English Language Supervisors: Teachers' Perspective

Abdalla Abu Naba'h, Nayel Al-Shara'h, Yahya Nassar and Muna Khattab *

ABSTRACT

The study aimed at investigating the opinions of English language teachers towards English language supervisors in Jordan. One hundred fifty teachers responded to a five-domain questionnaire designed by the researchers. The results indicated that teachers' opinions towards English language supervisors were almost negative on the five domains of the study and there were no significant statistical differences among the respondents towards English language supervisors due to gender, qualification, and experience. The study recommended that other studies be conducted in other areas and different domains and suggested that the Ministry of education specify standards for selecting and appointing English language supervisors.

Keywords: English Language Supervisors, Supervisory Practices, Training Sessions, Curriculum, Evaluation.

1. INTRODUCTION

There is a common belief among educators for the need of supervisory services on the part of teachers. This is due to the seriousness of the duties and responsibilities assumed by teachers in bringing up and preparing the pupils to lead a kind of fruitful life that serves the interests and welfare of the whole society. The significance of educational supervision stems also from the various purposes and roles it has in upgrading the teachers' competencies to improve the teaching process (Clickman, 1999). Another source of significance is the ability of educational supervision to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of the teaching process which, along with proposing the suitable remedies, constitute the core and essence of evaluating the whole teaching learning process. (Sullivan and Glanz 2001).

However, it has been noticed recently that in spite of the new trends of supervision and the new methods of teaching and supervising, the supervisory concept and the role of supervisor have not yet been clearly understood. Supervision is equivalent to inspection and still performed as a routine work in the form of unexpected traditional visits and a follow- up of exams and students evaluation.

The lack of clarity of the educational supervision concept is attributed to the existence of different educational philosophies. Gordon (1997) defined supervision as "leadership for the improvement of instruction and, ultimately, student learning," and proposed that teachers be involved in all leadership tasks that directly affect instruction. These tasks are "improvement of the school environment, curriculum development, instructional program development, staff development, direct assistance, external relations, leadership development, and improvement of assessment".

Waite (1998) believed that educational supervision is a kind of interactive process that involves the teacher and the supervisor, and results in providing the teacher with feedback to improve the teaching process. Anthony (2000) maintained that supervision is the broad concept that governs the whole process of teaching. He claimed that team teaching can be applied for both students and teachers.

Hoy and Patrick (2003) defined supervision as a process of observing, evaluating and implementing the educational process, improving instruction by working with teachers, developing the curriculum, and cooperating in providing a wholesome learning environment for children.

The most common purpose accepted by most educators and researchers is the improving of teaching and learning process (Waite, 1998). But within this common and main purpose, there are different views

regarding methods, styles and techniques employed to achieve the desired end. While Sergiovanni and Starrat (1988) stressed the vitality of improving the teaching environment and promoting the teaching learning process and the professional growth of teachers, Gordon (1997) listed a group of purposes for educational supervision such as; "developing the curriculum, selection of teaching aids and evaluating teachers and pupils". In other words, it is directed towards promoting all those who influence or are affected by the teaching process including the supervisor, teacher, pupils, curriculum, principals and local environment.

The last few decades have witnessed significant development in the field of educational supervision. Consequently, new tendencies and supervisory models have been evolved.

Sullivan and Glanz (2001) claimed that the school educational supervision is based on one of the following three supervisory theories:

1. Supervision as a scientific administration.
2. Supervision as human relations.
3. Supervision as human and scientific administration.

Most recently, Reeves (2006) has spoken of two main types of supervision:

1. Human relations supervision; which includes such models as: the dictatorial, democratic, diplomatic and negative supervision.
2. Supervision related to means and aims; which includes models like: the corrective, clinical, instructive, scientific, preventive and creative supervision.

It is noticed that modern supervisory models emphasize the importance of promoting interaction between the teacher and the supervisor. Specifying the supervisory tasks provides the supervisor with a clear picture of the tasks he is required to achieve and thus enables him to do his job efficiently. Cottrell et al. (2002) explained eight supervisory tasks that the educational supervisor should carry out:

1. Direct assistance; one-to-one support aims at meeting the teacher's instructional needs and guiding him to the best ways of carrying out his duties.
2. Providing the school with the suitable number of well-qualified teachers.
3. Providing the school with the sufficient teaching aids and other necessary supplements.
4. Regulating the teaching process; setting arrangement for teachers and pupils to abide by concerning the place, time, subject and effective specification of

objective to be achieved through teaching.

5. Curriculum development; such a role goes beyond preparing curriculum guides or selecting textbooks. It also involves assessing needs of students and the community, engaging in dialogue and reflection about the purpose and aims of the curriculum, and the design and development of curricular innovations.
6. Organizing and coordinating the students' related services.
7. Promoting external relations (between the school and the local community).
8. Assessing the teaching process and utilizing the evaluation results in improving that process.

