

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULT

This chapter presents an analysis and interpretation of data obtained from the respondents. The first part contains bio-data of the teachers and campus chiefs. The second part of the chapter presents the supervisory activities of campus chiefs as perceived by teachers and campus chiefs themselves. In the third part of the chapter was comparative results of the supervisory activities of campus chiefs and teachers. Finally, this chapter contains a discussion of the results of the responses of campus chiefs and teachers to the open ended question.

In comparing the opinions of supervisory activities perceived by the campus chiefs and teachers, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to test both groups. However, the number of population in the two groups were unequal, 9 in the group of campus chiefs and 101 in the group of teachers.

Jeanne (1967) stated that testing two samples which come from the same or different population should use the Mann - Whitney U test. Supporting above statement Lincoln (1974) said that non-parametric tests do not require rigid

assumptions about the population from which samples are taken. The only assumption needed is that the values of the random variables on which two groups are to be compared are continuously distributed. Therefore this statistical test is useful for this supervisory activities study.

Data was collected on the supervisory activities of campus chief as perceived by campus chiefs and teachers of nursing campus in Nepal. Questionnaires were given to 101 teachers and 9 campus chiefs in different nursing campuses. Each independent variables was tested by MEAN, SEM., 95% CI., and Mann - Whitney U Test to interpret differences between two categories. An analysis was made of selected factors based on dependent variables.

To aid in interpretation, data was classified into seven categories for studying the perception of supervisory activities. Data was presented for analysis and interpretation in the following order:

1. Sample characteristics.
 2. identification of supervisory activities of campus chief as perceived by campus chief, and teachers of nursing campus in Nepal.
- A. Activities in meeting the individual teacher need:
1. Assist new teacher in their work.

2. Assist in orientation of new teachers.
3. Recognize the individual teachers when their needs arises.
4. Be available to the individual teachers who desire personal conferences.
5. Provide a comfortable environment which contributes to the improvement of teaching.

B. Activities in curriculum study:

1. Advise teachers to study about curriculum change.
2. Advise to curriculum guides.
3. Motivate teachers to use new content.

C. Activities in instructional means:

1. Inform teachers about availability of instructional media.
2. Provide an adequate supply of books and professional journals.
3. Encourage teachers to keep up with new instructional materials in order to plan an ongoing expanding programme.
4. Advise teachers to utilize community resources in teaching learning activities.
5. Invite outside experts as consultants services for teachers.

D. Activities in in-service education:

1. Advise the teachers to observe and to give constructive criticism of the classes taken by individual teachers for better improvement of the classroom teaching.
2. Hold group conferences to discuss about instructional problems.
3. Encourage teachers to attend workshops and conferences.
4. Provide library facilities for teachers.
5. Encourage teaching to do advanced study according to campus need.
6. Provide adequate teaching materials in order to solve instructional problems.

E. Activities in group process:

1. Encourage co-operative group or community activities and discussion.
2. Promote co-ordinating meeting between hospital and campus and other division.
3. Assist the teachers to develop personal relationship with each other.

F. Activities in research

1. Inform teachers about research methods and procedures.
2. Advise teachers to use new ideas and practices.

3. Involve teachers in doing research.

G. Activities in evaluation

1. Encourage teachers in self-evaluation of their work.
2. Encourage teachers to evaluate campus activities or programme.

Data analysis and interpretation is shown in each table as follows:

Section I. General Information of Respondents:

Table 1.1 Distribution of the respondents according to the nursing campuses.

Nursing campus in Nepal	Campus chief		Teachers	
	No	%	No	%
Maharajgunj	1	11.1	47	46.5
Lalitpur	1	11.1	8	7.9
Bir Hospital	1	11.1	7	6.9
Nepalgunj	1	11.1	6	5.9
Pokhara	1	11.1	9	8.9
Biratnagar	1	11.1	8	7.9
Birgunj	1	11.1	7	6.9
Bharatpur	1	11.1	8	7.9
Tansen	1	11.1	1	1.1

All respondents all are female.

Table 1.2 General Information of Respondents.

Information	Campus chief		Teachers	
	No	%	No	%
Ethnic group:				
Brahmin	4	44.1	23	22.7
Chhetri	1	11.1	15	14.9
Rai/Limbu/Magar	3	33.3	24	23.8
Newar	1	11.1	32	31.7
Others	-	-	7	6.9
Age in years:				
21 - 36	2	22.2	62	61.4
37 - 50	7	77.8	35	34.6
51 - 65	-	-	2	2.0
No Response	-	-	2	2.0
Religion:				
Buddhist	-	-	14	13.9
Hindu	8	88.9	81	80.1
Christian	1	11.1	4	4.0
Others	-	-	1	1.0
No Response	-	-	1	1.0
Marital Status:				
Married	6	66.7	70	69.3
Unmarried	3	33.3	28	27.7
Widow	-	-	2	2.0
No response	-	-	1	1.0

Table 1.2 (Continued)

Information	Campus chief		Teachers	
	No	%	No	%
Basic qualification:				
Certificate in Nursing	-	-	23	22.8
B. Sc. Nursing	6	66.7	66	65.3
M. Sc. (MPH)	3	33.3	11	10.9
No Response	-	-	1	1.0
Residential Status:				
On campus premise	7	77.8	44	43.5
Off campus	2	22.2	55	54.5
No Response	-	-	2	2.0
Academic Status:				
Professor	-	-	1	1.0
Reader	1	10.0	7	6.9
Lecturer	6	60.0	20	19.8
Assistant Lecturer	2	20.0	40	39.6
Instructor	-	-	7	6.9
Deputy Instructor	-	-	10	9.9
Assistant Instructor	-	-	16	15.8

Section II. Analysis of supervisory activities.

