Role Perceptions And Role Performance of

Instructional Supervisors As Perceived by

Teachers and Supervisors in the

Public Schools of Qatar :

An Exploratory Study

Aref T.M.A. Al-ATARI

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

School of Education

University of Durham

October 1989

Dedicated

To

Ibtisam

Abstract

The main objectives of this study are to investigate the perceptions of the teachers and supervisors in Qatar concerning different aspects of supervision, to clarify role expectations and role performance of supervisors, and to identify some obstacles that hinder effective supervision. The independent variables of occupation, nationality, sex, teaching cycle, qualification and experience, are considered.

The study is divided into seven chapters. Different definitions of supervision are discussed in chapter 1, while four supervisory approaches are presented in chapter 2. Chapter 3 provides a brief account of the supervisory system in a number of developed countries, while chapter 4 outlines the educational and supervisory system in Qatar. The methodology, procedures and instruments employed are given in chapter 5. The data, arising from the fieldwork, is presented in chapters 6 and 7. The study concludes with a summary, conclusions and recommendations.

It was concluded that supervision is a problematic term, that no single best supervisory approach exists, and the aspects which supervisors emphasize vary from one country to another.

The discussion of the supervisory system in Qatar reveals that it is highly centralized, that supervisors are called upon to undertake many functions, and that supervisors, in general, lack adequate training.

The data shows different levels of convergence and divergence between teachers and supervisors concerning role expectations and role performance of supervisors. Within both groups, different perceptions existed as a function of personal characteristics. Teachers' responses suggested that teachers in different categories need different supervisory services.

Supervisors were anxious to create a non-threatening atmosphere, but unannounced and unrequested visits were not conducive to this. Pre- and post-observation conferences were haphazard and often unplanned. Supervisors took little trouble over evaluation.

The ideas of 'special training' for supervisors, 'peer supervision' and 'the principal-supervisor' found some support.

Many obstacles, particularly insufficient time, overwork, and the location of schools, alienate supervisors from ideal roles. And finally, the majority of respondents reported only qualified satisfaction with supervision.

Acknowledgements

Contents

Page

Tables

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 The importance of supervision

1.2 The importance of research on supervision

1.3 Statement of the problem

1.4 Limitations of the study

1.5 Organization of the study

1.6 Supervision defined

    1.6.1 Conceptual definitions

    1.6.2 Operational definitions

    1.6.3 Sources of Confusion

        1.6.3.1 The Complexity of the teaching process

        1.6.3.2 Role ambiguity

        1.6.3.3 Role Conflict

        1.6.3.4 The problem of terminology

1.7 Conclusion

1.8 References

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

> "There is nothing but trouble ahead in all
> research. If it were not so it would not be
> research."

Arvil S. Barr

1.1 The importance of supervision

Educational systems need highly competent personnel. Teachers are the crucial resource in any educational system, and the main hope for the accomplishment of educational reforms. There is general agreement about the need for well-qualified teachers.

In order that teachers can cope adequately with the tasks that they are required to undertake, they need a support system for the purpose of improving learning opportunities for students.

Qatari teachers, usually, enter the profession with relatively little training (2-4 years of preservice preparation), the aim of which is to develop the foundations for professional service, and provide some practical experience. The assumption is that they will continue learning during their induction period and even after they have attained fully qualified status. It is in this case, more of a starting point to a career, than a finishing point. Complaints from beginning teachers are common, particularly in their induction year. The transition from preservice education to classroom teaching is typically characterized by "reality shock" which means the "realization

the beginning teacher has when he finds the real world of teaching is vastly different from his previously held idealistic view of teaching".[1] The result will be "the collapse of the missionary ideals formed during teacher training by the harsh and rude reality of everyday classroom life".[2] The moment the student teacher becomes a teacher he has to satisfy superiors and parents, and must work harmoniously with and win the confidence of colleagues who vary in age and seniority.

The problem of beginning teachers, in the past few years, have become a topic of great concern. Many studies have been conducted to identify these problems.[3] Hayon, L. and Bertz, B. (1986) surveyed several studies and reported the following problems: isolation, heavy workload, unsuitable teaching materials. Other difficulties relating to classroom management and discipline, pupil evaluation, and teacher-parent relations were mentioned. New teachers are often given assignments that experienced teachers wish to avoid. Confronted with shortcomings in their performance, survival is the main concern for them in their beginning years. To cope with such survival problems beginning teachers revert to traditional attitudes and methods of classroom management.[4]

A number of primary schoolteachers, in Qatar, are not qualified because they started teaching as soon as they had left high schools (tables 6 and 7). They are totally unprepared to assume all the responsibilities expected of them. Others enter the profession "accidentally" or because it seemed the "only option". Even teachers who have received professional training and have had long experience

need help in order to achieve further professional growth. The function of supervisors varies according to the expertise of teachers; while the main concern with the beginning teachers is to socialize them into the profession, the main concern with the experienced teachers is providing feedback, support and assistance in improving their performance.

The organized body of knowledge from which teachers generate both the content and the methods of instruction is constantly expanding and changing. Teachers are busy as practitioners and need reliable materials to help them keep up with new curriculum developments. New developments in the behavioural and social sciences often have important implications for teaching methodology, and teachers need help and support in order to be informed about these ideas. Similarly new teaching materials and media equipment are constantly being developed, and teachers need to know what is available.

A broad range of factors combine to minimize teachers' professional satisfaction and effectiveness. The conditions under which teachers carry out their responsibilities are often such as to deny them a sense of effectiveness, success, and selfworth. Inadequate opportunities for psychological and personal success inevitably weaken teachers' commitment to and acceptance of the school. Incongruity between teachers' motivation and abilities and school conditions, over which they have little control, creates a situation structured for psychological failure. Teachers often try to overcome their feelings of failure by acting in ways that are educationally counterproductive; withdrawing emotionally from the classroom or becoming apathetic,

placing increased value on material rewards, becoming hostile to school officials, working for promotion to other positions that offer better prospects, or leaving the profession altogether. Often reform efforts aiming at improving the quality of teaching fail to consider the configuration of conditions that leads to the feeling of failure.[5] Therefore psychological support is important and teachers should be able to feel that there are other people who are interested in what they are doing.

Teachers face increasingly complex educational tasks. They are expected not only to teach knowledge of the basics, and generate enthusiasm for learning, but also to inculcuate desirable attitudes, develop essential skills, and reinforce cultural norms. In the increasingly individualised societies the responsibility of the school expands to include the personal adjustment and mental health of the students. Teachers are asked to lead the battle against the psychological problems that plague youth. They are expected to reduce youth delinquency and youth alienation. It appears as if other societal institutions which traditionally have shared those responsibilities with the school, have abdicated their role. In some societies, particularly poor and underdeveloped ones, teachers can scarcely avoid becoming involved in some forms of child care and family counselling. The result is that new functions are always being added to the schools. The effect is that teaching is becoming more difficult and stressful. Therefore, it is necessary constantly to introduce new ideas and new techniques into the teaching/learning environment, in order that teachers can cope with these increasing demands.

In many countries, teachers have faced criticism in recent years, because of the decline of student achievement, and the worsening of youth problems. They are called upon to achieve outcomes which far exceed traditional expectations. The "Nation at Risk" report in the USA (1983) called for increased recognition of "superior teachers" and for increased supervision. Nearly all states undertook similar studies and made recommendations calling for increased supervision.[6] In UK teachers are subject to both internal and external pressures. There is more "intervention" in schools by parents, LEAs, and central government, and there are moves towards monitoring and institutional appraisal, and for more central control of the curriculum. These are but a few examples indicating that the quality of education has become central to the political agenda of most countries. The attention of governments has turned increasingly to ways and means of upholding quality whether this is defined in terms of the type of qualifications available to schools, the content taught, or the levels attained by students. The procedures and legislative mechanisms by which government's intent is translated into action differ widely depending on the particular country involved. A key element in converting national priorities into procedures in the schools is the supervisory system. But the way in which this formal responsibility is carried out depends on the political and cultural conventions or ethos which permeate the educational system in a given country.[7]

All these factors contribute to the need for more highly specialized and accessible expert assistance to help teachers develop their work, and at the same time maintain a system of support and quality control for on-going programmes. Educational systems not only

need teachers with freedom, creativity and motivation, but also have a need for coordination, predictability and control. Both needs should be recognized while maintaining a proper balance.

These tasks could be undertaken by a supervisory system whose key role would appear to be related to helping teachers improve their teaching methods and to finding solutions to their educational problems. A number of professional educators (Harris, 1985; Lovel and Wiles, 1983; and Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1983) to cite but a few, emphasized the importance of supervision as one of the functions that is essential for the sound operation of schools. Harris (1985) states:[8]

> "There is little room of doubt about the importance of assuming a relationship between teacher behaviour and promoting of pupil learning. Consequently, supervision must be essentially oriented to changing teaching in ways that are perceived as improving".

However, it should be stated that a supervisory staff is not the only body that can take responsibility for helping teachers improve instruction. At this point, it is sufficient to assume that competent supervision is a particularly influential factor in the improvement of instruction. This research starts from that premise.

On the other hand, it is noteworthy that not all educators have always viewed the need for supervision in the same light. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) state that:[9]

> Many educators feel that supervision is not only unnecessary in modern schools, but is frequently an obstacle to school effectiveness.

The difference in view between proponents and opponents of supervision is not wide. The latter see supervision as an appendage to classical management theories which emphasize control, compliance, and authority, whereas proponents call for not any kind of supervision but competent supervision. They state that supervisory efforts are not always fruitful. Harris (1985) states that:[10]

> the effectiveness of many efforts in this direction is open to question. The results are sometimes either limited or disappointing, or have fallen short of realistic expectations. Success is not ruled, but much still has to be learned about the kinds of action that will suffice.

1.2 The importance of research on supervision

Hence, the importance of research on supervision to determine, among other things, to what extent are the aims of supervision implemented, and what kinds of relationship should exist between teachers and supervisors?

A number of authors (Harris, 1985; Mosher and Purpel, 1972; Weller, 1971) have emphasized the need for research on supervision, particularly on what actually happens during supervision. Zeichner and Tabachnic (1982) state that:[11]

> for many years research on supervision was not concerned with the ongoing interaction of the supervisory process, and few investigations examined what actually happened when supervisors and supervisees interacted within the context of supervisory relationships.

The findings of early research on supervision led Weller (1971) to conclude that:[12]

> supervision is rarely observed except by those who are actually involved in the process .... in reality, very little is known about what actually happens in instructional supervision.

Since research of the 1970s, several studies (Copeland, 1977; Isherwood, 1983; Blummberg, 1980) have been conducted to describe the overt behaviours (usually verbal) that occur during supervisory interactions.

Typically, studies on supervision have taken two main forms. The first form has been concerned with merely documenting the verbal behaviours of supervisors and teachers as they engage in the activities of supervision, usually, within the context of supervisory conferences. Most of these studies have employed systematic category systems for the classification of supervisory behaviour similar to the kinds of category systems that have been extensively employed in the studies of teaching.

The second type of study has sought to investigate the effectiveness of specific techniques (e.g. clinical supervision) in changing teacher behaviour.

In general there has more recently been a shift in the study of supervision from analysis of factors external to the supervisory process to studies of the actual interactions of supervisors and teachers.

On the other hand, perceptions of both supervisors and teachers concerning the roles and tasks of supervision are essential to an understanding of instructional supervision. Alfonso, Firth and Neville (1975) discussed the perception component, or the way a person regards the situation in a particular environment. It embraces the events, actions and behaviour of himself and others. The person then filters these factors through the sieve of his perceptions and values:[13]

> In brief, that which is perfectly clear to one individual may be completely confusing to another, because their perceptions are entirely different. Perceived behaviour and intended or actual behaviour may be distinctly different, and often are.

Argyris (1962) refers to the tendency of persons, including leaders, to be unaware of and to overlook the unexpected impact of their behaviours on others. This tendency can be attributed to two factors; one is the belief that truth is absolute, and the other is an emphasis on the objectivity of human behaviour based on the Skinnerian theory. These beliefs are challenged by the findings of other research which indicates that:[14]

> People do not behave according to the facts as others see them. They behave according to the facts as they see them. What governs behaviour from the point of view of the individual himself are his unique perceptions of himself and the world in which he lives.

Therefore, a supervisor must recognize that his behaviour will not be identically perceived by all persons with whom he operates. Hence, teachers' perceptions of supervision are very important factors to

consider. A supervisor must be cognisant of the fact that the teachers' perceptions of his role will determine how they receive his suggestions. As Fraser (1980) put it:[15]

> Unless teachers were satisfied with the supervision
> they receive, it would not have the desired effects
> of promoting professional growth and improving
> student learning.

The perceptions of supervisors are not less important. An understanding of supervisors' perceptions of their roles is a potent factor in accomplishing favourable progress and outcomes:[16]

> The significant variations between 'good and bad
> helpers' seem to occur at the level of beliefs and
> not at the level of methods. In other words the
> use of popular supervisory techniques or methods
> seem less important in the determination of the
> outcomes than the assumptions and purposes that
> underlie the overt behaviours of supervisors.

Because no model of supervision exists apart from the interpretations of those who employ it, the study of the meaning given to supervision by those involved in the process becomes a matter of importance, although, in practice, supervisors may not be aware of all the assumptions and beliefs that underlie their work. Moreover, they may not be conscious of the conflict in some instances, between their intentions (espoused theories) and their actual practice (theories in use) as Sergiovanni and Searrate (1983) put it.[17]

The importance of the perceptions of both supervisors and teachers is another premise of this present study.

In the Arab countries, the importance of supervision has grown over the years, because of real and pressing needs in the educational systems of those countries: the increasing size of schools and teaching staffs, the large number of inexperienced and beginning teachers, and the high percentages of dropouts and failures in schools. Researchers and concerned bodies show an increased interest in supervision. Nevertheless, rigorous studies are still few. The Education Department in the Arab Organization for Education, Culture and Science (the Arab equivalent to UNESCO) organized two seminars on supervision. The first was held in Baghdad in 1981 and the second in Damascus in 1983, where on both occasions, representatives of Arab ministries of education discussed the systems of supervision in Arab countries in order to develop them. They also discussed the possibilities of coordination among the concerned bodies, and the unification of terms.[18]

On a regional level, the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States surveyed the actual systems of supervision in the Gulf States (including Iraq). The survey was conducted in 1981 as a part of a programme for integration approved by the fifth conference of Arab Gulf ministers of education held in Kuwait in 1980.[19]

At the local level, seminars and conferences on supervision are organized in Arab countries from time to time. In Jordan and Iraq some studies (Amri, 1978; Musleh, 1976; Bazzaz, 1965; Al-Rawi, 1981; and Hayyawi, 1977) were conducted by postgraduate students as part of their research for higher degrees, from the universities of Baghdad and Amman.

Other studies (Adwani, 1981; Khalil, 1983; Omari, 1977; Obeidat, 1981; and Sassi, 1977) were conducted to obtain the Ph.D. degree from American, Egyptian and French universities.

The present study is conducted as a further contribution to these efforts to study and develop the actual supervisory practices in Arab countries. In fact, in spite of the increasing interest in developing the supervisory system, and in spite of the fact that many studies have been made of other aspects of education in Qatar (such as administration, curricula and primary education ...) research in the field of supervision is still largely lacking. Apart from a few unpublished reports and documents, there has been no substantive research specifically on supervision. This is due mainly to the nature of the country which is a new developing one.

It is hoped that this research will help to fill this gap. It is not sufficient to depend on the results of research studies conducted in foreign, or even other Arab countries, because the applicability of such results is limited.

1.3 Statement of the problem

This is an initial exploratory study of the supervisory system in the public schools in Qatar, an area which has not been seriously studied before. The study aims at:

- presenting a worldwide perspective on the supervision of instruction.

- investigating the beliefs of schoolteachers and supervisors in Qatar about a wide range of aspects of supervision.

- clarifying the tasks and practices of supervision according to their level of significance as perceived by supervisors and teachers in Qatar.

- determining to what extent the tasks are undertaken and the activities actually take place.

- rating both teachers' and supervisors' perceptions of the interpersonal relations between them.

- identifying some obstacles which inhibit effective supervision.

- contributing to the implementation of an effective system of supervision.

- offering assistance to supervisors to enable them to gain a better understanding of their role.

It is hoped that the study will suggest answers to the following questions:

- To what extent are the supervisors and teachers in Qatar aware of the goals and concepts of supervision as set out in contemporary literature?

- To what extent do the independent variables such as nationality, occupation, sex, qualification, teaching cycle and experience affect the views of the teachers and supervisors?

- How satisfied are both with the system of supervision in Qatar?

It is hoped that the results of this research will be of benefit to all who are concerned, and encourage the officials to examine more closely the current system of supervision with a view to improving its efficiency.

1.4 Limitations of the Study

This study is limited in the following ways, which make a generalization of the results hazardous:

- Data for the study were collected in Qatar and the findings may not be generalizeable to other countries.

- Structures and statistics change rapidly. The data used in a study can never be wholly up to date. This study is concerned with the state of education in Qatar in 1985/1986.

- This study is subject to all the limitations inherent in the use of a questionnaire for data gathering. It was assumed that teachers and supervisors are literate and understand what was asked, and that they were honest and sincere in their responses.

- Due to factors related to Qatari society, the cluster sample was employed, a method which has its limitations.

- The study was limited to a sample of 432 teachers and 78 supervisors. The views of principals were not considered, as this did not seem wholly relevant to the research topic.

- Interpretation of perceptual data has its own limitations and deficiencies. When one collects from living human beings a set of responses which are essentially their perceptions of reality (as opposed to getting measures of and the 'reality' itself), many

reservations should be taken into consideration. Due to several factors there is sometimes a difference between the answer given and the true answer. It is easy to observe, for example, that the predispositions of the respondents affect the answers. It is possible also to see an 'error of leniency', which is a general tendency to rate items too high, as for example in the responses of the supervisor on the items of supervisors' effectiveness and accomplishments. Also a 'halo effect' might occur in the responses of the teachers in rating supervisors. Borg defines 'halo effect' as a tendency of the observer to form an early impression of the person being observed and to permit this impression to influence his ratings on all behaviours, involving the given individual or groups. The low estimates of teachers or the supervisors' frequencies of application might result from this effect. These ratings might be labelled as reflecting an 'error of severity' or a general tendency to rate items too low on all characteristics.[20]

Nevertheless, although the behaviour of an individual as seen through the eyes of another individual may be different from the real behaviour of the individual, the responses have some meaning for research if they are interpreted with caution.

As mentioned before, this study and its data should be taken as an exploratory work intended primarily to serve as documentation for improving supervision in Qatar, and as a basis for generating suggestions for the attention of key decision makers, so that they may carry out improvements in the light of information presented.

1.5 The Organization of the Study

To establish the general context the historical, political and socio-economic background of Qatar, with special reference to the development and expansion of education since the discovery of oil, is presented. It is clear that education does not exist in a vacuum. The educational policy or system can not be divorced from the overall context of society. Therefore, an understanding of the background of Qatar is important to identify the factors, which have influenced, and are still affecting education, in general, and supervision, in particular. Those factors, as al-Misnad (1985) states, arise from the deep-rooted beliefs and customs of the Qatari society.[21] The present structure of the Qatari educational system, the aims of education, and the laws which regulate the educational processes, with special references to the origins and development of the supervisory system and the regulations governing it, are also discussed. Broadly speaking, Arab and developing countries were and are still, affected by modern western education. This is true of Qatar, which is an Arab developing country. Due to the late emergence of its modern educational system, Qatar depends on other Arab countries, particularly Egypt and Jordan, for skilled staff in all branches of education. The majority of teachers, and supervisors, particularly in male schools, are of a variety of Arab nationalities. Therefore, the literature on supervision in English, with the addition of a handful of available studies conducted in other Arab countries constitutes the theoretical basis for this study. This review of literature on supervision aims at identifying some factors felt to be of fundamental importance in supervision, using these factors to evaluate the present supervisory

system in Qatar, and using this survey as a basis for making suggestions to improve the present system of supervision in Qatar. The views of both teachers and supervisors are taken into account. In order to establish, and analyse their views on issues related to supervision, a questionnaire was applied. The questionnaire covers a wide area of supervision and is carefully structured. It is hoped that it will help in shedding some light on the current system of supervision in Qatar as a starting point to an analysis of its problems, and in making recommendations to improve it. In order to test the questionnaire and determine if any modifications should take place, a small pilot study was conducted. The pilot study was conducted to reveal any deficiencies in the instrument, provide early indications of any weakness in design, ensure both the clarity of the tools, and that important statements had not been omitted.

Starting from this introduction this study is organized in the following chapters:

-   Chapter One comprises an introductory statement about the importance of supervision, the importance of research on supervision, a statement of the problem, the aims of the study, the questions considered, and the organization of the study.
-   Chapter Two introduces the contemporary approaches to supervision.
-   Chapter Three presents a worldwide perspective of supervision. The aims, development, and current systems of supervision in the UK, France, Belgium, and the USA are considered in some detail.
-   Chapter Four provides a general background of Qatar, with special reference to its educational system, and system of supervision.

- Chapter Five describes the research procedures and methodology employed in gathering and analysing the data.

- Chapters Six and Seven are a presentation and analysis of the findings.

- Chapter Eight is a summary, conclusions and recommendations.

- Appendices.

1.6 Supervision defined

The previous section was devoted to emphasizing the importance of supervision, and the importance of research on supervision, particularly in the Arab countries, as points of departure for this study. The statement of the problem, limitations of the study, and its organization were included. The purpose of this section is to present different definitions of supervision, to provide direction to this research.

The purpose of defining any term is that of giving clarity and precision to its meaning. It helps in the identification and analysis of the characteristics of a particular process and facilitates the communication of ideas. In the absence of clarity it is possible for perceptions to be coloured by personal values and subjective philosophies. In such a case individuals may select certain activities and accept certain responsibilities while at the same time rejecting other possibilities. Such a situation creates confusion, inhibits interaction among the parties involved, and therefore, delays or impedes the instructional supervisory process. Hence, the necessity for a clear definition of supervision.

From a study of the literature it is clear that there are many definitions of supervision. Each one bears some element of uniqueness. As Eye and Netzer (1965) put it:[22]

> "The defence for so many definitions is that each author develops one for the purpose of giving his own presentation a focal point that will lead to consistency and completeness .... the uniqueness of a definition is not in its difference from other definitions, but rather in its stimulation of clarity in thought and statement".

An examination of the different definitions of supervision shows that the term has meant many things to many people. People have interpreted it in terms of their own past experiences, needs, and purposes. A supervisor may consider it a positive force for improvement of teaching while a teacher may see it as a threat to initiative and autonomy. Another teacher may think of it as a source of help and support. The difference in teachers' feelings about supervision is due to the various ways in which supervisors carry out their role. Any teacher with several years of experience has probably encountered more than one type of supervisor. Mosher and Purpel (1972) argue that there is no single universaly accepted concept of supervision:[23]

> "despite abundance in literature on supervision many educators wonder whether there really is such a thing as supervision, and are puzzled at the very widespread concern about such an elusive concept. By and large, educators are confused in their understanding of supervision, and ambivalent in their feeling about it".

For a better presentation of different definitions, it will be helpful to classify them as conceptual definitions and operational

definitions. In an attempt to make a clear distinction between them, the two sets of definitions will be discussed separately, although the distinction is inevitably somewhat artificial.

1.6.1 Conceptual definitions

The conceptual definitions are concerned with what is supervision. According to Glatthorn (1984) supervision is:[24]

> "a process of facilitating the professional growth of the teacher, primarily by giving him feedback about classroom interactions and helping the teacher make use of the feedback in order to make teaching more effective".

This definition excludes the systematic evaluation of teacher performance. The author believes that teacher evaluation should be perceived as a function separate from supervision. This aspect (the evaluation of teacher performance), which was overlooked by Glatthorn, together with stimulating teachers' professional growth, is cited in Krajewski's definition of supervision as "a means of stimulating, nurturing and appraising professional growth of teachers."[25] These two aspects were emphasized by Boardman, Douglass and Bent (1961), who regard supervision as a means "to develop a favourable setting for teaching and learning" in order to achieve the ultimate goal; that is 'to stimulate and guide the continual growth of pupils'.[26] However, the ultimate goal of supervision, improving student learning, should not exclude an evaluation of all the other expected products of the supervisory process. Other outcomes such as the professional growth of teachers, curriculum development, and instructional improvement should also be considered.

Improving the learning of students, or the products of teaching, is emphasized in the following definition by Burton and Bruckner (1955):[27]

> "supervision is an expert technical service aimed at studying and improving cooperatively all factors which affect child growth and development".

Since it is "an expert technical service", it should be provided by well-qualified persons, who are aware of the ultimate goals of education, and the factors which affect the teaching/learning situation. The supervisor, according to this definition, is an expert democratic leader, who commits himself to the cooperative formulation of policies and plans. He respects personality and individual differences, welcomes contributions from all parties, and provides opportunities for each person to have free expression on the assumption that educated workers are capable of growth. This portrait of supervision is founded on the principles of democracy and equality as the means to influence instruction.

Improving the learning of students is also emphasized by Harris (1985) who defines supervision as:[28]

> "what school personnel do with adults and things to maintain or change the school operation in ways that directly influence the teaching processes employed to promote pupil learning".

This definition suggests that supervision is a major feature of the operation of schools, not a special task or a set of techniques. It is

directed towards both maintaining and improving the teaching/learning processes of the school. Harris believes that within the total context of the school operation there is a "set of reasonably distinctive endeavours" which can be categorized as "supervisory". This requires that these endeavours have certain distinguishing characteristics. Supervisory endeavours are distinguished from other school endeavours by being directly instruction-related, but not highly pupil-related. In contrast, instruction is highly pupil-related. For instance, observing in a classroom, selecting new instructional material, conducting an in-service session, are supervisory endeavours, because they are directed towards influencing instruction in direct ways, but their impact on pupils is indirect. Administrative endeavours, on the other hand, fall short of being instruction-related or highly pupil-related. They tend to give unity to the entire operation by being related to all functional areas.[29]

Other conceptual definitions consider the organizational dimension, as well as the outcomes of supervision. Alfonso, Firth and Neville (1975) define supervision as:[30]

> "a behaviour officially designed by the organization that directly affects teachers' behaviour in such a way as to facilitate pupil learning and achieve the goals of the organization".

There are three key elements in this definition. First, the supervisory behaviour is "officially designated". It is not random, casually determined activity, but it bears the stamp of formal authority. Secondly, it directly affects teacher behaviour. This

rules out other tasks performed by supervisors, which while they may be important to the educational organization, are not specifically supervisory. It provides a criterion as to whether one is really engaged in supervisory activities, i.e. "does it really affect the teachers?". Thirdly, the definition specifies an ultimate outcome, that is the facilitation of student learning. This means that influencing teacher behaviour should be purposeful.

The organizational dimension is also considered by Lovel and Wiles (1983) who define supervision as:[31]

"an organizational behaviour system that interacts
with teaching behaviour system to improve the
quality of education for students".

The authors agree with Alfonso, Firth and Neville (in the previous definition), that instructional supervision is distinguished from other behaviours by its "deliberate focus on the school's teaching behaviour system". The authors rely heavily on a broad social science base characterised by scientific rationality and objectivity in prescribing research-based principals of supervisory behaviour.

They think of educational organizations as subsystems of society which are expected to provide certain valued services, with the students at the central focus of the organizational thrust. In order to achieve its objectives the educational organisation is itself composed of a cluster of interacting behaviour systems that exist to contribute to the achievement of the goals of the 'super system' (the educational organization). The teacher behaviour system facilitates

the achievement of student learning outcomes. The administrative behaviour system develops, and enforces rules, the counselling system helps students with personal problems, and the supervisory system, although external to the teacher-pupil system, is designed to influence purposefully teacher behaviour in such a way as to facilitate student learning. All these systems are in constant interaction with the organization and with each other, but they also have each their own identity. The achievement of a subsystem's purpose requires the specification of objectives, the development of programmes to achieve objectives, the definition of roles and competences to actualize the roles and, finally, continuous evaluation of results.[32]

The idea that supervision is a functional subset of administration, rather than a subsystem of the whole educational organization (as in the previous definitions) is supported by Eye and Netzer (1965) who regard supervision as:[33]

> "that phase of school administration which deals primarily with the achievement of the appropriate selected instructional expectations of all services".

This definition is based on three assumptions: first that both supervision and administration exist in close relationship within a single area of educational functions; secondly that supervision has particular pertinence for the products of teaching and learning. It deals with activities which are closely related to instruction, with the primary or major purpose being improvement of student learning. And finally that supervision is concerned with the selecting of instructional expectations.

This definition which makes supervision merely an appendage of administration, may seem unacceptable to those who view administration and supervision, although closely related, as discrete entities within the whole educational enterprise. The definition may originate from the development of supervision as part of school administration in American schools.

1.6.2   Operational definitions

Many authors resort to operational definitions of supervision 'which are sufficiently flexible to allow us to work usefully towards the eventual classification of it'. Operational definitions specify the primary functions, tasks, activities and goals of supervision. Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski (1980) report that as early as in 1931 the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association in the USA defined supervision as:[34]

> all activities by which educational officers may express leadership in the improvement of learning and teaching. Such activities as observation of classroom instruction, conduct of teacher meetings, and of individual conferences are clearly within the meaning of this term. The development and execution of plans looking toward increased effectiveness in reading, arithmetic and some other areas of the school programme, and the organization and reorganization of the curriculum and methods are still further examples of what is meant by supervisory activities.

Mosher and Purpel (1972) suggest an operational definition of supervision which regards it as a process aiming at: 'teaching teachers how to teach, and providing professional leadership in reformulating public education, its teaching, and its forms'.

The authors believe that if one of the basic purposes of schools is formal instruction then it is a prime function of supervision to improve the quality of that instruction:[35]

> When supervision is concerned with what is taught,
> how it is taught, and the effect of teaching on the
> learner, it is itself a special kind of learning.

The authors emphasise that their definition implies working with teachers as people and 'that supervisors be able to understand and respond to them as persons'. The two functions, stated in the definition, are not discrete. They are overlapping and represent a complex web of many kinds of activity:[36]

> The supervisor teaches in the sense that he
> assists, guides, and clarifies, but he is a leader
> in that he takes the responsibility for the
> direction and performance of others. In carrying
> out these responsibilities, the supervisor
> confronts much broader issues such as: what should
> be emphasized? what do the children really learn?
> and what materials are most appropriate?

However, it is expected that this concept will create resistance among teachers who perceive themselves as autonomous and competent professionals.

Weller (1971) agrees with Mosher and Purpel that the function of supervision includes teaching and training. He adds counselling to these functions. The basic assumption of the teaching function is that:[37]

instruction, a complex interaction of teacher
behaviours, learner behaviour, and content and
environment variables, is patterned.

Therefore, the role of supervisor is to help teachers recognize and understand the interaction variables in the teaching processes, and to help them acquire the skills needed. The training function assumes that:[38]

"teaching is a complex behaviour and as such can be broken into elemental behaviours that can be systematically developed in the teacher by training techniques".

The basic assumption of the counselling function is that the individual must satisfactorily solve his conflict roles before he can become an effective teacher.[39]

Another operational definition is to be found in the Dictionary of Education (Good, 1973):[40]

"all efforts of designated school officials directed towards providing leadership to teachers and other educational workers in the improvement of instruction.... It involves the stimulation of professional growth and the development of teachers, the selection and revision of educational objectives and methods of teaching and the evaluation of instruction".

The previous definitions are operational in that they emphasize and detail the tasks and activities of supervision. Even those authors who prefer conceptual definitions, see it necessary afterwards to

operationalize their definitions by specifying goals (tasks), activities (processes), and prerequisites (competences):[41]

> "This reflects a very simple rationale, namely, if
> instructional supervision services are to influence
> teaching, certain instruction-related tasks must be
> accomplished as a result of certain supervisory
> activities, implemented by competent people".

Harris (1985) specifies the following tasks, which have implications for instruction: developing curriculum, organization of instruction, providing staff, providing facilities, providing materials, arranging for in-service education, orienting staff members, and evaluating instruction. These are only a few of the many tasks undertaken in the total school operation. They are distinguished by their high level of instruction-relatedness. Some tasks are so broad that they can not be viewed as exclusively supervisory. From another point of view, no task is pure in the sense of falling entirely within a single functional area. Five of them may be crucial: curriculum development, in-service education, evaluation, developing materials, and orienting schoolteachers.

According to Harris the activities of supervision are "basic units of behaviour in action directed towards one or more tasks". Since tasks as operational goals have variations from one situation to another and from time to time, it is not possible to generalize on the activities needed for task accomplishment. Supervisory planning, therefore, involves the designing of activities suitable for task accomplishment in each particular situation. Harris listed, analysed and described 24 activities, among which include: lecturing, panel

presenting, listening, exhibiting materials, observing in classrooms, demonstrating, fieldtrips, intervisiting and writing.

He defines competences as "any combination of knowledge and skill that is adequate for accomplishing some specified outcome". The complexity and variety of knowledge and skill will vary depending on the task involved. For example, the task of evaluation might require knowledge of interaction and analysis, skill in listening and categorizing verbal and non-verbal behaviour, skills in transferring categorized events to a matrix, and skill in computing certain ratios and percentages.[42]

Lovel and Wiles (1983) assume that the following operational goals might provide direction to supervision: curriculum development, direct support and service for teachers, evaluation for personnel decisions, in-service education, and evaluation of educational results.

The authors identify some processes assumed to be basic, interdependent, and persistent in the various supervisory operations. These include releasing human potential, coordinating and facilitating change, communication and providing leadership.[43]

Eye and Netzer (1965) identify the following goals of supervision: professional maturity, curriculum development, instructional improvement, and school-community consolidation.

The authors specify the following processes of supervision: directing and controlling, stimulating, initiating, analysing and appraising, and designing and implementing.[44]

To sum up, supervision appears a problematic term to define, as is evident from the contrasting definitions discussed above. Some definitions are very general, others are very specific. Nearly all definitions share some common elements. In lieu of defining it, some educators cite the purposes, functions, and roles of supervisors. It is stated or implicit in the majority of the definitions that supervision is a process designed to improve instruction, promote professional growth of teachers, and facilitate the teaching/learning process.

1.6.3   Sources of confusion

The preceding section was concerned with the definitions of supervision. The literature revealed many definitions of the term resulting in confusion. This section will examine the sources of confusion surrounding supervision, that can be attributed to a number of both theoretical and practical factors.

1.6.3.1   The complexity of the teaching process

> "the search for effective teaching methods is like the search for the 'Holy Grail'".
>
> John D. McNeil

Since supervision is concerned with the improvement of teaching, the complexity of the teaching process is one factor contributing to the problem. Teaching is a complex set of attitudes, skills, knowledge, motivation and values. Teachers operate in the context of a

complex set of expectations about how and what they should teach, and this may lead to conceptualizations of what takes place in classrooms that are vague and often inaccurate. This may be also influenced by what one feels should be or should not be taking place in classrooms, or an uncritical acceptance of classroom descriptions that are reported in literature.

At this point, many questions arise: What constitutes good teaching? What attributes characterize an effective teacher? What indicators can be relied on in assessing effectiveness; should these be external indicators such as students, principals, supervisors, test scores, or should teachers gauge their own effectiveness through self-assessment? Do more effective teachers have teaching patterns that differ from teachers who are less effective? What about the conditions of schools such as the composition of students in classrooms?

There is a great difference of opinion concerning the answers to these questions. Research has yet to identify the components of effective teaching. There is no single model of effective teaching or learning. No one "right" way to teach exists, instead there is a variety of approaches. Many educational methods are widely adopted and defended, sometimes on personal prejudice.

Similarly the likelihood of any particular behaviour, in isolation from a multitude of behaviours, having a significant effect on pupil learning is very remote given the complexity of the teaching environment. Moreover the effect of a particular behaviour may be influenced in important ways by the presence of other behaviours.[45]

According to social learning theory, an influential teacher is one who can reward and punish or who has outstanding command of a particular field of knowledge. Because students wish to identify with adults who have status and power, they will choose as models those teachers who are strong, powerful, or extremely skilled.

Psychological theories of modelling, which describe how young people internalize the behaviour of their elders, suggest that for a teacher to have an impact on the behaviour of students, he must be perceived as having control over resources which are attractive to the young.[46]

Most often pupils describe influential teachers in terms of their ability to generate enthusiasm for learning through personal involvement with the subject matter, and skills in teaching it. They respond to teachers who communicate a sense of excitement which makes learning a pleasure. They see influential teachers as exceptionally "approachable", easy to talk to, and ready to listen when the students have difficulty understanding the material. Such behaviour proves to students that learning is worth their time and effort.[47] But warmth, enthusiasm, accessibility, are not task-relevant traits. They are connected with the expressive dimensions of teaching that make a teacher popular with students. They may become a hinderance to teaching, and to achieving high ratings.

Mosher and Purpel (1972) surveyed a number of studies of effective teachers. Among the definitions reported is one which states that:[48]

"the effective teacher is the one who responds
appropriately to specific factors in the classroom
.... factors such as the individual learner's
intellectual ability, the organization of his
knowledge, and how he thinks".

This definition emphasizes teacher behaviour in interaction with specific factors in the classroom. Another definition of effective teaching focuses on its products or results:[49]

"effective teaching is the ability to produce
agreed-upon educational effects".

Implicit in the definition is that agreement on the educational effects which the teacher must produce, must precede the evaluation of teachers, or the methods of accomplishing the aims of education. At this point, philosophical issues of what is to be taught or learned, are involved.

Ritchie (1986) surveyed a number of studies on teaching and concluded that:[50]

"after more than half a century of research on
teaching we do not know how to define, prepare for,
or measure teacher competence .... research on
teacher effectiveness and teacher competence does
not lead to a stable list of measurable teaching
behaviours effective in all teaching contexts. It
is generally agreed that the definitive theory for
teaching has not been formulated".

The situation means that evaluators have to rely on subjective criteria developed from their own experience. Ritchie reported a study by Worth in which 63 supervisors after viewing a 15-minute videotape of a grade

one teacher at work, ranged in their ratings of her teaching performance from "exceptional ... demonstrates a high level of professional skill" to "doubtful ... has not demonstrated suitability for teaching".[51] This reinforces the fact that professional supervisors do not necessarily agree, even about the same teacher.

In sum, it is not possible nor realistic to set out a list of teaching behaviours that when applied by any teacher in any context will enhance pupil learning. The best which can be hoped for is to identify specific clusters of teaching behaviours that under specific conditions promote progress towards particular outcomes.

Grouwss (1981) identifies the following clusters of behaviours as associated with teacher effectiveness: general clarity of instruction, higher achievement of expectations (more homework assigned, and faster pace), the class taught primarily as a unit, non-evaluative learning environment (relatively little praise and criticism), relatively few managerial problems, and a task-focused environment. The author considers personal characteristics such as qualifications, years of experience, and in-service courses not to be crucial.[52] Supervisors should be aware of the complexities involved, and hence avoid simplistic solutions.

1.6.3.2   Role ambiguity

Part of the problem is a function of the various changing roles and duties that have been ascribed to supervision. The conflicting pressures on supervisors to help teachers and evaluate them, to direct

curriculum development, and discharge a host of administrative and clerical tasks, complicate the problem of defining the job:[53]

> "the administration may expect the supervisor to direct, control, and monitor the behaviour of teachers. Teachers, on the other hand, may expect help and warm encouragement, free of threat. An administrator may expect the supervisor to work in the central office doing administrative tasks. Teachers may expect readily available help, service, and support for their teaching performance. The result can be confusion, disappointment, or even alienation of all parties."

One aspect of the problem is the overlapping of supervisory activities and other school activities, namely administrative activities. Lucio and McNeil (1969) consider that the confusion has arisen as a result of the acceptance of administrative functions by supervisors and of supervisory functions by administrators.[54] This notion is emphasized by Eye and Netzer (1965). In compliance with their definition of supervision as "a phase of school administration", they state that there is a difficulty in making a distinction between functions which are specifically supervisory in nature and other administrative functions which are managerial:[55]

> "It is impossible to do other than identify the extremes and recognize that between them there is a broad grey area of tasks that might be classified one way or the other. Some tasks, however, are totally inappropriate for such classification".

The other side of the problem is that only infrequently is there a person solely responsible for providing instructional supervision:[56]

"Those who expect a precise answer to the question
of who actually does supervision are in for
disappointment. It is extremely difficult to find
existing positions that embody the kinds of
functions ascribed to supervision".

Supervisors themselves are assigned a broad variety of titles and positions. Terms such as supervisors, consultants, specialists, inspectors and advisors (advisers) are among those widely used to designate staff members with supervisory responsibilities. But they are not the only contributors to the improvement of instruction. There are many people with a variety of titles who perform supervisory functions related to improving instruction. Among them are principals, curriculum directors, and other personnel. In England and Wales the head of a department in a school is expected to provide guidance and support for teachers in his department, particularly in their first year of teaching. Some teachers also are released from their teaching duties for specific periods to provide specialist professional advice to other teachers. They are called "advisory teachers".[57] In Kuwait and Egypt the "Mudarrison Al-Awa'el" (senior teachers or first teachers) are released from some of their classroom teaching in order to provide support and help.

The situation stems partly from the way supervision is viewed. If supervision is regarded as a role, then there is a particular incumbent labelled "supervisor", but:[58]

"when supervision is viewed as a process then all
school personnel (principals, librarians, division
chair-persons....) are supervisors at one time or
another".

In these circumstances, the role of supervisor is clouded with
ambiguity, and this is identified as an obstacle to effective
supervision. It is characterized by "uncertainty about
responsibilities ... and expectations of others for job performance".
Mair (1975) defines "role ambiguity" as:[59]

> "the situation in which an individual lacks the
> role definition which he feels is necessary to
> perform his role satisfactorily".

Normally, it is associated with tension, anxiety and with a reduction
in the extent to which the demands and requirement of the role are
successfully met by the role occupant.

Harris (1985) suggests that the term "supervisor" should be
reserved for those whose primary responsibilities are providing
leadership in supervisory activities, while their role in the
administration and management of teaching should be limited. Some
might question the need for distinguishing the supervisor from other
personnel. Harris regards this as logical, because if responsibility
is to be clearly designated, an individual or a group must be clearly
identified. He suggests three criteria for supervisors to "demonstrate
their unique contributions". The criterion of relevance is met when
"responsibility for the task of supervision is properly assumed". The
criterion of uniqueness is met when "supervisors have an array of
competences for effective use of leadership skills and processes which
are either not possessed by other personnel or are not readily
available for deployment in the various areas of supervision". And the
criterion of efficiency is met when a number of personal and

situational factors are combined in appropriate ways. These factors include time, energy, freedom and flexibility.[60]

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) differentiate between supervisors and other personnel who might carry out supervisory activities, according to the following criteria: "supervisors depend upon other people to help them achieve the supervisory goals". When supervisors and administrators work with things and ideas rather than with people in pursuing school goals, they tend to be operating in an administrative way:

> "working on budget, schedule, or preparing a memo, although relating to achieving or facilitating school purposes, are not supervisory behaviour because they are carried in a way that does not require dependence on others for success".61

Another criterion, stated by the authors, is that a supervisor, as an educational leader, should rely on expertise. He is assumed to be an expert in educational and instructional matters, to be able to engage effectively in the context of improving instruction.[62]

Drawing upon a number of research studies, Mosher and Purpel (1972) attribute three characteristics to supervisors: the supervisor does not usually have responsibility for the administration of an organizational unit such as a district or school, but usually has responsibilities in several units. He usually has major responsibility within one or more areas of supervision and has only incidental responsibilities in other areas.[63]

Lovel and Wiles (1983) differentiate between supervisory behaviour and administrative behaviour in that the former is concerned with improving education, through the evaluation of educational objectives and programmes, helping teachers develop professionally, and providing support and assistance to teachers to evaluate their performance, while the latter is concerned with control, management and co-ordinating programmes. Administrators would be responsible for quality control, and for the evaluation of teachers' performance, and for personnel decisions. The allocation of personnel, equipment, and materials would be matters of importance. The achievement of the tasks of administration requires an authority structure with more emphasis on formal authority.[64]

1.6.3.3   Role Conflict

Related to role ambiguity is role conflict stemming from the supervisor being both a helper and an assessor. How the supervisor can reconcile these two conflicting roles is an issue which has so far not been satisfactorily resolved:[65]

> "Nearly all discussions of supervision, in textbooks and periodicals, have wrestled with the difficult problem of separating helping behaviours from evaluating behaviours".

The duality of role is not peculiar to supervision. It is common to all organizations where the holders of various hierarchical positions are responsible, not only for the growth and development of others, but also for the evaluation of their performance.

Cooper (1982) describes the conflict supervisors face when they fulfill their various roles:[66]

"A great dilemma for persons charged with supervisory responsibilities, is how to balance their conflicting roles as evaluators and helpers. Supervisors are expected to develop open, trusting, and supportive inter-personal climates with teachers, although they are also expected to make judgements regarding teachers' effectiveness".

The other side of the coin is the teacher's dilemma in his need for help, which conflicts with his need to be seen as competent, for which he must be evaluated favourably. These needs do not necessarily conflict, but in practice are generally irreconcilible.

1.6.3.4 The problem of terminology

Relevant to the problem of defining supervision is the difficulty of terminology; that is whether the appropriate term is "supervision" or "inspection". Dodd (1968) defines inspection as implying:[67]

"A specific occasion when a school is examined and evaluated as a place of learning in such a way that advice may be given for its improvement and the advice is embodied in a report".

This definition makes inspection distinct from supervision which is a constant and continuous process of guidance based on frequent visits, when attention is directed to one or more aspects of the school and its organization.

Jones (1968) states that the two terms are different in that "to supervise" means "to see over" while "to inspect" means "to see into".[68] In Eastwood's words:[69]

> "When precisely used in a technical sense the terms inspection and supervision possess different connotations - the former implies some form of rating and assessment, while the latter suggests professional advice and assistance".

It is noteworthy that supervision is the term preferred in the USA, where it is connected with guidance, help, advice and professional development. The term inspection is disliked by American educators because it has associations of threat, intrusion, sanctions and inquisitorial approaches.

Inspection is the term still used in Britain and France, although in both countries there has been a clear shift from traditional inspection towards more advisory functions. In the expansionist 1960s, and the early 1970s the trend was for LEAs in England and Wales to change the titles of local inspectors to advisors (advisers) and for the central Government to mitigate or abandon their practice of regular general inspections of individual schools. But many LEAs have readopted the term "inspector", at least for the senior personnel, and have strengthened their inspection and evaluation procedures. Bolam (1982) attributes this "setback" to the "notorious" William Tyndale School Affair in the Inner London Education Authority which emphasized the advisors' inspectorial function as a means of ensuring the public accountability of teachers and headteachers.[70] At the central government level the term "inspector" has been consistently maintained.

However, it would seem to matter little what term is used. What is crucial in the context is what is seen as the objectives of inspection of supervision, how these people perform their jobs, and why?

In sum, there is a confusion and disagreement about the appropriate roles for supervision, and uncertainty exists in determining who are supervisors, and it is difficult to determine what are the key components of their job, how much authority they should have, and what should be their relationships with administrators and teachers. There is a need to clarify the roles and responsibilities of supervisors. Yet, it is not possible or even desirable to develop universal roles for supervision. The roles need to be defined in a flexible manner in an effort to eliminate as much of the confusion as possible. It may also be appropriate to develop broad categories of roles for instructional supervisors, which could give direction both for the preparation of supervisors and the development of role structure.

In the Arab countries, researchers, influenced by western education, and the American trends, in particular, tend to adopt the American definitions of supervision. Rayyan (1980) does not adopt any single definition. Instead he presents four facets of supervision: supervision as inspection, as help, as cooperation and as democratic leadership. He prefers the last of these. The author specifies the areas of activity with which supervision is concerned: educational values and attitudes, curriculum development, instructional activities, problem-solving, professional relationships, and morale building. According to this author these functions are performed through classroom visits, staff conferences, personal relations, and through the evaluation of teacher performance.[71]

According to Al-Afandi (1971) "Tushrif" the Arab equivalent of the verb "supervise" means "to coordinate and to mobilize". He views supervision as:[72]

"a professional development of teachers to enable them to affect students learning in the best way to contribute to the welfare of their society".

The seminar for developing instructional supervisory systems in Arab Gulf States held in Kuwait in October 1981 defined supervision as:[73]

"an educational system aiming at improving the learning/teaching process through developing the capacities of teachers and students and using suitable means to actualize the aims of education".

The Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (including Iraq) defined supervision of instruction as:[74]

"the process through which the evaluation and development of the teaching/learning process and the follow up of the actualization of educational goals is performed. It involves supervising all school activities, either instructional or administrative. Even out-of-school activities which have any bearing to instruction are included".

Al-Chetawi and Al-Ahmer (1984) surveyed the prevailing concepts of supervision in the Arab countries. Their findings indicate that supervision is viewed as:[75]

- a process aiming at improving the performance of teachers and upgrading their methods in order to maximize the return on education and to accomplish its goals.

- a human interaction and cooperation between the teacher and the supervisor to develop the whole context of education.

- a comprehensive view of the teaching/learning process in all its aspects (the teacher, the text-book, the curriculum and the buildings).

- a means of communication and interaction between the schools and the central administration.

- a comprehensive process to develop the potential of all parties involved, and

- a guidance and counselling instrument to improve teaching.

The titles of the post in Arab countries include "Mutafakkid" (inspector) in Tunisia, "Mushref" in Jordan and Iraq, "Akhessai" (specialist) in Bahrain, "Mustashar" (consultant) in North Yemen, and "Muwajjeh" (advisor) in Qatar, Libya and Oman. In some Arab countries more than one term is used. The terms "Murshed" (counsellor), in Tunisia, "Khabir" (expert) in Libya, "Mushref Awwal" and "Mushref Tarbawi" (senior supervisor and educational supervisor) in Iraq, are used, in addition to the above mentioned terms, to designate officials with supervisory responsibilities.

The term "Mushref" (supervisor) and the term "Muwajjeh" (advisor), are the most common in Arab literature on supervision. The old notorious term "Mufattesh" (inspector) is no longer used in most Arab countries. On the other hand, there is a growing tendency to reserve the term "Ishraf" for supervision of instruction, while using the term "Tawjeeh" for the guidance and counselling of students. The first is teacher-related, while the latter is student-oriented.

Generally speaking, in the Arab countries there are general supervisors for all subjects, particularly in the first 3-4 years of primary education, and specialist subject supervisors at the preparatory and secondary stages, as it is the case in Qatar. In some Arab countries, particularly the large ones, there are both central government supervisors and regional supervisors.[76]

For the purpose of this study, supervision in Qatar is defined as:[77]

> "The activities which help teachers to perform their tasks in a better way, upgrade (improve) their methods of teaching and evaluate them, as well as to develop curriculum, textbooks, materials, and activities in order to achieve the goals of education".

There is a corps of general and subject-matter supervisors. Their activities are regulated by ministerial instructions.

1.7 Conclusion

This study starts from the premise that teachers need a support system. They usually begin their careers with relatively little training. The organized body of knowledge is always expanding and changing. New teaching methods, materials and equipment are constantly being developed. Teachers face complex educational tasks, and therefore need help. It is assumed that supervision is one of the several sources of help.

The literature emphasizes the need for research on supervision, particularly on the interaction between supervisors and teachers. Arab countries are showing increasing interest in supervision, yet there are still very few research studies. In the case of Qatar, the research is negligible. The purpose of this study is to contribute to the understanding and development of supervision in the Arab countries.

Various definitions of supervision have been discussed and contrasted. Despite confusion stemming from role conflict, role ambiguity, the complexity of teaching processes, and the problem of terminology, most definitions agree that the ultimate goal of supervision is the improvement of instruction. In lieu of defining it, many authors operationalize the supervisory tasks, competences, and activities. Teacher professional growth, curriculum development and the evaluation of teachers are seen as basic.

Discussion of supervision by selected Arab authors, have been cited. They have much in common with Western, particularly American, works on the subject. Finally the concept of supervision in Qatar is presented. It has much in common with prevailing concepts in other Arab countries.

1.8 References

1. Hayon, L. and Beretz, M., Becoming a teacher : the transition from teachers' colleges to classroom life, Instructional Review of Education, Vol. 32, 1986, p. 414.

2. Weinstein, G., Pre-service Teachers' Expectations about the First Year of Teaching, Teaching and Teacher Education, No. 1, Vol. 4, Oxford, Pergamon Press, 1988, p. 36.

   See also: European Journal of Teacher Education, No. 1, Vol. 10, 1987, pp. 95-110.

3. Hayon, L., Perceived Teaching Difficulties by Beginning Teachers, Research in Education, Manchester University Press, No. 37, May 1987, p. 25.

   See also: Arends, R., Beginning Teachers as Learners, Journal of Educational Research, No. 4, Vol. 76, 1985, p. 225.

4. Hayon, L. and Beretz, M., op.cit., pp. 414-415.

5. Phi Delta Kappan, May 1987, p. 667.

6. Friend, M., Supervision of Instruction : The Perceptions of Selected Idaho Educators, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1986, p. 21.

7. European Journal of Education, No. 4, Vol. 21, 1986, p. 327.

8. Harris, B., Supervisory Behaviour in Education, 3rd edition, NJ, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1985, p. 27.

9. Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R., Supervision : Human Perspective, NY, McGraw-Hill Books, 1983, p. 122.

10. Harris, B., op.cit., p. 115.

11. Zeichner, K. and Tabachnic, B., The Beliefs Systems of University Supervisors in an Elementary Student Teaching Programme, Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol. 8, 1982, p. 34.

12. Weller, R., Verbal Communication in Instructional Supervision, NY, Teachers' College Press, 1971, p. 1.

13. Alfonso, R. et.al., Instructional Supervision : Behavioural System, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1975, pp. 35-36.

14. Combs, A. and Snygg, D., Individual Behaviour : A Perceptual Approach to Behaviour, NY, Harper Row, 1959, p. 17.

15. Fraser, K., Supervisory Behaviour and Teacher Satisfaction, Journal of Educational Administration, No. 2, Vol. 18, 1980, pp. 224-231.

16. Zeichner, K. and Tabachnic, B., op.cit., p. 36.

17. Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R., op.cit., p. 306.

18. Department of Education (Arab Organization for Education, Culture and Science), Educational Supervision in the Arab World, Tunisia, 1984 (in Arabic).

19. Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States, Educational Supervision in Arab Gulf States, Al-Riyadh, 1985 (in Arabic).

20. Borg, W. and Gall, M., Educational Research, Longman, 1983, p. 509.

21. al-Misnad, S., The Development of Modern Education in the Gulf, Ithaca Press, 1985, p. 5.

22. Eye, G. and Netzer, L., Supervision of Instruction, NY, Harper Row, 1965, p. 15.

23. Mosher, R. and Purpel, D., <u>Supervision : Reluctant Profession</u>, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1972, pp. 1-2.

24. Glatthorn, R., <u>Instructional Supervision</u>, quoted in Friend, M., op.cit., p. 27.

25. Krajewski, R., Instructional Supervision, <u>Contemporary Education</u>, No. 4, Vol. 49, 1977, p. 309.

26. Douglas, M. et.al., <u>Instructional Supervision in Secondary Schools</u>, NY, Appleton-Century, 1959, p. 17.

27. Burton, W. et.al., <u>Supervision : A Social Process</u>, Appleton-Century Crofts, NY, 1956, p. 10.

28. Harris, B., op.cit., p. 23.

29. Ibid, p. 25.

30. Alfonso, R. et.al., op.cit., p. 35.

31. Lovel, J. and Wiles, K., <u>Supervision for Better Schools</u>, 5th edition, NJ, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1985, p. 13.

32. Ibid, p. 19.

33. Eye, G. and Netzer, L., op.cit., p. 17.

34. Goldhammer, R. et.al., <u>Clinical Supervision</u>, 2nd edition, NY, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980, p. 12.

35. Mosher, R. and Purpel, D., op.cit., pp. 3-4.

36. Ibid, p. 22.

37. Weller, P., op.cit., p. 10.

38. Ibid, p. 12.

39. Ibid, p. 13.

40. Good, G. (ed.), <u>Dictionary of Education</u>, 3rd edition, NY, McGraw-Hill, 1973, p. 534.

41. Harris, B., op.cit., p. 35.

42. Ibid, pp. 41-47.

43. Lovel, J. and Wiles, K., op.cit. pp. 32-37.

44. Eye, G. and Netzer, L., op.cit., p. 17.

45. Grouwss, D., An Approach to improving teacher effectiveness, Cambridge Journal of Education, No. 1, Vol. 11, 1981, pp. 4-5.

46. Csikszentmihalyl, M., et.al., The Influence of Teachers, Phi Delta Kappan, No. 6, Vol. 67, 1986.

47. Ibid, p. 119.

48. Mosher, R. and Purpel, D., op.cit., p. 41.

49. Ibid, p. 41.

50. Ritchie, T., Supervision and Anarchy, McGill Journal of Education, No. 1, Vol. 21, 1986, p. 53.

51. Ibid, pp. 53-67.

52. Grouwss, D., op.cit., p. 5.

53. Lovel, J. and Wiles, K., op.cit., p. 3.

54. Lucio, W. and McNeil, J., Supervision : A Synthesis of Thought and Action, NY, McGraw Hill, 1969, p. 25.

55. Eye, G. and Netzer, L., op.cit., p. 37.

56. Mosher, R. and Purpel, D., op.cit., p. 25.

57. Bolam, R., School Inspectors and Advisers, In Mitzel, T. (ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Vol. 2, NY, Free Press, p. 4429.

58. Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R., op.cit., p. 12.

59. Mair, S., Evaluation Practices and Role Dysfunction among Community Junior Colleges Administration, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1986, p. 36.

60. Harris, B., op.cit., pp. 120-121.

61. Seriovanni, T. and Starratt, R., op.cit., p. 12.

62. Ibid, p. 13.

63. Mosher, R. and Purpel, D., op.cit., p. 28.

64. Lovel, J. and Wiles, K., op.cit., p. 39.

65. Goldhammer, R. et.al., op.cit., p. 13.

66. Cooper, J., Supervision of Teachers, In Mitzel, T. (ed.), op.cit., p. 1824.

67. Dodd, W., Primary Inspection in New Countries, O.U.P., 1966, p. 2.

68. Jones, A., The Inspector and the Professional Development of Teachers, The Journal of Educational Administration, No. 1, Vol. VI, 1968, p. 36.

69. Eastwood, G., The Inspectorate in New South Wales : A Critical Comment, The Journal of Educational Administration, No. 2, Vol. 11, 1964, p. 71.

70. Bolam, R., op.cit., p. 4430.

71. Rayyan, F., Technical Supervision : Theory and Practice, Kuwait, 'Dar Al-Kalam', 1980, p. 29 (in Arabic).

72. Al-Afandi, M., Technical Supervision of Instruction, Cairo, Dar Nahdat Misr, 1972, p. 210 (in Arabic).

73. Abd-Ul-Al, S., Unpublished paper submitted to the Arab Seminar on Supervision, Baghdad, 1983, p. 9 (in Arabic).

74. Arab Bureau of Education for Gulf States, op.cit., p. 17.

75. Al-Chetawi, A. and Al-Ahmer, A., The findings of a Study of the Reports of Some Arab Countries on Educational Supervision, In the Department of Education/Arab Organization for Education, Culture and Science, op.cit., p. 10 (in Arabic).

76. Ibid, pp. 15-17.

77. Abd-Ul-Al, S., op.cit., p. 10.

CHAPTER TWO

Supervision of Instruction : Schools of Thought

2.0 Introduction

2.1 Task-oriented Approaches

    2.1.0 Introduction

    2.1.1 Inspection

    2.1.2 Scientific Supervision

    2.1.3 Neoscientific Supervision

2.2 Human-oriented Approaches

    2.2.0 Introduction

    2.2.1 Democratic Supervision

    2.2.2 Human Relations Supervision

2.3 Structuralist Approaches

    2.3.0 Introduction

    2.3.1 Human Resources Supervision

2.4 Alternative Approaches

    2.4.0 Introduction

    2.4.1 Peer Supervision

    2.4.2 Clinical Supervision

2.5 Conclusion

2.6 References

CHAPTER TWO

Supervision of Instruction : Schools of Thought

2.0 Introduction

The preceding chapter discussed the importance of supervision and the importance of research on supervision, as starting points for this research. Different definitions of supervision were given, and sources of confusion surrounding the term were identified. The statement of the problem, limitations of the study, and organization of the study were included. The present chapter introduces different schools of thought of supervision.

The literature reveals that supervisory practices reflect a wide range of schools of thought. The proliferation of these schools is due to two main factors: the first is related to social-cultural factors such as population growth, changing school communities, and concern for more and better education. The second is the proliferation of theories, research models, and field studies in the behavioural sciences which have developed new ideas and new understanding of supervisory goals, functions, role, power and position. Theories of reinforcement, personality, learning, behaviour and communication; concepts of role, and role expectations, and dynamic, functional leadership have all contributed to the development of the present character of supervision, which was described by Lucio and McNeil (1969) as:[1]

> a synthesizing process, assimilating predicted
> consequences suggested by various theories with
> judgements about the desirability of consequences
> in unique situations.

This proliferation may lead to confusion; some supposedly new schools appear to be only different names for existing schools, or merely offshoots of others. Common elements among them make it sensible to view them as members of the same family.

These schools of thought can be presented either chronologically or according to their point of focus. In the first case they take the following sequence: inspection, democratic supervision, scientific supervision, human relations supervision, neoscientific supervision, clinical supervision, peer supervision and human resources supervision.

In the second case they can be classified as: task-oriented approaches which include inspection, scientific supervision, and neoscientific supervision; human-oriented approaches such as democratic supervision and human relations supervision; and human resources supervision which appears to be a synthesis of scientific and human relations supervision. Peer supervision and clinical supervision are presented in contrast to traditional general supervision. The classification according to focus appears to provide the better analytical survey of the field.

2.1 Task-oriented Approaches

2.1.0 Introduction

These approaches exemplified by inspectorial, scientific and neoscientific supervision share the assumption that teachers need to be helped, directed, told what to do and how to do it. Their emotions,

feelings, attitudes and morale are neglected. Although all these approaches have common elements, they will be discussed separately for the sake of analysis.

2.1.1   Inspection

The inspectorial approach emphasizes monitoring, accountability, testing and evaluation in order to maintain conformity and existing practices. This approach assumes that teachers are passive instruments, capable of performing work and accepting directions, but not of initiating action or exerting influence in any significant way.

Lovel and Wiles (1983) report the following assumptions upon which inspection was based (in the USA): no special professional competence was required for supervisors; no belief in a science of teaching that could be taught or learned; no concern for the emotions, feelings, attitudes or morale of teachers; and no effort to improve teachers or teaching. The inspector was simply there to determine whether children were learning. The teacher is held accountable for the pupil achievement. If a problem was identified, the responsibility for solving it was placed firmly on the teacher.[2]

Gwynn (1961) points out further that this approach makes no clear-cut distinction between the administrative and the inspectorial responsibilities of the inspector. Therefore, it was called by some 'administrative inspection'. A second feature noticed by Gwynn is the overlapping of duties between principals and inspectors with teachers confused about whose instructions to follow.[3]

Negative connotations are attached to this approach developing from the implication that supervision is needed because teachers can not be trusted. Lewis and Miel (1972) attributed these negative overtones in American schools to the fact that originally teachers were not trained.[4]

Inspection was challenged by democratic and human relations ideas which assume that teachers bring to schools ideas, attitudes, values and goals which are not in complete harmony with the schools goals. The assumption that teachers are tools to be manipulated, is rejected.

As a result, a major shift from inspection towards democratic and human relations supervision, which will be discussed later, characterized most decades of this century all over the world. In the USA, the 'administrative inspection' gave way to democratic supervision, advocated in many states in the 1930s. In other parts of the world, the International conference for Inspectors of schools held at Chichester, England, in 1955 discussed the 'Changing Role of the Inspectorate'. M. Francois of France pointed out that 'the idea of the inspector as a bogey-man, a bulwark of the established order, a dreaded judge, hair-splitting and merciless, seems to be dying out'. 'As the function of enforcement becomes less important' said the New Zealand delegate, 'inspectors are able to move towards a relationship of partnership with teachers'. Dr. Orata of the Phillippines declared that 'there has been a significant tendency towards giving teachers increasing freedom of action'. The Canadian delegate spoke of 'a trend towards a kind of leadership, in which autocratic direction gives way to guidance and a more liberal sharing of responsibility'.[5]

Nevertheless, this approach is still widely used, despite strong efforts to decrease reliance on it. Lewis and Miel (1972) surveyed the history of supervision pointing out that little progress had been made in 'erasing the impression that an official called supervisor (inspector) exists chiefly to catch teachers in a mistake and force them to conform to rules and norms'.[6]

2.1.2   Scientific supervision

The traditional scientific supervision, which has its roots in the scientific management of industry, represents also the classical autocratic philosophy of supervision. It shares with the 'administrative inspection' the assumption that teachers are passive instruments hired to carry out pre-specified duties in accordance with the wishes of management. Traditional scientific supervision emphasizes empirical research, productivity, evaluation, control, accountability and administrative efficiency, as a means of bringing economy, order and stability to the schools, which are seen as factories to create from the raw material (children) a valuable product.

