shortage of time, budget and other facilities. Regarding this, Nichols (2013) suggested that to obtain real data about school performance, inspectors should discuss more with teachers and students. In this respect Nichols also recommended that inspectors should discuss with teachers and students in the actual inspection time in schools.

As we can see from the table 5, item 4, the respondents were requested whether inspectors discuss with parents and representatives of the community such as PTA when they gather data about school performance. In this case, the mean value and standard deviation of teachers response ($M=2.15$, $SD=.69$) and principals response ($M=2.06$, $SD=.77$) reveals that both teachers and principals were rated low item regard to the discussion between parents and representatives of the community during actual inspection time. Similarly, the data obtained from interview indicted that most of time inspectors discuss with school principals during actual inspection time to gather data from schools. They did not discuss with parents and representatives of the community to gather data from schools because of financial constraints and time limitation. Regarding this, MOE (2012) describes that inspectors should discuss with parents and PTA when they are collecting evidence about school performance. But in this study the inspectors from this ground displays that inspectors are not discussing with parents and PTA members.

From this, the researcher concluded that teachers and principals were not happy with efforts made by inspectors to discuss with parents and representatives of the community during actual inspection time to gather data from schools.

With respect to table 5 item 5, teachers and principals were asked to rate the extent which inspectors invite the director to give a short presentation about the school, describing its context, its strengths; its priorities for development during actual evidence gathering. In this respect the mean and standard deviation of response show at ($M=3.05$, $SD=.65$) and ($M=3.00$, $SD=1.09$) respectively. This clearly indicated that the extent that inspectors inviting directors to give a short presentation about the school was medium.

As indicated in the same table of item 6, above teachers and principals were asked the extent which inspectors use school's self-evaluation report to get information during school inspection. In this case, teachers, principals with mean and standard deviation ($M=3.41$, $SD=.70$) and ($M=3.19$, $SD=1.10$) with the overall mean ($M=3.3$) indicated that inspectors'

use of school's self-evaluation report to get information during school inspection at moderate rate. Regarding this, the qualitative data obtained from interview show that most of time inspectors ignore to use school's self evaluation report because, most of time principals report as exaggerated manner. As a result, they are reluctant to use school self evaluation report. Additionally, the data obtained from document analysis of some schools report such as Waro, Kona, Gebera, Buge, Wagisa, and Oricha self evaluation indicated that the way the report done and the existence of schools did not match. It is more of exaggerated. Form this one can concluded that inspectors were not using school's self evaluation report effectively as much as important. Regarding this, MOE (2006E.C) in its inspection frame wok stated that inspectors should orient schools to do self evaluation report. Similarly, Whitby (2010) outlined that school self-evaluation and school inspections are to contribute optimally and complimentary to school improvement; as a result, he suggested that a combination of school self-evaluation and external inspection is very important.

In item 7 of the table 5, teachers and principals respondent were asked to rate the extent that inspectors check school self-evaluation report has done properly to get real information. As indicated in the table, the calculated mean and of teachers ($M=2.99$, $SD=.67$) and principals ($M=2.81$, $SD=.98$) indicated moderate performance on the issue. The overall mean ($M=2.9$) shows the disagreement of the majority of respondents with the issue. From this one can concluded that inspectors were not adequately checking up whether the school self-evaluation report has done properly.

With regard to item 8 of table 5, the respondents were asked to rate the extent which inspectors make classroom observation when they visit schools to gather data about students' interaction in the classroom. Accordingly, teachers with ($M=2.08$, $SD=1.05$) and school principals with ($M=1.50$, $SD=.51$) mean scores and standard deviation respectively indicated that inspectors were poor in making classroom observation when they gather data about students interaction in the classroom. Additionally, the overall mean ($M=1.79$) indicated that majority the respondents were disagreed on the issue. On the other hand, the data collected from the interview, the WEO inspectors revealed that:

“As they explained, they did not make classroom observation in all classes in all kinds of subjects because of shortage of time and budget. Thus, they described that they visit only one or two class from each inspected schools as sample.”

Therefore, from the results of the mean scores and the data obtained from the interview, one can conclude that inspectors did not make adequate classroom observation when they visit schools to gather data about students' interaction in the classroom. Regarding this, MOE (2006) stated that inspectors should spend half of inspection in classroom observation. But this study found that inspectors did not make adequate classroom observation. From this the researcher concluded that it is impossible, to give valid judgment on the classroom instruction without adequate observation.

In item number 9 of the same table, respondents were asked to rate the extent that inspectors obtain data from different documents about students' performance such as attendance, roster, continuous assessment form, timetable, lesson plan, and annual plan to make valid judgment. Consequently, teachers and principals with ($M = 3.46$, $SD = .68$) and ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 1.04$) mean scores and standard deviation respectively, indicated that inspectors obtain data at moderate rate from different documents about students' performance such as attendance, roster, continuous assessment form, timetable, lesson plan, and annual plan to make valid judgment. Besides, with overall mean ($M = 3.32$) the majority of respondents agreed as inspectors' obtaining data from different documents was moderate rate. Thus, it can be concluded that inspectors obtaining data from different documents about students' performance such as attendance; roster, continuous assessment form, timetable, lesson plan, and annual plan to make valid judgment was insufficient in the study area.

In item 10 of the same table, the respondents were asked to show the extent that inspectors observe physical plants of the school such as learning rooms, library, pedagogical center, toilet rooms about its functionality during gathering evidence from schools. In this regard, the calculated mean score and standard deviation of teachers ($M = 3.35$, $SD = .70$) and principals ($M = 3.13$, $SD = 1.14$) indicated that inspectors moderately observe physical plants of the school. Furthermore, the overall mean ($M = 3.24$) shows that the majority of respondents agreed at moderate rate on the issue. Therefore, it can be concluded that inspectors were observing physical plants of the school such as leaning rooms, library, pedagogical center, toilet rooms moderately about its functionality during gathering evidence in schools.

4.4. Analysis of the Extent to which Inspectors Give Feedback to Schools based on Observations

This section was assessment of teachers and principals' response on the extent of feedback given by inspectors based on observations to the primary Schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. To know, the extent of feedback the researcher prepared 8 items to respondents. Then, that was responded by using the degrees of strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree.

Table 6: Respondents View on Inspectors feedback given to schools based on observations

No	Items	Respondents				Over all mean
		Teachers(n=128)		Principals (n=16)		
		M	SD	M	SD	
1	Inspectors provide verbal feedback on their findings about how schools need to improve after inspection	3.04	.82	3.37	.88	3.20
2	Inspectors provide clear; written feedback that shows how schools need to improve after inspection	2.76	.70	2.56	.81	2.66
3	Inspectors provide timely feedback that gives opportunity to improve limitations in the school performance	2.76	.70	2.00	.63	2.38
4	Inspectors provide specific feedback that shows areas that need to be improved	2.75	.44	2.18	.75	2.47
5	Inspectors provide feasible feedback that can be implementable/practicable with the capacity of the school	2.87	.46	1.93	.77	2.4
6	Inspectors provide constructive feedback that encourages for improvement	2.85	.57	2.00	.81	2.43
7	Inspectors provide relevant feedback that can be applicable in school contexts	3.0	.53	1.93	.77	2.46
8	Inspectors provide accurate feedback that will lead to actual improvement	2.95	.55	2.25	.68	2.45
Overall mean						2.56

Key* n= number of respondent, **M** = mean, **SD** = standard deviation ; Mean value 3.50-4.00 high performed, 2.50 - 3.49 moderate performed, 1.50-2.49 low/poor performed and 0.1-1.49 very poor/low performed

Table 6 of item 1, the respondents were asked, to give their response on the extent inspectors provide verbal feedback on their findings about how schools need to improve after inspection. Regarding this, the mean score and standard deviation of teachers and principals (M=3.04, SD=.82) and (M=3.37, SD=.88) respectively indicated that, inspectors provide verbal feedback moderately on their findings about how schools need to improve after inspection. Additionally, the overall mean (M=3.20) shows that school inspectors provide

verbal feedback on their findings about how schools need to improve after inspection was moderately performed. The qualitative data obtained from interview supported this idea that, inspectors give verbal feedback at the end of inspection session in the school. Additionally, the data obtained from document analysis indicated that there was records of inspection suggestion file in the schools which show areas to be improved but it not as much as expected. Regarding oral feedback, MOE (2013) described that inspectors are expected to give enough oral feedback at the end school inspection session in each schools. At the same table item 2, the respondents were asked to rate the extent inspectors provide clear; written feedback that shows how schools need to improve after inspection. Accordingly, teachers and principals with mean score and standard deviation of (M=2.76, SD=.70) and (M=2.56, SD=.81) respectively indicated that inspectors did not provide clear; written feedback that shows how schools need to improve after inspection. Furthermore, the overall mean (M=2.66) also tells that majority of teachers and principals were disagreed on the issue. Similarly, document analysis indicated that majority of inspectors did not provide clear; written feedback that shows how schools need to improve after inspection. They simply give feedback that tells the level which school attained.

From this one can deduce that feedback given from inspectors in the study area was not clear that shows how schools need to improve after inspection. Regarding this, Nicholas (2013) noted that:

“... if schools are needed to improve as a result of inspection three things must be in place namely; the gathering of accurate data about the school and the identification of relevant and critical issues; the capability of inspectors to identify and communicate improvements that are suitable in a particular school context; and the formulation and production of an action plan and follow up.”

The implication shows that without giving proper written feedback, it is difficult to inform limitations of schools that needs improvement.

In the table 6 of item 3, the respondents were asked to give their agreement; the extent inspectors provide timely feedback that gives opportunity to improve limitations in the school performance. Consequently, the mean score and standard deviation of teachers (M=2.76, SD=.70) and principals (M=2.00, SD=.63) reported that inspectors are at poor rate in providing timely feedback that gives opportunity to improve limitations in the school performance.

Similarly, the overall mean ($M=2.38$) describes that majority of the respondents were disagreed on the issue. Similarly, the data obtained from interview indicated that inspectors did not provide timely feedback that gives opportunity to improve limitations in the school performance. Most of the interviewee noted that:

“They did not give timely feedback that gives opportunity to improve limitations in the school performance. This is due to inadequate number of inspectors in the Woreda education office and there are a number of schools in each woreda and shortage of time.”

From this, it is possible to conclude that inspectors did not provide timely feedback that gives opportunity to improve limitations in the school performance. As, noted MOE (2006E.C), inspectors should provide timely feedback that enables principals and teachers to improve their limitations in the school performance. Similarly, Ehren, Leeuw & Scheerens, (2005) advice that educators need to give timely feedback.

