Available online at http://www.journalcra.com

International Journal of Current Research
Vol. 4, Issue, 07, pp.057-065, July, 2012

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CURRENT RESEARCH

ISSN: 0975-833X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

SUPERVISION PRACTICES AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY IN GULU DISTRICT PRIMARY SCHOOLS, UGANDA: A SURVEY BASED INVESTIGATION

Jerry Bagaya, James Nicholas Odiya, and Grace Kasigwa Mbabazi

Gulu University, Faculty of Education and Humanities, P.O Box 166, Gulu, Uganda

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 20th April, 2012
Received in revised form
18th May, 2012
Accepted 08th June, 2012
Published online 30th July, 2012

Key words:
Supervision,
HRM efficiency,
Headteachers,
Teachers,
Gulu,
Uganda.

ABSTRACT

Research has demonstrated considerable controversy over the relationship between supervision and professional efficiency. This paper seeks to analyze the relationship between supervision practices and Human Resource Management efficiency (HRM) levels in Gulu district primary schools. The study employed a cross sectional parallel sample survey design. It was conducted on a sample of 14 supervisors, 39 headteachers and 237 teachers of primary schools in Gulu district. Data was collected through a questionnaire that contained 25 and 20 close-ended items to measure supervision practices and HRM efficiency levels respectively. The validity and reliability of the questionnaire was ensured through experts' opinion and pilot testing. A KR_{20} reliability coefficient of 0.77 and content validity index (CVI) of 0.90 for the supervision practices items were obtained. For the HRM efficiency level items, a Cronbach's alpha of 0.86 and CVI of 0.92 were obtained. The data was captured on an SPSS 17.0 data file and the Chi square test for independence used to analyze the three hypotheses. First, the results indicated that there was a significant difference in respondents' perceptions of supervision practices. Supervisors perceived supervision practices as less supportive while headteachers and teachers perceived them as more supportive. Secondly, there was a significant difference in respondents' perceptions of HRM efficiency levels. Supervisors perceived HRM efficiency as low while headteachers and teachers considered them as only moderate. Finally, there was a significant correlation between supervision practices and HRM efficiency levels. This implies that the less supportive the supervision practices, the lower the HRM efficiency levels. The study will serve as a motivation for application of more supportive supervision practices so that the human resource is developed to its full potential. The findings will also be useful to researchers in exploring factors affecting the effectiveness of supervision and inspection. The paper has four parts. First, it reviews the relevant literature and outlines the problem setting. Secondly, the research methodology is presented and discussed. Next, the findings are reported, discussed and conclusions drawn. The paper concludes with managerial implications and directions for further research.

INTRODUCTION

Background

World over, a dynamic system of supervision has become recognized as a cornerstone of a sound education system. An education system, of which human resource management (HRM) is a part, will not be able to rise above the level of its supervisors. The need to invest in supervision, therefore, cannot be underestimated. Supervision is the process of guiding and directing efforts of staff (Mohanty, 2000; Terry & Franklin, 2003) towards achieving efficiency and effectiveness in education (Okumbe, 1998). Supervision practices, on the other hand, are ways through which supervisors go about their work (Hornby, 2000) in the process of guiding teachers and headteachers to improve the quality of education provision. These practices consist of pre-supervision arrangements, frequency and duration of inspection, dissemination of findings, and follow up on implementation of recommendations (Blasé & Blasé, 2000; Education Standards Agency [ESA], 2006; Lee, Ding & Song, 2008; Lugaz, 2004; Menon, 2002; Mohanty, 2000; Musaazi, 1982; Office for Standards in Education [Ofsted], 2003,2005; Singhal, Bhagai, Kalpande & Nair, 1986; Wilcox, 2000). In this study, supervision practices were categorized as either less supportive or more supportive. Supervision practices are said to be more supportive if they are well planned, frequently and adequately done, findings expeditiously disseminated, and follow up on recommendations regularly made; otherwise they are considered less supportive and likely to have a bearing on HRM efficiency.

HRM efficiency is the creation of motivating and satisfying conditions that make possible greater self-direction by staff (Musaazi, 1982), leading to achievement of organizational objectives at an optimal cost (Armstrong as cited in Okumbe 2001; Chandan, 1997; Maicibi, 2005; Okumbe, 1998). In this study, HRM efficiency was considered to include efficiency in induction, deployment, performance appraisal, training and development (Okumbe, 2001) and measured at three levels-

Corresponding author: jbagaya@yahoo.co.uk

low, moderate and high. HRM efficiency level is considered high if teachers are adequately inducted, appropriately deployed, systematically appraised and provided with opportunities for training and development; otherwise it is low. High HRM efficiency levels can be determinants of productivity in the education sector. Evidence regarding the relationship between supervision practices and HRM efficiency is scanty, and most arguments resort to anecdotal evidence or have questionable methodologies. Considering this relationship, researchers and other scholars do not come to a convergent view. The relationship, like most education issues, has given rise to considerable controversy. Some scholars have observed that inspectors promote professional efficiency of headteachers and teachers (Masaba, 2004; Mohanty, 2000; Musaazi, 1982; Namugwanya, 2006, Nassozi, 2005; United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organisation [UNESCO], 2005). Similarly, research evidence has linked effective leadership with quality education. For example, Al-Hamdan and Al-Yacoub (2005), Bredson (2001), Brown (2005), Hangreaves and Hopkins (1991), Hopkins and Sebba (1995) cited in Bezzina (1997), have shown that the quality of education is highly dependent on professional efficiency and competence of staff and effective support infrastructure. However, this suggests nothing about supervision practices.