It believes in the possibility of objectively measuring behaviour related to effective teaching and implies that teaching behaviours can be controlled and regulated for optimal operation.

The primary task of the scientific supervisor is to discover educational laws and apply them through the labours of the teachers. The teacher is expected to find the controlling law through cooperation

with the supervisor. 'It is not a hierarchical relationship, for both of them are under the law of science'. Because the burden of finding the best methods is too great and complex to be laid upon the shoulders of teachers, supervisors undertake this task. They have the largest share in determining the proper methods.

Scientific supervision has spawned vast numbers of empirical questionnaires and analytical studies, all designed to produce a science of teaching:[7]

> Studies were used to determine the 'one' best way
> of achieving a special task. Workers were expected
> to do it that way and supervisors were there to see
> that they did.

Scientific supervisors tell, explain, show enforce, rate and reward. Naturally, there is a variety of pattern, but the fundamental assumption is that the teacher is an instrument who can be used and moulded by the administration to facilitate the achievement of the goals of the school:[8]

> After objectives had been determined and the best
> way of achieving them had been scientifically
> established, it was the function of supervisor to
> see to it that teachers carried out the
> specifications.

There is little or no concern for teachers as human beings except as instruments for getting the job done. Teachers are paid to perform with efficiency.

Arvil S. Barr was one of the important advocates of scientific supervision. He emphasized research as a means for improvement of the outcomes of instruction:[4]

> Only by this means can teachers and supervisors evaluate the instruction, keep it responsive to social needs, and in harmony with growth of scientific knowledge.

His idea of what it meant to be scientific evolved from an amalgamation of the principles of scientific management and behaviouristic psychology to a point of view that recognized science as a tool for thinking about and seeking to understand phenomena. His notion of science seems to be a systematic procedure for collecting observable data and assigning a uniform and descriptive vocabulary. Scientific method is characterized by the absence of personal bias and the systematic and objective investigation of phenomena using the methods of psychology, statistics and measurement. Science is seen as truth seeking, truth finding, and an attitude which seeks solution in the scientific study of educational problems.[10]

Building upon these assumptions, Barr called for the application of more scientific methods to supervision:[11]

> The object of scientific supervision is the development of a group of professionals who attack their problems scientifically, free from the control of tradition and actuated by the spirit of inquiry.

Application of scientific methods to supervision means that the supervisory programme would be based upon scientific studies of instruction, in so far as such research is available. It means that improvement will follow the pattern of science: measure, modify under controlled conditions, and measure again until the goals desired are attained. Through use of this method both supervisors and teachers would become experimental in their attitudes towards their work:[12]

> If supervisors were to follow the pattern of science, they need to begin by formulating the objectives of education. Once objectives are formulated, the scientific supervisor would survey the products of instruction in order to determine how improvement should be made.

Barr further outlined what he meant by science as it was to be applied to supervision: science is based upon observable facts, employs the method of analysis in the comprehension of complex phenomena, employs hypotheses in guiding the thinking process, employs objective measurement, employs quantitative methods in the treatment of the data, and is characterized by freedom from emotional bias. He urged supervisors to stimulate others to constructive problem-solving, helping them to discover and define instructional needs, to choose and apply appropriate methods of research, and to digest and interpret the results of research to the end that the process of instruction might be improved.[13]

However, it became evident that scientific supervision does not explain all events. Many questions were raised. As happened with inspection, democratic and human relations ideas stimulated a powerful

challenge to scientific supervision and laid the foundation for a growing concern with the psychological well-being of the teacher. Bruckner, an advocate of scientific supervision, changed his views:[14]

> Human beings do not function well when they are treated as moving parts of a machine. Every person is a thinking emotional being. There is no limit to his capacity for great and productive labour, creative cooperative effort, and loyal self-sacrifice when the whole man is thrown into the program.

Burton, another advocate of scientific supervision, later came to regard supervisors who insist on exclusively scientific method as 'ineffective' in the long run:[15]

> An ignorant enthusiasm for the scientific method seems to make some persons harsh, arrogant and dogmatic.

He differentiates between scientific method and philosophic method. The former is concerned with facts, reliability, and validity, whereas the latter is concerned with what ought to be, with how to deal with the known facts, and with aims, values and meanings:[16]

> Those things valued by a society are the ends of education, but they are not determined or validated by scientific method.

He urges supervisors to recognize the kind of interplay that should go on between science and philosophy, or between facts and values:[17]

> The curriculum must include those skills and knowledges which are clearly useful in life. These the scientific method will discover and place. But curriculum must also contain material leading to insights, attitudes and understanding .... The philosophical method will attempt to determine the kind of life from which scientific method extracts skills and knowledge for the curriculum.

Barr, a strong advocate of scientific supervision, sticks to his guns and rejects criticisms. The first is that science method is applicable to simple phenomena of the physical world, but not applicable to man. He chooses to reverse the argument:[18]

> The problems of man, mind and social relationships are infinitely complex; they are, in fact, so complex that it is only by the means of science that we may hope to comprehend them. It is through application of scientific method that problems of everyday life could be subjected to analyses.

The second argument is that scientific supervision is necessarily in conflict with cooperative and democratic ideas. He argues that not only are democratic and scientific supervision compatible, but that scientific supervision is democratic supervision:[19]

> Democratic supervision encourages initiative, self reliance and the participation of teachers, pupils and supervisors alike in the development of educational policies. Scientific supervision contributes to this program by a philosophy by which the findings of science are not hard and fixed conclusions to be forced upon teachers, but clues to more intelligent, more flexible, and more effective adaptation to the needs of the classroom.

He also views the process of scientific supervision as both science and an art:[20]

> The province of science is knowledge. Art is more
> nearly associated with skill. While knowledge may
> be gained by diverse means, skill can be acquired
> only through practice.

Nonetheless, the protests against supervisory practices that failed to recognize the feelings and morale of teachers led to the development of the human relations supervision, which will be discussed later. But scientific supervision did not loose support altogether. John McNeil is still optimistic about the future of scientific supervision, although he admits that it is not the only way to improve teaching. He considers one of the United States' great strengths is the extraordinary development of science and technology. In his view this is a direct consequence of the freedom of investigation and criticism:[21]

> It is not surprising that a scientific approach to
> supervision - that we can find out why some people
> are more effective teachers than others and that we
> can use this knowledge to help teachers become
> effective - is a central dimension in the
> supervision field.

Many factors combined to revive the importance of scientific supervision. One factor is the reaction against human relations supervision, particularly its neglect of the teacher in the classroom. Another factor has been the increasing demands for accountability since the early 70s in the USA, UK and many other countries. The author believes that this factor merits more detailed discussion, though it cannot be formally considered to be a form of supervision.

Accountability

Since its emergence in the early 70s, the term has come to mean different things ranging from improving education to putting the blame for failures on the teachers. Neave (1985) defines accountability as:[22]

> a process which involves the duty of individuals and of organizations to render periodically accounts for tasks performed to a body having both the power and authority to modify that performance perhaps by the use of sanctions or rewards.

It was defined by Kogan (1986) as a[23]

> condition in which individual role holders are liable to review and the application of sanctions if their actions fail to satisfy those with whom they are in as relationship of accountability.

It is in this sense a form of public auditing, designed to make the school or other educational institutions answerable to the public or its representatives. In fact it is not confined to schools alone but extends to all other public institutions. Kogan reported a definition of accountability by Rowbortom as:[24]

> a particular and concentrated responsibility of the individual for performance in keeping with the expectations of his own particular role.

This definition may lead to a confusion of accountability with responsibility. Whilst accountability subsumes responsibility, it can

not be reduced to it. One can be responsible without being accountable to anybody. Responsibility is the moral sense of performing a duty to the best of one's ability. Accountability implies the presence of a judge, armed with institutionalized sanctions. Similarly accountability may be confused with evaluation, which consists of the making of judgements and is a pre-requisite of requiring accountability. A person can not be held accountable without another making an evaluation of his performance. But evaluation is not tied to demands for or processes connected with accountability. Practitioners may engage in self-evaluation as an aid to their performance, or can seek consultative evaluation which might be supportive to them.[25]

Concepts of accountability in education, in their most narrow output oriented format, can be traced to the time of the 'payment-by-results' system in England. Excluding the last 40 years when teachers have been largely free to develop curriculum according to their own values and knowledge, British schooling has never been free from suggestions that it might be better if it were more subject to public challenge.

The more recent demands for accountability have stemmed in part from general political and social turbulance, in addition to economic decline. In Britain confidence has been shaken in the professionals and in public institutions. Public concern over standards coupled with economic cutbacks have led to increased demands for cost effectiveness in schools. Declining pupil enrolment has led to the closure of some schools, to drastic cuts in teacher numbers, and more rarely in advisers' numbers. An increasingly educated body of parents has become

much more vocal in its demands on schools. The 1986 Act in England ensures parental majorities on governing bodies. Control of curriculum has become a principal concern of political interest. There has been a marked centralist intervention in the curriculum from more than one central ministry. DES documents imply that people have the right to know and have more control. By 1984 the DES was proposing that teachers should be evaluated and that salaries should be related to performance. The LEAs were asked to encourage schools to evaluate their own performance so that governing bodies, parents and LEAs might have information about them. Schools were required to review their performance and practices and to make their findings public. The requirement to publish annual reports has led to formulations of performance indicators. The publication of the reports of the H.M.I. of individual institutions has been another element in this process.[26]

In the USA there has long been a tradition of distrust of and resistance to the hegemony of professionals, which has been called 'new despotism'. From the early 70s Federal authorities stimulated evaluation programmes. They started from the imperatives of cost effectiveness and the application of input-output models and the like. A number of activities were subsumed under the term including programme planning, budgeting, performance-based education, state-wide assessment, and management-by-objectives.[27]

In Australia there is a general concern that school leavers do not possess the literacy and numeracy skills necessary to enable them to function adequately in society. Calls have been made for schools and teachers to be made accountable for the allegedly parlous state of the

educational system. Issues such as whether teachers can be held liable in a court of law for the damage suffered by their students because of their incompetent or careless teaching, are discussed.[28]

In France, a report on 'the Fundamental principles of education for the future' requested from the College de France by the 'President de Republique', and submitted on March, 1985, recommended evaluation with the suggestion that bodies be set up to evaluate the instruction and study the activities of teachers, as well as institutional activity, both in higher and secondary education. These bodies would include members outside the inspectoral corps.[29]

In Taiwan the Department of Education in response to the President's mandate has begun to implement the so-called accountability system of divisional inspectors, requiring that each inspector should be responsible for the success or failure of education in the area to which he is assigned.[30]

In all these countries doubts have been raised about the quality of education, paralleled by a similar concern over standards in other fields such as health and social services. There is an increasing public and political belief that the school system is not subject to adequate evaluation. This has been described by some critics as a 'gap in the system'. These concerns are justified, and pressures for accountability are legitimate since schools play a crucial role in determining what sort of adult human beings children will eventually become. But the typical response to these pressures - tightening up a set of procedures with ideological and technical shortcomings - needs

to be reversed. For instance, standardized tests are used to judge teachers in terms of pupil achievement. This form of accountability may prove counterproductive because it may tempt teachers to 'teach the test' thus narrowing and restricting the teachers' role in an undesirable way.

What are the implications of accountability for supervision? Kogan (1986) states that the HMI is upon the spectrum of modes of accountability. They have no direct authority but are deeply involved in accountability issues. He reports a recent description of the essence of the HMI's accountability:[31]

> On the basis of their own observation they must report to the DES on the state of education in England and on the effects of current policy and expenditure. By long standing tradition they also seek to contribute directly or indirectly to the improvement of education in the institutions they visit.

In the field of higher and further education, HMI can decide which advanced courses are to be mounted. They make recommendations on whether independent schools should be legally registered; those which fail to be registered have to close. These are authoritative functions. Less authoritative but normatively powerful are the inspections of individual schools and broader thematic education surveys. Recently, too, they have begun to produce reports on whole local authority areas to which ministers and others pay attention. These reports are made public:[32]

> If they do not thus directly cause modifications in behaviour through instruction, they do form judgments which are delivered to those who can instruct. Governing bodies, local communities and the DES itself can take account of either individual report or the accumulations of them before making a decision on a particular case or on a general policy.

LEAs inspectors make evaluations in reports to the LEAs. Their recommendations directly affect teachers' careers and use of resources because they report directly to the teachers' employers and providers of resources.

However, the effectiveness of instituting evaluation and accountability systems, is a matter of speculation, in addition to the costs and the difficulties it faces. The 'gap-in-the-system' can not be bridged by inspecting, assessing, and examinations, but by the daily practices of teachers. As Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) put it;[33]

> Nagging questions born of the accountability movement remain ; How can supervisors be sure that teachers are indeed performing prescribed duties up to standards? What evaluation technology can be used to answer this question?

Lawston (1987) believes that the answer to the accountability movement lies in encouraging the development of teacher professionalisation. Teachers need to be able to argue against narrow measures, and show that education must necessarily be concerned with much wider objectives that the basics. Even if the basics remain as high priorities, an overemphasis on restricted teaching and testing programmes is not the most effective way of achieving better standards.[34]

2.1.3   Neoscientific supervision

Partly as a result of these accountability trends a new approach known as the Neoscientific supervision, emerged. It shares with traditional scientific supervision interest in control, accountability, and efficiency. The code words of this movement are 'teacher competencies', 'performance objectives', and 'cost-benefit-analyses'. The task dimension, concern for job, and concern for highly specified performance objectives, all lacking in human relations supervision, are strongly emphasized in neoscientific supervision, though at the expense of the human dimension. Neoscientific supervision relies heavily on impersonal quality-control mechanisms, such as performance contracts, accountability to predetermined objectives and competency standards. In brief, it is job-centered and task-oriented. It is assumed that if standards of performance, objectives or competencies can be identified, then the work of teachers can be controlled by holding them accountable to these standards, thus ensuring better teaching. But assuming a list of competencies, performance criteria and other specifications that apply to all teachers, to all teaching situations, to all students and at all times, relying on externally imposed authority and neglecting human dimensions, is undesirable and unrealistic:[35]

> Teachers do not identify with changes imposed from above. The effectiveness of the school, therefore, may actually be reduced rather than improved.

2.2 Human-oriented Approaches

2.2.0   Introduction

The preceding section introduced the task-centered approaches to supervision: inspection, scientific, and neoscientific supervision. In this section the human-oriented approaches : democratic supervision and human relations superivision are presented.

2.2.1   Democractic supervision

Democratic supervision, which has its roots in the American progressive education tradition, emphasizes the dignity of the individual teacher, opposes the supervision of individual activity, and is against conformity, and creating fear, which characterizes inspection. It evolved in the 30s and 40s as a result of growing concern with the nature and needs of human beings, and was, in part, a reaction to inspection and evaluation in administration and supervision. It was also influenced by a parallel movement in progressive education, the guidance and counselling of students leading to wise occupational choice.

The following principles are stated in the literature as characteristics of democratic supervision: Individuals have their own feelings, goals, and values that affect their modes of behaviour, the integrity of individual teachers must be protected and upheld at all times, the teacher has the right to think his own thoughts, exercise his initiative, develops his self-reliance, and participates in the

determination of goals and policies of instruction. Supervision should therefore be primarily concerned with releasing and sustaining the talent of the individual teacher; supervisory techniques should stress warmth, friendliness, leadership as a shared responsibility, full staff involvement in educational planning, and should avoid threats, insecurity and didacticism.[37]

The successful supervisor, hence, is portrayed as an educational leader who makes use of cooperative techniques in a democratic manner; he works for the improvement of the total teaching/learning situation, as well as the improvement of teachers in service, and provides rich opportunities for teachers to grow personally as well as professionally. Lucio and McNeil (1969) describes the character of democratic supervision by saying:[38]

> Teachers have feelings and emotions which are appealed to for action. Emphasis is given to personal determination of ends.

During the 1930s and 1940s, Burton and Bruckner, advocates of scientific supervision, began arguing against some of the techniques they had suggested in earlier writings. They tried to lift supervision out of its previous undemocratic image. Early in 1947 they shared Barrs' definition of supervision as:[39]

> an expert technical service primarily concerned with studying and improving the conditions that surround learning and pupil growth.

In 1955 they modified their definition of supervision to become:[40]

> an expert technical service primarily aimed at
> studying and improving cooperatively all factors
> which affect child growth and development.

This definition included an important addition which is 'cooperatively...'. This concept was lacking in the previous definition. It indicates a shift in thinking of supervision as a shared function in which the leader and the led experience power equalization. Democratic supervisors, according to the authors, provide the conditions necessary for the participation and cooperation of the total teaching staff. Such an approach better serves the ends of a 'democratic society.' Authority came not from the leaders but from the group. Burton believes that schools should achieve democracy, but only with years of arduous effort and courage in leadership along with education in the nature of democracy itself:[41]

> No longer could the supervisor enter the classroom
> to check the work of the teacher and assist in
> improvement according to specific principles that
> were already established. In a democratic process
> of supervision the teacher is assisted with his own
> program of work, with the development of his own
> personality and creative ability, is encouraged to
> initiate programs of study and experimentations for
> the improvement of her work.

They argued that 'teacher improvement is not so much a supervisory function in which teachers participate, but a teacher's function in which supervisors cooperate'. The authors asked 'How could one argue for self-activity of children and talk about creating environments in which they could work to solve problems cooperatively while

enforcing policies that denied teachers these same considerations. Burton states:[42]

> Efforts to aid teachers growth of whatever kind must be carried on with due regard for the experience and convictions of those teachers. Teachers should not be asked, except for sound reasons, to abandon or to modify principles and practices in which they have confidence.

Democractic supervision, according to Bruckner, stems from democracy itself which recognizes the worth of creative human individuality. He shared Burton's belief that the child could best learn democracy through cooperative group activities and meaningful experiences with adults at home, at school, and in the community. Therefore, he urged educators to feel, to think, to value, and to practice democracy in the schools so that they would truely reflect the values espoused by a democracy. The supervisor should foster and nurture the kind of critical self-analysis that would make democracy a reality to teachers and to their students.[43]

Alice Miel laid out the rationale for democratic supervision which is based on the methods of intelligence, is more effective and efficient, and is more rewarding for those involved. In her view the democratic, cooperative way of life draws its strength from taking into account the reasoning and feeling of every member. She believed that democracy can provide a higher efficiency than any resulting from authoritarian regimes. Considerable attention is given in her writings to explaining how democratic procedures could be applied to school organization, 'Democratic living in the classroom is next to impossible

without the favouring conditions of democratic living in the whole school'. She challenged the school officials to a new kind of leadership based not on authority but on responsibility. It was to be measured by the extent to which the leadership of every member of the school staff was encouraged.[44]

Miel counted supervisors among educational teachers whose role is crucial. She realized that those who were assigned to positions of special responsibility would make the difference in whether or not the leadership potential of every individual had been achieved. She believed that if schools were to be changed so that values and ideas were more compatible with those of a democratic society, it would come about because of sound, imaginative educational leadership. She rejected the 'external controls', the implications of the term 'supervisor', and the undemocratic practice of a large number of supervisors. She suggested the term 'consultant' as an alternative for 'supervisor'. Consultant is seen as a resource person who could assist as part of a democratic process:[45]

> By working democratically for teacher growth there is no end to the possibilities for improving education. Services could be characterized by their flexible, fluid organization. The consultant could provide assistance as a member of a service council, with the group in charge of a particular aspect of the instructional programme channelling particular service rendered.

A democratic supervisor needs to be an expert in the techniques of group action, organization, timing, strategy, coordination, in addition to the particular specialization to which he is assigned. Democratic

supervisors can nurture creativity in teachers by removing non-essential restrictions and encouraging improvement, experiments, and the kind of thinking that would result in new ideas about teaching. 'To foster creativity, ways must be found to encourage constructive differences within the limits of organizational requirements'.[46]

However, democratic supervision can be misinterpreted. Even its advocates such as Miel, found that some 'supervisors had gone too far in their efforts to help teachers feel good about what they were doing, forgetting the very function of supervision, that is improving instruction'. In 'Supervision for Improved Instruction', Lewis and Miel (1972) reaffirmed that function. They regard 'overseeing' and 'quality control' as legitimate concerns for supervisors. 'Its omission had contributed to the demise of democratic supervision'. Moreover, they made a distinction between 'authority' and 'authoritarianism', with the former as necessary for effective supervision.[47] In 1961, Miel talked about the legitimacy of setting limits and enforcing them when necessary. Miel described this as a 'control function' essential to the nurturing of creativity:[48]

> For enforcement purposes, self-control is most desirable but it must be supplemented, in case of need, by control through an authority figure representing the group membership. One of the most important functions of administration and supervision then, is final enforcement of certain rules to make sure that the business of education will proceed in an orderly fashion.

The critics of democratic supervision claimed that it was more theoretical than practical. Lovel and Wiles (1983) describe it as a

type of manipulation where supervisors treated teachers kindly to get them to do what they wanted them to do. Critics called for a supervision in which individuals are recognized as possessing dignity and at the same time are aware of their responsibility to the group, and the group's responsibility to the individual:[49]

> It recognizes no superiority of vision other than that which is demonstrated by performance ... at any given moment this 'superiority' may rest with any member of the group.

2.2.2   Human relations supervision

Human relations supervision has its origin in democratic supervision, and is still widely preached and practised. It was a successful challenger to scientific supervision in the same way as democratic supervision was a successful challenger to inspection. The findings of behavioural sciences that human beings have their own goals, values, feelings, emotions and needs which cause them to behave in certain ways; that these factors are important determinants of efficiency and effectiveness; that the informal social systems that workers form can be an important stimulus in setting standards for worker production; and that involvement in decision making and open communication systems enhance commitment to, and understanding of new practices, all these findings combined to create the human relations theory of supervision.

Instead of conformity, control, and accountability, which characterize the scientific supervision, the informal relations among personnel, sensitivity to needs, promoting personnel development,

removing constraints, building staff morale, release of the creative energies of group members, shared leadership, cooperative decision making, self-evaluation, worth and dignity of the individual, and maximising freedom of action, are emphasized. Teachers are viewed as 'whole people' in their own right rather than as packages of needed energy, skill, and aptitudes to be manipulated by administrators and supervisors to achieve the goals of the schools. Supervisors should work to create a feeling of satisfaction among teachers by showing interest in them as people. It is assumed that a satisfied staff will work harder and will be easier to work with, to lead, and to control. It is assumed that teachers are capable of participating in decisions, and that the role of supervisor is to provide a climate where this participation can happen. Participation is an important method, and its objective is to make teachers feel that they are useful and important to the school. 'Personal feelings' and 'comfortable relationships' are the watchwords of this approach. In contrast, maintaining of quality of learning, and the necessity for responsibility and authority are less emphasized:[50]

> The human relations approach that grows out of the assumption that teachers were capable of making judgements about teaching classroom activities and should participate in decisions regarding the improvement of their own teaching, had the effect of diverting the attention of supervisors from improvement of instruction to activity designed to cultivate good feelings often at the expense of competent discharge of duties.

Therefore, although it remains powerfully influential today, it has been subjected to modification and criticism. It has been argued that complete reliance on individual initiative and interpersonal

relationships to produce improvement seems unwarranted. Studies of leadership and those related to training, strongly support supervisory approaches which emphasize formal design, planning and structural implementation of instructional programmes.

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) believe that human relations supervision led to the neglect of teachers. It became permissive:[51]

> The focus is on winning friends in an attempt to influence them. 'Winning friends' is a slick tactic that made the movement seem manipulation and inauthentic, even dishonest.

Goodwin (1983) reports that human relations supervision is still popular within American supervisory circles today but is:[52]

> Limited by its inability to provide teachers with the maximum opportunity for professional growth and to fully unleash their talents.

Lovel and Wiles (1983) believe that human relations supervision had failed to live up to expectation. There were serious problems, and it was becoming clear that the approach was not the total answer. Practitioners were raising questions and demanding answers. In many cases Supervisors lost significant contact with local schools, teachers, and the instructional programme. Role, responsibility, and authority were unclear in many situations and contributed to poor communications and working relationships between supervisors, principals and teachers. Supervisors were often more interested in being democratic than in helping teachers identify and solve problems.

In sum, human relations supervision was perceived as laissez-faire approach. Sometimes it was applied without any alteration in the belief system of those who had applied it. It became another way of manipulating people to achieve predetermined ends.[53] Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) identify the problem within human relations supervision as one of focus:[54]

> Human relations supervision had been used to help
> people feel good about themselves while it failed
> to incorporate them as actual shareholders in the
> educational enterprise.

They attribute the problems of human relations supervision to the 'misunderstandings as to how the approach should work and to the faulty theoretical notions inherent in the approach itself'. They conclude that 'human relations supervision promised much but delivered little'.[55]

As a result, human relations supervision gave way to more structured approaches where concern for humans persisted and extended beyond human relations to recognize teachers as vital human resources who can make significant contributions as rational decision-makers and problem solvers.

2.3 Structuralist Approaches

2.3.0 Introduction

Lovel and Wiles (1983) call the new approaches 'structuralist approaches'. These approaches are a synthesis of human relations and scientific supervision. Structuralism recognizes the fact that schools have their own goals and needs, and teachers also have goals and needs. These needs are not always in harmony, and there can be conflict which causes dissatisfaction and even alienation. Therefore, structuralists look to the school structure as a way of coping with such potential conflict.

From bureaucracy and inspection, structuralism draws the elements of hierarchy of authority, impersonalization of management, tasks achieved through fixed positions, and control maintained through general rules. From human relations supervision the elements of 'informal organization, the importance of human beings; their needs and their feelings as significant factors in organizational efficiency and effectiveness' are built on.[56]

In sum, structuralism aims at reducing (but not eliminating) the strain between organizational needs and personal needs, between discipline and autonomy, between formal and informal relations, between management and workers, and between the various levels of the educational hierarchy. These approaches are best represented by the 'human resources supervision' which will be discussed at this point.

2.3.1   Human Resources Supervision

The main principles of this approach are borrowed from recent organizational theories. According to the human resources theory, the members of an organization are capable of making important contributions to the achievement of organizational goals. Often the human resources are not utilized to their full potential and, can represent important untapped resources. Therefore, it is important for organizational leaders to provide a structure that facilitates the utilization of the competence and creativeness of members on important matters of organizational policy formulations and problem solving.

The members of the institution need to feel that they are a significant part of the organization, and thus need to be significantly involved in the processes of determining and achieving goals. As decision makers and problem solvers, they have a vested interest in organizational effectiveness and efficiency and this concern provides a basis for self-determination of direction and self discipline.

To apply human resources wherever they are found to problems wherever they exist will require instructional supervisors who know the resources and who have the competence to provide the needed support.[57]

Sergiovanni used the term 'human resources supervision' to describe the supervisory approach which goes beyond human relations in recognizing that teachers desire to contribute and if given the opportunity will serve the school as vital resources in its operations:[58]

> Teachers are prepared to work hard if work has
> meaning ... and if they are allowed to make
> decisions, supporting these decisions through
> realistic 'target setting' and assistance in
> carrying out responsibilities. Teachers need to
> have an idea of what they were going to accomplish,
> its values and its rationale.

Human resources supervisors do not work to make teachers feel important, useful or wanted, but rather to provide opportunities for teachers to experience these feelings. Participation, for example, is used to improve the quality of all decision making, not to promote good feelings. Indeed, as this quality increases, meaningful satisfaction is experienced by all participants:[59]

> Satisfaction is not a means to obtaining higher
> performance from teachers, but rather an end which
> teachers seek and obtain from successful work
> experience.

Goodwin (1986) makes the following assumptions as the basis for the human resources supervision: teachers desire to contribute effectively and creatively to the accomplishment of worthwhile objectives; the majority of teachers are capable of exercising more initiatives, responsibility and creativity than their present jobs or circumstances allow; supervisors should work to help teachers contribute their full range of talents to the accomplishment of school goals; and supervisors should encourage teachers to participate in important as well as routine decisions. Indeed the more important the decision, the greater should be the supervisors' efforts to tap faculty resources; the quality of decisions made and teacher performance will improve as supervisors and teachers make full use of the range of

insight, experience, and creative ability which exists in their school, and teachers will exercise responsible self-direction and self-control in the accomplishment of worthwhile objectives that they understand and have helped create.[60]

Human resources supervision, as advanced by Sergiovanni, shares many of the features of other approaches. It focuses on the improvement of instruction, though it views links between organization, leadership, educational programme, and instruction as being more deliberate and interdependent. More emphasis is given to integrating individual needs with school objectives. One way of doing that is by emphasizing the importance of meaningful work to teachers, and by viewing teacher satisfaction, derived from accomplishmebt, as a critical key to building motivation and commitment and therefore improving instruction.[61]

Sergiovanni makes distinctions between human relations and human resources supervision. Both, he says, are concerned with teacher satisfaction. But while satisfaction in human relations supervision is viewed as an end in itself it is viewed in human resources supervision as a desirable end towards which teachers will work.

The human relations supervisor assumes that satisfied teachers are easier to work with, and to lead, and as a result effectiveness will be increased. In contrast, the human resources supervisor assumes that satisfaction results from the successful accomplishment of important and meaningful work to which teachers are committed.

Human relations supervision is characterized by a warm, supportive and friendly climate, and by low performance but satisfaction and some innovation. Human resources supervision tends to be associated with a supportive, goal oriented climate and high performance, satisfaction and some innovation. In human relation supervision, performance expectations are low, work pressures are eliminated, and security is guaranteed. Teachers face no compulsion to show commitment, energy and effort beyond what is minimally required to carry on day by day duties. Little opportunity exists for teachers to grow professionally, and enjoy deep satisfaction from their work. Supervisors fail to distinguish between using people and working with people to achieve school goals.

Human resources supervision encourages professional development of teachers, and evokes responses from subordinates characterized by high commitment to their work, high loyalty to the school, high goal performance, and a desire combined with an opportunity for personal and professional growth.[62]

Sergiovanni also distanced human relations supervision from traditional autocratic supervision (inspection). Autocratic supervision ignores the 'human element', is associated with closed climates, and is characterized by low performance and low satisfaction. 'Human resources supervision' emphasizes the human element:[63]

> A well-meaning supervisor or administrator who ignores the human organization often finds that his efforts are unappreciated as well as ineffective in terms of school performance.

While autocratic supervision requires that supervisors get things done, human resources supervisors work to help teachers accomplish school tasks. Within this context, supervisors do not merely solve the group's problems but focus on the group solving its problems. They do not merely move the group forward but help the group as it moves forward. They initiate discussions, define problems and goals, evaluate, summarize, monitor, provide information and the like. The teaching staff will not accomplish its goals without these and other leadership roles being fulfilled. Human resources supervisors are concerned with these roles but 'hold no monopoly on them'. Leadership functions are considered to be the responsibility of the entire group, not of the designated supervisors alone.[64]

Sergiovanni calls upon human resources supervisors to have an 'educational platform':[65]

> If the human resources supervisor is to draw out the genuine talent and leadership of subordinates, he needs to know what his own basic opinions, values, beliefs and principles are. Without any commitment to some basic educational ideas, how can the supervisors or the subordinates develop some sense of direction as they work together to achieve their educational goals.

On the other hand, the supervisor can best assist teachers in clarifying what their educational platform is or ought to be, only if he has clarified his own.

The educational platform consists of a series of assumptions and beliefs usually expressed in declarative or sometimes normative

statements. The assumptions and beliefs deal with the way children and youths grow, with the purposes of schooling, with the nature of learning, with the pedagogy of teaching, with the educational programme and with school climate.

Indeed every one has an unexpressed platform. Our actions usually reveal our assumptions and attitudes. Supervisors should compare their platform with the school's platform. If there happen to be any discrepancies, efforts should be made to reconcile them or modify one of them.

However, Sergiovanni cautions that if implemented dogmatically and indiscriminately, human resources supervision would cause more problems than it would solve:[66]

>It would be a mistake to view the assumptions,
>concepts, and practices associated with human
>resources supervision as universally applicable.

One's set of values, and one's norms, for example, affect one's orientation towards a job. Some teachers will never be properly motivated to work and others will be usually motivated to work regardless of what supervisors do. Many teachers would desire and seek satisfying work and will respond to human resources supervision. But many will not, and alternative supervisory methods and procedures that suit them will be needed; human relations or scientific supervision may be appropriate:[67]

> Human resources supervision is not an exilir to be administered indiscriminately to all. But it is a powerful conception of supervision, that, by using the concept of motivation and job enrichment, can markedly improve the identity, commitment, and performance of most teachers and the effectiveness of schools.

2.4 Alternative Approaches

2.4.0 Introduction

In the previous sections of this chapter the task-oriented approaches, human-oriented approaches, and structuralist approaches of supervision were discussed. The present section will introduce the alternative approaches to supervision; peer supervision as an alternative to traditional official (formal) supervision, and clinical supervison, which is classroom-centered, as an alternative to general school supervision.

2.4.1 Peer supervision

The literature of supervision in recent years has included a number of proponents of peer supervision. It is recognized by many as an important source of professional growth. They argue that given that teachers' high level of distrust of their supervisors, the disproportionate teacher-supervisor ratio, and the threat of formal evaluative visits, the teachers are more likely to benefit from a system of peer supervision than from traditional forms of supervision:[68]

> when teachers are encouraged to help each other to
> understand better teaching, they not only improve
> technically, but also begin to develop and
> internalize a professional role, which is an
> essential element in improving the quality of
> education.

Blumeburg (1980) argues that fellow teachers are the first source of professional help in schools; they often give help to their colleagues in an informal manner; through conversation they can discuss problems concerning classroom teaching; they are more readily available to each other than the supervisors; and they face similar problems. Moreover, they are less (or not) threatening and easier to approach than the supervisors. He concludes that teachers do use each other as peer supervisors, if supervision is interpreted broadly to mean the offering of any kind of mutual assistance on the job.[69]

Kamp (1986) surveyed a number of studies on teachers' attitudes in two decades (1964-1984) and concluded that teachers were less likely in 1984 (38%) than in 1964 (54%) to say that they receive help from supervisors. But in 1984 they were more likely than teachers in 1964 to receive help from resource teachers and subject matter specialists. Teachers' colleagues in the school were the primary source of help both in 1964 and 1984, but in 1984 they rated ideas from peers more highly than ideas from individuals in official supervisory positions. Kamp attributes this development to the gains in teacher experience and preparation since 1964 which means that 'any given teacher today can seek advice from a large pool of well-qualified peers who have closer contacts with students than do the supervisors'.[70]

In a recent study conducted by Zahorik (1987) 52 teachers reported that they spent an average of 63 minutes in conversation with other teachers during a typical school day, of which 41 minutes were devoted to discussing teaching, learning, and other education-related matters. The average number of times teachers estimated that they got help during the year was 266 (8 times a week), the average numbers of times they gave help was 345 (10 times a week). The types of help with teaching that are exchanged are: materials, discipline, activities, evaluation, methods of teaching, objectives, reinforcing, lecturing, questioning, and room organization. Help with the first four types was given most frequently.

Approximately 70% of the help given or got can be classified in these four categories, which share a common feature: they are student-oriented. The other categories are teacher-oriented. 75% of the teachers identified teachers at the same grade level as the teachers with whom they exchange help. Classroom proximity teachers and available teachers as being more helpful than other sources, fellow teachers help is specific to a particular problem, personal, available and immediate. Other sources usually lack these qualities.[71]

The results of this study differ from those reported elsewhere. Lortie (1975) reports that only 25% of the teachers he studied had much contact with their peers, and almost half of the teachers had no contacts. The results of a study by Bishop and McPherson (1972) show that social conversation predominates in teacher exchanges rather than work-related issues. These results may be attributed to school factors. The results of Zahorik's study show that teacher experience

and school organization play a role in collegial interaction. Bird and Little (1983) found that collegiality is greater when time, space and other forms of support for collaboration are available. Little (1982) found that collegial practices are characteristic of schools that have relatively high achievement.[72]

Building on such results Blumeburg (1980) poses a number of questions: Why not let the matter rest there? Why not take advantage of the internal resources? Are there ways of building on the already existing informal systems through which teachers help each other so that help becomes less chancy and more effective? and, given that such ways do exist or might be invented, should they be used in all cases?[73] Those are two groups of questions: one concerns the feasibility and the other involves the desirability.

The findings of other research studies support peer supervision. In a study of 13 teachers trained as colleague consultants who were paired with 13 non-trained teachers, Goldsberg (1980) found that 12 of the non-trained teachers made specific changes in their classroom teaching, altered their classroom organization, or became more aware of their teaching. Of the trained teachers 10 reported either performance or attitude changes.[74]

Freeman, Palmer and Ferten (1980) report on the results of a peer supervisory programme that involved 26 schools, 65 administrators and 323 teachers. Both the administrators and teachers received training in skills of supervision, planned a programme of peer support, and implemented the plan. At the end of the training year 89% of the

teachers had more positive attitudes toward supervision, 98% confessed an interest in improving instruction, and 94% expressed confidence in the peer supervision as an aid in the improvement of instruction. The authors conclude that while it can not be proved that classroom instruction has improved as a result of this effort, 'there is clearly a renewed sense of commitment to the potential of supervision and a confidence in the merits of peer supervision'.[75]

Peer supervision receives its greatest support from clinical supervision (see later). Some forms of clinical supervision involve teachers as supervisors, with teacher and supervisor collaborating in planning and critiquing instruction, in a collegial atmosphere. McNergney and Carrier (1981) proposed a model of clinical supervision emphasizing teacher-supervisor collegiality. A major feature of the model's reciprocity is the process of teachers assisting each other to identify their strengths and weaknesses. Alfonso (1977) reports a study by Gray in which clinical supervision by peers was attempted. The results indicated that peer supervision can bring about important changes in teaching, even among senior teachers, and that the teachers express greater self-confidence and increased admiration and respect for fellow teachers.[76]

In 1983 the Instructional Management Programme at the Far West Laboratory in the USA established Peer-Assisted Leadership (PAL), a unique professional development programme for principals. A key feature of the programme is having principals help each other to become better instructional leaders. Principals and vice-principals of schools of the region have taken part in a year-long PAL process.

Working in groups of 10-25 the participants first select partners with whom to work. The programme helped the principals to develop skills that they can use to analyse their own and other principals management behaviour, to learn how other principals lead their schools, how to gain support from colleagues, and how to shadow and conduct 'reflective interviews' with their partners.

The programme consisted of six meetings (6 weeks), during which the participants learn the skills needed. Between meetings they apply these skills. By the sixth meeting they are ready to present models of their partners' leadership behaviour. Pariticipant principals said that they have benefitted from the experience. Among the outcomes mentioned are that they learned to plan their actions more carefully, focus more sharply on behaviours trying to find a reason for every behaviour, learn new techniques and strategies for dealing with issues in their own schools, become more aware of goals, better able to understand the consequences of their actions, and constantly re-evaluating them, and use reflective thinking towards managing their schools.[77]

It is interesting that peer supervision models have been applied in some educational institutions other than schools. The college of education at Texas technical university has implemented a particular process of peer supervision since 1973 in order to help faculty members to describe, analyse, assess, and modify instruction. A team consists of a professor who will be observed, an observation team leader, one to three other professors, and an associated graduate student. They exchange roles as everyone both observes and has a turn as an observee. The team works through Cogan's clinical supervision stages.

The findings show that faculty members have access to valuable data and expert assistance from team colleagues. The data, feedback, and assistance were identified as facilitative because they were directed to concerns identified by the faculty members. In contrast, feedback provided by other resources may be evaluative and may not address the faculty members' concerns. The team members developed supportive relationships. Discussions concerning teaching became more common, lengthy and sophisticated.

However, time is a major problem as two or more hours often are required to complete each cycle. Faculty members are usually willing to devote a great deal of time to research and writing, which count in tenure and promotion. On the other hand, this process is risky as colleagues criticise each other's teaching. The organizational structure and academic traditions of most colleges encourage faculty members to set goals, plans, and teach in isolation from others. Professional autonomy is sustained. Colleagues are often reluctant to offer suggestions or to criticise the teaching of other faculty members.[78]

Developing from this concept, peer-based programmes were established in the USA in which master teachers were given the responsibility and the means to work with beginning teachers as well as veteran teachers in an 'in-house' system of instructional leadership. The Toled Intervention Program uses experienced teachers to train beginning teachers and help troubled veterans. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Career Development Plan releases experienced teachers from teaching duties to serve as advisors to help

less-experienced teachers. California's Mentor Teacher Program uses teachers selected by teachers to work in self development. The Marin County Teacher Advisor Project uses teachers in planning, problem-solving and training teachers.[79]

These programmes are similar to the mentoring programme which was introduced in Britain in 1973 on an experimental basis then on a national basis in 1976. The programme includes a 'teacher-tutor', a veteran teacher who helps beginners in their first year. The beginner teachers has a reduced load and spends the remaining time with tutor. Fagan (1982) reports that mentoring facilitated the development of teachers.[80]

However, peer supervision has its critics. Alfonso (1977) describes peer supervision as a 'disturbingly slippery concept':[81]

> One is not sure whether a user of the term is describing a loose arrangement of interpersonal influence, a system in which teachers are organized into helping teams under the direction of an administrator of a supervisor, or whether the term is used to imply total teacher responsibility for the improvement of instruction.

He doubts the value of peer supervision because of its limitations and defects which can be summarized as follows: peer supervision requires a radical change in the traditional pattern of school organization and staffing, it cannot be successful in a school environment characterized by isolation, fragmentation, stratification, and standardization, and it needs a school organization which encourages interaction among teachers and team planning.[82] In Eisner's (1983) words:[83]

> The school needs to become a professional community
> with space enough for teachers to grow as
> professionals. They have much to offer each other,
> but their contributions are not easily made when
> they are isolated.

Peer supervision implies a degree of openness and trust among teachers, which needs time to develop. This argument finds support in the results of a study reported by Withhall and Wood (1979) which shows that initial teacher reactions to opportunities to observe colleagues and be observed by them were negative, but after one or two experiences of peer supervision the teachers commitment to the process increased significantly.[84]

McFaul and Cooper state that teachers seemed to honour an unstated agreement of 'live-and-let-live', that no one would be made uncomfortable in the supervisory process. Therefore, teachers' willingness or ability to engage in substantive analysis of classroom behaviours 'was called into question'. The authors conclude that it is impossible to foster trust, openness and reflective behaviour where survival necessitates the opposite. Without trust and openness peer supervision seems unworkable.[85]

Peer supervision runs the risk of becoming random activities which are unrelated to other instructional improvements and activities, and not necessarily related to the goals of the school. Alfonso argues that proponents of peer supervision saw it as a substitute for formal supervision, in order to gain power from administrators. He suggests that when focusing primarily on the processes of observation, analysis and feedback, peer supervision may work. But within the broad context

of supervision, which comprises curriculum development, in-service education, and long range planning, peer supervision is severely limited in its value, and should be used as an adjunct to a broadly based programme of instructional improvement rather than as a replacement.[86]

It is true that there are barriers to success. The organizational structure and academic traditions in most schools encourage teaching in isolation from colleagues. Observers may be reluctant to challenge or discuss certain decisions and actions. Many teachers are reluctant to have important aspects of their teaching criticized. Beginning teachers, in particular, feel vulnerable, while experienced teachers may resist peer supervision as an inadequate use of time. Proponents argue that good teachers should share their talents and be prepared to work for the benefit of their colleagues. Both arguments are persuasive and can be reconciled by a programme with many dimensions and options.

It is also important that peer supervision should not exist in isolation from regular supervisory evaluative procedures. It should be used for developmental purposes rather than evaluative purposes. It should not be compulsory, but neither should it occur spontaneously. Otherwise, the outcomes will be 'hit-or-miss' in which some teachers share and others are left out. Teachers and administrators should agree about its purposes. Its objectives should be to make teachers accustomed to collaborative efforts aiming at maximising teaching effectiveness:[87]

> By developing collaborative networks among teachers
> and providing structured opportunities for peer
> review, schools can enrich the organizational
> climate while providing classroom teachers a
> potentially powerful vehicle for instructional
> improvement.

Blumburg (1980) suggests that as a prior condition, peer supervision should help teachers learn how to help each other through a collaborative strategy. The role of the administration in peer supervision is crucial in moving the school in the direction of a more open, help seeking, and help giving environment. The more the administration exhibits active concern with what teachers are doing and how they relate to each other, the more the teachers will exhibit similar concerns.[88]

In sum, peer supervision has the potential of bringing colleagues together in collaborative efforts to improve instruction. It is an 'on-site' approach that taps intrinsic motivation provided that staff members are trained in collaborative problem-solving skills and that a trusting environment is created in order that teachers can collect and use descriptive feedback on topics of their own concern to improve their performance. But it should be a part of a total staff development programme.

2.4.2   Clinical supervision

Clinical supervision was originally developed by Morris Cogan in the 1950s in the Harvard Newton Summer Program, a laboratory school operated in association with Harvard's Master of Arts in Teaching

(MAT). Anderson (1986) states that he first heard of 'clinical supervision' from Cogan during his early years at Harvard University:[89]

> Cogan's book (1973) should be regarded as the definitive volume in clinical supervision even though Goldhammer and other colleagues/students of Cogan got their ideas published much earlier.

Cogan (1973) defines clinical supervision as:[90]

> the rationale and practice designed to improve the teacher's classroom performance. It takes its principal data from the events of the classroom. The analysis of these data and the relationship between teacher and supervisor form the basis of the program.

Definitions of other authors are not very different. Goldhammer (1980) defines clinical supervision as:[91]

> that phase of instructional supervision which draws its data from first hand observation of actual teaching events, and involves face-to-face (and other associated) interactions between the supervisor and the teacher in the analysis of teaching behaviours and activities for its improvement.

Goldhammer reported the following detailed definition of clinical supervision by Flanders:[92]

> A special case of teaching in which at least two persons are concerned with the improvement of teaching and at least one of the individuals is a teacher whose performance is to be studied. It seeks to stimulate some change in teaching, to show that a change did, in fact, take place, and to compare the old and new patterns of instruction in ways that will give a teacher useful insights into the instructional process.

These definitions, and several others, have many elements in common, particularly the emphasis on what takes place in the classroom. Proponents of clinical supervision argue that if instructional improvement in the classroom is the ultimate goal of supervision, then the supervisor must be willing to spend a considerable time working with teachers on classroom problems or issues that the teachers identify and about which they require more information. In Cogan's words 'it is in the classroom that new methods of teaching break down'. Hence, Cogan's selection of the word 'clinical' which was rejected by his colleagues in Harvard because of its hospital connotations. Cogan states that he chose the word 'clinical':[93]

> to draw attention to the emphasis placed on
> classroom observation, an analysis of in-class
> events, and the focus on teachers' and students'
> in-class behaviour.

This emphasis is based also on the premise that teaching is behaviour, and that teaching is what teachers do and what pupils do in interaction. As Cogan puts it:[94]

> teaching is the actual (observable) teaching
> performance and the results of teaching'.

The emphasis on the results is important, because it suggests that teaching performance is inseparable from its effects. A further related assumption is that teaching, as a complex interaction, is patterned and thus it can be classified and studied in the same way as are other intellectual and social phenomena. It is subject to understanding and control.

The emphasis on in-classroom events differentiates clinical supervision from general supervision. The latter relates to supervisory operations that take place principally outside the classroom, such as the revision of curriculum, the preparation of units and instructional materials, and the evaluation of the total programmes, while the events occuring inside the classroom are treated only as a background of shared professional understandings. In contrast, clinical supervision is focused upon the improvement of the teachers classroom instruction. The principal data are the records of classroom events only. The central objective is the development of the professionally responsible teacher who is able to analyse his own performance, open to help from others, and self-directing. As Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) put it:[95]

> general supervision refers to the attention and concern supervisory leaders give to organizational factors such as healthy and supportive relationships, on the one hand, and the broad educational leadership and statesmanship responsibilities of supervision, on the other. Clinical supervision, by contrast, refers to face-to-face encounters with teachers about teaching, usually in classrooms, with the intent of professional development and improvement of its instruction.

It is clear that the dichotomy between general and clinical supervision is artificial and made only to stress the narrower focus of clinical supervision, which makes it as a subset or subcategory of general supervision as it is used to indicate all of the activities, functions, and operations that are intended to help teachers to upgrade their performance. Advocates of clinical supervision argue that this narrowness of focus makes this approach better than traditional

supervision. Goldhammer states that this characteristic makes clinical supervision more easily defined, and causes less role confusion than does general supervision:[96]

> Because it is more specific, and because of the
> greater amount of interaction and participation on
> the part of the teacher and the supervisor, it is
> probably easier for the parties to understand and
> accept their respective roles.

The emphasis on 'inclassroom' teaching in clinical supervision, has also arisen as a result of inadequacies in the pre-service education of teachers, the dissatisfaction with general supervision and the resistance of teachers to it, coupled with an urgent need to help teachers deal with 'myriads of educational novelties':[97]

> the kind of precise help the situation demands will
> not be delivered by scatter-shot supervision
> amounting to little more than sporadic visits
> followed by some global comments; teachers are
> better left alone, than merely tampered with.

Proponents of clinical supervision (Kilbourn, 1986; Shane and Weaver, 1972; McFaul and Cooper, 1983) cite other features as characteristics of clinical supervision; the respect for the teacher's autonomy; the collegial relationship; nourishment of versatility; the building of confidence, enthusiasm and interest; the flexibility that encourages teachers to generate, present and carry out ideas for the improvement of instruction.

Most writers in the field of clinical supervision describe the model as consisting of stages. Although they disagree as to the number

and names of the phases, their models have similar content. Cogan's model consists of eight phases: establishing the teacher-supervisor relationship, planning with the teacher, planning the strategy of observation, observing instruction, analysing the teaching/learning process, planning the strategy of the conference, the conference, and finally renewed planning. Cogan states certain phases may be ommitted or altered, or new procedures instituted, depending upon the successful development of a working relationship between the supervisor and the teacher.[98]

The eight phases of Cogan are reduced to five in Goldhammer's mode: pre-observation conference, analysis and strategy, the conference, and post-conference analysis.[99]

Lovel and Wiles (1983) suggest that the stages could be reduced to only three: pre-observation, observation and post-observation. These three phases are given other names in Acheson and Gall's model: planning conference, observation, and feedback conference.[100]

For a successful clinical supervision programme, the following guiding principles are provided for clinical supervisors: start slowly on a small scale. Begin with 2-3 of the best teachers so that the clinical supervisor has access to valuable feedback, and in order to develop trust with teachers. Provide thorough orientations to all participants, in order to develop a 'common cause', problem-solving skills, and a communication system. Publicize the reason for and nature of the pilot programme to all teachers in order to alleviate many of the anxieties and misunderstandings. Work to understand

teaching from the teachers' perspectives, without abandoning one's own views. Analyse positive teaching patterns and practices. Monitor your clinical supervision programme, through records of observation, teachers' opinions, students' achievement, and the willingness of other teachers to participate.[101]

In recent years, the knowledge base of clinical supervision has expanded and its ideas have become increasingly accepted in practice. Although it began as a method of training student teachers, it quickly generated considerable interest and was extended to the training of experienced teachers as well. During the 70s it received support in the contexts of public school settings and teacher education programmes in the USA. The State Board of Education in North Carolina decided to incorporate clinical supervision as part of the state wide performance analysis system. By the beginning of the 80s there was a considerable amount of writings on the subject in the USA, Canada and Australia. 'It was clear that clinical supervision was an elegant idea that had potential beyond its place of origin'. Smyth (1986) preached it in Australia, Bolam (1982) called for the training of English advisors in 'some new supervisory techniques such as clinical supervision', and Makinde (1985) and Adwani (1981) investigated the feasibility of its application in Nigerian and Saudi public schools respectively.[102]

This popularity may emanate from the fact that many aspects of clinical supervision were (and are still) appreciated before it was formally enunciated by Cogan. Sullivan (1980) stresses that clinical supervision has elements that reflect the major trends of the time during which it was developed. 'Its design shows evidence of the

cooperative efforts that characterized the 1950s'. Mayfield (1983) believes that clinical supervision developed by Cogan is identical to Flander's 'steps of inquiry', and that 'collegial supervision' developed by Lucio (1976) is very much the same as Cogan's clinical supervision. Anderson (1986) pushes the argument a little further and states that:[103]

> It is possible that other educators outside the USA, were into what we now call clinical supervisory activities in more ways than available publications enable us to know.

This popularity is supported by several studies which show that desirable changes in the teacher's classroom behaviour do occur in the context of clinical supervision. Shuna (1973) conducted a study of 9 teachers, 3 receiving clinical supervision, and 6 receiving traditional supervision. She found evidence of teacher growth in self-confidence and self-direction as a result of clinical supervision. Significant differences were also found in the pupils' perceptions of changes in teacher behaviour favouring the experimental group.[104]

Reavis (1977) reports a study of Coffy in which 17 teachers received clinical supervision. He found significant changes in teacher behaviour in 4 of the 10 categories in Flander's Interaction Analysis. Reavis (1977) conducted a study in which 9 supervisors, trained in clinical and traditional supervision, participated. They were then assigned one teacher that they supervised in the clinical pattern and one that they supervised in the traditional pattern. The results revealed a significant difference favouring clinical supervision.

Reavis concluded that 'clinical supervision appears to have some merit. There is reason to believe that it tends to build more positive communication between supervisors and teachers, and that this is so perceived by teachers'.[105]

Garman (1971) conducted a study in which five teaching assistants in college level English received clinical supervision and lectures on teaching methods and five others received only lectures on teaching methods. Four of the five receiving clinical supervision were able to implement behaviours covered in the lectures, whereas only one of the five receiving lectures only was able to implement the behaviours.[106]

Krajewski's study utilized an experimental and a control group of MAT (Master of Arts in Teaching) interns. The experimental group received five clinical supervisory visits with videotaped analysis of the teaching and Flanders' Interaction Analysis. The study reported that the experimental group as indicated by analysis of variance became more indirect in approach, praised more, talked less and utilized student input more. The study concluded that the clinical supervised group exhibited better teaching and more accurate self-perception evaluation than did the control group.[107]

Mayfield (1983) conducted a study to test the effects of clinical supervision on the reading achievement of third grade pupils in four elementary schools. 183 pupils were participants in the third grade clinical supervision group, and 117 pupils of the same grade were participants in the non-clinical supervision group. Teachers of the first group (the experimental) received clinical supervision between

January and April 1982. The teachers of the second group received traditional supervision. In the end of the term both groups were administered the California Reading Achievement Test. The findings of the study were supportive of the following conclusions: clinical supervision in the regular classroom setting appears to be effective in facilitating growth in reading comprehension which can be measured in terms of positive academic gains. Clinical supervision seems to be an effective system of supervising and examining students/teachers learning patterns and assisting them in becoming more competent. The regular school administrator can, with properly guided instruction, use the clinical supervision model to identify, prescribe and individualize supervision with a higher success index in terms of achievement.[108]

However, the mere novelty of clinical supervision did not protect it against criticism. From the outset the word clinical was negatively thought of, inspite of the insistence of advocates that it refers to close observation, detailed observational data, face-to-face interaction between supervisor and teacher, and intensity of focus that binds the two in an intimate professional relationship.

Apart from the negative connotations of the word clinical, the basic conception of clinical supervision and actual instances of its practice are problematic:[109]

> the conception is problematic because of the usual
> difficulties of definition that attend practical
> work. The practice is problematic because of the
> usual tension between ideal and real.

Unfortunately, the definitions of clinical supervision have become numerous and varied. Some educators have come to define any practice which is based on descriptive information collected in a teacher's classroom as clinical supervision. For some, clinical supervision is a checklist approach wherein supervisors inspect a teacher's classroom for frequency counts of effective teaching practices, and based on these frequencies, recommend increasing or maintaining the frequencies. In this case, it may be confused with ordinary supervision, which has been thought of as conducted at a distance:[110]

> there is no one style of clinical supervision, but
> rather a variety of idiosyncratic styles. Although
> the basic tenents of clinical supervision appeal to
> many educators, there is little evidence to
> indicate that it is being widely accepted.

Blumberg (1980) argues that the term 'clinical supervision' is not descriptive of anything that may happen. He questions whether its goals and activities are restricted to those who are practising it. He concludes that:[111]

> institutionalizing a good idea in the form of one
> word can render it impotent. There is always a
> risk of a mechanical, rather ritualistic going
> through phases.

Weller (1971) cautions against unwarranted generalizations regarding clinical supervision when he argues that clinical supervision, like teaching itself, is not founded on any over-riding theory translated into intuition, and trial and error.[112] Sergiovanni (1987) emphasizes the need for developing a useful and theoretical base

for clinical supervision in order for it to evolve into a field of professional practice. Otherwise it will become a set of routines. Sergiovanni discusses many types of theories: descriptive and normative, and concludes that within the human sciences, and particularly within professional practice fields, normative and descriptive theories are intertwinned.[113]

Ben Harris pointed out several limitations to the clinical supervision:[114]

> the one-to-one relationship is expensive in supervisor's time. The equipment required for general use of videotaping can be expensive, also opportunities for group interaction are sacrificed in many clinical designs, with considerable loss in group morale.

Clinical supervision is demanding in terms of time, manpower and resources. There is a need for some skills necessary for the job. The list includes: drawing pertinent information, design and carrying out meaningful data collection strategies, observation, hypothesis information and testing, analysis, planning, assessing and developing clear expectations.

This demanding list requires training and preparing of competent willing participants, supervisors and teachers alike, who are capable of functioning at a high conceptual level. The cycle of clinical supervision is time consuming. A coherent organizational communication system is no less crucial, in order to avoid inconsistent messages.

Videotaping is a common technique with clinical supervision. Apart from costs, which limit its feasibility, this technique, although providing a useful and readily accessible representation of teaching and classroom life, may provide an incomplete picture; due to the selective nature of lens and screen, some aspects of classroom life could be neglected. The artifacts of teaching (work materials, testfiles, plans, notebooks and other teaching products) together with videotaping can provide a more complete representation of classroom life.

Retallic (1986) has reservations about clinical supervision as a technique or technology made up of knowledge skills which can be 'aquired by supervisors and applied to teachers' 'in much the same way that a piece of technological equipment might be used'. Thus it enables supervisors to think of clinical supervision as a means by which they can keep a step ahead of teachers. Retallic calls for an alternative way of understanding clinical supervision, an approach 'which will replace the notions of predictions based on scientific laws with the interpretive notions of understanding, meaning and intention'. In fact Retallic is warning against making clinical supervision more than a 'refined teacher inspection technology' unless educators embrace a comprehensive teacher development system.[115]

In sum, clinical supervision has been applauded by some as the best, most sophisticated, and described by some advocates as 'having enough weight to hit the target', whilst labelled by opponents as unreal and unworkable. The truth may be somewhere between the two extremes. Goldhammer et.al. viewed practical clinical supervision as a

'goal sought rather than a goal achieved'. It has potential to change the practice of supervision substantially, but pitfalls and obstacles cannot be underestimated. Despite pitfalls Reavis (1984) emphasizes that no study has found traditional supervision as effective in changing teacher behaviour when compared to clinical supervision.

2.5 Conclusion

Literature published in last decades recommends various supervisory approaches deemed to be effective in improving the teaching/learning process. Too frequently those approaches have been essentially ideological (i.e. advocating democratic supervision or human relations supervision) rather than practical.

From another point of view, these supervisory approaches appear as a series of actions and reactions. They represent trends and countertrends. Democratic supervision emerges as a response to autocratic inspection. Human relations supervision presents a challenge to scientific supervision. The flaws in human relations supervision sparked off structuralist approaches, such as human resources supervision which appears as a synthesis of scientific supervision and human relations supervision, by containing elements of both approaches. The threatening nature of supervision, a high level of distrust of supervisors, and the disproportionate teacher-supervisor ratio, led some educators to suggest peer supervision as an alternative to traditional supervision. But the pitfalls of 'teachers supervising teachers' led to the suggestion that peer supervision should be only a part of general supervision.

The neglect of 'in-classroom' teaching in favour of general supervision led to the development of a contrasting approach which concentrates on 'in-classroom' teaching. As a result clinical supervision gradually gained prominence. As usual, despite its popularity it is not immune to criticism.

Any approach is not as unique as it may at first appear. In a sense, some approaches are modifications or combinations of other approaches. Vestiges of old approaches can still be found in present practices, though they are not currently in favour. Old views are still held by many, and elements of them become integrated in the new ones. Thus, human relations supervision has its origins in democratic supervision. Neoscientific supervision is a new version of scientific supervision, and can be traced to the 'payment-by-results' in England, which looks somewhat the same as the 'management-by-objectives' model. Some elements of clinical supervision can be found in 'classroom visit and follow-up conference' outlined by Burton in 1926. He suggested that the supervisor should establish a relationship with the teacher, observe in the classroom to gather information, and help the teacher think about how best to improve classroom practice.

The common elements among schools may lead to confusion. Scientific supervision may be confused with inspection. Human relations supervision may be confused with human resources supervision. It may be difficult to differentiate between clinical supervision and ordinary practices in schools.

On the other hand, some schools, which may be found in the literature of supervison, have not been discussed in this chapter, because they appear to be only different names for existing schools. Collegial supervision, participatory supervision, and horizontal supervision seem to be merely other names for peer supervision. Starting from this argument, it is expected that newer approaches will develop in the future.

It would be inaccurate to imply that there is a coherent approach. None of them has grasped the total reality, but each has a perceived selection from reality. They can be viewed as images of truth, in their own right. When applied alternatively and integratively, they provide a more comprehensive view of reality than does any one alone. This means that no single best approach exists. What may work successfully in some situations may be destructive in others. The mere novelty of any of them does not mean that it is the ideal one, or that old approaches have become obsolete.

The theoretical basis of all approaches is drawn from theories in other fields, particularly the social sciences and psychology. This fact supports the argument that supervision of instruction has no characteristic thought of its own. It borrows and constructs perceptions from other fields. Anderson (1986) states that:

> Nearly all discussions of administrative/ supervisory activities in schools have been anchored in prevailing practices and theories about the supervision of the personnel in the many worlds of work outside of education.

There are a number of well-established fields of study that have produced concepts, theoretical formulations and research findings that have implications for the practice of instructional supervision. Communication, leadership, motivation, human relations and a number of similar fields have been employed to form the conceptual base from which supervisors derive strategies, methods and techniques. Social psychology has been drawn on to form the 'human relations' view of supervisory behaviour. Communication theory has offered another way of viewing supervision with emphasis on self analysis and feedback techniques. Scientific management in industry is drawn on to form scientific supervision.

Sergiovanni draws upon leadership as it is seen through the social sciences to develop the 'human resources supervision'. He acknowledges his indebtedness to Maslow for an understanding of organizational theory.

2.6 References

1. Lucio, W. and McNeil, J., Supervision : A Synthesis of Thought and Action, NY, McGraw-Hill, 1969, p. 1.

2. Lovel, J. and Wiles, K., Supervision for Better Schools, NJ, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1983, pp. 28-29.
   See also: Wiles, J. and Bondi, J., Supervision : A Guide for Practice, Columbus, Ohio, Bell and Howell Co., 1980, p. 7.

3. Gwynn, J., Theory and Practice of Supervision, NY, Dodd, Mead and Co., 1961, p. 9.

4. Lewis, A. and Miel, A., Supervision for Improved Instruction, Belmont, Calif, Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1972, p. 39.

5. Chang, P., The Role of Administrators, Inspectors and Heads of Schools in Improving the Qualitative Aspect of Education, Teaching Education in New Countries, No, 3, Vol. 11, Feb. 1971, Oxford University Press, p. 192.

6. Lewis, A. and Miel, A., Supervision for Improved Instruction, op.cit., p. 39.

7. Lucio, W. and McNeil, J., Supervision : A Synthesis of Thought and Action, op.cit., p. 8.

8. Lovel, J. and Wiles, K., Supervision for Better Schools, op.cit., p. 31.

9. Barr, A. et.al., Supervision : Democratic Leadership in the Improvement of Learning, NY, Appleton-Century Co., 1947, p. 218.

10. Ibid, pp. 347-350.

11. Barr, A., Scientific Supervision cited in Bolin, F., The Language of Instructional Supervision, Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1983, p. 53.

12. Barr, A., Scientific Study of Classroom Supervision, quoted by Bolin, F., op.cit., p. 55.

13. Barr, A., et.al., Supervision: Democratic Leadership, op.cit., p. 222.

14. Bruckner, L., Does Our Present Curriculum Fit the Needs of the Elementary School?, cited in Bolin, F., op.cit., p. 129.

15. Burton, W., et.al., Supervision : A Social Process, NY, Appleton-Century Co., 1955, p. 61.

16. Cited in Bolin, F., op.cit., p. 111.

17. Burton, W., Introduction to Education, NY, Appleton Century Co., 1954, p. 429.

18. Barr, A., Scientific Supervision, cited in Bolin, F., op.cit., p. 184.

19. Ibid, p. 184.

20. Ibid, p. 185.

21. McNeil, J., A Scientific Approach to Supervision, in Sergiovanni, T. (ed.), Supervision of Teaching, Virginia, ASCD, 1982, p. 31.