At the same table item 4, the respondents asked whether inspectors are providing specific feedback that shows areas that need to be improved or not. Thus, teachers and principals with mean score and standard deviation of ($M=2.75$, $SD=.44$) and ($M=2.81$, $SD=.75$) respectively indicated that inspectors did not provide specific feedback that shows areas that need to be improved. In addition, the overall mean ($M=2.47$) shows that the majority of respondents were disagreed on the point. Therefore, it can be concluded that that inspectors did not provide specific feedback that shows areas that need to be improved. Regarding this, Mmbando & Hongoke (2010) outlined that one of the assumption underling school inspection is, inspection process leads to a set of feedback recommendations which describe the main areas requiring improvement of specific to the school inspected.

At the same table item 5, the respondents were asked whether inspectors provide feasible feedback that can be implementable /practicable with the capacity of the school or not. Regarding this, the calculated mean score and standard deviation of teachers ($M=2.87$, $SD=.46$) and principals ($M=1.93$, $SD=.77$) show that inspectors providing feasible feedback that can be implementable/practicable with the capacity of the school is low. As well, the overall mean ($M=2.4$) also informs that the majority of the respondents were disagreed on the issue. Similarly, during interview the participants informed that the inconsistency of some standards make complexity to give feasible feedback that can be implementable /practicable with the capacity of the school. Regarding this, one of the interviewee replied that:

“There is complexity in the standards that mean some secondary school standards are mixed within primary schools and primary schools standards are mixed within secondary schools. As a result, it is difficult to give feasible feedback that can be implementable /practicable with the capacity of the school.”

In the same table of item 6 the respondents requested whether inspectors provide constructive feedback that encourages for improvement or not. On this issue, teachers and principals with (M=2.85, SD=.57) and (M=2.00, SD=.81) mean score and standard deviation respectively depicted that inspectors did not provide constructive feedback that encourages for improvement. Also, the overall mean (M=2.43) tells that inspectors did not provide constructive feedback that encourages for improvement. Concerning this, Akindele (2012) in his finding indicated that one of the challenges that hinder implementation inspection feedback is lack of constructive feedback. He also recommended that inspectors /supervisors are expected to give constructive feedback.

On the same table item 7, indicated that teachers and principals with (M=3.00, SD=.53) and (M=1.93, SD=.77) mean score and standard deviation respectively indicated that inspectors did not provide relevant feedback that can be applicable in school contexts effectively. The overall mean (M=2.46) shows that majority of the respondents disagreed on issue. Regarding this, Haule (2012) suggested that giving feedback that can be implementable with in capacity of school promotes implementation of proposed recommendations/ feedbacks. Supporting this, Matete (2009) explained that non provision relevant feedback to schools which can be implementable in school context imposes burden on the minds of school leaders.

In the same table of item 8 respondents were asked whether inspectors provide accurate feedback that leads to actual improvement or not. The calculated mean score and standard deviation of teachers and principals (M=2.95, SD=.55) and (M=2.25, SD=.68) respectively reported that inspectors did not provide accurate feedback which leads to actual improvement to the schools. The overall mean (M=2.45) implies that the respondents were disagreed on the issue. Regard to giving accurate feedback Jhon (2017) outlined that offering accurate feedback enables schools to see the schools achievement standard unless school leaders unable to understand their strength and limitations.

4.5. Analysis of the Extent to which Inspectors take follow-up Activities and make schools accountable after inspection

The main purpose of this section is to assess the extent of inspectors taking follow-up activities and making schools accountable after inspection. Therefore, the researcher analyzed the data based on seven items, which was used by respondents on scale of strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree as follows.

Table 7: Respondents View on the extent of inspectors taking follow-up activities and making schools accountable after inspection

No	Items	Respondents				Overall mean
		Teaches (n=128)		Principals (n=16)		
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1	Inspectors take post-inspection follow up activities for schools that have met the standard to improve their performance further	1.87	.64	1.93	.57	1.9
2	Inspectors take post-inspection follow up activities for school below the standard/ low achiever for improvement	2.13	.60	2.12	.50	2.13
3	Inspectors follow up the implementation of proposed recommendation in school	2.05	.45	2.06	.44	2.55
4	Inspectors asses improvements and outcomes made after feedback has given	1.93	.42	2.00	.36	1.97
5	Inspectors facilitate experience sharing programs among schools	1.70	.52	1.81	.54	1.76
6	Inspectors make recognition for schools achieved the level/standard	1.62	.54	1.75	.57	1.69
7	Inspectors make responsible bodies accountable if school has not made the required improvement	1.58	.58	1.68	.60	1.6
Overall mean						1.94

Key* n= number of respondent, M = mean, SD = standard deviation; Mean value 3.50-4.00 high performed, 2.50 - 3.49 moderate performed, 1.50-2.49 low/poor performed and 0.1-1.49 very poor/low performed

As shown in table 7 items 1, the respondents were asked whether inspectors take post-inspection follow up activities for schools that have met the standard to improve their performance further or not. The calculated mean score and standard deviation of teachers (M=1.87, SD=.64) and principals (M=1.93, SD=.57) show that inspectors did not take post-inspection follow up activities for schools that have met the standard to improve their performance further. In addition, the overall mean (M=1.9) shows that almost all of the respondents were disagreed on the issue. Regarding this MOE (2006E.C) describes that schools that met the standard should not left from observation/inspection. They should be

followed for further improvement. The implication shows that, it is impossible to sustain progress in schools without further follow up.

In the same table item 2, respondents needed to show the level of response of the extent which inspectors take post-inspection follow up activities for school below the standard/ low achiever for improvement. Regarding this, the mean score and standard deviation of teachers and principals ($M=2.13$, $SD=.60$) and ($M=2.12$, $SD=.50$) respectively indicated that inspectors post-inspection follow up activities for school below the standard/ low achiever for improvement was not sufficient. Besides, the overall mean ($M=2.13$) describes that the majority of the respondents were disagreed on the issue. Similarly, the data obtained from interview also indicated that due to lack of adequate budget, time and facilities; follow up activity was very low. Reading this, one of the interviewee replied that:

“...even if the budget planned for inspection is for reporting we could not get it. For many times we reported to zone, we could not get adequate response regarding lack of adequate budget and time and facilities on inspection practice.”

As described the same table of item 3, the respondents were requested whether inspectors follow the implementation of proposed recommendation in school or not. On this issue, teachers and principals with ($M=2.05$, $SD=.45$) and ($M=2.06$, $SD=.44$) mean scores and standard deviation respectively and overall mean ($M=2.55$) showed that inspectors moderately follow the implementation of proposed recommendation in school. Concerning this, Mmbando & Hongoke, (2010) inspection can be gauged from the extent to which follow-up and accountability activities after inspection practiced to check whether the recommendations are implemented or not. However, the findings of the study revealed that inspectors did not follow up the implementation of proposed recommendation in schools.

As in the same table of item 4, indicates, teachers and principals with ($M=1.93$, $SD=.42$) and ($M=2.00$, $SD=.36$) mean scores and standard deviation respectively confirmed that, Inspectors assessment of improvements and outcomes made after feedback was very low. The overall mean also ($M=1.97$) shows almost all of the respondents strongly disagreed on the issue. In line with this Wolf (2009) described that through inspection assessing improvements and outcomes made after feedback is one of crucial role of inspectors. From this, one can conclude that inspection follow up practice of assessing improvements and outcomes made after feedback in the study area was poor performed.

In the same table item 5, the respondents were requested whether inspectors facilitate experience sharing programs among schools or not. Consequently, the calculated mean scores and standard deviation of teachers ($M=1.70$, $SD=.52$) and principals ($M=1.81$, $SD=.54$) respectively indicated that inspectors were not facilitating experience sharing programs among schools adequately. The overall mean ($M=1.76$) tells that almost all respondents were disagreed on the issue. Similarly, the data obtained from interview indicated that inspectors did not implement experience sharing programs among schools due to lack of budget, time and facilities. Regarding this, MOE (2006E.C) describes that one of inspections practice to enable schools to share experience among each other. But the findings of the study show that inspectors did not exercise experience sharing program among schools.

In the same table above, item 6, the respondents were asked whether inspectors make recognition for schools achieved the level/standard or not. Concerning this, the mean scores and standard deviation of teachers and principals ($M=1.62$, $SD=.54$) and ($M=1.75$, $SD=.57$) respectively indicated that inspectors did not make recognition for schools achieved the level/standard. Additionally, the overall mean ($M=1.69$) describes that majority of the respondents were strongly disagreed on the issue. Regarding this, almost all interviewee replied that they believe the importance of making recognition for schools achieved the level/standard but due to lack of budget they could not able to conduct recognition program for schools achieved the level/standard rather than giving certificate.

In item 7 of table 7 teachers with ($M=1.58$, $SD=.58$) and principals ($M=1.68$, $SD=.60$) mean scores and standard deviation indicated that inspectors did not make responsible bodies accountable if school has not made the required improvement. Similarly, the overall mean ($M=1.6$) shows the majority of the respondents were strongly disagreed on the point. The data from all of the interviewee show that they did not take any measurement/accountability system on schools which did not show progress rather than describing and reporting the level the school exists. Regarding this, the interviewee explained that:

“Generally, there is a problem in practice and implementation of school inspection. In the school inspection framework in objective part indicated that one of the main objectives of school inspection is improving schools for quality of education and taking accountability/ measurement on schools did not show improvements in continuous inspection. But, in the framework there is no any

disciplinary measurement/ accountability activities described in the framework. As a result, they faced problem to implement taking measurement / accountability actions on those schools which do not show progress/ improvement.”

4.6. Analysis of Teachers’ Perceptions towards School Inspection as a Facilitator of School Improvement in primary Schools for Quality of Education.

This part of data analysis deals with teachers’ perception towards school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. Hence, the following eight items have been identified and the responses of the respondent teachers were presented, and analyzed in table 8 below.