On the other hand, some studies have found insignificant relationship between supervision and effective leadership. For example, they found that supervision only has a marginal capacity to improve school operations, including HRM practices (Aggarwal, 2004; Kabagambe, 2004; Karindiriza, 1989; Lee, Ding & Song, 2008; Okumbe, 1998; Ssekamwa & Lugumba, 2000). This implies that more supportive supervision practices may not necessarily result in better HRM practices. In view of the above literature review, it is evident that controversy exists regarding the relationship between supervision and HRM efficiency. These studies indicate that there is still a question about whether supervision practices are closely correlated with HRM efficiency. Since there was no study on this relationship in the context of primary schools in Gulu district, the researchers investigated the relationship between supervision practices and HRM efficiency levels in Gulu district primary schools.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the existence or non-existence of interdependence between supervision practices and HRM efficiency levels.

Research Objectives

Specifically, the study aimed to achieve the following research objectives:

1. To establish whether there is any significant difference in respondents' perceptions of supervision practices in Gulu district primary schools.
2. To find out if there is any significant difference in respondents' perceptions of HRM efficiency levels in Gulu district primary schools.
3. To determine the degree of dependence of HRM efficiency levels on supervision practices.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were developed based on the aforementioned discussion:

$H_{1(null)}$: There is no significant difference in respondents' perceptions of supervision practices in Gulu district primary schools.

$H_{2(null)}$: There is no significant difference in respondents' perceptions of HRM efficiency levels in Gulu district primary schools.

$H_{3(null)}$: HRM efficiency levels do not significantly depend on supervision practices.

The Context of the Study

The study was carried out in Gulu district, Uganda. It covered nine sub-counties out of 15 in Gulu Municipality, Omoro and Aswa Counties. By participation, the study was limited to supervisors who are directly responsible for monitoring and supervision of schools, headteachers and teachers on whom HRM efficiency levels can be measured. The study focused on five elements of supervision practices: Pre-supervision arrangements, frequency, duration, dissemination and follow up of inspection recommendations. The four facets of HRM efficiency considered for the study were induction, deployment, appraisal and training and development.

Significance of the Study

Findings from the study will help supervisors improve their service delivery, headteachers to enhance their HRM efficiency and professional growth of teachers. It will also provide baseline information for further research in the areas of supervision and HRM.

Theoretical Framework

The study was modeled on the theory of communicative action advanced by Jürgen Habermas in 1981 as an extension of Max Weber's theory of rationalization that is control oriented. The theory postulates that participants in any social interaction reach consensus on a plan of action through reasoned argument (Agyemang, 2009; Bolton, 2005; Lovat, 2007; Szczezelkun, 1999). It was adopted because the study focuses on supervision induced improvement in HRM efficiency, which requires understanding, support and participation by supervisors, headteachers and teachers to come up with action plans for improving the quality of service delivery. In adopting its use, however, the researchers are aware of its limitations that include the challenge of achieving mutual agreement, communicative action differing with rank and the requirement for actors to be in close proximity to each other. But according to Wiersma and Jurs (2005:20), "the criteria by which we judge a theory is not its truth or falsity but rather its usefulness".

METHODOLOGY

To investigate the problem, the study employed a cross sectional parallel sample survey design using questionnaires with a sample of 14 supervisors, 39 headteachers and 237 teachers (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970) randomly selected from an

accessible population of 15 supervisors, 45 headteachers and 607 teachers. According to Wiersma and Jurs (2005), studies concerned with views, opinions, feelings and perceptions of relationships between variables are best investigated through this type of design. The questionnaire had 25 items measuring supervision practices categorized as less supportive and more supportive and 20 items measuring HRM efficiency levels as low, moderate or high (Appendix A). The questionnaire was pretested using a convenient sample of 27 respondents in Masindi district, Uganda. A Kuder Richardson-20 (KR_{20}) reliability coefficient of 0.77 (for the supervision practices' scale) and a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.86 (for the HRM efficiency levels' scale) were obtained. These were well above the acceptable thresholds of 0.70 (Amin, 2005, p.302; Wiersma & Jurs, 2005, p.327) and 0.80 (Bryman, 2004 as cited in Ngware, Wamukuru & Odebero, 2006, p.346) respectively. To test for validity, judgments of three experts based on relevancy were analyzed and gave an overall CVI of 0.91. Items with CVI less than 0.70 were modified based on the experts' opinion.