The supervisory practices adopted by modern educational supervision are numerous, integrative and regularly changing. Traditional supervisory practices were criticized by some educators for not promoting the teacher's involvement in the supervisory process and degrading the teacher's self-evaluating practices. Sullivan and Glanz (2001) classified the supervisory styles into:

1- Classroom visitation; which focuses on one or more of such aspects as: curriculum, teacher's questions, classroom activities, extra curricular activities and teaching methods.
2- In- Service Training; which is devoted to helping teachers in the improvement of their professional growth through participation in various regular training courses.
3- Micro Teaching; which focuses on utilizing the feedback technique to improve the teachers performance through applying certain techniques and displaying the teacher's performance on video film. The practice is repeated until the teacher masters the targeted teaching skill before moving to new ones.
4- Integrated Approach; which employs more than one supervisory style to achieve the same supervisory goal.

The supervisor is advised not to stick to a single supervisory style but to vary his styles when attempting to achieve different targets.

The concept of modern supervision requires the supervisor to be an integral member of the school staff and calls for teachers to participate in all the supervisory tasks that directly impact instruction and aim at the improvement of student learning.

Mackinnon (2004) proposed what he described as principles of modern supervision. These principles included:

1. Fostering human relations among all staff members is considered the milestone in developing a school environment conducive to good instruction.

2. Modern supervision is democratic, creative and collaborative.

3. Modern supervision is comprehensive; cares for all the parts that affect the instructional process (curriculum, principals, teachers, students, local community …).

4. Modern supervision is an unceasing process; carried out throughout the year.

5. Modern supervision is carried out by all the parts that affect and are affected by the instructional process (supervisors, principals, teachers and peers).

6. Modern supervision aims ultimately at the improvement of the teaching-learning process.

7. Modern supervision is a planned scientific process; not performed randomly or aimlessly.

The role of this educational supervisor is narrow in scope, focusing only or mainly on the criticism of teachers, rather it is comprehensive in the sense that it aims at improving all components of the teaching learning process. He is viewed as a teacher of teachers, preparing the initial leadership cadre, and eventually assisting in the preparation of other teachers for the tasks of instructional leadership. He is also a leader of leaders, introducing, coordinating, and facilitating goal setting and leadership structures within the supervision program. Finally, the supervisor is a problem solver, monitoring the supervision program and intervening when necessary to assist teachers in dealing with difficulties that arise. (Lizzio et al., 2005).

Guss (2001) reported in the Indiana ASCD supervision study the reactions of teachers concerning supervision as follows:

"They tended to want to avoid being the object of supervision. Some of them considered supervision an attack upon them personally. Others thought of it as a program dealing with materials, ideas and schedules rather than with teaching-learning situations as it affects personal relationships.

Munro (2000) conducted a study to investigate teachers' perception of competent supervisors. They found that best supervisors-as perceived by teachers - were empathetic, attentive, and understanding of others' feelings. These supervisors flexibly adjusted their own responses to colleagues and openly and effectively solved problems that otherwise might fester. They nurtured mutually satisfying

relationships. Another study investigated the same topic (Okeafor and Poole, 2002) in which the researchers discussed a shared understanding of the tasks and purposes of supervision and listed the most important features of good supervisory practices to be:

• clear establishment of a working agreement for a session;

• active, respecting and empathic engaging with the supervisee by the supervisor;

• communicating of support and validation;

• an ability to share ideas, frameworks and experience in a way that is helpful to the supervisee;

• being open to feedback as an aid to this process.

They also mentioned the agreed upon bad practices to be as follows:

• unaware competitiveness, and telling (as opposed to suggesting or exploring)

• failure to help the teacher explore beyond what he or she already knows.

• the establishment of a hierarchical as opposed to a colleague-colleague interaction.

• the apparent avoidance of any contention or challenge.

The findings of the two above studies were in accordance with the findings of Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2004) who have identified six common leadership styles and determined how each style affects the organization's climate. Four of these styles- visionary, coaching, democratic, and affiliative-help to create a positive climate in which people feel energized to do their best. The findings of their study revealed that teachers did their best job and felt most satisfied when they perceived that the supervisor:

• Led flexibly rather than sticking to needless rules.

• Let them teach in their own way, holding them accountable for the results.

• Set challenging but realistic goals for excellence.

• Valued their efforts, recognizing a job well done.

Many studies (Delorme (1985), Lunsford (1990), Glanz (1994), Bennet (1995), Atkins (1996), Bulach (1997), and Richards (1999)) investigated the perceptions of teachers about the importance of good and clear supervisory relationship in achieving the goals of supervision and the supervisory methods and the evaluation process. They revealed that when the supervisor respected the teachers' way of thinking and cooperated with them, their views of supervision and supervisory roles tended to alter positively. And that the evaluation process be updated and changed to include

teachers' input.

Cottrell et al. (2002) identified the key features of supervision from the perspectives of educational supervisors and teachers. Telephone interviews were conducted with selected informants representing a range of specialists. The sample comprised educational supervisors and teachers. Results revealed that direct supervision and the quality of the supervisory relationship are essential to effective supervision. It emphasized the need for clear guidance on supervision and the establishment of appropriate procedures and mechanisms to resolve difficulties relating to inadequate supervision.