Table 8: Respondents view on Perceptions on school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools

No	Items	Respondents Teaches(n=128)						
			SA	A	DA	SDA	Mean	SD
1	School inspection practiced by inspectors from Woreda education office is a useful practice to improve schools performance	N 6 % 4.7	25 19.5	93 72.7	4 3.1	2.26	.59	
2	The inspection feedback enabled me to improve my limitation observed during actual inspection	N 3 % 2.3	20 15.6	100 78.1	5 3.9	2.16	.514	
3	My students’ academic performance is improved after inspection feedback has given	N 1 % .8	20 15.6	101 78.9	6 4.7	2.13	.47	
4	school inspection brought encouragement to me as a school a teacher	N 3 % 2.3	20 15.6	96 75.0	9 7.0	2.13	.55	
5	School inspection is useful in helping me to identify my own needs for improvement	N 2 % 1.6	21 16.4	92 71.9	13 10.2	2.09	.56	
6	My lesson plan preparation is improved after class room observation by inspectors	N 2 % 1.6	23 18.0	93 72.7	10 7.8	2.13	.55	
7	My students’ continuous assessment practice is improved after inspection feedbacks	N 2 % 1.6	26 20.3	86 67.2	14 10.9	2.13	.60	
8	My classroom instruction has improved as a result of school inspection feedback	N 2 % 1.6	20 15.6	90 70.3	16 12.5	2.06	.58	
Overall mean						2.14		

Key* n= number of respondent, M = mean, SD = standard deviation; Mean value 3.50-4.00 high performed, 2.50 - 3.49 moderate performed, 1.50-2.49 low/poor performed and 0.1-1.49 very poor/low performed.

As indicated in item 1 of table 8 respondent teachers were asked to give their view on school inspection practiced from inspectors as a useful practice to improve schools performance. Regarding this, 93(72.7%) and 4(3.1%) of teachers respondents respectively replied that they were disagreed and strongly disagreed on the issue. The remaining 25(19.5%) and 6(4.7%) of the respondents replied as they were agreed and strongly agreed respectively. In addition to this, the mean scores and standard deviation of teachers ($M=2.26$, $SD=.59$) reveals that inspection practice as carried out by inspectors as not perceived as a useful practice to improve schools performance. Similarly, the qualitative data from interview indicated that the teachers did not perceive school inspection as useful practice to improve schools performance. As findings of Mmbando & Hongoke, (2010) revealed that school inspection is the integral part of school improvement aimed for performance improvement and quality of education. Its purposes are centered on controlling school performance. In a wider sense, the purposes school inspection practice is centered with overall performance evaluation for quality of education.

In item 2 of the above table, 5(3.9%) and 100(78.1%) teachers admitted that inspection feedback given by inspectors did not enable them to improve their limitation observed during actual inspection. On the other hand 3(2.3%) and 20(15.6%) of teachers respondents confirmed that inspection feedback given by inspectors enabled them to improve their limitation observed during actual inspection. Furthermore, teachers with ($M=2.16$, $SD=.51$) mean and standard deviation respectively indicated that the inspection feedback given by inspectors did not enable them to improve their limitation observed during actual inspection. In addition to this, the information gathered through the interviews made indicated that teachers did not perceive inspection feedback enable them to improve their limitation observed during actual inspection. They perceive it as political mandate. To sum up, based on the findings one can infer that the respondents have not better understanding of how inspection feedback enables them to improve their limitations. Similarly, Haule's (2012) empirical study on "the perceptions of school teachers and leaders toward school inspections in Tanzania Secondary Schools" found that teachers did not perceive as it enables for performance improvement for quality of education. Moreover, the finding indicated that the teachers needed awareness creation about school inspection feedback.

As indicated in the table 8, item 3, almost of teachers respondents 101(78.9%) and 6(4.7%) disagreed and strongly disagreed about the students' academic performance improvement

after inspection feedback has given, whereas some of them 1(0.8%) and 20(15.6%) of teacher respondents replied as they strongly agree and agree respectively. Besides, the calculated mean scores and standard deviation of teachers ($M=2.13$, $SD=.47$) indicated that teachers did not perceive as students' academic performance improved after inspection feedback has given. This implies that the feedback given from inspectors is inadequate. Then, the inspectors as well woreda education office as required for teachers to work with providing awareness opportunity which helps to develop further potential in order to have good understanding. From this, the researcher believes that creating awareness is very important to upgrade teachers to have better understanding about inspection feedback. Therefore, the education offices including inspectors should give enough emphasis for awareness creation.

As can be observed from the table 8, item 4, and the teacher respondents i.e. 9(7.0%) and 96(75%) were strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively school inspection brought encouragement to them as a school a teacher. The rest 20(15.6 %) and 3(2.3%) of teacher respondents were agreed and strongly agreed respectively. Additionally, the mean and standard deviation ($M=2.13$, $SD=.55$) of teachers responses indicated that strong disagreement on the encouragement to them as a school a teacher through inspection practice. Then, the researcher motivated to decide on disagree because the interviews clearly pointed that the inspectors were not well worked on the described case. According to Matete (2009), Nicholas (2013), Haule (2012), found that good awareness and understanding of teachers depends on giving adequate orientation, creating awareness about the purpose of school inspection unless teachers perceive as imposing burden on them. Therefore, it is quite clear that, unless offering adequate awareness in concepts of school inspection in education sector is carefully examined in line with its practice, the aims of inspection could not be achieved.

In the same table above, in item 5, 105(82%) of the teacher respondents replied that they were disagreed on the issue. The remaining, 23(18%) of the respondents were agreed on the issue. Furthermore, teachers with ($M=2.09$, $SD=.56$) mean scores and standard deviation respectively indicated that they did not perceive school inspection as useful as in helping them to identify their own needs for improvement. This implies that the teachers understanding of school inspection, as useful as in helping them to identify their own needs for improvement is low.

With respect to item 6 of table 8 above, researcher requested questionnaires related to the extent of improving teachers lesson plan preparation after class room observation made by

inspectors. Accordingly, 93(72.7%) and 10(7.8%) of teacher respondents admitted that they disagree and strongly disagree respectively on the point and the rest 23(18%) and 2(1.6%) of the teacher respondents, agreed and strongly agreed respectively. Additionally, the mean score and standard deviation of teachers ($M=2.13$, $SD=.55$) indicated that teachers have negative perception on the issue. From this, the researcher concluded that, the significant number of teachers were not agree as inspection practice enables them to improve the lesson plan after class room observation made by inspectors.

In table 8 of item 7, the, researcher requested questionnaires related with teachers perception to the extent which students' continuous assessment practice improvement after inspection feedback. Concerning this, 86(67.2%) and 14(10.9%) of teacher respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed on the issue respectively and the remaining 26(20.3%) and 2(1.6%) of the respondents agreed on the issue. In addition to this the mean scores of and standard deviation of teachers ($M=2.13$, $SD=.60$) show that teachers have low perception as inspection feedback improves students' continuous assessment practice. From this result the researcher concluded that teachers perception regarding students' continuous assessment practice improvement after inspection feedback was inadequate and below standard. From this, the researcher concluded that, the greater number of teachers were not agree as inspection practice enables them to improve students' continuous assessment practice after class room observation made by inspectors.

The data on table 8 item 8, the respondents were asked to indicate their agreement level concerning classroom instruction improvement as a result of school inspection feedback. Regarding this, 90(70.3%) and 16(12.5%) the teacher respondents were disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively and the rest, 20(15.6%) and 2(1.6%) agreed and strongly agreed respectively. Similarly, the response of teachers with ($M=2.06$, $SD=.58$) mean scores and standard deviation show that teachers have low perception regarding classroom instruction improvement after feedback has given. Therefore, it is quite clear that, unless improving classroom instruction, the value of inspection is fruit less. To this end, John (2017) outlined that the main aim of school inspection is to improve quality of education through school improvement and the school improvement is manifested through effective classroom instruction and students' academic achievement.

4.7. Analysis of Principals' Perceptions towards School Inspection as a Facilitator of School Improvement in Primary Schools for Quality of Education.

This part of data analysis deals with principals' perception towards school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. Hence, the following sixteen items have been identified and the responses of the respondent principals were presented, and analyzed in table 9 below.

Table 9: Respondents view on Perceptions on school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools

No	Items		Respondents Principals(n=16)					
			SA	A	DA	SDA	M	SD
1	My performance evaluation skill is improved after inspection feedback has given	N	2	9	4	1	2.75	.77
		%	12.5	56.3	25	6.3		
2	My performance evaluation skill is improved after inspection feedback has given	N	-	7	8	1	2.37	.61
		%	-	44	50	6		
3	My controlling skill is improved after inspection feedback has given	N	-	7	8	1	2.37	.61
		%	-	44	50	6		
4	My controlling skill is improved after inspection feedback has given	N	-	7	8	1	2.37	.61
		%	-	44	50	6		
5	School inspection practiced by inspectors from Woreda education office is a useful practice to the schools for performance improvement for quality of education	N	2	3	10	1	2.31	.87
		%	12.5	18.7	62.5	6.25		
6	My school has achieved the required minimum performance standards after inspection feedback trough follow up	N	-	5	10	1	2.25	.57
		%	-	31	63	6		
7	Inspection practice informed to stake holders about how well my school is performing	N	-	3	11	2	2.06	.57
		%	-	18.8	68.8	12.4		
8	Inspection practice secured an effort to improve the quality of education	N	1	3	10	2	2.19	.75
		%	6.2	18.8	62.5	12.5		
9	Inspection enabled my schools to work in collaboration with the government and people	N	-	7	8	1	2.37	.61
		%	-	44	50	6.2		
10	My resource management skill is improved after inspection feedback has given	N	-	9	6	1	2.50	.63
		%	-	56.3	37.5	6.2		
		%	-	31.3	56.3	12.4		

Table 9: Respondents view on Perceptions on school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools (continued)

No	Item		Respondents (Principals=16)				Mean	SD
			SA	A	DA	SDA		
11	My planning skill is improved after inspection feedback has given	N	1	6	8	1	2.44	.72
		%	6.2	37.5	50	6.2		
12	My students outcomes/ academic performance is improved after inspection	N	-	7	8	1	2.37	.61
		%	-	44	50	6.2		
13	My student ethics is improved after inspection feedback	N	-	7	8	1	2.37	.61
		%	-	44	50	6.2		
14	My school's engagement with parents and the community is improved as a result of inspection	N	-	5	9	2	2.19	.65
		%	-	31.3	56.3	12.4		
15	school inspection brought encouragement to me as a school principal	N	-	7	8	1	2.37	.61
		%	-	44	50	6.2		
16	My file documentation skill is improved as a result of inspection feedback	N	1	7	7	1	2.50	.73
		%	6.2	44	44	6.2		
Over all mean						2.38		

Key* n= number of respondent, M = mean, SD = standard deviation ;Mean value 3.50-4.00 high performed, 2.50 - 3.49 moderate performed, 1.50-2.49 low/poor performed and 0.1-1.49 very poor/low performed

As indicated in the table 9, in item 1, the majority of principals respondents, 9(56.3%) and 2(12.4%) were agreed and strongly agreed that their performance evaluation skill is improved after inspection feedback has given. The remaining 4(25%) and 1(6.3%) the principal respondents were disagreed on the issue. Relatively, the mean scores and standard deviation of principals (M=2.75, SD=.77) show that principals' on their performance evaluation skill improvement after inspection feedback is moderately.