The researchers administered the questionnaires to supervisors and headteachers while research assistants administered the questionnaires to teachers with on-the-spot collection and realized a response rate of 100%. Data were edited, coded and transferred to a computer to allow for efficient analysis. In the supervision practices' scale, each item had two alternative responses a) and b) that were coded 1 for less supportive and 2 for more supportive practices respectively. For the HRM efficiency levels' scale, scores across statements were summed to arrive at a total ranging from 20 to 60. A respondent's perception of the HRM efficiency level was coded using the following ranges: low (1) for a sum of 20 – 33, moderate (2) for the sum of 34 – 47, and high (3) for the sum of 48 – 60. Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) Statistics 17.0 was used to analyze the data. All the hypotheses were tested using the Chi square test for independence since the data involved relationships between categorical variables (Amin, 2005; Balnaves & Caputi, 2001). The hypotheses were tested at a 5% level of significance (i.e., $\alpha = 0.05$).

RESULTS

The first hypothesis focused on the relationship between category of respondents and perceptions of supervision practices. The null hypothesis was stated as:

$H_{1(null)}$: There is no significant difference in respondents' perceptions of supervision practices in Gulu district primary schools. This two-tailed (non-directional) hypothesis was tested at a 5% level of significance (i.e. $\alpha = 0.05$).

The descriptive statistics in column 3 and row 6 of Table 1 indicate that more supervisors (71.4%) reported supervision practices in the district as less supportive while more headteachers (84.6%) and teachers (75.1%) reported that the practices were more supportive. These descriptive statistics suggest that there are differences in respondents' perceptions of supervision practices. Since the data were categorical and in the form of frequencies of the relationship between the variables, the most appropriate non-parametric test is the Chi square test for independence (Balnaves & Caputi, 2001). The Chi square test for independence assumes that: No more than 25% of the cells have expected frequencies less than five, there is no cell with zero expected frequency, the sample data is a random sampling from a fixed population, the sample is of a sufficiently large size, and that the observations are independent of each other (Amin, 2005; Coolican, 2004). These assumptions were assessed through the visual inspection of the expected frequencies and the sampling design. The assessment indicated that the data showed no violation of the above assumptions.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Respondents' Perceptions of Supervision Practices

Supervision Practices		Category of Respondents: Supervisors	Head Teachers	Teachers	Total
Less Supportive	Frequency	10	6	59	75
	Column %	71.4	15.4	24.9	25.9
More Supportive	Frequency	4	33	178	215
	Column %	28.6	84.6	75.1	74.1
Total	Frequency	14	39	237	290

The results of the Chi square test for independence, χ^2 (2, n = 290) = 17.509, $p < 0.001$, indicates that there is a statistically significant difference in respondents' perceptions of supervision practices. The value of $p < 0.001$ is less than the significance level of 0.05 (Appendix B). Consequently, $H_{1(null)}$is rejected. Therefore, supervision practices were reported as less supportive by the majority of supervisors and reported as more supportive by the majority of head teachers and teachers. The second hypothesis focused on the relationship between category of respondents and perceptions of HRM efficiency levels. The null hypothesis was stated as:

$H_{2\ (null)}$: There is no significant difference in respondents' perceptions of HRM efficiency in Gulu district primary schools. This two-tailed (non-directional) hypothesis was tested at a 5% level of significance (i.e. $\alpha = 0.05$).

The descriptive statistics in the third, fourth and fifth columns of Table 2 indicate that more supervisors (64.3%) reported low HRM efficiency levels while more headteachers (53.8%) and teachers (44.7%) reported moderate levels of HRM efficiency. These descriptive statistics suggest that there are differences in respondents' perceptions of HRM efficiency levels in the district.

Since the data were categorical and in the form of frequencies of the relationship between the variables, the most appropriate non-parametric test is the Chi square test for independence (Amin, 2005; Balnaves & Caputi, 2001). The Chi square test for independence assumes that: No more than 25% of the cells have expected frequencies less than five, there is no cell with zero expected frequency, the sample data is a random sampling from a fixed population, the sample is of a sufficiently large size, and that the observations are independent of each other (Amin, 2005; Coolican, 2004). These assumptions were assessed through the visual inspection of the expected frequencies and the sampling design. The assessment indicated that the data showed no violation of the above assumptions. The results of the Chi square test for independence, χ^2 (4, n = 290) = 15.075, p = 0.005, indicate that there is a statistically significant difference in respondents' perceptions of HRM efficiency levels. The

value of $p = 0.005$ is less than the significance level of 0.05 (Appendix C). Consequently, $H_{2(null)}$ is rejected. Therefore, HRM efficiency levels were reported low by the majority of supervisors and reported as moderate by the majority of headteachers and teachers.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Respondents' Perceptions of HRM Efficiency Levels

		Category of Respondent			
HRM Efficiency Levels		Supervisors	Head teachers	Teachers	Total
Low	Frequency	9	5	76	90
	Column %	64.3	12.8	32.1	31.0
Moderate	Frequency	5	21	106	132
	Column %	35.7	53.8	44.7	45.5
High	Frequency	0	13	55	68
	Column %	0	33.3	23.2	23.4
Total	Frequency	14	39	237	290

The third hypothesis focused on the relationship between supervision practices and HRM efficiency levels. The null hypothesis was stated as:

$H_{3(null)}$: HRM efficiency levels do not significantly depend on supervision practices.