Mackinnon (2004) investigated the supervisees' perception of the ideal and factual supervisory relationship. Results asserted that the effectiveness and continuance of this relationship depends on trust and the language is that of mutual responsibilities and obligations rather than rights. Supervisors need to increase their knowledge and ability to deliver good quality supervision within a complex relationship where future issues are hard to predict.

More recently, Goleman (2006) discussed the importance of good supervisory relationship on the quality of teaching. When supervisors present a school environment of warmth and trust, and establish personal relationships with teachers, they can fulfill their tasks more effectively.

The above studies indicated that the majority of teachers held negative attitudes towards educational supervisors and supervision in general. Those attitudes were generally attributed to the factual supervisory practices, styles and behaviors. Many teachers viewed the supervisors as inspectors and they were not satisfied with the factual role practiced by English language supervisors. Other studies revealed that some of the supervisory domains needed improvement in order to meet the actual needs of both teachers and students. On the other hand, some studies showed that when supervisory practices were based on human relations ' i.e. when the supervisor respected the teachers' way of thinking and cooperated with them , their views of supervision and supervisory roles tended to alter positively.

2. PROBLEM OF THE STUDY

The researchers inquired a number of M.A TEFL students, who are in-service teachers, about English

language supervision in their schools and there was a wide spread complaint amongst them about the real role of English language supervisors. They criticized their supervisors' practices sharply and viewed them as mere inspectors. The most important thing for them to do during their visits was to check preparation notebooks and to ensure that teachers follow the directions concerning the completion of the prescribed curriculum and watch teachers in their classrooms. Therefore, the researchers decided to conduct this study to investigate the opinions of teachers of English language about supervisors in different domains, aiming at providing both teachers and supervisors with a clear-cut idea about English language supervision in Jordan.

3. AIMS OF THE STUDY

The study aims to investigate the opinions of English language teachers of English language about supervision in Jordan. In addition, the study aims to find out the effect of the participants' gender, qualification, and experience on their opinions about English language supervision. More specifically, the study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are the opinions of English language teachers of English language supervisors?
2. Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in teachers' opinions of English language supervisors due to gender?
3. Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of teachers' opinions of English language supervisors due to academic qualification?
4. Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of teachers' opinions of English language supervisors due to experience?

4. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

There is no doubt that the results of the study will benefit teachers, supervisors, educators , and decision makers at the Ministry of Education and consequently might serve to improve the quality of teaching English in Jordan and else where.

5. LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

1. The study is confined to the opinions of secondary English language teachers in Amman and Zarka

directorates of education in Jordan.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of the study, the researchers define the following terms operationally:

1. **Supervision**: ways that should be followed by a man/ woman in power, who observes the educational progress in a specific subject. e.g., The English language.

2. **Supervisor:** a person formally designated by the Ministry of Education to assist the teachers in improving their performance and to promote their participation in enhancing the teaching process.

3. **Opinion**: the extent by which a respondent obtains from the Likert Scale after answering the items in the questionnaire sheet entitled "Teachers' opinions of English language supervisors".

6. PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

Sample

The sample of the study consisted of 150 secondary English language teachers, who were selected on grounds of convenience and accessibility. The sample was selected purposefully because all secondary English language teachers participated in correcting the papers of the English language in the General Secondary Education Examination and met in one of the centers designated by the Ministry of education for correcting the papers. Therefore, it was convenient to distribute the questionnaire and to get them completed in a short time.

Table (1) shows the distribution of the participants according to gender, qualification, and experience.

Table 1. Sample distribution according to gender, academic qualification, and experience

Gender		Qualification			Experience		
male	female	Diploma	B.A	M.A	Less than 5 years	6-10 years	More than 10 years
100	50	22	112	16	43	42	65

Research Instrument

For the purpose of this study, the researchers devised a questionnaire that measures teachers' opinions of English language supervisors. The questionnaire consisted of forty- five items distributed among the following domains:

1. Relationship with teachers. (Questions 1-9)
2. Supervision practices. (Questions 10-18)
3. Training sessions.(Questions 19-27)
4. Curriculum. (Questions 28-36)
5. Evaluation. (Questions 37-45)

Each domain consists of nine items that measure teachers' opinions of English language supervisors.

The level of answers for each item in the questionnaire was designed in accordance with Likert scale: Agree strongly (5), Agree (4), Neutral (3), Disagree (2), Disagree strongly (1).

To ensure the validity of the questionnaire, it was judged by a jury of five university professors: (1) specialists in evaluation and assessment, (2) in Psychology, and (2) in English language methodology. Some minor changes in the wording of the items were made based on their suggestions and comments .However; all agreed that the questionnaire was valid for measuring what it was designed for.

Reliability coefficient for all domains was calculated

by using Gonbach Alpha formula; it was (0.84). This was considered to be high reliability and sufficient for the purpose of the study.