As can be seen from the table 6, items 2, 3 and 4 the principals requested questionnaires related with principals perception on improvement of decision making, controlling, and instructional supervision skill improvement after inspection feedback. Regarding these points, 8(50%) and 1 (6%) of the respondents replied that as they disagreed and strongly disagreed on the issues. The remaining 7(44%) of the respondents were agreed on the points. Furthermore, the mean scores and standard deviation of principals in item 2, 3 and 4 (M=2.37, SD=.61) indicated that principals have low perception on the issues. From this, one infers that awareness creation is important to promote practice of school inspection and giving in- service training to inspectors. Regarding this Chanda (2002) suggested that introducing the importance of school inspection to stakeholders is very important to

implement the practice of school inspection effectively unless it is difficult to implement inspection as it brings positive effect on stakeholders.

In the same table of item 5, principal respondents were asked rate the extent which school inspection practiced from inspectors as useful practice to the schools for performance improvement. Accordingly, 11(68.5%) of the respondents were disagreed and the rest 5(31.25%) agreed. Similarly, principals with mean scores and standard deviation ($M=2.31$, $SD=.87$) show that they did not perceive school inspection practiced by inspectors as useful practice to the schools for performance improvement. Similarly, the data obtained from interview indicated that principals' perception towards school inspection as useful practice to the schools for performance improvement was low. From this one concluded that principals were not well satisfied with school inspection practiced by woreda education inspectors.

As can be observed from the table 9, item 6, the researcher asked the principal respondents to rate the extent which they agree as their school achieved the required minimum performance standards after inspection feedback trough follow up. To this end, the majority of principal respondents 11(69%) were disagreed. The remaining 5(31%) replied as they agree on the issue. Furthermore, the mean scores and standard deviation of principals ($M=2.25$, $SD=.57$) show that schools did not achieve the required minimum performance standards after inspection feedback trough follow up. From this one can conclude that feed back and follow up practice from inspectors was not adequate.

As indicated in item 7 of table 9 respondent principals were asked to give their response on inspection practice informs to stakeholders about how well their school is performing. Regarding this, 11(68.8%) and 2(14.2%) of respondents admitted that they disagree and strongly disagree on the point and 3(18.8%) the respondents replied that they agree on the issue. Additionally, the mean scores and standard deviation of principals ($M=2.06$, $SD=.57$) shows that inspection practice did not inform to stakeholders how well their school is performing. This implies that the perception of school principals on the inspection practice informing how well the school is performing to stakeholders is moderate. Regarding this, MOE (2006E.C) describes that school inspection practice informs to stakeholders how well their school is performing.

As indicated in the above table, item 8, principals were requested to rate the extent which inspection practice secured an effort to improve quality of education. In this case, 10(62.5%)

and 2(12.5%) the principal respondents were disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. The remaining 1(6.2%) and 3(18.8%) of principals respondents were agreed and strongly agreed. In addition to this the mean score and standard deviation of principals ($M=2.19$, $SD=.75$) show that inspection practice did not secure an effort to improve quality of education in the study area. Regarding this, ESDP V (2012), indicated that school inspection is one of the component of education quality assurance that aimed measuring school performance for quality of education through feedback and follow up. From this the researcher can deduce that if principals do not perceive school inspection as quality improvement tool, it is difficult to say that principals are implementing the recommendations/feed backs given by inspectors.

In item 9 of the same table, the principal respondents were asked whether inspection practice enabled them to work collaboration with the government and people/community or not. The response of principals 8 (50%) and 1(6%) the respondents were disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. 7(44%) of the principal respondents were agreed on the issue. The response of principals also with ($M=2.37$, $SD=.61$) mean score and standard deviation described that inspection practice did not enable them to work collaboration with the government and people/community. From this, it is possible to conclude that school inspection practice was not collaborating schools with of the government and peoples/community.

Regarding this, MOE (2006 E.C) inspection framework describes that:

“...enable schools to work in collaboration with the three development forces /the ruling party, government and people’s wings/ on education access, equity, efficiency, relevance and quality.”

In table 9 of item 10, principals were asked whether their resource management skill was improved after inspection feedback has given or not. In this case, 6(37.5%) and 1(6.2%) principal respondents were disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. On the other hand, 9(56.3%) of the principals respondents were agreed. The mean value and standard deviation of principals ($M=2.50$, $SD=.63$) showed that principals have moderate perception on the issue.

In table 9 of item 11, the researcher requested principals to give response the extent which their planning skill improved after inspection feedback has given. Accordingly, 7(43.8%) of the respondents were agreed on the issue. The remaining, 9 (56.2%) disagreed on the issue.

The calculated mean and standard deviation of principals ($M=2.44$, $SD=.72$) show that principals planning was not improved after inspection feedback has given.

In item 12 and 13 of the above table, the respondents were asked whether their students' outcomes/ academic performance and ethics improved after inspection or not. Consequently, 9(56%) of the respondents were disagreed on the issues. The mean scores and standard deviation of the respondents ($M=2.37$, $SD=.61$) indicated that their students outcomes/ academic performance was not improved after inspection feedback.

Item 14 of the above table, the principal respondents, were asked whether their school is engaged with parents and the community as improved as a result of inspection or not. The majority 11(68.7%) of the respondents were replied that the disagreed. The mean score and standard deviation of ($M=2.19$, $SD=.65$) respondents show that their schools engagement with parents and the community was low. Furthermore, the data obtained from interview and document indicates that the engagement of schools with parents and community through inspection is low. The implication shows that inspection is not introducing the performance of schools to public. As outlined by (John, 2017) one of the main aim of school inspection aim is to engage schools with community as well the wider society about standards and quality in education for children and young people.

In item 15 of the above table, the principals respondents with 9(56%) and mean score and standard deviation ($M=2.37$, $SD=.61$) show that school inspection has not brought encouragement to them as a school principal. In the last item of this table, the principal respondents were asked if their file documentation skill is improved as a result of inspection feedback or not. In this case, 8 (50%) the principal respondents were disagreed on the issue. The mean score standard deviation of them ($M=2.50$, $SD=.73$) described that principals file documentation skill was not improved as a result of inspection feedback.

4.8. Analysis of major Challenges that Affect School Inspection practice in primary Schools

This section assesses and examines the major challenges or constraints that school inspection practices in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. As it was revealed from the questionnaire, interview and other secondary sources there were challenges that encountered to the practice of school inspection indicated in table 10 below.

Table 10: Responses on the challenges for the implementation of school inspection

No	Item	Respondents				Over all mean
		Teachers (n=128)		Principals (n=16)		
		M	SD	M	SD	
1	Poor description of inspectors job in the school inspection frame work	1.88	.54	1.87	.61	1.87
2	Lack of relevant inspection manual in the school to follow the guidelines	1.89	.59	2.13	.88	2.01
3	Some standards are irrelevant to implement	1.86	.55	2.37	.61	2.11
4	A number of inspectors are inadequate of to inspect schools properly	1.94	.57	2.00	.63	2.03
5	Inspectors have inadequate qualification to carry out effective school inspection practice	3.81	.430	3.56	.89	3.68
6	Inspectors do not provide adequate orientation to school principals and teachers about school inspection purpose	2.26	.91	2.44	.89	2.35
7	Lack of cooperation, collaboration, commitment among teachers, schools' principals, and inspectors, school committees to implement recommendations	2.06	.70	2.19	.65	2.12
8	Inspectors are subjective during inspection process	2.20	.78	2.50	.81	2.35
9	Lack of provision of adequate fund/ budget to carry out effective school inspection practice from Woreda education office to encourage inspectors towards effective discharge of their duties	1.50	.64	1.63	.80	1.56
10	Lack of provision of adequate facilities for inspection process from woreda education office to enable inspectors to discharge their duties effectively	1.54	.67	1.62	.50	1.58
11	Lack of pre-service training for inspectors to provide them with the necessary unique skills regarding school inspection	1.84	.48	2.13	.34	1.98
12	Lack of adequate in-service training for inspectors to update their school inspection skill	1.96	.50	2.38	.71	2.17

Table 10: Responses on the challenges for the implementation of school inspection**(Continued)**

No	Items	Respondents				Over all mean
		Teachers(n=128)		Principals (n=16)		
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
13	Non implementation of inspection feedbacks/recommendations by the school stakeholders	1.98	.56	2.13	.34	2.05
14	Non provision of adequate feedback from inspectors to schools to initiate for improvement	2.10	.68	2.13	.50	2.11
15	Non provision of effective follow up activities to check improvements made after inspection feedback has given	1.79	.610	1.69	.47	1.74
16	Inspectors lack autonomy to carry out inspection process independently	2.43	.63	2.37	.50	2.4
17	Inspectors have low experience on the practice of school inspection	3.17	.870	3.75	.68	3.46
18	Inspectors have fault finding approach during school inspection process	2.73	.80	2.31	.70	2.52
19	Inspectors have limited time schedule to carry out adequate inspection	1.75	.86	1.44	.62	1.59
Over all mean						2.15

Key* n= number of respondent, **M** = mean, **SD** = standard deviation ; Mean value 3.50-4.00 high performed, 2.50 - 3.49 moderate performed, 1.50-2.49 low/poor performed and 0.1-1.49 very poor/low performed

As it can be seen in table 10 above items principals rated Inspectors have limited time schedule to carry out adequate inspection (M=1.44), lack of provision of adequate facilities for inspection process from woreda education office to enable inspectors to discharge their duties effectively (M=1.62), lack of provision of adequate fund/ budget to carry out effective school inspection practice from woreda education office to encourage inspectors towards effective discharge of their duties(M=1.63), non provision of effective follow up activities to check improvements made after inspection feedback has given(M=1.69), poor description of inspectors job in the school inspection framework (M=1.87), irrelevance of some standards to implement (M=2.00), lack of relevant inspection manual in the school to follow the guidelines(M=2.13), lack of pre-service training for inspectors to provide them with the necessary unique skills regarding school inspection(M=2.13), non implementation of inspection feedbacks/recommendations by the school stakeholders(M=2.13), non provision of adequate feedback from inspectors to schools to initiate for improvement(M=2.13), lack of cooperation, collaboration, commitment among teachers, schools' principals, and inspectors, school committees to implement recommendations (M=2.19), Inspectors fault-

finding approach during school inspection process (M=2.31), inadequate number of inspectors to inspect schools properly (M=2.37), Inspectors lack of autonomy to carry out inspection process independently (M=2.37), lack of adequate in-service training for inspectors to update their school inspection skill (M=2.38), lack of adequate orientation from inspectors to school principals and teachers about school inspection purpose (M=2.44), Inspectors subjectivity during inspection process (M=2.50) were reported as the major challenges that affect the practice of primary school inspection in the study area.