22. Cited in Smith, A., The Politics of Accountability, International Review of Education, Vol. 33, 1987, p. 3.

23. Kogan, M., Education Accountability : An Analytic Overview, Hutchinson, 1986, p. 18.

24. Ibid, p. 25.

25. Smith, A., The Politics of Accountability, op.cit., p. 3.

26. Pearce, J., School Oversight in England and Wales, European Journal of Education, No. 4, Vol. 21, 1986, p. 339.
See also: Bolam, R., School Inspectors and Advisors, in Mitzel, E., (ed.) Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Vol. 2, NY, The Free Press, 1982, p. 4431.

27. Kogan, M., Education Accountability, op.cit., p. 20.

28. Nelson, J., New Dimensions on Accountability, Australian Journal
    of Education, No. 3, Vol. 31, 1987, p. 220.

29. Malam, T., How the Inspecotrate Operates in the French Education
    System, European Journal of Education, op.cit., p. 352.

30. Li, T., Critical Analysis of School Supervision in Taiwan,
    Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University,
    1984, p. 76.

31. Kogan, M., op.cit., p. 73.

32. Ibid, p. 74.

33. Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R. Supervision : Human Perspectives,
    NY, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1983, pp. 290.

34. Lawston, D., The Changing Role of the Teacher, Prospects, No. 1,
    Vol. XVII, 1987, p. 92.

35. Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R., Supervision : Human
    Perspectives, op.cit., pp. 4-6.

36. Mosher, R. and Purpel, D., Supervision : The Reluctant Profession,
    Boston, Houghton Miffilin, 1972, p. 16.

37. Ibid, p. 17

38. Lucio, W. and McNeil, J., Supervision : A Synthesis of Thought and
    Action, op.cit., p. 12.

39. Barr, A., et.al., Supervision : Democratic Leadership, op.cit., p.
    9.

40. Burton, W. et.al., Supervision : A Social Process, p. 11.

41. Burton, W., Introduction to Education, cited in Bolin, F., The
    Language of Instructional Supervision, op.cit., p. 110.

42. Ibid, p. 112.

43. Ibid, p. 128.

44. Miel, A., <u>Changing the Curriculum</u>, NY, Appleton Century Crofts, 1946, p. 172.

45. Ibid, p. 176.

46. Ibid, p. 178.

47. Lewis, A. and Miel, A., Supervision for Improved Instruction, op.cit., p. 63.

48. Miel, A., <u>Creativity in Teaching</u>, Belmont, Cal., Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1961, p. 224.

49. Lovel, J. and Wiles, K., Supervision for Better Schools, op.cit., p. 32.

50. Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R., Supervision : Human Perspectives, op.cit., p. 17.

51. Ibid, p. 4.

52. Goodwin, S., <u>An Explication of Human Resources Supervision</u>, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pitsburgh, 1983, pp. 22-23.

53. Lovel, W. and Wiles, K., Supervision for Better Schools, op.cit., p. 32.

54. Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R., Supervision : Human Perspectives, op.cit., p. 22.

55. Ibid, p. 3.

56. Lovel, J. and Wiles, K., Supervision for Better Schools, op.cit., p. 35.

57. Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R., op.cit., p. 121.

58. Ibid, p. 122.

59. Sergiovanni, T., <u>Professional   Supervision   for   Professional Teachers</u>, Washington D.C., ASCD, 1975, p. 7.

60. Goodwin, S., An Explication of Human Resources Supervision, op.cit., pp. 24-25.

    See also: Sergiovanni, T., The Context of Supervision, Washington, ASCD, 1982, p. 6.

61. Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R., op.cit., p. 290.

62. Ibid, pp. 5, 51, 68.

63. Ibid, p. 44.

64. Sergiovanni, T., Human Resources Supervision, in Sergiovanni, T. (ed.) Professional Superivion for Professional Teachers, op.cit., pp. 27-28.

65. Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R., op.cit., p. 227.

66. Ibid, p. 193.

67. Ibid, p. 193.

68. Gitlin, A., et.al., Improving Teaching Through Peer Evaluation, McGill Journal of Education, No. 1, Vol. 22, Winter 1987, p. 52.

69. Blumeburg, A., Supervisors and Teachers : A Private Cold War, Berkely, Cal., McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1980, p. 202.

70. Kamp, K. et.al., Two Decades of Teacher Attitudes, Phi Delta Kappan, April 1986, p. 563.

71. Zahorik, J., Teachers' Collegial Interaction, The Elementary School Journal, Vol. 87, March 1987, pp. 385-395.

72. Ibid, p. 393.

73. Blumberg, A., Supervisors and Teachers, op.cit., p. 203-204.

74. Cited in Zahorik, J., op.cit., p. 398.

75. Freeman, G. et.al., Team Building for Supervisory Support, Educational Leadership, no. 37, 1980, pp. 356-358.

76. Alfonso, R., Will Peer Supervision Work, Educational Leadership, No. 8, Vol. 34, 1977, p. 587.

77. Barnett, B. et.al., Peer-Assisted Leadership, <u>Phil Delta Kappan</u>, No. 9, Vol. 67, 1986.

78. Skoog, G., Improving College Teaching Through Peer Observation, <u>Journal of Teacher Education</u>, No. 2, Vol. 31, 1980, pp. 23-25.

79. Waters, C.M., et.al., Toledo's Internship, <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, No. 5, Vol. 66, 1985.

80. Fagan, M., Mentoring Among Teachers, <u>Journal of Educational Research</u>, No. 2, Vol. 76, 1982, p. 114.

81. Alfonso, R., Will Peer Supervision Work, <u>Educational Leadership</u>, No. 8, Vol. 34, 1977, p. 594.

82. Ibid, p. 595.

83. Eisner, E., The Art of Teaching, <u>Educational Leadership</u>, No. 4, 1983, p. 52.

84. Withall, J. et.al., Taking the Threat Out of Classroom Observation, <u>Journal of Teacher Education</u>, No. 1, Vol. 30, 1979, pp. 55-58.

85. McFaul, S. et.al., Peer Clinical Supervision in an Urban Elementary School, <u>Journal of Teacher Education</u>, No. 5, Vol. 34, 1983, p. 34.

86. Alfonso, R., Will Peer Supervision Work, op.cit., p. 601.

87. Alfonso, R. et.al., Colleagueship in Supervision, in Sergiovanni, T., (ed.), Supervision of Teaching, op.cit., p. 99.

88. Blumberg, A., Supervisors and Teachers : A Private Cold War, op.cit., p. 211.

89. Anderson, P., The Genesis of Clinical Supervision, in Smyth, J. (ed.) <u>Learning About Teaching Through Clinical Supervision</u>, Sydney, Croom Helm, 1986, p. 12.

90. Cogan, M., <u>Clinical Supervision</u>, Boston, Houghton Miffilin, 1973, p. 9.

91. Goldhammer, R. et.al., <u>Clinical Supervision</u>, NY, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980, p. 19.

92. Ibid, p. 19.

93. Cogan, M., Clinical Supervision, op.cit., p. 9.

94. Cited in Lovel, J. and Wiles, K., Supervision for Better Schools, op.cit., p. 170.

95. Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, Supervision : Human Perspectives, op.cit., p. 295.

96. Goldhammer, R. et.al., Clinical Supervision, op.cit., p. 20.

97. Cogan, M., Clinical Supervision, op.cit., p. IX.

98. Cogan, M., Clinical Supervision, op.cit., pp. 10-13.

99. Goldhammer, R. et.al., op.cit., p. 32.

100. Lovel, J. and Wiles, K., Supervision for Better Schools, op.cit., p. 172.

See also: Retallic, J., Technical, Cooperative and Critical Approaches, in Smyth, J. (ed.), Learning About Teaching Through Clinical Supervision, op.cit., p. 91.

101. Goldsberry, L., Is Clinical Supervision Practical, in Smyth, J. (ed.) Learning About Teaching, op.cit., pp. 148-151.

102. See: Smyth, J. (ed.), Learning About Teaching, op.cit., p.20.

- Bolam, R., School Inspectors and Advisors, in Mitzel, E. (ed.), <u>Encyclopedia of Educational Research</u>, NY, Free Press.

- Makinde, S., <u>Strategies for Improvement of Instructional Supervision in Nigeria</u>, Doctoral Dissertation, College of Education, Florida State University, 1985.

- Adwani, S., <u>The Relationship Between Teacher and Supervisors As Perceived by Teachers, Supervisors and Principals In Secondary Schools In Saudi Arabia</u>, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1981.

103. Anderson, R., The Genesis of Clinical Supervision, in Smyth, J. (ed.) Learning About Teaching, op.cit., p. 18.

104. Shuma, K., <u>Changes effectuated by a Clinical Supervisory Relationship</u>, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1973, pp. 115-120.

105. Reavis, C., A Test of the Clinical Supervisory Model, <u>Journal of Educational Research</u>, No. 6, Vol. 70, 1976, pp. 313-315.

106. Garman, N., <u>A Study of Clinical Supervision as a Resource for College Teachers of English</u>, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1971, p. 15-20.

107. Kragewski, R., Clinical Supervision to Facilitate Teacher Self-Development, <u>Journal of Research and Development in Education</u>, No. 2, Vol. 9, 1976, p. 58.

108. Mayfield, J., <u>The effects of Clinical Supervision on Pupil Achievement in Reading</u>, Doctoral Dissertation, Wayne State University, 1983, pp. 18-26.

109. Lovel, J. and Wiles, K., Supervision for Better Schools, op.cit., p. 182.

110. Harris, B., <u>Supervisory Behaviour in Education</u>, Englewood Cliffs, Cal., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1985, p. 99.

111. Blumberg, Supervisors and Teachers, op.cit., p. 234-235.

112. Weller, R., <u>Verbal Communication in Instructional Supervision</u>, NY, Teachers College Press, 1971, 31.

113. Sergiovanni, T., A Theory of Practice for Clinical Supervision, in Smyth, J. (ed.), Learning About Teaching, op.cit., pp. 43-56.

114. Harris, B., Supervisory Behaviour in Education, op.cit., p. 99.

115. Retallic, J., Technical, Collaborative and Critical Approaches, in Smyth, J. (ed.), Learning About Teaching, op.cit., pp. 85-94.

116. Anderson, R., The Genesis of Clinical Supervision, in Smyth, J., Learning About Teaching, op.cit., p. 8.

CHAPTER THREE

Supervision of Instruction : A Worldwide Perspective

CHAPTER THREE

Supervision of Instruction : A Worldwide Perspective

"Historical backgrounds and perspectives often are
used as proper backdrops for discussion of
contemporary issues".

Eye and Netzer

3.0 Introduction

The previous chapter introduced a number of contemporary trends of
supervision, or supervision in theory. This chapter presents the
supervisory systems in a number of developed countries, or supervision
in practice. In this sense, the two chapters are complementary.

Supervision of instruction, as a formally defined set of
responsibilities, is, at least, as old as public education itself.
Historically it has evolved from a function emphasizing inspection,
monitoring, and enforcement to one emphasizing curriculum development,
training and formative evaluation. However, the aspects which
supervisors emphasize, or over which they exercise control vary widely
from one country to another depending on several factors in the country
involved. In Norway, for example, there is no system formally called
supervision or inspection, as it is called in most European countries,
while in France, Belgium, and Ireland the role of inspectors has
expanded to include defining the curriculum and the approval of
textbooks and materials. In the USA supervisors are charged with the
functions of evaluation, curriculum development, and in-service
education. In England and Wales H M I exercise oversight rather than
control and are responsible for the implementation of national norms.[1]

Broadly speaking, the Arab countries have no indigeneous systems of supervision. Together with other aspects of education, the supervisory practices of western countries have been adopted, perhaps adapted, by Arab countries, since colonial times. More recently, the USA has been influential in the educational systems in the Arab world, and in the development of supervision. Therefore a brief account of supervisory systems in a number of developed countries will be presented in this chapter.

3.1 Inspection in England and Wales

3.1.0   Introduction

Inspection (the more used English term for supervision) is undertaken on two levels; the national level, where there is a national force of about 500 inspectors known as Her Majesty Inspectorate (HMI), and the local level where there are advisory staffs attached to more than 100 local educational authorities (LEA). HMI advise the DES (Department of Education and Science), whereas local advisors advise schools, the education officers who administer the local authorities and the local councillors who determine their policy. In order to understand this dual system, it is necessary to trace its roots in the history of education in England.

Until 1833 the British government took no part in the primary education, which had been largely provided by the church, particularly through the charity schools run by the S.P.C.K. In general the church was opposed to the idea of government national schools. Church-related

institutions often designated ministers as inspectors. Therefore, inspection has not been originally a concern of the government. The earliest inspectors, or school visitors, as they were known, were generally of the local clergy.[2]

It was in the industrial field that the first government inspectors made their appearance, with the duty of considering the working conditions in factories, particularly in their impact on the young. Under the 1802 Act "an apprentice in mill or factory was to receive instruction daily, during working hours, in reading, writing, and arithmetic, under a discrete and proper person ... in some room set apart for that purpose"; and on Sundays he was to have an hour's instruction, including appropriate questioning, in Sunday schools. Visitors were appointed to check that these rules were observed. The discovery by the factory inspectors of the inadequacy of the educational clauses of the Factory Act contributed to an appreciation of the need for a more formal scheme of educational inspection.[3]

In 1833 the first grant of public money to education was voted by the Parliament and for six years it was distributed unconditionally to the two principal voluntary societies (British and Foreign School Society which began to establish schools in 1808 and the National Society for promoting the Education of the poor in the principles of the established church in 1811).[4]

By 1839 it was felt that the public had the right to know how their money was being spent and to some assurances that it was being spent as Parliament intended. In April of that year the Committee of

the Privy Council on Education was set up, and in June the committee recommended that:[5]

> no further grant be made for the establishment or
> support of normal schools unless the right of
> inspection be retained.

Dunford (1976) regards this development as the first step towards the abolition of religious monopoly in the control of education.[6] In December of that year the first two HMI were appointed, a development which was not welcomed by the religious bodies until a concordant, which gave the glercy a leading role in their appointment and control, was reached. One of the early consequences of this concordant was that inspection became denominational. Until 1870 the great majority of the Anglican inspectors were clergymen, but from 1870-1968 no clergymen or ministers, from any denomination, were appointed, and schools of every denomination were, and still are inspected by the same inspectors. The ban on clergymen was only lifted in 1968.[7]

In the early years the objective of inspection was to collect facts and information and to report the results to the Committee of Council. Inspectors were not to interfere with religious instruction, or discipline, or management of schools. Inspection was not seen as a means of exercising control, or restraining local efforts, but offering assistance.[8] But the inspectors quickly established the practice of giving advice, observing methods of teaching, and ascertaining how far those methods had been successful:[9]

> The first inspectors contributed to educational
> advance; they drew attention to the poor quality of
> teachers, to the need for a system of colleges of
> education, they spread information about successful
> experiments, advocated separate classrooms, and
> encouraged the establishment of infant and mixed
> schools.

In 1847 the pupil-teacher system, under which some scholars "were

to be prepared to complete their education as school masters in a

normal school (College of Education)", was introduced. Candidates were

to be examined by HMI. Furthermore, normal schools were to be

inspected before receiving any grant. Schoolmasters had to be examined

before they could be employed.[10] In 1858 an examination system was

recommended as a means 'to secure, efficient teaching for every child'.

The salary and prospects of teachers depended on the results of the

examination conducted by the HMI. This was considered a negative

development because:[11]

> Inspectors were bound to give their attention to a
> mechanical examination instead of looking at the
> school as a whole. They were regarded by the
> teachers as enemies instead of being constructive
> advisors. It meant a heavy increase in inspectors'
> work.

The examination system together with the payment-by-results system

were abolished at the end of the 19th century. In 1863 a new grade of

Assistant Inspector, with the job of marking exercises, was instituted.

Thus "class distinction" was introduced into the inspectorate, which

did not disappear until 1944. In 1870 the Forster Act necessitated a

further increase in the number of HMI and led to the appointment of

local inspectors by some of the larger school boards.[13] In 1851 the

inspection of evening schools began, and in 1898 a branch of HMI was formed for the inspection of secondary schools, technical schools, and the schools of Arts and Science. In 1883 the first female inspector was appointed for needlework, followed in 1890 by another for cooking and laundry work. In 1896 women inspectors were allowed to inspect infant and girls' schools for purposes unconnected with housecraft. But it was not until 1903 that the first woman was appointed with the rank of HMI.[14]

At the beginning of the 20th century there were three inspectorates: the elementary inspectorate (which included HMIs, Junior Inspectors, Women Inspectors, and Assistant Inspectors), the secondary inspectorate, and the technological inspectorate. This tripartite organization survived until 1944, when it was unified.[15] During the 2nd World War, the youth services, community centres, and service education, were added to the responsibilities of inspectors. After the war, the short-term residential colleges and education in prisons and borstals were added.[16] After the war the inspectorate was organized in ten divisions covering the whole country. A division was further divided into districts.[17]

There have been changes since the war, in part to adapt to the 1944 Education Act, and partly as a result of the rapid expansion of all aspects of education:[18]

> The reorganization in the immediate post war years not only reflected the new Act, but introduced changes more dramatic and far-reaching than any had gone before.

After the war HMI became involved in administrative duties, in advisory work, especially in the writing of educational pamphlets and in relation with a wide variety of bodies on the fringe of education. But that involvement was at the expense of their basic function, the inspection of schools, which had declined considerably by the mid-60s. It was indeed suggested that the HMI were no longer necessary.[19] A select committee of the Parliament found in 1968 that the statutory obligation on the Secretary of the State to cause inspection of all educational establishments had for long been disregarded, and that HMI regarded themselves essentially as advisors.[20] Hough (1975) attributes this development to the fact that, after the war, other professional bodies had developed which were felt capable of exercising the functions of the HMI. It may also be attributed to the system of education in England being teacher-centered. It was asserted that the superivision of instruction is a matter for the teachers themselves. The headteacher is responsible for the professional competence and development of his staff, and he has under his leadership a variety of others concerned with supervision and advice; deputy headteachers, head of departments, and teachers with pastoral and counselling duties. The teachers' autonomy is genuine, although not complete. There is a growing tendency towards teacher participation in curricular matters.[21]

3.1.1   HMI

About 500 HMIs inspect schools, colleges of further education, and local education authorities. Although the title 'Her Majesty's Inspectorate' implies independence, they are essentially civil servants (teachers are not), and not completely independent of the DES

(Department of Education and Science). There is a genuine independence in educational matters in that the Secretary of the State does not directly tell them what to do or what to write. They are, within limits, free to hold and express their own opinions, and are not required to support government or department policy. It was felt that this policy independence was a guarantee of there being no control of the curriculum by the central government. The inspectors supply the DES with information and make recommendations. These are not always accepted but usually considered.[23]

HMIs have long seen themselves as an elite force. Unlike many teachers until relatively recently they are always graduates. They are recruited from classroom teaching, from headships or from advisory work, at an average age of about 40. The new recruit is provided with a mentor who oversees the first year's experience and acts as a guide. This apart, there is little formal induction training, and the provision of subsequent training is limited.

For purposes of general inspection the head office assembles inspection teams of between 2-5 for primary schools and 12-20 for secondary schools. The team leader known as the reporting inspector (RI), has to obtain detailed factual information about the school in advance. The team arrives on Monday and observes lessons steadily until mid-Friday, meeting each evening as a rule to develop and formulate their impressions, and leaving a draft of the departmental sections of the report with the RI. This coverage amounts to 10-15% of the lessons in a typical school week. Before leaving, the RI will discuss the team's judgment with the headteacher. He then has to write

the report while his recollections are still fresh. The draft report is rehearsed orally with the governing body some weeks or months later, and in due course the report is printed and published. The LEA is then required to set down what it proposes to do about each significant item in the report.[24] Although HMI no longer assess individual teachers, their reports can be viewed as threatening. On the other hand, if a LEA wishes to ignore or set aside the findings of an HMI inspection there is no legal power to compel it to do otherwise.[25]

A strong consciousness of the curriculum as a whole and of the school as an environment for learning can be seen in every HMI report. In the last 4-5 years HMI have developed into one of the most prolific sources of comment on current educational issues. On the basis of their accumulated experience and evidence, HMI have issued wide-ranging surveys of primary, middle, and secondary education. Although they have no research facility of their own, they exercise a strong influence on the use of the Department's limited budget for research. They act as influential advisors to the major funding bodies in research, and their specialists in higher education can affect the priorities attached to major bids for funds.[26]

3.1.2   LEAs Advisors

The local inspectorate began in response to the need to provide supervision for practical subjects such as handicrafts, domestic science, and physical education. Their responsibilities have expanded rapidly with the recognition of local responsibility. The first local inspectors were appointed in 1872 as a result of the 1870 Education

Act.[27] They were less highly regarded than the HMI, although closer in touch with teachers. The 1944 Act made it possible for the LEAs to cause inspection to be made of any educational establishment maintained by the authority.[28] Since then there has been a rapid growth in the number of LEA inspectors, probably 4-5 of them to each HMI. Their status and pay vary among authorities.[29]

The presence of local inspectors and advisors relieved HMI of some responsibilities for formal inspections. They do much of the work that formerly was performed by HMI such as advising the LEA on the progress of schools, organizing in-service courses for local teachers, and giving person-to-person advice in the classrooms.[30]

Unlike HMI, who work on a national level, LEA advisors have strictly local responsibilities. Advisors are employed in each of the 104 LEAs in England and Wales (different conditions exist in Scotland and Northern Ireland). Almost all authorities have local advisors. As a group they are generally better qualified than most teachers, and have more varied experience.[31]

They are recruited from classroom teaching at headship department or primary headteacher level, at an average age of 38-40. Induction training or in-service training are rare.[32] They are normally appointed with two sorts of responsibilities: subject or specialist responsibilities related to the relevant teachers throughout the LEA and general or pastoral responsibilities in relation to all teachers in a particular district of the LEA (usually about 20 primary and secondary schools).[33] In all LEAs the duties of advisors include:[34]

- maintaining a good knowledge of the schools/departments within their area, chiefly by visiting classrooms to observe teaching,

- using that knowledge as a basis for advice to education officers, headteachers, classroom teachers, board of governors and elected councillors, and

- providing or arranging professional support for teachers according to needs, ranging from full inspection to career councelling or in-service training.

In most LEAs advisors also have some of the following functions:[35]

- participation in selection, appointment and redeployment of senior teaching staff,

- giving specialist advice to education officers on matters of staffing, funding and school building needs and design,

- providing personal councelling and career advice to teachers,

- working with teachers in developing curriculum and innovations, and

- developing, negotiating and disseminating accounts of good practice.

In response to several pressures, a document entitled 'The Role of LEAs Advisory Services' was drawn as a result of an agreement among DES offices, HMI, representatives of the advisors trade union, and offices of the local authority associations. The document calls for urgent review of advisory provision, a clear definition of functions, good management of advisors, the recognition (for the first time) that

advisors have distinctive training needs, and the need for more appropriate levels of manning. The complementary relationship with HMI is considered.[36]

Advisors encounter several difficulties in adopting an improvement-facilitator role; they lack necessary time and secretary support. Their administrative and inspectorial responsibilities prevent possibly many teachers from seeing them in a supervisory role.[37]

Although they outnumber HMI the influence of the latter on government policy is greater than that of the LEAs Advisors whose influence on local policy varies from moderately significant to negligible.[38]

There are no statutory or formal links between HMI and LEA advisors. It is customary to describe the two services as complementary. On the other hand many teachers see inspection by advisors as inspection by their employer and inspection by HMI as a safeguard.[39]

It is noteworthy that the position of the HMI and LEAs advisors may radically change. There will be a national curriculum, for the first time, determined by the DES. Conflicting messages about the future of the HMI have been emerging. Dunford (1988) quoted Cooper and Lybrand as saying that LEAs will monitor schools' performance and provide accountability for the use of public funds in their schools. In July 1988 the DES deputy secretary hinted that the Education Bill

would give local advisers a role in policing the national curriculum. In September the DES told LEAs that it has not been decided who is to employ the people who are going to monitor the national curriculum. A month later Mr. Baker was assuring LEAs that he has no plans to nationalize their inspectorates. On the public level, there are some calls to resist expanding the role of HMI. There are calls for an independent HMI in the future, because it appears that the inspectorate may become the agents of the DES.[40]

3.2 Inspection in Scotland

Scotland has its own system of inspection. There seems to have been a significant difference between the educational philosophies which animated the English and Scottish inspectorates during the first half of this century. The educational objectives of the Scottish inspectors were traditional and conservative. They inspected schools formally, reporting on teachers in accordance with a prescriptive, conventional procedure:[41]

> Though many were men of acknowledged charm and ability, they appear to have cultivated a rigidly uniform style of address and conduct. They were seen as a threat to the professional dignity of the teacher and as agents of a system which was educationally sterile.

While their English colleagues were at the forefront of change, they were preserving the traditions of the established school curricula. They visited schools as outsiders with powers that were felt to paralyse originality. Gatherer (1975) attributes this

difference to the presence of a dual inspection system in England (HMI and LEA inspectors):[42]

> the presence of LEA advisors may have influenced the deployment of HMI's energies and encouraged them to look more comprehensively at the educational development of the system.

In 1947 the Advisory Council in Scotland recommended a change in the role and attitudes of Inspectors. The report urged that there should be less emphasis on the time-wasting practice of hurried, routine inspection and more on guidance and encouragement so that inspectors would become above all consultants and collaborators of a profession which had matured to full stature and status.[43]

A select committee of Parliament investigating the functions of Inspectorates in England and Wales and Scotland in 1968 found that in contrast to England and Wales the inspection in Scotland remained an important part of the Inspectorate's role, but it was evident here too that the main work of the inspectors had become advisory, and that far-reaching changes had occurred in the Scottish inspectorate's functions during the previous two decades.[44]

3.3 Inspection in Northern Ireland

Although there had been inspectors employed by the various education societies in Ireland prior to 1831, that year witnessed the beginning of a national system of school inspection. Until the end of the last century only the primary or national schools had a formal

inspectorate. When the Technical Instruction system was established in 1899 it too acquired a separate inspectorial system.[45]

The secondary schools were not inspected until 1902 when temporary inspectors seconded from the HMI, were appointed. They were replaced in 1909 by permanent inspectors, many of whom had been primary inspectors. Efforts to unify the three inspectorates were unsuccessful.[46]

The primary inspectorate has been a major force in the education system, forming the main link between the central department and a school system of over 3000 schools. In the opening decades of this century the published reports of the inspectors provided a rich body of information and comment on the school system. However the power of the inspectorate suffered from inefficiency in its senior members and from the growing militancy of the teachers who were unwilling to tolerate any longer the power of the inspectorate, whose role extended to determining teachers' salaries under the payment-by-result system. Even the dominance of the secondary inspectorate has declined since 1968 due to the appointment of administrative officers to the secretaryship of the Department and to the growing complexity and scale of the policy process in an expanded education system.[47]

Nevertheless, due to their advisory and executive roles, the inspectors are in a position to influence not only the formulation of education policy but also to exercise a significant influence on its implementation. This influence includes most matters bearing on

curricular policy and school pedagogic practice, the location, recognition, and funding of schools. But on larger issues their influence is limited.[48]

In their contribution to policy formulation the inspectors initiate internal discussion of a policy matter and write reports following school visits or meetings with school authorities or teacher organizations. In general, within the past three decades the role of the inspectorate has simply been fact finding and more involved with issues such as curriculum development, special education and school administration as well as with various specialized pedagogical questions.[49]

3.4 Inspection in France

The French term "inspection général" covers a wide range of tasks. They include ensuring that courses and administrative activity conform to nationally established regulations and that management is efficient as well as the evaluation of the educational system and an advisory function.[50] The 'Inspection Général de L'instruction Publique', was established by a decree of Napoleon 11 in 1852. But its origins can be traced to the period of the Consulate when there were appointed three 'inspecteur général' responsible for:[51]

> touring the lycees, visiting them very meticulously and, acting so to speak as the roving eye of the government, enlightening it in regard to the school, their state, their achievements and their weaknesses'

At the outset, the 'Inspection général de l'instruction Publique' consisted of eight 'inspecteurs général' responsible for higher education, six with oversight of the national lycees, the communal colleges and free (non-state) secondary schools, and two for primary education. They were supplemented in 1886 by an 'inspecteur général' of nursery schools. Their numbers were reduced in 1889 when the inspectorate for higher education was abolished and teachers at this level became subject only to the evaluation of their peers. An 'inspectorate général' of technical education was created in 1921.[52]

Since 1980 the 'Inspection Général de l'instruction Publique' has been replaced by the 'Inspection Général de l'Education Nationale' (IGEN). Several separate administrative bodies formerly involved in inspection have been merged. Nowadays the inspectorate operates at three principal levels - the 'Inspecteurs Généraux', equivalent to HMI, who are high status professionals who operate at national level, and are much more involved in policy making than are their English counterparts; the 'Inspecteurs Pedagogique Regionaux' who operate at the regional level, and the 'Inspecteurs Départmentaux' who operate at the department level, concentrating chiefly upon the inspection of certified teachers.[53] 'Inspecteurs Généraux' (members of the IGEN) are recruited from among public school teachers who acquired their experience in a comprehensive range of teaching categories, from regional inspectors, heads of institutions, 'Academy inspecteurs', and 'Professeurs de les classes Préparatoires' which prepare students for competitive entry to the "Grandes Ecoles".

IGEN members are appointed by a decree from the President of the republic following a recommendation from the "Ministre de I'Education Nationale". From 1982, their appointment became subject also to a recommendation of a consultative commission. They have to pass an examination in order to be promoted to this position. There are about 130 "Inspecteurs Généraux".[54]

The 'Inspecteurs Généraux' exercise their responsibilities within a given field : modern languages, mathematics, natural sciences, etc. The different groups are headed by a dean appointed by the minister. The main duties of the IGEN are : contributing to the recruitment and training of teaching staff, observation and oversight of the educational system with the concomitant monitoring and evaluation, and the provision of information and recommendations, especially with regard to the structure and running of schools, course content and teaching methods. These duties involve various specific tasks:[55]

- Individual inspection, and the assessment of the quality of teaching and teaching methods. The rating may have a bearing on the promotion of teachers and their movement from one appointment to another
- A consultative function involving education and reform proposals, particularly as regard syllabuses and teaching methods
- Involvement in the recruitment and training of teachers
- Involvement in educational research.

In general, the inspectorate, in France, is seen as one of the keystones in a hierarchical system. In response to pressures from

teachers (some of them refused to be inspected) the structure and responsibility of the 'IGEN' were redefined in 1982. Teachers were entitled to comment on their reports and to appeal in cases where their performance rating had dropped. Individual evaluation came to be regarded as a broad appraisal of the education system.[56]

From 1982 to 1986 the Ministry of Education reasserted the authority of the inspectorate as the best way for guaranteeing the quality of public service of national education is for it to be regularly assessed by a corps of independent civil servants. 'IGEN' accordingly were asked to set up visits and to ensure a greater presence within institutions. Since 1986 great importance has been attached to the hierarchy and overall governance with the setting up of a department to supervise the inspectorate and management staff.[57]

The Inspecteurs Pedagogique Regionaux

This body, equivalent to LEAs advisers in England, are involved in the recruitment and training of teaching staff; observing and helping to organize classroom activities, guidance and evaluation; inspection and recommended rating of teaching staff on behalf of the 'IGEN'; the provision of information and proposals regarding the functioning of institutions, syllabuses and teaching methods; and involvement in the organization of educational and teaching activity by means of advice given to the rectors.[58]

Other Inspectorates

In addition to the 'IGEN' and 'Inspecteur Généraux', there are the 'Inspecteur Departmentaux', who are the directors of the educational services in their local departments, the 'Inspecteurs de I'enseigement technique' who advise rectors on questions concerning public and private technological education, while also coordinating the inspection of teaching staff in this sector, and the "Inspecteur Général de l'administration de l'Education Nationale" (IGAEN), who are involved in the administrative, financial, auditing and economic spheres.[59]

3.5 Inspection in Belgium

In Belgium the inspectorate has always played a key role in the educational system, particularly as regards quality control, implementation of policy and monitoring of implementation, and the modernisation of education. The inspectorate is, in fact, the highest educational authority in frequent direct contact with the schools, teachers and pupils.

Since the constitutional amendments of 1970-1980 different communities of Belgium have acquired a large degree of autonomy in education. This has resulted in the state inspectorate having only limited authority in communal, provincial and private schools. The state inspection to which these schools are subject centres on whether the required subjects are being taught soundly, the level of studies and the application of the language legislation. Teaching methods are not included.[60]

Some non-government schools have their own inspectorates. Inspection of religious instruction is performed by persons delegated by the church leaders. The inspection of artistic education in institutions such as music and arts academies comes under another ministry. In addition there are separate inspectors for special education.

Inspectors are recruited from among the state education teaching staff, with 10 years experience. The applicant must hold a teaching diploma at the level he is to inspect. In addition, a professional test has to be passed and an interview in which the applicant is tested on the required personal attributes, essential knowledge, judgment and typical professional qualities. In certain cases the applicant must give a number of lessons. To be appointed inspector general, applicants must have at least six years' experience as inspectors.[61] Under the terms of Royal Decree of 14th December 1976 the duties of the inspectorates in state institutions are as follows:[62]

- counselling teachers,

- informing and retraining them,

- making sure that schools are capable of carrying out their educational assignments adequately,

- supervising the standard of studies,

- cooperating in drawing up the curriculum, timetables and administrative guidelines,

- counselling on the choice and use of methods in teaching,

- representing the minister or the department on committees and at symposia and conferences, and

- Observing teaching in classrooms, questioning the pupils and examining their classroom or homework.

Inspectors report on every teacher, with the latter having the right of appeal against the judgement. However, the role of the inspector is conceived as being principally concerned with the school as a whole rather than with the individual teacher.[63]

3.6 Supervision of Instruction in the USA

3.6.0 Introduction

Generally speaking, American educators agree that supervision of instruction is essential for the operation of good schools. Supervisors are part of the tradition of a developing system of professional specialists in American education. Modern education organizations in their hope to maintain their effectiveness as institutions of learning feel obliged to involve many people in supervisory activities.

3.6.1 Historical background

Supervision of instruction, in the USA, is the product of many of the same forces that have shaped the schools. Its objectives and techniques have always been in accord with the purposes of schools and have been determined by these purposes:[64]

> the story of supervision then is a story to be read
> concurrently with the story of the development of
> American schools.

In the 17th century special committees of laymen were selected in the township to inspect schools for the purpose of controlling standards and to determine the quality of the teaching. Helping teachers improve instruction was not one of their principal functions.[65]

A review of the literature reveals that authors in the field have generally agreed about the evolution and characteristics of supervision. However they differ in terminology related to the predominant features of each period and in the limits of any period, indicating the difficulty of setting beginning and ending dates for phases which continually overlap.

Lucio and McNeil (1969) suggests the following four overlapping periods, each of which seems to contain some dominant and unique characteristics;[66] the period of administrative inspection 1642-1875, the period of efficiency orientation 1876-1936, the period of cooperative group efforts in the improvement of instruction and learning 1937-1959, the period of research orientation 1960s.

Gwynn (1969) and Alfonso et.al. (1975) agree as to the first period which, according to them, continued until the beginning of this century. Scientific supervision is the term they use for the second period. They call the third period that of the cooperative-democratic approach. Alfonso et.al. describe the 4th period as : mutual concern and cooperative interaction towards organizational improvement goals. Gwynn calls it creative supervision, with allied concepts of supervision as guidance, curriculum improvement, group processes, and indigenous instructional teams.[67]

In the first period inspection was concerned largely with the management of schools and the content of the prescribed curriculum rather than with the improvement of instruction. The functions of the supervisor were more judicial than executive or advisory in character. He was required to make judgments about the teacher rather than the teaching or the pupil's learning. Decisions were made upon the basis of what the inspector thought he saw. The remedy always seemed to be that of displacing or replacing the teacher. The procedure was a testing one designed to find out how much the teacher had taught the children, a basis on which the teacher was rated.[68]

It was assumed that the inspector knew more subject matter than the teacher and could teach better than he did. His observations, demonstration teaching, and conferences were based upon the idea that specific knowledge and skills were to be transferred from the inspector to the teacher.[69] This concept continued until the early years of this century, perhaps due to the appointment of special supervisors for physical education, manual work, and fine arts, as these areas were added to the curriculum. Those supervisors were needed because the average teacher was not qualified to teach these subjects.[70]

As early as the beginning of the 18th century the need for consultation and advice was realised, suggesting that inspection should be something more than merely making judgments about teachers. With the rise of normal schools in the 19th century, great attention was paid to the training of the teachers. On the other hand, the impact of business practices and ethics upon education was strong. 'Precision and efficiency were the guiding stars of most public enterprises'.

Supervision began to concern itself not only with rating of teachers, but also with helping them for the improvement of teaching. Professional personnel replaced the lay committees. More friendly relations between teachers and supervisors replaced autocratic relationships. But the authoritarian nature of supervision did not disappear altogether with these developments, except perhaps at the theoretical level. In practice, it has persisted to the present day, in some places, despite its incongruity with contemporary definitions of supervision. But as supervision deals increasingly with the improvement of teaching and less with the rating of teachers, the function of control becomes weaker.[71]

The increasing educational responsibilities of the schools during this period gave impetus to the cooperative and coordinative aspects of administration and supervision. Enlarged schools and school systems in the 20th century, together with the shortage of adequately prepared teachers, the inclusion of extra-curricular activities, followed by an emphasis on foreign languages, mathematics and science created a need for more supervisors. A new dimension of supervision was created; namely special-area supervision. The number of areas covered increased with the developments and made coordination and cooperation of paramount importance.

Social and educational challenges modified the supervisor's primary tasks during the second half of this century. Competition with foreign nations in space research, and a public awakening to the necessity for financial contributions to intellectual enterprises are among the factors that have encouraged the development of an

environment in which problems are solved through study. The operational aspects of many private and public organizations have been subjected to systematic study. School administration and consequently supervision have been studied with improved research procedures:[72]

> the scrutiny of supervision moved beyond the
> head-counting type of scrutiny into more
> sophisticated efforts to determine the nature of
> and reasons for the interrelationships among
> persons and situations.

Many new ideas in the field emerged in the 20th century. The period from 1920-1950 produced two major theories of supervision which still retain an influence. These are the theory of "Scientific" and the theory of "Democratic" supervision. Other schools of thought emerged also in this period such as: leadership for improvement, and cooperative superivision. Later in the 1950s, the concept of "supervision for Human Relations" emerged. In this period also the "Innovation" and "Change" schools of though developed with the expectation that the supervisor would function as a "change agent".

The 1970s have seen the literature stressing "Clinical" and "Peer" supervision as potentially effective models to help teachers improve their instruction. The "Accountability-movement" of the 1970s has directed the supervisors into responsibilities related to teacher evaluation and in-service education.[73] These approaches have been fully discussed in the preceding chapter.

3.6.2   Organizing for Supervision

Public education is not a function of the Federal Government of the USA. The constitution of the USA, when it divided the powers between the Federal Government and the States, left the responsibility for education to the States by keeping silent on the subject. The 10th Amendment in 1791 to the constitution provides that "the powers not delegated to the US by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people".[74] Because the constitution did not mention education, each individual state is left in control of its own system. Barnes (1984) states that the omission was probably intentional because there was great fear that the national government would use the schools for social and political propaganda.[75]

As a result, each state has the right and the responsibility to originate and control its educational system as it deems most appropriate. Consequently the educational practices and policies differ among states. However, there are some similarities. In each state there is a state department for education to supervise, administer, aid, accredit, and set standards for school districts. The department is controlled by a State Board of Education which establishes the policies for public schools, in compliance with state laws. Board members are either elected by the people or appointed by the state governor and usually serve for terms ranging from 2-6 years. The key educational official and chief executive officer of the Board is the Superintendent of public instruction or state commissioner of education. He exercises leadership in planning, research,

coordinating, advising, and promoting public relations. He may be elected by people or appointed by the government or by the Board for a period of 1-6 years.[76]

Each state is divided into local districts. There are about 16000 school districts operating about 100,000 schools in the whole country. These districts are run by elected boards, usually 5-7 in numbers, working within certain broad policies established at the state level. Generally, the board, through the superintendent of schools, oversees the day-by-day operation of the schools. If, for any reason, the local district fails to provide the minimum requirements of the state, the state department is empowered by law, to take action necessary to remedy the fault.[77]

Consequently, supervision of instruction, in the USA, rests with state and local personnel. A large degree of supervision of the educational programme is delegated to the local school district. Outside enforcement of state laws, the supervisory personnel of the state act only as advisors to the local school system. Some school districts have no supervisors. In other districts principals and heads of departments are charged with the task of supervision. As a result, supervision of instruction at the local level in the USA, varies from state to state, among districts and even from school to school.[78]

3.6.3 Shared function

Supervision in American schools is a function diffused among many persons. Nearly all professional school personnel, central office

supervisors, schools principals, department chairpersons, assistant principals or deans of instruction, and lead teachers or resource teachers, are all involved in the activities of supervision.

The long established practices associated with supervision as a shared profession have generated many issues, conflicts and uncertainties among staff personnel. Frequently, supervisors' identity and effectiveness are at issue. Conflict between principals and supervisors often emerges from undifferentiated responsibilities for supervision.

Many titles have been assigned to supervisors over the years; consultant, coordinator, supervisor, and director are but a few of the titles currently in general use. The variety of titles can only add to the confusion about supervisors' responsibilities, although a new title is often selected in the hope that it will resolve the problem. In Harris' (1985) words "supervisors tend to become all things to all people, and often fail to maintain a clear focus on the improvement of instruction".[79]

The acceptance of a few basic definitions of terms used for positions involved in supervision may eliminate some of the confusion:

- The principal as a supervisory person is widely recognized as an ideal instructional leader who is expected to make a major contribution to the supervisory process. He has a primary responsibility to coordinate the efforts of his staff; to define and evaluate local school goals; plan, implement and evaluate

instructional programmes designed to achieve those goals; attract, select, support and facilitate the professional growth of staff members; evaluate and coordinate the work of professional personnel; and see that adequate and appropriate instructional materials and equipment are provided. Such a broad range of responsibilities requires both consultative and management services.[80]

- Assistant principals or deans of instruction are widely reported to be employed for supervisory purposes at the secondary school level where school size and organizational complexity frustrate the efforts of most principals to devote much time to supervision.[81]

- Department chairpersons as members of supervisory teams continue to be widely advocated. In some states they are freed from teaching duties up to three periods a day, and trained in basic supervisory practices.[82]

Lead teachers and resource teachers are new titles for differentiated teaching staff assignments which were publicized in the past as having profound implications for improving education. Under several identical labels rather diverse concepts of differentiated staffing have emerged. One organizational arrangement employed a master teacher or team leader with nominal supervisory responsibilities. Another arrangement proposed a hierarchy of teaching within the school, with all teachers having some responsibilities. Neither arrangement flourished. The

shortage of well-qualified personnel to give dynamic leadership to instructional improvement made those arrangements impractical except under special conditions.[83]

- The Assistant Superintendent for curriculum and instruction has responsibility to develop and implement decisions about what should be taught and how it should be taught. He is responsible for developing a plan of action to implement the curriculum development goals of the school system. He ensures that the supervisory staff does not become separated from the rest of the school system.[84]

- The curriculum and supervision planning council.

    This is a body with responsibility for making recommendations and taking decisions concerning curriculum and supervision, within the framework of the overall policy of the system. In some school districts other names may be found such as planning committee, development committee, and curriculum policy committee. This body conducts studies, experiments and makes innovations. It advises the administration on all curriculum and instruction policies and problems.[85]

- Supervisors, as professional persons whose major responsibilities are in the supervision function area, are deployed at both the district level and school level. At both levels they have many functions in the following areas - programme development, actualization, coordination and evaluation, psychological and technological assistance to principals and teachers, evaluation of

personnel performance, professional staff development and the evaluation of educational outcomes.

In some school districts these tasks are discharged through curriculum councils. In others they are undertaken through central office supervisory staff. The size of the district is an important factor in the allocation of central office personnel. In large school systems specialists with a broad range of specializations are appointed to the central office team. Smaller districts utilize outside resources such as nearby universities, neighbouring school districts and community resources.[86]

A review of the literature shows that supervisory duties fall into two broad categories - the helping role and the administrative role. Some of the tasks in the helping role include: plan and arrange in-service education programmes, visit and observe in the classroom, hold individual conferences with teachers, develop curriculum designs and coordinate efforts for curriculum improvement, and develop and prepare new instructional media.

Some of the tasks classified under the administrative role include: coordinate instructional programmes, assist in the evaluation and appraisal of school programmes, and routine administrative duties.[87]

Instructional supervisors are sometimes assigned to a particular school, usually in large schools where principals, assistant principals and department heads can not provide the needed support. The tasks of the local school instructional supervisor are similar to those of the

central office team. "Coordinator" and "consultant" are other titles suggested for supervisors. Lovel (1985) recommends the position of coordinator where there is a need for the coordination of programmes at the central office level. Examples of such programmes would include voactional and technical, early childhood, special education and science. Such a programme requires overall coordination since normally there are certain specialized services that have to be shared by several schools. In some situations, various parts of the programme have to be provided in different schools but need to be available to all students.

The position of consultant is established to provide specialized services and consultations for the teaching staff, principals and school boards. Consultants participate in the psychological and technological support for teachers; they make suggestions, and provide descriptive feedback.[88]

In terms of numbers, supervisors of instruction have dramatically increased in the past decades up to the 80s. Department of Education statistics show that the increase in supervisors employed by local districts between 1960 and 1980 was 154% while the increase in the total instructional staff employed by local districts in the same period was 67%. Despite this increase the ratio of classroom teachers to supervisors was still 62:1 in 1979. The size of supervisory staff varies widely by region, state, and type of school district. The general acceptance of supervisors on local district staffs is evidenced by the fact that more than 94% of all school districts enrolling 5000 students have supervisors of instruction.[89]

In 1979 The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) made a survey of 308 school systems. The results showed an increasing size of central office supervisory staff. It was rare to find central office staff that had decreased in size in the 70s. Lovel (1985) attributes the increase to - the increase in educational services for all pupils, the development of compensatory programmes (financed by federal funds), the growing school enrolments, and the change in organizational structure.[90]

Emphases on vocational and technical education and later the expansion of special education programmes, emphasized at both the federal government and state levels, have contributed to the growing number of supervisors, directors and coordinators. However, declining enrolments, and budget cutting in the 1980s have reversed the pattern.

Intermediate Units and Service Centers

Staffs of county offices, regional service centers and study councils are described as intermediate units. They provide supervisory services which include interpreting local educational needs, improving education, providing consultative services, developing courses of study, and promoting in-service education. These units emerged after World War 11 in a number of states in the form of reorganized county superintendents' offices.

While intermediate unit organizations originally tended to be county units, regional projects and service centers of various sizes for many special purposes were promoted. Both Federal funds and state

funds were available to develop such projects. The development of new organizational patterns for providing supervisory services emphasized the need for locally based services. Each of these intermediate service organizations has supervisors of some kind on its staff.[91]

Unofficial organizations of national scope exercise a certain amount of supervision in American schools. Regional Accrediting Associations approve schools so that they may become accredited. A visiting committee, selected by the executive secretary of the Association, examines the school in respect to each item in the 'Evaluative Criteria'. The visiting committee writes a report to the school and to the Association indicating its findings. Accredited schools are visited every five years by the visiting committee. If gross deficiencies in standards are found in a school, the committee may warn or withdraw its approval.[92]

3.7 Supervision in the Arab Countries

Supervisory theories and practices in the western world were exported to nearly all corners of the globe during the colonial period of the 19th century by Britain, France and the USA. More recently the USA has been influential in promoting educational organizations and hence supervision in many developing countries. Karagozoglu (1972) states that the Turkish supervisory system was inherited from the old French system of inspection.

As early as the beginning of the 17th century western European
influence, especially the French, has been felt in the Ottoman
culture:[93]

> consequently the French system of education was
> copied completely by the Turkish administration.
> Thus the French system of inspection was introduced
> into the Turkish educational system.

The French influence continued until the early 1950s, when the USA
began to have close relationships with Middle East countries. After
the second world war, USA increased her relationship with Turkey in
technical, educational and economic fields:[94]

> this relationship developed almost to the point of
> a major transition from one foreign influence to
> another.

As a result, Turkish educators came to accept American educational
philosophy and principles, in which democratic human relations between
teachers and supervisors are emphasised:[95]

> but still today it is possible to see the residue
> of autocratic French attitudes among most of the
> Turkish supervisors.

In Nigeria, most schools are modelled on those in Britain, the colonial
power there when modern education was first introduced. As a result,
the system of education, in general, and the system of supervision, in
particular, are transplants. Their major characteristics are those
familiar to the western world.[96]

In Thailand, the first educational system, the Department of Education and the Ministry of Public Instruction were established in the 18th century. In the 20th century, education was modernized according to western models. An expansion of the supervisory duties occurred rapidly during this century.[97]

In Malaysia, which gained its independence in 1957, the Federal Inspectorate of Schools came into being as a result of the Report of an Educational Committee in 1956. As early as 1950 the Barnes report outlined the need for the establishment of an independent inspectorate of schools. A special committee of educational policy in 1952 reaffirmed the recommendations of the Barnes committee:[98]

> that a corps of Independent Inspectors should be
> established in order to function in the Federation
> in the same manner as HMI in Great Britain in
> respect of the improvement of teaching standards.

The functions of the Malaysian inspectorate, as outlined in the Education Act of 1961 and the means through which the functions are undertaken look approximately the same as in Britain. But it has been suggested that they should be modified in the light of recent trends in the USA.[99]

Egypt was the first Arab country to establish a modern supervisory system in 1836. But it was not until 1883 that an official document, defining inspection (as it was called) and the tasks of inspectors, was issued. It stated that:[100]

> inspectors are the eyes of the minister of
> education, through which he sees the work of
> teachers, principals and students, and makes sure
> that they abide by the programmes. They are
> special assistants of the minister who dispatches
> them, whenever he wants, to the schools and offices
> to inform him, by written reports, about what they
> see; good or bad.

The document went on to say:[101]

> the inspectors must inspect the cleanliness of the
> schools, students, and equipment, test the students
> with regard to lessons, behaviour and appearance,
> and scrutinize the work of the principals, teachers
> and other officials.

According to the document, rewards or punishments would be decided in

the light of the reports. It is noteworthy that this document is very

similar to the first French document on inspection in the Consulate

period. This is not surprising since the first attempts to modernize

the system of education in Egypt were inspired by French models,

following the invasion of Egypt by Napoleon in 1798.

Today it is the American approaches to supervision that are

accepted in the Arab countries. This is clear from the Arab literature

on supervision, which draws heavily on American references. In

accordance with this influence most Arab countries changed the terms

'inspection' and 'inspectors' into 'supervision' and 'supervisors'.

American approaches of supervision are usually presented as models

which should be followed. Democracy, human relations, collegiality,

cooperation and the like, which characterize American approaches,

appear attractive to Arab educators.

Al-Chetawi and Al-Ahmar surveyed a number of official documents submitted by 12 Arab countries to the Arab Organization for Education, Science and Culture, and found that all of them agree that supervision is a process aiming at the improvement of the performance of teachers and the development of their teaching methods, a human interaction and cooperation between teachers and supervisors in order to improve the educational process, a comprehensive view of the teaching/learning process with all its elements (the teacher, the textbooks, and the school environment), a means of communication and interaction between the school and the administration at the ministerial levels, a means to develop the capacities of all who are involved in the educational process, and a means of guidance, counselling and information.

According to the documents there is a consensus that the old conception of inspection which conjures up the notion of an inspector seeking to identify the faults of teachers should give way to a new perspective which emphasizes help, cooperation and guidance.[102]

Supervisors, according to the documents, should undertake the following tasks: helping teachers in all aspects relevant to the educational process (curriculum, methods of teaching, evaluation and lesson plan), follow up and evaluation of the various aspects of the educational process (evaluation of teachers, students, curriculum and textbooks) and monitoring the implementation of the ministerial orders, drawing up the curriculum and developing instructional aids, administrative tasks (transferring of teachers, drawing up the school timetable, and advising the Ministry about the schools), in-service

education of teachers, planning and conducting research, encouraging research and innovation, and the exchange of experiences among teachers.

These tasks are undertaken through reporting on teachers, principals and schools; supervisory visits; demonstration lessons; workshops; lectures and bulletins.[103]

In general, the following criteria are taken into account when supervisors are recruited: experience in teaching which should be 4-12 years, technical competencies which are determined by the candidates' reports, university qualifications, personal characteristics, capacity for leadership and innovation, good reputation and behaviour.

A number of documents emphasize the necessity of interviewing and examining the candidates before appointment. Other documents emphasize the pre- and in-service training of supervisors, and keeping them up to date through seminars, and workshops.[104]

The following factors are identified as barriers to the success of supervisors; overwork, technical problems, shortage of efficient manpower, the location of schools, overlapping of duties, role conflict, and inadequate training.[105]

In a regional survey of supervision in Arab Gulf countries (including Iraq), conducted by the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States in Riyad (1985), the officials of the divisions of supervision in the member states agreed that the objectives of

supervision of instruction are, helping teachers understand the aims of education, helping teachers apply suitable methods in instruction, encouraging teachers' professional growth, developing human relations in schools, and contributing to the evaluation and development of schools' curricula.[106]

It is noteworthy that the sixth objective was not mentioned by the officials of the United Arab Emirates (UAE), while the Iraqi officials added two other aims; the development of cooperative group work, and the development of national spirit. These two aims have something to do with the ideology of the ruling Arab Socialist Ba'ath party in Iraq.

The following were identified as the duties that supervisors should undertake; clarifying the aims of education, following up the performance of teachers, orienting teachers to suitable methods, training teachers to apply modern methods, training teachers to use instructional aids, contributing to problem-solving, demonstration lessons, evaluating the teaching/learning situation, encouraging experimentation, classroom visits, contributing to the planning of activities, participating in general examinations, evaluation of the curricula and textbooks, transferring teachers among schools, and reporting on teachers.[107]

The officials in the Gulf states differ as to the priorities to be attached to these objectives and tasks. It is curious that the tasks of participating in general examinations, the distributing of teachers among schools, contributing to the development of curricula, evaluating the school textbooks, and reporting on teachers were not regarded as

important by the Qatari officials although they are given prominence in the Ministerial circular No. 3 issued in 1977.

Studies conducted on supervision in the Arab countries show a significant discrepancy between role expectations embodied in the aforementioned objectives and tasks and role performance. In a questionnaire study Khalil (1983) found that 83% of a sample of 554 Jordanian teachers believe that there is a significant discrepancy between the ideal and the actual perceptions of 32 supervisory practices, described by the questionnaire. Teachers are not satisfied with current supervision. They believe that it does not, improve instruction, promote professional growth, contribute to self-esteem, establish supportive staff interaction, enable teachers to participate in decision-making, allow teachers to influence the supervisory process, give teachers due recognition, or establish trust, respect and friendly relations.[109]

The results of another study conducted by Omari (1977) also show that the Jordanian teachers' perceptions of the current goals, role, power and position of supervisors in their system differed markedly from their expectations. Teachers considered authoritarian supervision basically shaped the character of their system. They would have wished the character of supervision to reflect the human relations aspects.[109]

The results of a study conducted by Adwani (1981) indicate that the majority of teachers, supervisors and principals in Saudi Arabia agree that the existing system for the supervision of instruction needs to be revised. The majority of teachers and principals who

participated in the study disagreed with the proposition that the existing system guarantees that teachers perform their job in the best manner. In contrast, the majority of the supervisors considered that this was the case.[110]

A questionnaire study conducted by Rayyan (1980) found that teachers in Kuwait believe that the authoritative inspectorial practices still prevail. The results show that the activities of supervisors are confined to the syllabi and methods of teaching. Professional relationships, extra-curricular activities, and the personal problems of teachers receive little attention.

The following problems were identified as obstacles to effective supervision: inadequate training of supervisors, overwork of both teachers and supervisors, the nature of the syllabi, the nature of school day, the prevalence of out-of-date educational thoughts, the limited powers of supervisors and lack of incentives.[111]

Al-Musailim (1987) states that supervision in Kuwait does not live up to the expectations. Supervisors are immersed in clerical work instead of being involved in their proper role of instructional leadership. They have to follow the directions of the Ministry which restricts their initiatives by its instructions. The Ministry eroded the autonomy of the supervisors and left nothing to their initiatives and decisions. They have strictly to follow the instructions.[112]

Al-Kobaisi (1979) reports that the teachers in Qatar saw that the supervisors' methods were not helpful, because their visits were too

short and infrequent. Even then the recommendations made by them were mostly traditional and almost unchanged and consequently not of much direct, practical use to those facing daily classroom problems. The results of their visits was often of a long list of recommendations and warnings angrily written in the teachers' records.[113]

3.8 Conclusion

Starting from the fact that Supervisory systems in Arab countries were (and still are) strongly influenced by their counterparts in Western countries, systems of supervision in a number of developed countries are discussed in this chapter. To show how the present has grown from the past, and to what extent the implications of the earlier developments are still being worked out, historical developments and current conceptions in those countries are examined. The literature reveals that the emergence of supervision was not the same in all countries. For example, while it began, in England and Wales, as a means for monitoring the distribution of government aid to schools, it began, in the United States, as a means of controlling standards, and determining the effectiveness of teaching. But, in both countries, as elsewhere in the world, the developments led to a supervision related to improvement of instruction, curriculum development, in-service education, educational leadership and evaluation.

However, the role expectations, the functions of supervisors, the authority they have and their status differ widely from one country to another. The systems are discussed in their specific national

contexts. The author emphasizes this point because Arab educators have presented western trends, in general, and American trends, in particular, as models to be followed. Typically, American trends, according to them, represent the present while other western trends represent the past, which should be abandoned.

The chapter concludes with a brief account of the historical development and the current perceptions of supervision in the Arab World.

3.9 References

1. European Journal of Education, Vol. 21, No. 4, 1986, p. 327.

2. Blackie, J., Inspecting and the Inspectorate, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970, p. 4.

3. Edmonds, E.L., The School Inspector, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972, p. 25.

4. Ibid, p. 30.

5. Dunford, J.E., Her Majesty Inspectorate of Schools in England and Wales, M.Ed. Thesis, University of Durham, 1976, p. 4.

6. Ibid, p. 3.

7. Blackie, J., op.cit., p. 6.

8. Edmonds, E.I., op.cit., p. 39.

9. Blackie, J., op.cit., p. 10.

10. Dent, H., Education in England and Wales, 2nd edition, Hodder and Stoughton, 1982, p. 8.

11. Blackie, J., op.cit., p. 14.

12. Ibid, p. 17.

13. Ibid, p. 18.

14. Gordon, P., Katharine Bathurst : A Controversial Woman Inspector, History of Education, Vol. 17, No. 3, 1988, p. 193-207.

15. Blackie, J., op.cit., p. 21-22.

16. Ibid, p. 30.

17. Ibid, p. 31.

18. Hopkins, R., Her Majesty Inspectorate, The Times Educational Supplement, January 8, 1982.

19. Ibid.

20. Gatherer, W.A., Control and Guidance : The Role of the Inspector, in Houghs, M. (ed.) Administering Education, The Athlone Press of the University of London, 1975, p. 184.

21. Ibid, 183-185.

22. Pearce, J., School Oversight in England and Wales, European Journal of Education, op.cit., p. 331.

23. Blackie, J., op.cit., p. 53.

24. Pearce, J., op.cit., p. 333.

25. Ibid, p. 334.

26. Ibid, p. 334.

27. Blackie, J., op.cit., p. 18.

28. Edmonds, E., op.cit., p. 148.

29. Pearce, J., op.cit., p. 335.

30. Gatherer, W., op.cit., p. 183.

31. Bolam, R., School Inspectors and Advisors, in Mitzel, E. (ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 5th edition, Vol. 2, NY, The Free Press, 1982, p. 4429.

32. Pearce, J., op.cit., p. 336.

33. Bolam, R., op.cit., p. 4429.

34. Pearce, J., 337.

35. Pearce, J., op.cit., p. 338.

36. Ibid, p. 341.

37. Bolam, op.cit., p. 4430.

38. Pearce, J., op.cit., 331.

39. Blackie, J., op.cit., p. 91.

40. Dunford, J., The Curriculum Private Eye, Education, April 1983, p. 315.

41. Gatherer, W., op.cit., p. 182.

42. Ibid, p. 183.

43. Ibid, 184.

44. Ibid, p. 184.

45. O Buachalla, S., The Inspectorial Role in 20th Century Irish Education, European Journal of Education, op.cit., p. 359.

46. Ibid, p. 359.

47. Ibid, 360.

48. Ibid, 362.

49. Ibid, 363.

50. Malan, T., How the Inspectorate operates in the French Education System, European Journal of Education, op.cit., p. 345.

51. Ibid, p. 346.

52. Ibid, p. 346.

53. Bolam, R., op.cit., p. 4431.

    Note: France consists of 25 Academies which are territorial divisions placed under the authority of a rector. According to population density each Academie includes between 2-7 departments. The educational administration in each department comes under the authority of a regional inspector.

    Source: Gendt, R.V., Creativity of the School : Some European Approaches, in Houghes, op.cit., p. 125.

54. Malan, op.cit., p. 346-347.

55. Ibid, p. 348.

56. Ibid, p. 350.

57. Ibid, p. 351.

58. Bolam, op.cit., p. 4431.

    See also: Malan, op.cit., p. 347-348.

59. Malan, op.cit., p. 353.

60. Jansen, W., The Changing Role of the Inspectorate in Belgium, European Journal of Education, op.cit., pp. 365-366.

61. Ibid, p. 368.

62. Ibid, p. 368-369.

63. Ibid, p. 369.

64. Hammock, R., et.al., Supervising Instruction in Secondary Schools, NY, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1955, p. 1.

65. Ibid, p. 2.

66. Eye, G. et al., Supervision of Instruction, NY, Harper & Row, 1965, p. 4-5.

67. Gwynn, J., Theory and Practice of Supervision, NY, Dodd, Mead, 1969, pp. 3-17.

    See also: Alfonso, R. et.al., Instructional Supervision, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1975, pp. 16-27.

68. Eye, G. et.al., op.cit., p. 5.

69. Hammock, R., op.cit., p. 2.

70. Eye, G. et.al., pp. 6-8.

71. Goldhammer, R. et.al., Clinical Supervision, NY, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980, p. 14.

72. Eye, G. et.al., p. 9.

73. Cooper, J., Supervision of Instruction, in Mitzel, E. (ed.), op.cit., p. 1825.

74. Cincotta, H. et.al., The US System of Education, US Information Agency, 1986, p. 6.

75. Barnes, G., The American University, Philadelphia, ISI Press, 1984, p. 89.

76. Cincotta, H., op.cit., pp. 6-7.

- 175 -

77. Black, T.M., <u>Straight Talk about American Education</u>, NY: Harcourt Brace Jounavich, 1982, pp. 262-264.

78. Cincotta, H., op.cit., p. 8.

79. Harris, B., <u>Supervisory Behaviour in Education</u>, 3rd edition, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1985, pp. 11-112.

80. Lovel, J. et.al., <u>Supervision for Better Schools</u>, 5th edition, NJ, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1985, p. 239-240.

81. Harris, op.cit., p. 114.

82. Ibid, p. 115.

83. Ibid, p. 115.

84. Lovel, J., op.cit., p. 222.

85. Ibid, p. 224.

86. Ibid, p. 245.

87. Ibid, pp. 219-220.

88. Love, 218.

89. Harris, B., op.cit., p. 113.

90. Lovel, J., op.cit., p. 213.

91. Harris, B., op.cit., p. 116.

92. Ibid, p. 119.

93. Karagozoglu, A., <u>The Role of Ministry Supervisors in the Turkish Educational System</u>, Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972, p. 69.

94. Ibid, p. 69.

95. Ibid, p. 70.

96. Makinde, S., <u>Strategies for Improvement of Instructional Supervision in Nigeria</u>, Doctoral Dissertation, The Florida State University, 1985, p. 1.

97. Tapaneeyangkul, S., An Analysis of Secondary School Supervisors in Bangkok, Doctoral Dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1983, pp. 26-35.

98. Ibrahim, B., The Needed Supervisory Competences for Instructional Supervision as Perceived by Members of the Federal Inspectorate of Schools, Malaysia, Doctoral Dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1977, p. 1.

99. Ibid, p. 47.

100. Mutawia, I. et.al., Administration Basics for Education, Jedda, Dar Al-Shorook, 1982, p. 210 (in Arabic).

101. Ibid, p. 210.

102. Al-Chetawi, et.al., Educating the Instructional Supervisors, in The Arab Organization for Education, Culture and Science, The Educational Supervision in the Arab World, Tunisia, 1984, p. 10 (in Arabic).

103. Ibid, p. 11-12.

104. Ibid, p. 12.

105. Ibid, 14.

106. Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States, Educational Supervision in the Arab Gulf States, Alriyad, 1985, pp. 65 (in Arabic).

107. Ibid, pp. 71-72.

108. Khalil, S., The Relationship Between Teacher Perceptions of Ideal and Actual Supervisory Behaviour and Teacher Satisfaction with Supervision, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1983, pp. 191-193.

109. Omari, K., Teachers and Supervisors in Jordan, Doctoral Dissertation, Syracuse University, 1977, p. 186.

110. Adwani, S., <u>The Relationship Between Teacher and Supervisors as Perceived by the Teachers, Supervisors and Principals in Secondary Schools in Saudi Arabia</u>, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1981, pp. 217-225.