The researchers received a permission from the Ministry of education to conduct the study and distributed the questionnaire hand-to-hand and explained to them the purpose of the study and asked them to deal with the questionnaire positively and seriously. In fact, schools' principals were very cooperative and helpful in collecting the questionnaires from the participants and contacted us later to collect the completed questionnaire.

Statistical Procedures

The statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) program was used in processing the data of this study. Means, percentages, standard deviations, Independent T-test, ANOVA and other statistical tests were used to answer the questions of the study.

The following levels of percentages were used in interpreting the findings of the study:

More than 80%:	very high
70- 79%	high
60-69%	moderate
50- 59.9%	low
Less than 50%	very low

7. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

To answer the first question "what are the opinions of the English language teachers of English language supervisors in Jordan, the means and percentages of each domain as well as the means and the percentage of the total domain of the questionnaire were calculated. Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 show the results.

Table (2) shows that teachers' opinions of English language supervisors were low on most of the items whereas the opinions were moderate on items 1, 5, 6, 9. The total degree of the opinions on the first domain was low 59%.

Table (3) shows that teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors were almost moderate on the whole items whereas the opinions were high on items 13; 16 and 18 which received the lowest degree of the opinions. The total degree of the opinions was moderate with a percentage of 63%.

Table (4) shows that teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors were low on almost all items except

for items 25 and 26; the opinions were high and moderate respectively on those two items. The total degree of opinions was low with a percentage of 58%.

Table (5) shows that teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors were low on the items 29, 31, 32, 35, 36 whereas the opinions were was high on 34 and moderate on 28, 30, 33. The total degree of the opinions was low with a percentage of 58%.

Table (6) shows that teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors were low on items 39, 40, 43 whereas the opinions were moderate on items 38, 42, 44, 45. But the opinions on items 37, 41 were high. The total degree on the whole domain was moderate with a percentage of 62%.

Table (7) shows that teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors were low on the relations with teachers, training sessions, and curriculum whereas the opinions were moderate on supervisory practices and evaluation. The overall opinion of all domains was moderate.

Table 2. Means and percentages of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors on the first domain "relations with teachers"

No	Item	Means	Percent	degree
1	The supervisor respects teachers' feelings	3.14	63 %	Moderate
2	The supervisor takes into account teachers' circumstances	2.84	56%	Low
3	The supervisor encourages teachers to express their views freely and frankly	2.95	59%	Low
4	Supervisors' authority stems from teachers' confidence	2.79	56%	Low
5	The supervisor distinguishes between the males and females during class-Room supervision	3.03	60%	Moderate
6	Female teachers hold different viewpoints From their male counterparts towards supervisors	2.98	60%	Moderate
7	The supervisor provides teachers with educational brochures about TEFL	2.74	55%	Low
8	The supervisor solves teachers' problems	2.89	58%	Low
9	The supervisor's relationship with teachers is an authoritative one	3.30	66%	Moderate
	Total	2.96	59%	Low

Table 3. Means and percentages of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors on the second domain "supervisory practices"

No	Item	Means	Percent	Degree
10	The supervisor practices modern supervisory methods	3.12	62%	Moderate
11	The supervisor sustains the changes in teacher's teaching methods	3.21	64%	Moderate
12	The supervisor imposes his own method of teaching upon teachers	3.22	64%	Moderate
13	The supervisor inspects more than supervises	3.54	71%	High
14	The supervisor has more interest in the teacher's strength of character in the classroom	3.13	63%	Moderate
15	He is more interested in the daily plans than with students' achievements	3.39	68%	Moderate
16	the supervisor suggests remedial work to remedy the low level of students' achievement	2.68	54%	Low
17	The supervisor suggests remedial work to remedy the low level of students' achievement	3.25	65%	Moderate
18	I am always convinced of what the supervisor says about the ideal teaching methods	2.85		low
	Total	3.15	63%	moderate

Table 4. Means and percentages of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors on the third domain "training sessions"

No	Item	Means	Percent	Degree
19	I always benefit from those training sessions held by supervisors	2.8	56%	Low
20	The supervisor always plans to develop teachers' abilities during the training sessions	2.92	58%	Low
21	The supervisor is always creative in his work	2.81	56%	Low
22	The supervisor holds more qualifications than teachers which qualify him to administer training sessions	2.51	50%	Low
23	The supervisor himself lectures during the training sessions	2.89	58%	Low
24	The supervisor discusses with teachers the real obstacles in the English language curricula	2.88	58%	Low
25	The supervisor depends on other teachers on holding such training sessions	3.58	72%	High
26	The supervisor employs modern teaching methodology during the training sessions	3.16	63%	Moderate
27	The English language curriculum for each grade is evaluated during the training sessions	2.60	52%	Low
	Total	2.90	58%	Low

Table 5. Means and percentages of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors on the fourth domain "curriculum"