On the other hand, teachers reported that lack of provision of adequate fund/ budget to carry out effective school inspection practice from woreda education office to encourage inspectors towards effective discharge of their duties (M=1.50), lack of provision of adequate facilities for inspection process from woreda education office to enable inspectors to discharge their duties effectively (M=1.54), Inspectors have limited time schedule to carry out adequate inspection (M=1.75), non provision of effective follow up activities to check improvements made after inspection feedback has given (M=1.79), lack of pre-service training for inspectors to provide them with the necessary unique skills regarding school inspection (M=1.84), irrelevance of some standards to implement (M=1.86), poor description of inspectors job in the school inspection frame work (M=1.88), lack of relevant inspection manual in the school to follow the guidelines (M=1.89), inadequate number of inspectors to inspect schools properly (M=1.94), lack of adequate in-service training for inspectors to update their school inspection skill (M=1.96), non implementation of inspection feedback/recommendations by the school stakeholders (M=1.98), lack of cooperation, collaboration, commitment among teachers, schools' principals, and inspectors, school committees to implement recommendations (M=2.06), non provision of adequate feedback from inspectors to schools to initiate for improvement (M=2.10), Inspectors subjectivity during inspection process (M=2.20), inadequate provision of inspectors orientation to school principals and teachers about school inspection purpose (M=2.26), Inspectors lack of autonomy to carry out inspection process independently (M=2.43), Inspectors have limited time schedule to carry out adequate inspection (M=2.73). Concerning qualitative data, during the interview inspectors similarly said;

In adequacy of budget, facilities such as computer to organize data, irrelevance of standards that mean some of the standards were not recognizing contexts of schools, lack of pre-service training, lack of cooperation among stakeholders, non implementation of inspection feedbacks, political influence, shortage of inspectors,

poor description of inspectors job in the inspection framework were factors affecting implementation of school inspection practice.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the main findings of the study and provides research recommendations based on the findings and conclusions. The main purpose of this study was to assess the practices and challenges of school inspection in Primary Schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. With this regards, this part deals with the summary of findings, the conclusions drawn on the bases of the findings and the recommendations forwarded on the basis of findings.

5.1. Summary of Major Findings

The findings reported in the chapter four summarized along the following themes that reflect the research questions. The practice of school inspection was important to inspect overall performance of schools for school improvement and quality of education and to make accountability among stakeholders. Thus, Education office inspectors are responsible to gathering evidence to identify strength and weakness of schools, to giving feedback which shows limitation of schools to plan for improvement through follow up and to suggest the ways of improvements in the process of implementation of school inspection. However, it is indicated that, school inspectors were not performing as expected. Therefore, the purpose of this study was assessing the practices and challenges on school inspection in Kembata Tembaro Zone Primary Schools and recommending possible solutions. To this end, the following basic research questions were formulated.

1. To what extent do inspectors gather evidence to identify strength and weakness in primary schools in Kembata Tembaro Zone?
2. To what extent do inspectors give feedback based on observations in primary schools in Kembata Tembaro Zone?
3. To what extent do inspectors carry out follow- up and accountability activities after inspection in primary schools in Kembata Tembaro Zone?
4. How do school principals and teachers perceive school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools in Kembata Tembaro Zone?
5. What are the major challenges that school inspectors faces during school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone?

To this effect, the study was conducted in Kembata Tembaro Zone Selected Primary Schools. Accordingly, three Woredas, 16 school principals, 128 teachers and 4 woreda education inspectors were included by using census and proportionality sampling techniques. The data were gathered through both quantitative and qualitative tools. Accordingly, 924 copies of a questionnaire were prepared and distributed for teachers and 128 copies of questionnaires for principals. On the other hand, to obtain qualitative data, interview sessions were conducted with Woreda Education Office Inspectors from the sampled Woredas and Town Administration. Moreover, document analysis was used to obtain qualitative data.

The quantitative data collected by using questionnaire was analyzed and interpreted using frequency, mean scores and standard deviation by using SPSS version 20 whereas, the qualitative data gathered through the open-ended questionnaire, interview and document analysis were analyzed by narration in line with quantitative data. According to the result of data analysis, the following major findings were identified. Therefore, based on the analysis of data, the findings of the study summarized as follows:

1. Analysis of the teachers and principals general background data demonstrated that majority (57.8%) and (75%) of them were males respectively. Regarding, the age of respondents, the data indicates (77.3%), teachers (63%), principals and (75%) of school inspectors are active age groups ranged 26-40 years. This depicts that majority of respondents able to know the practice of school inspection. Regarding to service, majority 101(79%) of teachers,9(56%) principals and 3(75%) inspectors have less than 20 years and 27(21.1%) teachers, 7(44%) principals and 1(25%) inspectors have above 21 years service. Concerning to level of education/ qualification, 52(41%) and 73(57%) teachers were diploma and first degree holders respectively and 15(94%) of principals were first degree holders. All 4(100%) of inspectors were first degree holders. This enables them to implement school inspection practice properly.
2. The study showed that inspectors practice of gathering evidence, to identify strength and weakness of schools is insufficient. Because both teachers and principals with overall mean ($M=2.82$) replied that inspectors did not collect adequate data that enables them to know strength and weakness of schools to give valid judgment.
3. The findings of the study indicated that feedback given by inspectors based on observations in the study area is insufficient. Regarding this, both teachers and

principals respondents with overall mean score (M=2.56) asserted that inspectors did not provide adequate verbal, written clear, specific, feasible, constructive, relevant and accurate feedback that applicable and leads to performance improvement.

4. As the findings of the study indicated that the extent which inspectors take follow-up and accountable system after inspection is, ineffective with overall mean score (1.94).
5. Concerning, the perceptions of teachers' on school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools for quality of education, teachers with overall mean (M=2.14) show that they have low perception. Similarly, the perceptions of principals' on school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools for quality of education, principals with overall mean (M=2.38) show that they have low perception.
6. Regarding the major challenges that affect the practice of school inspection; the respondents confirmed that lack of provision of adequate fund/ budget, lack of provision of adequate facilities, lack of provision feedback, non provision of effective follow up activities, lack of pre-service training for inspectors, irrelevance of some standards , poor description of inspectors job in the school inspection frame work, inadequate number of inspectors, lack of adequate in-service training for inspectors, non implementation of inspection feedbacks/recommendations, lack of cooperation, collaboration, commitment among teachers, schools' principals, and inspectors, school committees, non provision of adequate feedback, inadequate provision of orientation. All these are reported as the major challenges that affect the effectiveness of school inspection practice in primary schools of the study area.

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the finding of the study the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The critical/main role of inspection as one of the dominant strategies for monitoring and improving the performance of education system in schools cannot be overemphasized. Inspection is concerned, in the main, with the improvement of standards and quality of education and should be an integral part of a school improvement program. This requires active practice of inspector/inspectorates in identifying strength and weakness of schools through gathering adequate data,

providing relevant feedback and follow up system. The findings of this study show that inspectors tried to collect evidence by using schools self evaluation report, document, discussing with school directors, observing different documents such as students' performance such as attendances, rosters, continuous assessment forms, timetable, lesson plan, annual plan, and visiting physical plants of the school such as leaning rooms, library, pedagogical center, toilet rooms about their functionality to identify strength and weakness of schools performance. However, the study strongly revealed that inspector's effort in collecting evidence from classroom observation to know students interaction in the classroom; making discussion with students, teachers, parents as well as representatives of the community were very low. Therefore, without collecting adequate data from aforementioned sources, it is difficult to give valid judgment based on strength and weakness of schools performance. Therefore, one can conclude that without collecting adequate data, it is difficult to identify strength and weakness of schools.

2. Providing adequate feedback/recommendations based on observations is very important for performance improvement. As a result, inspectors are expected to give verbal/ oral feedback after observation. They are also expected to give written, clear, timely, specific, feasible, constructive, relevant and accurate feedback that leads to performance improvement for quality of education. However, the findings of the study revealed that inspectors did not give written, clear, specific, feasible, constructive, relevant and accurate feedback. From this, we can deduce that without giving adequate feedback, schools could not know their strength and weakness. This implies that schools cannot show improvement. As a result, improvement of schools and quality of education cannot be achieved.
3. Follow- up and accountability activities after inspection are crucial activity to know improvements/implementation of recommendation after inspection feedback has given. To this end, inspectors are anticipated to take follow up and accountability measurement. However, the findings of the study forwarded that inspectors did not take follow-up and take accountability measurements system after inspection to see improvements/implementation of recommendations. Accordingly, one can conclude that without effective follow up and accountability system, it impossible to know implementation of recommendations and improvements made after feedback has given. This implies that, schools cannot strive for improvement and better

achievement. Ultimately, school improvement for of quality of education cannot be achieved.

4. As indicated above, one of the assumption of school inspection is, integral part of school improvement program for school performance improvement and quality of education. This requires the positive attitude of teachers and principals. Unless teachers and principals perceive inspection as practice of improving school performance for quality of education the inspectors exercise will have not brought desired effect. However, the findings of the study forwarded that the teachers' and principals' perception towards school inspection as a facilitator of school performance improvement in schools for quality of education in the study area was low.

5. Finally, the results of the study discovered that school inspection practice in the study area was negatively affected by many problems; such as, lack of provision of adequate budget, lack of provision of adequate facilities, limited time schedule to carry out adequate inspection, non provision of effective follow-up system, lack of pre-service training for inspectors, irrelevance of some standards, poor description of inspectors job in the school inspection frame work, inadequate number of inspectors, lack of adequate in-service training for inspectors, non implementation of inspection feedbacks/recommendations , lack of cooperation, collaboration, commitment among teachers, schools' principals, and inspectors, school committees to implement recommendations, non provision of adequate feedback and Inspectors lack of autonomy to carry out inspection process independently. All these are reported as major challenges that could affect the effectiveness of school inspection in primary schools of the study area. These the above all situations including challenges could hinder effective practice of school inspection for school improvement and quality of education in the study area.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study and the conclusion dawn, the following recommendations were drawn to minimize and solve the problems that impede the practice of school inspection in Kembata Tembaro Zone Primary Schools:

- The findings of this study strongly revealed that inspectors did not collect adequate evidence from schools to give valid judgment based on strength and weakness of

schools performance. To this end, the Woreda education office inspectors are expected to collect all relevant data from schools to give valid judgment.