111. Rayyan, F., <u>Technical Supervision : Theory and Practice</u>, Kuwait, Dar Al-Kalam, 1980, pp. 121-122 (in Arabic).

112. Al-Musailim, M., <u>Current Problems of Educational Administration in the State of Kuwait</u>, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Durham, 1987, pp. 91-93.

113. Al-Kobaisi, A., <u>The Development of Education in Qatar, 1950-1977, with An Analysis of Some Educational Problems</u>, Doctoral Thesis, University of Durham, 1979, p. 200.

CHAPTER FOUR

Qatar : General Background

CHAPTER FOUR

Qatar : General Background

4.0 Introduction

The preceding chapters were concerned with supervision in theory
and practice. This chapter presents a brief account of Qatar, its
educational system, and the system of supervision of instruction. This
is because of a belief that many of the factors which affect
supervision have their roots in the historical, economical and societal
soil.

4.1 Geographical Background

Qatar is a small independent Arab country consisting of a
semi-desert peninsula projecting north from mainland Arabia for some
160 KM half way along the western coast of the Gulf. It is 80 KM
across at its widest point, and has a total area of about 10432 square
KM, including several offshore islands. The highest point is only
120 m. The land frontiers at the neck of the peninsula are shared with
Saudi Arabia to the West and the United Arab Emirates to the East,
while the nearest seaward neighbours are Bahrain, which is separated
from Qatar by a 20 miles strait, and Saudi Arabia. Another close
neighbour, Iran, is only 120 miles away.

At first glance the country appears flat over extensive areas.
Closer examination reveals regional variations. In the north there are
areas of vegetation in contrast to the south, which is arid with

stretches of salt flats. There are some basins called 'Alriyads' (Gardens) where rainwater is collected. There are some valleys where water flows only after rainfall. There are no truely high areas but a few scattered sandstone and limestone hills in the Dukhan area on the west coast. The interior consists of gravel plains and low hills.[1]

Qatar has a desert climate with a long hot humid summer and a mild winter with little rain. Rainfall seldom reaches 5 inches a year. Therefore, until the discovery of oil made it possible to finance agricultural activity, the only vegetation, apart from a few date gardens, was coarse grass and occasional stunted brushwood, providing shortlived grazing for flocks of sheep, goats and camels.

The country occupies an important pivotal position on the Gulf, for it lies only 350 miles from the southern straits of Hormus, which provides access to the Gulf of Oman, the Arabian Sea, and the Indian Ocean.[2]

4.1.1   Historical Background

Not much is known regarding the ancient History of Qatar although Danish archaeological expeditions between 1956 and 1964 unearthed a large number of relics providing conclusive evidence that Qatar has been inhabited since the stone age. Even more important are the discoveries of Sumerian type pottery, from around the time of Ur, linking Qatar with the Iraqi civilizations of ancient times.

Herodotus, the Greek historian, reported that the first inhabitants were an ancient tribe of Canaanites noted for their seafaring prowess. Contemporary findings confirm that the west coast of Qatar was linked with the great trading centre of Dilmun (Bahrain today), famous since the third millennium, for its economic ties with both India and Mesopotamia. Qatar was also connected with the trade route to the famous port of Gerrha (probably Qatif in Saudi Arabia eastern province today) during the ninth century B.C., from where the great caravan routes both across the Arabian desert and north into Mesopotamia started.[3] At the very beginning of Islam the country was mentioned, when in 630 AD, the Prophet Mohammed (Peace on Him), sent an envoy to convert this part of Arabia.

It is assumed that the country was ruled by successive tribes until the Portuguese invasion at the beginning of the 16th century. There followed nearly four centuries of colonial rivalry between Portuguese, Dutch and French, as well as the Ottomans. Because of its enormous strategic importance on the route to India, the country became exposed to foreign penetration. On the other hand, linked to the Arabian mainland, Qatar has always been closely connected with the prevailing political conditions in the central and eastern parts of Arabia.

Interested in safeguarding the route to India throughout the late 19th and early 20th century, Britain pursued a policy of containing the Ottoman presence and influence on the western shores of the Gulf. In 1868, Sheikh Moh'd Bin Thani, the founder of the present ruling family, was the first ruler of Qatar to enter into an agreement with the

British Resident in the Gulf.[4] The Anglo Ottoman treaty of 1913 recognized the independence of Qatar. In 1914 the Anglo Ottoman convention confined the Ottoman influence to the west of Qatar. Also under that convention Britain undertook not to interfere in Qatar's internal affairs.[5] In 1916 Seikh Abdulla Bin Qassim, the grandfather of the present Emir, entered into a treaty with Britain which continued in force until independence. The treaty was similar to those concluded with other Gulf rulers. Under the treaty Abdulla undertook not to cede, lease, or mortgage any of his territory, and not to enter into relations with any foreign power without British consent.[6]

The growing interest of the British in the Gulf coincided with the increasing influence of the Wahhabi movement (a religious movement in alliance with the ruling Al-Saud family) in Nejd (central Arabia), which extended its influence to the Gulf. Since the talks between Faisal Bin Turky, the great grandfather of the present Saudi monarch, and Moh'd Bin Thani, the two ruling families in Doha and Riyad have retained close ties and the Qataris continued to entertain strong Wahhabi sentiments.[7]

Following the decision of the labour government of Britain in 1968 to terminate all British defence commitments east of Suez by the end of 1971, a proposal for establishing a confederation of nine Arab Emirates was accepted, and a declaration was made. But the difficulties proved insurmountable. Bahrain and Qatar became independent states. On the 3rd September 1971, Qatar announced the formal termination of the treaties with Britain, and became a sovereign Arab State. Within a few days, it became a member of the Arab League and of the United Nations.

The failure of the confederation of Arab Emirates, did not mean the abandonment of the concept. In fact, rapprochment and coordination continued paving the way for the Cooperation Council of the Gulf Arab States, which includes all Arab Gulf States except Iraq. The six member states, are currently implementing far reaching economic reforms which will create a free trade area.

4.1.2   The Economy

Prior to the discovery of oil, economic activities in Qatar were limited by the relative inaccessibility of the coast to large ships, lack of water, a harsh climate and the aridity of the soil.[8] Conditioned by these circumstances, the Qataris earned their living by herding in the desert, and fishing and pearling in the coastal areas.[9] The decline of the pearling industry in the 1930s, due mainly to Japan's development of cultured pearls, threatened this limited but vital source of income and the employment of the majority of the population. The pearling industry had begun to decline even earlier as a result of the economic crises which followed the first World War and the international monetary crisis of 1929 which decreased the demand for luxury commodities. The discovery of oil and the beginning of its production brought Qatar the revenues and the employment the economy needed at a most opportune time.[10]

In 1949 Qatar became an exporter of crude oil with its first shipment to Europe. Oil production accounts for the bulk of the state's wealth.[11] The income from the export of oil is estimated to be about 92 per cent of the total revenues of the state. Government

disbursement generates more than 90 per cent of the country's economic activity. The oil sector still dominates the economy although manufacturing became significant with the completion of some modern plants in the 1970s. Apart from that, the economy is largely service-oriented. Expansion of the service sector followed naturally from the early stages of the development of the economy.

Oil wealth has raised the gross national product per capita and has been the main source for the improvement of standards of living. Qatar's oil reserves are 6000 million barrels.[12] The life of oil is estimated at about 25-30 years, depending on the extraction rate which is lower than its peak of half million b/d. Even after the depletion of oil Qatar hopes that it will remain an important force in the world energy equation through huge natural gas resources discovered recently north of the country. It is expected that the gas industry will start operation some time in the 1990s. Reserves of natural gas, estimated at about 50 trillion cubic foot, place the country among those with highest gas reserves.[13]

With such large oil and gas reserves and small indigenous population, the country can become a rentier state. Nevertheless, a future without oil is a prospect which preoccupies many Qataris, taking into account that oil is a finite source of income. The bitter past experience of relying on one commodity - pearls, prompted the government to seek to diversify the income resources through export-oriented industries, trade, finance and agriculture.

Following the transfer of power in 1971 the government began decreasing the dependence of oil. A plan for the diversification of the economy through industrialisation was initiated including fertilizer plants, a new cement plant, a steel mill, a natural liquid gas plant, and a petrochemical complex. Light industries such as tiles, bricks, paper tissues, paints, detergents and cosmetics flourished also. Most plants are concentrated in the industrial coastal city, Umm Said. An industrial development technical centre was created to supervise the development of these projects.[14]

Diversification requires a skilled trained workforce. Qatar's long term aims of economic development require that every pupil should be oriented to a technical or scientific type of training. But educators have limited control over the career choice of pupils since in the end these are determined by the relative rewards for different jobs. For some time to come the country will need to recruit expatriates to man the diversification plans.

4.1.3   Demography

The present population of Qatar is descended from a number of migratory tribes who arrived in the country during the 18th century, to escape the harsh conditions in neighbouring regions such as Negd and Al-Hasa (Saudi central and Eastern provinces today). Immigration continued throughout the formation of the first Saudi state during the Wahhabi era in the early 19th century.[15] By the turn of the century, a small number of Persians had come to Qatar. Many more Persians came during the 1930s, and by 1939 almost 20% of the population of Qatar

consisted of Persians. In addition, there was a number of 'Huwalas', Arab and Sunni moslems, who had lived on the Persian coast and later returned to the Arab side.[16]

A very large number of slaves were brought from East Africa during the 19th century to work in the pearling industry. They remained slaves until the mid-50s. Almost half the population until the discovery of oil were non-Qataris. The common experience they shared with Qataris over the years gradually welded them together and today they are regarded as Qataris. Qatar, like other Gulf states, has naturalized great numbers of Bedouins as well as non-Arab residents during the last few decades.[17] The oil wealth led to improvements in the medical and health care facilities, in the water supply and in housing conditions which have led to a decline in the infant mortality rate and to an increase in life expectancy. All these factors contributed to an increase of population, and to a young age distribution.[18]

Nevertheless the national population was and is still too small to provide the manpower needed for development projects. The large oil revenues which increased demand for skilled and unskilled labourers prompted an influx of great numbers of expatriates. Two types of immigrants have come to Qatar. The first is the unskilled workers necessary for the heavy construction industry and the second is the skilled workers who exchange their knowledge and expertise for share of the available prosperity. While the Negroes and Persians have been absorbed, firm restrictions on the acquisition of citizenship for new

immigrants make them rootless and aware of the transitory nature of their presence.

Qatar has not been able to implement its ambitious development programme without relying heavily on immigrants from other Arab countries (Egypt, Palestine and Jordan, in particular) and non-Arab countries (particularly Pakistan, India and Iran). In 1980 the participation of non-nationals in the total workforce was 84.50 per cent. In other words, in order to implement development projects, Qatar needed 453 non-nationals for every 100 nationals. As a result of the influx, the Qataris are outnumbered by non-Qataris in the total population as well as in the labour force.[19]

According to Al-Misnad the non-Qataris are one and half times the total national population.[20] The Qataris government has indicated an awareness of the problem, and attempted to find appropriate solution to alleviate it in the long term through training and educating the indigenous population. Apart from fulfilling a basic human demand, the investment in education was seen by national planners, essentially as the preparation of the population to become the workforce of a modern industrial state.[21]

4.1.4   Religion

Islam is the country's official religion and Islamic jurisprudence is recognized as the basis of the legal system. The Quranic learning and adherence to the Islamic faith are values that are held in high esteem. The religious leaders have had a strong influence on the

educational, legislative and judicial systems. The majority of Qataris are followers of the Sunni sect and the minority (of Persian Origin) are shi'tes. Qatari society is conservative. Its customs and traditions have their origins in Islamic values and in the traditions of the nomadic tribes. Even after the implementation of modernisation programmes the religious values and traditions have not, in general, been sacrificed.

4.2 Educational System in Qatar

Prior to 1956 there was no official modern education in Qatar. Limited as it was, the traditional religious teaching at the "Kuttab" (religious school) was the only education available. Ten religious schools had been established by ruler Sheikh Qassim Ben Muhammed (died 1914).[22] But the only semi-modern school established in the early years of the reign of his son, Abdullah, was forced to close in 1938 for financial reasons. The founder of the school, Sheikh Muhammed Al-Mani, left to go to Saudi Arabia.[23]

According to Al-Kobaisi (1979) the move from the "Kuttab" to modern education began when the first modern school was opened in Doha around 1948-1949. It was run by one teacher and enrolled about 50 boys.[24] As a result of later goverment aid, the schools developed rapidly. In 1951, a primary school for boys was opened, with 240 students. By 1954 the number of schools had increased to four, with 560 boys and 26 teachers recruited from various Arab countries, particularly Egypt and Palestine.[25]

But it was not until 1956, when a department (ministry) of education had been established, that education on a national scale began. That year 17 primary schools for boys were opened. The next year education for girls began when two schools were started.[26] Once the opposition to the education of girls was overcome, education for women grew rapidly, and from the early 1970s the disparity between the numbers of girls and boys in school began to diminish (see Table 1).

Secondary education for boys also started in 1956, when three classrooms in a building of one of the primary schools were opened as a secondary school and enrolled 49 boys. The next year witnessed the building of a secondary school which included intermediate (preparatory) classes as well. But intermediate education for girls has to wait until 1961/1962 when a preparatory class was opened in a girls' elementary school to enrol 12 girls. Secondary education for girls started in 1963 with only 6 girls.[27]

Since the mid-1960s the system of education has consisted of the primary, preparatory and secondary cycles (stages) with 6 years, 3 years and 3 years for each respectively. In the second year of their general secondary education, students have a choice of specializing either in art (literature) or in science. In addition there is a technical (industrial school) and a commercial secondary school, which developed from evening class courses for training and re-training national workers in the late 1950s. A religious institute comprising preparatory and secondary classes was opened in 1960-1961. These three schools are for boys only. But while the majority of students in the industrial and commercial schools are Qatari, the opposite is the case

in the religious institute.[28] The secondary schools of all types end with the general secondary certificate, a qualification for admission to the University of Qatar, or for a scholarship to study abroad.

Admission to the University of Qatar is available for all Qataris and for some non-Qataris (usually non-nationals represent 30 per cent of student population).[29] There are also a limited number of scholarships for non-national students to study abroad. Those students must be sons of government officials with a long period of service.

Development, in general, and the development of education, in particular, led naturally in 1977 to the establishment of the University of Qatar, which developed from two teachers colleges (for men and women) opened early in 1973. The university enrolls about 5000 students in six faculties, Education, Humanities, Islamic Studies, Engineering and Economics.

4.2.1   Educational Policy

Education until the last quarter of this century was carried out without any stated policy. In 1982-1983 a cabinet resolution was adopted laying down a written educational policy. Since then, education has adhered to the basic concepts adopted by this policy which included details of the educational system, language, cultural relations, and scientific research. The policy embraces all the practices of the 26 years during which education has been provided in Qatar. It also represents the outcomes of the ideas and experiments underlying these practices. It was established by a committee

consisting of the state ministries and organizations concerned with education, development, science and culture. The policy defines the general objectives as follows:[30] fulfillment of the society's aspirations and demands of a modern, free and dignified life; building up a comprehensive personality aware of its national and human role and an adherent - in its individual or collective conduct of the sublime Islamic and Arab ideals; achievement of the cohesiveness of Arab Islamic society through inculcating unity of thought, action and destiny; developing the proper affiliations of the Qatari citizen, namely affiliation to Qatar, the Gulf, Arabism, Islam and humanity; preservation of the Arab-Islamic personality of the Qatari society, its genuine traditions and intellectual, cultural, Arab and Islamic heritage; giving great attention to the human element as a major part of the socio-economic development of the country in order to achieve socio-economic independence and prosperity in all domains; opening up to the world with its technological and scientific innovations to catch up with those means of progress and modernism that conform with the Arab-Islamic pattern of Qatari Society; fostering and promoting educational and cultural relations between Qatar and the Arab and Islamic countries on the one hand, and the other countries of the world and the international and regional organizations working for humanity on the other; encouraging the dissemination of culture in the various scientific literary and technical fields and constantly expanding their organs, centres and activities; and cooperation in building human and world civlization for the benefit and welfare of humanity as a whole. In addition to these general objectives, there are specific objectives for every educational stage.

4.2.2   General Features

- Statistics show that Qatar has achieved a great increase in the number of students at all the different stages. The total number of students in Government schools reached 52050 in 1985-1986, in addition to 6997 students in the evening schools which are attended by young people over school age and adults (Tables 1 and 11).

Private education has also recorded rapid growth. The number of students in private schools reached 16019 in 1980 (Table 2). Nevertheless, the state educational system dominates the educational services. The children of Non-Qatari families are typically those who join private schools.

- The increase in the number of students was accompanied by an increase in the total number of teachers to 3858 (excluding administrative personnel) in 1985-1986 (Table 3). The average number of students per teacher is 13 which is a very satisfactory ratio. But there are substantial differences between individual schools. For example, the ratio in the schools of Doha (the capital) ranges from 20:1 to 40:1.

- As it is clear from the statistical tables, the non-national teachers outnumber national teachers, particularly in male and preparatory and secondary schools. In 1985-1986 there were 1341 Qatari female teachers : 913 at the primary stage, 328 at the preparatory stage, and 100 at the secondary stage. In the same year there were 864 non-Qatari female teachers : 319, 244 and 301 in the three stages

respectively. There were 1574 non-Qatari male teachers : 741, 464 and 369 in the three stages respectively. The corresponding numbers of Qatari male teachers were 60, 10 and 9 respectively. In sum there were 1420 Qatari teachers representing 36.81 per cent of all teachers against 2438 non-Qatari teachers representing 63.19 per cent (Table 4).

It is expected that the number of Qatari female teachers will continue to increase as a consequence of the Qatarization policy, and because teaching is the most socially accepted profession for women. Primary boys' schools up to the 4th year and staffed by women teachers have been operated since the late 1970s. This policy has contributed to the male teachers being outnumbered by female teachers. In 1985-1986 there were 2205 female teachers compared with 1653 male teachers. The policy helped also to overcome the problem of shortage of male teachers in primary schools and was a means of providing jobs for female graduates.

Providing sufficient numbers of local teachers receives a high priority in planning, and generous incentives are provided. But the teaching profession does not attract large numbers of males. This is mainly due to the availability of other employment opportunities for nationals. Until very recently the labour market was expanding, and job opportunities proliferated. Even those male nationals who are employed in schools regard their job as a first step from which they move to better jobs in the ministry of education or in other ministries.[31] The faculty of education has recently suffered from a fall in the number of applications for admission.

This is not the case for females for whom teaching is one of a limited number of professions in which their employment is socially acceptable. In some subjects there is already a surplus of women teachers and a situation of unemployed women teachers, or a disguised unemployment, in the near future, is not ruled out.

Non-national teachers come on either a contract or a secondment basis. However, there is a regional shortage of well-qualified teachers. The rapid expansion of the oil states' educational systems, together with attempts elsewhere in the region to widen enrolments, have resulted in a shortage of teachers throughout the region. Those countries, which traditionally supply the Gulf states with teachers, are reluctant to allow a large number of their qualified people to work abroad, since the export of teachers has begun to have a detrimental effect upon the quality of domestic teaching. Therefore the recruitment of teachers has become serious problem for the oil rich states, such as Qatar. The figures for 1985-1986 show that 1255 (856 females and 399 males) teachers in Qatar were non-university graduates. Most of them are secondary schools graduates. Others (mostly non-Qataris) are graduates of teachers' institutes, but their number is not clear from the statistics.[32] In addition, there are some who joined the universities, either as full time students or by correspondence, but left before graduation. The University of Qatar provides courses for teachers at both undergraduate and post-graduate levels. These part-time studies lead to the B.Ed. degree, the general diploma and the advanced diploma. In addition, there are in-service short courses run by the Ministry of education (Tables 6 and 7).

-    General education continues to dominate in terms of numbers. Less than 300 out of 52050 students are studying in commercial and industrial schools (table 8). The disinclination for technical education can be attributed to socio-economic and cultural factors. Broadly speaking, there is a general prejudice against manual work among the Middle Eastern peoples.[33] In the Gulf region the secure government employment, regardless of academic qualifications or training, contributes to this phenomenon. The segregation of general education from technical education is another factor. General education and university degrees are still regarded as more prestigious than technical education. The result is that only students with extremely poor academic records enroll in technical education, sometimes attracted by financial inducements given to encourage students to join technical schools.[34]

-    Science students are outnumbered by arts students. This is true, in particular, of Qataris and females. The figures for 1985-1986 show that there were 1790 females in the literary (Arts) branch of secondary education and 843 in the science branch. In contrast, there were 917 male students in the literary branch and 1124 in the scientific branch. This phenomenon may be attributed to the limited opportunities for girls to continue university education in the science fields, either at home or abroad. Even at the University of Qatar females are not admitted to the faculty of Engineering. By nationality these figures are distributed as follows: 2114 Qataris in the literary branch and 755 in the scientific branch, compared with 593 Non-Qataris in the literary branch and 1212 in the scientific branch (Table 9).

- The numbers of girls and boys in schools are almost equal. In 1985-1986 the number of girls was 25525 representing 49 per cent of a total of 52050 students (Table 10). The difference is negligible, and may be partly attributed to the presence of a number of foreign (non-resident, mostly Arab and Muslim) boys in the secondary schools, particularly in the religious institute, who are awarded government scholarships. This interpretation is supported by the fact that when distributing the students by nationality, the difference between Qatari males and females become 500 students only. Females are outnumbered by males at the primary stage. The males are 16573 against 15271 females. It is noteworthy that the females are also outnumbered by the males in the private schools, Arab and foreign as well. As is obvious from the tables the female students in the Arab private school in the year 1985-1986 were 912 against 1102 males, and in the foreign schools, females were 4867 against 5670 male students. But, as it is the case in the public schools the difference is small (Table 2).

The difference begins to narrow at the preparatory cycle: 6276 males against 6003 females until the males are outnumbered by the females in the secondary cycle as follows: 3676 and 4251 respectively (Table 10). It can be inferred from the previous figures that the rate of drop-out among the males are higher than among the females. This is due to the males taking jobs at the age of preparatory and secondary schools. Usually those leavers continue their education in the evening schools.

In the year 1985-1986 there were 6997 persons attending evening schools and anti-illiteracy centers distributed as follows: 3606

Qataris; 3391 Non-Qataris, and 4299 males, 2698 females. It is noteworthy that while the female Qataris almost equal the male Qataris (1806, 1800 respectively) the female non-Qataris are outnumbered by the non-Qataris (892, 2499 respectively) (Table 11).

- The non-national students in the government schools are outnumbered by the Qatari students. The figures are 21556 and 30494 respectively (Table 12). This is due to the presence of the Arab and foreign private schools which, in 1985-1986, enrolled 5482 and 10537 Qatari and non-Qatari students respectively. These figures include pre-primary students who were 4859. If subtracted, the students in the primary, intermediate and secondary level at the private schools were 11160, the majority of them were non-Qataris.

If added to the non-Qataris in public school they will outnumber the Qataris. Even in this case it does not reflect the real demographic situation where the Qataris are outnumbered by the expatriates. Another factor would help to interpret this situation. That is many of the expatriates are single.

- In terms of money the national expenditure on education has been increasing with the growth in oil revenue. The education budget increased from QR 1 million in 1955 to 1,012,458,900 in 1985-1986. With sufficient funds at its disposal the government was able to provide free education for all, including non-Qataris, until the end of the secondary school. Textbooks, stationary, transport to and from home, and sports clothing are all facilities available to students free of charge. During the early years of modern education students were

paid stipends. At the university level scholarships are available for all Qataris who pass the secondary examination, and a limited number of scholarships are available to non-Qataris, either at the university of Qatar or abroad.

- It is argued that these incentives are sufficient to meet the public demand for education without a law making education compulsory. This viewpoint is challenged by some authors. al-Misnad (1985) argues that lacking a compulsory education law results in drop-out, wastage and low productivity of the educational system. However, it is difficult to determine the extent to which Qatar has achieved the universality of education. There are no official statistics since 1970 to help determine whether a one hundred per cent attendance at primary schools has been achieved. But if the situation of Kuwait and Bahrain are of any guide, one can guess that a certain percentage of both boys and girls aged 6-14 are not enrolled in primary schools. al-Misnad attributes the high rate of illiteracy among the 6-14 year age group and drop-out from school education to lack of effective compulsory education legislation.[35]

- The non-existence of government kindergartens is another factor which may contribute to the high rate of illiteracy, repeating, dropout from schools, and the difficulties of adaptation among the 6-14 years age group, since the private kindergartens, with only financial profit in mind, could not under any circumstances provide the right environment for the steady growth of pupils.[36]

It is noteworthy that kindergarten education was offered in primary schools in the early years of the modern education in Qatar. Then it was cancelled in the late 1950s.[37] The Ministry of education itself is anxious for the state kindergarten as evidenced in a study submitted to the cabinet.[38]

4.3 The System of Instructional Supervision in Qatar

4.3.1 Introduction

Supervision in Qatar developed from an inspection system. Consistent with the prevailing tendency in the Arab countries, the terms "Inspection" and "Inspectors" were changed in the mid-1970s to "supervision" and "supervisors". It is assumed that the change represents the adoption of a more modern school of thought, rather than simply using new words.[39] To what extent the change was an actual one is an issue this study is concerned with.

The whole system of supervision in Qatar was regulated by a ministerial circular published in 1977. The circular defines supervision as the "eye of the educational administration which caters for field practices, orients working units and persons responsible for implementation, corrects their approach, evaluates their work, and undertakes rapid initiatives to remove any hurdles which impede their work". The circular went on to say "thus the achievement of goals, the formulation of strategies and accurate means for implementation, the implementation of progress and development, and the accomplishment of higher standards, are to a great extent, dependent on educational

supervision". The circular emphasized that supervision is an integral part of the whole educational process, in all its aspects. A positive point in the circular is its emphasis that the duties and objectives which it defines are not limits but signals and indications towards the ultimate goal of improving teaching.[40]

The Aims of Supervision

According to Abdul'al, supervision of instruction in Qatar aims at: helping teachers to understand the general aims of education (as viewed by the state), the specific goals of their subject matter, and the goals of each teaching cycle; helping to coordinate the role of the school and the role of other information agencies (such as the mass media, youth welfare and the mosques), where their activities have a bearing on education; helping teachers to achieve a better understanding of their subject matter and textbooks, their logical and psychological sequence, and the relation between subject matter and life; helping teachers to choose the best teaching methods for their subject; encouraging them to produce and innovate instructional aids; and use school activities for the promotion of learning. These aspects are taken into account when reporting on teachers, evaluating teacher performance in order to discover excellences of different kinds wherever they may be found, or to identify their inadequecies. Helping teachers in self-appraisal is considered part of the evaluating process; evaluating and developing curricula and textbooks with regard to their fitness to the potentialities of students, surveying the opinions of teachers, evaluating them in light of the results of examinations; evaluating the students through questionning them during

school visits, preparing standardized tests for students, reviewing the
results of school examinations, following up school activities;
helping to improve the relations among teachers through fair
distribution of the teaching load, developing the team spirit and
reinforcing loyalty to the school community, improving relations
between the teachers and the school administration, encouraging
demonstration lessons, encouraging seminars and professional meetings,
solving their problems as far as possible; helping and encouraging the
professional development of teachers; helping to make the school
environment attractive for both teachers and students.[41]

4.3.2   Crganizational Arrangements

According to the circular, educational supervisors consist of the
following: head of supervision for boys' schools, female head for
girls' schools, male and female head of subject matter supervision,
male and female supervisors of subject matter, male and female heads of
the primary cycle (up to the 4th year), male and female supervisors of
the primary cycle.[42]

Usually the subject matter supervisors are charged with the
general supervision of schools. However, the male and female heads of
supervision have been abolished. They were replaced by heads of the
"secondary and preparatory cycle", and "the primary cycle" in both male
and female schools.[43] Another ministerial order was issued later which
linked the supervisors directly with the Director of technical affairs,
leaving the heads of the cycles to deal only with administrative
matters. A year later another ministerial order relinked supervisors

with the heads of the teaching cycle. According to the above order supervisors were linked technically to the heads of subject matter supervisors while they were linked administratively to the heads of the cycles to which they were assigned.[44]

The tasks of the head of supervision, which have been distributed later between head of the cyle and the head of subject matter supervisor, include both administrative and technical duties. In addition, the female head of the cycle is held responsible for every thing that goes on in girls' schools such as admission and transfer of girls, administrative enquiries, the anti-illiteracy and adult centers and cultural activities.[45]

The subject matter head supervisor's functions are technical rather than administrative. According to the above circular, he has the main responsibility for whatever concerns his subject matter: its content, methods of instruction, evaluation, textbooks, selection of instructional materials and the allocation of the textbooks to be studied each month:

- He is the link between his subject matter supervisors and the central administration and he is held responsible for the accomplishment of its goals in the schools.
- He participates in planning, in the distribution of and transfer of teachers in schools, and in conducting in-service programmes.
- He participates in the supervision of instruction in schools.
- He reports on his subject matter supervisors.

- Through and in cooperation with his subject matter supervisors, he supervises the examinations, model answers of questions, and the allocation of marks for each question in schools.[46]

The subject matter supervisor is considered the main reference for the teachers of his subject matter, since, according to the circular, he/she is more experienced than they are, and more informed of recent developments in methods of teaching. It is assumed that he/she is familiar with new ideas in his subject matter. Therefore, he/she is better able to innovate than his teachers, to develop the abilities and potentialities of his teachers, provide the environment that helps them to innovate and stimulate their effectiveness, in order to accomplish higher standards.[47]

He/she is expected to review his subject matter, at the beginning of the scholastic year, to scrutinize the results of the students in the previous year's examinations, to survey the teachers of his/her subject matter, to order the textbooks for his/her subject, and to prepare written advice and suggestions to his/her teachers.

4.3.3   Classroom Visits

According to the circular, the main instrument through which the subject supervisor carries out his tasks is the school visit which comprise:[48]

- orientation visits at the beginning of the school year, when he/she reviews with the teachers the results of the previous

year's examinations and any new official instructions or regulations, discusses with them the aims of their subject, the methods of planning lessons, the methods of teaching, the methods of evaluating students, school activities, and instructional aids, and makes them aware of any innovations. Usually the teaching load is agreed upon and the timetable is designed at this visit. The supervisor leaves the teachers written advice and suggestions which the teachers are required to sign.

- orientation evaluative visit(s) to teachers in classrooms in the first term of the year without informing them in advance. This visit aims at evaluating the teacher with regard to:

  - his self-discipline, his ability to cope with different situations, his balance and calmness,

  - the effect of the teacher's personality on his students,

  - his intelligence and presence of mind,

  - good behaviour and cooperativeness,

  - his/her external appearance and physical characteristics, and

  - his/her compliance with administrative instructions.

The supervisor is required to visit all the classrooms of his/her teachers to inspect:

- the teacher's mastery of subject matter, and his interest in keeping his knowledge up to date,

- how the teacher introduces his students to new lessons,

- his methods of teaching and to what extent they stimulate the students, and

- the classroom skills, posing questions and general administration of the classroom, and the use of instructional aids.

During the visit the supervisor examines the lesson plan and its conformity with the supervisory instructions, the written assignments of the pupils, the participation of teacher(s) in school activities, their innovation, and cooperation.

The supervisor is expected to answer any question concerning the subject, listen to any criticism concerning the curricula and textbooks and submit it to the ministry, and, if there is any misconduct he/she must inform the Ministry immediately.

Typically the visit is followed by a conference with the teacher, after which the supervisor writes his/her notes in the school visit record for the teachers to sign.

-   evaluative visit in the second term of the year aiming at:

    -   making sure that the teacher works according to the supervisory plan and executes the instructions which the supervisor wrote on the previous visit,
    -   examining the attainment levels of the pupils,
    -   planning with the teacher to make the best use of the rest of the year, and
    -   drawing the teacher's attention to any inadequacy.

As usual he leaves written instructions for the teacher to sign. After this visit the supervisor is required to make his final evaluation and report to the Ministry. There is an official rating instrument for this purpose. The evaluation is confidential and is not

available to the teacher himself. It is combined with another rating instrument, filled in by the principal. Together they make the final assessment which affects the professional career of the teacher (see appendices 3 and 4).

Other visits are made to examine the results of the examinations during the year, to see the questions set for the final exam, the model answers, the marks allocated, and the general preparation of the school for the final exam. He has the power to approve, to modify or to reject the questions prepared by the teachers.

He is required, if possible, to review the results of the final exam, once released, with his teachers. But he is entitled to delay that until the beginning of the next year. And this is what normally takes place.

4.3.4   The General Supervisor

The subject supervisors are responsible for the general supervision in schools. Typically each supervisor is allocated one school. The duties of the general supervisor are administrative rather than technical. The ministerial circular defined the tasks of the general supervisor as:[49]

-    helping, advising and assisting the school administration,
     particularly in making the school environment attractive, in
     establishing activity communities within the school and in
     stimulating cooperation between the teachers and the
     administration,

- emphasising administrative discipline and the necessity to abide by ministerial orders,

- working as a link between the school administration and the central administration.

- settling any dispute that may have arisen in the school, reporting any misconduct and undertaking enquiries.

The supervisor of elementary school up to the fourth year is charged with supervising teachers in all subjects, and also with general supervision.

Abdul'al adds that supervisors in Qatar are required to:[50]

- participate in producing and modifying textbooks.

- participate in "in-service" courses for teachers. "They have the main responsibilities for designing the in-service programmes, lecturing, conducting seminars and workshops, teach demonstration lessons and analyse results".

- participate in "drama activity" by preparing plays, playing roles, reviewing texts, producing plays and evaluating the performance.

- take part in out-of-school activities : in the media, in panels, and in research.

To what extent those duties are actually carried out it is difficult to say.

Staffing

Typically supervisors are promoted from among the teachers. A few of them are, as is the case with teachers, recruited from other Arab countries, either on contract or on a secondment basis. The trend now is towards promoting Qatari teachers to the supervisory positions. A ministerial decree issued in June 1985 confined the recruitment to the post of assistant supervisor to Qataris as far as possible. The decree required a university degree, 5 years experience as a school teacher, without interruption for more than two years, and a "very good" rating during the teaching years, as essentials for promotion.

As for subject supervisors, the decree stated that they should be recruited from among assistant supervisors after three years experience with rating "very good" throughout those three years.

Qataris with five years experience in primary schools as school teachers or principals or both, principals of preparatory schools, and deputy principals of secondary schools are eligible to be considered for the position of primary cycle supervisor.

The subject head supervisor, and primary cycle head supervisor are to be recruited from among the staff of supervisors. A university degree is essential for all these positions. In addition the recruit should not have committed any offence, and should have no physical deficiencies. The initial recruitment is for one year, after which he may get tenure according to his efficiency. It is assumed that, during

the first year, he acquires familiarity with supervisory activities through accompanying experienced supervisors.[51]

According to Abdul'al the following criteria are taken into account when selecting a supervisor:[52]

- he must show a talent for leadership, innovation and planning,

- he must have a strong personality, and ability to influence others, and

- he must have good behaviour and good reputation.

The following criteria are taken into account when evaluating the performance of the supervisor:[53]

- the extent to which he helps teachers understand the aims of education,

- the extent to which he helps them improve the methods of teaching,

- his role in the professional development of teachers,

- his innovations, experiments and adaptation to new ideas,

- his role in developing curricula, textbooks and instructional aids,

- his balance, personality and self discipline,

- his good behaviour and reputation,

- his relations with colleagues, supervisors and teachers, and

- the objectivity of his reports on teachers and principals.

As it is the case with evaluating teachers, there is a rating instrument to evaluate the supervisor (see appendix 5).

4.3.5   Discussion and Comments

-    The educational system in Qatar is highly centralized. Educational objectives, curricula, subject matter, textbooks and activities are all formulated, and planned by the Ministry of Education, then handed down to the administrators and school teachers for implementation. Similarly, supervisory perceptions, practices and methods are planned, and formulated by the Ministry, then delegated to supervisors for practice and implementation:[54]

> centralized systems are notorious for their propensity to condone and encourage direction from above and this implies that worthwhile ideas are more likely to originate from the administrators of the system rather than from the younger professional staff.....

In the centralized systems the importance of individuals in junior positions may be lost or ignored. Control is concentrated in a few people in the higher echelons. In this situation freedom may be lost and loosing freedom generally means loosing creativity.

In such a system it is expected that the supervisor will conform to the directives or rules of his superiors. This, in turn, requires that he imposes his own control over his subordinates.

Stress on authority, compliance, control and identification of wisdom with hierarchical position are characteristics of centralized systems, which put teachers in a position of passively accepting the directives of the supervisors. A possible consequence is that teachers

may regard their students as being in the same passive position in relation to them.

- The figures show that the Qatari male supervisors are outnumbered by the non-Qataris. In 1986 there were 36 non-Qatari male supervisors against 16 Qataris. The opposite is to be found in the female section. In the same year there were 35 Qatari female supervisors against 22 non-Qataris. It seems clear that there is an official policy of Qatarizing supervision, particularly in the female section (tables 13 and 14).

- Female supervisors are an inferior corps. No female supervisor has yet participated in a supervisory conference at the international, Arab or regional level. No female supervisor has taken part in compiling textbooks which are written by male supervisors, and some male teachers. All head supervisors are males.

- In the primary schools supervisors supervise teachers in all subject areas, up to the 4th year. The question of whether people can supervise across all subject areas is very much an issue of debate in supervision. The situation is usually rationalized by the argument that the same general principles or methods of teaching apply whether one is teaching reading or social studies or mathematics. Probably some comments of a helpful, practical nature can be made about methods of classroom management, questioning techniques, how to maintain discipline and the like which would be applicable in most specialities. Nonetheless it seems obvious that when a body of knowledge or a special

skill such as reading is to be taught, the supervisor must know that subject or has the skill to analyze how accurately and effectively it is being taught.[55]

- According to the ministerial circular supervisors are called upon to undertake many functions, some of which are clerical, administrative or of a non-instructional nature. This wide range of duties tends to turn the supervisor into a 'Jack-of-all trades'. The effects of accepting too many functions are serious. The acceptance of inappropriate tasks is perhaps the most serious hazard for the supervisor. But the supervisor is likely to be criticised by his superiors if he declines to accept all the functions assigned to him.

- Generally speaking, supervisors in Qatar lack adequate training and preparation for the job. They are drawn mainly from the ranks of experienced teachers, on the assumption that a relatively long experience in teaching, in addition to a university degree, is sufficient for someone to undertake supervisory duties. But this premise cannot be taken for granted because the demands on the supervisor are different from the demands made upon the classroom teacher. They may not be more difficult or more complex, but simply different from that required of the teacher. It can not be assumed that talent transfers unchanged when a person is moved from one position to another.

Experience must not be overestimated, because situations and persons are not always similar to those which have been encountered

previously. On the other hand, the accumulation of teaching experience may be merely replication of one year's experience rather than enrichment of one's potential.

It should be stressed that supervision is a specialized service, and that the position is required to be filled by well-qualified people who possess the appropriate skills. As attention is focused upon the need for educating teachers, equal attention is necessary to the education of supervisors. As it is not true that anyone can teach also it is not true that any teacher can supervise. Lack of training leads the supervisor to emphasize conformity to rules, regulations and the wishes of the senior officials:[56]

> A person who has accepted a position for which he is not well-qualified, sooner or later supports his ego and defends his inabilities by blaming someone else for his failure to fulfill the demands of that position.

It may be argued that the novice supervisor spends a year of induction with an experienced colleague, after which a recommendation of permanency is made. But it is no longer adequate to assume that the traditional 'on-the-job' method of training can meet the needs of a system that is growing rapidly. It is more likely that "on-the-job" method will incline a novice to imitate his mentor in the way that a novice unqualified teacher tends to imitate his own teachers.

When the author asked the supervisors in Qatar whether they kept in touch with the literature on supervision 51 out of 78 supervisors answered "No". But 21 out of the 27 who answered "Yes" failed, when

asked, to mention any book or journal they had read. Five books on supervision (in Arabic) and two books (in English) were mentioned by respondent supervisors (see Table 28). A female supervisor stated that "we don't find any literature on supervision. It is not available. We depend on experienced colleagues". A male supervisor admitted that his books on supervision dated from the 1950s.

When asked whether they had attended any courses or seminars on supervision 60 of them answered "No". Among the other 60 supervisors 26 stated that they had attended short courses (1-2 weeks) which concentrated on the methods of teaching, 3 female supervisors stated that they had attended a 2-weeks supervisory course, 6 male and female supervisors stated that they had attended courses abroad, and two supervisors had attended postgraduate courses in American universities (see table 29).

These results emphasize the formal, concentrated and post-graduate or in-service training programme for educating supervisors.

- Theoretically, at least, the position of a supervisor in Qatar is a prestigious one. According to the official educational policy the supervisor occupies an important position. His report has profound influence on the professional future of a teacher. The supervisor himself may see his position as a way to achieve the prestige which has been denied him as a classroom teacher. This may have been stimulated by resentment at being controlled. Supervisors who place a high value on the prestige of their position may be inclined to become authoritarian and inflexible. Some may see the post primarily as a

source of power. The greater prestige which is attached to the position makes it attractive to those lower in the hierarchy who are ambitious, and consequently, a competitiveness within the ranks develops. In this situation these individuals interested in moving up in the hierarchy should be required to acquire the skills that will fit them for the position they seek.

- The possibility of conflict with the school principal is a very real one because it is difficult to identify those functions essentially supervisory in nature and others which are managerial. For example, the supervisor and the principal are both responsible for evaluating the performance of the teacher, but they may disagree over the transferring of teachers, or over the design of the time-table.

The result may be conflicting demands upon the teacher. He may be torn between two obligations. The different expectations of supervisors and principals may create frustrating situations. Hence, there is a need for harmonizing the different demands. The various positions must be clearly defined and communicated to all members of the staff. These persons must hold each other in mutual respect based upon common understanding of functions and achieved through their sincere desire to support the total operation of the school rather than to realize personal and immediate goals:[57]

> when two or more people are engaged in a common task, there must be some plan and agreement which will keep them working to the same purpose without getting in each other's way or nullifying each other's efforts.

- The ministerial circular states that the subject supervisor is the "main reference" for his teachers concerning their subject:[58]

> He is more experienced than they are, more informed of methods of teaching, and is officially responsible for being aware of every new idea of his subject ... he has more innovative ability than his teachers. He is responsible for developing the potential and capabilities of the teachers and for creating the appropriate atmosphere for creative activity and productive work.

In Qatar this situation does not obtain. Many teachers come from Arab countries, either on a contract or on a secondment basis. In both cases many of them are more experienced, better qualified and informed than the supervisors in Qatar. It is not exceptional for some of them to have been supervisors or college lecturers in their home countries. In terms of qualifications there were 37 male teachers and 11 female teachers in 1985-1986 who held post-graduate degrees (tables 6 and 7).

A reasonable generalisation, then, is that supervisors are observing teachers who possess characteristics, qualifications and experience similar to their own or better. In this case the supervisor may feel insecure in attempting to influence people whom he knows are superior to him in ability, and therefore he tends to avoid situations in which his ability could be challenged and his lack of ability exposed to teachers. He may fear the ingenuity and innovative capacity of the teachers he is supposed to influence or, worse than that, he might belittle their potential and their efforts and refrain from any genuine exchange of ideas and viewpoints. At the same time he needs to demonstrate that he possesses greater knowledge and skills than do his teachers, because his position requires that he be able to do so.

In such a case the supervisor will be more dictatorial with teachers, will permit less latitude in the variation of their methods, and will resort to the formal power inherent in his status position to impose his point of view. The situation is similar to that of an insecure teacher who suppresses those brilliant pupils who might expose his ignorance were he not to use rigid controls. In this case teachers will concentrate on meeting the minimum requirements necessary for personal survival. For those reasons, an incompetent supervisor with the power of control over others is a potential danger to the whole learning process.

The statement that the 'supervisor is the main reference ...' is a strange one. It leaves little room for the teacher to look for various references concerning subject matter and its methods of teaching, may discourage him from renovating and developing his potential, and may lead to his dependency. It is better to revise that statement to be read that the 'supervisor is one of the references ...' particularly if we bear in mind that many supervisors in Qatar are not qualified to be main referees for the teachers.

- Supervisors in Qatar are charged with the task of evaluating the teacher's performance. In general, there is no reason for any efficient teacher to shrink from the opportunity or even the necessity of having his performance evaluated. But the problem is that there is no consensus on what constitutes good teaching. This disagreement persists because "people's perceptions of teaching are almost invariably bound up with their own ideologies or undisclosed prejudices".[59] Rarely do teachers know what criteria the supervisor

uses. Rarely are supervisors required to provide any justification for their rating beyond general statements. The rating instrument used lists certain traits of teachers assumed to be important. It is completed by the supervisor and then forwarded to the ministry as a report on the teacher's personality and his teaching performance. On this report, together with the principal's report, the promotion, transferring, renewing or termination of the teacher's contract depend (Appendices 3 and 4).

The personality dimension comprises the following items: the general appearance of the teacher, his conduct and self-discipline, his relations with colleagues and superiors, his relations with students and his execution of instructions. These items raise many questions: is there a consensus in Qatar on what constitutes good appearance? How can conduct and self-discipline be rated? What is the kind of relationship appreciated? and moreover what is meant by this notion of "abiding by instruction"? Does it not conjure up the impression of docility, conformity, compliance and regimentation? Is the teacher entitled to disagree, or may be to stick to his point of view? The ministerial circular implies that he is not entitled to disagree. In the supervisory visit of the second term of the year the supervisor should make sure that the teacher has executed his previous instructions and that his overall performance is in accordance with the regulations. How is it possible that a teacher is encouraged to innovate while at the same time he is required to abide scrupulously by the rules?

With regard to the teacher's performance, the following items are considered: the teacher's mastery of the subject and his interest in renewing it, the teaching method, the lesson plan, the pupils' work, the impact of the teacher on the student learning and on the curriculum, his school activity, and instructional aids.

These items raise also several questions. The supervisor can rate, to some extent, the teacher's mastery of the subject, but how can he rate how far the teacher has kept up to date. Is the teacher entitled to employ his own methods, and do supervisors tolerate the use of methods other than those they prefer? Is the teacher entitled to make lesson plans of his own or he is required to abide by particular models of plans? The ministerial circular states that the supervisor should make sure that the lesson plan of the teacher accords with the supervisory plan.

As for the impact of the teacher on the pupils' learning, the question is how can one determine whether that learning should be attributed to the effect of teacher or to other influences? One does not challenge the criteria because the specific purpose of teaching is to promote the pupil's learning in a sustained and systematic way. But in rating this outcome all aspects of the teaching learning situation and environment must be involved. On the other hand, the expectations placed upon the teacher must be realistic, not only with respect to his own capabilities but also with respect to the capabilities of his pupils, and the conditions under which their learning takes place.

The 'impact of the teacher on the curriculum' is to be rated by the supervisor. But what is meant by curriculum and how can it be rated?

Concerning the participation of the teacher in school extra-curricular activities, the efforts of some teachers may be conspicuous because they are relieved of a proportion of the teaching load to participate in those activities. The question is: should they be considered as more active and therefore better rated than other teachers who are given a full teaching load?

"The participation of the teacher in the administrative efforts", though mentioned in the ministerial circular as an item to be rated by the supervisor, is included only in the rating instrument to be completed by the school principal.

Another item mentioned in the ministerial circular to be rated by the supervisor is the "intelligence and presence of mind of the teacher". If this were included in the rating instrument, it is legitimate to ask: how it could be done?

It is obvious from the previous discussion that the evaluation of teachers in Qatar is not based upon carefully selected reference or criteria. Judgements made without comparing to a reference point are seldom valid. Reliance upon cliches, prejudices and general statements is wholly unsuitable. Of course it is not expected that prejudice or subjective biases could be entirely eliminated but their detrimental effects might be minimised by means of self-examination by supervisors

and "readiness to modify their viewpoints as a hypothesis is modified or reformulated in the normal course of scientific enquiry". As Sergiovanne (1983) put it:[60]

> Having stands on some issues does not mean automatically imposing them on others. A person may have convictions and respect for the convictions of others who disagree".

The effects of prejudices might be eradicated also by labourious collecting of evidence or information. But people are, in general, impatient with this labourious task. They want to look and judge rather than to go through the painful process of deciding on the procedures of evaluation that would give judgments a high degree of reliability and validity. It is necessary to determine what kind of information is to be collected, how it is to be collected, where it will be sought, and what values are to be placed upon each item collected. The collection of information requires technical skills. Otherwise, evaluation is accomplished in generalties rather than in specifics. General evaluation results in generalized, meaningless and ambiguous conclusions.

On the other hand, instead of conformity, it is better to call for broadening, invigoration and enrichment. The supervisor should consider every observation potentially as something new to tell him, by way of modification of his earlier impressions. The result will be that both the supervisor and the teacher are sharing the objective of improving and enriching the work of both of them.

Teachers should be encouraged to reflect, to evaluate and to comment upon their work. They will be eager to participate in evaluation which they see as furthering their own professional competencies rather than evaluation which they feel that its results will be used against them.

If teachers feel that their views are valuable, are being heard, and that they can influence what is being done, they will be less alienated, more responsible for and committed to their work. Otherwise, they will conceal their mistakes. It is a human inclination to conceal failures if one fears sanctions. The supervisor is not able to know about all teaching failures, and the teacher will not disclose that he has not met the expectations unless the objective of evaluation is not threatening.

Supervisors and administrators, when overcome by the importance of their positions, tend to expect that when disciplinary actions and other external controls are used, they can identify the weaknesses and failures and caused effectiveness, but the advantage is rapidly lost, because they have a remote contact with the classroom in the sense that whatever they want to effectuate there, is dependent upon an intermediary person; the teacher who has an immediate contact with the pupils, and has a major control over the classroom operation. Therefore, unless he is actively involved in the evaluation process, without feeling threatened, the whole process will be fruitless.

Teachers should be informed about what is being done, when it is being done, the procedures and criteria employed, the results and what

happens next. Their autonomy and flexibility in handling assigned roles and their desire to innovate should be guaranteed.

4.4 <u>Conclusion</u>

Educational systems can not be understood except within the broad and overall context of the society. The roots of many problems have to be traced in the wider socio-economic environment. Therefore this chapter was commenced with a general, historical, socio-economic and political background of Qatar.

To identify specific factors which affect supervision in Qatar, the educational system, in general, was analysed, and some features were singled out.

In order to draw meaningful conclusions and specify role expectations of supervisors, the system of supervision in Qatar and the legislations which regulate it were analyzed.

The chapter ends with a number of concluding remarks, among which are that:

- the system of instructional supervision is highly centralized. Both supervisors and teachers are required to abide strictly by the official instructions. Conformity is emphasized, which may be attributed to the teachers being recruited from different countries,

- instead of raising the professional competence of the teacher, the main function of supervision in Qatar is to check the performance of teachers and ensure that they teach according to the official viewpoints,

- the legislation perpetuates the image of supervision as that of classroom visitation, and emphasizes the external aspects to the extent that the primary purpose of the visit is relegated to a minor role,

- supervisors, in general, lack specialization and training for the job,

- the prestigious position of supervisors may lead to autocratic supervision,

- the importance of supervision in primary schools is underestimated, and

- female supervisors are an inferior corps.

4.5   References and Notes

1. Diab, M., *The Natural Geography of Qatar*, unpublished MA Thesis, The University of Cairo, 1977, p. 65 (in Arabic).

   See also: Taha, Y., *The Coasts of Qatar : A Geomorphological Study*, Unpublished MA Thesis, The University of Cairo, 1980 (in Arabic).

2. Nyrop, R. et.al., *Area Handbook for the Persian Gulf*, Washington, US Government Press Office, 1977, p. 238.

3. Wilson, A. (translated into Arabic by Yousof, A.), *The Arab Gulf*, Kuwait, Amal Library, p. 98 (in Arabic).

4. El-Mallakh, R., *Qatar : Development of an Oil Economy*, Croom Helm, 1979, p. 19.

   See also: Al-Mansour, A., *The Political Development of Qatar*, Kuwait, Dar Al-Salasel, 2nd edition, 1980, p. 249 (in Arabic).

5. Al-Mansour, A., op.cit., p. 275.

6. Ibid, p. 265.

7. Djalali, M.R., *Le Golf Persique*, Paris, Dalloz, 1978, p. 96-97.

8. Sinclair, C.A., *Education in Kuwait, Bahrain and Qatar : An Economic Assessment*, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Durham, 1977, p. 171.

9. El-Mallakh, R., op.cit., p. 19.

10. Al-Misnad, S., *The Development of Modern Education in the Gulf*, Ithaca Press, 1985, p. 9.

11. Nafi, Z.A., *Economic and Social Development in Qatar*, Frances Printer, 1983, p. 1.

12. Note: Sinclair (op.cit.) estimated the reserves of crude oil in Qatar at about 6000 M/B. Nafi, the head of the projects and Studies Division in the Economics Department of Qatar General Petroleum Corporation (QGPC), estimates the reserves at about 3.585 billion barrels.

13. Nafi, Z.A., op.cit., p. 67.

14. Al-Misnad, S., op.cit., p. 12.

15. Al-Eisa, J., The Qatari Society, Cairo, 1982, p. 43-49 (in Arabic).

16. Zahlan, R., The Creation of Qatar, Croom Helm, London, p. 99.

17. Al-Eisa, J., The Urbanization in the Modern Qatari Society, Cairo, 1979, 127 (in Arabic).

18. Nafi, Z.A., op.cit., p. 4.

19. Al-Misnad, S., op.cit., p. 15.

Note: The results of the last census conducted in Spring 1986, show that the population of Qatar (including expatriates) is 369079. But the Annual Statistical Abstract, published by the Central Statistical Organization, in July 1987, did not give any information concerning the National - non-National ratio. When the author asked for details, an official source at the Organization emphasized that the Qataris are outnumbered by the non-Qataris, but it is strictly forbidden to give details.

20. Al-Misnad, S., op.cit., p. 14-15.

21. Sinclair, op.cit., p. 340.

22. Zahlan, R., op.cit.

Note: it is curious, if true, that, according to an Ottoman document, there were 15 primary schools in Qatar in 1890. Reference: Al-Mansour, A., op.cit., p. 225.

It is highly possible that the "Kuttabs" were confused to schools.

23. Al-Misnad, S., p. 35.

24. Al-Kobaisi, A.J., <u>The Development of Education in Qatar</u>, 1950-1977, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Durham, 1979, p. 36.

25. The Ministry of Education, <u>The Annual Report, 1985-1986</u>, Doha, 1987, p. 293 (in Arabic).

26. The Ministry of Education, <u>The Annual Report</u>, 1987, p. 293 (in Arabic).

27. Al-Misnad, S., op.cit., p. 91.

28. The Ministry of Education, <u>The Annual Report</u>, 1987, op.cit., p. 160.

29. Annual Statistical Abstracts, p. 114.

30. The Ministry of Education, <u>The Educational Policy</u>, 1986.

31. For example, while there were 79 Qatari male teachers in 1985-1986, there were 285 in administrative positions in the schools and at the Ministry's quarters (Table 5).

32. The Ministry of Education, <u>The Annual Report</u>, 1987, p. 69-70.

33. Al-Misnad, S., op.cit., pp. 167-177.

34. Ibid, p. 176.

35. Ibid, pp. 80-82.

36. The Ministry of Education, <u>Development of Education in Qatar in 1984/1986/1986</u>, a paper submitted to the international conference in Education, 40th session, Geneva 1986, p. 34 (in Arabic).

37. Al-Misnad, S., op.cit., p. 49.

38. The Ministry of Education, <u>Development of Education in Qatar in 1984/1985/1986</u>, op.cit., p. 34 (in Arabic).

39. Abdul'al, S., <u>Educational Supervision in Qatar</u>, unpublished paper submitted to the Arab Seminar on Supervision in Baghdad, 1981, p. 10 (in Arabic).

40. The Ministry of Education, circular no. 3, 1977 (in Arabic).

41. Abdul'al, S., op.cit., p. 12.

42. The Ministry of Education, circular no. 3, 1977.

43. The Ministry of Education, Ministerial Decree 5, dated 1983 (in Arabic).

44. The Ministry of Education, Ministerial Decree 2, dated 1986 (in Arabic).

45. The Ministry of Education, circular no. 3, 1977.

46. Ibid, p. 4.

47. Ibid, p. 4.

48. Ibid, p. 5.

49. Ibid, p. 8.

50. Abdulal, S., op.cit., p. 11.

51. The Ministry of Education, <u>Decree No. 49, dated 6.6.1985</u> (in Arabic).

52. Abdul'al, S., op.cit., p. 12.

53. Ibid, p. 13.

54. Eastwood, G.R., The Inspectorate in New South Wales : A Critical Comment, <u>The Journal of Educational Administration</u>, Vol. 11, No.2, Oct. 1964, p. 71.

55. Mosher, R. and Purple, D., <u>Supervision : The Reluctant Profession</u>, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972, p. 83.

56. Eye, G. and Netzer, L., <u>Supervision of Instruction</u>, NY, Harper and Row, 1965, p. 128.

57. Ibid, p. 71.

58. The Ministry of Education, circular no. 3, dated 1977, p. 9.

59. Hogan, P., The Central Place of Prejudice in the supervision of Student Teachers, Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol. 9, 1983, p. 31.

60. Serigovanni, T. et.al., Supervision : Human Perspectives, NY, McGraw Hill Book Company, 1983, p. 218.

CHAPTER FIVE

Procedures and Methodology

CHAPTER FIVE

Procedures and Methodology

The preceding chapters were concerned with the supervision of instruction, in theory and practice. A general background of Qatar, its educational system, and particularly the system of instructional supervision was given in chapter IV. This chapter is devoted to the procedures, methodology, and instruments employed to obtain the date of this study, which will be presented in the next two chapters.

5.1 Population and the Sample

Teachers and supervisors of public schools in Qatar, were the target population of this study. At the time when the study was conducted there were 3858 teachers in Qatar and 109 supervisors. The sample of the study consisted of 432 teachers representing 11.2% of the statistical population. On the other hand, the entire population of supervisors was considered as a sample though only 78 participated. This size for the two samples was considered satisfactory. Although there is no easy answer to the question of sample size, 10% of the target population is accepted in descriptive research, particularly in larger populations. For smaller populations 20% may be required.[1] However, although larger samples are, in general, better than smaller samples, they can lead to erroneous conclusions. There are many sources of sampling bias which can affect a study, regardless of the sample size. Larger samples do not necessarily guarantee a good representation of the population. Sampling error, beyond the control of the researcher, can exist. Of course, no sample will have a

composition precisely identical to that of the total population. Occasionally, just by chance, a sample will differ from the population on some variables. Usually this will not make a significant difference. If there is a variable for which non representation might really affect the outcome of the study, the researcher should stratify on the variable rather than leaving all to chance. Sampling bias is another story. It does not result from random, chance differences between samples and populations. It is systematic and is generally the fault of the researcher. If aware of sources of bias, a researcher can avoid it. A major source of bias is the use of volunteers, a second source is the use of available groups just because 'they are there', or because administrators allow the researcher to use only particular groups. The researcher should be aware of sources of sampling bias and do his best to avoid them. If this is not possible, the researcher must decide whether the bias is so severe that the results will be seriously affected. If a decision is made to continue with the study, with full awareness of the existing bias, such bias should be completely reported in the final research report.[2] In this study, the author tried to avoid sampling bias.

Due to factors, related to Qatari society, the cluster sampling method was employed to obtain the sample of teachers. Unlike a simple random sample, the unit in the cluster sample is not the individual, but rather a naturally occurring group of individuals. For example, all the teachers in a school constitute a cluster insofar as they are alike with respect to characteristics relevant to the variables of the study. The distribution of the characteristics within clusters is usually not random but relatively homogeneous. These clusters exist as

social units and the individuals in them tend to resemble each other, although their homogeneity is not complete. The homogeneity may arise from common selective factors, or from joint exposure to the same factors, or to mutual influence or to a combination of these.

Cluster sampling is economical because it saves time and involves less expense. For example, it is easier to use all the teachers in a school than several teachers in many schools. It is generally more convenient when the population is very large or spread over a wide geographic area. Sometimes it is the only feasible method of selecting a sample. For example, when the researchers do not have control over subjects that they would like to choose.[3] As far as this study is concerned the author applied this method to avoid misinterpretation of his intentions if he selected randomly female teachers. In this case it would have been highly possible that he would not have secured official permission, or secured answers from the selected participants.

As with most things, nothing is all good. Cluster sampling has its drawbacks. For one thing, the chances are great of selecting a sample which in some way is not representative of the population. The sampling error in the cluster sampling method is greater than in random sampling. One way to compensate for this is by selecting a large sample. For example, including more schools, thus increasing the likelihood that the schools selected adequately represent all the schools.

It is essential also that the clusters actually included in the study be chosen at random from a population of clusters. Another

procedure requirement is that once a cluster is selected, all the members of the cluster be included in the sample. On the other hand, the sample should be spread over as many clusters as possible, in order to extend the sample over the diverse portions of the population. But it is necessary to keep down the costs which would be involved in covering many clusters. Some economic compromise between the two conflicting effects of clustering is needed.

In order for the results of the study to be generalizable to the population, a sub-sampling or multi-stage sampling method, which involves the selection of clusters within clusters, is recommended.

The steps in clusters sampling are not very different from those of random sampling. The major difference is that random selecting of groups (clusters) is involved, not of individuals. Cluster sampling involves the following steps: identifying and defining the population, determining the desired sample size, identifying a logical cluster, listing all clusters (or obtaining a list) which comprises the population, estimating the average number cf population members per cluster, determining the number of clusters needed by dividing the sample size by the estimated size of a cluster, randomly selecting the needed number of clusters (using a table of random numbers), and finally including all population members in each selected cluster.

The author applied all the above steps. He obtained a list containing the names and locations of all the 161 public schools in Qatar, drew randomly 18 schools : 8 primary schools (4 boys' and 4 girls' schools), 6 preparatory schools (3 girls' and 3 boys' schools),

and 4 secondary schools (2 boys' and 2 girls' schools). The schools are located in the capital and other towns. Finally all teachers in the randomly selected schools were considered the sample of the study. Since schools in Qatar are almost uniform in their functions and educational practices the sample thus obtained is considered representative.

It was assumed that 12 per cent of the teachers' population may represent the total population satisfactorily. Therefore, the number of about 450 teachers, in addition to all supervisors was decided upon. 600 copies of a questionnaire were distributed. The author himself distributed the questionnaire in the boys' schools and to the male supervisors, while the Female Education Presidency/The Ministry of Education, distributed it in the girls' schools and to the female supervisors, because in Qatar it is strictly forbidden for males to enter girls' schools.

To ensure a high percentage rate of participants' return, the author visited all the selected male schools and the Supervisory Department, and met personally as many teachers and supervisors as he could to explain the objectives of the study. But because the researcher could not visit girls' schools or communicate with female supervisors a 100 per cent return could not be guaranteed. The author tried his best to follow up non-respondents, through cooperation with the Directorate of Technical Research/The Ministry of Education. On the other hand, a number of copies were considered invalid because they contained several incomplete answers indicating lack of interest or carelessness. For example, one respondent wrote on his incomplete

questionnaire 'I do not believe that such a research will provide any benefit to develop the supervisory system. Therefore, I do not want to waste my time for nothing'. The researcher heard such statements from other teachers who expressed their doubts that educational research, in general, would make any real difference. In contrast, many other participants showed interest and cooperation, and considered it an opportunity to express their viewpoints. Some teachers and supervisors volunteered additional information.

Out of the 600 copies 90 were either not returned or considered invalid. The valid returns consisted of 432 teachers' questionnaires and 78 supervisors' questionnaires. The returned teachers' questionnaires represent 88 per cent of the distributed questionnaires, while the returned supervisors' questionnaires represent 71.5 per cent of the distributed questionnaires. Table 15 shows that 209 (41%) participants were Qataris compared with 301 (59%) non-Qataris, that 249 (48.8%) were males compared with 261 (51.2%) females, 156 (30.6%) had non-university qualifications and 322 (63.1%) had the BA degree, compared to 32 (6.3%) who had higher degrees (MA or Ph.D.), 221 (43.3%) were in primary schools compared to 289 (56.7%) in prep-secondary schools, and 179 (35%) were less-experienced compared to 331 (64.9%) who were more experienced. The demographic data for the two main groups (teachers and supervisors) will be presented separately.

5.2 Characteristics of the Respondents

The participants were asked questions concerning occupation, nationality, sex, qualification, teaching cycle and experience. The results will be presented taking each variable at a time.

5.2.1   Occupation

The sample consisted of 510 participants; 432 teachers representing 84.7% of the participants and 78 supervisors represent 15.3% of the whole sample. Table 16 shows that the number of Qatari teachers was less than the non-Qatari teachers (177 to 255 or 41% to 59%). The numbers and percentages of male teachers and female teachers were very close : 211 (48.8%) to 221 (51.1%) respectively. The table also shows that the teachers who had the BA degree were twice the number of teachers who had non-university qualifications : 262 (60.6%) compared to 156 (36.1%) respectively. The teachers who had higher degrees were only 14 (3.2%). It is also clear that there were more teachers in the prep-secondary schools than in the primary schools : 245 (56.7%) compared to 187 (43.3%). It is interesting that teachers who had more than 10 years experience were twice the number of teachers who had less than 10 years experience : 277 (64.1%) to 155 (35.9%) respectively.