No	Item	Means	Percent	Degree
28	The supervisor informs the teachers about any changes in English Curricula	2.99	60%	Moderate
29	The supervisor develops English language curricula in cooperation with teachers	2.61	52%	Low
30	The supervisor focuses on a specific teaching method in teaching English for the secondary stage	3.08	62%	Moderate
31	The supervisor distributes a variety of question models about Tawjihi curriculum	2.57	51%	Low
32	The supervisor performs model English lessons in front of teachers	2.58	51%	Low
33	The teacher is viewed by supervisors as a tool to perform and carry out any curriculum	3.39	68%	Moderate
34	The supervisor stresses on finishing the curriculum by the end of the scholastic year	3.50	70%	High
35	The supervisor provides teachers with necessary teaching resources for teaching any curriculum	2.87	57%	Low
36	The supervisor discusses with teachers the gaps existed in the curriculum	2.54	51%	Low
	Total	2.90	58%	Low

Table 6. Means and percentages of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors on the fifth domain "evaluation"

No	Item	Means	Percent	Degree
37	Personal relationships contribute a lot to improve teachers' evaluation report	3.48	70%	High
38	The supervisor is interested in teachers' qualifications more than experience	3.03	60%	Moderate
39	Teachers' performance improves after the supervisor visit	2.60	52%	Low
40	The supervisor holds more qualifications than teachers do which fulfills the validity of evaluation	2.75	55%	Low
41	The time spent by supervisors with teachers is short and not enough for evaluation	3.81	76%	High
42	The supervisor is an extension to the school principal in the evaluation process	3.35	67%	Moderate
43	The supervisor studies the plans prepared by teachers carefully	2.77	55%	Low
44	The supervisor focuses on citing the behavioral objectives when he checks the teachers plans	3.21	64%	Moderate
45	The report sent by the supervisor to teachers depends on other previous reports	3.05	61%	Moderate
	Total	3.12	62%	Moderate

Table 7. Means and percentages of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors on the different domains

No	Domains	Rank	Mean	Percentage	Degree
1	Relations with teachers	3	2.96	59%	low
2	Supervisory practices	1	3.15	63%	Moderate
3	Training sessions	4	2.91	58%	Low
4	Curriculum	5	2.90	58%	Low
5	Evaluation	2	3.11	62%	Moderate
Total			3.01	60%	Moderate

To answer the second question "Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors attributed to the gender variable", Independent T-test was used to answer the above question as shown in Table (8).

Table (8) shows that computed t-values on all the domains and the total score were respectively: 0.89, 1.26, 1.39, 0.54, 0.54, and 1.30. All of these values were less than the critical t-test value (1.96). Such results mean that there was no significant difference at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of teachers' opinions of English language supervisors which might be attributed to the gender variable. That is, teachers' opinion of English language supervisors was not affected by the respondents' gender.

To answer the third question: "Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors which might be attributed to the academic qualification variable". Means and one way ANOVA were employed to answer the above question as shown in Tables (9 and 10) respectively.

Table (10) shows that the computed (F) values for the first domain (relations with teachers, the second domain (supervisory practices), the third domain (training sessions), the fourth domain (curriculum) and the fifth

domain (evaluation were as follows 1.43, 1.10, 1.98, 2.16, 1.03 respectively. All these values were less than the critical (F) value (3.06). This means that there was no significant difference at (a=0.05) in the means of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors which might be due to the academic qualification. Therefore, teachers' opinions were not affected by the academic qualification variable.

As for the fourth question: "Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors which may be attributed to the experience variable" Means and One- way ANOVA were used to answer the above question as shown in Tables (11 and 12) respectively.

Table (12) shows that the computed (F) values for the first domain (relations with teachers, the second domain (supervisory practices), the third domain (training sessions), the fourth domain (curriculum) and the fifth domain (evaluation) were as follows 0.53, 0.64, 1.20, 1.93, 0.06 respectively. The total score was 1.11. All these values were less than the critical (F) value (3.06). This means that there was no significant difference at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)) in the means of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors which might be due to the experience. Therefore, teachers' opinions were not affected by the experience variable.

Table 8. Results of Independent T-test for differences in teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors according to the gender variable

No	Domains	Males		Females		T-test	* sig.
1	Relations with teachers	2.93	0.60	3.02	0.50	0.89	0.37
2	Supervisory practices	3.12	0.46	3.22	0.38	1.26	0.21
3	Training sessions	2.86	0.72	3.2	0.61	1.39	0.17
4	Curriculum	2.89	0.55	2.93	0.44	0.54	0.59
5	Evaluation	3.01	0.45	3.14	0.33	0.54	0.54
Total		2.98	0.40	3.07	0.54	1.30	0.19

* Significant at (a=0.05) - T (1.96).