This two-tailed (non-directional) hypothesis was tested at a 5% level of significance.

The descriptive statistics in rows 4 and 6 of Table 3 indicate that respondents' perceptions were higher for the correlation between low HRM efficiency levels and less supportive supervision practices (45.6%) than between high HRM efficiency levels and less supportive supervision practices (8.8%). Conversely, the perceptions were higher for the correlation between high HRM efficiency levels and more supportive supervision practices (91.2%) than that between low HRM efficiency levels and more supportive supervision practices (54.4%). These descriptive statistics suggest that the less supportive the supervision practices, the lower the HRM efficiency levels. Conversely, more supportive supervision practices are complimented by high HRM efficiency levels.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for the Relationship between Supervision Practices and HRM Efficiency Levels

		HRM Efficiency Levels			
Supervision Practices		Low	Moderate	High	Total
Less Supportive	Frequency	41	28	6	75
	Column %	45.6	21.2	8.8	25.9
More Supportive	Frequency	49	104	62	215
	Column %	54.4	78.8	91.2	74.1
Total	Frequency	90	132	68	290

Since the data were categorical and in the form of frequencies of the relationship between the variables, the most appropriate non-parametric test is the Chi square test for independence (Balnaves & Caputi, 2001). The Chi square test for independence assumes that: No more than 25% of the cells have expected frequencies less than five, there is no cell with zero expected frequency, the sample data is a random sampling from a fixed population, the sample is of a sufficiently large size, and that the observations are independent of each other (Amin, 2005; Coolican, 2004). These assumptions were assessed through the visual inspection of the expected frequencies and the sampling design. The assessment indicated that the data showed no violation of the above assumptions.

The results of the Chi square test, χ^2 (2, $n = 290$) = 29.989, $p < 0.001$, indicate that HRM efficiency levels significantly depend on supervision practices. The value of $p < 0.001$ is less than the significance level of 0.05(Appendix D). Consequently, $H_{3(null)}$ is rejected. On the evidence of this data there would appear to be no doubt that there is a correlation between supervision practices and HRM efficiency levels in the population from which the sample of 290 respondents was drawn. A weak strength of effect, r (288) = 0.306, $p < 0.001$ that is statistically significant, was found between supervision practices and HRM efficiency levels. This implies that the more supportive the supervision practices, the higher the HRM efficiency levels. The coefficient of determination $r^2 = 0.094$ means that approximately 9.4% of the HRM efficiency level criterion variance is predictable based on using information available to us on supervision practices and 90.6% of the variability is unaccounted for. Turning to the adjusted standardized residuals and comparing them with the cutoff of two, we notice that the adjusted standardized residuals in the cells corresponding to low and high HRM efficiency levels are above the cutoff point (Appendix D). Therefore, these cells make a particularly strong contribution to the relationship between supervision practices and HRM efficiency levels.

DISCUSSION

The first finding of the study revealed that there were significant differences among supervisors, headteachers and teachers concerning their perceptions of supervision practices. The majority of teachers and headteachers reported that supervision practices were more supportive as opposed to more supervisors reporting less supportive practices. This is consistent with Jawoko's (2003) and Namugwanya's (2006) findings that showed lack of collaboration among supervisors, teachers and headteachers during instructional supervision. The difference in perception could be explained by the level of understanding of the facets of supervision and what actually constitutes supportive supervision practices. Inspectors are likely to have an in-depth understanding of supervision practices than headteachers and teachers, and are therefore more aware of the nature of supervision practices and the factors that affect them (Andaleed, 1998). As such, they are likely to rate supervision practices differently from teachers and headteachers. On the other hand, headteachers perceptions of supervision practices were close to those of supervisors probably because of much closer links with supervisors and are considered as first supervisors.