These figures approximately reflect the statistical population. In 1985-1986 there were 1420 (36.8%) Qatari teachers compared to 2438 (63.2%) non-Qatari teachers, 1653 (42.8%) male teachers compared to 2205 (57.2%) female teachers, 1255 (32.5%) teachers holding non-university qualifications and 2555 (66.2%) teachers with the BA degree compared to 48 (1.3%) who had higher degrees. Teachers in primary schools were 2033 (52.7%) while teachers in prep-secondary schools were 1825 (47.3%). The official statistics do not show the distribution of teachers by experience (see Chapter four).

5.2.2   Nationality

Table 18 shows that the Qatari female teachers were more than three times the number of the Qatari male teachers : 136 (31.5%) females compared to 41 (9.5%) males. Conversely, the non-Qatari male teachers were twice the number of the non-Qatari female teachers : 170 (39.4%) to 85 (19.6%) respectively. The table also shows that the non-Qatari teachers were better-qualified than their Qatari colleagues: 12 (2.8%) of the non-Qatari teachers had higher degrees compared to only 2 (.5%) Qataris, 169 (39.1%) of the non-Qataris had the BA degree, compared to 93 (21.5%) Qataris, and 74 (17.1%) non-Qataris had non-university qualifications compared to 82 (18.9%) Qataris.

It is clear also that there were more Qatari teachers in primary schools than in prep-secondary schools : 103 (23.8%) compared to 74 (17.1%), while the opposite is the case with the non-Qataris teachers: 171 (39.6%) in prep-secondary schools compared to 84 (19.5%) in primary schools. The table also shows that the non-Qataris are more experienced than the Qataris : 165 (38.2%) of the non-Qatari teachers had more than 10 years experience compared to 90 (20.8%) who had less than that, while there was 112 (25.9%) Qatari teachers who had more than 10 years experience compared to 65 (15.1%) with less than that.

These figures reflect the statistical population. In 1985-1986 there were 79 (2.1%) male Qatari teachers and 1341 (34.7%) female teachers, while there were 1574 (40.8%) non-Qatari male teachers and 864 (22.4%) females. The Qatari teachers were less well-qualified than non-Qatari teachers : 709 (18.4%) Qatari teachers had non-university

qualifications, 709 (18.4%) had the BA degree, and only 2 (.5%) had higher degrees, compared to 546 (14.1%) non-Qatari teachers with non-university qualification, 1846 (47.8%) with the BA degree, and 46 (1.2%) with higher degrees (see Chapter Four).

Table 19 shows that the number of Qatari female supervisors was three times the number of the Qatari male supervisors; 24 (30.7%) compared to 8 (10.3%). In contrast, the number of non-Qatari male supervisors was twice the number of non-Qatari female supervisors; 30 (38.5%) to 16 (20.5%). The table shows that while the number of Qatari and non-Qatari supervisors who had the BA degree was very close, the number of non-Qatari supervisors who had higher degrees was more than three times the number of the Qatari supervisors who had the same degree : 28 (35.9%), 32 (41.1%), 14 (17.9%) and 4 (5.1%) respectively. It is also clear that the majority of the Qatari supervisors were in primary schools : 23 (29.5%) compared to 9 (11.5%) in prep-secondary schools. In contrast, the number of non-Qatari supervisors in prep-secondary schools was nearly three times the number of non-Qatari supervisors in primary schools : 35 (44.9%) compared to 11 (14.1%). The table also shows that the non-Qatari supervisors are more experienced : 45 (57.7%) had more than 10 years experience and only 1 (1.3%) had less than that, compared to 23 (29.5%) Qatari supervisors who had less than 10 years and 9 (11.5%) who had more than that.

These figures reflect, to a great extent, the statistical population; in 1985-1986 the number of Qatari male supervisors was half the number of their female colleagues : 16 (14.7%) compared to 35 (32.1%) while the non-Qatari female supervisors were outnumbered by the non-Qatari males : 22 (20.2%) to 36 (33%).

5.2.3   Sex

It has been mentioned that the Qatari male teachers were out-numbered by the Qatari female teachers, while the non-Qatari female teachers were outnumbered by the non-Qatari male teachers. Table 20 shows the number of male and female teachers who had non-university qualifications or the BA degree are very close : 77 (17.9%) male teachers and 79 (18.3%) females had non-university qualifications, and 124 (28.7%) male teachers and 138 (31.9%) female teachers had the BA. It is clear that there were more male than female teachers who had higher degrees : 10 (2.3%) males compared to 4 (.9%) females.

Table 20 shows that there were more male teachers in prep-secondary schools than in primary schools : 131 (30.3%) compared to 80 (18.6%), while the number of female teachers in both cycles was almost the same : 107 (24.7%) compared to 114 (26.4%). It is clear that, regardless of sex, teachers who had more than 10 years experience were more than those who had less : 141 (32.6%) males and 136 (31.5%) females had more than 10 years compared to 70 (16.2%) males and 85 (19.7%) females who had less than that.

These figures adequately reflect the statistical population; In 1985-1986 there were 399 (10.3%) male teachers and 856 (22.3%) female teachers who had non-university qualifications, compared to 1217 (31.5%) male teachers and 1338 (34.7%) female teachers who had BA degrees. There were 37 (.9%) male teachers with higher degrees and 11 (.3%) female teachers with higher degrees. In the same year male teachers were outnumbered by females in primary schools : 1232 (31.9%)

females compared to 801 (20.8%) males. Although there were more female teachers than males in prep-secondary schools, the difference was relatively small : 973 (25.2%) females compared to 852 (22.1%) males.

As for the supervisors, it has been mentioned before that there were more Qatari female supervisors than males, while the opposite is the case in non-Qatari supervisors. It is interesting that the vast majority of the female supervisors (39 or 50%) had only the BA degree, and only one (1.2%) had a higher degree, while 17 (21.8%) male supervisors had higher degrees and 21 (26.9%) had the BA degree. Table 21 also shows that the number of male supervisors in prep-secondary schools was twice the number in primary schools : 26 (33.3%) compared to 12 (15.3%). The numbers of female supervisors in both cycles were relatively close : 22 (28.2%) and 18 (23.1%). It is evident that there were more females in primary schools than male supervisors : 22 (28.2%) compared to 12 (15.3%). It is also clear that the vast majority of male supervisors had more than 10 years experience : 33 (42.3%) compared to only 5 (6.4%) who had less than 10 years. In contrast, the number of female supervisors who had more than 10 years experience or less than that were almost identical : 21 (26.9%) compared to 19 (24.4%).

5.2.4   Qualification

The relation of qualification to sex and nationality has been mentioned in the last few pages. Table 22 shows that the vast majority of teachers in primary schools had non-university qualifications : 140 (32.4%) compared to 46 (10.6%) who had the BA degree. Conversely, the

vast majority of respondent teachers in prep-secondary schools had the BA degree : 216 (50%) compared to 16 (3.7%) who had non-university qualifications. Similarly the vast majority of teachers who had higher degrees were in prep-secondary schools; 13 (3%) compared to 1 (.3%) in a primary school. It is interesting that the number of more-experienced teachers who had non-university qualifications was twice the number of less-experienced 102 (23.6%) compared to 54 (12.5%), the number of more-experienced teachers who had the BA was more than the number of less-experienced : 163 (37.7%) compared to 99 (22.9%), and that the number of more-experienced teachers who had higher degrees was almost six times the number of less-experienced : 12 (2.8%) compared to 2 (.5%).

These figures reflect, to some extent, the statistical population. In 1985-1986 there were 1189 (30.8%) teachers in primary schools who had non-university qualifications, 839 (21.7%) in the same cycle had the BA, and only 5 (.1%) had higher degrees. Conversely 1716 (44.5%) teachers in the prep-secondary schools had BA degrees, 66 (1.7%) had non-university qualifications and 43 (1.2%) had higher degrees.

Table 23 reveals that while the number of supervisors in primary and prep-secondary schools who had BA degrees were close : 32 (41.1%) compared to 28 (35.9%), the number of supervisors in prep-secondary schools who had higher degrees was 8 times the number of supervisors in primary schools who had higher degrees : 16 (20.5%) compared to 2 (2.5%). It is also clear that the vast majority of supervisors who had higher degrees were more experienced : 17 (21.8%) had more than ten years experience compared to 1 (1.3%) who had less than that. In

contrast 37 (47.4%) supervisors who had the BA degree were more experienced compared to 23 (29.5%) of the less-experienced.

5.2.5. Cycle

The relation between cycle, nationality, sex, and qualification had already been presented. Table 24 shows that the respondent teachers in all cycles who had more than 10 years experience were more than those who had less than that : 68 (15.8%) teachers in primary schools had less than 10 years experience compared to 119 (27.5%) who had more than that, and 87 (20.2%) in prep-secondary schools had less than 10 years experience compared to 158 (36.5%) teachers who had more than that.

As for the supervisors, Table 25 shows that 20 (25.6%) primary school supervisors had less than 10 years experience compared to 14 (17.9%) who had more than that. In contrast, the number of supervisors in prep-secondary schools who had more than 10 years experience was 10 times the number of supervisors who had less than that : 40 (51.3%) compared to 4 (5.2%).

5.2.6   The Professional Education of Supervisors

Respondent supervisors were requested to answer questions concerning their professional education. The responses show that supervisors in Qatar, in general, lack adequate training and preparation for the job. Table 28 reveals that a fairly high percentage of supervisors (51 or 65.3%) did not keep in touch with the

literature on supervision. Furthermore, only six of the respondents could mention a reference related to supervision, they had read. Five books in Arabic, and two books in English, were mentioned, all are old-fashioned. A male supervisor admitted that his references dated back to 1950s. A female supervisor stated that 'we do not find any literature on supervision. It is not available. We depend on experienced colleagues'.

Table 29 shows that the majority of supervisors (60 or 77%) had not attended any course or seminar on supervision. A number of them (26) stated that they had attended short courses (1-2 weeks) which concentrated on the methods of teaching. A few others (3) stated that they had attended a 2-week supervisory course. Six supervisors stated that they had attended supervisory courses abroad, and two supervisors stated that they had attended post-graduate courses in American universities.

5.3 The Instrument

This is a descriptive research, the prevailing method in social sciences. Descriptive research describes what is. It is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist, practices that prevail, beliefs or points of view that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are being felt, or trends that are developing. Although it does not involve experiments, it goes beyond the mere gathering and tabulation of data. It seeks to uncover the nature of the factors involved in a given situation, estimate their relative importance, identify which underlying factors have some relationships or links

between them, and then draw conclusions. It allows for the gathering of information which serves as a basis for future research, founded, perhaps, on tentative hypothesis. Thus, description is often combined with comparison or contrast, involve measurement, classification, interpretation and evaluation. This type of research is also called survey research. Warwick and Lininger (1975) suggest that a survey is an adequate method for collecting information when: 1) the purpose of the research calls for quantitative data; 2) the participants are familiar with the information that is sought; and 3) the researcher is well acquainted with the situation under study.[4]

According to Ebel (1980) a survey is a powerful tool to use in conducting research when the purpose of the research is to identify popular problems, to identify and understand the variables associated with those problems, and to generate knowledge that can be effective in solving those problems.[5] Babbie (1973) points out that there are three basic survey designs; the cross-sectional survey, the longitudinal survey, and the approximating longitudinal survey. In a cross-sectional survey, such as our study, data are collected at one point in time, usually with the purpose of describing present conditions, and examining relationships among variables.[6]

The tests, observations, examinations of documents, questionnaires and interviews are the main tools of survey researches. The questionnaire is used to convert into data the information given by participants. By providing access to what is 'inside a person's head' this approach makes it possible to measure what a person knows, what he likes or dislikes, what he thinks, what experiences have taken place,

and what is occuring at present. This information can be transformed into a number of quantitative data by using rating scale techniques.

The questionnaire is probably the most used and most abused of data gathering devices. Perhaps more attention has been directed to its misuse rather than its use. Poorly constructed questionnaires have deserved the criticism they have received. The preparation of a questionnaire takes a great deal of time, ingenuity and hard work. Despite abuse, questionnaires have unique advantages and, properly constructed and administered, can serve as appropriate and useful data-gathering device in a particular situation. Certain information can not be obtained in any way other than by asking people, and even when an alternative is available, the 'asking route' may still be the most feasible.

As far as this study is concerned, the main data collection instrument was a questionnaire developed by the author. Some items were adapted from other research studies, while others were developed as a result of a review of literature or drawn from the job description of supervisors in Qatar. The questionnaire was originally written in English, approved by the advisor, and then translated into Arabic. The questionnaire in English is appended.

The validity and reliability of the instrument were carefully considered. In general, a test is valid when it measures what it claims to measure.[7] To ensure the face validity of the questionnaire, a number of teachers, supervisors, and professors of education were requested to check the Arabic copy and determine its validity. Some

valuable revisions were suggested, and on the basis of these suggestions, some items were rewritten. It seems that the questionnaire has concurrent validity, which is a test of whether the instrument works according to concurrent criterion measures. Since the research instrument does distinguish the teachers' perceptions from the supervisors' perceptions, it would appear that the questionnaire possesses concurrent validity.

The concurrent and predictive validity of the instrument is dependent on its reliability, which is concerned with consistency and precision of measurement.[8] Theoretically, it is defined as 'that part of the total test variance that is systematic or non-error variance'. In contrast, unreliability is 'that part of the total test variance due to error'. There are three different methods of measuring reliability: the test-retest method, the parallel test, and the split-half method (the internal consistency). Each of these methods has its advantages and disadvantages. If the correlation between the test and retest betweel parallel tests, or between the two halfs of the test, approaches unity, that is if the scores remains essentially the same, then the test is reliable.[9]

The author applied the first method, the test-retest method, which is based on administering the same test twice on the same examinees, then correlating the results. A sample of 15 teachers and three supervisors was chosen to answer the same questions on two different occasions within one month (20 days between them). The two sets of scores were then correlated. Any item which had a correlation coefficient less than .75 was ommitted.

To obtain the necessary co-operatioon of principals and participants the written permission of the Ministry of Education in Qatar was obtained. In order to obtain valid data, participants were assured in the 'letter to the respondents' that all information would be kept confidential and that neither their names nor the names of their schools were required.

The questionnaire consisted of eight sections. Each section included a cluster of related items covering a wide range of categories pertaining to supervision. The first two sections involved selected supervisory tasks and activities. They had two sets of responses. The ideal responses on a 4-point scale of importance identified the extent to which participants would like those tasks and activities to be applied. The actual responses on a 4-point scale of application identified the extent to which these tasks and activities were already applied. The ideal responses comprised four categories of importance ranging from higher ('very important' and 'important') to low ('less important' and 'not important'). The actual responses comprised also four categories of application ranging from higher ('to a great extent' and 'to some extent') to low ('to a little extent' and 'not at all'). Participants were requested to mark each item according to their perception of its degree of importance and frequency of application. This technique provided a basis to the researcher for interpreting the data. The responses for the degree of importance were accepted as perceived 'role expectations' for supervisors. On the other hand, the responses for the frequency of application were accepted as perceived 'role performance' for supervisors. These two sets of data were used to find degrees of 'divergence-convergence' between teachers and

supervisors on the role perception of supervisors. When presenting and analysing the data the higher categories of importance or application were combined together, and the lower categories were also combined. By eliminating the middle options sharp contrasts were achieved.

The 3rd section was concerned with the supervisory visits. It included questions concerning the frequency of visits, the time spent during the visit, the pre-observation and post-observation conferences, the behaviour of both the teacher and supervisor, and the helpfulness of the visit. The 4th section concerned the evaluation of teachers, a major task of supervisors. It included questions about the ability of supervisors to evaluate the performance of teachers, and the adequacy of the criteria of evaluation.

The 5th section concerned the degree of importance and frequency of application of selected criteria of teachers' evaluation. As in the first and second sections, participants were requested to mark each item according to its perceived degree of importance and frequency of application on two rating scales. The 6th section consisted of a number of items concerning staffing. The 7th section was devoted to problems hindering effective supervision, while the 8th section was devoted to a number of general ideas.

5.4 Data Treatment

The data that was acquired from the questionnaire, were first coded and later processed in the computer center in the University of Qatar, and later in the University of Durham using the Statistical

Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-X). To analyze the data, descriptive and inferential statistics were used. While descriptive statistics describe or summarize the data, the inferential statistics allow the drawing of inferences which have wider genererizability.[10] The following statistical techniques were used:

- Simple frequency distributions and percentages were used to present tendencies and clusters in the responses. Frequencies were converted into percentages to make the results more easily computed.

- An overall weight quotient was computed for each item. This process provided data to rank and classify activities, tasks and criteria in parts 1, 2 and 5 according to participants' perception of their importance and frequency of application. Weight quotients were calculated as follows: choices were given arbitrary values; e.g. 'very important' and 'to a great extent' (4), 'important' and 'to some extent' (3), 'less important' and 'to a little extent' (2), and 'not important' and 'not at all' (1). Then the number of responses to each choice were multiplied by the value assigned to the choice and these products were added together. These sums give the 'raw score' of the individual item. Finally the weight quotient (WQ) of the particular item was found by the following formula

$$\frac{Wi \times 100}{Ni \times 4} = Wq, \text{ where}$$

(Wi) refers to the total raw weight of a particular item.

(Ni) refers to the population answering this item.

(4) refers to the highest positive value assigned to a particular choice.

To give a better understanding of this method, the following example is provided:

Item 7 : in-service education

Choices	No. of responses	assigned value	Raw weight
very important	210	4	840
important	229	3	687
less important	56	2	112
not important	15	1	15
	510		1645

$$Wq = \frac{1645 \times 100}{510 \times 4} = 81$$

This method of weighting produces quotients ranging in value from +100.00 to 25. Thus in the above example if all 510 respondents had answered 'very important', the wq would have been 100.00, and if all had answered 'not important' the wq would have been 25.

- The 't' value of significance was employed to determine the statistical significance of differences between ideal and actual responses in sections 1, 2 and 5. The 't' value is a statistical test that allows the comparison of two means of scores arising from a single source in order to determine the probability that the difference between the means is a real difference rather than a chance difference.[11]

- This test was followed by Pearson Correlation Coefficient which shows the extent to which two sets of data secured from the same group are related to one another.[12]

- The effects of the independent variables were tested in two ways. First a Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine the statistical significance of differences between teachers and supervisors as two main groups. The Mann-Whitney U test is a powerful non-parametric test when the difference between two groups is to be assessed.[13] For example, it compares males to females, teachers to supervisors ... etc. for possible significant differences. But it can not be used with more than two groups or with more than two variables at a time. For example it can not compare male teachers to male supervisors, or Qatari teachers with Qatari supervisors. Another test was employed for this task. The chi-square test symbolized as x^2 was used to determine the statistical significance of differences between the teachers and supervisors in different categories. With a chi-square test more than two variables at a time can be taken. It compares proportions actually observed in a study with proportions expected if they are significantly different. Expected proportions are usually the frequencies which would be expected if the groups were equal. The chi-square value increases as the difference between observed and expected frequencies increases.[14]

- For all tests the .05 level of significance and beyond was accepted. If the difference between responses or means is reported to be significant at the .05 level then such a difference would be attributed to chance in only one in a hundred. Since inferences are

prabability sentences, a researcher is only probably correct when he makes an inference and concludes that there is a true difference, or true relationship, between groups. However, in the next chapter statistical techniques used will be specified at each point of the analysis.

The questionnaire was not the only instrument in this study. The author also contacted and interviewed a number of appropriate people to obtain more information relevant to the supervisory process. He also reviewed the official reports and documents.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter was devoted to the procedures and methodology. The statistical population of this study, teachers and supervisors of public schools in Qatar, was identified. The sample and sampling procedures were described, and justified. A comprehensive description of the characteristics of respondents was provided, with reference to the target population. It was clear that the characteristics of the respondents, in general, reflect the characteristics of the statistical population.

5.6 References and Notes

1. Gay, L.R., _Educational Research_, Charles E. Mervil Publishing Co., Ohio, 1976, p. 77.

2. Ibid, pp. 78-79.

3. Ary, D. et.al., _Introduction to Research in Education_, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, NY, 1979, p. 125.
   See also: Kish, L., The Design of Sample Survey, in Collier, R.O. (ed.), _Research Design and Analysis_, Phi Delta Kappan, Bloomington, Indiana, 1961, pp. 57-58.

4. Warwick, D.P. and Lininger, C.A., _The Sample Survey_ : _Theory and Practice_, NY, Mc-Graw-Hill, 1975, p. 69.

5. Ebel, R.L., Survey Research in Education : The Need and Value, quoted by Warwick, D. and Lininger, C., Ibid, p. 72.

6. Babbi, E.R., _Survey Research Methods_, Belmont, Ca, Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973, p. 113.

7. Mason, E. and Bramble, W., _Understanding and Conducting Research_, NY, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1978, p. 225.

8. Van Dallu, D.E., _Understanding Educational Research_, NY, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973, pp. 338.

9. Borg, W. and Gall, M., _Educational Research_, 4th edition, Longman, 1983, pp. 281-285.

10. Popham, W., _Educational Statistics_, NY, Harper and Row, 1967, pp. 136-138.

11. Tuckman, B., _Conducting Educational Research_, NY, Horcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc., 1978, pp. 257.

12. Ibid, p. 259.

13. Ibid, p. 269.

14. Popham, W., _Educational Statistics_, op.cit., p. 277.

CHAPTER SIX

Presentation and Analysis of the Data

6.0 Introduction

Section I - The Tasks of Supervisors

6.1.0 Introduction

6.1.1 Clarifying the Aims of Education

6.1.2 Promoting Teachers' Professional Growth

6.1.3 Evaluating and Developing the Curriculum

6.1.4 Orienting Teachers to Suitable Teaching Methods

6.1.5 Developing Human Relations in Schools

6.1.6 Encouraging Teachers to Innovate

6.1.7 Conclusion

Section II - Degree of Importance and Frequency of

 Application of 12 Selected Supervisory Activities

6.2.0 Introduction

6.2.1 Providing Materials and Facilities

6.2.2 Demonstration Lessons

6.2.3 Organizing for Teaching

6.2.4 Administrative and Clerical Work

6.2.5 Evaluating the Teaching/Learning Process

6.2.6 Intervisitation among Teachers

6.2.7 In-service Education

6.2.8 Orientation Programmes for New Teachers

6.2.9 Conducting Research

6.2.10 Supervisory Visits

6.2.11 Disseminating Information

6.2.12 Supporting the School Library

6.2.13 Conclusion

CHAPTER SIX

Presentation and Analysis of the Data

6.0 Introduction

The preceding chapter was devoted to the procedures, methodology and the description of the instruments employed. This and the next chapter will present and analyze the data obtained from the questionnaire. In accordance with the objectives of the study mentioned in chapter 1, the analysis will focus on:

- Investigating the beliefs of school teachers and supervisors in Qatar concerning a wide range of aspects of supervision.

- Clarifying the tasks and activities of supervision according to their level of significance as perceived by supervisors and teachers.

- Showing to what extent the tasks are undertaken and the activities actually take place.

- Identifying some obstacles which inhibit effective supervision.

- Finally, the analysis will seek to reveal to what extent independent variables such as occupation, nationality, sex, qualification, teaching cycle, and experience have affected the responses.

The data relevant to each item is treated individually and independently of other items, using the following statistical techniques. Simple frequency distributions and percentages were used to present tendencies and clusters in the responses. The Mann-Whitney U

test was employed to determine the statistical significance of differences between the responses of teachers and supervisors. Cross-tabulation of occupation by all other independent variables, together with a series of chi-square tests were applied to determine whether the independent variables have brought out any significant differences in responses. The correlation coefficient was applied to determine the relation between ideal and actual perceptions, the t value for paired responses was utilized to determine the statistical significance of differences between ideal and actual responses in questions 1, 2 and 5, while the weight quotients were used to rank order the selected items in parts 1, 2, 5 and 7. The .05 level of significance and above was accepted as showing significance.

SECTION I

The Tasks of Supervisors

6.1.0   Introduction

Teachers and supervisors who participated in this study, were requested to rate six items, considered to be fundamental tasks of supervisors, according to their perceived level of importance and frequency of application, on a two-part scale. The first part, which measured the importance of each task is a four-point scale ranging from the highest (very important) to the lowest (not important). The four categories of importance represent the ideal responses or the desired status. The other part, which measured the frequency of application, is also a four point scale ranging from the highest (to a great extent) to the lowest (not at all). These four options represent the actual responses or the present status.

To make comparisons easier the percentages of the two higher responses on each scale ('very important' and 'important'; 'to a great extent' and 'to some extent') are combined together. Also, the percentages of the lower options ('less important' and 'not important'; 'to a little extent' and 'not at all') are combined together when interpreting the data. By eliminating the middle responses sharp contrasts will be revealed. Each item will be discussed separately using the aforementioned statistical techniques.

The six selected tasks, as they appeared in the questionnaire, were: to clarify the aims of education and the role of teachers; to promote the teachers' professional growth; to contribute to the evaluation and development of the curricula; to develop human relations at schools and to encourage teachers to innovate. The discussion will follow this order.

6.1.1   Clarifying the Aims of Education

According to Abdulal, the ex-president of the Supervisory Department in Qatar, one of the main objectives of supervision in Qatar, is to help teachers understand the aims of education which the state seeks to achieve through schools and other public institutions. This includes the general aims of education, the specific aims of the subject matter and the specific aims of the teaching cycle. Accordingly the participants in this study were requested to show the degree of importance of this item, then to consider its frequency of application.

Table 30 shows that the weight quotient of importance (83.8) ranked the third, while the weight quotient of application (58.5) ranked the second. Out of 510 participants, nearly 88.2% considered this item either as 'very important' or 'important', while only 44.1% perceived that it was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Table 31).

The 't' value (Table 32) shows that the difference between ideal and actual responses was significant beyond the .05 level. The

figures show that the application of this task is very low compared with its importance.

Table 33 which compares the ideal and actual responses of both teachers and supervisors on the six items (tasks) reveals that while there was a general agreement between teachers and supervisors on the importance of this task, there was a sharp difference on its application. Over 88% of teachers and supervisors considered that clarifying the aims of education was either 'very important' or 'important'. In contrast, only 37.3% of teachers stated that supervisors undertook this task 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent', while 82% of supervisors held such beliefs. The Mann-Whitney U test shows that while the difference between teachers and supervisors concerning the importance of this item was not significant, the difference between the two groups concerning its application was large and statistically significant above the .05 level.

Table 34 compares the ideal and actual responses of teachers in different categories, and reveals that the vast majority of teachers (more than 85%), across all independent variables regarded the clarifying of the aims of education either as 'very important' or 'important'. The percentage of teachers in different groups who reported such perceptions were very close. Differences were not significant according to the chi-square test.

On the contrary, though teachers, in different categories, tended to give a low assessment to what supervisors do to clarify the aims of education, different perceived levels of application were reported.

The percentages of teachers in different categories, who reported that supervisors undertook this task 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent', ranged between 14.3 and 49.2 per cent. According to the chi-square test, the differences among teachers across all categories, concerning the application of this task, were significant beyond the .05 level. It is strange that while more non-Qatari and male teachers than Qatari, and female teachers stated that this task was frequently applied, experienced teachers and teachers holding higher qualifications (most of them males and non-Qatari) reported lower levels of application, while inexperienced teachers and teachers with non-university qualifications (mostly females and Qatari) reported relatively higher levels of application. It seems possible either that, as the degree of teachers and their experience increase, they tend to be more critical, or that supervisors, in performing this task, focus on less-experienced and less well-qualified teachers, irrespective of their nationality or sex.

Table 35 compares the ideal and actual responses of supervisors in different groups concerning this task. The figures show that non-Qatari, male, experienced supervisors, supervisors with higher qualifications and supervisors in prep-secondary schools placed particular importance on this task. More than 94% of supervisors in the above categories considered this task either as 'very important' or 'important'. A considerable majority of female supervisors (82.5%) and supervisors with the BA qualification (85%) gave similar responses, while the correspondent percentages of Qatari, inexperienced supervisors, and supervisors in the primary cycle were 75.1%, 66.6% and 76.6% respectively. The figures give the impression that as the

qualification and the experience of the supervisor increase, he or she tends to put more emphasis on clarifying the aims of education.

This conclusion could also be applied to the performance of this task. Supervisors who perceived this task to be of great value, tended to report high levels of application, while those who put less emphasis on it, reported relatively lower levels of application. According to the chi-square test, the differences among supervisors, across almost all independent variables, concerning the importance and application of this task, were significant. Though there was a relatively large difference between female and male supervisors, it was not statistically significant.

Table 36 shows that differences between teachers and supervisors in most sub-categories, concerning the importance of this task, were not significant. There were significant differences at the .05 level between Qatari teachers and supervisors, teachers and supervisors with higher degrees, and experienced teachers and supervisors. Respectively, 86.5%, 75.1%, 85.7%, 100%, 86.7% and 90% of participants in the above groups viewed this task either as 'very important' or 'important'. Though statistically significant, the differences were not large. Only between inexperienced teachers and supervisors the difference was large in scope as well as statistically significant at the .001 level. 91% of inexperienced teachers compared to 66.6% of inexperienced supervisors considered this task either as 'very important' or 'important'. This discrepancy might mean that the limited experience of teachers makes them feel more in need of help to clarify the aims of education, while the limited experience of supervisors makes them less

aware of the importance of this task. It is highly possible that they think it is less important than other tasks, or that it is a task, which can more properly be undertaken by someone else.

Table 37 suggests a substantial disagreement between teachers and supervisors across almost all sub-categories concerning the application of this task. Teachers registered a low assessment of the frequency of application of this task, while, except for the inexperienced, supervisors reported high levels of performance. The percentages of inexperienced supervisors (45.8%) and inexperienced teachers (48.2%) who reported that this task was frequently undertaken, were close and the difference was not significant according to the chi-square test.

In sum, this task was supported by the vast majority of the participant teachers in this study, irrespective of their personal characteristics. It was also supported by supervisors, though on different levels. While considerable percentages of participants thought that it was either 'very important' or 'important' for supervisors to clarify the aims of education, different perceived levels of performance were reported. Teachers registered a low assessment of supervisors' performance, while supervisors, in general, attached more importance to what they do to clarify the aims of education.

The independent variables have affected the responses of supervisors concerning the importance and application of this task. In general, as the qualification and the experience of the supervisor increase, he or she tends to put more emphasis on this task and report

that they undertake it frequently. In comparison, the ideal responses of teachers were not influenced by the independent variables. Differences among teachers, in different categories, were narrow in scope and not significant. Only the actual responses of teachers were dependent on personal characteristics. It can be concluded either that the more experienced and better qualified teachers were more critical, or that supervisors focus, when they perform this task, on the inexperienced and ill-qualified teachers. Yet the assessments of performance reported by teachers, across all independent variables, were very low compared with the assessments reported by supervisors (except inexperienced supervisors). On the other hand, those assessments of performance were very low when compared with the importance attached to this task by teachers in different categories.

6.1.2   Promoting Teachers' Professional Growth

Instructional supervision exists to improve the quality of student learning through improving instruction. Although knowledge is still limited concerning the effectiveness of various activities for improving learning by improving instruction, there is little room for doubt about the relationship between teacher behaviour and promotion of pupil learning. Consequently, dynamic supervision must be eventually oriented to changing teaching in ways that are perceived to be beneficial.

Respondent teachers and supervisors participating in this study were requested to express their opinions concerning the importance and application of promoting the teachers professional growth. The figures

show that this task was supported by the participants, but infrequently applied. The weight quotient of importance (84.3) ranked the second, while the weight quotient of performance (56.2) ranked the fourth (Table 30). Out of 510 respondents approximately 91.1% marked it either as 'very important' or 'important'. Conversely, only 40.2% were of the opinion that this task was undertaken either 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Table 31). The t value (Table 32) indicates that the difference between ideal and actual responses was significant above the .05 level.

A comparison of both teachers' and supervisors' perceptions concerning the importance and application of this task is presented in table 33. Although both groups agreed that supervisors should promote the teachers' professional growth, more teachers (92.8%) than supervisors (82.1%) considered this task either as 'very important' or 'important'. The Mann-Whitney U test suggests that the difference between the two groups, though narrow, was statistically significant. It appears that teachers are more interested in promoting their professional growth than are the supervisors.

The actual responses reveal a sharp discrepancy between teachers and supervisors concerning the frequency of application. The percentage of supervisors who stated that this task was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent', though relatively low, was nearly twice the percentage of teachers who expressed similar perceptions (66.7% to 35.4%). According to the U test, the difference was both large and statistically significant.

Table 38 displays the ideal and actual responses of teachers in different categories. The table reveals that teachers' ideal responses were independent of personal characteristics. More than 91% of teachers, across almost all independent variables regarded this task either as 'very important' or 'important'. Only for the teachers with higher degrees has the percentage been less than that (78.5%). The weight quotients of importance for different groups of teachers were very close and sometimes almost identical. Differences were not significant.

Concerning the actual responses of teachers the table reveals a contrast. The percentages of teachers who replied that supervisors undertook this task 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent', barely reached 40%. Nevertheless, except between inexperienced and experienced teachers, differences among teachers in other categories were significant. The lowest percentage was that of teachers with higher degrees (14.3%) followed by Qatari and female teachers (26% and 25.7%). The percentages of teachers with the BA degree; primary teachers, experienced teachers, and teachers in the prep-secondary cycle ranged between 32 and 35%, whereas the percentages of male, inexperienced teachers, teachers with non-university qualifications, and non-Qatari teachers were slightly more than 40%.

It seems likely that supervisors in undertaking this task, concentrate on the inexperienced and less qualified teachers because they feel that they are the ones who need help to promote their professional growth. It is also probable that male teachers gave a relatively high assessment of the frequency of application because male

supervisors put more importance on this task, and spend more time performing it. This conclusion finds support in the analysis of supervisors' ideal and actual responses displayed in Table 39.

The table reveals a close agreement between certain groups of supervisors (male, non-Qatari, experienced supervisors, supervisors in prep-secondary cycle, and supervisors with higher degrees) and all groups of teachers on the importance of this task. More than 86% of supervisors in the above categories considered that promoting the teachers professional growth either has 'very important' or 'important'. Female supervisors, supervisors with the BA degree and primary supervisors were also in favour of this task, but to a lesser degree. The percentages of supervisors in the above categories were between 72.5 and 76.5 per cent, while the percentages of Qatari supervisors and inexperienced supervisors, who held similar views were 68.8% and 62.4% respectively. The chi-square test suggests that differences among supervisors, in most categories, were not significant. Only between Qatari and non-Qatari, and between supervisors with higher degrees and supervisors with the BA degree, were the differences significant. It seems that the more experienced and better qualified the supervisor, the more likely he or she is to agree with teachers on the importance of this task. This conclusion is supported by the results displayed in table 40, which shows that the differences between non-Qatari teachers and supervisors, male teachers and supervisors, and experienced teachers and supervisors, concerning the importance of this item, were not significant. Though the difference between teachers and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle appears narrow, it was statistically significant. It is also

interesting that a greater proportion of supervisors with higher degrees (100%) than teachers with higher degrees (78.5%) marked this task either as 'very important' or 'important'. It is possible that better qualified supervisors are more aware of the need of many groups of teachers to promote their professional growth, while teachers with higher degrees do not feel much need for this help because they are already well prepared for the job.

On the other hand, the differences between Qatari teachers and Qatari supervisors, female teachers and female supervisors, teachers and supervisors with the BA degree and inexperienced teachers and supervisors, who held similar convictions, were large and significant. It is possible that inexperienced supervisors feel either that this task is not an essential aspect of their work, or that they are not qualified to undertake it. The figures in Table 39 show that supervisors who put more emphasis on promoting teachers professional growth, also reported high levels of application. According to the chi-square test differences among supervisors in all the above groups were significant at the .05 level or beyond.

Similarly, the differences between teachers and supervisors, in almost all sub-categories, concerning the performance of this task, were significant at the .05 level or above. Only between inexperienced teachers and supervisors, and between primary teachers and supervisors, were the differences not significant (Table 41).

In general, the overwhelming majority of teachers, irrespective of personal characteristics were in favour of this task, which was also

supported by supervisors, particularly male, non-Qatari, experienced supervisors, supervisors with higher degrees, and those in prep-secondary schools.

It can be concluded that teachers, in general, are more interested in 'promoting' their 'professional growth' than are the supervisors. Likewise, it was realized that the more experienced and better qualified the supervisor was, the more he or she was of the opinion that supervisors should frequently undertake this task. It is possible that other supervisors felt that promoting the teachers professional growth was not an essential part of their work, or that they did not feel themselves adequately prepared for it.

The figures on the actual level suggest that teachers felt that supervisors do not make much effort to promote the professional growth of teachers. Even among supervisors, the perceived levels of application were lower than the perceived levels of importance. These results suggest that supervisors should devote more time and effort to this matter. According to the chi-square test, the independent variables have not brought out significant differences among teachers concerning the importance of this task. Similarly, differences among supervisors, in general, were not significant. On the actual level, the responses of teachers were affected by the independent variables. Except between inexperienced and experienced teachers, the differences among teachers in other categories were significant. The independent variables have also affected the actual responses of the supervisors. Differences among supervisors in all categories concerning the application of this task, were significant.

6.1.3   Evaluating and Developing the Curriculum

The role of supervisors in curriculum development stems from the fact that it is difficult and probably disfunctional to separate curriculum and instruction. However the curriculum is defined, instruction is the process by which students are led to encounter the curriculum. A crucial component of teaching is planning the proposed conditions with which students will interact, that is the curriculum. On the other hand, because of changing conditions, curriculum development continues during the instructional process.

Participants in this study were requested to rate this task according to its importance and then according to its application. Compared with other tasks, this one was considered less important and infrequently applied. Both the weight quotient of importance (74.4) and of application (50.8) ranked fifth (Table 30). Approximately 70.4 per cent out of 510 regarded it either as 'very important' or 'important', while only 26.7% replied that it was undertaken either 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Table 31). The difference between the two figures is large as well as statistically significant, according to the t value (Table 32).

The figures in Table 33 indicate that supervisors, in general, put more importance on their role in evaluating and developing curricula, than do the teachers. While 87.2% of supervisors perceived this item either as 'very important' or 'important', only 67.3% of teachers felt the same way. The difference between both groups is significant according to the U test. On the actual level, both groups found this

task was infrequently undertaken. Only 24% of teachers stated that this task was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. Even among supervisors, who emphasized the importance of this item and who usually gave a high assessment of their performance of other tasks, only 41% gave similar responses.

The analysis of teachers' ideal responses given in Table 42, suggests significant differences among teachers according to qualification and experience. Approximately 92.9% of teachers with higher degrees compared to 69.8% of teachers with the BA degree and 60.9% of teachers with non-university qualifications, and 70.7% of experienced teachers compared to 61.3% of inexperienced teachers viewed this task either as 'very important' or 'important'. In comparison, differences among teachers in other groups were not significant. The percentages of teachers in those groups who considered 'the evaluation of curricula' either as 'very important' or 'important' were relatively close. They ranged between 63.9 and 72.4. The figures give the impression that experienced and better qualified teachers are more aware of the supervisors' role in developing and evaluating curricula.

Concerning the application of this task, the figures given in the same table reveal that the actual responses of teachers were not affected by the independent variables. The percentages of teachers, across all categories, who stated that this task was performed 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' ranged between 14.2 and 29. Differences were not significant according to the chi-square test.

As for the supervisors, Table 43 compares the ideal and actual responses of supervisors. The analysis shows that both types of responses were dependent on personal characteristics. Over 94.8 per cent of male, non-Qatari, experienced supervisors, supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle, and supervisors with higher degrees, considered the 'evaluation and development of the curricula' either as 'very important' or 'important'. The percentages of female supervisors and supervisors with the BA degree, who expressed similar views, were 80 and 83.3 respectively, whereas the percentages of Qatari, inexperienced, and primary supervisors were between 66.7 and 73.5. According to the chi-square test, differences among supervisors, in the above groups were significant at the .05 level or above. It could be concluded that while supervisors in all groups, supported the evaluation and development of the curricula, the experienced and the better qualified tended to put greater emphasis on this task.

The figures of the actual responses reveal wide variations. The percentages of supervisors who responded that this task was applied 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' ranged between 0.00 (female supervisors) and 84 (male supervisors). Between these two extremes the reported levels of performance may be grouped into two categories: the percentages of male supervisors (84.2%), supervisors with higher degrees (83.3%), non-Qatari supervisors (60.9%), supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle (56.8%), and experienced supervisors (53.7%), who gave high or relatively moderate assessments, and the percentages of Qatari supervisors (12.5%), inexperienced supervisors (12.5%), primary supervisors (20.6%) and supervisors with the BA degree (28.3%), who gave very low assessments. The percentages of supervisors in the last

group approximate to the percentages of teachers, in different groups. Differences among supervisors, in the above categories were significant.

It is very probable that, although all supervisors are theoretically expected to contribute to the evaluation and development of the curricula, only some of them are officially required to undertake this task. The existence of a special department for the curriculum, with designated personnel for every subject, might explain why supervisors in general do not feel obliged to undertake this task, which they consider the responsibility of the specialists in the curriculum department.

The most interesting figure was that for female supervisors. None of them stated that they undertake this task 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. Slightly more than half of them (52.5%) stated that they did so 'to a little extent', while 47.5% stated that they never contribute to the evaluation and development of the curriculum. This is in sharp contrast to the male supervisors, of whom 84.2% replied that they very frequently undertake this task.

This result suggests that male supervisors are chosen to participate in the process of evaluating and developing the curriculum. This conclusion is supported by a similar conclusion mentioned earlier in chapter four, that is 'female supervisors have an inferior position'. It is not possible to say whether this is due to the lack of experience and qualification, or to the normal status of women in a male-dominated society, or to both factors.

Table 44 shows that differences between male teachers and supervisors, non-Qatari teachers and non-Qatari supervisors, teachers and supervisors with the BA degree, teachers and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle, and experienced teachers and supervisors, concerning the importance of this task were significant, while differences between teachers and supervisors in other sub-categories were not significant. In comparison, differences between teachers and supervisors, in most sub-categories, regarding the application of this task were significant. Only between Qatari teachers and supervisors, primary teachers and supervisors, and inexperienced teachers and supervisors, the differences were not significant, according to the chi-square test (Table 45).

Broadly speaking, this task was accepted but only infrequently applied. Supervisors, particularly male, non-Qatari, experienced, better qualified supervisors, and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle, were more aware of the importance of evaluating and developing curricula. The analysis of actual responses shows a general agreement among teachers that supervisors rarely contribute to the evaluation and developing of curricula. By contrast, the supervisors' actual responses suggest a sharp discrepancy among supervisors. Except for male supervisors and supervisors with higher degrees, the levels of performance reported by other categories of supervisors, particularly female, Qatari, inexperienced and primary supervisors, were very low. This result gives the impression that male and better qualified supervisors are chosen to undertake this task.

6.1.4   Orienting Teachers to Suitable Teaching Methods

The close relationship between curriculum and instruction has already been defined when discussing the last item. If curriculum could be defined as a thoughtful answer to the question 'what should be taught in schools?', then instruction may be defined as an answer to the question: 'How shall it be taught?'. Hence, the importance of the methods of teaching, which contributes to the success of actualizing the curriculum.

The analysis of this item suggests that it was perceived as the most important task by the respondents in this study. The weight quotient of important (88.3) ranked high in the list of tasks. Similarly the weight quotient of application (72.6) ranked first (Table 30). The overwhelming majority of the participants (96.5%) perceived this task either as 'very important' or 'important', and a relatively high percentage (71.2%) of the 510 respondent teachers and supervisors reported that it was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Table 31). Nevertheless, the difference between ideal and actual responses was still significant beyond the .05 level, according to the t value (Table 32).

Table 33 shows that over 95 per cent of both teachers and supervisors marked this item either as 'very important' or 'important'. Though the difference between both groups appeared narrow, it was statistically significant, according to the Mann-Whitney U test. The distribution of responses may explain this situation, for while the majority of supervisors (80%) chose the first option (very important),

only 53% of teachers were of this opinion. None of the supervisors marked the last two options (less important and important), while a number of teachers selected these responses. Concerning the application of this task, the table shows that although teachers reported a relatively high level of performance, differences between them and supervisors, were significant above the .05 level. While 100% of supervisors stated that they very often orient teachers to methods appropriate to subject matter, only 66% of teachers expressed similar beliefs. Whether this high assessment is an exaggeration, or reflects the actual practices of supervisors, is not revealed.

The ideal and actual responses of teachers in different categories are given in Table 46. The table indicates a substantial agreement among teachers, across all independent variables, concerning the importance of this task. More than 94 per cent of teachers in each category, viewed this item either as 'very important' or 'important'. Concerning performance, except for teachers with higher degrees, who reported that this task was rarely undertaken, the percentages of teachers, in other categories, who responded that supervisors very frequently orient teachers to appropriate methods of teaching, were between 58.8 and 76.9%. Differences among teachers in most categories, were not significant. The difference between teachers with higher degrees and teachers with the BA or non-university qualifications, were large as well as statistically significant. There was also a significant difference between teachers in primary and the prep-secondary cycle. The highest levels of application were reported by inexperienced teachers, primary teachers, and teachers with non-university qualifications. This result may indicate that

supervisors when concerning themselves with the orientation of teachers towards suitable methods, focus on the less qualified and less experienced. Certainly these groups of teachers appreciate the efforts of supervisors, in this area, more than do other teachers.

Table 47 shows a general agreement of supervisors, irrespective of personal characteristics, on the importance and application of this item. All supervisors, in all categories, considered that orienting teachers to appropriate methods either as 'very important' or 'important'. Likewise, all of them responded that they perform this item 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. Supervisors clearly believe that they regularly perform what is expected from them. Differences among supervisors, concerning the importance and performance of this task, were not significant.

On the other hand, differences between teachers and supervisors in almost all sub-categories, concerning the importance and application of this task were significant according to the chi-square test (Tables 48 and 49).

In sum, the analysis of ideal and actual responses put this task the first in importance and application. The overwhelming majority of participants, regardless of personal characteristics, considered that supervisors should frequently orient teachers to appropriate methods. It seems that participants thought that this task, more than any other task, was directly related to effective instruction. Differences among supervisors and also among teachers, concerning the importance of this

task, were not significant. While differences among supervisors regarding its performance were not significant, there were significant differences among teachers only in two categories. Inexperienced teachers and teachers with the non-university qualifications, found the efforts of supervisors, in this area, satisfactory.

6.1.5   Developing Human Relations in Schools

The literature on supervision in Qatar considered 'developing human relations in schools' as one of the essential tasks of supervisors. This task comprises encouraging teachers to know and value each other, providing opportunities for social interaction, and seeking to develop a permissive atmosphere, in which personal freedom to express a point of view or an idea is protected and in which people attempt to share personal feelings and ideas and to understand other persons, feelings and ideas.

The weight quotient of importance for this function (78.7) ranked fourth, while the weight quotient of application (56.2) ranked third (Table 30). Approximately 81.2 of the respondents regarded this item either as 'very important' or 'important'. On the contrary, only 39.8% percent considered that supervisors undertook it 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Table 31). The differences between perceived levels of importance and application is significant beyond the .05 level (Table 32).

Table 33 compares the ideal and actual responses of both teachers and supervisors, and indicates a close agreement on the importance of this task. Though a difference between both groups did exist, it was statistically not significant. Nearly 79.6% of teachers compared to 89.8% of supervisors marked this item either as 'very important' or 'important'.

The distribution of actual responses reveals the contrast. Proportionally more supervisors (74.4%) than teachers (33.5%) replied that this task was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. The difference between the two groups concerning the performance of this task appears large and statistically significant, according to the U test.

Teachers' responses concerning the importance and performance of this function are given in Table 50. The table shows that the ideal responses were dependent on qualification and experience. As the qualification and experience of teachers increase they tend to attach greater importance to developing human relations in school. All teachers with higher degrees compared to 79.8% of teachers with the BA degree and 77.6% of teachers with non-university qualifications viewed this task either as 'very important' or 'important'. Similarly, 83.8% of experienced teachers compared to 72.3 per cent of inexperienced teachers, felt the same way. According to the chi-square test, the differences between teachers in each of the above two groups, were significant at the .05 level or above. More primary teachers than teachers in the prep-secondary cycle (83.5 to 76.7%), more female than male teachers (81.5 to 77.5%) and more Qatari than non-Qatari teachers

(82.5 to 77.7%) considered this task either as 'very important' or 'important'. Yet differences were relatively small and statistically not significant.

Concerning the performance of this task, teachers' responses were not affected by the independent variables. Regardless of personal characteristics, teachers believe that supervisors rarely seek to develop human relations in schools. The percentages of teachers who stated that supervisors undertook this task 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' ranged between 32 and 37.8. As in many cases, better qualified teachers were more critical. Only 14.3% of them held similar convictions. Differences among teachers, in all categories, were not significant.

Table 51 shows that over 79.1% of supervisors, in all categories, perceived that developing human relations either as 'very important' or 'important'. Except between primary supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle, the differences among supervisors in other categories, were not significant. The actual responses suggest that supervisors, in general, thought that they spent a great deal of time on a task which they believe to be important. The responses were independent of personal characteristics except qualification. All supervisors with higher degrees compared to 66.7 percent of supervisors with the BA degree responded that this task is undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'.

According to the chi-square test, differences between teachers and supervisors concerning the importance of developing human relations in

school were not significant, except between non-Qatari teachers and supervisors and between teachers and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle. A greater proportion of non-Qatari supervisors than non-Qatari teachers (95.6 to 77.7%) and proportionally more supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle than teachers in this cycle (97.7 to 76.7%) regarded this item either as 'very important' or 'important' (Table 52). On the contrary, the figures given in Table 53 indicate a substantial disagreement between teachers and supervisors, in different sub-categories, concerning the performance of this function. While teachers, in all groups, reported relatively low levels of application, all supervisors considered that they devoted some attention to this task, though there were differences among the groups concerning the amount of time which they spent on it.

In sum, the overwhelming majority of the participants in this study agreed that supervisors should seek to develop human relations in schools. The teachers' ideal responses varied according to qualification and experience. As the experience and qualification of teachers increase they were more likely to emphasize the importance of this task. Supervisors' ideal responses were dependent only on the teaching cycle. Supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle more than primary supervisors attached particular importance to this function. The figures show that supervisors who put more importance on the 'developing of human relations' also reported that they spent more time on this task. Relatively big differences according to nationality, sex, experience and qualification, did exist, but were not significant except between better qualified and less-qualified supervisors. It appears that better qualified supervisors are more likely to give a

high priority to the performance of this task. As far as teachers are concerned, lower levels of performance were reported. The independent variables have not brought out significant differences among teachers. It is clear that teachers would wish supervisors to devote more time to developing human relations in schools.

6.1.6   Encouraging Teachers to Innovate

Though the literature on supervision in Qatar attached particular importance to this task, it was the least supported, as well as the least performed, according to the participants in this study. The weight quotient of importance (70.7) and the weight quotient of application (46.5) ranked it at the bottom of the list (Table 30). Out of the 510 respondents, only 65.3% considered this task either as 'very important' or 'important', while only 21.4% stated that it was frequently undertaken (Table 31). The difference between the desired and actual practices, was also large and significant (Table 32). The relatively low level of importance and of application may be an indication that in the schools of Qatar, conformity rather than innovation is encouraged. New procedures or methods may be easily interpreted as violations of the rules.

The ideal and actual responses of teachers and supervisors are given in Table 33. The analysis of ideal responses shows that a large percentage of supervisors (82) viewed this task either as 'very important' or 'important'. A fairly high proportion of teachers (62.2%), but less than that of supervisors, also gave a similar response. According to the U test the difference between both groups'

responses is significant at the .01 level. The figures give the impression that supervisors, in general, recognize the importance attached to this task in the literature, more than do the teachers. It is possible that teachers feel that innovation is neither to their advantage nor within their capacity.

The distribution of actual responses shows that both teachers and supervisors agree that this task is only infrequently performed. Only 17.3 per cent of teachers stated that supervisors frequently encourage teachers to innovate. Even among supervisors only 43.6% held similar convictions. Nevertheless, the difference between teachers and supervisors responses was large as well as statistically significant. It seems that supervisors, although they were in favour of this task, admitted that they rarely performed it. It is also probably that, due to administrative requirements, supervisors prefer conformity to innovation.

Teachers' ideal and actual responses are shown in Table 54. With the exception of teachers with higher degrees who strongly favoured this function, teachers in other categories gave relatively low priority to its importance. According to the chi-square test, differences were not significant except between better qualified and less qualified teachers and experienced and inexperienced teachers. Teachers' actual responses, given in the same table, indicate a general agreement among teachers, regardless of their personal characteristics, that supervisors rarely 'encourage innovation'. The percentages of

teachers who replied that this task is undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' ranged between 7 and 20. Differences were not significant.

Supervisors' responses concerning the desired and present status of this function are given in table 55. The figures reveal that the importance which supervisors attached to this task was in direct proportion to their qualification and professional experience. Over 94% of non-Qatari, male, experienced, better qualified supervisors, and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle considered that supervisors should encourage innovation. In comparison, the percentages of supervisors in other groups were between 50 and 70. According to the chi-square test, differences among supervisors, across all independent variables, were significant at the .05 level or above.

Although supervisors usually report high levels of application to their work, they gave a relatively low assessment of their commitment to encouraging teachers to innovate. The percentages of supervisors who replied that this task was applied 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' ranged between 28.2 and 66.7%. The responses were independent of all variables except the teaching cycle. A greater proportion of supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle (52.3%) than primary supervisors (32.4%) replied that they frequently undertook this task. The difference is large and statistically significant. Although differences among supervisors in other categories appear large, they were not statistically significant.

Table 56 shows significant differences between teachers and supervisors in a number of categories concerning the importance of this item. More male supervisors than male teachers (94.8 to 65%), a greater proportion of experienced supervisors than experienced teachers (96.3 to 66.7%), and more supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle than teachers in this cycle (95.4 to 60.8%) regarded this item either as 'very important' or 'important'. Differences between teachers and supervisors in other sub-categories were not significant. In contrast, the differences between teachers and supervisors in almost all categories, concerning the application of this task, were significant. Only between Qatari teachers and supervisors, was the difference not significant (Table 57).

It is possible to conclude that, compared with other tasks, this was not strongly supported by most participants. Certain groups of supervisors, particularly the more experienced and better qualified showed more awareness of the importance of encouraging teachers to innovate. This view was also shared by better qualified teachers. Other categories of teachers and supervisors gave a low assessment to the importance of this task, which of all tasks had the lowest level of application. This result supports the conclusion that conformity rather than innovation is emphasized in the schools of Qatar. The independent variables have brought out significant differences among supervisors in all categories concerning the importance of this function. Conversely teachers' ideal response were not affected by the independent variable except only in two categories. In comparison, teachers' actual responses were independent of all variables, while the supervisors' actual views were dependent only on the teaching cycle.

The results support the conclusion that supervisors in Qatar are interested in ensuring that teachers comply with organizational demands or achieve organizational goals, rather than in encouraging them to be innovative.

6.1.7   Conclusion

The participants were requested to rate six selected supervisory tasks, first according to their perceived degree of importance, and second according to their perceived frequency of application, on two 4-point scales. The first scale was concerned with the ideal responses, or the role expectations, while the second was concerned with the actual responses, or the role performance.

The six tasks, cited in the questionnaire, were: to clarify the aims of education, to promote teachers' professional growth, to contribute to the evaluation and development of curricula, to orient teachers towards appropriate methods to subject matter, to develop human relations in schools and to encourage teachers to innovate.

All the six tasks were supported in some degree by the participants. The weight quotients of importance were 83.8, 84.3, 74.4, 88.3, 78.7 and 70.7 respectively. The mean of the weight quotients was 80. According to the above weight quotients of importance, the rank order of the six tasks would be:

- to orient teachers to suitable teaching methods;
- to promote teachers' professional growth;

- to clarify the aims of education;

- to develop human relations in schools;

- to contribute to the evaluation and development of the curriculum; and

- to encourage teachers to innovate.

When the six tasks are rated by the teachers alone, the above order remains the same. But when rated by supervisors they took the following order:

- to orient teachers to suitable teaching methods;

- to clarify the aims of education;

- to contribute to the evaluation and development of the curriculum;

- to develop human relations in schools;

- to promote teachers' professional growth; and

- to encourage teachers to innovate.

It can be concluded that, though both teachers and supervisors generally agree on the importance of the six tasks, they do not agree on the priorities that should be attached to them. Both groups agree that 'orienting teachers to suitable teaching methods' is the most important task. Both groups agree that 'encouraging teachers to innovate' is the least important tasks, and that 'developing human relations in schools' is the 4th in importance.

Beyond this agreement, sharp contrasts are revealed. Teachers considered that 'promoting teachers' professional growth' was the second in importance while supervisors put it as the fifth. Teachers

were of the opinion that 'clarifying the aims of education' was the third in importance, while supervisors put it the second. 'The evaluation and development of the curriculum' was the 5th in importance, according to teachers, while it was considered the 3rd by supervisors (Table 58). As far as role performance is concerned, the findings show that both groups agree that 'orienting teachers to suitable methods' was the most frequently applied task, and both groups considered 'clarifying the aims of education' as the second in application.

Apart from this agreement the data show that teachers perceived 'promoting teachers' professional growth' as the third in application, while supervisors perceived it the fourth. By contrast, 'developing human relations' was perceived by teachers as the fourth, while it was perceived by the supervisors as the third in application. 'Contributing to the evaluation and development of the curriculum' was considered by the supervisors as the least applied, while it ranked the fifth, in the opinion of the teachers. Conversely, teachers considered that 'encouraging innovation' was the least applied, while it was ranked fifth, in the opinion of the supervisors.

However, within the ranks of teachers and supervisors different rank orders of importance and performance can be identified (see tables 59 and 60).

Role Expectations and Role Performance

The data show that there was a significant discrepancy between role expectations and role performance. This conclusion is based on the large differences between the weight quotients of importance and the weight quotients of application. The mean of weight quotients of importance was 80, while the mean of weight quotients of application was 56.7. The differences between the weight quotients of importance and the weight quotients of application, in the teachers' responses, in particular, were large. Only one weight quotient of application seems fairly high (68.9). Other weight quotients were between 44 and 55. In contrast the weight quotients of importance ranged between 72.5 and 87. The mean of weight quotients of importance for teachers, was 79.3, while the mean of weight quotients of application was 54.2. According to supervisors, the weight quotients of importance ranged between 77.2 and 95.1, while the weight quotients of application were between 59 and 93.2. The mean of weight quotients of importance was 83.7, while the mean of weight quotients of application was 71.3. Similarly, the correlation coefficient (table 199) shows weak relations between participants' ideal and actual responses. However, the correlation coefficients (tables 202 and 203) suggest that the relations between supervisors' ideal and actual responses were, in general, stronger than the relations between teachers' ideal and actual responses.

It is clear that while teachers and supervisors agree, in general, on the role expectations for supervisors, they disagree in their assessment of the role performance. While teachers gave low assessments of the perceived frequency of application of five tasks out of six, and a relatively moderate assessment of the remaining task, supervisors gave a very high assessment of frequency of application of one task, a

moderate assessment of frequency of application of three tasks, and low assessments of the frequency of application of two tasks. The discrepancy between role expectation and role performance, which those findings reveal, is important and should clearly be a matter of concern to the authorities.

The Effects of Independent Variables

Within the two main groups (teachers and supervisors), different sub-groups, whose perceptions were considerably at variance, could be identified. In general, non-Qatari, male, experienced, better qualified supervisors, and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle, appear as one group. They usually attached more importance to each task, and gave relatively high assessments of the performance. In comparison, Qatari, female, primary, inexperienced supervisors, and supervisors with the BA degree, were usually inclined towards the lower options on both scales. This is true for all tasks, except the fourth (to orient teachers to suitable methods), which was emphasized by all supervisors, irrespective of their personal characteristics. There was agreement both on its importance and its application.

With respect to teachers, there was a general agreement among them, on the degree of importance of the six tasks. The group which most frequently shows significant differences from the rest, is the teachers with higher degrees. In most cases, the percentages of experienced teachers, were very close to the percentages of teachers with higher degrees. It is apparent that experienced and better qualified teachers appear in many cases as one group. In the light of these findings it seems reasonable to conclude that different groups of teachers require different services from the supervisors. For example,

the long experienced and better qualified teachers do not feel in need of further professional growth, and they would like to see their supervisors paying more attention to other tasks such as 'evaluating and developing curriculum', developing human relations, and providing opportunities for innovation. In comparison, inexperienced and less qualified teachers would wish the supervisors to give greater assistance in promoting their professional growth. All groups of teachers were in favour of the task most directly related to the teaching process, that is 'orienting teachers to suitable methods'. On the actual levels, teachers in general tend to give a low assessment of the role importance of supervisors. But the more experienced and better qualified teachers were particularly critical.

SECTION II

Degree of Importance and Frequency of Application of

12 Selected Supervisory Activities

6.2.0   Introduction

The first part of the questionnaire was concerned with six selected supervisory tasks. The data arising from that part has been presented and analyzed in the preceding section. The present section is devoted to the analysis of the data arising from the second part of the questionnaire, which is concerned with 12 selected supervisory activities. As with the supervisory tasks, the respondents were requested to rate 12 items, considered to be important activities of supervisors, first according to their perceived level of importance and then according to their frequency of application, on two 4-point category scales. The first scale ranges from the highest 'very important' to the lowest 'not important', while the other ranges from the highest 'to a great extent' to the lowest 'not at all'. Each item will be taken at a time and analyzed using the same statistical techniques. The discussions of the 12 items will follow the order in which they appeared in the questionnaire, irrespective of their rank order of importance or application. Activities are defined as the basic units of behaviour purposefully applied to accomplish some specific task-relevant outcomes. Ben Harris (1985) called them the 'tools of the trade', while tasks are viewed as 'operational goals'.

6.2.1   Providing Materials and Facilities

Designing or re-designing and equipping facilities for instruction, selecting and obtaining appropriate materials for use in implementing curriculum, previewing, evaluating, designing and otherwise finding ways of providing appropriate materials are included in this area.

This activity was moderately supported and infrequently applied, as perceived by the participants in this study. Both the weight quotient of importance (71.1) and of application (49.6) ranked seventh (Table 62). Approximately 67.9 per cent of participants marked it either as 'very important' or 'important', while only 26.5% replied that it was applied 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. The majority of respondents selected the last two options of performance, 'to a little extent' and 'not at all' (Table 63). According to the t value the difference between the ideal and actual responses was significant beyond the .05 level (Table 64).

Table 65 presents the ideal and actual responses of both teachers and supervisors and reveals large differences between the groups concerning the importance and performance of this item. While nearly 88.8% of supervisors considered that 'providing facilities and materials' as a 'very important' or 'important' activity, only 65.5% of teachers felt the same way. It is possible that teachers thought that this activity was not directly related to effective instruction, or that it could be done by the administrative staff or other departments. There was a substantial disagreement between both groups concerning the

performance of this item, although both reported low levels of performance. Approximately 55.1% of supervisors compared with 21.3% of teachers responded that this activity was frequently applied. According to the U test the differences between teachers' and supervisors' responses concerning the desired and present status were significant above the .05 level.

Teachers' ideal and actual responses are given in Table 66. It is clear that teachers' ideal responses were dependent on teaching cycle and experience. More teachers from the primary cycle (73.2%) than teachers from the prep-secondary cycle (59.6%), and more experienced teachers (70.4%) than inexperienced teachers (56.8%) considered 'providing facilities and materials' either 'very important' or 'important'. According to the chi-square test the differences among teachers in each of the above two groups were significant at the .05 level. It is interesting that primary teachers agreed with the experienced teachers in their assessment of the importance of this activity, although, in most cases, they appear identical with the inexperienced teachers. This applies also to the teachers in the prep-secondary cycle who shared with the inexperienced teachers their view concerning the importance of this activity, although they usually appear identical with the experienced teachers.

Teachers' responses concerning the performance of this activity, show that supervisors rarely seek to undertake it. The percentages of teachers who stated that supervisors frequently 'provide materials', ranged between 14.3 and 23.9, and sometimes were almost identical.

Differences were not significant except between Qatari and non-Qatari teachers, and even there the difference was not large.

Table 67 compares supervisors' ideal and actual responses. The analysis of ideal responses indicates a substantial agreement among supervisors on the importance of this activity. More than 80 per cent of female, male, non-Qatari, better qualified, experienced supervisors, and supervisors in prep-secondary schools were of the opinion that this item was 'very important' or 'important'. The percentages of Qatari, primary supervisors, and supervisors with the BA degree were 71.9, 76.5 and 75 respectively. The lowest perceived degree of importance was that of the inexperienced supervisors (66.6). It could be concluded that as the qualification and experience of the supervisor increase, he or she is more likely to attach particular importance to providing materials and facilities. It is possible that inexperienced and less qualified supervisors considered that this activity was time consuming, and that they would rather pay attention to other activities, which are, in their opinion, more important. Though large differences did occur, they were statistically not significant.