Table 9. Means for different domains according to the educational qualification variable

No	Domain	Diploma	B.A	M.A
1	Relations with teachers	3.14	2.94	2.85
2	Supervisory practices	3.03	3.16	3.22
3	Training sessions	3.06	2.91	2.63
4	Curriculum	3.02	2.91	2.67
5	Evaluation	3.01	3.14	3.06

Table 10. Results of One-way (ANOVA) for differences in the means of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisor according to the academic qualification

No	Domains	Source of domain	Sum of squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Relations with teachers	Between groups	0.94	2	0.47	1.43	0.34
		Within groups	48.61	148	0.32		
		Total	49.56	150			
2	Supervisory practices	Between groups	0.43	2	0.21	1.10	0.33
		Within groups	29.06	148	0.19		
		Total	29.50	150			
3	Training sessions	Between groups	1.85	2	0.92	1.98	0.14
		Within groups	69.04	148	0.46		
		Total	70.90	150			
4	Curriculum	Between groups	1.15	2	0.57	2.16	0.11
		Within groups	39.37	148	0.26		
		Total	40.52	150			
5	Evaluation	Between groups	0.36	2	0.18	1.03	0.35
		Within groups	25.80	148	0.17		
		Total	26.16	150			
6	Total score	Between groups	0.29	2	0.14	0.44	0.39
		Within groups	22.43	148	0.15		
		Total	22.72	150			

* Critical (F) = (3.06).

Table 11. Means for different domains according to the experience variable

No	Domain	Less than (5) years	(6-10) years	More than(10) years
1	Relations with teachers	2.97	2.88	3.00
2	Supervisory practices	3.19	3.09	3.17
3	Training sessions	2.97	2.73	2.97
4	Curriculum	2.81	2.85	2.99
5	Evaluation	3.10	3.13	3.11

Table 12. Results of One-way (ANOVA) for differences in the means of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisor according to the experience variable

No	Domains	Source of domain	Sum of squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Relations with teachers	Between groups	0.35	2	0.18	0.53	0.58
		Within groups	49.20	148	0.33		
		Total	49.56	150			

No	Domains	Source of domain	Sum of squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
2	Supervisory practices	Between groups	0.25	2	0.13	0.64	0.53
		Within groups	29.25	148	0.20		
		Total	29.50	150			
3	Training sessions	Between groups	1.86	2	0.93	1.20	0.13
		Within groups	69.03	148	0.47		
		Total	70.90	150			
4	Curriculum	Between groups	1.03	2	0.51	1.93	0.14
		Within groups	39.49	148	0.26		
		Total	40.52	150			
5	Evaluation	Between groups	1.93	2	0.68	0.06	0.44
		Within groups	26.14	148	0.18		
		Total	26.16	150			
6	Total score	Between groups	0.34	2	0.17	1.11	0.33
		Within groups	22.39	148	0.15		
		Total	22.7	150			

* Critical (F) = (3.06).

8. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

First: Discussion of Findings of the First Question
- Discussion of Findings Related to the First Domain: Relations with Teachers

The results show that the English language teachers were not so satisfied with the supervisors' practices concerning their relations with teachers. According to Table (2), teachers believed that supervisors did not respect teacher's feelings nor do they encourage them to express their views frankly and freely. The supervisors also were not concerned with English teachers' problems in school nor did they provide them with educational brochures about methods of teaching English.

The researchers believe that teachers' dissatisfaction with this type of supervisory model is due to the fact that most supervisors still think of supervision as inspection. This result supported the findings of (Bulach, 1997). His study revealed that supervisors practiced poor human relations with teachers and most of the teachers viewed supervisors negatively in this respect. However, this did not support the findings of (Lunsford, 1990) who concluded that there was kind and mutual satisfaction in the relation between teachers and supervisors as a result of frequent contact.

- Discussion of Findings Related to the Second Domain: Supervisory Practices

The results indicate that the English language teachers were also not content with the supervisory practices that they had received. According to item 13, teachers viewed

supervisors as inspectors who inspected more than they supervised.

The researchers attribute this result to the inadequate pre-service training received by most of ELS who are usually transferred from the teachers to supervisors without receiving enough training. This sudden transition created problems for both teachers and supervisors in terms of the kind of relationships. In addition, the researchers believe that most ELT neither had enough qualifications nor did they hold enough pre- service training sessions for ELT. Items 20, 22, in the questionnaire support this trend. The result is consistent with that of (Delorm, 1985) who indicated that the supervisors were viewed negatively by most teachers who did not receive enough training and recommended that supervisors develop teachers professionally through intensive training sessions. In addition, the findings of (Glanze, 1994) support this result in the sense that the supervisory practices and methods were inspective and that supervisors did not practice supervisory methods.

- Discussion of Findings Related to the Third Domain: Training Sessions

The results revealed teachers' unwillingness to attend the training sessions. According to the responses of the participants, teachers do not get immediate benefit from those training sessions; they are also not developed professionally and supervisors tended to depend on other teachers in holding and lecturing in those sessions as item 25 shows. Teachers find no room for creativity in those sessions.

The researchers believe that the lack of training received by supervisors made them unable to train, help, and communicate with teachers.

- Discussion of Results Related to the Fourth Domain (Curriculum)

The results indicate in general that the English language teachers were not convinced with the supervisors practices in the curriculum domain.