The second finding revealed a significant difference in the perceptions of respondents regarding HRM efficiency levels in the district. More supervisors reported low HRM efficiency levels while few headteachers and teacher reported their HRM efficiency levels as low. These findings are consistent with the available literature (Al-Hamdan & Al-Yacoub, 2005; Marcoulides, Larson & Heck, 1995; Menon, 2002) that noted concerns regarding the efficiency of headteachers. The differences in perception may be attributed to knowledge on HRM, evaluation of superiors, and biasness in self assessment. Supervisors' knowledge of HRM arises from the fact that their

work involves, among other things, looking into how headteachers manage and lead teachers. These details are spelt out in the framework for inspecting schools (ESA, 2006), which unfortunately is not available to the headteachers and teachers. Headteachers, on the other hand, derive their knowledge mainly from experience and are more likely to be knowledgeable than teachers. In addition, headteachers are more likely to rate themselves towards the higher scale while teachers are normally torn between two worlds (telling the truth or pleasing their superiors) and may therefore rate headteachers moderately. This is in line with Al-Hamdan and Al-Yacoub's (2005) assertion that score revelation for low levels of efficiency leads to laziness at work. As such, most raters would simply prefer to rate others as moderate because of the general belief that low rating may cause problems between teachers and headteachers. However, since teachers constitute one of the most important components of the school system, their views concerning HRM efficiency are considered extremely important (Menon, 2002). On the side of supervisors, they set and define standards expected of headteachers and are more experienced at evaluation work. They are therefore more likely to be objective in rating headteachers' performance. For validation purposes, however, different means of measuring headteachers' performance were used (e.g. self-report, supervisory ratings & teacher ratings [Marcoulides, Larson & Heck, 1995]). Although it is important to consider that headteachers were requested to evaluate their HRM practices, and that self-report ratings are more favourable than rating by others, the fact that headteachers rated themselves predominantly in the moderate/high scale is an indication of the perceived importance of HRM.

The third finding revealed that there is a significant relationship between supervision practices and HRM efficiency levels. The less supportive the supervision practices, the lower the HRM efficiency levels and vice versa. To our knowledge, this is the first study that directly links supervision practices to HRM efficiency levels. Although previous research relating supervision practices to HRM efficiency levels have been scanty, the findings of this study are in consonance with the few findings in the available research literature. Namugwanya's (2006), Nassozi's (2005), Smith and Holdaway's (1995) findings that tend to link inspection to performance of schools are supported by the findings of this study. More concrete support is from Al-Hamdan and Al-Yacoub's (2005) argument that headteachers needed guidance and supervision to opmitise their HRM efficiency levels. This could be explained by the belief that through teamwork and support, performance can be realised. Due to the complex nature of education, headteachers and teachers face a number of challenges that need to be tackled. In most cases, handling these challenges calls for contribution from all stakeholders. Supervisors form a good link among the stakeholders as they have the expertise to guide on management and instructional issues. As a result, the closeness of supportive supervisors to headteachers is likely to improve on their HRM efficiency levels. Our findings, however, are at variance with the findings of Karindiriza (1989) and Kabagambe (2004) that there exist a negligible relationship between supervision and competence of secondary school teachers in Kampala, and that the role of inspectors appears to be minor respectively. While Karindiriza (1989) found a negligible correlation (the exact value of which was not reported), this study found a stronger strength of effect (9.4%). Karindiriza's (1989) study was carried out in Kampala, the capital city of Uganda, where most teachers and headteachers think that they do not need to be externally supervised. Schools for this study were selected from Gulu district and consider themselves lacking in many aspects. Therefore, the difference in the strength of effect of the relationship can be explained in terms of contextual factors, such as school location, resources, and perception the staff have of themselves. Staff in and around Kampala perceive themselves as capable of handling situations on their own than those in the rural areas who from time to time need to be supported. This is in congruent with Lee, Ding and Song's (2008) finding that highly reputable schools paid little attention to supervisory visits as compared to ordinary schools. Highly reputable schools are likely to set higher standards than the basic minimum the supervisors are looking for, in order to survive and attain higher status. As a result, they do not think that every supervisory requirement has relevance to them. To such schools, external supervision is viewed as a burden since they already have internal monitoring mechanisms and learning effectiveness in view of having provided a conducive environment. On the other hand, schools with inadequate resources cannot provide services beyond the basic minimum (Smith & Holdaway, 1995) and this constrains leadership effectiveness. In such situations, teachers' work environment is not conducive because of inadequate provision of relevant teaching and learning materials (Ngware, Wamukuru & Odebero, 2006).

Conclusions

The research intended to determine the existence or non-existence of interdependence between supervision practices and HRM efficiency levels. The study employed the cross sectional parallel sample survey design with a sample of 290 teachers, headteachers and supervisors of primary schools in Gulu district. Data collected using questionnaires was analysed by the Chi square test for independence. The analysis showed that there were statistically significant differences in respondents' perceptions of supervision practices and HRM efficiency levels, and a statistically significant dependence of HRM efficiency levels on supervision practices. In view of these findings, the study concludes that differences in perceptions of supervision practices and HRM efficiency levels pose a great challenge to initiatives to improve school operations. Therefore adopting more supportive supervision practices where all stakeholders are involved is essential in improving HRM efficiency levels but there are other important factors that need to be considered.