The table reveals moderate levels of performance. The percentages of supervisors, who reported that they very often 'provide materials and facilities', ranged between 50 and 61.8, except supervisors with higher degrees, for whom the percentage was 77.8. Differences among supervisors, across almost all independent variables, were not significant according to the chi-square test. There was a statistically significant, though narrow, difference between primary and prep-secondary supervisors. More primary supervisors than

supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle, stated that they very frequently undertook this activity. It is probable that the teaching staffs in the primary schools need help more than their colleagues in the prep-secondary cycle.

A cross-tabulation of occupation with other independent variables shows that differences between teachers and supervisors, in most categories, concerning the importance of this item, were not significant. There were significant differences only between non-Qatari teachers and non-Qatari supervisors, between teachers and supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle, and finally between experienced teachers and supervisors (Table 68).

In contrast, Table 69 shows a high level of divergence between teachers and supervisors, across all independent variables, concerning the application of this activity. While the percentages of teachers who reported that supervisors very frequently 'provide facilities and materials' ranged between 14.3 and 23.9, the percentages of supervisors who expressed similar perceptions were between 48.3 and 77.8. Chi-square test exceeded the .05 level of significance.

In sum, the figures give the impression that 'providing facilities and materials' is an activity, which was moderately supported by teachers, but strongly favoured by the vast majority of supervisors in most categories, particularly the non-Qatari, experienced, and better qualified supervisors. Teachers with higher degrees held similar convictions, while inexperienced supervisors shared with most teachers their moderate assessment of the importance of this activity.

Teachers' ideal responses were affected only by the teaching cycle and experience. Primary teachers more than teachers in the prep-secondary cycle, and experienced than inexperienced teachers considered that supervisors should frequently 'provide facilities and materials'. In comparison, supervisors' ideal responses were independent of all variables.

On the actual level, teachers' responses were independent of all personal characteristics, except nationality. Although both Qatari and non-Qatari teachers gave a very low assessment of performance, the difference between the groups was significant. Concerning supervisors' actual responses, there were no significant differences, except between primary supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle.

6.2.2   Demonstration Lessons

According to the participants in this study, demonstration lessons were among the least important and the least applied activities. In both weight quotients of importance and application (66.8 and 37.4% respectively) it ranked the eleventh (Table 62). Slightly more than half the participants (55.7%) rated it either as 'very important' or 'important', while only 3% considered that it was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. Approximately 43.1 per cent stated that it was undertaken 'to a little extent', while more than half the respondents (53.9%) stated that it had never taken place (Table 63). The t value (Table 64) indicates significant differences between the importance and frequency of application of this activity.

Teachers' and supervisors' ideal and actual responses are presented and compared in Table 65. The table shows that supervisors more than teachers emphasized the importance of the 'demonstration lessons'. While about two thirds of supervisors marked this item either as 'very important' or 'important', only 53.4% of teachers were of this opinion.

According to the U test, the difference between teachers' and supervisors' responses was significant at the .05 level. Both groups reported very low levels of performance. Approximately 11.6 per cent of supervisors compared to 1.4 per cent of teachers reported that this activity was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. The difference, between the groups, was significant.

Table 70 presents the ideal and actual responses of teachers. The analysis of ideal response shows that inexperienced and less qualified teachers were of the opinion that supervisors should frequently give demonstration lessons. Nearly 71% of the former and 67.3% of the latter regarded this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. In comparison, the percentages of teachers in other groups, who gave similar responses, ranged between 43.6 and 60.4, except for teachers with higher degrees for whom the percentage was only 21.4. The figures suggest that those two categories of teachers feel more need for demonstration lessons. According to the chi-square test there were significant differences only between in-experienced and experienced teachers, and between less qualified and better qualified teachers.

The distribution of the actual responses reveals a general agreement among teachers that supervisors rarely perform this activity. Differences were not significant. A number of teachers reported that sometimes 'demonstration lessons' are given by teachers in the presence of supervisors and other teachers.

Large, although statistically not significant differences, occurred among supervisors in different categories (Table 71). More than 70 per cent of male, non-Qatari, primary, better qualified, and experienced supervisors considered this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. The percentages of supervisors in other groups, who held similar beliefs, ranged between 58.4 and 65.9. It is noticeable that more supervisors from the primary cycle than supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle (70.6 to 65.9%) attached particular importance to this item. This result could be related to the fact that teachers in the primary cycle are in general, less qualified and less-experienced than teachers in the prep-secondary cycle, and therefore are more in need of demonstration lessons.

Supervisors, in general, agree on the low frequency of application of this activity. According to the chi-square test, differences were not significant, except between male and female supervisors. It is noticeable that primary supervisors, who typically gave low assessments of performance for other activities, reported a relatively high level of performance for this activity.

A cross-tabulation of occupation with all other independent variables, indicates that differences between teachers and supervisors,

across almost all sub-categories, concerning the importance of this activity were not significant. There were large as well as significant differences only between non-Qatari teachers and non-Qatari supervisors, between teachers and supervisors with higher degrees, and finally between experienced teachers and supervisors (Table 72). Another cross-tabulation (Table 73) suggests significant differences between teachers and supervisors in most categories concerning performance despite the fact that both teachers and supervisors in all groups, reported very low levels of performance.

In conclusion, this activity was among the least favoured and also one of the least frequently undertaken. Contrary to the researcher's expectations, supervisors, particularly male, non-Qatari, experienced, primary and better qualified supervisors, supported this activity more than did the teachers. Among teachers, it was supported by the inexperienced and the less qualified teachers. This result may reflect the needs of these two groups of teachers.

In sum, teachers and supervisors, irrespective of personal characteristics, gave a very low assessment of the supervisors' efforts in this area, despite statistically significant differences between the groups. The moderate level of importance, and the low degree of application may be attributed to the fact that demonstrating is time consuming. It needs detailed plans and specific arrangements, which make it uneconomical. From another point of view, the artificality of 'demonstrating' makes it less practical and less accepted. However, the involvement of the observer and interaction with the demonstrator, good follow-up activities, and the avoidance of artificiality, can make the demonstration lesson a valuable exercise.

6.2.3   Organizing for Instruction

Grouping of students, planning class schedules, assigning spaces, allocating time for instruction, and arranging for teaching teams are examples of the kind of work involved in this activity. That is to say making arrangements whereby pupils, staff, space, and materials are related to instructional objectives in a coordinated and efficient way.

This activity was among the most favoured by the participants in this study. The weight quotient of importance (79.1) put it the third. The vast majority of respondents (85.1%) perceived it either as 'very important' or 'important'. Although the weight quotient of application (59.2) put it the fourth, less than half the participants (45.9%) stated that it was frequently applied (Tables 62 and 63). According to the t value (Table 64) the difference between the degree of importance and the frequency of application was significant.

Table 65 reveals that the vast majority of teachers (83.4%) and of supervisors (94.8%) were in favour of this activity. Nevertheless, the difference between both groups' ideal responses, was significant above the .05 level according to the Mann-Whitney U test. The table suggests a substantial discrepancy between the groups concerning the application of this activity. While more than 84.6 per cent of supervisors stated that they very frequently organize for instruction, only 38.9% of teachers expressed a similar perception. The difference is large as well as statistically significant according to the U test.

The figures set out in Table 74 indicate a general agreement among teachers, across all independent variables, on the importance of this activity. More than 78.7 per cent of teachers in all groups considered that supervisors should 'organize for teaching'. Differences in general, were not significant, except between experienced and inexperienced teachers, and between teachers from the primary and the prep-secondary cycle. Proportionally more inexperienced than experienced teachers (91.6 to 78.7 per cent) marked this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. Although the percentages of teachers in the primary and prep-secondary cycle, who had similar beliefs, were close (81.8 to 84.5 per cent) the difference between the two groups was statistically significant. On the actual level, the figures in the same table show that teachers viewed supervisors as less interested in organizing for teaching. The percentages of teachers in different groups, who replied that this activity was frequently undertaken, ranged between 21.4 and 49.1. The responses were independent of all variables except experience. A greater proportion of inexperienced teachers (49.1%) than experienced teaches (33.2%) stated that this activity was applied 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'.

Supervisors' responses concerning the desired and present status of this activity are presented in Table 75. The figures show that supervisors agree with teachers on the importance of this item. Over 77.7 per cent of supervisors, in different categories, considered the organizing for instruction either as 'very important' or 'important'. This result gives the impression that teachers and supervisors viewed this activity as very much associated with effective teaching.

Supervisors also reported high levels of performance. 82 per cent of supervisors, in all categories, reported that this activity was applied 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. The percentages were very close and the differences were not significant. This result shows that supervisors thought that they spent much time on an activity which they believe to be important.

A cross-tabulation of occupation with all other independent variables, reveals that while there was a high level of convergence between teachers and supervisors, in almost all sub-categories, regarding the importance of this activity, there was a high level of divergence concerning its application (Table 76).

In sum, despite statistically significant differences, both teachers and supervisors, irrespective of personal characteristics, put particular emphasis on this activity. It can be concluded that the respondents believed that it is directly related to effective teaching. The figures given in the tables reveal a substantial disagreement between teachers and supervisors, across all sub-categories, regarding the frequency of application. The high levels of importance reported by supervisors, were matched by high levels of performance. On the contrary, there was a wide gulf between perceived levels of importance and the application reported by teachers.

6.2.4   Administrative and Clerical Work

This activity is characterized by endeavours that are indirectly related to instruction. These are the coordinating, facilitating and

controlling which characterize the work of principals and other
Ministry officials. Supervisors are supposed to do some administrative
and clerical work, in the same way as principals are supposed to assume
supervisory functions.

In the opinion of the participants in this study, clerical and
administrative work is the least important activity. The weight
quotient of importance (63) ranked at the bottom of the list of
activities. It was perceived either as 'very important' or 'important'
by 46.4 per cent of the participants. In striking contrast, it was
considered among the most applied activities. The weight quotient of
application (73.2) ranked it the third. Approximately 77.1% of the
participants responded that it was undertaken 'to a great extent' or
'to some extent' (Tables 62 and 63). The t value shows that the
difference between the degree of importance and the frequency of
application of this activity was significant beyond the .05 level
(Table 64).

Table 65 shows that the ideal responses were dependent on the
occupation of the participants. A greater proportion of supervisors
(70.5%) than teachers (42.1%) considered that supervisors should
frequently perform administrative and clerical work. Similarly, more
supervisors (88.5%) than teachers (75%) replied that this activity was
frequently applied. According to the Mann-Whitney U test, differences
between teachers and supervisors concerning the degree of importance
and the frequency of application, were significant above the .05 level.
However, it is noticeable that supervisors reported a degree of
application, which exceeds their perceived level of importance. This

means that supervisors thought that they spent more time undertaking administrative and clerical work than they considered it deserved. Teachers' perceived level of application was also more than their perceived level of importance. It could be concluded that while teachers and supervisors differ on the degree of importance of this item, both groups have high, though different, assessments of application. It is likely that supervisors' high level of performance is the result of their official mandate rather than their convictions.

Teachers' responses concerning the desired and present status of this item are presented in Table 77. The analysis shows that the ideal responses were affected by the qualification and the teaching cycle. While 40.4 per cent of teachers with non-university qualifications and 45.4% of teachers with the BA degree viewed 'administrative and clerical work' either as 'very important' or 'important', none of the teachers with higher degrees felt the same way. The vast majority of this category of teachers (78.6%) considered this item as 'less important'. The table also shows that more teachers in the prep-secondary cycle than in the primary cycle, (47.7 to 34.8) held similar views. According to the chi-square test, differences among teachers in the above two groups were significant at the .05 level. The percentages of teachers in other groups were relatively close. They ranged between 38.4 and 45.8. Differences were narrow and statistically not significant. The figures in the same table show that the percentages of teachers, in all categories, who replied that supervisors frequently perform administrative and clerical work were close. They ranged between 71.2 and 77.4. Nevertheless, significant, though narrow, differences related to qualification and teaching cycle were revealed.

The figures set out in table 78 indicate a wide variance in supervisors' ideal responses. Proportionally more Qatari than non-Qatari supervisors (87.5 to 58.7%), a greater proportion of primary supervisors than supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle (94.2 to 52.2%), and more inexperienced than experienced supervisors (95.9 to 59.3%) were of the opinion that 'administrative and clerical work' is an 'important' or 'very important' activity. Differences among supervisors in the above groups were large as well as statistically significant.

The distribution of actual responses shows that the high levels of frequency of application reported by Qatari, female, primary, inexperienced supervisors, and supervisors with the BA degree, were congruent with the high degree of importance. The vast majority of supervisors in the above groups (more than 90%) replied that this activity was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. Conversely, the high levels of performance reported by non-Qatari, male, better qualified, experienced supervisors, and supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle, were inconsistent with the moderate levels of importance. Over 81 per cent of supervisors in the above categories responded that they frequently perform 'administrative and clerical work'. This means that certain groups of supervisors were undertaking an activity which they favoured, while other groups of supervisors spent must time on an activity which they did not consider to be particularly important.

This conclusion supports the interpretation mentioned earlier, that supervisors are officially expected to do 'administrative and

clerical work'. Differences among supervisors concerning the application of this activity were not significant, except between supervisors from the primary and prep-secondary cycle. 97.1 per cent of the former compared to 81.8% of the latter replied that they frequently undertook this activity.

A cross-tabulation of occupation with all other independent variables reveals significant differences between teachers and supervisors, in almost all sub-categories, regarding the importance of this item except between non-Qatari teachers and non-Qatari supervisors, and between teachers and supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle. Conversely, differences between teachers and supervisors, concerning the performance of this activity, were not significant except between Qatari teachers and supervisors, female teachers and supervisors, primary teachers and supervisors and between inexperienced teachers and supervisors (Tables 79 and 80).

In sum, there was a substantial disagreement among participants concerning the importance of 'administrative and clerical work'. While this activity was the least supported by teachers, it was moderately supported by certain categories of supervisors and strongly favoured by other categories. It seems that teachers perceived this activity as only remotely related to effective teaching. However, both groups replied that it was among the most applied activities. It is clear that teachers, irrespective of their personal characteristics, thought that their supervisors were interested in 'administrative and clerical work' which they did not regard as of much value. Male, non-Qatari, experienced and better qualified supervisors, though viewing this

activity as important, reported a frequency of application disproportionate to its degree of importance. Other groups of supervisors believed that they were devoting their time to a worthwhile activity.

6.2.5 Evaluating the Teaching/Learning Process

The evaluation of teachers' performance as well as determining the school's effectiveness in achieving preferred outcomes, is an appropriate task for instructional supervision. The results of the evaluation can be used as a basis for planned improvement, for reporting educational outcomes to the community, and as a way of justifying the need for additional resources.

According to the participants in this study this activity is the most important. Its weight quotient (86.1) ranked at the top of the list of activities. Its weight quotient of performance (74.2) ranked the second (Table 62). Nearly 92.5% of the participants considered 'the evaluation of the teaching/learning process', either as 'very important' or 'important'. In comparison, 74.3% replied that it was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Table 63). Despite a fairly high level of performance, the difference between the degree of importance and frequency of application was significant above the .05 level (Table 64).

Teachers' and supervisors' responses regarding the importance and application of this activity are compared in table 65. The figures show that teachers and supervisors agreed upon the importance of this

activity. The overwhelming majority of supervisors (98.7%) and of teachers (91.4%) considered that the 'evaluation of the teaching/ learning process', as a 'very important' or 'important' activity. According to the U test, the difference, though narrow, was statistically significant. Regarding the frequency of application, the difference was large as well as statistically significant. While all supervisors stated that they very frequently undertook this activity, only 69.7% of teachers gave a similar assessment.

Table 81 indicates a general agreement among teachers on the importance of this activity. Over 89.7 per cent of teachers, across almost all independent variables, rated it either as 'very important' or 'important'. Differences were not significant except between male and female teachers, and this difference was not large. The distribution of actual responses reveals the contrast. Three independent variables (sex, qualification and the teaching cycle), have resulted in significant differences among teachers concerning the actual status of this item. It is clear that male teachers more than female teachers (73.4 to 66.1 per cent), a greater proportion of teachers with non-university qualifications than teachers, with the BA or higher degrees (81.4, 64.2 and 42.8 respectively), and proportionally more teachers from the primary cycle than teachers from the prep-secondary cycle (81.8 to 60.4 per cent) stated that supervisors very frequently undertook the activity of evaluating the teaching/learning process. Differences among teachers in the above groups were large and statistically significant. It is clear that the highest levels of performance were reported by teachers in the primary cycle and the teachers with non-university qualifications, followed by

the Qatari, male and inexperienced teachers. This finding gives the impression that either teachers in these groups who very often appear as one group, are more conscious of supervisors' work in evaluation or that supervisors focus on the primary cycle, where most inexperienced, less qualified, and Qatari teachers work. The primary cycle is viewed as the crucial level of the educational system in Qatar. Essentially though, the less qualified and inexperienced teachers are concentrated there. It is probable, then, that 'the teaching/learning process' in this cycle needs more evaluation. But it is interesting that the female teachers reported lower levels of performance than males, which suggest that the work of male supervisors in 'evaluating the teaching/learning process' is more obvious.

However, supervisors' responses, concerning the actual and the desired status of this item, were not related to independent variables (Table 82). An examination of the two lower options on both scales of importance and application suggests that this activity was important as well as frequently undertaken. None of the supervisors selected the lower two options on the scale of performance, while only one supervisor selected the 'less important' choice on the scale of importance. According to the chi-square test, differences among supervisors were not significant. It could be concluded that while supervisors, irrespective of their personal characteristics, believed that their efforts to 'evaluate the teaching/learning process' were in direct proportion to the importance they attached to this activity, only certain groups of teachers held similar views.

A cross-tabulation of occupation with all independent variables, reveals significant differences between teachers and supervisors, in almost all sub-categories. Supervisors more than teachers in all groups, placed particular importance on this activity. Similarly a greater proportion of supervisors than teachers gave high assessments of performance (Tables 83 and 84).

In sum, this was the most important and the second most frequently undertaken activity. The overwhelming majority of participants, regardless of their personal characteristics, agreed about its importance. In comparison, the majority of teachers, in most groups, and an even greater majority of supervisors, reported that this activity was very frequently undertaken. It is noticeable that the high level of importance, and of application, reported by the respondents, is consistent with the importance attached to this activity by the ministerial circular 3 issued in 1977, which put particular stress on the 'evaluation of the teaching/learning process'. It is considered the core around which other activities are arranged.

6.2.6   Intervisitation Among Teachers

Intervisiting or 'teacher visitation' is distinguished from observing in that the former is not undertaken for evaluative purposes. The teacher visits another teacher to discover methods which he or she may adopt to his own purpose. It is a form of sharing skills, experiences and strengths with other teachers, observing each other informally, increasing awareness of the relatedness of the curriculum, confronting similar problems, and gaining from each other's experience.

It provides situations in which teachers might continue to grow professionally and find better ways of meeting the needs of individual children. Intervisiting is also distinguished from demonstration lessons, in that there is little pre-arranging of the teaching. The visitors see reality, in normal classes not specially planned for observing or demonstrating. Probably this distinction explains why this activity was thought more important than demonstrating, by the participant in this study. The weight quotient of importance (72) ranked it sixth. Approximately 67.9 per cent rated it either 'very important' or 'important'. By contrast, the weight quotient of application (37) ranked it twelfth. This means that it was the least frequently applied. The distribution of the actual responses shows that none of the participants marked the first choice, while only 2.5% selected the second choice. The majority of the respondents favoured one of the lower categories of application (Tables 62 and 63). The difference between ideal and actual responses was significant above the .05 level (Table 64).

Table 65 shows that more teachers than supervisors (69.2 and 60.3 per cent) viewed this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. According to the U test the difference between the groups was statistically significant, though it appears relatively narrow. Concerning the frequency of application, both groups agree this item was only infrequently applied. Nearly 2.5% of teachers and 2.6% of supervisors replied that this activity was undertaken 'to some extent'. It could be concluded that there are certain administrative obstacles inherent in the school system which make this activity the least applied. It is possible also that some teachers may not like 'being observed' by others.

Teachers' ideal responses are presented in Table 85. The table shows that different degrees of importance were reported by teachers. The lowest degree was reported by the inexperienced. Only 56.8% of the inexperienced teachers considered this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. On the contrary the highest percentage who expressed a similar belief was teachers with higher degrees (100%). Between the two extremes, the percentages of teachers who felt the same way ranged from 64.4 to 76.2 per cent. The figures shows that the ideal responses were dependent on the qualification and the experience of the teacher. As the experience of the teacher and his qualification increase he or she is more likely to support 'intervisiting'. It is highly possible that the inexperienced and less qualified teachers feel insecure, while their 'autonomous classrooms are being intruded'.

Supervisors' ideal responses are given in table 86. The table shows a wide variety of responses. While 'intervisitation' was considered fairly important by non-Qatari, experienced, male supervisors, and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle, it was 'less important' or 'not important' in the view of the majority of supervisors in other categories. Differences related to independent variables were significant except for sex.

Concerning the application of this item, the figures given in tables 85 and 86 reveal a general agreement among teachers as well as among supervisors that this activity was rarely undertaken. The independent variables have not brought out significant differences either among teachers or among supervisors.

A cross-tabulation of occupation by all other independent variables shows that there were significant differences between Qatari teachers and Qatari supervisors, teachers and supervisors with the BA degree, teachers and supervisors of the primary cycle and inexperienced teachers and supervisors. More teachers than supervisors, in the above categories considered 'intervisitation among teachers' either 'very important' or 'important'. The percentages of teachers and supervisors, in other sub-categories, who held similar beliefs were very close. On the actual level, there were no significant differences (tables 87 and 88).

In conclusion, a fairly high proportion of teachers, in most groups, supported the activity of 'intervisitation'. The experienced and the better qualified teachers, in particular, emphasized its importance. In comparison, supervisors, particularly the inexperienced, the Qatari, the less qualified and primary supervisors, were not much in favour. While there was a substantial discrepancy, among most participants, concerning the importance of this item, there was a substantial agreement that supervisors rarely arrange for 'intervisitation among teachers'. It can be concluded that there must be administrative obstacles which impede the performance of this activity. It is also highly possible that certain groups of teachers feel insecure when visited. This conclusion finds support in a teachers' comment that 'intervisitation is very often abused'. A supervisor stated that 'intervisitation should have a specific purpose, planning and follow-up. It should be undertaken in terms of the specific needs of individual teachers. Otherwise it will be an ineffective and superficial activity'.

6.2.7   In-Service Education

In-service education is clearly important, particularly in developing countries which do not have an adequate supply of well-educated and trained teachers, while facing strong demands for universal public education. Although in-service education may be viewed as an extension of the pre-service education of new teachers, growth in teaching competences should be looked upon as a life-long process. The term in-service may mean different things to different people. It may be thought of as 'faculty meeting or a workshop or a visiting lecture' a course in a university, seminars, or attending conferences. But however it is conducted the process should not be haphazard. It should be tailored to the teachers needs. Evaluation may reveal areas where in-service training is needed or changes of the curriculum may dictate the programme.

As perceived by the participants in this study, this activity was among the most important, but among the more infrequently applied activities. Its weight quotient of importance (81) ranked it the second while its weight quotient of application (58.8) ranked it the fifth (Table 62). The figures given in table 63 suggest that the vast majority of participants (86.1%) perceived this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. By contrast, only 44% of the participants replied that it was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Table 63). The t value (table 64) shows that the difference between ideal and actual responses was significant above the .05 level.

Teachers' and supervisors' responses concerning the importance and frequency of application of 'in-service education' are presented in table 65. The analysis of ideal responses shows that although a difference between teachers and supervisors existed, it did not reach the significant level of .05. Approximately 97.5 per cent of supervisors compared with 84 per cent of teachers were of the opinion that this item was either 'very important' or 'important'. Similarly, the difference between teachers and supervisors concerning the frequency of application, was not significant. But it is interesting that more teachers than supervisors (54.4 to 35.9%) reported that this activity was frequently applied. This is one of the few cases in which teachers gave a higher assessment of supervisors' performance than did the supervisors themselves. This may be attributed to the fact that certain categories of supervisors are not involved in in-service activities. This conclusion is supported by an analysis of the supervisors' actual responses.

Teachers' ideal responses are shown in table 89. Over 80 per cent of teachers, in different categories, considered 'in-service education' either as 'very important' or 'important'. The percentages of teachers who gave such responses, were very close, and the differences were not significant except between teachers from the primary cycle and teachers from the prep-secondary cycle. Nearly 89.3% of the former compared with 80% of the latter were of the opinion that in-service education was either 'very important' or 'important'. Similarly a relatively greater proportion of inexperienced than experienced teachers (87.7 compared to 81.9%) were of the same opinion, though the difference was not statistically significant. Although the figures give the

impression that the inexperienced and primary teachers feel more need for 'in-service education', the high percentage of teachers with higher degrees, who gave similar responses (92.9%) suggests that the need for 'in-service education' is also felt by the better qualified teachers. As mentioned earlier, 'in-service education' may be looked upon as an extension to pre-service education, as far as new teachers are concerned, but it is an essential part of professional growth and life-long education, as perceived by experienced and better qualified teachers.

As far as performance is concerned, teachers gave different assessments of supervisors' efforts in this area. The percentages of teachers with non-university qualification and inexperienced teachers, who stated that this activity was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' were relatively moderate (55.1 and 50.4 per cent), while the percentage of teachers with higher degrees was low, only 28.6%. The percentages of teachers in other groups were between 40.4 and 49.8. Differences related to independent variables existed only between teachers with higher degrees and teachers with the BA degree or non-university qualifications. The figures suggest that inexperienced and less qualified teachers are usually selected to participate in the 'in-service education' programmes, which typically take the form of short refresher courses (2-3 weeks). Lectures delivered by supervisors are the main part of the programme.

Supervisors' responses are given in table 90. The table shows that this activity is strongly supported by supervisors. Over 91.7 per cent in all categories marked this item either as 'very important' or

'important'. None of them selected the lowest option (not important) while only two selected the third choice (less important). Nevertheless, the independent variables have demonstrated significant, though narrow, differences between male and female supervisors, inexperienced and experienced supervisors and between supervisors with the BA degree and supervisors with higher degrees.

Supervisors' actual responses could be grouped into three categories. Male and better qualified supervisors reported a high level of performance. Nearly 71 per cent of the former and 83.3 per cent of the latter replied that they undertook this activity either 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. The percentages of the experienced, non-Qatari supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle were 44.5, 43.5 and 43.2 respectively, while the percentages of the female, inexperienced, primary, less qualified and Qatari supervisors, ranged from 2.5 to 26.5. It is noticeable that the experienced, non-Qatari supervisors, and supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle, who usually appear identical with the male and better qualified, reported lower levels of performance. The explanation for this finding may be the extremely low level of performance reported by female and less qualified supervisors. According to the chi-square test, differences related to the sex, qualification and the experience of supervisors were significant above the .05 level.

A cross-tabulation of occupation with other independent variables shows that differences between non-Qatari teachers and non-Qatari supervisors, male teachers and male supervisors, less qualified teachers and supervisors, teachers and supervisors in the

prep-secondary cycle, and between experienced teachers and supervisors concerning the importance of this item were all significant beyond the .05 level. A greater proportion of supervisors than teachers in each of the above categories, marked this item either as 'very important' or 'important'. The percentages of teachers and supervisors in other sub-categories, who reported similar perceptions, were relatively close, and the differences were not significant (table 91). Table 92 compares the actual responses of teachers and supervisors, in different sub-categories, and shows that except for male, experienced and better qualified supervisors, supervisors in other sub-groups gave lower assessments of performance than did the teachers. Differences related to sex, experience and qualification were significant.

In conclusion, the vast majority of teachers and supervisors were in favour of 'in-service education'. The figures concerning the frequency of application revealed the contrast. Different levels of performance were reported. Except for the male and better qualified supervisors who gave high assessments of application, other supervisors stated that this activity was not very regularly undertaken. In most categories more teachers than supervisors considered that it was frequently undertaken.

6.2.8   Orientation Programmes for New Teachers

New teachers, whether new graduates, or newcomers from other countries, need the basic information necessary to carry out their assigned responsibilities. This includes acquainting new staff members

with facilities, staff and community, and involves keeping the staff informed of organizational developments.

This activity was perceived as relatively important but infrequently undertaken. Its weight quotient of importance (70) ranked eighth, while its weight quotient of performance (38.4) ranked tenth (Table 62). It was viewed either as 'very important' or 'important', by 65.8 per cent of the participants. In comparison only 5% stated that it was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Table 63). The difference between the degree of importance and the frequency of application is large as well as statistically significant according to the t value (Table 64). This large difference suggests the reasons which made this activity rarely applied. It is probable either that other activities are given priority because they are regarded more important, or that there are administrative and procedural complications.

Table 65 which compares teachers' and supervisors' responses, indicates a substantial agreement between teachers and supervisors on the relative importance of 'orientation programmes for new teachers'. Approximately 71.8% of supervisors compared to 64.8 per cent of teachers rated this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. According to the Mann-Whitney U test this difference between the groups' perceptions was not significant. In the same manner, the U test shows that the difference between teachers and supervisors concerning the frequency of application, was not significant. Both groups reported very low levels of performance. Only 9% of supervisors and 4.4% of teachers stated that this activity was undertaken 'to a

great extent' or 'to some extent'. This is one of the few items on which teachers and supervisors show a high level of agreement, both on its importance and its application.

Table 93 sets out teachers' responses. The analysis of ideal responses suggests that the inexperienced teachers regarded this activity as particularly important. Approximately 88.4% of them marked it either 'very important' or 'important'. Conversely, slightly over 50 per cent of the experienced teachers, gave similar responses. The difference between the groups was significant. The percentages of teachers in other categories were very close. They ranged between 62.2 and 68.6. Differences were narrow as well as not significant. It is clear that teachers who lack experience are more likely to feel more in need of 'orientation programmes', than do other teachers. Concerning the frequency of application, the percentages of teachers who replied that this activity was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' were around 5. Differences were not significant.

Supervisors' ideal responses (table 94) were affected by nationality and experience. A greater proportion of non-Qatari than Qatari supervisors (80.4 and 59.4%) regarded this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. Similarly, more experienced than inexperienced supervisors (77.7 to 58.4%) expressed similar views. According to the chi-square test, differences among supervisors, in the above two groups, were significant at the 0.5 level. It could be concluded that as the experience of the supervisor increases he or she is more likely to attach importance to this activity. This conclusion may find support in the fact that a higher percentage of the better

qualified supervisors (83.3) than the supervisors with the BA degree (68.4) held similar beliefs. Nevertheless, more primary supervisors than supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle (76.5 to 68.2%) and more female than male supervisors (77.5 to 65.8) considered the 'orientation programmes for new teachers' either as 'very important' or 'important', although female and primary supervisors are, in general, less experienced. This may be attributed to the fact that there are more inexperienced teachers in primary schools than in prep-secondary schools. Secondly, girls' schools more than boys' schools receive a high percentage of new teachers. It is very likely then that primary and female supervisors feel that their teachers are more in need of 'orientation programmes'.

The distribution of supervisors' actual responses, reveals that supervisors, across all independent variables, gave a low assessment of performance. The percentages of supervisors who replied that this activity was frequently undertaken did not exceed 20%. In some categories none of the supervisors stated that they frequently arranged for orientation programmes. Differences related to independent variables were not significant, except for the teaching cycle. While none of the supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle reported that this activity was frequently undertaken, nearly 20.6 per cent of supervisors in the primary cycle, stated that it was.

A cross-tabulation of occupation with other independent variables, reveals a general agreement among teachers and supervisors, in different sub-categories concerning the degree of importance and frequency of application of this item. On the ideal level differences

were not significant except between non-Qatari teachers and non-Qatari supervisors, inexperienced teachers and inexperienced supervisors, and between experienced teachers and experienced supervisors (Table 95). It is interesting that more teachers than supervisors in some sub-categories placed particular stress on this item. For example, Qatari teachers more than Qatari supervisors, and inexperienced teachers more than inexperienced supervisors rated this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. Certainly these group of teachers feel they could benefit from 'orientation programmes'. Concerning performance there were significant differences only between primary teachers and primary supervisors, and between experienced teachers and experienced supervisors, despite the fact that all of them reported very low levels of performance (Table 96).

In sum, this activity was perceived as relatively important, but very infrequently undertaken. The data show that inexperienced teachers, in particular, strongly supported this activity. It was concluded that inexperienced teachers feel much in need for 'orientation programmes'. It was also strongly supported by primary and female supervisors. Concerning performance, teachers and supervisors, irrespective of personal characteristics considered that 'orientation programmes' were offered only 'to a little extent' or 'not at all'.

6.2.9   Conducting Research

A combination of research activities are required in order to accomplish desired outcomes when implementing supervisory tasks. This

includes analyzing; categorizing; computing certain ratios and percentages; using data for stimulating and guiding instructional practices; and using tests, inventories, rating scales and questionnaires. In brief, supervisors should conduct research and interpret results.

This activity was only moderately supported by the participants in this study. Its weight quotient of importance (69) ranked tenth. Only 59.8 per cent marked it either 'very important' or 'important'. It was also among the least frequently applied activities. The weight quotient of application (45) ranked it eighth (Table 62). Only 20.6% of participants stated that it was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Table 63). The difference between the degree of importance and the level of application is large as well as significant (Table 64).

The analysis of teachers' and supervisors' responses (Table 65) shows that supervisors more than teachers (71.8 to 57.7%) rated this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. The difference between the groups was significant beyond the .05 level according to the Mann-Whitney U test. It is likely that supervisors found that 'research' was of value in performing their tasks, while teachers thought that it was not directly related to successful instruction. However, both groups reported very low levels of performance. 28.2% of supervisors and 19.2% of teachers replied that 'research' was conducted 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'.

Teachers' responses are presented in Table 97. The distribution of ideal responses shows that they were affected by qualification and experience. All teachers with higher degrees compared to 64.9% of teachers with the BA degree and 41.7% of teachers with non-university qualifications regarded this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. Similarly 66.1 per cent of experienced compared to 42.6 per cent of inexperienced teachers, held similar views. A chi-square test shows that the differences among teachers in the above two categories, were significant beyond the .05 level. The percentages of teachers in other categories were relatively close. They range from 54.3 to 60.7. The differences were not significant. The figures give the impression that the more experienced the teacher is, the more likely he or she is to appreciate the value of 'research'.

The independent variables have resulted in a wide variation in supervisors' responses concerning the desired status of this item. There are three clusters of supervisors' ideal responses. More than 84% of male, non-Qatari, experienced, better qualified supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle, were of the opinion that 'conducting research' is 'very important' or 'important' (Table 98). The percentages of female supervisors and supervisors with the BA degree were 60 and 63.4 respectively. Finally, 40.7% of Qatari supervisors, 52.9% of primary supervisors and 33.4% of inexperienced supervisors, held similar views. Differences among supervisors in all groups were significant at or beyond the .05 level. It is clear that the inexperienced and less qualified supervisors were less in favour of this activity, either because they did not have the skills required for research, or because they were not aware of the relationship between

research and effective supervision. It is noteworthy that this result agrees with the results of a recent study of the perceptions of primary supervisors in Qatar. Ramzi (1988) found that nearly 59% of the subjects viewed 'research' as a valuable activity for supervisors.

Similarly, while there was a general agreement among teachers that supervisors rarely 'conduct research' different perceived levels of performance were reported by supervisors. The percentages of Qatari supervisors (6.3%), female supervisors (2.5%), supervisors with the BA degree (11.7%), primary supervisors (11.7%), who stated that they spent much time 'conducting research' were even less than the percentages for teachers, while the percentages of non-Qatari, male, experienced supervisors, and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle ranged from 38.9 to 55.3%. A high level of commitment to 'conducting research' was reported by supervisors with higher degrees. The vast majority of these supervisors (83.3%) replied that they frequently undertook this activity. This may be attributed to the fact that 'conducting research' requires skills and competencies which need an advanced level of training. Differences among supervisors, across all independent variables, concerning the application of this activity, were significant at the .05 level or beyond according to the chi-square test.

A cross-tabulation of occupation by all other independent variables, reveals significant differences between non-Qatari teachers and non-Qatari supervisors, male teachers and male supervisors, experienced teachers and supervisors, and between teachers and supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle. Proportionally more

supervisors than teachers in the above groups gave a high assessment of importance and performance. The percentages of teachers, and supervisors in most of the other groups, were relatively close, and the differences were not significant. It is noticeable that teachers more than supervisors, in some sub-categories, reported high levels of importance and performance, although differences were not significant. While teachers and supervisors with higher degrees agreed on the importance of this activity, they show some divergence concerning its application (Tables 99 and 100).

In conclusion, this activity was perceived as relatively important but infrequently undertaken. Different perceived levels of importance and application were given. With regard to performance, the overwhelming majority of teachers and supervisors, in most categories, reported low levels of performance. Only supervisors with higher degrees and to a less extent, male supervisors, stated that they spent much time 'conducting research'.

Teachers' ideal responses were affected by qualification and experience. The more experienced and better qualified teachers put particular emphasis on this item. Supervisors' ideal responses were dependent on all variables. Experienced, better qualified, male, non-Qatari supervisors, and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle also considered it important. While all groups of teachers, under-rated the level of application, supervisors in certain categories, particularly the better qualified and male supervisors reported a relatively high level of application.

6.2.10   Supervisory Visits

This activity involves the systematic observing of a teacher during classroom instruction in order to analyze his or her practice. Often the main interest is to observe the pupil-teacher interactions. Observations are important for the supervisors to collect the direct data necessary to inform them of the problems teachers are encountering and to help them make decisions about needs for in-service education or curriculum development programmes. The data collected could be used a a feedback for teachers to examine their 'actual behaviour'. Very often classroom visits are made for evaluative purposes, and the supervisor enters the classroom armed with some type of rating instrument.

This activity was the most frequently applied, although it was the 4th in importance as perceived by the participants in this study. The weight quotient of importance was 77.1 while the weight quotient of performance reached 89.8.   thus it was among the few activities for which the weight quotient of performance exceeded the weight quotient of importance (Table 62). Also the percentage of participants who stated that it was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (97%) was more than the percentage of participants who regarded it either as 'very important' or 'important' (76.4) (Table 63). The difference between the ideal behaviour and the observed behaviour was large as well as significant beyond the .05 level (Table 64). The analysis of the responses of both teachers and supervisors separately sheds light on this discrepancy.

Table 65 sets out the ideal and actual responses of both teachers and supervisors. The distribution of ideal responses shows that the activity of 'classroom visits' was supported by both groups. But while nearly 98.7 per cent of supervisors rated it either as 'very important' or 'important', the percentage of teachers who gave similar responses was 72.5. Concerning application, all supervisors stated that they undertook this activity either 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. Teachers also reported a very high level of performance. It is one of the small number of activities, where teachers gave an assessment of performance higher than the assessment of importance. According to the U test differences between teachers and supervisors, concerning importance and performance, were significant above the .05 level. The high percentages of performance reported by both groups suggests that supervisors were task-oriented. 'Classroom visits' are the most overt aspect of their work. Many other activities such as evaluation and written reports depend on these visits. But whether these visits are truly effective or merely superficial to comply with official requirements will be discussed in the next section.

Teachers' ideal and actual responses are compared in Table 101. The table shows that the independent variables have brought out significant differences among teachers in most groups, concerning the importance of 'classroom visits'. The percentages of female, primary, inexperienced teachers and teachers with non-university qualifications who considered this item either as 'very important' or 'important' ranged from 70.1 to 80.8. The percentages of male, experienced teachers and teachers from the prep-secondary cycle ranged from 66 to 68. Teachers with higher degrees gave a very low assessment of importance;

only 35.7 per cent regarded this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. According to the chi-square test, differences related to independent variables, except nationality were significant. It is interesting that inexperienced, primary and less qualified teachers supported 'classroom visits' although it is usually a source of concern and embarrassment for these groups of teachers, in particular (see next chapter). Certainly, teachers in the above categories feel the need for 'feedback' from the supervisors. Despite embarrassment, they may be anxious to exhibit their teaching performance and skills, to establish themselves as recognized practitioners, and to have their efforts appreciated.

Teachers' responses concerning the frequency of application of this activity reveal a substantial agreement among teachers, irrespective of personal characteristics. More than 95 per cent of teachers, in all categories, replied that supervisors very often visit teachers in classrooms. A chi-square test shows that differences were not significant.

With regard to supervisors' responses (Table 102) only one supervisor viewed this activity as 'less important'. All the other supervisors perceived it either as 'very important' or 'important'. Nevertheless, significant differences, resulting from some independent variables, occurred. A scrutiny of the distribution of the ideal responses of supervisors may explain this result. The majority of Qatari, female, less qualified and inexperienced supervisors selected the first option (very important) while the responses of non-Qatari and experienced supervisors were divided almost evenly between the first

two categories of importance. The majority of supervisors with higher degrees tended towards the second option. Concerning performance, the actual responses suggest a general agreement among supervisors that they very frequently visit teachers in classrooms. The vast majority of supervisors, in different categories, favoured the first category of application. Differences were not significant.

A cross-tabulation of occupation with all other independent variables shows that a greater proportion of supervisors than teachers, in all subcategories, considered this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. Differences were significant. Similarly, despite high levels of importance reported by teachers and supervisors, differences between the groups, in most cases, were significant, perhaps because supervisors, except one, did not select any of the low choices of performance (Tables 103 and 104).

In sum, although this activity was favoured by the participants of this study, different degrees of importance were reported. While of great importance to supervisors, in all categories, 'classroom visits' was only relatively important to teachers in many groups. Despite significant differences, there was a general agreement between teachers and supervisors that this activity was the one most frequently undertaken. In fact, it is very difficult for supervisors to avoid visiting teachers in classrooms. Many other activities and decisions are related to these visits. Supervisors are expected to report the visit in the supervisory visits record which teachers are asked to sign. But to what extent these visits are fruitful, it is difficult to say.

6.2.11   Disseminating Information

The steady flow of essential information about instruction to concerned teachers together with a feedback system, is necessary for promoting individual growth, upgrading of accepted practices, reinforcing interaction among members of the teaching staff, reinforcing the best practices, and discouraging the least desired practices. This activity could be done through the use of visual and verbal presentations, educational bulletins and circulars, exhibiting materials and equipment, discussing and lecturing.

The participants in this study were of the opinion that this activity is relatively important. Its weight quotient of importance (76.8) ranked the 5th. Approximately 77 per cent considered it either as 'very important' or 'important'. The weight quotient of application (54.4) ranked it 6th (Table 62). Nearly 34.7 per cent stated that it was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Table 63). The figures indicated that supervisors show little commitment to this activity. The difference between ideal and actual perception was significant (Table 64).

The analysis of teachers' and supervisors' responses is presented in Table 65. It is clear that the overwhelming majority of supervisors (96.1%) compared to 73.6% of teachers perceived this activity as of great value. The difference between both groups' ideal responses was large as well as statistically significant, according to the U test. The table reveals a substantial agreement between teachers and supervisors about the low level of performance. Only 39.8% of

supervisors and 33.8 per cent of teachers considered that this activity was frequently undertaken. The difference appears narrow, and the U test has not reached the .05 level of significance. The convergence of teachers and supervisors, on the low level of performance, which rarely occurred, indicates that there may be external obstacles which prevent the supervisors from performing this task.

Teachers' responses are presented in Table 105. The distribution of ideal responses shows that 'disseminating information' was an activity supported by the majority of teachers. Over 64.4% of teachers in all categories regarded it either as 'very important' or 'important'. Differences existed, but were not significant except between Qatari and non-Qatari teachers. 64.4% of the former compared with 80% of the latter perceived this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. The figures show that teachers gave a low assessment to what supervisors do to disseminate information. Less than 41.2 per cent of teachers in all categories perceived that supervisors spent much time disseminating information. Significant differences related to nationality and sex occurred.

Table 106 compares supervisors' ideal and actual responses. The figures suggest that supervisors would like to devote more time to this activity than they actually do. Despite statistically significant differences, more than 87.5% of supervisors, across all independent variables, considered that they should frequently undertake this activity. Conversely, less than 79% stated that they frequently 'disseminate information'. In some categories, the percentages did not exceed 2.5%. Moreover, a marked variation could be seen among

supervisors. At the bottom of the performance scale, the percentages of Qatari, female, inexperienced, primary, and less qualified supervisors, ranged from 2.5% to 31.7%. Respectively 47.8 per cent of supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle, and 48.1% of experienced supervisors held similar convictions. The percentages for non-Qatari and better qualified supervisors were 60.9 and 66.7 respectively. And finally at the top lies the percentage of male supervisors (79). It is noticeable that this is one of the few cases where the percentages of the experienced, better qualified, male, non-Qatari supervisors, and supervisors in the pre-secondary cycle, were not close. Perhaps this is because of the very low percentage of female supervisors (2.5%) which supports another conclusion mentioned earlier, that is, certain activities are assigned to male rather than female supervisors.

A cross-tabulation of occupation with all other independent variables shows that supervisors more than teachers, across all subcategories, attached importance to this activity. Table 107 shows that, at the .05 level or beyond, differences between teachers and supervisors, in almost all subgroups, concerning the importance of this activity, were significant.

With regard to performance, the table reveals a somewhat different picture. The Qatari, female, less qualified, primary and experienced teachers reported higher levels of performance than the levels reported by corresponding supervisors in the same sub-categories, while the assessments of performance given by non-Qatari, male, better qualified, experienced supervisors, and supervisors from the pre-secondary cycle, were higher than the level perceived by teachers in the same sub-groups.

In sum, this activity was strongly supported by the vast majority of supervisors and the male, non-Qatari and better qualified teachers. However, a fairly high proportion of teachers in other categories also conceived 'disseminating information' either as 'very important' or 'important'. Among supervisors in almost all categories significant differences concerning the desired and present status, were revealed, while significant differences among teachers' ideal and actual percentages, were related only to nationality.

6.2.12   Supporting the School Library

The school library forms an essential resource for professional growth. Teachers need to keep themselves abreast of developments in teaching, both in its general aspects and in the area of their particular subject matter. They are expected to read and to study. But they cannot supply all the periodicals, books and other material which they need for professional development. By its very presence, the school library acts as a stimulus to improvement.

This activity was not among the most important, as perceived by the participants in this study. Similarly, it was not frequently undertaken. Both the weight quotient of importance (69.2) and of performance (43) ranked the 9th (Table 62). Approximately 61.6 per cent of the participants perceived it either as 'very important' or 'important', while only 15.3% stated that it was undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Table 63). The difference between the ideal responses and the actual responses was significant beyond the .05 level (Table 64).

The figures given in Table 65 indicate substantial differences between teachers and supervisors concerning both the degree of importance and the frequency of application. A greater proportion of supervisors (75.7%) than teachers (59%) viewed this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. Although both groups gave a very low assessment of performance, a relatively higher proportion of supervisors than teachers (26 to 13.2%) stated that they show interest in school libraries.

Table 108 sets out teachers' responses concerning the degree of importance and frequency of application of this activity. The analysis of ideal responses shows that they were dependent on the qualification and experience of the teachers, while independent of other variables. It is clear that the more experienced and better qualified the teacher is, the more likely he or she is to attach particular importance to the 'school library'. While all teachers with higher degrees considered this item either as 'very important' or 'important', 63.7 per cent of teachers with the B.A. degree and 47.4 per cent of teachers with non-university qualifications gave similar responses. Similarly 69.7 per cent of experienced compared to 40 per cent of the inexperienced teachers felt the same way. By contrast, differences among teachers in the remaining categories were not significant. The percentages of teachers in those categories were close, and sometimes were almost identical. They ranged from 54.3 to 63.9. The low levels of importance reported by teachers in most categories suggest that teachers, in general, were not interested in activities which did not appear to have a direct influence on teaching.

The figures show that teachers' actual responses were independent of all personal characteristics except experience. Teachers in different groups, underestimated supervisors' efforts to support the school library. The percentages of teachers who replied that this activity was frequently undertaken did not exceed 21.4.

Supervisors' responses are set out in Table 109. The table shows that all the independent variables, except the teaching cycle, occasioned significant differences among supervisors concerning the desired status of this activity. While of great value for male, non-Qatari, better qualified, experienced supervisors, and supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle, supporting the school library was only of moderate importance for primary, female supervisors and supervisors with the B.A. degree, and of little importance for Qatari and inexperienced supervisors. Once again it seems that as the qualification and the experienced of the supervisor increase, he or she is more likely to attach particular importance to activities, such as 'supporting school library', which do not appear of direct relevance to effective instruction.

With regard to performance, supervisors across all categories reported low levels of application. The percentages of supervisors who perceived this activity undertaken 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' ranged from 12.5 to 44.5. Though differences among supervisors did exist, they were statistically, not significant except between male and female supervisors.

Despite a generally low reported frequency of application it seems that supervisors who gave a higher assessment to the importance of the 'School Library' tended also to give a higher assessment of performance than did other supervisors. 42.1% of male supervisors and 44.5% of supervisors with higher degrees reported that this activity was frequently undertaken. The percentages of non-Qatari and experienced supervisors were 36.9 and 33.3 respectively, while the percentages of supervisors in other categories ranged from 12.5 to 29.6. A cross-tabulation of occupation with all other independent variables shows that slightly more Qatari teachers than Qatari supervisors, and slightly more inexperienced teachers than inexperienced supervisors rated this activity either as 'very important' or 'important'. The percentages of female teachers and female supervisors, of primary teachers and supervisors, and of teachers with the B.A. degree and supervisors with the B.A. degree were close. All teachers and supervisors with higher degrees agreed on its importance. The differences between teachers and supervisors in the above groups were slight, as well as statistically not significant. By contrast, a greater proportion of supervisors than teachers in the other subcategories, expressed similar views, and the differences were significant (Table 110).

Concerning performance, supervisors more than teachers, in all sub-categories, stated that this activity was frequently undertaken. Nevertheless, significant differences occurred only between non-Qatari teachers and supervisors, male teachers and supervisors, teachers and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle, and between experienced teachers and supervisors (Table 111).

In conclusion, except for teachers with higher degrees, the school library was not of great importance. A marked variation could be seen in participants' responses. The more experienced and better qualified the participant is, the more he or she tends to emphasize using the school library. This conclusion applies to supervisors as well as to teachers. However, both groups reported that supervisors spent little time on 'supporting school libraries'. Nevertheless, slight differences occurred. Generally speaking, supervisors more than teachers stated that this activity was frequently undertaken. In particular supervisors who gave a high assessment of importance reported high levels of performance.

6.2.13   Conclusion

The data concerning the responses to 12 selected supervisory activities have been presented and analyzed, in this section. This made it possible to compare how often each activity was actually undertaken with how frequently participants would like it to be performed, as part of the supervisory process. The 12 tasks as they originally appeared in the questionnaire were, providing materials, demonstration lessons, organizing for teaching, administrative and clerical work, evaluation of the teaching/learning process, inter-visitation among teachers, in-service education for teachers, orientation programmes for new teachers, conducting research, classroom visits, disseminating information, and supporting the school library.

All the 12 activities were, in some measure, supported by the participants. The weight quotients of importance ranged from 63 to

86.1. The mean of weight quotients was 73.4. Between 46.4 and 92.5 per cent of the participants rated all activities either as 'very important' or 'important'. No activity was marked as 'not important' by more than 12.4%, while only 6.1 to 41.2 per cent favoured the 'less important' option. According to the weight quotients of importance the six most favoured activities were the evaluation of the teaching/ learning process, in-service education, organizing for teaching, classroom visits, disseminating information and inter-visitation among teachers, while the six least favoured activities were providing materials, orientation programmes for new teachers, supporting the school library, conducting research, demonstration lessons, and administrative and clerical work.

When the 12 tasks are rated by teachers alone the above order remains the same except that 'disseminating information' become the 4th and the classroom visits becomes the 5th (see Table 61). But when rated by supervisors a somewhat different order appears. The most strongly supported activities by supervisors were : the evaluation of the teaching/learning process, classroom visits, disseminating information, in-service education, organizing for teaching, and providing materials, while the least preferred activities were administrative and clerical work, supporting the school library, conducting research, orientation programmes for new teachers, demonstration lessons, and inter-visitation among teachers.

A comparison of teachers' and supervisors' responses reveals that both groups agree that the following five activities were the most important (although they disagree on the degree of importance): the

evaluation of the teaching/learning process, inservice education, disseminating information, organizing for teaching, and classroom visits. Both groups agree that conducting research, orientation programmes, supporting the school library, and demonstration lessons were the least important. Teachers' and supervisors' views were radically different toward two activities: administrative and clerical work which ranked at the bottom according to teachers while supervisors put it 7th. The inter-visitation ranked 6th for teachers while it was the least supported by supervisors. 'Providing materials' ranked 7th according to teachers while supervisors put it 6th.

However, within the ranks of teachers different levels of divergence and convergence could be identified as to the importance of different tasks. This result supports a conclusion mentioned in the previous section that teachers' expectations from supervisors are not necessarily the same - what seems of the highest priority for one teacher or group of teachers may be of little importance to others. So it is the responsibility of supervisors to assess their teachers' needs and offer the service which they feel they need. In the same manner different rank orders could be identified according to different groups of supervisors.

With regard to performance, Table 62 shows that, according to the weight quotient of performance the six most frequently undertaken activities were: classroom visits, the evaluation of the teaching/learning process, administrative and clerical role, organizing for teaching, in-service education, and disseminating information. The weight quotient of the above activities ranged from 54.4 to 89.8. The

six least undertaken activities were; providing materials, conducting research, supporting the school library, orientation programmes, demonstration lessons, and inter-visitation among teachers. The weight quotients of these activities ranged from 37 to 49.5.

When rated by teachers alone the above rank order remains almost the same with only slight differences. Teachers put administrative and clerical work second, while the evaluation of the teaching/learning process ranked third. The 'in-service education' ranked fourth while 'organizing for teaching' ranked fifth. And finally teachers put 'inter-visitation' as eleventh and 'the demonstration lessons' as twelfth.

Supervisors agree that the most 4 frequently undertaken activities were; classroom visits, the evaluation of the teaching/learning process, the administrative work, organizing for teaching. Providing materials and facilities ranked fifth and in-service education ranked sixth, while disseminating information ranked seventh. Supervisors agreed with teachers that conducting research and supporting the school library ranked eighth and ninth respectively. Demonstration lessons ranked tenth and orientation programmes ranked eleventh, while inter-visitation was at the bottom of the scale (Table 61).

Once again, the orders varied according to different groups of teachers of supervisors (Tables 112 and 113).

Role Preferred and Role Observed

The data show that the observed role of supervisors did not coincide with the ideal role recommended in the literature of instructional supervision, and preferred by the majority of the participants in this study. This conclusion is based on the wide difference between the weight quotients of importance and the weight quotients of application. All the weight quotients of importance were more than 63, while six weight quotients of application were under 50. Similarly while almost all activities were supported by more than 55% of the participants, except 'administrative work' which was supported only by 46.4 per cent, only 4 activities were perceived, as frequently undertaken, by more than 50%. These 4 activities are: classroom visits, administrative and clerical work, the evaluation of the teaching/ learning process, and organizing for teaching. All of the above activities, except 'administrative work' were among the most favoured. It is noticeable that the frequency of application of two of the above activities, (administrative work and classroom visits), was higher than the degree of importance, which means that these two activities were allocated more time than they deserved. The degree of importance attached to other activities was higher than the level of performance. According to the 't' value the differences between the degree of importance and the frequency of application of all activities, were significant beyond the .05 level. Similarly, the correlation coefficient (Table 200) shows weak relations between ideal and actual responses of the participants. However, the correlation coefficients given in tables 202 and 203 suggest that the relations between supervisors' ideal and actual responses were, in general, stronger than the relations between teachers' ideal and actual responses.

The Effects of the Independent Variables

The degree of importance and the frequency of application of almost all activities were dependent, to a great extent, on the personal characteristics of the respondents. Although teachers and supervisors were in favour of almost all activities, the Mann-Whitney U test indicates a substantial disagreement between the two groups concerning the degree of importance of 10 activities. The differences between both groups concerning the degree of importance of in-service education and the 'orientation programmes' were not significant. Except for the 'intervisiting' supervisors attached more importance on each activity, than did the teachers.

Similarly, except for 'in-service education' supervisors reported higher levels of performance for all categories, than did the teachers. The U test suggest significant differences between both groups concerning the frequency of application of 9 activities. Differences were not significant between them concerning the frequency of application of 'intervisiting', 'orientation programmes' and 'in-service education'.

Teachers' ideal perceptions were affected by the independent variables, particularly experience, qualification and the teaching cycle. The ideal perceptions of teachers concerning the degree of importance of 8 activities were affected by experience, while qualification and cycle resulted in significant differences among teachers concerning the degree of importance of 6 and 5 activities respectively. The nationality and the sex of the teachers were the

least crucial. The ideal responses of teachers concerning only one activity were affected by nationality, while the sex of the teacher affected the ideal responses concerning two activities. In general, it can be concluded that as the qualification of the teacher and his experience increase he or she is likely to place more emphasis on the work of the supervisors. But this was not always the case. For example, more inexperienced than experienced teachers and more teachers with non-university qualification or with the B.A. than teachers with higher degrees emphasized the importance of 'demonstration lessons', 'administrative work', and 'classroom visits'. A high percentage of inexperienced teachers was in favour of 'orientation programmes'. It appears that the inexperienced and less qualified teachers felt in need of these activities, or that they thought these activities were directly related to effective teaching. Perhaps they thought that other activities were only remotely connected with effective teaching.

With regard to performance, the data showed that teachers' perceptions of the frequency of application of four activities were independent of personal characteristics. These activities were demonstration lessons, inter-visiting, orientation programmes, and classroom visits. Teachers, across all independent variables, agree that these activities, except classroom visits, were rarely undertaken. In contrast they stated that the 'classroom visits' was the one most frequently applied. The perceived levels of performance of other activities reported by teachers were affected, in some measure, by independent variables. More non-Qataris than Qataris perceived 'providing materials', and 'disseminating information' as frequently applied. while more inexperienced than experienced teachers stated

that supervisors frequently organize for teaching, the opposite was the case concerning 'conducting research' and 'supporting the school library'. More male than female teachers replied that supervisors spent much time on 'evaluating the teaching/learning process, conducting research', and 'disseminating information'. More teachers with the B.A. degree than teachers with higher degrees considered that supervisors frequently undertook 'administrative work', evaluated 'the teaching/learning process' and participated in in-service education. The teaching cycle occasioned significant differences among teachers concerning the application of only one activity. More teachers from the prep-secondary cycle than primary teachers stated that supervisors had a high commitment to 'administrative work'.

In the same manner, the independent variables have brought out significant differences among supervisors concerning the degree of importance and the frequency of application of most activities. Contrary to what the researcher had expected, there was a greater variance in supervisors' responses than in teachers' responses. In general, two categories of supervisors could be identified. First, the male, non-Qatari, better qualified, experienced supervisors, and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle who attached particular importance to most activities and reported high levels of commitment to undertaking them. By contrast, in most cases the female, Qatari, primary, less qualified and inexperienced supervisors reported, relatively moderate levels of importance and moderate or low levels of performance. Since female, Qatari and primary supervisors, were, in general, less qualified and inexperienced, it is very likely that the

qualification and the experience of the supervisors were the variables that occasioned significant differences rather than the nationality or the sex.

The degree of importance of 'providing materials', and 'demonstration lessons' was not dependent on the personal characteristics of the supervisors. A greater proportion of better qualified and experienced supervisors than less qualified and inexperienced supervisors were of the opinion that supervisors should frequently conduct research, support the school library, disseminate information, participate in in-service education, and arrange for intervisitation among teachers. More non-Qataris than Qataris placed particular importance on 'supporting the school library, disseminating information, conducting research, and arranging for intervisiting. More male than female supervisors shared the better qualified and experienced supervisors opinion that 'supporting the school library', disseminating information, conducting research, and participating in in-service education were either 'important' or 'very important'. And finally supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle more than primary supervisors considered conducting research and 'intervisitation' either as 'very important' or 'important'.

In contrast more Qatari than non-Qatari supervisors, more inexperienced than experienced supervisors, and more supervisors with the B.A. degree than supervisors with higher degrees considered the classroom visits and the administrative work either as 'very important' or 'important'. Proportionally more female than male supervisors considered the evaluation of the teaching/learning process as 'very

important' or 'important'. And finally 'organizing' for teaching was more strongly supported by supervisors with the B.A. degree than by supervisors with higher degrees.

With regard to performance, the independent variables have not resulted in significant differences among supervisors concerning the frequency of application of 4 activities : organizing for teaching, the evaluation of the teaching/learning process, intervisiting and classroom visits. It is noticeable that a greater proportion of primary supervisors than supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle attached high importance to 3 activities: administrative work, providing facilities and materials and the orientation programmes. It is highly possible that teachers in the primary cycle need these services, particularly the orientation programmes, more than do teachers from the prep-secondary cycle. The male more than the female supervisors gave a high assessment of performance of demonstration lessons and supporting the school library. The male, better qualified and experienced supervisors reported high levels of application of in-service education. Male, better qualified, experienced and non-Qatari supervisors replied that they frequently conduct research and disseminate information.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Section III - The Criteria for Evaluation

7.3.0 Introduction

7.3.1 The lesson plan

7.3.2 The attainment of pupils

7.3.3 The personality of the teacher

7.3.4 Teacher's mastery of the subject matter

7.3.5 Classroom skills

7.3.6 Conclusion

Section IV - Staffing

7.4.0 Introduction

7.4.1 The need for professional education for supervisors

7.4.2 Participants' opinions concerning supervisors'
        professional education

7.4.3 Peer supervision

7.4.4 Participants' opinions concerning peer supervisors

7.4.5 The principal-supervisor

7.4.6 Participants' opinions concerning the idea of the
        'principal-supervisor'

7.4.7 Conclusion

Section V - Problems and Obstacles

7.5.0 Introduction

7.5.1 Insufficient time

7.5.2 Overwork

7.5.3 The location of schools

7.5.4 Lack of cooperation with teachers

7.5.5 Overlapping of duties

7.5.6 Role ambiguity

7.5.7 The incompetence of some supervisors

7.5.8 Conclusion

Section VI

7.6.0 Introduction

7.6.1 Teachers perceptions of supervisors

7.6.2 The authority of supervisors

7.6.3 Satisfaction with supervision

7.6.4 Conclusion

CHAPTER SEVEN

SECTION I

The Characteristics of Supervisory Visits

7.1.0   Introduction

The preceding chapter was concerned with tasks and activities of supervisors. The present chapter is devoted to the supervisory visits, evaluation, staffing and problems. The first section comprises 14 items pertaining to the frequency, duration, helpfulness of the visit, pre-observation and post-observation conference, and the kind of relationships which obtain between teachers and supervisors.

7.1.1   Frequency of Supervisory Visits

Typically teachers are visited twice a year, once each semester. These are considered evaluative visits. There is an 'orientation school visit' at the beginning of the school year, which does not include classroom observation. The participants were asked whether they thought this number was adequate.

Table 114 shows that a fairly high percentage (67.6%) of the respondents either 'strongly agree' or 'agree' that the number was adequate. Table 115 suggests that proportionately more supervisors (75.6%) than teachers (66.2%) considered this number adequate. According to the U test the difference between the two groups was

significant. Teachers' responses were independent of all variables except experience. Approximately 58.1 per cent of inexperienced compared to 71 per cent of experienced teachers considered the present rate of supervisory visits adequate (Table 116). The figures suggest that inexperienced teachers would like to be more frequently visited. Either they feel they would benefit from more 'feedback', or they would like to show their competencies and skills.

In comparison, supervisors' responses were not affected by the independent variables. Although differences existed between male and female supervisors, between better qualified and less qualified supervisors, and between inexperienced and experienced supervisors, they did not reach the .05 level. But it could be concluded that male, better qualified and experienced supervisors, irrespective of nationality or teaching cycle, would wish to devote more time to supervisory visits (Table 117). Female, less experienced and less qualified supervisors feel satisfied with the present rate of visits. It is noticeable that the satisfaction of the three above categories of supervisors was in sharp contrast to the dissatisfaction of female, inexperienced and less well qualified teachers.

7.1.2   The Time Spent during the Visits

Usually the supervisor observes nearly a whole lesson (sometimes a part of the lesson). Participants were asked whether they thought that the time spent was sufficient. In contrast to the fairly high percentage of participants who considered the present rate of visits adequate, only 38% of all respondents thought that the time spent

during the visit was enough (Table 114). A large as well as significant difference occurred between teachers and supervisors concerning this item. 31.7% of teachers compared to 73.1% of supervisors were of the opinion that the time spent was enough (Table 115). Teachers' responses were affected only by experience. Although teachers in all groups were not satisfied with the time spent during the visit, the inexperienced teachers were the most dissatisfied (Table 118). Supervisors' responses were independent of all personal characteristics except for teaching cycle. Primary supervisors, more than supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle, replied that they would like to spent more time on the visits (Table 119). It is noticeable that supervisors' responses concerning the time spent were consistent with their perceptions of the adequacy of the frequency of visits. The percentages of supervisors who were satisfied, with both the time spent during the visit and the frequency of visits, were almost identical.