- It is also advisable for inspectors to collect evidence from classroom observation to know students interaction in the classroom; making discussion with students, teachers, parents as well as representatives of the community such as, Parent-Teachers Association (PTA), Kebele Education Training Board (KETB), and School Improvement Committee during actual inspection time.
- Additionally, it is advisable for inspectors to use inspection framework effectively.
- As the finding of the study revealed that the Inspectors practice in providing clear, specific, feasible, constructive, relevant and accurate feedback/recommendations was inefficient. Therefore, it is recommended that Woreda Education Office and Zone Education Department work together with Woreda Education Inspectors to promote feedback system of school inspection.
- The findings of the study also forwarded that Inspectors taking post-inspection follow up and accountability system was insufficient. To this end, the researcher recommended that inspectors are expected:
 - To take follow up system for schools that have met the standard to improve their performance further;
 - To take follow up system for schools below the standard/ low achiever for improvement; implementation of proposed recommendation in the school;
 - To facilitate experience sharing programs among schools and recognition of schools achieved the level/standard;
 - To making responsible bodies accountable if school has not made the required improvement through continuous follow up.
 - Additionally, it is advisable that Ministry of Education collaboration Regional Education Bureaus should amend Ethiopian General Education Inspection Framework, as describing relevant standards for each education level and clearly showing job descriptions of inspectors.
- In addition, the result of the study showed, teachers' and principals' perception towards school inspection as a facilitator of school performance improvement in schools for quality of education in the study area was low. To this end, it is suggested that inspectors including Woreda Education Office experts should create awareness

regarding purpose inspection in line with giving adequate inspection process in schools.

- Finally, the findings indicated that school inspection practice in the study area was negatively affected by many problems. For this matter, it is recommended that all concerned bodies, such as school principals, Woreda education offices, Zonal Education Department should discuss on challenges affecting proper implementation school inspection practice and coming to the solution.
- At last, to better address the problems, it can be suggested that further studies needed to be conducted in this area with regard to; effectiveness of school inspection for quality of education; teachers' and principals perception on the school inspection practice etc.

References

- Abebe, (2014). The practices and challenges of school-based supervision in government secondary schools of Kamashi Zone of Benishangul Gumuz Regional State. Unpublished MA thesis, Jimma University.
- Abiy, Z., (2009). *Introduction to research method*. Graduate studies and research office: Addis Ababa University.
- Akindele, (2012). *The challenges facing school inspection aimed at Universal Basic Education implementation in Nigeria*. *International Journal of Learning & Development* ISSN 2164-4063/2012, Vol. 2, No. 5, Nsukka, University.
- Alvi, M., (2016). *Manual for selecting sampling techniques*. In Research University of Karachi, Iqraq University online At <https://Mpra.Ub.Uni-Muenchen.De/70218/> MPRA Paper No. 70218, Posted 25 March 2016 17:01 UTC
- Barrow, M. I., (2011). A Critical Assessment of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers on Educational Quality in Secondary Schools in the Larger Mombasa District, Kenya. Unpublished M. Ed. Thesis. Kenyatta University, Nairobi.
- Best & Kan, (2006). *Research in education*. 10th ed. Butler University, Emeritus
- Chapman, C., (2000). *Improvement, inspection and self-review*. *Improving Schools*, 3 (2), 57-63. Retrieved on 12th February 2012
<http://www.imp.sagepub.com/content/3/2/57>.
- _____, (2001a). *Changing classrooms through inspection*. *School Leadership and Management*, 21 (1), 59-73. Retrieved 26th March 2013 from:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13632430120033045>.
- _____, (2002). Ofsted and school improvement: Teachers' perceptions of the inspection process in schools facing challenging circumstances. *School Leadership and Management: Formerly School Organization*, 22 (3), 257-272. Retrieved on 26th June 2012 from:
<http://www.dx.doi.org/10.1080/1363243022000020390>
- Chanda, V. M., (2011). Teachers' and head teachers' attitudes towards education standards

- office supervisory activities in public secondary schools on the Copper Belt Province in Zambia. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Nairobi, Kenya.
- _____, (2012). *Educational Research, Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. U.S.A, Pearson.
- De Wolf, I. F., & Janssens, F. J. G., (2007). *Effects and side effects of inspections and accountability in education: an overview of empirical studies*. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(3), 379-396. doi: 10.1080/03054980701366207
- De Wolf, (2009). *Do inspections improve primary school performance?: Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis September 2009, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 221–237 DOI: 10.3102/0162373709338315c 2009 AERA. <http://eepa.aera.net>*
- Ehren, M. C. M., (Ed.). (2016). *Methods and modalities of effective school inspections. Accountability and Educational Improvement*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-31003-9_7
- Ehren, M. C. M., Leeuw, F. L. & Scheerens, J., (2005). *On the impact of the Dutch Educational Supervision Act: Analyzing assumptions concerning the inspection of primary education*, *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26 (1), 60-76.
- Ehren, M. C. M., & Visscher, A. J. (2006). *Towards a theory on the impact of school inspections*. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 54(1), 51–72.
- _____, (2008). *The relationship between school inspections, school characteristics and school improvement*. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 56(2), 205–227.
- Ehren, M.C.M., Mcnamara, G., Altrichter, H. and O’Hara, J., (2013). *Impact of school inspections on improvement of schools—describing assumptions on causal mechanisms in six European countries*. *Educational Assessment Evaluation and Accountability* February 2013 DOI: 10.1007/s11092-012-9156-4
- Ehren, M., Perryman, J, & Spours, K., (2014). *Accountability and school inspections*. Leading education and social research, Institute of education: University of London
- Ehren, M. C. M. (Ed.). (2016). *Methods and modalities of effective school inspections. Accountability and Educational Improvement*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-31003-9_7
- Frimatus, (2014). *The role of school inspection in improving academic performance in community secondary schools in Tanzania*. Un published PhD, Dissertation, Mzumbe University, Dares Salaam.
- Gobore, A.A, (2017). *The influence of school inspection on changing teachers’ practices in primary schools Babati District, Manyara Region in Tanzania*. Unpublished PhD, Dissertation, Open University of Tanzania.

- Gaertner, H. Wurster, S. & Pant, H. A., (2014)). *The effect of school inspections on school improvement, School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice*, 25:4, 489-508, DOI: 10.1080/09243453.2013.811089
- Galabawa, (2001). Development and Issues Regarding Universal Primary Education (UPE) in Tanzania. Paper presented at ADEA Biennial Meeting held in Arusha, Tanzania, 7-11 October.
- Grauwe, A., (2001). *School supervision in four countries volume 1: Challenges and reforms*. Paris: UNESCO-IIEP. Retrieved on 3rd July 2012 from: <http://www.unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001248/124823e.pdf>.
- Grauwe, A., (2007). *Transforming School Supervision into a Tool for Quality Improvement. International Review of Education* 53: 709-714
- Grauwe, A., (2008). *School Monitoring system and the impact on disparity*. Background paper prepared for the education for all. Global monitoring. . Oxford. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Haule, M. E.(2012). The perceptions of school teachers and leaders toward school inspections In Tanzania secondary schools. . Un published MA thesis; University of Twente
- Jawoko, N. E., (2003). An Investigation into the Practice of Collaborative Supervision of Instruction in Primary Schools in Nebbi District, Uganda. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Makerere University, Kampala.
- Jensen, B., (2010). *Investing in our teachers, investing in our economy*. Melbourne: Grattan Institute. Retrieved 20th June 2012 from <http://www.grattan.edu.au/static/files/assets/b8e7dc66/057>
- John, K. (2017). The effectiveness of school inspectors in assuring the quality of primary education in Shinyanga District. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Open University Tanzania
- Julie, P., (2013). A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS (5th ed) Open University press
- Kagambe, E., (2004). A Formative Evaluation of the Performance of School Inspectors in the Management of Primary Schools in Kabarole District, Uganda. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Makerere University, Kampala.
- Kambuga & Dadi, (2015). School inspection in Tanzania as a motor for education quality: challenges and possible way forward
- Klerks, M., (2013). The effect of school inspections: a systematic review.

- www.schoolinspections.eu (retrieved January 2014).*
- Koul, (2005). *Journal of Educational Computing Research* 32 (3), 227-239 *Electronic Journal of Science Education* 4 (1)
- Learmouth, (2000). *Inspection: What is it for School?* [http:// books.google.com/ books?](http://books.google.com/books/)
Retrieved on January 2015.
- Lyimo, L.P., (2015). *The impact of school inspection on students' academic achievement.*
Unpublished PhD, Dissertation, Open University of Tanzania.
- Macharia, S. M., & Nicholas, S. K.,(2014). *School Inspection in Uganda: Reflections, Experiences and Emerging Issues. International Journal of Education and Research Vol. 2 No. 3 March 2014*
- Matete, R. E., (2009). *The Impact of Primary School Inspection on Teaching and Learning in Tanzania: A Study of Mbeya City District.* Educational Research Oslo, Comparative and International Education Institute, University of Oslo Master of Philosophy: 142.
- Mmbando & Hongoke,(2010). *Management, inspection and supervision for effective delivery of quality education; Tanzania Commission for Universities.*
- MoE, (1994). *The Education training policy, school management, finance and community participation.* Addis Ababa: Birhanian Selam Printing
- MoE, (2002). *The education and training policy and its implementation.* Addis Ababa EMPDA.
- MoE, (2007). *Review of Ethiopian Education and Training Policy and Its Implementation.* Addis Ababa: USAID
- MoE, (2006E.C.) *National General Education frame work for school Inspection.*
- Mohammed, B.I., (2015). *The role of educational inspectors in curriculum implementation in public secondary schools in Nigeria, Nsukka University.*
- Moswela, (2010). *Instructional Supervision, a tool for improvement or weapon: Instructional supervision in Botswana Secondary Schools.*
An investigation. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership,* Volume 38(1).
- Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G., (2003). *Research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approach.* Nairobi: Acts Press.