A quick review of these items show that the English language supervisors did not discuss the obstacles presented in the English language curriculum; they did not work on developing and modifying these curricula. Furthermore, teachers claimed that supervisors emphasized finishing the curricula by the end of the scholastic year more than implementing these curricula methodologically. In addition, teachers were viewed by supervisors as tools for implementing the English language curricula. Items 33 and 34 support these notions.

- Discussion of Findings Related to the Fifth Domain: Evaluation

The results show that teachers' evaluation process was not accepted by the majority of the English language teachers. They stressed that the time spent with the supervisor was short and was not valid enough to discuss matters of evaluation. Moreover, knowing the supervisor beforehand contributes a lot to improving the teacher's report at the end of the year. Furthermore, the English language teachers claimed that supervisors did not have enough qualifications to qualify them to pass judgment on other teachers and most of the evaluative reports were based on previous ones issued by school principals.

The researchers attribute this result to the fact that school principals were considered as permanent supervisors in their schools and their role was not less important than that of supervisors. In addition, the social relationships play an important role in the process of evaluation. The researchers believe that teacher's evaluation was affected by the degree of sociability between the teacher and the supervisor.

The findings of Richard (1999) support this result. He revealed that teachers were not concerned with the supervisors' evaluation, since supervisors did not make fair judgments about teachers and that supervisors should communicate positively with teachers during the evaluation process. However, the results of Atkins (1996) did not support this result. Teachers in this study preferred

the process of evaluation and asked for more involvement in it. In addition, teachers had positive views towards the classroom visit, but they asked for more supervisory classroom visits before the evaluation process.

- Discussion of Findings Related to the Different Domains

Table (7) shows that the teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors were low on supervisory practices, relations with teachers, and training sessions whereas they were moderate on Evaluation and curriculum and the total domains of the questionnaire. These results show that the general opinions about English language supervisors were almost neutral and generally negative in the general sense. So, English language teachers were not satisfied with the supervisors' practices on the five supervisory domains as it was shown through their responses on the items of the questionnaire. The scale point "disagree" of the five scales in the Likert, occupied nearly all items.

The researchers attribute these results to the fact that most of the English language supervisors did not follow the same procedures in their supervision. In addition, many teachers seemed to have bias in favor or against some supervisors for the sake of personal interests. Moreover, some of those teachers may not have been acquainted with the roles of supervisors or the whole system of supervision. Novice teachers tended to apply what they studied at universities which might contradict - somehow -with the philosophy of the Ministry of Education.

Second: Discussion of the findings related to the second question

Table (8) shows that computed t-values on all the domains and the total score were respectively: 0.89, 1.26, 1.39, 0.54, 0.54, and 1.30. All of these values were less than the critical t-test value (1.96). Such results mean that there were no significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of teachers' opinions of English language supervisors which might be attributed to the gender variable. That is, teachers' opinion of English language supervisors was not affected by the respondents' gender.

The researchers believe that the sample of the study might hold approximate opinions about the English language supervisors during the process of correcting the Tawjihi English language examinations. Actually, the English language teachers found it an opportunity to

discuss their everyday affairs and so they exchanged opinions during the process of correcting Tawjihi papers, especially during the breaks.

Third: Discussion of the findings related to the third question

Table (10) shows that the computed (F) values for the first domain (relations with teachers, the second domain (supervisory practices), the third domain (training sessions), the fourth domain (curriculum) and the fifth domain (evaluation were as follows 1.43, 1.10, 1.98, 2.16, 1.03 respectively. All these values were less than the critical (F) value (3.06). This means that there were no significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors which might be due to the academic qualification. Therefore, teachers' opinions were not affected by the academic qualification variable.

The researchers attribute this result to the fact that 74.8 % of the subjects of the study were holders of Bachelor of Arts and work in the same educational area. This means that the majority of the English language teachers share similar opinions about supervision. Moreover, they might receive equal training methods by the English language supervisors and so they expressed similar viewpoints towards supervisors. In addition, those teachers are expected to have a comprehensive picture about the educational supervisors through lectures, seminars held by the Ministry of education.

Fourth: Discussion of the findings related to the fourth question

Table (12) shows that the computed (F) values for the first domain (relations with teachers, the second domain (supervisory practices), the third domain (training sessions), the fourth domain (curriculum) and the fifth domain (evaluation) were as follows0.53, 0.64, 1.20, 1.93, 0.06 respectively. The total score was 1.11. All these values were less than the critical (F) value (3.06). This means that there were no significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors which might be due to the experience. Therefore, teachers' opinions were not affected by the experience variable.

The researchers attribute this result to the fact that most of the subjects of the study had nearly the same experience in teaching English. All of them were teachers of the twelfth grade (Tawjihi) and they were not permitted to teach Tawjihi unless they had two years of experience at least in training. Moreover, experienced teachers tended to share approximate opinions about different supervisory models. Consequently, they might hold the same picture about supervision.