Managerial Implications

Our study indicates that supervision practices are important drivers of the way the human resource is managed. An education system that does not have a strong monitoring and evaluation arrangement will not achieve its goals (Leonard & Hilgert, 2007; Mohanty, 2005). Consequently, inspectors need to be trained, motivated and adequately facilitated so that they can meet the demands of quality education. In addition, headteachers and teachers should be educated to enhance their understanding of supervision and HRM practices that are

beneficial to professional growth. All documents relating to inspection and supervision should be accessible to other stakeholders. This will help in bringing about consensus on what is meant by quality education. Finally when evaluating the quality of education provision, including HRM efficiency, other factors need to be considered other than limiting the dependence only on supervision practices.

Limitations and Directions for Further Research

The current research was limited to four facets of HRM (i.e. induction, deployment, appraisal and training). Future work should include other potential dimensions of HRM such as recruitment, selection, career management, incentives, team based work organization, and job security. Secondly, the biographical variables such as age, educational level, experience, job tenure, and school location may influence the respondents' perceptions of the supervision and HRM practices. Future studies, therefore, should incorporate these variables in the study design. Finally, there is need to investigate the effectiveness of supervision (school based & external). The study could also be replicated to secondary schools and tertiary institutions.

REFERENCES

Aggarwal, J.C. (2004). *Development and planning of modern education* (*8th ed*.). New Delhi: Vikas.

Agyemang, G. (2009). Responsibility and accountability without direct control? : Local education authorities and the seeking of influence in the UK schools sector. *Accounting*, *Auditing and Accountability Journal, 22* (5), 762 – 788.

Al-Hamdan, J.M. & Al-Yacoub, A.M. (2005). Evaluation of sections' head performance at Kuwait secondary schools. *International Journal of Educational Management, 19* (3), 233 – 245.

Amin, M.E. (2005). *Social science research: Conception, methodology and analysis.* Kampala: Makerere University.

Andaleeb, S.S. (1998). Delivering primary education in Bangladesh: Enabling the field personnel. *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 11* (5), 379 – 396.

Balnaves, M. & Caputi, P. (2001). *Introduction to quantitative research methods*. London:Sage.

Bezzina, C. (1997). Restructuring schools in Malta: The road to improvement. *International Journal of Educational Management, 11* (5), 194 – 202.

Blase, J. & Blase, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 38* (2), 130 – 141.

Bolton, R. (2005). *Habermas's theory of communicative action and the theory of social capital: A paper presented at meeting of the association of American Geographers*, Delver, Colorado, April 2005.

Bredeson, P.V. (2001). Negotiated learning: Union contracts and teacher professional development. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* (*EPAA), 9*(26). Retrieved December 21, 2006, from http://www.epaa.asu.edu

Brown, A. (2005). Implementing performance management in England's primary schools. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 54* (5/6), 468 – 481.

Chandan, J.S. (1997). *Management: Concepts and strategies*. New Delhi: Vikas.

Coolican, H. (2004). *Research methods and statistics in psychology (4 th ed.)*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Education Standards Agency. (2006). *Hand book for school inspectors*. Kampala: Author.

Hornby, A.S. (2000). *Advanced learner's dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jawoko, E.N. (2003). *Inspectors of schools and teachers' practice of collaborative instructional supervision in primary schools. A case study of Nebbi district*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala.

Kabagambe, E. (2004). *School inspectors' role in the management of primary schools: A case study of Kabarole district in western Uganda*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala. Kampala.

Karindiriza, E.S.K. (1989). *The relationship between supervision and competence of teachers in and around Kampala*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala.

Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*, 607 – 610.

Lee, J.C., Ding, D., & Song, H. (2008). School supervision and evaluation in China: The Shangai perspective. *Quality Assurance in Education, 16* (2), 148 – 163.

Leonard, E.C., & Hilgert, R.L. (2007). *Supervision: Concepts and practices of management (10 th ed)*. USA: Thomson.

Lovat, T. (n.d). *Synergies and balance between values education and quality teaching*. Newcastle: Aurthor.

Lugaz, C. (2004). Barriers to decentralisation: Examples from West Africa. *International Institute of Educational Planning, 22* (4), 4 -5.

Maicibi, N.A. (2005). *Pertinent issues in management: Human resource and educational management*. Kampala: Net Media.

Marcoulides, G.A., Larson, T.J., & Heck, H.H. (1995). Examining the generalisability of a leadership model: Issues in assessing administrator performance. *International Journal of Educational Management, 9* (6), 4 – 9.

Masaba, C.W.(2004). *The inspectorate function and the management of quality in primary Education in Kampala City Council*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Makerere University

Menon, M.E. (2002). Perceptions of pre-service and in-service teachers regarding the effectiveness of elementary school leadership in Cyprus. *International Journal of Educational Management, 16* (2), 91 – 97.

Mohanty, B. (2000). *School administration and supervision*. New Delhi: Deep & Deep.

Mohanty, J. (2005). *Educational administration, supervision and school management. (2 nd ed.*). New Delhi: Deep & Deep.

Musaazi, J.C.S. (1982).*The theory and practice of educational administration*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Namugwanya, B. (2006). *Teachers' perceptions of school inspection: A case study of Mubende district*.