- Mwinyipembe, M. M., (2011). The effectiveness of quality assurance and standards officers in school supervision and performance: Kenyatta University, Nairobi
- Nicholas, (2013). Effectiveness of school inspection in staff development in secondary schools in Wakiso District, Uganda. Unpublished MA thesis, Catholic University of Eastern Africa .Nairobi, Kenya
- Nelson, R., & Ehren, M., (2014). Review and synthesis of evidence on the (mechanisms of) impact of school inspections
- Ogoegbunam,E.I., (2012). Appraisal of the inspection of primary schools in South East Zone of Nigeria. Unpublished PhD Dissertations, Nsukka University.
- Ololube N.P., & Major, N. B., (2014). *School inspection and Educational supervision: Impact on Teachers productivity and teachers education program. Nigeria. International Journal of Scientific Research in Education* MARCH 2014, Vol. 7(1), 91-104.
- OFSTED, (2010). Learning: creative approaches that raise. Ref 080266
- _____, (2012). *Evaluating educational inclusion. guidance for inspectors and schools.* Reference HMI 235, Alexandra houses, 33 Kingsway, London
- _____, (2013). Annual Report 2012/2013: Schools, London
- Scheerens & Ehren, M. C. M (2015). *The Evidence base for school inspection frameworks. See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287402429>*
- SNNPREB, (2009). Annual report schools performance evaluation and training. Unpublished Document, Hawassa.
- Sammons, P (2004). Improvement through Inspection: An evaluation of the impact of Ofsted's work (HMI 2244). London, UK: Office for Standards in Education.
- _____, (2006). Improving Schools and Raising Standards: The Impact of Educational Reforms in England. In Eder Ferdinand, Angela Gastanger & Franz Hofman, *Qualitat Durch Standars? Nwe York Waxmann.*
- Sembirige, P., (2009). The Role of the District Inspectors in the Improvement of Primary School Teaching in Selected Primary Schools in Mukono District: Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Makerere University, Kampala.
- Sarah. A., (2015) School inspection and its influence in the quality development of inclusive

- education practices in Uganda, University of Oslo.
- Sivonike, A. (2010). *Teachers and pupils on primary school Inspection service in Tanzania. A case study of Dares Salaam*. Unpublished M.A dissertation. Dares Salaam: University of Dares Salaam, Tanzania.
- Sumra, (2005). CEF Global Midterm Review; Tanzania Programme Report. Commonwealth Education Fund
- Rosenthal, L, (2004). *Do School Inspections improve school quality?: Ofsted inspections of Secondary school examination results in the UK, Economics of Education Review*. London: Unpublished.
- Tadele, A. T., (2014). *Relationship between instructional supervision and professional development The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives* Vol. 13, No.
- Taherdoost, H., (2016). *Sampling methods in research methodology; how to choose a sampling technique for research. International Journal of Academic Research in Management* Vol. 5, No. 2, 2016, Page: 18-27, ISSN: 2296-1747
- Tesfaw T.A & Hofman R.H, (2012). *Instructional supervision and its relationship with Professional development: perception of private and government secondary school teachers in Addis Ababa*. Published MA thesis, University of Groningen
- Tyagi, R.S (2010): *School based instructional Supervision and the Effective Professional Development of Teachers*. Project Report, Department of Educational Administration, NEUPA, New Delhi.
- USAID, (2010). *Impact assessment of Education Program in Ethiopia*.
- UNESCO-IIEP. (2007). *Alternative models in reforming school supervision*. Paris: UNESCO- IIEP. Retrieved on 4th July 2012
- Whitby, K., (2010). *School inspection: recent experiences in high performing education systems; literature review*. Reading: Education Trust.
- Wilcox, B., (2000). *Making inspection visits more effective: The English experience* International institute for educational Planning *UNESCO*: Paris.
- World Bank, (2005). *Education in Ethiopia: Strengthening the Foundation for Sustainable*

Progress

Appendix-A

Jimma University

**College of Education and Behavioral sciences
Department of Educational Planning and Management (EdPM)**

Post Graduate study

This Questioner will be filled by Teachers

**Thesis Topic: Practices and challenges on school inspection in primary schools of
Kembata Tembaro Zone**

Researcher: Mengistu Feleke Feltamo

Dear respondents!

I am a Master of Educational leadership student at the Jimma University. I am conducting a study on Practices and Challenges of Inspection on Primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. This study seeks to investigate how school inspection practice is being carried out; what challenges hinder inspection process and how inspection enables schools to improve their performance for school improvement and quality of education.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data for the study entitled “**The Practices and challenges on school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone.**” Your responses are vital for the success of the study. So, you are kindly requested to read all questions and fill the questionnaire with genuine responses. Be sure that the responses you may give used only for educational purpose and information is kept confidential.

Please note the following points before you start filling the questionnaire:

1. Do not write your name on the questionnaire
2. Read all the questions before attempting to answer the questions
3. There is no need to consult others to fill the questioner
4. Provide appropriate responses by using "√" or "X" mark to choose one of the selected Likert scales.
5. Give your answer for all questions.

Thank you in advance for your genuine cooperation!

Part One: General information and personal data

Indicate your response by using "√" or "X" in the box provided.

1. School _____ 2. Sex: Male Female
 2. Age in years: _____ 3. Work experience in years: _____
 4. Educational background: Certificate (TTI) Diploma First degree MA/MS degree

Part Two: Indicate your responses for the following Likert type scale items using "√" or "X" mark to write in the box corresponding to an action.

1=Strongly Disagree (SD), 2=Disagree (D), 3=Agree (A), 4=Strongly Agree (SA)

I. The following statements are statements about how inspectors gather evidence to identify strength and weakness in your school where the scale is: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD). Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a tick [√] in one of the boxes provided.

No	Items	Scales			
		S	A	D	S
		A			D
		4	3	2	1
1	Inspectors give adequate orientation to schools before actual inspection				
2	Inspectors make discussion with school director about purpose of the inspection during actual inspection time				
3	Inspectors make discussion with teachers and students during actual inspection time				
4	Inspectors make discussion with parents and representatives of the community				
5	Inspectors invite the director to give a short presentation about the school, describing its context, its strengths; its priorities for development.				
6	Inspectors use school's self-evaluation report to get information				
7	Inspectors check whether the school self-evaluation report has properly done or not to get real information				
8	Inspectors make classroom observation when they visit your school to gather data about students interaction in the classroom				
9	Inspectors obtain data from different documents about students' performance such as attendance, roster, continuous assessment form, timetable, lesson plan, annual plan to make valid judgment				
10	Inspectors observe physical plants of the school such as leaning rooms, library, pedagogical center, toilet rooms about their functionality				

11. If there are any other means of inspectors gather evidence during school inspection, please write them briefly _____

II. The following statements are statements about feedback given by school inspectors based on observations in your school where the scale is: Strongly Agree (**SA**), Agree (**A**), Disagree (**D**) and Strongly Disagree (**SD**). Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a tick [√] in one of the boxes provided.

No	Items	Scales			
		SA	A	D	SD
		4	3	2	1
1	Inspectors provide verbal feedback on their findings about how schools need to improve after inspection				
2	Inspectors provide clear; written feedback that shows how schools need to improve after inspection				
3	Inspectors provide timely feedback that gives opportunity to improve limitations in the school performance				
4	Inspectors provide specific feedback that shows areas that need to be improved				
5	Inspectors provide feasible feedback that can be implementable/practicable with the capacity of the school				
6	Inspectors provide constructive feedback that encourages for improvement				
7	Inspectors provide relevant feedback that can be applicable in school contexts				
8	Inspectors provide accurate feedback that will lead to actual improvement				

9.If there are any other ways inspectors giving feedback, please write down briefly below _____

III. The following statements are about inspectors' follow-up activities and make schools accountable after inspection in your school where the scale is: Strongly Agree (**SA**), Agree (**A**), Disagree (**D**) and Strongly Disagree (**SD**). Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a tick [√] in one of the boxes provided.

No	Items	Scales			
		SA	A	D	SD
		4	3	2	1
1	Inspectors take post-inspection follow up activities for schools that have met the standard to improve their performance further				
2	Inspectors take post-inspection follow up activities for school below the standard/ low achiever for improvement				
3	Inspectors follow up the implementation of proposed recommendation in school				
4	Inspectors asses improvements and outcomes made after feedback has given				
5	Inspectors facilitate experience sharing programs among schools				
6	Inspectors make recognition for schools achieved the level/standard				
7	Inspectors make responsible bodies accountable if school has not made the required improvement				

8. If there are any other ways inspectors follow up and make schools accountable, please write down briefly below _____

IV. The following statements are statements about the perceptions of teachers on how school inspection contributes to performance improvement for school improvement where the scale is: Strongly Agree (**SA**), Agree (**A**), Disagree (**D**) and Strongly Disagree (**SD**). Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a tick [√] in one of the boxes provided

No	Items	Scales			
		SA	A	D	SD
		4	3	2	1
1	School inspection practiced by inspectors from woreda education office is a useful practice to improve schools performance				
2	The inspection feedback enabled me to improve my limitation observed during actual inspection				
3	My students' academic performance is improved after inspection feedback has given				
4	school inspection brought encouragement to me as a school a teacher				
5	School inspection is useful in helping me to identify my own				

	needs for improvement				
6	My lesson plan preparation is improved after class room observation by inspectors				
7	My students' continuous assessment practice is improved after inspection feedbacks				
8	My classroom instruction has improved as a result of school inspection feedback				

V. The following are challenges that affect school inspection practice in schools where the scale is: **Strong challenge (S CH), Challenge (CH), Minor challenge(M CH), Not challenge at all(N CH)**. Please indicate the extent to which you decided to each statement by placing a tick [√] in one of the boxes provided.