By contrast, while a fairly high percentage of teachers (66.2%) indicated that they thought the number of visits was adequate, only 31.7% considered the time spent during the visit was adequate. The large difference is rather difficult to explain. However, it is possible that teachers' relative satisfaction with the number of supervisory visits implied a dislike of the visit itself. The dislike of the supervisory visits is well-documented in the literature of supervision. Cogan (1973) attributed it to the teachers' fear of the supervisors' 'little black book'. This interpretation finds support in some comments written by teachers in the margins of the questionnaires. A teacher wrote 'it would be better if there were no visits at all'. Another teacher wrote 'even two visits are more than enough'. 'It

happens, for some reasons or another, that we are not visited at all and nothing detrimental takes place', a teacher wrote. But these comments do not represent the perceptions of all teachers. It is highly possible that there are teachers who would like to be visited more than twice a year. As mentioned earlier, the inexperienced and less qualified teachers were less satisfied with the frequency of the supervisory visits. A number of teachers shared the view of some supervisors that the frequency of the visits as well as the time spent should be in direct proportion to the experience of the teacher. They thought that inexperienced teachers should receive more visits. It seems that all the fuss is related to the supervisory visits being conceptualized as evaluation of the teacher's performance and worse than that, as a diagnosis of weakness in the teacher's methods of instruction.

Concerning teachers' dissatisfaction with the duration of the visit, it is probable that teachers thought that supervisors can not make fair judgements of their performance, provide feedback, or assess the achievement of the pupils, by attending only one lesson. The visit is usually divided between observing the teacher and asking the children a few questions which may not be related to the topic of the observed lesson. Very often teachers are evaluated on this basis. However, supervisors see it all very different. Their satisfaction with the frequency and duration of visits can be attributed to their belief that a good supervisor can evaluate the situation from one or two visits. Usually further visits do not change the opinions which they have formed, and also teachers greatly dislike further visits.

This viewpoint is also related to the conceptualizing of the visit as wholly concerned with an evaluation of the teacher's performance.

In sum, what matters is not the frequency of visits and the time spent. Rather it is the helpfulness of the visit and the accuracy of the evaluation. These two issues will be discussed later.

7.1.3   Pre-Observation Conference

In theory the classroom visit should be preceded by a conference. Participants were asked to state how frequently a conference took place. The difference between teachers and supervisors on this item was enormous. While 92.3% of supervisors stated that the visit was 'always' or 'frequently' preceded by a conference, only 44.7% of teachers gave the same reply (Table 120). Clearly both of these responses cannot be true. While the truth may lie somewhere between the two extremes, it is possible that the word 'conference' has been misunderstood. Probably supervisors considered any meeting with the teacher as a conference, while teachers understood it as more structured teacher-supervisor interaction.

Teachers' responses concerning this item were independent of all variables except sex. The percentages of teachers who stated that there was always or frequently a conference ranged between 41.6 and 47.8. The differences were not significant except between male and female teachers although the difference was narrow (Table 121).

Table 122 presents supervisors' responses and reveals that the responses were independent of all variables. More than 87 per cent of supervisors in all categories stated that the visit was always or frequently preceded by a conference. It is interesting that none of the supervisors selected the 'never' option.

7.1.4   The Length of the Pre-Observation Conference

Participants were requested to say how long the conference, if one was held, lasted. The U test indicates that there was a significant difference between teachers and supervisors concerning this item. Approximately 41.4% of teachers said that the conference lasted only a few minutes, 15% half an hour, and 25% stated that it depended on the circumstances. The corresponding percentages of supervisors were 21.8%, 32.1% and 46.2% respectively (Table 123).

Table 124 shows that teachers' responses were dependent on nationality and teaching cycle. More primary teachers (49.2) than teachers in the prep-secondary cycle (35.5) and more Qatari (49.7) than non-Qatari teachers (35.7) stated that the conference lasted only a few minutes. In comparison, supervisors responses were not affected by the independent variables. Slightly less than half the supervisors, in all categories, stated that the length of the conference depended on the circumstances (Table 125).

It is not possible to determine which responses are nearer to the truth. But to the best of the researcher's knowledge it can be safely stated that the length of the conference depends on the circumstances,

such as the school timetable. On the basis of this it can be concluded that conferences are not considered as essential as the visit itself. They are haphazard, unplanned, and dependent upon circumstances.

7.1.5   The Purpose of the Pre-Observation Conference

Participants were asked to state what they considered to be the purpose of the conference. Different answers were given which included; to inform the teacher that the supervisor will visit him/her in the classroom, to find out the location of the classroom, to get to know the teacher if he/she is newly appointed or recently transferred to the school, or if the supervisor himself has only recently taken up his present post, to find out in general what the lesson will be about, to give advice, and to discuss, in general, the circumstances of the school. The most frequently mentioned purposes were to inform the teacher that the supervisor will visit him, to find out which class the teacher has and to make sure that the teacher has a lesson. A supervisor wrote that he considered the pre-observation conference a courtesy and that it was impolite to arrive unannounced in a lesson. 'It creates a human atmosphere', he wrote. In contrast, a teacher wrote that 'it is merely so that the supervisor can impose his presence'. A number of teachers indicated that the conferences were just a routine matter and included nothing more serious than chat.

The above responses reinforce the impression that the conference is not considered an integral part of the supervisory process. At best it is considered a courtesy, at worst a routine matter, or a means of imposing the supervisor's presence. Few respondents stated that there is any serious discussion of important educational issues.

7.1.6   The Feelings of Teachers During the Visit

Participants were nearly evenly divided on this item. 53.1% either agreed or strongly agreed that teachers feel embarrassed during the visit, while 46.9% indicated that they disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 114).

Table 115 shows that the difference between teachers and supervisors concerning this item was not significant. Approximately 51.7% of teachers compared with 61.6% of supervisors reported that teachers frequently feel embarrassed during the visit. This is one of the few cases in which there is a general agreement between teachers and supervisors.

Teachers' responses were independent of all variables except experience. A greater proportion of inexperienced teachers (72.9%) than experienced teachers (39.8) reported that they feel embarrassed during the visit. The difference appears large as well as significant. Although more teachers with non-university qualifications and with the B.A. degree, than teachers with higher degrees reported similar perceptions, the differences were not statistically significant. The percentages of teachers in other groups were around 50 (Table 126).

Although a marked variation appears in supervisors' responses, differences were significant only between better and less qualified supervisors, and between supervisors from the primary and prep-secondary cycles. Better qualified supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle stated that teachers rarely feel embarrassed

during the visit. This view is also shared, although to a less degree, by male, non-Qatari and experienced supervisors (Table 127). However, the feeling of the teacher during the visit depends on the teachers' as well as on the supervisors' behaviour. Some teachers may experience anxiety, unease or embarrassment, others may respond with pleasure or may feel a kind of stimulation, and sense of challenge. Similarly a well trained and experienced supervisor may be more able to make teachers perceive him not as a threatening authority representative figure.

7.1.7   The Behaviour of Teachers During the Visit

Despite the fact that 52 per cent of the participants indicated that teachers feel embarrassed, when visited by supervisors, only 36.2% stated that teachers behave differently during the visit by supervisors (Table 114). Once again the difference between teachers and supervisors concerning this item was not significant. Nearly 35.2% of teachers compared to 42.3% of supervisors thought that teachers behave differently during the visit (Table 115).

There were significant differences among teachers related to qualification and experience (Table 128). Proportionately more inexperienced teachers than experienced teachers (52.9 to 25.3%) and more teachers with non-university qualifications than teachers with the B.A. or higher degrees (43.6% to 31.6 and 7.1) respectively, stated that they behaved differently during supervisory visits. The percentages of teachers in other categories, who reported similar responses, were close (between 33 and 37%). It could be concluded that

the less qualified and less experienced the teacher is, the more he/she is likely to behave differently in a manner he/she thinks satisfies the supervisor. The result is not surprising since inexperienced and less qualified teachers are usually less confident than the experienced and better qualified.

By contrast, the independent variables have brought out significant differences among supervisors, except between male and female supervisors. The percentages of non-Qatari, better qualified, experienced supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle who replied that teachers usually behave differently during the visit, were very low (between 5.6 to 27.8%) (Table 129). It is clear that these percentages approximate to the views of teachers in most categories, while the percentages of supervisors in other categories, who felt the same way, ranged from 53.3 to 75. This result may support a conclusion mentioned earlier, that it is the less qualified and less experienced teachers who may behave differently during the visit. Since Qatari, primary, inexperienced and less qualified supervisors work usually with inexperienced and less qualified teachers, the result is not surprising.

7.1.8   The Post-Observation Conference

It is assumed that the visit should conclude with a conference. Participants were requested to state how frequently the visit is followed by a conference. Table 130 shows that a greater proportion of supervisors than teachers (83.3 to 51.1%) reported that the visit was frequently followed by a conference. The U test indicates that the

difference between teachers and supervisors was significant. It is interesting that teachers as well as supervisors responses concerning this item were independent of all personal characteristics. The percentages of teachers in all categories ranged from 42 to 60 while the percentages of supervisors ranged from 76 to 95 (Tables 131 and 132).

According to teachers' responses it could be concluded that supervisors gave a relatively higher commitment to the post-observation than to the pre-observation one, although in both cases the commitment was less than satisfactory. According to supervisors both pre-observation and post-observation conferences were given equal importance and time. However, it is possible that supervisors regard the post-observation conference as more important than the pre-observation conference, and that there is something to discuss in the post-observation conference, that is the observed lesson. This conclusion finds support in the discussion of the following two items.

7.1.9   The Length of the Post-Observation Conference

Participants were asked to state how long the post-observation conference, if any, lasted. Tables 134 and 135 show that teachers' as well as supervisors' responses were independent of all personal characteristics. On the basis of the participants' responses it could be stated that although supervisors, in general, are interested in holding post-observation conferences, the length of the conferences, or even whether or not they take place depends, to a great extent, on the circumstances. Very often the rigid school timetable does not allow

time for such conferences, or it severely restricts its length and consequently the discussion which can take place. This conclusion emphasizes the necessity of holding both pre- and post-observation conferences and of providing sufficient time and space for them to be conducted effectively.

7.1.10   The Purpose of the Post-Observation Conference

Participants were asked to state what matters are discussed in the post-observation conference. Different responses were given which included 'to discuss the notes of the supervisor', 'to plan for the coming period', and 'to discuss the work of the students'. A number of teachers indicated that there was no discussion, but only comments from the supervisor 'who spoke more than he listened'. One teacher wrote 'usually the teacher sat beside the supervisor until he completed writing his notes in the record of supervisory visits, then the teacher read what had been written and signed it. Sometimes, if the teacher is occupied in a class, the supervisor writes his notes for the teacher to sign, then leaves the school without even seeing the teacher'. Another teacher wrote 'the supervisor put his point of view which is not subject to discussion'. 'He rarely asks the opinion of the teacher or allows an opportunity for the teacher to present his viewpoint'. A number of teachers indicated that supervisors usually write merely routine comments which teachers are accustomed to. Most frequently they are general comments which teachers do not take seriously. No one seems to be sure whether these comments differ from the confidential report, which the supervisor submits to the Ministry and to which the teacher does not have access.

Even the responses of the supervisor imply that the conference is one-sided. They indicated that during the conference they suggest new methods of teaching, and estimate the need of the teacher for guidance.

A number of supervisors agree that the supervisor's notes are usually discussed during the conference. Similarly, the achievement of the pupils is evaluated. A number of teachers and supervisors stated that supervisors, after the classroom visit, see some written work of the pupils, look at the lesson plans of the teachers to determine whether they conform to the plans advocated by the supervisors. A number of teachers considered that one of the deficiencies of the conference is the lack of privacy. Very often it is held in the principal's office or in the staff room in the presence of other colleagues.

A comparison between the pre-observation and the post-observation conference suggests that supervisors in Qatar place more emphasis on the latter. While the pre-observation conference is largely routine and a formality, substantial matters are sometimes discussed during the post-observation conference. Essentially though, the holding of the conference depends, to a great extent, on the school schedule. If the timetable does not allow time, it is not held at all, and in this case the supervisor leaves the school, after registering his notes, without even seeing the teachers. Even if a conference is held, it it seldom a genuine discussion. This kind of conference is not what the literature of supervision recommends, which is that the post-observation conference, should be a culmination of the visit. In Qatar, practical difficulties should be overcome, and adequate arrangements should be

made for sufficient time and a suitable place for a meaningful conference. The interaction in the conference should be participatory, responsive, and formative. The conference should be a shared exploration; a search for better choices and alternative strategies.

7.1.11   The Freedom of Teachers to Express Their Viewpoints

Participants were asked whether teachers feel free to express their viewpoint during the conference. Approximately 57% replied that they agreed or strongly agreed with the above statement (Table 114). The U test shows that there was a significant difference between teachers and supervisors concerning this item. While the overwhelming majority of supervisors (96.1%) "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the above statement, only 50.6% of the teachers shared this perception (Table 115). The independent variables have produced significant differences among teachers in three categories. The figures give the impression that the more experienced and better qualified the teacher is, the more he/she is likely to feel free to express his/her viewpoint. The male, better qualified and more experienced teachers reported higher levels of freedom than the female, less qualified and less inexperienced, irrespective of nationality or teaching cycle (Table 136). This result is not surprising since better qualified and experienced teachers feel more secure and confident.

Conversely, the independent variables did not reveal any significant differences among supervisors. Over 94 per cent of supervisors in all categories, thought that teachers were free to express their opinions (Table 137). As usual, there was a substantial

divergence between teachers and supervisors concerning this item. It is likely that supervisors genuinely thought that teachers were free to express their viewpoint, that they welcome discussion and respect teachers' opinions. Nevertheless, there must be some truth in the teachers' complaints. The situation is a function of the teacher-supervisor relationship, which only too often appears as a superior-subordinate relationships. As long as the supervisor is seen as an authority figure, who is able to influence decisions at upper levels of the hierarchy, he/she will pose a threat to the teacher. This does not mean that a supervisor is necessarily threatening, rather it means that he may be perceived by the teacher as a source of threat, no matter what the supervisor's good intentions may be. As one teacher put it 'to be on the safe side, it is better not to discuss' or 'to oppose the supervisor's opinion' because such a discussion may be perceived as 'paramount to rebeliousness'. Another teacher wrote 'very often expressing one's views can be misunderstood and misinterpreted. One may be transferred to another school or cycle due to a dispute with the supervisor or the principal'. Part of the problem lies in the confidential report to which the teacher has no access. Many decisions are taken on the basis of this report. Therefore teachers hesitate to risk embarking on arguments with the supervisors. Another part of the problem is related to the 'tyrany of the schedule which rarely allows time for genuine discussion. As mentioned earlier, it frequently happens that supervisors write their notes without face-to-face discussion with the teacher who then has to sign. Sometimes they leave the school without even seeing the teacher. A teacher referred to the 'parental status' of the older supervisors which makes younger teachers shy away from genuine discussion. This is not strange in an Arab 'patriarchal' society.

7.1.12   Supervisors' Consideration of Teachers' Own Circumstances

Participants were asked whether they thought that the supervisor takes into account the circumstances of the teacher, and whether he/she tries to put himself/herself into the teacher's place imagining how he/she might react in a similar situation. Less than half of the participants (48.2%) replied that they agreed or strongly agreed with this statement (Table 114). Once again the disagreement between teachers and supervisors, concerning this item illustrates a feature which is common to many of the other items; that is what supervisors think they are doing and what teachers perceive them as doing are two different things. The vast majority of supervisors (98.7%) compared to only 39% of teachers agreed with the above statement. The difference is large as well as statistically significant according the U test (table 115). The chi-square test shows that teachers' as well as supervisors' responses were independent of all personal characteristics. While over 95% of supervisors, asserted that they took the teacher's circumstances into account, the percentages of teachers, across all independent variables, who held similar conviction, ranged between 21 and 42 (Tables 138 and 139).

Some previous comments may be applicable here. Both sides are telling part of the truth. Because supervisors are seen as representatives of the authority, their behaviour would be misunderstood. If a supervisor was task-oriented, or if he tried to take into account both the teacher's needs and the welfare of the pupils, he could be perceived as a person who is no longer aware of what is really going on. A teacher wrote 'supervisors have been out of

the classroom so long that they have forgotten what it is all about. They remember things from their own or other peoples' experience, but actually they have lost touch with the real world of teaching'. A number of supervisors seems aware of the teachers' perceptions. A supervisor wrote 'I frequently get the feeling that, when I criticize what a teacher is doing, the unspoken response is 'if you are so competent, do it yourself'. Another supervisor indicated that the circumstances of the teacher should be taken into account, 'but there are limits. The welfare of the students should not be damaged'. However, it could be concluded that whenever teachers are promoted to the post of supervisor they will tend towards idealism. Up to a point, this is normal. The role expectations of a supervisor are different. Gradually supervisors' behaviour becomes incogruent with their previous actual behaviour. This change causes resentment among the teachers. A compromise should be reached. Otherwise, barriers will hinder the communication between teachers and supervisors.

7.1.13   The Impression the Supervisor Leaves After the Visit

The supervisor leaves the impression that the aim of the visit is to improve the learning/teaching process; rather than to identify the teacher's errors:

It is interesting that a high proportion of participants (73%) either agreed or disagreed with this statement (Table 114). Although a significant difference existed between teachers and supervisors, concerning this item, the important thing is that a fairly high proportion of teachers (71% compared to 100% of the supervisors) agreed

with the statements (Table 115). It is also interesting that the highest percentage of teachers was that of teachers with higher degrees (71.4%) who usually appear more critical. Tables 140 and 141 suggest that teachers as well as supervisors' responses were not affected by the independent variables.

It seems that supervisors, in general, are aware of what the visit may achieve, of how their presence may be perceived, and of how specifically their comments may be interpreted. Accordingly it can be concluded that supervisors do try to alleviate teacher's anxiety by emphasizing their good intentions, by explaining that criticism is not aimed at revealing teachers' weaknesses but rather, at improving instruction.

7.1.14   The Helpfulness of the Visit

Slightly more than half the participants in this study either 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' with this statement (Table 114). The difference between teachers and supervisors was both large and statistically significant. All supervisors compared to 44.5% of teachers believed that the visit was helpful in improving the learning/teaching situation (Table 115).

Teachers' responses were influenced by all the independent variables except the teaching cycle. More male than female teachers (57.4 to 34.8%) and more non-Qatari, than Qatari teachers (53.7 to 34.5) perceived the supervisory visits as helpful. Less qualified and inexperienced teachers gave similar replies, although, in most cases,

the experienced and better qualified are those who share the opinions of the male and non-Qatari teachers (Table 142).

Although all supervisors either agreed or strongly agreed that the visit improves the teaching/learning, significant differences among supervisors related to nationality, sex, and experience existed. Table 143 explains this situation. The majority of Qatari, female and inexperienced supervisors selected the first option (strongly agree) while the majority of non-Qatari, male and experienced supervisors favoured the second option (agree).

The figures support the conclusion that supervisors take almost a polar stance to that of teachers. Supervisors tend to view the results of the visit in a very positive way, while a considerable proportion of teachers regarded the visit by supervisors as of little value. It is highly possible that both groups are telling the truth as they see it. The over-estimation of supervisors' assessment for what they do, may be a matter of 'wishful thinking', while the 'under-rating' of teachers' assessment for supervisors' efforts may reflect their subjective feelings that nothing would change after the visit. It is possible that teachers expect easy answers to their problems. As mentioned earlier (in chapter 5) when one collects from human beings a set of responses which are essentially their perceptions of reality (as opposed to getting measures of the reality itself) many reservations should be taken into consideration.

The low assessment of teachers of the results of the supervisory visit may be attributed to the fact the visit is not requested by the

teacher, and is essentially undertaken for evaluative purposes. For the teacher to feel that the visit was helpful, he must have sought the help, although not asking for help, does not mean that the teacher does not need it. Sometimes a teacher may not ask for help in case he is considered incompetent. Certainly supervisors encounter teachers who resist help or claim that they do not need it. However, the way in which the help is offered has something to do with its helpfulness. The offered help should not appear as irrelevant or offensive. The person who is supposed to be the source of help (the supervisor) should be able to provide it. Conducting the visit without a high commitment to holding pre-and-post-observation conferences, and without genuine discussion with teachers, makes the visit merely ritualistic.

7.1.15   Conclusion

The supervisory visits were given high priority in the ministerial circular no.3 issued in 1977, concerning supervision. The figures related to this activity in the preceding section showed that it was the one most frequently undertaken, though it ranked relatively low in importance. This supports the prominence given to classroom visits in the literature. But the crucial question is what are the features of supervisory visits in Qatari school? and to what extent do they exhibit the characteristics recommended in the literature? To answer these questions 14 items were discussed concerning frequency and duration, pre-and-post-observation conferences, helpfulness, and the kind of relationships prevailing between teachers and supervisors.

The distribution of responses showed that a fairly high percentage of participants considered the present number of visits (two a year) was adequate. Teachers' responses were independent of all personal characteristics except experience. A relatively high proportion of inexperienced teachers stated that they would like to be visited more than twice a year. Despite anxieties related to visits, it seems either that teachers in this category would have liked more feedback, or they would have wish to make their work more widely known. By contrast there were no significant differences among supervisors. Yet it could be concluded that the male, the better qualified, and the experienced supervisors, irrespective of their nationality or sex, would like to spend more time on classroom visits. It is probable that they thought that the current number of visits was not enough to accomplish the aims of the exercise.

Concerning the duration of the visit, the data reveals a high level of divergence between teachers and supervisors concerning this item. While the majority of supervisors considered the time they spent on the visit was sufficient, there was general agreement among teachers that the time spent was not enough. Teachers' responses were dependent on experience. The inexperienced teachers were the least satisfied with the time spent on the visit. Supervisors' responses were affected by the teaching cycle. Primary supervisors would like to devote more time to the visit.

Teachers indicated that the pre and post-observation conferences were not regularly conducted. Only slightly more than half the teachers reported that the visit is frequently preceded and followed by

a conference. By contrast, supervisors stated that conferences were frequently held. About 45% of the participants stated that the pre-observation conference lasts for only a few minutes, while 28% estimated that it was longer. A substantial proportion indicated that the length of the conference varies according to the particular situation. It is clearly impossible to discuss important matters, adequately in a few minutes. It can be concluded that conferences are often haphazard and frequently unplanned. Their occurrence and their length depend, to a great extent, on the timetable of the school. Nevertheless, the figures give the impression that the post-observation conference is given more commitment, than the pre-observation conference. Substantial matters are discussed in the post-observation conference.

The figures show that participants were almost evenly divided concerning the embarrassment which teachers feel during the visit. This was one of the few items of concern on which there was general agreement between teachers and supervisors. Teachers' responses were affected only by experience. A greater proportion of inexperienced teachers stated that they frequently feel embarrassed during the visit. This does not seem a surprising finding. Inexperienced teachers are likely to be less confident and therefore more likely to be anxious and embarrassed by the visit. Supervisors' responses depended on qualification and teaching cycle. Better qualified supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle stated that teachers rarely feel embarrassed.

A relatively low percentage of participants replied that teachers behaved differently during the visit. There was also a high level of convergence between teachers and supervisors concerning this item. The analysis of responses revealed that the less qualified and less experienced the teachers were the more likely they were to behave in a manner they believed satisfied the supervisors. Qatari, less qualified, inexperienced and primary supervisors shared this view.

The overwhelming majority of supervisors, irrespective of their personal characteristics, believed that teachers feel free to express their opinions during the conferences or the visits. In comparison, teachers' responses were dependent on sex, qualification and experience. Male, better qualified and experienced teachers, did feel free to say what they thought. It seems a little surprising that the responses were not affected by nationality. One would have expected a difference between Qatari and non-Qatari teachers, since the latter have much less security. This is not as strange as it appears on the surface, because even Qatari teachers are anxious to get good reports in order to be promoted to better positions. Rarely did nationality affect the responses throughout this study.

Less than half the participants stated that the supervisor takes into account the circumstances of the teachers and tries to put himself in his place imagining what might be his reaction in similar circumstances. Supervisors reported that they did attempt to do this. Conversely a very low percentage of teachers thought that supervisors did make this imaginative effort. Nevertheless, a fairly high percentage of teachers, as well as the vast majority of supervisors

reported that supervisors leave the impression that their aim is the improvement of the teaching/learning situation, rather than that of identifying teachers' faults.

The data suggest that there was a substantial discrepancy between teachers and supervisors concerning the helpfulness of the visit. While the overwhelming majority of supervisors thought that the visits were helpful, less than 50% of teachers agreed. Inexperienced, less qualified, male, and non-Qatari teachers, reported a relatively high level of helpfulness.

In sum, the participants, particularly teachers, perceived the number of supervisory visits as adequate, but the time spent on the visit as inadequate. Classroom visits are unannounced, they are mainly for evaluative purposes, they are not conducted at the request of the teachers and do not meet their needs. It is highly probable that they occur only to comply with a Ministry requirement that teachers should be observed. Pre-observation and post-observation conferences are haphazard, unplanned, and vary according to circumstances. Although supervisors are anxious to create a human, cordial, non-threatening climate, they were anxious to inspire trust, confidence, and persuading the teachers that their visits are well-intentioned and meant to be helpful, the majority of teachers did not perceive that the visit make any real difference in the teaching/learning situation.

SECTION II

The Evaluation of Teachers

7.2.0   Introduction

The preceding section was concerned with the supervisory visits. This section is devoted to the evaluation of teachers. Section 11 of the preceding chapter revealed that the evaluation of teachers was the most favoured as well as the second most frequently undertaken activity. The present section is an analysis of the responses to 4 statements pertaining to the evaluation of teachers' performance. The following section is concerned with the criteria for the evaluation.

7.2.1   The Capability of Supervisors to Evaluate Teachers

Participants were asked whether they thought that supervisors were capable of evaluating teachers. Supervisors more than teachers (89.8% to 55.3%) thought that they were capable of evaluating teachers. The difference is large and statistically significant, according to the U test (Table 144). Teachers' responses were dependent on sex, qualification, and teaching cycle. Proportionately more male than female teachers (61.6 to 49.3%), a higher proportion of teachers with non-university qualifications than teachers with the B.A. or higher degrees (68.6, 49.6, 14.3% respectively) and more teachers from the primary cycle than teachers in the prep-secondary cycle (64.2 to 48.6%) believed that supervisors were capable of evaluating teachers. Differences among teachers in the above groups were significant at the

.05 level or beyond according to the chi-square test. Although more inexperienced than experienced teachers (60 to 52.7%) reported similar responses the difference was not significant. The percentages of Qatari and non-Qatari teachers were very close (54.2 to 56.1%) and the difference was not significant. It is noticeable that the female teachers who are, in general inexperienced and less qualified, share the views of the experienced and the better qualified teachers, probably because their supervisors are also less qualified and less experienced (Table 147).

Although supervisors in all groups thought that they were capable of evaluating teachers, the ratings of the male, non-Qatari, better qualified, experienced supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle were relatively moderate. The percentage of supervisors in the above groups ranged from 81.9 to 88.9 while the percentages of supervisors in the other categories ranged from 90 to 100% (Table 148). Differences were significant except between male and female supervisors. It seems that the better qualified and more experienced the supervisor was, the more likely he/she was to be aware of the difficulties of evaluation.

7.2.2   Participants' Opinions Concerning the Problem of Evaluation

The most frequently mentioned reason was that the number of visits was insufficient. Another reason given was that the rating instrument was not efficient. The former reason was mentioned mostly by teachers, while the latter was mostly mentioned by supervisors. A teacher wrote 'one lesson is not enough to make a judgement. It is not fair to

evaluate a teacher's performance on the basis of one or two visits'.
Moreover, as one teacher put it 'the supervisor does not see more than
a limited part of the teacher's performance, and this is not enough for
evaluation. She makes only fragmentary and completely inadequate notes
on the observation, while at any one time there is a wide range of
activities and behaviours'. A number of teachers indicated that very
often the evaluation depended on chance, or on circumstances and
factors beyond the teacher's control. For example, a particular class
or a particular group of students may affect the evaluation. A lucky
teacher may be visited while teaching a class of excellent students,
whereas another unlucky colleague may be visited while teaching a
difficult class. Supervisors consider the teacher with the good class
better than the teacher with the difficult class, although this
judgement does not take account of the difference in the circumstances.
Worse than that, one teacher added 'the personal relations with the
administration often determine which classes a teacher should teach.
Very frequently, difficult classes are reserved for newly appointed or
transferred teachers. Several teachers considered that some
supervisors were not qualified to be responsible for supervision and
evaluation. One teacher wrote: 'Frequently teachers are better
qualified and more experienced than the supervisors. Nevertheless, the
supervisor, because of his official position, can impose his opinion,
and evaluate teachers according to how far they accept and implement
his suggestions'.

Another teacher considered that the incompetence of some
supervisors was clear from the inconsistency of their judgements.
National prejudice and personal relations were mentioned by a number of

teachers as factors which negatively affected evaluation. A number of supervisors shared these concerns. A supervisor wrote 'evaluation is not so simple that it can be done after limited observations'. Very often he makes his judgement on unreliable recollections when rating the teacher'. Another supervisor drew attention to the great number of variables which affect a teacher's performance, and cautioned against over-simplification, and against relying too much on 'first impression' which some supervisors form about a particular teacher, and which continues to determine their rating of the teacher. It sometimes happens that the first impression is formed as a result of the notes of the administration.

In sum, teachers' opinions about the capability of supervisors to evaluate teachers did not necessarily mean that they doubted the competencies of supervisors. Rather it indicated that teachers have legitimate anxieties. They were worried that several factors, irrelevant to the performance of teachers, affected the evaluation. Similarly, a number of supervisors agreed that many factors and circumstances, beyond the control of the teacher, affect the teaching/learning situation. Therefore, they cautioned against over-simplification in judging a teacher's performance.

7.2.3   Innovation or Conformity

Participants were asked to state whether they thought that supervisors put more importance on innovation or on conformity. It emerged that a relatively high percentage of teachers (62.5%) compared to 39.7% of supervisors believed that conformity rather than innovation

was emphasized (Table 145). The percentages of both teachers and supervisors, who stated the opposite, were relatively close (14.8 to 23.1%), while more supervisors than teachers (37.2% to 22.7%) stated that both aspects were equally emphasized .

The differences among teachers concerning this item were narrow and statistically not significant, except between teachers from the primary cycle and teachers from the pre-secondary cycle. A relatively lower percentage of teachers from the primary cycle thought that innovation was emphasized. In comparison, large and significant differences among supervisors, were related to sex and qualification. A greater proportion of female and less qualified supervisors than male and better qualified supervisors considered that conformity was emphasized. Although relatively higher percentages of Qatari, primary, and inexperienced than non-Qatari, experienced supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle, shared the same opinion, the differences were not statistically significant (Tables 149 and 150).

The results support a conclusion mentioned earlier in the preceding chapter, that is that conformity rather than innovation is emphasized in the schools of Qatar. Innovation may be viewed as a violation of rules, though the literature of supervision in Qatar considered encouraging innovation as an important task of supervisors. Part of the problem may be traced in the items of the rating instrument, among which is the 'implementation of instructions'. The ministerial circular 3/1977 states that supervisors, in the second term, should make sure that teachers have implemented the curriculum. A well-trained open-minded supervisor would not understand this in

terms of literal conformity which precludes innovation, initiative, and imaginative thinking. On the contrary, if abused or misunderstood, such a statement could be felt to authorise the supervisor to check any innovation. In the words of a teacher 'my supervisor does not tolerate any methods of teaching other than those he prefers'.

7.2.4   The Clarity of Criteria

Participants were asked whether they thought that the criteria of evaluation were made clear. Beyond the .05 of significance, the difference between teachers and supervisors, concerning this item was significant. 75.6% of supervisors compared with 54.9% of teachers considered the criteria for evaluation were made clear (Table 146).

Supervisors' responses were independent of all characteristics. The majority of supervisors, in all categories, either agreed or strongly agreed with the above statement. Although a relatively higher proportion of better qualified supervisors stated that the criteria were made clear, the difference between them and the less qualified supervisors did not reach the .05 level. In comparison, differences among teachers related to qualification and teaching cycle were revealed. Teachers with higher degrees and from the prep-secondary cycle perceived the criteria of evaluation as somewhat ambiguous. It is probable that they viewed the criteria as consisting too much of general rather than specific items (Tables 151 and 152).

7.2.5   Conclusion

Though it is difficult to reconcile with the functions of giving help ans support, evaluation was viewed as a crucial function of supervision. A fairly high percentage of the participants in this study believed that supervisors were capable of evaluating a teacher's performance. But there was a wide difference of opinion between teachers and supervisors. Few teachers believed that supervisors were capable of making valid assessments. In particular, a very low percentage of teachers with higher degrees thought that supervisors were competent to do this. All participants, and teachers in particular, thought that the problem of making valid assessments was a function of the multitude of variables that influence the teaching/learning process. They considered that supervisors can not observe, in one or two visits, more than a small part of the process. Therefore they can not make accurate judgements about the performance of teachers. Sometimes, chance plays a crucial role in forming supervisors' impressions. Circumstances beyond the control of teachers such as the composition of pupils in a particular class may affect the evaluation of a teacher.

A conclusion mentioned earlier, that conformity rather than innovation was emphasized in the school of Qatar, still holds here. To a great extent, this confirms the view that the aim of the evaluative visits is to determine whether the teacher was carrying out instructions, rather than to promote the educational process. And finally, a fairly high proportion of participants believed that the criteria for evaluation were clear. As might have been expected more supervisors than teachers held such beliefs.

SECTION III

The Criteria for Evaluation

7.3.0   Introduction

In a sense, this section can be considered an extension of the preceding section. It is devoted to the criteria of evaluating teacher's performance. Participants were requested to mark five items, considered to be important criteria for evaluation, according to their level of importance and frequency of application, on two 4-point rating scales. The first scale is concerned with the ideal perceptions and ranges from the highest 'very important' to the lowest 'not important', while the other is concerned with the actual perceptions and ranges from the highest 'to a great extent' to the lowest 'not at all'. Each item will be analyzed separately using the same statistical techniques employed in sections one and two of the preceding chapter.

7.3.1   The Lesson Plan

This criterion was considered the least important. Its weight quotient of importance (77.6) ranked at the bottom (Table 153). Approximately 63.1 per cent of the participants regarded it either as 'very important' or 'important'. On the contrary, its weight quotient of application (93.6) ranked at the top. The vast majority of participants (98.5%) replied that it was undertaken either 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Table 154). The difference between ideal and actual responses was significant beyond the .05 level according to the t value (Table 155).

The analysis of ideal and actual perceptions of both teachers and supervisors is given in table 156. The distribution shows a substantial disagreement between teachers and supervisors concerning the importance of this criterion. While it was strongly supported by 89.8 per cent of the supervisors, only 58.3 per cent of the teachers considered it either as 'very important' or 'important'.

Table 157 indicates that teachers' ideal responses were affected by qualification, teaching cycle and experience. The less qualified and less experienced the teacher was, the more likely he or she was to attach particular importance to this item. The percentages of inexperienced, less qualified and primary teachers who believed that a teacher should frequently have a 'written lesson plan' ranged between 68.5 and 74.4, while the percentages of teachers in other categories were between 50 and 60.

Although the vast majority of supervisors, across all independent variables, strongly supported this criterion, significant, though slight, differences existed among supervisors, in different categories, except between primary supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle. The percentages of male, non-Qatari, better qualified and experienced supervisors ranged from 77.8 to 87, while the percentage of supervisors in other groups ranged from 90 to 100 (Table 158).

Concerning application, there was a general agreement among teachers as well as among supervisors, regardless of their personal characteristics, that this criterion was always employed in evaluating

a teacher's performance. Over 95 per cent of teachers and of supervisors in different groups, reported such a belief. Differences were not significant, except between less qualified and better qualified supervisors. It is clear that the application of this criterion, while congruent with what supervisors prefer, was incongruent with what teachers, in general, prefer. In sum, this criterion seems a good example of an item which supervisors are spending much time on, but which is not considered very important by the teachers.

Certainly there are reasons for this discrepancy. A lesson plan prepared for a single class period or a single day is generally viewed by educators as the basis of instructional planning. It provides first hand evidence about teachers' objectives and work patterns. It is a handy and useful device, a kind of daily organizer and prompter for the teacher. A supervisor wrote 'to go to the classroom without your written lesson plan is like going to war unarmed'. Nevertheless, important as this device may seem, it is not popular among a considerable percentage of teachers. The first reason is probably that writing a daily plan means work, and few people seem to like this kind of work. It is also very often treated by supervisors and principals as though it was in itself a sufficient basis for evaluation. As one teacher put it, 'It becomes one of the principle exhibits and the supervisors sometimes makes their judgement solely on the basis of the lesson plan even without visiting the teacher in the classroom'. Some experienced teachers, in particular, perceived 'a written lesson plan' as a 'waste of time'. 'We teach better without it', a teacher wrote. 'It prevents spontaneity and creativity'. Another teacher indicated

that seldom does the lesson go as it was planned. Though it can be important, there may be little relationship between the lesson plan and the nature of the teaching/learning processes that occur in the classroom', another teacher wrote. As a consequence, written lesson plans became a routine matter produced only for the supervisor or other officials, rather than as an integral part of the long term planning of instruction.

7.3.2   The Attainment of Pupils

In the opinion of the participants in this study, this criterion was important as well as frequently employed to evaluate teachers. The weight quotient of importance (81.4) approximates to the weight quotient of application (81.6), although when compared with other criteria it ranked 4th in importance and 2nd in application (Table 153). Likewise, the percentage of participants who considered it either as 'very important' or 'important' was almost identical with the percentage of participants who stated that it was employed either 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Table 154). The difference between the ideal and actual perceptions did not reach the .05 level of significance (Table 155).

Teachers' and supervisors' responses are set out in Table 156. Although the vast majority of both groups were in favour of this criterion, the supervisors showed a higher level of preference than teachers. All the supervisors compared with 81.7% of teachers rated 'the attainment of pupils' either as 'very important' or 'important'. In the same way, although both groups replied that teachers were

frequently evaluated according to this criterion, the percentage of supervisors (97.5) who gave such a reply was higher than the percentage of teachers (85). According to the U test the difference between teachers and supervisors concerning the degree of importance and frequency of application, was significant.

While supervisors' ideal responses were independent of all variables, teachers' ideal responses were dependent on qualification and teaching cycle. Proportionately more teachers with non-university qualifications (91%) than teachers with the B.A. degree (76.4%) or with higher degrees (78.6%), and a greater proportion of primary teachers (92.6%) than teachers from the pre-secondary cycle (73.4%) regarded this item either as 'very important' or 'important'. Differences among teachers in the above two categories were significant beyond the .05 level (Tables 159 and 160).

These results do not mean necessarily that the experienced and highly qualified teachers do not attach importance to the 'attainment of students' as a criterion of evaluating the teacher's performance, rather, the findings may suggest that they feel that this criterion by itself is not a sufficient test of teacher effectiveness. 'Teachers can get results by all kinds of means' as one teacher put it. 'Attributing the resulting learning to a particular teacher or even to the school is merely over-simplification' another teacher wrote. In fact, looking only or even primarily at results rather than practices is undesirable. The danger is that teachers may only 'teach the test'.

Concerning the frequency of application there was close agreement among teachers as well as among supervisors, in almost all categories, that the 'attainment of students' was very often considered when evaluating teacher's performance. Over 81.1 per cent of teachers and more than 88.8 per cent of supervisors held such convictions. Differences were not significant except between male and female teachers and between less qualified and better qualified supervisors. Nevertheless, the differences were not large. In conclusion, the data give the impression that teachers were evaluated according to a generally accepted criterion. The vast majority of participants in this study, regardless of personal characteristics, were of the opinion that teacher's performance should be evaluated according to the attainment of students. Similarly the vast majority reported high levels of application. In most cases the perceived levels of application exceeded the perceived levels of importance. The data suggest that teachers were held accountable for the achievement of students. While teachers did not 'dispute' this 'accountability', they cautioned against the 'mechanical' interpretation of the 'results of students' or regarding them the only indicator of the effectiveness of the teacher. Moreover, this kind of accountability may lead to undesirable behaviours of teachers and have negative effects on the learning of students.

7.3.3   The Personality of the Teacher

The participants in this study believed that there was a direct relationship between the personality of the teacher and successful teaching. the weight quotient of importance (84.6) ranked 2nd. The

vast majority of the respondents (92.8%) were of the opinion that the personality of the teacher should be considered when evaluating his/her performance. Conversely, the weight quotient of application (63.2) ranked 4th. Out of 510 respondents only 48.3 per cent reported that it was frequently applied (Tables 153 and 154). The difference between preferred and observed perceptions was large as well as statistically significant, according to the t value (Table 155).

Table 156 compares teachers' and supervisors' responses and shows that there was a close agreement between the two groups on the importance of this item. Although a relatively higher percentage of teachers (93.9) compared to 85.9% of supervisors considered this criterion of much value, the difference did not reach the .05 level of significance. The very small number who selected the last option (not important) creates the impression that this item was strongly supported by the participants. No one considered it 'not important'. Concerning application the table reveals the contrast. Supervisors more than teachers (79.5 to 42.5 per cent) replied that they utilized this criterion in evaluating teacher's performance. The difference was significant according to the U test.

Teachers' ideal responses are presented in Table 161. Although over 91 per cent of teachers across all independent variables, rated this item either as 'very important' or 'important', significant, though narrow differences, were observed between male and female teachers, and between experienced and inexperienced teachers. The table presents also the actual responses of teachers. Although teachers, in all categories, reported low levels of application,

significant differences existed between less qualified and highly qualified teachers and between primary teachers and teachers from the prep-secondary cycle. The lowest percentage was that of teachers with higher degrees (14.3%). The percentages of teachers in other categories ranged from 37.9 to 46.2.

Table 162 gives the responses of supervisors and reveals significant differences between Qatari and non-Qatari supervisors, and between inexperienced and experienced supervisors. Over 80 per cent of supervisors in almost all categories regarded this criterion either as 'very important' or 'important'. For Qatari and inexperienced supervisors the percentages were 75.1 and 70.8 respectively.

It is noticeable that the percentages of supervisors in certain categories (non-Qatari, male and experienced supervisors) who put particular importance on this item, approximate to the percentages of teachers, who held similar perceptions, while the percentage of teachers in other categories were higher than the percentages of supervisors.

With regard to implementation, there was a marked variance in the supervisors' responses. Significant differences among supervisors, in almost all categories, concerning the frequency of application, occurred, except between primary supervisors and supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle. It is clear that the perceived level of application was in direct proportion to the perceived levels of importance. Supervisors who reported higher levels of importance were

inclined to report higher levels of application. Thus, more than 84 per cent of male, non-Qatari, better qualified, experienced supervisors, and supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle stated that they very frequently considered the 'personality of the teacher' when evaluating his/her performance. The percentages of supervisors in other groups were between 66.6 and 75. Nevertheless, none of the supervisors in any group, selected the last option (not at all).

In sum, the figures give the impression that teachers, irrespective of their characteristics, would like their supervisors to apply this criterion but felt it was not generally used. The responses of supervisors suggest that as the qualification and the experience of the supervisor increases he/she was more likely to emphasize the importance of the 'personality of the teacher' and to consider it more frequently when evaluating the teacher.

7.3.4   Teacher's Mastery of Subject Matter

According to the weight quotient of importance (81.9) this criterion ranked 3rd. It was perceived either as 'very important' or 'important' by 85.8% of the participants. On the contrary, the weight quotient of application (57) ranked 5th. Out of 510 participants only 36.9% responded that it was applied 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' (Tables 153 and 154). The difference between the preferred and actual status was significant according to the t value (Table 155).

Table 156 shows the responses of teachers and supervisors and reveals that while there was a relatively high level of convergence

between teachers and supervisors concerning the degree of importance, there was a high level of divergence concerning the frequency of application. Although a higher percentage of teachers (87.5) than supervisors (76.9%) marked this item either as 'very important' or 'important', the difference was not statistically significant. In comparison, 33.3% of teachers and 56.4% of supervisors replied that they frequently consider a teacher's mastery of subject matter when evaluating his/her performance.

Teachers' responses concerning the importance of this criterion were independent of all variables except experience. More than 83.2 per cent of teachers, across all independent variables, considered this criterion of much value. Although there was a statistically significant difference between inexperienced and experienced teachers, it was not large. On the contrary, there was a noticeable variance in supervisors' ideal perceptions which can be grouped into three categories. More than 84 per cent of male, non-Qatari better qualified, experienced supervisors and supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle shared with teachers their strong support for this item; a fairly high percentage of female, less qualified and primary supervisors (70, 71.6 and 61.8 respectively) held similar convictions, and finally less than 50 per cent of Qatari and inexperienced supervisors thought that teachers should be evaluated according to their knowledge of the subject matter (tables 163 and 164).

It seems as though Qatari and inexperienced supervisors did not think that there is a direct relation between teacher's knowledge of subject matter and his/her success in teaching, or that they felt it is

difficult to judge the teacher's knowledge. A supervisor stated 'I do not care whether the teacher was of wide or limited knowledge. I care only for results. Moreover, it is difficult to evaluate the teacher's knowledge'. Another supervisor indicated that 'very often a teacher of moderate knowledge of his (her) subject achieves results better than an expert'. This conclusion finds support in the analysis of supervisors' responses concerning the degree of importance of the attainment of students and the classroom skills. These two items were perceived as of much value by supervisors.

With regard to application, the figures show that despite some statistically significant differences related to nationality, qualification, and experience, more than 60 per cent of teachers, in different groups thought that supervisors rarely employed 'the mastery of subject matter' in evaluating a teacher's performance. This finds support in the distribution of supervisors' actual perceptions. Independent variables have resulted in significant differences among supervisors, across all categories, concerning the frequency of application. A high percentage of Qatari, inexperienced, primary, less qualified and female supervisors stated that they rarely applied this criterion in evaluating teachers, while more than 63.2% of supervisors in other groups replied that they frequently considered the mastery of subject matter when evaluating a teacher's performance. The figures suggest that even supervisors who attached high levels of importance of this item tended to report relatively lower levels of application. It seems as if the official tendency in the schools of Qatar is to emphasize the results of teaching rather than the teacher's knowledge of the subject matter, although it is difficult to see how they can be separated.

In sum, the vast majority of teachers, irrespective of personal characteristics, favoured this item, while there was substantial disagreement among supervisors. It appears that non Qatari, male, better qualified, experienced supervisors, and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle, and to a lesser degree, female and less qualified supervisors, shared the teachers' views.

With respect to application, the large majority of teachers, in all categories, thought that supervisors neglected this criterion. This result was supported by the analysis of supervisors responses which showed that certain groups of supervisors, particularly those who considered it of little importance, reported very low levels of application. Even supervisors who perceived it of much value reported relatively lower levels of application. This very big difference can be interpreted as the result of a general tendency in the schools of Qatar to look primarily for the results of teaching rather for the level of the teacher's knowledge. It is also probable that supervisors, in general, found it difficult to judge the knowledge of teachers, while it was easier to evaluate the outcomes of teaching.

7.3.5   Classroom Skills

In the opinion of the participants in this study this was the most important criterion. Approximately 97.7 per cent regarded it either 'very important' or 'important'. The weight quotient of importance (87.7) ranked it first. It seems that the participants thought that the important factor in achieving the aims of instruction, was not 'what he knows' but 'how he teaches and what he accomplishes'. To a

lesser degree, a relatively high percentage of the respondents (72.3) stated that the criterion was applied 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. The weight quotient of application (73.3) ranked it 3rd (Tables 153 and 154). According to the t value the difference was significant beyond the .05 level (Table 155).

Teachers' and supervisors' responses are compared in Table 156. The distribution of responses shows a general agreement of both groups on the importance of 'classroom skills'. More than 96 per cent of teachers and supervisors marked this item as 'very important' or 'important'. The statistically significant difference was negligible. By contrast the figures reveal a high level of discrepancy between the two groups concerning the application of this criterion. While almost all supervisors replied that they very frequently employed this criterion in evaluating teacher's performance, only a moderate percentage of teachers (67.5) held similar perceptions. According to the U test, the difference was large and statistically significant. This means that supervisors thought that they very often made evaluations according to this criterion, while a relatively lower percentage of teachers felt the same way.

Table 165 suggests that teachers' ideal responses were dependent on sex and teaching cycle. Although the difference between male and female teachers, and between teachers from the primary cycle and from the prep-secondary cycle, was narrow, it was statistically significant. In general, more than 93 per cent of teachers, across all categories, were of the opinion that this criterion should be employed when evaluating a teacher's performance. Supervisors, in all groups, shared

this opinion. Supervisors' ideal responses were independent of all variables. In the same way supervisors' actual perceptions were independent of almost all variables. Over 95 per cent of supervisors, in all categories, responded that they frequently utilized this criterion in evaluating teacher's performance. Despite a statistically significant difference between inexperienced and experienced supervisors, it was small (Table 166). Conversely the percentages of teachers who believed that an assessment of 'classroom skills' was frequently used in evaluation ranged between 60 and 74. There were large and statistically significant differences between male and female teachers, and between inexperienced and experienced teachers. 74.2 of female teachers and 74.6% of inexperienced teachers compared with 60.7% of male teachers and 64.2% of experienced teachers reported a high frequency of application.

In sum, the great majority of teachers and supervisors, across all categories, supported this criterion. But while the overwhelming majority of supervisors stated also that they frequently used it in evaluating teacher's performance, relatively lower percentages of teachers (between 57 and 74) thought that it was regularly applied.

7.3.6   Conclusion

Five selected criteria for evaluating teacher's performance have been analyzed and discussed in this section. The five items, as they originally appeared in the questionnaire, were; the lesson plan, the attainment of students, the personality of the teachers, the mastery of subject matter, and the classroom skills. All five items were

supported, though on somewhat different levels. The weight quotients of importance were: 77.6, 81.4, 84.6, 81.9 and 87.7 respectively. According to the above weight quotients, the 5 criteria took the following order : classroom skills, the personality of the teacher, the mastery of subject matter, the attainment of students, and the lesson plan. It is clear that except for the weight quotient of the 'lesson plan' other weight quotients were close. In the same way, except for 'lesson plan' which was supported by only 63.1% of the participants, more than 84 per cent of the participants strongly favoured the other items. When the ideal responses of teachers are considered alone the above rank order remains the same. But when the ideal responses of supervisors are considered separately the items took the following order: the attainment of students, classroom skills, lesson plan, personality of the teacher, and mastery of the subject matter (Table 167).

However, within the ranks of teachers and supervisors, different rank orders are revealed, although rank orders of teachers for all items were relatively close (Tables 168 and 169). With regard to application the weight quotients were not close (respectively 93.6, 81.6, 63.2, 57 and 73.3). Accordingly the 5 criteria took the following order; the lesson plan, the attainment of students, the classroom skills, the personality of the teachers, and the mastery of subject matter. The percentages of participants who stated that these criteria were frequently applied, ranged from 36.9 to 98.5. The weight quotients of importance of the personality of the teacher, mastery of subject matter and classroom skills were higher than the weight quotients of application. The weight quotient of application of 'the

'lesson plan' was higher than the weight quotient of importance, while the weight quotients of both importance and application of 'the attainment of students' were almost identical. This result finds support in the results of the t value test which show statistically significant differences between ideal and actual perceptions of all items except the 'attainment of students'. Similarly the correlation coefficient (table 201) shows weak relations between ideal and actual responses of the participants. However the correlation coefficients given in tables 202 and 203 indicate that the relations between supervisors' ideal and actual responses were, in general, stronger than the relations between teachers' ideal and actual responses.

The above rank order of application was the same for teachers and supervisors. More interesting is that this rank order was agreed upon by all categories of teachers, which rarely happens. Conversely, there was some difference in the rank orders of supervisors (Tables 167, 168 and 169).

The Effects of the Independent Variables

Although all five items were, in some measure, supported by the participants in this study, the independent variables, particularly qualification and experience have brought out significant differences among teachers as well as among supervisors, concerning the degree of importance of each criterion. For example, 'the lesson plan' was supported by a greater proportion of less qualified, primary and inexperienced teachers than better qualified, experienced teachers and teachers from the prep-secondary cycle. Similarly, more teachers with non-university qualifications than teachers with either the B.A. or higher degrees, more primary teachers than teachers from the

prep-secondary cycle placed particular importance on 'the attainment of students'. 'The personality of the teacher' was more favoured by female and experienced teachers. Proportionally more experienced teachers were in favour of 'the mastery of subject matter', and finally, female and primary teachers put more emphasis on classroom skills.

As far as supervisors are concerned, it is noticeable that differences among them concerning the degree of importance of 'the attainment of pupils' and the classroom skills were not significant. 'The lesson plan' was strongly supported by more Qatari, inexperienced and less qualified supervisors than non-Qatari, experienced and better qualified supervisors. By contrast, more non-Qatari and experienced supervisors than Qatari and inexperienced supervisors were in favour of 'the personality of teachers'. And finally, more non-Qatari, highly qualified, experienced supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle perceived 'mastery of subject matter' of much value.

With regard to application, differences among teachers concerning 'the lesson plan' were not significant. Although teachers, across all independent variables replied that supervisors very frequently evaluated teachers according to 'the attainment of pupils', the percentage of female teachers, who reported such perceptions, was greater than the percentage of male teachers. Similarly, although teachers, in all groups, reported low levels of application of 'the personality of teachers' significant differences were observed between teachers with non-university qualifications and teachers with the B.A. or higher degrees, and between primary teachers and teachers in the prep-secondary cycle. This conclusion is also applicable to 'the mastery of subject matter'. Qatari teachers shared with the less

qualified and primary teachers a low assessment of the application of this item. In the same manner, although fairly high percentages of teachers reported that supervisors frequently evaluated teachers according to 'classroom skills', female more than male teachers, and inexperienced more than experienced teachers, held such beliefs.

As for supervisors, there was a close agreement that teachers were evaluated according to the lesson plan, 'the attainment of students' and 'the classroom skills'. Nevertheless, statistically, though small, differences existed between less qualified and highly qualified supervisors concerning the first two of the above criteria. Similarly significant differences occurred between inexperienced and experienced supervisors concerning the 3rd one. Concerning 'the mastery of subject matter' and 'the personality of the teachers' a marked variance was observed in supervisors' actual responses. A greater proportion of male, non-Qatari, experienced, better qualified supervisors and supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle gave a high assessment of application.

SECTION IV

Staffing

7.4.0   Introduction

The preceding section was devoted to the criteria for evaluating teacher's performance. Five selected criteria were discussed to determine their degree of importance and frequency of application. The present section is concerned with staffing. Six items related to this area will be discussed.

7.4.1   The Need for Professional Education for Supervisors

A combination of knowledge and skills is required for the implementation of the supervisors tasks mentioned early. Therefore it is reasonable to expect supervisors to have special training in the competencies that are functional in this task accomplishment.

Participants in this study were asked whether they thought that supervisors needed special training. The majority of participants (76.4%) stated that they 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' with this statement (Table 170). Although a relatively higher percentage of teachers (78.7) than supervisors (64.1) held such a belief, the Mann Whitney U test shows that the difference was statistically not significant (Table 171).

Teachers' responses were independent of nationality and teaching cycle, while dependent on sex, qualification and experience. Nevertheless, differences related to these variables were not large. In general, over 75 per cent of teachers, in all groups, believed that supervisors should have professional training in supervision (Table 172). The percentages of supervisors, who expressed similar views, were relatively lower than the percentages of teachers. They ranged between 58.3 and 72.2. The independent variables have not resulted in significant differences among supervisors (Table 173). In sum, the majority of teachers, and a fairly high percentage of supervisors considered the idea of 'special training' of supervisors, as a worthwhile proposal.

This result is supported by the findings of a recent study of the opinions of primary supervisors in Qatar. Ramzi (1988) reports that 74% of primary supervisors agreed that supervisors should be trained before appointment. However, he found a substantial disagreement concerning what was meant by preparation. More than 81 per cent stated that the preparation should consist of general educational programmes (very similar to the programmes of 'teacher education'). These supervisors perceived the 'B.A. degree is enough'. Only 31% thought that a supervisor should have a higher degree. 59% believed that a general diploma in education after the B.A. degree was desirable, while 52% thought that a diploma in supervision was essential. Approximately 26% thought that the preparation should be done in universities or specialized institutes. 78% stated that the preparation should be in accordance with the needs of the cycle.

7.4.2   Participants' Opinions Concerning Supervisors' Professional
Education

Participants were asked whether they supported the proposition that supervisors needed professional training, and if so, to give reasons. Different responses were given. These included the view that 'a university degree alone was not an adequate training for a supervisor'. Supervision, like any other skilled occupation, required some professional preparation, as well, if it was to be carried out effectively'. As one supervisor put it, 'the professional training of supervisors should be a continuous process in order that they can cope with changes in education'. Another supervisor wrote 'effective supervision needs academic, educational, and administrative training, in addition to a comprehensive knowledge and communication skills'.

Participants who did not think that supervisors need any professional training had their reasons too. 'Teaching experience is sufficient for a supervisor to perform his duties', one supervisor wrote. Another supervisor pointed out that for all supervisors there was an induction year when they accompanied an experienced colleague. One supervisor questioned what was meant by 'professional training' and stated 'since a supervisor has been educated at a university or teachers' institute, and has long experience in teaching, he is already qualified for supervision'. This view was shared by a number of teachers. 'Teacher training or a university degree together with long experience in teaching are what a supervisor needs to do his job', one teacher wrote.

It is apparent that the difference among participants was about whether a university degree or teacher training, together with long experience in teaching, were sufficient for a supervisor to carry out his responsibilities. The literature on supervision indicates that these are not sufficient. A good teacher does not necessarily make a good supervisor. Experience should not be over-estimated because it may be merely a replication of one year's experience. Even the induction year is not effective because the novice supervisor is trained by a supervisor who himself may lack professional training. In sum, there should be 'professional training' for supervisors, as there is 'teacher education', not because supervision is more difficult, but because it is different.

7.4.3   Peer Supervision

The proposition of 'peer supervision' or 'teacher-teacher supervision' or 'collegial supervision', as it has been called, is based on a number of assumptions. These include the growing competence, specialization, and better preparation of teachers, the need for a broader base of participation in instructional supervision, and the growing conviction that effective supervisory behaviour is not just a function of formal position, but rather of many factors such as competence in an area of common concern and the level of esteem by fellow group members. These factors, and many other, may have contributed to the popularity of the idea of 'teachers supervising teachers', which has been widely advocated in the literature of supervision in recent years.

Participants were asked whether they supported the idea of 'teachers supervising teachers' (Peer supervision). Participants were divided evenly on this matter. Nearly half of them stated that they either 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' with this statement (Table 170). The idea had some support from teachers and supervisors. Table 171 shows that 50.4% of teachers compared with 47.4% of supervisors were in favour of this idea.

Teachers' responses were dependent on the qualification and the teaching cycle. More teachers with higher degrees (78.6%) than with the B.A. degree (60.4%) or with non-university qualifications (31.4%), and more teachers from the prep-secondary cycle (61.2%) than teachers from the primary cycle (36.4%) were of the opinion that teachers can carry out supervisory duties. Differences among teachers in each of the above two categories were significant according to the chi-square test. Slightly more male, non-Qatari, and experienced teachers than female, Qatari, and inexperienced teachers held a similar belief, but the differences were not significant. The figures suggest that as the qualification of the teacher increases he/she is more likely to perceive supervision as a shared function which may be done by teachers as well as by supervisors (Table 174).

Table 175 shows a wide variance in supervisors' responses. Between 60 and 70% of male, non-Qatari, better qualified and experienced supervisors considered the idea of 'peer supervision' as very promising, while the percentages of Qatari, female, less qualified and inexperienced supervisors, who shows enthusiasm for the idea, ranged between 20.9 and 40. Differences among supervisors in the above

categories were significant. Although more supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle than in primary cycle, gave a similar response, the difference was not significant.

In sum, the 'peer supervision' approach was of relatively great value as perceived by better-qualified teachers and teachers from the prep-secondary cycle. A fairly high proportion of male, non-Qatari, better qualified and experienced supervisors felt the same way. One would not have expected the supervisors to support the idea, since, if implemented, much of their work and consequently some of their jobs would disappear.

7.4.4   Participants' Opinions Concerning Peer Supervision

Respondents who supported the idea gave the following reasons. 'Some teachers are well qualified and have long experience in teaching', one teacher wrote. 'It is not rare to find teachers who are better qualified and more experienced than some supervisors'. A supervisor pointed out that 'evaluation should be a continuous process, and improving teaching is an everyday job. To this end, teachers should cooperate'. 'The more experienced should help the less experienced and those beginning in the profession should not hesitate to ask for help from their older colleagues', another supervisor stated. She thought that 'peer supervision' enhances the 'team spirit', creates a cooperative atmosphere, and in general, improves the outcomes of teaching'. 'Such results can not be achieved by infrequent formal supervisory visits'. One teacher noticed that 'teachers benefit from each other more than from supervisors'. Teachers are much more

familiar with the situation in their schools than are the supervisors. They see each other daily. 'More important, peer supervision is more genuine because it is not connected with evaluation', she wrote. An important reason for supporting 'peer supervision' was that 'it would be a good preparation for prospective supervisors, since the latter are, usually, recruited from the ranks of teachers'.

Participants who were not in favour of the idea, had their reasons too. Some considered that not all teachers were sufficiently well qualified to undertake the responsibility of peer supervision. 'How to select who would be supervised by whom was seen as a problem by others. Another teacher was worried that the official designation of a particular teacher as a teacher-supervisor (senior or first teacher) with certain privileges, might be a result of personal relations and non-educational factors, rather than competence, experience, and qualifications. In such cases, 'it was possible', the teacher added, that 'the position would be used to gain personal benefits, rather than to perform a productive job'. Probably because of these problems, a teacher suggested that 'peer supervision' should be informal. 'Otherwise it may create hatred, and poison the cordial atmosphere in school'. A number of teachers and supervisors pointed out that supervision involves a great many extra duties, which would need time. 'Therefore, if a teacher is given responsibilities for supervision he/she should be relieved of a certain amount of teaching'.

In sum, the idea was not objected to, in principle, but rather it raised some serious questions. Do teachers have the necessary skills and understanding, to supervise each other? Do they 'really' want to

be involved in 'self-or-peer supervision', and if they do, have they the time? Will it turn out to be another form of traditional supervision with all the superficiality and negative connotations? These questions and many others are appropriate and legitimate. But it was suggested that the approach was well worth trying.

7.4.5   The Principal-Supervisor

The idea that principals are instructional supervisors and that they should perform supervisory duties, in addition to their administrative functions, has recently gained prominence in the literature of supervision.

Participants in this study were asked whether they were in favour of this idea. Only 32.8% of them either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement (Table 170). Both teachers and supervisors were disinclined to support the idea of the principal - supervisor. The percentages of the former (32.6) compared to the latter (33.3) who either strongly agreed or agreed with the statement, were almost identical (Table 171).

Teachers' responses were independent of all variables except experience. More experienced (35.7%) than inexperienced teachers (27.1) supported the idea. Although both percentages were very low, the difference was statistically significant. The lowest percentage was that of the highly qualified teachers (21.4). The percentages of teachers in other groups were around 30 (Table 176). In the same manner, supervisors' responses were not affected by the independent

variables. Less than 45 per cent of supervisors, across all categories, were in favour of the idea of the principal-supervisor (Table 177).

7.4.6 Participants' Opinions Concerning the Idea of the 'Principal-Supervisor'

Both those who supported the idea of the principal acting as a supervisor and those who were opposed to it, were asked to give reasons for their opinions. Supporters of the idea pointed out that principals are in much closer touch with the teaching/learning process than are the supervisors. Other participants drew attention to the fact that 'teachers are also evaluated according to how they carry out administrative work and abide by administrative discipline. Principals rather than supervisors can assess these aspects of teachers' behaviour'. Other supporters stressed the co-operative nature of supervision. 'None of the supervisors, or principals, or teachers can independently shoulder the task of improving instruction. To this end, all should cooperate', one supervisor wrote.

Opponents of the idea argued that principals, in Qatar, are not sufficiently well qualified to supervise teachers. they are, frequently, recent graduates and they themselves need supervision and guidance. Some of them came straight from the university to the principalship 'without ever holding a chalk', as one teacher put it. the majority of teachers have longer experience and better qualifications. Supervisors, in general, are more experienced and better qualified than principals, and consequently are in a better

position to supervise and evaluate teachers. A number of participants stated that the principals have administrative responsibilities which leave little time for further duties, that effective supervision needs special training, and that principals are not familiar with all subjects. It can be concluded that while participants were not opposed to idea, in principle, they were concerned that principals, in Qatar, were not adequately prepared for supervision.

7.4.7   Conclusion

Six items related to staffing were discussed in this section. The data showed that a substantial majority of participants were in favour of the proposal that supervisors should have special professional training. Teachers more than supervisors supported the idea, but the difference between the two groups were not significant. Supporters of the idea were aware that a university degree and long experience in teaching were not sufficient for someone to become a successful supervisor. Supervision, as any other skilled occupation, requires special preparation. On the contrary, other participants thought that a university degree and a relatively long experience in teaching were an adequate background for supervision.