Unpublished Masters Dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala.

Nassozi, D. (2005). *Impact of supervision on the quality of teaching and learning in private secondary schools in Mpigi district, Uganda.* Unpublished Masters Dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala.

Ngware, M.W., Wamukuru, D.K., & Odebero, S.O. (2006). Total quality management in secondary schools in Kenya: Extent of practice. *Quality Assurance in Education, 14* (4), 339 – 362.

Office for Standards in Education. (2003). *Inspecting schools: Framework for inspecting schools*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectors.

Office for Standards in Education. (2005). *The annual report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools 2004/2005*. Retrieved July 28, 2006, from http://www.ofsted.gov.uk

Okumbe, J.A. (1998). *Educational management: Theory and practice*. Nairobi: Nairobi University Press.

Okumbe, J.A. (2001). *Human resource management: An educational perspective*. Nairobi: Educational Development and Research Bureau.

Singhal, R.P., Bhagai, N.M., Kalpande, V.A. & Nair, T.K.D. (1986). *School inspection system: A modern approach*. New Delhi: Vikas.

Smith, D.M. & Holdaway, E.A. (1995). Constraints on the effectiveness of schools and their principals. *International Journal of Educational Management, 9* (5), 31 – 39.

Ssekamwa, J.C. & Lugumba, S.M.E. (2000). *Development and administration of education in Uganda*. Kampala: Fountain.

Szczelkun, S. (1999). *Summary of the theory of communicative action*. London: Author.

Terry, G.R. & Franklin, S.G. (2003). *Principles of management* (*8th ed*.). Delhi: A.I.T.B.S.

United National Education Scientific and Cultural Organisation. (2005). *Education for all global monitoring report – 2005*. Paris: Author.

Wiersma, W. & Jurs, S.G. (2005). *Research methods in education: An introduction* (*8th ed*.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Wilcox, B. (2000). *Making school inspection visits more effective: The English experience.* Paris: UNESCO.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

Supervision Practices Scale

Dear respondent,

This questionnaire is part of a study being conducted in Gulu district. It is intended to find out the nature of supervision practices used by School Inspectors in primary schools.
The information sought is meant for academic purposes and will be treated with utmost confidentiality. The respondent's number on the questionnaire is a data analysis code.
Please respond to all items in the questionnaire, as sincerely as possible, by circling your response.

1. Inspection of primary schools has mainly been
    a) With advance notice.
    b) Without advance notice.
2. During inspection, headteachers are usually
    a) Found prepared for inspection.
    b) Caught by surprise.
3. Inspection of primary schools usually
    a) Falls within school programmes.
    b) Requires adjustments in school programmes.
4. The school inspection exercise
    a) Treats staff with courtesy and sensitivity.
    b) Causes some discomfort in the staff.
5. School inspection requires
    a) Little time and effort by the school in preparing for it.
    b) Much time and effort by the school in preparing for it.
6. The type of school inspection per season usually used is
    a) One comprehensive inspection.
    b) A series of short inspections.
7. Inspection in a given school per session is done by
    a) At least two inspectors.
    b) One inspector.
8. Primary schools are inspected
    a) At regular intervals.
    b) Only when they have problems.
9. The number of times a primary school is inspected depends on the
    a) The relative needs of the school.
    b) Total number of schools to be inspected.
10. Primary schools are inspected
    a) At least twice in a year.
    b) Less than two times in a year.
11. School inspection has usually been
    a) Spread throughout the year.
    b) Concentrated in some parts of the year.
12. Inspectors usually stay in a primary school for
    a) At least a whole day.
    b) Less than a day.
13. During a school inspection session
    a) All aspects of the school are inspected.
    b) Specific aspects of the school are inspected.
14. During school inspection
    a) All teachers are supervised.
    b) Selected teachers are supervised.
15. School inspectors observe
    a) A whole lesson from the beginning to the end.
    b) Part of the lesson so as to cover more teachers.
16. After observing lessons, inspectors conference with
    a) Individual supervised teachers and then all the teachers.
    b) All the teachers at once.
17. Upon meeting headteachers, teachers and learners, inspectors
    a) Allow staff and learners to freely give their views on the findings.
    b) Give staff and learners unilateral judgments about the school.
18. After inspection, inspectors usually submit their reports to the school
    a) Immediately or soon after.
    b) After a long time.
19. Inspection reports are usually made available to
    a) All stakeholders.
    b) The headteacher only.
20. The reporting style inspectors use

a) Varies according to recipients.
b) Is uniform for everybody.

21. Follow up on the implementation of recommendations is done
    a) Regularly.
    b) Rarely.
22. School inspectors judge the effectiveness of schools based on
    a) Previous and current inspections.
    b) On the spot findings.
23. School inspectors
    a) Support schools in implementing the recommendations.
    b) Require that the schools act on the findings as recommended.
24. After a follow up visit by the inspectors,
    a) Schools find the implementation of recommendations easy.
    b) Schools can only implement the recommendations with help.
25. School inspection
    a) Enhances the professional growth of teachers.
    b) Scares away and stresses teachers.