No	Items	Scales			
		S CH	CH	Minor CH	Not CH
		4	3	2	1
1	Poor description of inspectors job in the school inspection frame work				
2	Lack of relevant inspection manual in the school to follow the guidelines				
3	Some standards are irrelevant to implement				
4	A number of inspectors are inadequate of to inspect schools properly				
5	Inspectors have inadequate qualification to carry out effective school inspection practice				
6	Inspectors do not provide adequate orientation to school principals and teachers about school inspection purpose				
7	Lack of cooperation, collaboration, commitment among teachers, schools' principals, and inspectors, school committees to implement recommendations				
8	Inspectors are subjective during inspection process				
9	Lack of provision of adequate fund/ budget to carry out effective school inspection practice from woreda education office to encourage inspectors towards effective discharge of their duties				
10	Lack of provision of adequate facilities for inspection process from woreda education office to enable inspectors to discharge their duties effectively				
11	Lack of pre-service training for inspectors to provide them with the necessary unique skills regarding school inspection				
12	Lack of adequate in-service training for inspectors to update their school inspection skill				
13	Non implementation of inspection feedbacks/recommendations by the school stakeholders				
14	Non provision of adequate feedback from inspectors to				

	schools to initiate for improvement				
15	Non provision of effective follow up activities to check improvements made after inspection feedback has given				
16	Inspectors lack autonomy to carry out inspection process independently				
17	Inspectors have low experience on the practice of school inspection				
18	Inspectors have fault finding approach during school inspection process				
19	Inspectors have limited time schedule to carry out adequate inspection				

20.If there are any other challenges primary school inspectors face, please write them briefly_____

21. What do you suggest to overcome the above challenges? Please write below

22. Suggest ways inspection can be enriched so as to increase school improvement for quality of education

Appendix-B

Jimma University

**College of Education and Behavioral sciences
Department of Educational Planning and Management (EdPM)**

This Questioner will be filled by School Principals

Post Graduate study

**Thesis Topic: Practices and challenges of school inspection in primary schools
of Kembata Tembaro zone**

Researcher: Mengistu Feleke Feltamo

Dear respondents!

I am a Master of Educational leadership student at the Jimma University. I am conducting a study on Practices and Challenges of Inspection on Primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. This study seeks to investigate how school inspection practice is being carried out; what challenges hinder inspection process and how inspection enables schools to improve their performance for school improvement and quality of education.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data for the study entitled “**The Practices and challenges of school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone.**” Your responses are vital for the success of the study. So, you are kindly requested to read all questions and fill the questionnaire with genuine responses. Be sure that the responses you may give used only for educational purpose and information is kept confidential.

Please note the following points before you start filling the questionnaire:

1. Do not write your name on the questionnaire
2. Read all the questions before attempting to answer the questions
3. There is no need to consult others to fill the questioner
4. Provide appropriate responses by using "√" or "X" mark to choose one of the selected Likert scales.
5. Give your answer for all questions.

Thank you in advance for your genuine cooperation!

Part One: General information and personal data

Indicate your response by using "√" or "X" in the box provided.

1. School _____ 2. Sex: Male Female
2. Age in years: _____ 3. Work experience in years: _____
4. Educational background: Certificate (TTI) Diploma First degree MA/MS degree

Part Two: Indicate your responses for the following Likert type scale items using "√" or "X" mark to write in the box corresponding to an action.

1=Strongly Disagree (SD), 2=Disagree (D), 3=Agree (A), 4=Strongly Agree (SA)

I. The following statements are statements about how inspectors gather evidence to identify strength and weakness in your school where the scale is: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD). Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a tick [√] in one of the boxes provided.

No	Items	Scales			
		SA	A	D	SD
		4	3	2	1
1	Inspectors give adequate orientation to schools before actual inspection				
2	Inspectors make discussion with me about purpose of the inspection during actual inspection time				
3	Inspectors make discussion with teachers and students during actual inspection time				
4	Inspectors make discussion with parents and representatives of the community such as PTA				
5	Inspectors invite me to give a short presentation about the school, describing its context, its strengths; its priorities for development.				
6	Inspectors use school's self evaluation report to get information				
7	Inspectors check whether the school self-evaluation report has properly done real information				
8	Inspectors make classroom observation when they visit your school to gather data about students interaction in the classroom				
9	Inspectors obtain data from different documents about students performance such as attendance, roster, continuous assessment form, timetable, lesson plan, annual plan to make valid judgment				
10	Inspectors observe physical plants of the school such as leaning rooms, library, pedagogical center, toilet rooms about their functionality				

11. If there are any other means of inspectors gather evidence during school inspection, please write them briefly_____

II. The following statements are statements about feedback given by school inspectors based on observations in your school where the scale is: Strongly Agree (**SA**), Agree (**A**), Disagree (**D**) and Strongly Disagree (**SD**). Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a tick [√] in one of the boxes provided.

No	Items	Scales			
		SA	A	D	SD
		4	3	2	1
1	Inspectors provide verbal feedback on their findings about how schools need to improve after inspection				
2	Inspectors provide clear; written feedback that shows how schools need to improve after inspection				
3	Inspectors provide timely feedback that gives opportunity to improve limitations in the school performance				
4	Inspectors provide specific feedback that shows areas that need to be improved				
5	Inspectors provide feasible feedback that can be implementable/practicable with the capacity of the school				
6	Inspectors provide constructive feedback that encourages for improvement				
7	Inspectors provide relevant feedback that can be applicable in school contexts				
8	Inspectors provide accurate feedback that will lead to actual improvement				

9. If there are any other ways inspectors giving feedback, please write down briefly below_____

III. The following statements are about inspectors' follow-up activities and make schools accountable after inspection in your school where the scale is: Strongly Agree (**SA**), Agree (**A**), Disagree (**D**) and Strongly Disagree (**SD**). Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a tick [√] in one of the boxes provided.

No	Items	Scales			
		SA	A	D	SD
		4	3	2	1
1	Inspectors take post-inspection follow up activities for schools that have met the standard to improve their performance further				
2	Inspectors take post-inspection follow up activities for school below the standard/ low achiever for improvement				
3	Inspectors follow up the implementation of proposed recommendation in school				
4	Inspectors asses improvements and outcomes made after feedback has given				
5	Inspectors facilitate experience sharing programs among schools				
6	Inspectors make recognition for schools achieved the level/standard				
7	Inspectors make responsible bodies accountable if school has not made the required improvement				

8. If there are any other ways inspectors follow up and support schools, please write down briefly below _____

IV. The following statements are about the perceptions of school principals on how school inspection contributes to performance improvement for school improvement where the scale is: Strongly Agree (**SA**), Agree (**A**), Disagree (**D**) and Strongly Disagree (**SD**). Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a tick [√] in one of the boxes provided

No	Items	Scales			
		SA	A	D	SD
		4	3	2	1
1	My performance evaluation skill is improved after inspection feedback has given				
2	My decision making skill is improved after inspection feedback has given				
3	My controlling skill is improved after inspection feedback has given				
4	My instruction supervision skill is improved after inspection feedback has given				
5	School inspection practiced by inspectors from woreda				

	education office is a useful practice to the schools for performance improvement for quality of education				
6	My school has achieved the required minimum performance standards after inspection feedback through follow up				
7	Inspection practice informed to stakeholders about how well my school is performing				
8	Inspection practice secured an effort to improve the quality of education				
9	Inspection enabled my schools to work in collaboration with the government and people/community				
10	My resource management skill is improved after inspection feedback has given				
11	My planning is improved after inspection feedback has given				
12	My students outcomes/ academic performance is improved after inspection				
13	My student ethics is improved after inspection				
14	My school's engagement with parents and the community is improved as a result of inspection				
15	school inspection brought encouragement to me as a school principal				
16	My file documentation skill is improved as a result of inspection feedback				

V. The following are challenges that affect school inspection practice in schools where the scale is: **Strong challenge (S CH)**, **Challenge (CH)**, **Minor challenge (M CH)**, **Not challenge at all (N CH)**. Please indicate the extent to which you decided to each statement by placing a tick [√] in one of the boxes provided.

No	Items	Scales			
		S	CH	Minor	Not
		CH	CH	CH	CH
		4	3	2	1
1	Poor description of inspectors job in the school inspection frame work				
2	Lack of relevant inspection manual in the school to follow the guidelines				
3	Some standards are irrelevant to implement				
4	A number of inspectors are inadequate to inspect schools properly				
5	Inspectors have inadequate qualification to carry out effective school inspection practice				

6	Inspectors do not provide adequate orientation to school principals and teachers about school inspection purpose				
7	Lack of cooperation, collaboration, commitment among teachers, schools' principals, and inspectors, school committees to implement recommendations				
8	Inspectors are subjective during inspection process				
9	Lack of provision of adequate fund/ budget to carry out effective school inspection practice from woreda education office to encourage inspectors towards effective discharge of their duties				
10	Lack of provision of adequate facilities for inspection process from woreda education office to enable inspectors to discharge their duties effectively				
11	Lack of pre-service training for inspectors to provide them with the necessary unique skills regarding school inspection				
12	Lack of adequate in-service training for inspectors to update their school inspection skill				
13	Non implementation of inspection feedbacks/recommendations by the school stakeholders				
14	Non provision of adequate feedback from inspectors to schools to initiate for improvement				
15	Non provision of effective follow up activities to check improvements made after inspection feedback has given				
16	Inspectors lack autonomy to carry out inspection process independently				
17	Inspectors have low experience on the practice of school inspection				
18	Inspectors have fault finding approach during school inspection process				
19	Inspectors have limited time schedule to carry out adequate inspection				

20. If there are any other challenges primary school inspectors face, please write them briefly

21. What do you suggest to overcome the above challenges? Please write below

22. Suggest ways inspection can be enriched so as to increase school improvement for quality of education

Appendix-C

Jimma University

College of Education and Behavioral sciences
Department of Educational Planning and Management (EdPM)

Post graduate study

Thesis Topic:
**Practices and Challenges on School Inspection in Primary Schools of Kembata
Tembaro Zone**

Researcher:

Mengistu Feleke Feltamo

Dear respondents!

The purpose of this interview is to collect data for the study entitled “**The Practices and challenges of school inspection in primary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone.**” The information you provide will have constrictive and paramount importance for the successful accomplishment of this study. So, you are kindly requested to give your genuine response. Your response will be used only for academic purpose and the responses will be kept confidential.

Thanks you in advance for your cooperation!

Part I: General Information and Respondents’ Personal Data

1. Woreda_____
2. Sex_____
3. Age_____
4. Educational Background_____
5. Qualification of subject: major_____ minor_____
6. Service year_____
7. Experience as inspector_____

Part II. Interview guide questions for Woreda /Town education office Inspectors

1. How do you gather evidence to identify strength and weakness in primary schools to give judgment/grade? Can you give examples from your experience?
2. How can you give feedback based on observations in primary schools?
3. To what extent do you carry out follow- up and take accountability activities after inspection in primary schools?

4. How do you see school principals and teachers perception to school inspection as a facilitator of school improvement in primary schools?
5. What practical problems are affecting the inspection practice?
6. What do you suggest to overcome the challenges?
7. Suggest ways inspection can be enriched so as to increase school improvement for quality of education.