Concerning 'peer supervision' the data revealed that participants were divided evenly on this suggestion. Teachers and supervisors with higher degrees and from the prep-secondary cycle, in particular, supported the idea, which was also supported, to a lesser degree, by male, non-Qatari, and experienced supervisors and teachers. By contrast, inexperienced, primary, less qualified teachers and

supervisors were not in favour of this proposal. It is interesting that female teachers favoured the idea more than female supervisors. While supporters of 'peer supervision' saw numerous advantages in the idea of 'teachers supervising teachers', opponents expressed legitimate concern that, in practice, the idea would be abused, because not all teachers were qualified for supervisory duties. Hence, a suggestion that 'peer supervision' should be, if implemented, informal and voluntarily conducted.

On the contrary, the majority of participants, across all independent variables, exhibited a high level of disfavour of the idea of the 'principal-supervisor'. It is probable that while they were not opposed to the idea, in principle, they considered that, in practice, it was unlikely to work well because, in Qatar, the principals are often newly graduated and relatively inexperienced.

SECTION V

Problems and Obstacles

7.5.0   Introduction

The data discussed in the preceding sections showed that, with few exceptions, the observed behaviours of supervisors were not the same as the preferred behaviours set out in the literature of supervision. This finding suggests the existence of crucial problems or obstacles which mitigate supervisors' efforts. In this section supervisors were requested to rate seven problems on a four-point evaluation scale, according to the extent that each obstacle hindered effective supervision. The options ranged from the highest 'to a great extent' to the lowest 'not at all'. Supervisors were requested to add any other obstacles they considered detrimental. Teachers were not asked to mark these items, because the majority of participants in the pilot study, and in the preliminary talks, pointed out that teachers were not in a position to evaluate the problems of supervisors.

The seven problems as they originally appeared in the questionnaire were: insufficient time, overwork, location of schools, lack of cooperation with teachers, overlapping of duties with other officials, the ambiguity of the role of supervisors, and the incompetence of some supervisors. The discussion will follow this order.

7.5.1 Insufficient Time

Adequate time is needed in order that supervisors can effectively perform all duties and activities expected of them. Proper time is also needed for self-improvement. Therefore, it was not strange that supervisors ranked this problem as second. The weight quotient was 79 (Table 178).

Qatari, female, less qualified, primary, and inexperienced supervisors particularly complained of insufficient time. Between 81 and 97 per cent of supervisors in the above groups stated that this problem impeded their efforts 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. The percentages of participants in other categories who held the same view ranged from 50 to 65. According to the chi-square test the differences among supervisors, in different groups, were significant except between males and females (Table 179). The figures suggest that the less qualified and the less experienced the supervisor was the more likely she/he was to complain of insufficient time. It could be concluded that the more experienced and qualified supervisors were more capable of using their time effectively.

7.5.2 Overwork

As mentioned earlier, supervisors are expected to carry out various responsibilities. While teachers are required to teach, principals are required to administer and coordinate, and curricula staff are required to develop the curriculum; supervisors' duties extend, theoretically at least, to include aspects of all the above

areas and others as well. Accordingly, it was not surprising that overwork was perceived as a major problem. Its weight quotient was the highest (81.4) (Table 178). Approximately 79.4% of the supervisors considered it a serious problem. However, the responses were dependent on almost all variables. More than 85% of Qatari, female, less qualified, primary and inexperienced supervisors regarded this as the most frustrating obstacle. The percentages of supervisors in other categories were relatively low (between 61 and 79) (Table 180). The conclusion mentioned earlier, still holds here, that the less qualified and less inexperienced the supervisor was, the more likely he or she was to feel over-burdened by the multitude of responsibilities.

7.5.3 The Location of Schools

Supervisors are assigned different schools all over the country. Therefore, it was to be expected that the location of schools would be considered a problem. The weight quotient (78.8) ranked 3rd (Table 178). Approximately 71.7% of the supervisors considered it had a negative effect. The distribution of responses was substantially affected by sex. All female supervisors viewed this obstacle as frustrating. By contrast, the percentages of supervisors in other groups were between 42.1 and 64.8. The chi-square test shows that differences among supervisors were significant except between Qatari and non-Qatari and between inexperienced and experienced (Table 181). It could be concluded that the sex of the supervisor was the variable which mostly affected the responses, rather than experience or qualification.

7.5.4 Lack of Cooperation with Teachers

Interestingly enough, this was not considered a major problem. The weight quotient (64.7) ranked it sixth (Table 178). Slightly more than half the supervisors (51.2%) viewed teachers as not very cooperative.

The independent variables have resulted in significant differences among supervisors, across all categories. Once again, supervisors were divided into two main groups. The first group comprised the Qatari, female, less qualified, primary, and inexperienced supervisors who complained that teachers were not cooperating in their attempts to improve instruction. Conversely, supervisors in other categories, reported high levels of cooperation (Table 182). It is probable that the less experienced and less qualified failed to secure teachers' cooperation, or that teachers did not take seriously the supervision of the less qualified and less experienced, and accordingly, even if they exhibited a superficial consent, in fact they did not cooperate.

7.5.5 Overlapping of Duties

Obviously, no aspect of human behaviour is without reference to others. Despite efforts to categorize certain activities as supervisory, the very nature of supervisors' work which includes areas of other officials' fields, particularly principals and curriculum staff, makes the problem of overlapping a factor of dissatisfaction, although, theoretically at least, there should be cooperation among all the parties involved.

However, in comparison with other problems, this one did not appear as detrimental as expected. Its weight quotient (73.3) ranked it 5th (Table 178). A fairly high percentage of supervisors (65.3) considered that it did have negative effects. It is noticeable that supervisors' responses was dependent only on qualification. The difference between highly qualified (33.3%) and less qualified (75%) who complained of overlapping was large, as well as statistically significant (Table 183). It seems that the better qualified supervisors were more able to manage. Although differences among supervisors in other categories were observed, they were statistically not significant.

7.5.6   Role Ambiguity

This problem is related to the preceding problem. Organizational positions and roles that overlap several organizational functions and relationships are potentially much more ambiguous than clearly defined positions. Role ambiguity tends to lead to tension and stress. The weight quotient of this problem (78.2) ranked it 4th (Table 178). A relatively high percentage of supervisors (74.3) regarded this obstacle as frustrating. While independent of qualification and teaching cycle, the responses were affected by the nationality, sex and experience. The female, Qatari, and inexperienced supervisors felt that they suffered more from role ambiguity than did the male, non-Qatari, and experienced supervisors (Table 184).

A supervisor wrote 'very often we are not quite sure whether we are administrators or supervisors, whether the nature of our efforts is

technical or administrative. Sometimes we are looked upon as experts, sometimes we are no more than ordinary clerks'. Another supervisor pointed out the conflicting tasks of improving and evaluating teachers. 'Although the conflict is resolved, on the part of supervisors, because in order to improve you have to evaluate, the problem is that you cannot truly build confidence with teachers as long as you are perceived as an evaluator'. This key problem leaves the supervisor uncertain as to whether he is an evaluator or an advisor.

7.5.7   The Incompetence of Some Supervisors

Abdul'al, the ex-president of the Supervisory Division in Qatar, considered this as one of the crucial problems which impeded the development of effective supervision. Due to several internal and external factors under-qualified and inexperienced supervisors are sometimes recruited.

The figures in Table 178 give the impression that supervisors took a defensive stance on this problem. The weight quotient (63.1) ranked at the bottom. Less than half the participants (46%) showed concern for its negative effects. The percentages of Qatari, female, primary, less qualified and inexperienced supervisors, were very low. They ranged between 15 and 45, while the percentages of supervisors in other groups were between 47 and 72. Except between males and females, differences among supervisors, in other groups, were significant (Table 185).

7.5.8   Conclusion

Seven selected items, considered to be important problems of supervisors, were discussed and analyzed in this section. The seven problems, as they originally appeared inthe questionnaire were: insufficient time, overwork, location of schools, lack of cooperation on the part of teachers, overlapping of duties with other officials, ambiguity of the role of supervisors, and the incompetence of some supervisors.

Almost all the seven problems were perceived of considerable negative effect. The weight quotients ranged from 63 to 81. According to the weight quotients the seven items took the following order: Overwork, insufficient time, location of schools, ambiguity of the role of supervisors, overlapping of duties with other officials, lack of cooperation with teachers and the incompetence of some supervisors. This order was not the same for all supervisors (Table 186).

The above order suggests that the first four key problems were related to the organizational and theoretical framework of instructional supervision in Qatar, rather than to persons. By contrast the least three important problems have something to do either with teachers, other officials, or with supervisors themselves. On the basis of this conclusion one may recommend the reorganization of supervision in a way that allows better investment of time and effort, on the one hand, and decreases the tension resulting from role ambiguity, on the other.

The Effects of Independent Variables

The data generally revealed significant differences related to the independent variables. Broadly speaking supervisors were grouped into two main categories; the Qatari, female, less qualified, primary, and inexperienced supervisors who gave a higher assessment of the detrimental effects of all problems except 'overlapping' and 'incompetence', than did other supervisors.

The distribution of responses concerning 'overlapping' shows that females and less qualified supervisors shared with the non-Qatari and experienced supervisors the opinion that this problem was important. While the Qatari and inexperienced supervisors shared with the male and the best qualified the view that this problem was not very important. The percentages of supervisors in both the primary and prep-secondary cycle were almost identical. Differences were not significant except between the less and the highly qualified supervisors.

The analysis of responses concerning 'incompetence', shows a contrast. While a relatively high proportion of non-Qatari, better qualified, experienced supervisors, and supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle considered this problem relatively important, the vast majority of Qatari, less experienced, less qualified, and primary supervisors, thought either that it was less important or that it was not a problem at all.

SECTION VI

7.6.0   Introduction

This is the last section of the data analysis. It includes general items concerned with the teachers' perceptions of supervisors, the authority of supervisors, and the satisfaction of participants with supervision.

7.6.1   Teachers' Perceptions of Supervisors

One of the problems that hinders supervision is the conflicting demands of improving instruction and evaluating teachers. Even if supervisors try to resolve this conflict, a considerable proportion of teachers will continue to perceive supervisors as evaluators rather than helpers.

Participants in this study were asked to indicate whether they thought that teachers perceived supervisors as helpers or assessors. On this item, opinions were roughly evenly divided. 48.8% of them stated that they either agreed or strongly agreed with the above statement, while slightly more than half of them (51.1%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed. The distribution of responses shows that the majority of participants fell into the second and third categories of opinion (in the middle); 38.2% stated that they agreed while 32.5 stated that they disagreed. In contrast, only 10.6% selected the extreme choice of agreement (strongly agree) compared to 18.6% who favoured the last option (strongly disagreed) (Table 187).

Table 190 shows that there was a substantial disagreement between teachers and supervisors concerning this item. Approximately 84.6% of supervisors compared to 42.3% of teachers, either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The difference appears large as well as statistically significant. The percentages of teachers, who either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement ranged from 0.0% to 61.5% while the percentages of supervisors, who held similar beliefs, ranged from 78.3 to 95.8. Although the majority of teachers across most categories replied that supervisors were perceived as assessors rather than helpers, significant differences were observed. Relatively higher percentages of male, non-Qatari, teachers than female and Qatari teachers either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. It is interesting that primary, less qualified and less experienced teachers expressed similar perceptions. It is highly possible that the inexperienced, less qualified and primary teachers received a great amount of the supervisors' help. On the other hand it seems that male supervisors offer more help than female supervisors (Table 193).

By contrast supervisors' responses were independent of all variables except nationality and experience. Although the vast majority of supervisors in all groups reported that they were perceived as helpers rather than assessors, the non-Qatari and experienced supervisors were more aware of the actual perceptions of teachers. Therefore, they reported relatively lower levels of agreement with the statement than did the Qatari and inexperienced supervisors (Table 194).

7.6.2   The Authority of Supervisors

The authority that a supervisor has is that to influence the behaviour of teachers (and principals to some extent). Authority can be granted on the basis of legitimacy, that is, teachers should accept the authority of supervisors because of certain laws, rules or regulations that require compliance. But in a sense, the right of a supervisor to influence teachers' behaviour is granted by teachers themselves. It is what teachers are willing to concede to supervisors. In this case, competence, knowledge, professional skills, and experience are the sources of authority. In reality, supervisors need both sources of authority. Without the competence authority, position authority will be shallow and will probably result in alienation, non-compliant behaviour, negative feelings, low satisfaction, and ineffectiveness. But competence authority should be able to rely on formal authority when necessary.

Participants were asked whether they thought that supervisors derived their authority from their hierarchical position or from their competence and experience. The percentage of participants who considered that supervisors derived their authority from their legal position, was almost the same as the percentage who thought that they derived it from experience and competence (35.5 to 35.9). 28.6% were of the opinion that supervisors derived their authority both from their hierarchical position and their competence (Table 188).

The difference between teachers and supervisors concerning this matter was significant. More teachers (39.6%) than supervisors (12.8%)

stated that the authority of supervisors was derived from their position in the hierarchy, while more supervisors than teachers (53.8% to 32.6%) were inclined to the view that it derived from competence and experience. The percentages of teachers and supervisors who chose the 3rd option (from both legal position and competence) were relatively close (27.8 and 33.3) (Table 191).

Supervisors' responses were not affected by the independent variables except by qualification. Less than 22% of supervisors, in different categories, reported that their authority was hierarchy-related. A fairly high percentage (at around 61) of Qatari, female, less qualified, primary and inexperienced supervisors attributed their authority to competence, while the percentages of non-Qatari, male, experienced supervisors and supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle, who agreed with this view, were relatively moderate (between 44 and 48). For supervisors with higher degrees it was only 27.8%. The percentage of supervisors who chose the 3rd option, was between 25 and 39. For supervisors with higher degrees it was 50 (Table 196).

While independent of nationality and teaching cycle, teachers' responses were dependent on sex, qualification, and experience. The percentages of teachers who thought that supervisors' authority was a function of their position, ranged from 30 to 48. For teachers with higher degrees it was 78. It is surprising that the percentages of the Qatari, female teachers and teachers with the B.A. degree together with experienced teachers and teachers from the prep-secondary cycle, who held this view were relatively higher than the percentages of the

non-Qatari, male, primary, inexperienced teachers and teachers with non-university qualifications. It could be concluded that the inexperienced, less qualified, male, and primary teachers perceived their supervisors as relatively competent. The percentages of teachers who perceived the supervisors' authority as a result of competence and experience ranged from 22 to 43. For teachers with higher degrees it was only 7.1. The previous comment applies here, that is the percentages of non-Qatari, male, primary, inexperienced teachers and teachers with the non-university qualifications who attributed the authority of supervisors to competence, were relatively higher than the percentage of other teachers. The third option was selected by 14 to 29 per cent (Table 195).

In general, the results seem to be largely what might have been expected. Teachers feel that supervisors derive their authority from their official position, while supervisors consider that their position is a consequence of their competence and experience. Even the more charitable teachers do not seem to perceive much difference in terms of experience and competence between themselves and the supervisors. For them supervisors are just teachers who have been lucky enough to be appointed to a more prestigious and less demanding job.

7.6.3   Satisfaction with Supervision

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their satisfaction with the supervision in Qatar. Approximately 58.2% replied that they were satisfied either 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. The distribution of responses shows that the majority of

respondents fell into the middle categories. 40.6% stated that they were satisfied 'to some extent', while 32.1% stated that they were satisfied 'to a little extent'. 17.6% fell in the first category (to a great extent', while 10.6% were 'not at all' satisfied (Table 189).

The figures given in Table 192 show a substantial disagreement between teachers and supervisors on this issue. While most supervisors stated that they were satisfied 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' only 52.1% of teachers had the same view. The difference was large as well as statistically significant.

Despite significant differences, the vast majority of supervisors (over 80%) reported high levels of satisfaction. Conversely teachers, in general, were less satisfied. Nevertheless different degrees of teachers' satisfaction were reported. Relatively higher percentages (between 56 to 66%) of non-Qatari, male, less qualified, primary, and inexperienced teachers were satisfied 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. The percentages of teachers in other groups were less than 45. It is noticeable that the female and the best qualified teachers were the least satisfied. 36.7% of female compared to 68.3% of male teachers gave high assessments of satisfaction. Similarly 14.2% of teachers with higher degrees compared to 45.4% of teachers with the B.A. degree and 66.7 of teachers with non-university qualifications held similar convictions. Since female teachers are supervised by women supervisors, it seems that female supervisors are less effective than men, or at least the teachers do not consider them to be doing as good a job. This conclusion finds support in the analysis of most

items throughout this chapter. Likewise, better qualified teachers appear more critical on most items (Tables 197 and 198).

It can be concluded that the supervisors were in substantial agreement concerning satisfaction, while different groups of teachers held different opinions on this matter.

7.6.4   Conclusion

Participants were divided fairly evenly on the matter of teachers' perceptions of supervisors. However, more supervisors than teachers thought that they were perceived as helpers rather than assessors. To a lesser extent, male, primary, inexperienced and less qualified teachers agreed with this view. The percentages of female, better qualified, experienced teachers and teachers from the prep-secondary cycle indicate that these groups did not perceive supervisors as helpers. Among supervisors who held this view the percentages of non-Qatari, experienced, and male supervisors were relatively low compared with those of other groups of supervisors. It is curious that male supervisors did not, on the whole, see themselves primarily as helpers but a relatively high proportion of the teachers they visited did see them in this role. This result suggests that these supervisors were more aware of teachers' concerns.

Concerning the authority of supervisors, the percentages of participants, who stated that supervisors derived their authority from their legal position, was almost the same as the percentages of those

who considered that they derived it from their competence and experience. However, more teachers than supervisors considered the authority came from their official position.

Regarding satisfaction with supervision, few respondents selected the two extreme categories 'to a great extent' or 'a little extent'. The majority of respondents stated that they were satisfied 'to some extent' or 'to a little extent' (the latter implies some dissatisfaction). Although supervisors, in the previous section agreed that there were a number of barriers which mitigated their efforts, the majority of them (over 80%) replied that they were satisfied 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. By contrast, the percentages of teachers who held similar views, did not exceed 68. While the male, primary, inexperienced teachers and teachers with non-university qualifications reported relatively higher levels of satisfaction, the female and the better qualified were the least satisfied. This finding supports a conclusion frequently mentioned, that is the female and better qualified teachers who were, in general, more critical. The negative perceptions of the females may be a result of the women supervisors being less effective, due to lack of experience and adequate preparation, while the feeling of the better qualified teachers may be attributed either to the fact that they do not see supervisors as resource persons, or that supervisors concentrate on the less qualified and less experienced teachers because they feel that they are the ones who are more in need for supervisory services.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Summary, Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1 Summary

8.2 Findings

8.3 Conclusions

8.4 Recommendations

    8.4.1 Recommendations for Practice

    8.4.2 Recommendations for Research

CHAPTER EIGHT

Summary, Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1 Summary

The previous chapters have described the background of the problem, a review of the related literature, the design and methodology of the study, and a presentation and interpretation of the research findings.

In the first chapter the importance of the study, a statement of the problem, the limitations of the study, and the organization of the study were presented. Conceptual and operational definitions of supervision were also discussed. Perceptions of supervision by selected Arab authors, have been cited and discussed. The roots of the confusion and ambiguity surrounding the concept of supervision were traced.

Chapter two presented a number of contemporary approaches to supervision. Those approaches were divided into four groups. First there were task-oriented approaches such as inspection, scientific supervision, and neoscientific supervision. The second group comprised human-oriented approaches which include democratic supervision, and human relations supervision. Thirdly there was human resources supervision which represents the structuralist approach, and appears as a synthesis of scientific and human relations approaches. And finally peer supervision and clinical supervision were considered as alternative approaches in contrast to traditional and general supervision.

The supervisory systems in a number of developed countries, or supervision in practice, were discussed in chapter three. The systems were discussed in their specific national contexts. This point is important because Arab educators have too uncritically adopted western trends, in general, and American trends, in particular, as models to be followed. Typically, American approaches, according to them, represent the present, while other western trends, represent the past, which should be abandoned. The chapter concluded with a brief account of the historical development and the current perceptions of supervision in the Arab world.

A brief account of Qatar, its educational system and the system of instructional supervision, was given in chapter four. The rationale for this is the belief that many factors which affect supervision have their roots in the general historical, economic and societal context.

Chapter five was devoted to the procedures, methodology, and instruments employed to obtain the empirical data of this study. The statistical population of the study, teachers and supervisors of the public schools in Qatar, was identified. The sample and sampling procedures were described and justified. A comprehensive description of the characteristics of respondents was provided, with reference to the target population.

The findings arising from the fieldwork and the interpretation of the results were presented in chapter six and seven. The present chapter will summarize findings, draw conclusions and suggest recommendations.

8.2 Findings

- The data showed that teachers and supervisors, in general, were in favour of the six selected tasks, though on somewhat different levels. According to the weight quotients of importance, the rank order of the six tasks was:

- to orient teachers to suitable methods,
- to promote teachers' professional growth,
- to clarify the aims of education,
- to develop human relations in schools,
- to evaluate and develop curriculum, and
- to encourage innovation.

When rated by teachers alone, the above order remains the same. But when rated by supervisors alone, they took the following order:

- to orient teachers to suitable methods,
- to clarify the aims of education,
- to evaluate and develop curriculum,
- to develop human relations in schools,
- to promote teacher's professional growth, and
- to encourage teachers to innovate.

However, within the ranks of teachers and supervisors, several rank orders could be identified. What was of much value for teachers

or supervisors in a certain group, was not equally important for another group.

According to the weight quotients of application, the six tasks take the following order:

- to orient teachers to suitable methods,
- to clarify the aims of education,
- to promote teacher's professional growth,
- to develop human relations in schools,
- to evaluate and develop the curriculum, and
- to encourage innovation.

When rated by teachers alone, the above order remains the same, but when rated by supervisors alone, the above order would be somewhat different. 'Promoting teacher's professional growth' ranked the 4th, while 'developing human relations' ranked the 3rd. Similarly, 'encouraging innovation' ranked 5th while 'developing curriculum' ranked at the bottom. The comment mentioned earlier, still holds here, that is different rank orders could be designated depending on different groups of teachers and supervisors.

- The data revealed that 11 out of 12 selected supervisory activities, were, in some measure, supported by more than 50% of the participants. The exception was 'Administrative and clerical work' which was favoured by only 46.4%.

According to the weight quotients of importance, the six most strongly supported were: the evaluation of the teaching/learning process, in-service education, organizing for teaching, classroom visits, disseminating information, intervisitation among teachers, while the six least favoured activities were: providing materials, orientation programmes for new teachers, supporting the school library, conducting research, demonstration lessons, and administrative and clerical work.

When rated by teachers alone it remains nearly the same, except that 'disseminating information' becomes the 4th and 'classroom visits' becomes the 5th. But when rated by supervisors alone a somewhat different order appears. The most strongly supported activities by supervisors were: the evaluation of the teaching/learning process, the classroom visits, disseminating information, in-service education, organizing for teaching, and providing materials, while the least preferred activities were: administrative and clerical work, supporting the school library, conducting research, orientation programmes for new teachers, demonstration lessons, and intervisitation among teachers.

According to the weight quotients of performance the six most frequently undertaken activities were classroom visits, the evaluation of the teaching/learning process, administrative and clerical work, organizing for teaching, in-service education, and disseminating information. The six least undertaken activities were providing

materials, conducting research, supporting the school library, orientation programmes, demonstration lessons, and intervisitation among teachers.

A slightly different rank order emerges when the items are rated by teachers alone. 'Administrative and clerical work' ranked the second, while the evaluation of the teaching/learning process ranked the third. 'In-service education' ranked the fourth, while 'organizing for teaching' ranked the fifth. And finally, teachers put 'intervisitation' as the 11th while 'demonstration lessons' ranked at the bottom. Supervisors agree that the four most frequently undertaken activities were classroom visits, the evaluation of the teaching/learning process, the administrative and clerical work, and organizing for teaching. 'Providing materials and facilities' ranked the 5th, and 'in-service education' ranked the 6th, while 'disseminating information' ranked the 7th. Supervisors agreed with teachers that 'conducting research' and 'supporting school library' ranked the 8th and 9th respectively. 'Demonstration lessons' ranked the 10th and 'orientation programmes' ranked the 11th, while 'intervisitation' ranked at the bottom.

As expected, different rank orders are revealed depending on different groups of teachers and supervisors.

- The distribution of responses concerning the frequency of supervisory visits revealed that a fairly high percentage of participants considered the present number of visits was adequate. Teachers' responses were independent of all personal characteristics

except experience. A relatively high proportion of inexperienced teachers stated that they would like to be visited more than twice a year. In contrast, supervisors' responses were not affected by the independent variables.

Concerning the duration of the visit, the data revealed a high level of divergence between teachers and supervisors concerning this item. While the majority of supervisors considered the time they spent during the visit was sufficient, there was a general agreement among teachers that the time spent was not enough. Teachers' responses were independent of all variables except experience. The less experienced teachers were the least satisfied. Supervisors' responses were influenced by the teaching cycle. Primary supervisors stated that they would like to devote more time to the visit.

Teachers indicated that pre- and post-observation conferences were not regularly held. Conversely, supervisors replied that conferences were frequently conducted. The length of the conference depended on a number of factors, particularly the timetable of the school. The purposes of the conference vary from one situation to another.

The figures showed that the participants were almost evenly divided concerning the embarrassment which teachers feel during the visit. Teachers' responses were affected only by experience. A greater proportion of inexperienced teachers stated that they frequently feel embarrassed during the visit. Supervisors' responses were dependent on qualification and teaching cycle. Better qualified

supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle were of the opinion that teachers rarely feel embarrassed.

A relatively low percentage of participants replied that teachers behaved differently during the visit. There was a high level of convergence between teachers and supervisors concerning this item. The data revealed that the less qualified and less experienced the teacher was, the more likely he/she was to behave in a manner he/she believed satisfied the supervisor. Qatari, primary, inexperienced and less qualified supervisors, shared this view.

The overwhelming majority of supervisors, irrespective of their personal characteristics, believed that teachers feel free to express their opinions during the conferences or the visits. In comparison, teachers' responses were dependent on sex, qualification, and experience. Male, better qualified and experienced teachers stated that they did feel free to say what they thought.

Supervisors more than teachers stated that they take into account the circumstances of the teachers and try to put themselves into the place of the teacher imagining what might be their own reaction in similar circumstances. A very low percentage of teachers thought that supervisors did make this imaginative effort.

A fairly high percentage of teachers and the majority of supervisors reported that supervisors leave the impression that their aim is the improvement of the teaching/learning process, rather than identifying teachers' faults. And finally, the vast majority of

supervisors thought that the visit was helpful, while slightly more than 50% of teachers expressed a similar conviction. Inexperienced, less qualified, male, and non-Qatari teachers, reported a relatively higher level of helpfulness.

- Approximately 60% of the participants in this study believed that supervisors were capable of evaluating teachers' performance. While the over-whelming majority of supervisors held such a conviction, few teachers believed that supervisors were capable of making valid assessments. They thought the difficulty of making valid assessments was a function of the many variables that influence the teaching/learning process. The data showed that when evaluating teachers, supervisors put more emphasis on conformity than on innovation. Moreover, a fairly high proportion believed that the criteria for evaluation were not clear.

- The analysis suggested that five selected criteria for evaluation of teachers' performance were, in some measure, favoured by the participants. According to the weight quotients of importance, the five items took the following oraer: classroom skills, the personality of the teacher, the mastery of subject matter, the attainment of students, and the lesson plan. When the ideal perceptions of supervisors are considered separately, the rank order of importance would be: the attainment of students, classroom skills, lesson plan, personality of the teacher, and mastery of subject matter. But the rank order varied among different groups of both supervisors and teachers.

According to the weight quotient of performance, the five criteria took the following order: the lesson plan, the attainment of students, the classroom skills, the personality of the teachers and the mastery of subject matter. In general, this order was the same for teachers and supervisors. But while teachers, in all categories, agreed on this order, a marked variance is noticeable in the supervisors' perceptions. For example, the 'lesson plan' was considered either 1st or 2nd by all supervisors except those with higher degrees who ranked it at the bottom. The 'attainment of students' ranked 1st or 2nd. Non-Qatari, experienced, and better qualified supervisors put it 3rd or 4th. Except for better-qualified supervisors, who put it 2nd, the 'personality of the teacher' ranked 4th. Better qualified supervisors also put the 'mastery of subject matter', the 3rd, while for other supervisors it ranked at the bottom. And finally, 'classroom skills' ranked either 1st, 2nd or 3rd.

- The participants were in favour of the proposal that supervisors should have special professional training. Teachers more than supervisors supported the idea but the difference between both groups was not significant.

Concerning 'peer supervision' the data revealed that participants were divided evenly on this idea. Teachers and supervisors with higher degrees and from the prep-secondary cycle, in particular, supported the idea, which was also supported, to a lesser degree, by male, non-Qatari, and experienced teachers and supervisors. On the contrary,

the majority of participants, across all independent variables, exhibited a high level of disfavour to the proposal that there should be 'principal-supervisors'.

- Seven problems were perceived as obstacles that alienate supervisors from their ideal roles. According to the weight quotients the problems took the following order: overwork, insufficient time, locations of schools, ambiguity of the role of supervisors, overlapping of duties with other officials, lack of cooperation with teachers, and the incompetence of some supervisors. The above order was not always the same for all supervisors. For supervisors, in all groups, 'overwork' ranked 1st, 2nd or 3rd, while the 'lack of cooperation with teachers' ranked either 5th, 6th or 7th. Other problems were given different rank orders according to different groups of supervisors. In general, male, non-Qatari, experienced, better qualified supervisors, and supervisors from the prep-secondary cycle, showed a high level of ability to cope with these problems.

- Participants were divided evenly on the matter of teachers' perceptions of supervisors. More supervisors than teachers thought that they were regarded as helpers rather than assessors. To a lesser degree, male, primary, inexperienced and less qualified teachers agreed with this view. The percentages of non-Qatari, experienced and male supervisors, who held similar perceptions, were relatively low compared with those of other groups of supervisors.

Concerning the authority of supervisors, more teachers than supervisors considered the authority of supervisors derived from their

official position. Supervisors, in general, thought that they derived their authority from their competence and experience, while a number of teachers and supervisors perceived the authority of supervisors as a function of both legal position and competence.

Regarding satisfaction, few respondents expressed extreme satisfaction or dissatisfaction with supervision. The majority of respondents stated that they were satisfied 'to some extent' or 'to a little extent'. Supervisors, more than teachers, stated that they were satisfied 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent'. The percentage of teachers who felt the same way was relatively lower. Female and better qualified teachers were the least satisfied.

8.3 Conclusions

Within the limits of this study a number of conclusions can be drawn. The conclusions are based on the findings of the study and with reference to the objectives mentioned in chapter one. The main purpose of this study was to give a picture of current supervisors' and teachers' perceptions in the light of the existing conditions in Qatar and in the light of current views concerning modern supervision. The study focused on the following objectives: furnishing the reader with contemporary theory of instructional supervision, investigating the beliefs of school teachers and supervisors in Qatar concerning a wide range of aspects of supervision, clarifying the tasks and activities of supervisors according to their degree of importance and frequency of application as perceived by teachers and supervisors in Qatar, identifying some obstacles which mitigate the effectiveness of

supervision in Qatar, and finally, determining the effects of independent variables such as sex, qualification, teaching cycle, and experience on the participants' responses.

Conclusions drawn from the literature presented in the first three chapters will be mentioned to accomplish the first objective, while conclusions based on the findings of the study together with the analysis of the supervisory system in Qatar will be mentioned to realize the remaining objectives.

- The literature reveals that supervision is a problematic term which is difficult to define precisely. Various definitions of supervision together with role ambiguity, role conflict, the complexity of the teaching process, and the problem of terminology all contribute to the confusion surrounding supervision. Yet most definitions agree that the ultimate goal of supervision is the improvement of instruction. In lieu of defining it, many authors operationalize the supervisory tasks, competencies, and activities. Teacher professional growth, curriculum development and the evaluation of the teaching/learning process are seen as basic tasks of supervisors.

- Supervisory approaches, recommended in the literature, have been essentially ideological rather than practical. From another point of view these approaches appear as a series of actions and reactions or trends and countertrends. The deficiencies in one trend spark off a new approach deemed to be more effective.

Any approach is not as unique as it may at first appear. Some approaches are merely syntheses, or modifications of other approaches. Some approaches appear to be only different names for existing ones. Vestiges of old approaches can still be found in present practices, though they are not currently in favour. Old views are still held by many, and elements of them become integrated in the new ones.

Therefore it would be inaccurate to imply that there is any single coherent approach. None of them comprehends the total reality, but each has a perceived selection from reality. Each can be viewed as an image of truth in its own right. When applied alternatively and integratively, they provide a more comprehensive view of reality than does any one alone. This means that no single best approach exists. What may work successfully in some situations may be deleterious in other situations. The mere novelty of any of them does not mean that it is the ideal one, or that old approaches have become obsolete.

The discussion suggests that the theoretical basis of all approaches is drawn from theories in other fields particularly social studies and psychology. Theories of communication, leadership, motivation, human relations, and a number of similar fields have been employed to form the conceptual base from which supervisors derive strategies, methods, and techniques.

- The literature suggests that supervision of instruction, is, at least, as old as public education itself. Historically, it has evolved from a function emphasizing inspection, monitoring, and enforcement to one emphasizing curriculum development, training and formative

evaluation. The aspects which supervisors emphasize, or over which they exercise control vary widely from one country to another depending on several factors. In Norway, for example, there is no system formally called supervision or inspection, while in France, Belgium and Ireland the role of inspectors has expanded to include defining the curriculum and the approval of textbooks and materials. In the U.S.A. supervisors are charged with the functions of evaluation, curriculum development and in-service education. In England and Wales HMI exercise oversight rather than control and are responsible for the implementation of national norms.

- The educational system in Qatar is highly centralized. Educational objectives, curricula, subject matter, textbooks and activities are all formulated and planned by the Ministry of Education, then handed down to the administrators and school teachers for implementation. In the same manner, supervisory perceptions, practices and methods are planned and formulated by the Ministry then delegated to supervisors for practice and implementation.

- The figures show that the Qatari male supervisors are outnumbered by the non-Qataris. The figures concerning female supervisors reveal the contrast. This fact parallels a similar situation of female teachers. Qatari female teachers outnumber the non-Qatari female teachers, while Qatari male teachers are outnumbered by non-Qatari male teachers. Female supervisors are an inferior corps. This conclusion finds support in the analysis of responses of the questionnaire.

Although this result reflects the status of females in a male-dominated society, it may be attributed to lack of experience and of high qualifications among female supervisors.

- In the elementary schools supervisors supervise teachers in all subjects areas up to the 4th year. The question of whether it is possible for one person to supervise across all subject areas was raised.

- Supervisors are called upon to undertake many functions, some of which are clerical, administrative or of a non-instructional nature. The analysis of the responses of the questionnaire shows clearly that overwork was one of the crucial problems that mitigate the effectiveness of supervision.

- Supervisors lack adequate training and preparation for the job. They are drawn mainly from the ranks of experienced teachers, on the assumption that a relatively long experience in teaching, in addition to a university degree, is sufficient for someone to undertake supervisory duties.

- Theoretically, and compared with teaching, the position of a supervisor in Qatar is a prestigeous one, despite the fact that a number of teachers have refused the promotion to the position of supervisor. His/her report has profound influence on the professional future of a teacher. The supervisor himself may see the position as a way to achieve a level of prestige which is not possible as a classroom teacher. Supervisors who place a high value on the prestige of their

position may be inclined to become authoritarian and inflexible. Some may see the post primarily as a source of power. At the same time, the prestige which is attached to the position makes it attractive to those who are ambitious and consequently, a competitiveness develops.

- The possibility of conflict with the school principal is a very real one because it is difficult to identify those functions essentially supervisory in nature and others which are exclusively managerial. The result may be conflicting demands upon the teacher, who may be torn between two obligations. The different expectations of supervisors and principals may create a frustrating situation. This conclusion is supported by the analysis of the data arising from the fieldwork. The overlapping of duties was one of the obstacles that prevent supervisors from undertaking their ideal roles.

- Sometimes, supervisors in Qatar are observing teachers who possess characteristics, qualifications and experience similar to or better than their own. In this case the supervisor may feel insecure in attempting to influence teachers whom he/she knows have better qualifications and more experience. He/she tends to avoid situations in which his/her ability could be challenged and his/her competence exposed to teachers.

- In their assessment of the importance and application of selected tasks and activities, the data revealed that there were different levels of convergence and divergence between teachers and supervisors concerning role expections and role performance of supervisors. Both

groups agreed that a 'good' supervisor may be expected to undertake most of the selected tasks and activities, which they perceived either as 'very important' or 'important', though there were significant differences between both groups concerning the degree of importance of most items. In general, supervisors placed more importance on most tasks and activities than did the teachers. In most cases, the percentages of supervisors who considered the tasks and activities either as 'very important' or 'important' were higher than the percentages of teachers. It appeared that teachers strongly supported tasks and activities which they thought as highly instruction-related, while they did not see much value in tasks and activities which appeared remotely related to effective teaching. In contrast, while supervisors agreed with teachers on the importance of most items, they tended to emphasize the importance of tasks and activities which were relatively less important for teachers. It appears that supervisors were inclined to perceive their role in terms of official expectations rather than the expections of teachers or the expectations stated in the literature.

- The data also showed that supervisors, in general, have a very high assessment of their role performance. They marked almost all tasks and activities as frequently applied. This means that there was a high level of convergence between their perceptions of role expectations and role performance. Most items which supervisors ranked highest in importance were highest in performance. What supervisors expected of a 'good' supervisor, they consider that they also perform. Essentially though, there was a noticeable difference between preferred and observed behaviours. The levels of importance reported by

supervisors were higher than the levels of performance. This means that even as perceived by supervisors the actual perceptions were not the same as the ideal perceptions.

Teachers gave very low assessments of supervisors' role performance. They tended to mark almost all tasks and activities as infrequently applied. It was interesting that the few activities which teachers considered as frequently performed, were not ones on which the placed much value. This means that, in teachers' opinions supervisors did not perform what is expected of a 'good' supervisor. The data taken together give the impression that teachers displayed a divergence in their perceptions of the role expectations and role performance for supervisors.

However, the analysis of responses revealed significant differences among teachers as well as among supervisors concerning the role expectations and the role performance. It seems reasonable to conclude that different groups of teachers require different services from the supervisors. What seems important to one group of teachers may be of less value to another group. Specifically, experienced and better qualified teachers differed significantly in their expectations of supervisors, from inexperienced and less qualified teachers. Similarly they were more critical of supervisors' performance. In most cases they reported low levels of application. In comparison, less qualified and inexperienced teachers, reported relatively higher levels of performance. That is to say that not all teachers held negative feelings towards supervisors' performance. The data revealed that some teachers reacted favourably. It can be concluded either that better

qualified and experienced teachers were more critical or that supervisors, when undertaking their tasks and activities, focus on less qualified and less experienced teachers on the assumption that the former are mature enough to work independently, while the latter are more in need of supervisory help.

In the same manner, supervisors at different career stages of different sexes, and with different qualifications and experience, varied in their perceptions of their role. Most of the time male, experienced, better qualified supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle placed more importance on tasks and activities which appeared of less value to supervisors in other groups. In the same way, male, experienced, better qualified supervisors and supervisors in the prep-secondary cycle reported high levels of application of those activities.

- The data concerning the supervisory visits suggest that the visits were perceived as administrative procedures conducted for evaluative purposes rather than an activity designed to help teachers. The visits were usually unannounced as well as unrequested. This means that supervisors were usually unaware of the purpose and plan of the lesson observed. As a result they are not able to make useful suggestions for improvement.

Pre- and post-observation conferences were not considered an integral part of the supervisory process. They were haphazard, frequently unplanned and varied according to circumstances. Their occurrence and length depended on many factors, particularly the

timetable of the school. When they were held, they were usually one-sided, that is the supervisor's side. The data gave the impression that the post-observation conference was given more committment than the pre-observation conference. Where substantial matters were discussed, it was almost always in the post-observation conference. During the conference, the opinions of teachers were not commonly and actually encouraged. This lack of genuine dialogue between supervisors and teachers seriously mitigates the benefits which both could derive from the conference. Although supervisors were anxious to create a human, cordial, and non-threatening climate, and were anxious to inspire trust, confidence and to persuade the teachers that their visits were well-intended and meant to be helpful, the majority of teachers did not perceive that the visit made any real difference in the teaching/learning situation.

- It seems that supervisors did not take enough trouble when evaluating teachers. Their judgements were based on two observations. Frequently, the first impression of the supervisor, which was based on the principal's opinion and factors such as the composition of the class, played a crucial role in the evaluation of the their performance. As a result, teachers had little confidence in the objectivity of the supervisors' evaluations of teacher's performance. They thought that the criteria of evaluation were too broad and not clear. Some supervisors were aware of the dangers of oversimplification in evaluation, and drew attention to the multitude of variables which affect a teacher's performance. Teachers, in general, felt that they were frequently evaluated according to unfavourable criteria such as the 'written lesson plan'. They thought that some criteria such as

'the attainment of students' were over-estimated, while favourable criteria such as 'the mastery of the subject matter' were only infrequently taken into consideration.

The data concerning evaluation support the conclusion that conformity rather than innovation was emphasized in the schools of Qatar. This supports the view that the aim of the evaluative visit was to determine whether the teacher was carrying out instructions rather than to promote the process of educational development.

- The data concerning staffing support the conclusion that supervision is a skilled profession, and therefore, supervisors should have professional training. Some alternative approaches to supervision such as 'peer supervision' are worth considering, although they should be applied carefully. While the idea of the 'principal-supervisor' is accepted in principle, it may in practice be better to reserve supervisory tasks to supervisors and leave managerial duties to principals.

- The data concerning the obstacles to effective supervision suggest that supervisors were suffering from insufficient time, over work, role ambiguity, and, to a lesser extent, from overlapping of duties and lack of cooperation with teachers. However, as the qualification and the experience of the supervisor increased, he/she was more capable of coping with these problems.

- And finally, the way in which supervisors perceived themselves differed from the way teachers perceived them or the way they would

have preferred them to be. Supervisors perceived themselves to be more helpful than the findings proved them to be. They thought that their authority was a consequence of their competence and expertise. Conversely, teachers perceived supervisors as assessors rather than helpers. They thought that the authority of the supervisors was a function of their official mandate rather than of their competence or experience.

Taken together, the data indicate an underlying communication gap between teachers and supervisors. Teachers' dissatisfaction with the existing system may be a result of this communication gap.

8.4 Recommendations

It was hoped that this study would contribute to the improvement and development of the supervisory system in Qatar. To this end, a number of recommendations for practice as well as for further research are made.

8.4.1 Recommendations for practice

- The role expectations for supervisors should be redefined in the light of the results of this study and similar research studies. Preferred tasks and activities must be considered an integral part of the supervisory roles. The practices which gained little support from the participants should either be improved to the degree that makes them acceptable, or be dispensed with. However, if a particular practice was given a low rating this should not be interpreted as

meaning that it is of little potential value. The fault may rather be in the way in which the activity was carried out. Therefore, the low rating should challenge the supervisors to a careful study of that particular practice in order to find out why it did not find much favour and how it can be improved. However favoured and disfavoured practices should not necessarily be considered as either essentially good and bad practices. The same practices may seem helpful to some teachers, while of less value to others.

- In particular, since the supervisory classroom visits and the related conferences were perceived as less helpful, serious consideration should be given by supervisors to developing a plan to make these supervisory functions more responsive to teachers' needs. Increasing the frequency of the visits and conducting announced and requested visits, in addition to the unannounced visits, would give more credibility to the evaluative comments of the supervisors.

Conferences should be an integral part of the supervisory visit. Specific arrangements should be made to avoid terminating the conference prematurely. Nor should it be held in the presence of people who are not involved. It is also essential that the conference be a two-way interaction rather than an authoritarian conceptualization. The meeting should go beyond mere 'complimentary remarks'. Positive reinforcement and praise are needed but weaknesses should also be identified. The supervisor should say what he or she feels, be honest and helpful. The conference should conclude with specific recommendations rather than general comments. Both parties should avoid the 'don't rock the boat' policy. If conducted in this manner, the visit would be helpful rather than perfunctuary.

- The evaluation of teacher's performance should not be oversimplified. Supervisors should be aware of all the variables that affect the teaching/learning situation. They should listen to the teacher's self-evaluation, and encourage teachers to share in the evaluation progress. They should describe and explain the purposes and procedures, including all items and criteria to the teachers and emphasize that the primary goal is to help.

In certain cases it would be better to designate a task force or some persons other than (or in addition to) supervisors to make evaluation for personnel purposes. Pertinent to the matter of evaluation is the issue of the confidential report which is not shown to the teachers. In some other countries such as England and Wales for example, HMI reports are published and sent to the schools and the teachers for them to read and comment on before they are sent to the Secretary of the State. The HMI reports refer to subjects and organisation but do not name individual teachers.

- From the evidence that supervisors perceived themselves differently from what teachers perceived them to be or preferred them to be, it is important that they try to develop clear and honest communication with their teachers so that they can develop the essential mutual understanding that will help them to discover what supervisory services their teachers want and what supervisory behaviours they prefer.

To eliminate the communication gap, better channels of communications should be established. It is important that teachers

should be fully informed concerning the procedures which supervisors will use for supervision and evaluation. Essentially, also, supervisors and teachers should meet on occasions other than the classroom visits. The more frequently both groups meet, the more productive their interaction will be. Informal meetings are recommended in order to build rapport between teachers and supervisors. Frequent meetings could also minimize role conflict, develop credibility, and establish open and trusting relations.

- Teachers should also be involved in the activities of supervisors to improve instruction. Improving instruction has a much better chance of success when the people who will be directly affected by the improvements are involved in the planning and implementation. Supervision is a shared process not a unilateral one.

It would be helpful also if teachers can evaluate supervisors' performance. It should be clear that the purpose of this evaluation is to provide 'feedback' that will help supervisors to realise what they emphasize the most and what they neglect so that they can adjust their activities to meet the needs of the teachers.

- The idea of 'peer supervision' is recommended, at least on a voluntary and experimental basis. It should be within the framework of general supervision. The application of this idea has many advantages, and would make good use of existing human resources. This proposal parallels another proposal that supervisors should be required to return periodically to classroom teaching.

- It is proposed that there should be an annual general conference of all supervisors to disseminate information and exchange ideas for solving educational problems. In such a conference, experiences would be shared, new ideas cultivated, and information would be given about the results of research studies in the educational, particularly supervisory, fields.

- In order to provide the necessary professional help to teachers when they need it, supervisors should be placed closer to schools. Remote areas should have locally based supervisors. This requires a re-organization of the Supervisory Department.

- Good supervision is professionalized. This means that the qualification and training of supervisors should meet some definite requirements, and the job can not be undertaken by any person who has not been professionally trained. If this is accepted there are a number of consequences. Supervisors should be selected carefully. They should have expertise in supervisory techniques, skills in leadership, and competence in human relations as well as adequate teaching experience. Teachers who aspire to be supervisors should be trained in the above areas before embarking on the job. Present supervisors should have in-service training, should involve themselves in short courses, workshops and seminars on supervision so that the supervisory ideal behaviour will be more consistent with the real supervisory behaviour. The University of Qatar and the Ministry of Education should cooperate to make arrangements for these activities. It must be emphasized that haphazard on-the-job learning is not sufficient. The University of Qatar provides courses on supervision

within its programmes for the general and advanced diploma in Education. But it is noticeable that these programmes are attended by more teachers than supervisors. It may be that supervisors consider that they are mature enough, or that they have already established their careers. However, the training and retraining of supervisors should be continuous.

- A variety of supervisory behaviour is to be encouraged. It is recommended that different supervisory approaches are experienced and explored. No supervisory technique is perfect. What is the best approach may vary from one particular situation to another. Supervisors are encouraged to discover what supervisory strategies teachers consider to be effective. Supervisors must be trained and encouraged to take into account teacher's preferences, perceptions, needs and levels of teaching. Supervisors should look at teachers developmentally so that they can match stages of teacher development with appropriate supervisory orientations thus using the right supervisory behaviour with the right teacher. However, in all cases, supervisors need to move away from the authoritarian inspectorial supervision towards a more cooperative and participatory model. They should build teachers' esteem, autonomy and self-actualization by showing teachers respect, permitting innovation and providing opportunities for the recognition of merit and achievement. They should not try to mould teachers to their style of teaching. Rather they should encourage them to consider alternative teaching techniques and recommend up-to-date resources. They should acknowledge the teacher's point of view, listen to what the teacher says and show that

they appreciate the value of his or her opinion. In sum they must regard teachers as fellow professionals.

8.4.2   Recommendations for research

One purpose of exploratory studies is to identify areas for further research. This research was intended to be an initial exploratory study of the supervisory system in the schools of Qatar, an area where research is still in its early stages. The study may raise more questions than it provides answers. And if so, the author would hope that it stimulates further research into the area of educational supervision. Accordingly a number of recommendations for further investigations are provided:

- Before generalizations can be made further studies must be conducted. This study could be replicated using other techniques. Other statistical techniques could be employed and other independent variables such as age and teaching field could be considered. Other techniques such as the analysis of verbal behaviour and other kinds of interaction between teachers and supervisors in conferences and selected situations may prove useful. Even a follow-up confirmatory study using the same methods or more refined ones might be conducted by other researchers in order to strengthen the credibility of the conclusions. The author also recommends investigating supervisors' performance through a meticulous study of their reports.

- Since there is a disparity between teachers' preferences and teachers' perceptions of supervisory behaviour, and between teachers' and supervisors' perceptions, a study could be conducted to discover the reasons for these differences. The origins and persistence of this discrepancy should be investigated.

- To make the findings of this study more representative, a similar study using the same methodology or a more refined one should be conducted to investigate the perceptions of teachers in non-government private schools, the perceptions of the principals and other officials.

- An experimental study could be conducted comprising supervisors who will attend advanced training programmes (as an experimental group) and compared after say 3-4 years with a control group to ascertain whether these supervisors had become more effective as a result.

- Comparative studies may be conducted to compare one or more aspects of the supervisory system in Qatar with one or more systems in the Gulf, in other Arab, or in foreign countries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

References in Arabic

Official Documents:

- The Ministry of Education, Ministerial Decree 5, dated 1983.

- The Ministry of Education, Ministerial Decree 49, dated 1985.

- The Ministry of Education, Ministerial Decree 62, 1986.

- The Ministry of Education, Circular No. 3, 1977.

- The Ministry of Education, Educational Policy, 1985.

- The Ministry of Education, Development of Education in Qatar - in 1984/1985/1986, a paper submitted to the International Conference on Education, 40th Session, Geneva, 1986.

- The Ministry of Education, The Annual Report, 1985-1986, Doha, 1987.

- Central Statistical Organization, Annual Statistical Abstract, Doha, 1987.

Other References:

- Al-Afandi, M., Technical Supervision of Instruction, Cairo: Dar Nahdat Misr, 1972.

- Abdul'al, S., Supervision of Instruction in Qatar, Unpublished paper submitted to the Arab Seminar on Supervision, Baghdad, 1983.

- Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States, Educational Supervision in Arab Gulf States, Al-Riyadh, 1985.

- Department of Education (Arab Organization for Education, Culture and Science), Educational Supervision in the Arab World, Tunisia, 1984.

- Diab, M., The Natural Geography of Qatar, Unpublished MA Thesis, The University of Cairo, 1977.

- El-Eisa, J., The Qatari Society, Cairo, 1982.

- El-Eisa, J., The Urbanization in the Modern Qatari Society, Cairo, 1979.

- Al-Mansour, A., The Political Development of Qatar, Kuwait, Dar-Al-Salasel, 1980.

- Mutuia, I., et.al., Administration Basics for Education, Jedda, Dar Al-Shorook, 1982.

- Rayyan, F., Technical Supervision: Theory and Practice, Kuwait, Dar Al-Kalam, 1980.

- Ramzi, A., Supervision of Instruction : The Perceptions of Primary School Supervisors in Qatar, Unpublished Survey Research, 1988.

- Taha, Y., The Coasts of Qatar : Geomorphological Study, MA Thesis, The University of Cairo, 1980.

- Yousef, A., (translator), The Arab Gulf, Kuwait, Amal Bookshop, 1981.

References in English

Journals:

- Alfonso, R., Will Peer Supervision Work, Educational Leadership, No. 8, 1977.

- Arends, R., Beginning Teachers As Learners, Journal of Educational Research, No. 4, Vol. 76, 1983.

- Barnett, B., et.al., Peer-Assisted Leadership, Phi Delta Kappan, No. 9, Vol. 67, 1986.

- Barth, R., School Reform, Phi Delta Kappan, No. 5, Vol. 68, 1986.

- Change, P., The Role of Administrators, Inspectors, and Heads of Schools in Improving the Qualitative Aspect of Education, Teaching Education in New Countries, No. 3, Vol. 11, 1971.

- Csikszentmihalyi, M. and McCormack, J., The Influence of Teachers, Phi Delta Kappan, No. 6, Vol. 67, 1986.

- Dunford, J., The Curriculum Private Eye, Education, April 1983.

- Eastwood, G., The Inspectorate in New South Wales : A Critical Comment, The Journal of Educational Administration, No. 2, Vol. 11, 1964.

- Eisner, E., The Art of Teaching, Educational Leadership, No. 4, 1983.

- European Journal of Education, The Editorial, No. 4, Vol. 21, 1986.

- Fagan, M., Mentoring Among Teachers, Journal of Educational Research, No. 2, Vol. 76, 1982.

- Frazer, K., Supervisory Behaviour and Teacher Satisfaction, Journal of Educational Administration, No. 2, Vol. 18, 1980.

- Freeman, G., et.al., Team Building for Supervisory Support, Educational Leadership, No. 37, 1980.

- Gitlin, A., et.al., Improving Teaching Through Peer Evaluation, McGill Journal of Education, No. 1, Vol. 22, 1987.

- Gordon, P., Katharine Bathurst : A Controversial Woman Inspector, History of Education, No. 3, Vol. 17, 1988.

- Grouwss, D., An Approach to Improving Teaching Effectiveness, Cambridge Journal of Education, No. 1, Vol. 11, 1981.

- Hayon, L., Perceived Teaching Difficulties by Beginning Teachers, Research in Education, No. 37, 1987.

- Hayon, L. and Beretz, M., Becoming a Teacher : The Transition from Teachers' Colleges to Classroom Life, Instructional Review of Education, No. 32, 1986.

- Hogan, P., The Central Place of Prejudice in the Supervision of Student Teachers, Journal of Education for Teaching, No.9, 1983.

- Hopkins, R., Her Majesty Inspectorate, The Times Educational Supplement, 8th January 1982.

- Jansen, W., The Changing Role of the Inspectorate in Belgium, European Journal of Education, No. 4, Vol. 21, 1986.

- Jones, A., The Inspector and The Professional Development of Teachers, The Journal of Educational Administration, No. 1, Vol. 6, 1968.

- Kamp, K., et.al., Two Decades of Teacher Attitudes, Phi Delta Kappan, No. 8, 1986.

- Krajewski, R., Instructional Supervision, Contemporary Education, No. 4, Vol. 49, 1977.

- Krajewski, R., Clinical Supervision to Facilitate Teacher Self-Development, Journal of Research and Development in Education, No. 2, Vol. 9, 1976.

- Lawton, D., The Changing Role of Teachers, <u>Prospects</u>, No. 1, Vol. XVII, 1987.

- London, P., Socializing The Young, <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, No. 9, Vol. 68, 1987.

- Malam, T., How the Inspectorate Operates in the French Education System, <u>European Journal of Education</u>, No. 4, Vol. 21, 1986.

- McFaul, S., et.al., Peer Clinical Supervision in an Urban Elementary School, <u>Journal of Teacher Education</u>, No. 5, Vol. 34, 1983.

- Nelson, J., A New Dimension on Accountability, <u>Australian Journal of Education</u>, No. 3, Vol. 31, 1987.

- O'Buachalla, S., The Inspectorial Role in 20th Century Irish Education, <u>European Journal of Education</u>, No. 4, Vol. 21, 1986.

- Pearce, J., School Oversight in England and Wales, <u>European Journal of Education</u>, No. 4, Vol. 21, 1986.

- Reavis, C., A Test of the Clinical Supervisory Model, <u>Journal of Educational Research</u>, No. 6, Vol. 70, 1976.

- Ritchie, T., Supervision and Anarchy, <u>McGill Journal of Education</u>, No. 1, Vol. 21, 1986.

- Skoog, G., Improving College Teaching Through Peer Observation, <u>Journal of Teacher Education</u>, No. 2, Vol. 31, 1980.

- Smith, A., The Politics of Accountability, <u>International Review of Education</u>, Vol. 33, 1987.

- Waters, C.M. and Wyatt, T., Toledo's Internship, <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, No. 5, Vol. 66, 1985.

- Weinstein, G., Pre-Service Teachers' Expectations About the First Year of Teaching, <u>Teaching and Teacher Education</u>, No. 1, Vol. 4, 1988.

- Withall, J., et.al., Taking the Threat Out of Classroom Observation, <u>Journal of Teacher Education</u>, No. 1, Vol. 30, 1979.

- Zahorik, J., Teachers' Collegial Interaction, <u>The Elementary School Journal</u>, No. 4, Vol. 87, 1987.

- Zeichner, K. and Tabachnic, B., The Beliefs of University Supervisors in an Elementary Student Teaching Programme, <u>Journal of Education for Teaching</u>, No. 8, 1982.

<u>Books</u>:

- Alfonso, R., et.al., <u>Instructional Supervision : Behaviour System</u>, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1975.

- al-Misnad, S., <u>The Development of Modern Education in the Gulf</u>, Ithaca Press, 1985.

- Ary, D., et.al., <u>Introduction to Research in Education</u>, NY, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

- Babbi, E.R., <u>Survey Research Methods</u>, Belmont, Cal., Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973.

- Barnes, G., <u>The American University</u>, Philadelphia, ISI Press.

- Barr, A., et.al., <u>Supervision : Democratic Leadership in the Improvement of Learning</u>, NY, Appleton-Century Co., 1947.

- Black, T.M., <u>Straight Talk About American Education</u>, NY, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982.

- Blackie, J., <u>Inspecting and the Inspectorate</u>, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.

- Blumeberg, A., <u>Supervisors and Teachers : A Private Cold War</u>, Berkely, McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1980.

- Borg, W. and Gall, M., <u>Educational Research</u>, Longman, 1983.

- Burton, W., Introduction to Education, NY, Appleton Century Co., 1954.

- Burton, W., et.al., Supervision : A Social Process, NY, Appleton Century, 1956.

- Cincotta, H., et.al., The US System of Education, US Information Agency, 1986.

- Cogan, M., Clinical Supervision Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

- Collier, R.O. (ed.), Research Design and Analysis, Phi Delta Kappan, Bloomington, Indiana, 1961.

- Combs, A. and Snygg, D., Individual Behaviour : A Perceptual Approach to Behaviour, NY, Harper Row, 1959.

- Dent, H., Education in England and Wales, 2nd edition, Hodder and Stoughton, 1982.

- Djalali, M.R., Le Golf Persique, Paris, Dalloz, 1978.

- Dodd, W., Primary Inspection in New Countries, O.U.P., 1966.

- Douglas, M., et.al., Instructional Supervision in Secondary Schools, NY, Appleton Century, 1959.

- Edmonds, E.L., The School Inspector, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

- El-Mallakh, R., Qatar : Development of an Oil Economy, Croom Helm, 1979.

- Eye, G. and Netzer, L., Supervision of Instruction, NY, Harper Row, 1965.

- Gay, L.R., Educational Research, Ohio, Charles E. Mervil Publishing Co., 1976.

- Goldhammer, R., et.al., <u>Clinical Supervision</u>, 2nd edition, NY, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

- Good, G. (ed.), <u>Dictionary of Education</u>, 3rd edition, NY, McGraw-Hill, 1973.

- Gwynn, J., <u>Theory and Practice of Supervision</u>, NY, Dodd, Mead and Co., 1961.

- Hammock, R., et.al., <u>Supervising Instruction in Secondary Schools</u>, NY, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1955.

- Harris, B., <u>Supervisory Behaviour in Education</u>, 3rd edition, NJ, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1985.

- Hough, S.M. (ed.), <u>Administering Education</u>, The Athlone Press of the University of London, 1975.

- Kogan, M., <u>Education Accountability : An Analytic Overview</u>, Hutchinson, 1986.

- Lewis, A. and Miel, A. <u>Supervision for Improved Instruction</u>, Belmont, Calif., Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1972.

- Lovel, J. and Wiles, K., <u>Supervision for Better Schools</u>, 5th edition, NJ, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1983.

- Lucio, W. and McNeil, J., <u>Supervision : A Synthesis of Thought and Action</u>, NY, McGraw-Hill, 1969.

- Mason, E. and Bramble, W., <u>Understanding and Conducting Research</u>, NY, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1978.

- Miel, A., <u>Changing the Curriculum</u>, NY, Appleton Century, 1946.

- Miel, A., <u>Creativity in Teaching</u>, Belmont, Cal., Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1961.

- Mitzel, T. (ed.), <u>Encyclopedia of Educational Research</u>, Vol. 2, NY, Free Press, 1982.

- Mosher, R. and Purpel, D., <u>Supervision : The Reluctant</u> <u>Profession</u>, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

- Nafi, Z.A., <u>Economic and Social Development in Qatar</u>, Frances Printer, 1983.

- Nyrop, R., et.al., <u>Area Handbook for the Persian Gulf</u>, Washington, US Government Press Office, 1977.

- Popham, W., <u>Educational Statistics</u>, NY, Harper and Row, 1967.

- Sergiovanni, T., <u>Professional Supervision for Professional</u> <u>Teachers</u>, Washington, ASCD, 1975.

- Sergiovanni, T., <u>The Context of Supervision</u>, Washington, ASCD, 1982.

- Sergiovanni, T. (ed.), <u>Supervision of Teaching</u>, Virginia, ASCD, 1982.

- Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R., <u>Supervision : Human</u> <u>Perspectives</u>, NY, McGraw-Hill Books, 1983.

- Smyth, J. (ed.), <u>Learning About Teaching Through Clinical</u> <u>Supervision</u>, Sydney, Croom Helm, 1986.

- Tuckman, B., <u>Conducting Educational Research</u>, NY, Horcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc., 1978.

- Van Dalen, D.E., <u>Understanding Educational Research</u>, NY, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.

- Warwick, D.P. and Lininger, C.A., <u>The Sample Survey : Theory</u> <u>and Practice</u>, NY, McGraw-Hill, 1975.

- Weller, R., <u>Verbal Communication in Instructional</u> <u>Supervision</u>, NY, Teachers' College Press, 1971.

- Zahlan, R., <u>The Creation of Qatar</u>, Croom Helm, 1979.

Theses:

- Adwani, S., The Relationship Between Teachers and Supervisors As Perceived by Teachers, Supervisors and Principals in Secondary Schools in Saudi Arabia, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1981.

- Al-Kobaisi, A., The Development of Education in Qatar, 1950-1977, with an Analysis of Some Educational Problems, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Durham, 1979.

- Al-Musailim, M., Current Problems of Educational Administration in the State of Kuwait, Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Durham, 1987.

- Bolin, F., The Language of Instructional Supervision, Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1983.

- Dunford, J.E., Her Majesty Inspectorate of Schools in England and Wales, 1860-1870, M.Ed. Thesis, University of Durham, 1976.

- Friend, M., Supervision of Instruction : The Perceptions of Selected Idaho Educators, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1986.

- Garman, N., A Study of Clinical Supervision as a Resource for College Teachers of English, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1971.

- Goodwin, S., An Explication of Human Resources Supervision, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1983.

- Ibrahim, B., The Needed Supervisory Competences for Instructional Supervision as Perceived by members of the Federal Inspectorate of Schools, Malaysia, Doctoral Dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1977.

- Karagozoglu, A., The Role of Ministry Supervisors in the Turkish Educational System, Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.

- Khalil, S., The Relationship Between Teacher Perceptions of Ideal and Actual Supervisory Behaviour and Teacher Satisfaction with Supervision, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1983.

- Li, T., Critical Analysis of School Supervision in Taiwan, Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1984.

- Mair, S., Evaluation Practices and Role Dysfunction Among Community Junior Colleges Administration, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1986.

- Makinde, S., Strategies for Improvement of Instructional Supervision in Nigeria, Doctoral Dissertation, College of Education, Florida State University, 1985.

- Mayfield, J., The Effects of Clinical Supervision on Pupil Achievement in Reading, Doctoral Dissertation, Wayne State University, 1983.

- Omari, Teachers and Supervisors in Jordan, Doctoral Dissertation, Syracuse University, 1977.

- Shuma, K., Changes Effectuated by a Clinical Supervisory Relationship, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1973.

- Sincalir, C.A., Education in Kuwait, Bahrain and Qatar : An Economic Assessment, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Durham, 1977.

- Tapaneeyangkul, S., An Analysis of Secondary School Supervisors in Bangkok, Doctoral Dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1983.