The result is in consistence with the findings of Bennet (1995) which showed that there were differences in teachers' expectations about the role of the English language supervisors which might be attributed to the experience variable in favor of the highest experience.

9. CONCLUSIONS

In the light of the study findings, the researcher concluded the following:

1- Teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors were almost negative on the five domains of this study. Teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors were low on the first, third, and fifth domains; however, they were moderate on the second, fifth and the total domains of the questionnaire. Thus, the scale "disagree" of the five point scale in the Likert scale occupied nearly al the items.

2- Teachers' opinions of the English language supervisors were not affected by the respondents' gender, qualification, and experience variables.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The following recommendations stemmed from the results of the study:

1- Conducting similar studies in other areas in Jordan to find out whether the respondents' gender, qualifications, and experience affect or not their opinions towards English language supervisors.

2- Investigating other domains in supervision, such as the objectives and testing domain in order to find out the opinions of the English language teachers towards these domains.

3- Comparing the model of English language supervision in private and public schools.

4- Conducting studies about the supervisors' preparation in Jordan to find out the real norms by which the Ministry Education adheres to in selecting and appointing supervisors.

B. The researchers propose the following suggestions:

1- The Ministry of Education is called upon to hold intensive workshops and training sessions for

supervisors in order to the modern supervisory methods.

2- The Ministry of Education is to specify standard norms for appointing and selecting educational supervisors.

3- English language supervisors have to pay the teachers more than one supervisory visit during the scholastic year.

4- The number of teachers supervised by one supervisor should be specified and minimized.

5- The English language supervisors should change some of the inspective practices in supervision restricted to searching for and hunting some mistakes made by the teachers.

REFERENCES

Anthony, B. 2000. Team Teaching, Plus or Minus ESP, *English Teaching Forum*, 38-46.

Atkins, A. 1996. Teacgers' Opinions of the Teacher Evaluation Process, *ERIC Document*, (ED 398628).

Benett, D. 1995. The Role of Content Knowledge in Instructional Supervision, *ERIC Document*, (ED 379277).

Bulach, C. 1997. Mistakes Educational Leaders Make, *ERIC Document*, (ED 404737).

Clickman, C.D. 1999. *Supervision of Instruction*. 2nd ed. Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Cottrell, David. Kilminster, Sue. Jolly, Brian. 2002. What is Effective Supervision and How Does It Happen? A Critical Incident Study, Educational Leadership, 60 (3).

Delorme, T.G. 1985. An Assessment of the Attitudes and Perceptions of Selected Elementary School Teachers Who Serve Native American Children toward Instructional Supervision and Evaluation. Dissertation Abstract International, 45(8), 2324-A.

Drummond, R. 1995. Evaluation of Interns and Iternship by Full 1994 Directing Teachers. *International Dissertation Abstract International*, (ED 38704).

Glanz, J. 1994. History of Educational Supervision: Proposals and Prospects, *Dissertation Abstract International*, (ED 36918-78).

Lunsford, B.F. 1990. Perception of Relationships between Teachers and Supervisors during the Implementation of New Teaching. *Dissertation Abstract International*, (ED 113222).

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., McKee, A. 2004. *Primal Leadership: Learning to Lead with Emotional Intelligence*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

Goleman, Daniel. 2006. The Socially Intelligent Leader, *Educational Leadership*, 64 (1).

Gordon, Stephen P. 1997. Participatory Supervision, *Education*, 111 (4).

Guss, Carolyn. 2001. How Is Supervision Perceived? *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 18 (3).

Hoy, Waynes K. and Patrick B. Forsyth. 2003. *Effective Supervision: Theory into Practice*, Random House, New York.

Lizzio, Alf, Stokes, Lorraine, Wilson, Keithia. 2005. Approaches to Learning in Professional Supervision: Supervisee Perceptions of Processes and Outcome, *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 23 (3).

Mackinnon, Jacquelin. 2004. Academic Supervision: Seeking Metaphors and Models for Quality, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 28 (4).

Munro, P. M. 2000. Supervision: What's Imposition Got To Do With It? *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 16 (2).

Okeafor, Karen R. Poole, Marybeth G. 2002. What Kind of Supervision Do Veteran Teachers Need? *Educational Leadership*, 60 (5).

Reeves, Douglas. 200. Leadership Leverage, *Educational Leadership*, 64 (2).

Richard, J. Tannenbaum. 1999. Laying the Ground Work for a Licensure Assessment, *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 33.3 (225-244).

Sergiovanni, T. J. and Starrat, R. J. 1988. *Supervision: Human Perspectives*, 4th ed. McGraw-Hill, Inc, New York.

Sullivan, Susan and Glanz, Jeffrey. 2001. *Supervision That Improves Teaching: Strategies and Technique*s. Cornwin Press, Inc, California.

Waite, Duncan. 1998. *Rethinking Instructional Supervision: Notes on Language and Culture*, The Falmer Press, London.

*

.

.   150

.

.

.

.   .

.   :