End.

Thank you for your cooperation.

HRM Efficiency Level Scale

Dear respondent,

This questionnaire is part of a study being conducted in Gulu district. It is intended to collect information about human resource management practices in primary schools. The information sought is meant for academic purposes and will be treated with utmost confidentiality. The respondent's number on the questionnaire is a data analysis code. For each item, rate the performance of your headteacher at each of the activities given by the statements below by ticking in the appropriate box. Please respond to all items as sincerely as possible.

	Statement	Performance Rating		
		Low	Moderate	High
1.	Receiving new teachers according to properly developed strategies.			
2.	Providing new teachers with well documented background information about the school.			
3.	Introducing new teachers to the school community using pre-determined plans.			
4.	Familiarising new teachers to various offices and facilities as planned.			
5.	Briefing new teachers on the vision, mission, goals and objectives of the school as planned.			
6.	Deploying teachers within the school according to a balanced system of deployment.			
7.	Delegating responsibilities to teachers following standard guidelines.			
8.	Sharing responsibilities among teachers according to developed strategies.			
9.	Clarifying roles and responsibilities to all teachers, and reminding them on these regularly.			
10.	Balancing experience among teachers using agreed strategies.			
11.	Ensuring that agreed guidelines for staff performance appraisal are availed to all teachers.			
12.	Developing and implementing teachers' performance appraisal plan.			
13.	Conducting appraisal meetings with individual(s) concerned, on a regular basis, to review past performance and plan for the future.			
14.	Instituting a system for keeping and updating performance appraisal records of teachers.			
15.	Using appraisal results to coach and develop teachers based on their strengths, weaknesses and needs.			
16.	Developing and instituting a staff training policy, plan or programme.			
17.	Selecting teachers to attend workshops based on their prioritised training needs.			
18.	Having a system in place for conducting school based workshops on a regular basis.			
19.	Documenting and institutionalising support to teachers who go for further studies.			
20.	Ensuring that teachers are placed in positions where they can use their newly acquired skills.			

End.

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B

SPSS Output for Testing Hypothesis 1

Supervision Practices * Category of Respondent Crosstabulation

			Category of Respondent			
			Supervisors	Headteachers	Teachers	Total
Supervision Practices	Less Supportive	Count	10	6	59	75
		Expected Count	3.6	10.1	61.3	75.0
		% within Category of Respondent	71.4%	15.4%	24.9%	25.9%
	More Supportive	Count	4	33	178	215
		Expected Count	10.4	28.9	175.7	215.0
		% within Category of Respondent	28.6%	84.6%	75.1%	74.1%
Total		Count	14	39	237	290
		Expected Count	14.0	39.0	237.0	290.0
		% within Category of Respondent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.509[a]	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	15.298	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.916	1	.027
N of Valid Cases	290		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.62.

APPENDIX C

SPSS Output for Testing Hypothesis 2

HRM Efficiency Level * Category of Respondent Crosstabulation

			Category of Respondent			
			Supervisors	Headteachers	Teachers	Total
HRM Efficiency Level	Low	Count	9	5	76	90
		Expected Count	4.3	12.1	73.6	90.0
		% within Category of Respondent	64.3%	12.8%	32.1%	31.0%
	Moderate	Count	5	21	106	132
		Expected Count	6.4	17.8	107.9	132.0
		% within Category of Respondent	35.7%	53.8%	44.7%	45.5%
	High	Count	0	13	55	68
		Expected Count	3.3	9.1	55.6	68.0
		% within Category of Respondent	.0%	33.3%	23.2%	23.4%
Total		Count	14	39	237	290
		Expected Count	14.0	39.0	237.0	290.0
		% within Category of Respondent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.075[a]	4	.005
Likelihood Ratio	18.165	4	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.562	1	.453
N of Valid Cases	290		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.28.

****

SPSS Output for Testing Hypothesis

Supervision Practices * HRM Efficiency Level Crosstabulation

			HRM Efficiency Level			
			Low	Moderate	High	Total
Supervision Practices	Less Supportive	Count	41	28	6	75
		Expected Count	23.3	34.1	17.6	75.0
		% within HRM Efficiency Level	45.6%	21.2%	8.8%	25.9%
		Adjusted Residual	5.1	-1.7	-3.7	
	More Supportive	Count	49	104	62	215
		Expected Count	66.7	97.9	50.4	215.0
		% within HRM Efficiency Level	54.4%	78.8%	91.2%	74.1%
		Adjusted Residual	-5.1	1.7	3.7	
Total		Count	90	132	68	290
		Expected Count	90.0	132.0	68.0	290.0
		% within HRM Efficiency Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.989[a]	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	30.469	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.562	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	290		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.59.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.306	.000
N of Valid Cases		290	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.