1. Grading of perception.

Perceptions of teachers and campus chiefs on the supervisory activities of the campus were measured by using following grade score techniques.

Perception grading symbolized Score

Done extremely well	A	6
Done well	B	5
Average	C	4
Not so well done	D	3
Done very poorly	E	2
Not done	F	1

2. Analysis Methods

Following results were obtained from each activity of the campus chiefs as perceived by teachers and campus chiefs themselves. The results were presented in different statistical indicators Mean (M), Standard Error of Mean (SEM.) and 95% confidential intervals ($M + 2 \text{ SEM.}$). Mann Whitney U wilcoxon was used to see the significance of the difference between average score given by teachers and campus chiefs.

3. Interpretation guide

Averages of the numerically ranked perceptions were then interpreted according to the following ordinal scale:

Statement made If range of score in average

	Average Score
Extremely well	6
Almost extremely well	5.50 to 5.99
Just extremely well	5.10 to 5.49
Exactly well	5.0 to 5.09
Almost well	4.50 to 4.99
Just well	4.10 to 4.49
Exactly average	4.00 to 4.09
Almost average	3.50 to 3.99
Just average	3.10 to 3.49
Exactly not well	3.0 to 3.09
Almost not so well	2.50 to 2.99
Just not so well	2.10 to 2.49
Exactly not so well	2.0 to 2.09
Not done	1.0

Table 2.1 A Result of perception score of each item of teachers and campus chiefs Mean, SEM., 95%CI

ITEM	R	MEAN	SEM.	95 % CI.
A	T	112.90	20.54	108.41-117.90
	C	126.62	12.50	116.17-137.07
B	T	31.58	6.76	30.17- 33.04
	C	35.42	3.55	32.14- 38.71
C	T	48.98	9.43	46.94- 51.40
	C	55.87	5.11	51.60- 60.14
D	T	120.76	22.37	115.68-125.85
	C	137.50	12.21	123.62-151.37
E	T	26.74	6.11	25.43- 28.04
	C	32.62	3.20	29.94- 35.30
F	T	24.11	10.28	21.83- 26.38
	C	27.85	10.60	18.04- 37.66
G	T	25.92	7.09	23.01- 33.84
	C	28.42	7.02	24.69- 34.68

Table 2.2 B Result of Mann-Whitney U-Wilcoxon

ITEM	R	MEAN RANK	P-VALUE	SIG.
A	T C	44.31 63.50	.0497	*
B	T C	47.78 64.64	.1263	NS
C	T C	44.63 66.13	.0294	*
D	T C	40.55 60.67	.0488	*
E	T C	44.98 74.63	.0032	*
F	T C	43.65 54.29	.2902	NS
G	T C	48.68 60.21	.2997	NS

Note: R = Respondent

T = Teacher

C = Campus chief

Supervisory Activities:

A: Meetings the individual teachers needs

B: Curriculum study

C: Instructional means

D: Inservice education

E: Group process

F: Research

G: Evaluation

Supervisory Activities Item A,C,D,E were significant, because in average teachers perception they were just well done, where in campus chiefs perception they were extremely well done. Highest Mean Rank of campus chiefs was 74.63 and lowest was 54.29. Highest Mean Rank of teachers was 48.68 and lowest Mean Rank was 40.55.

Items B,F,G were not significantly different because average teachers and campus chief view were approximately the same.

Table 2.3 A Responses of campus chiefs and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the campus chiefs in the area of meeting the individual teachers needs.

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN	SEM.	95 % CI.
1.Assist new teachers in their work.	T (96) C (9)	24.13 27.11	4.93 2.66	23.13-25.13 25.06-29.16
2.Assist in orientation for new teachers.	T(95) C (8)	32.02 37.62	7.44 3.77	30.50-33.53 34.46-40.78
3.Recognize individual when need arises.	T (97) C (9)	13.00 14.11	3.65 3.17	12.26-13.73 11.66-16.55
4.Be available to teachers who desire advice.	T (95) C (9)	23.16 25.33	4.90 1.43	22.16-24.16 22.02-28.63
5.Provide comfortable environment.	T (97) C (9)	19.10 20.22	3.45 2.90	18.40-19.79 17.98-22.45

Table 2.4 B Result of Mann-Whitney U-wilcoxon response of campus chiefs and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the campus chiefs in the area of meeting the individual teachers needs.

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN RANK	P-VALUE	SIG
1.Assist new teacher in their work.	T (96) C (9)	51.36 70.50	.0702	NS
2.Assist in the orientation new teachers.	T (95) C (8)	50.18 73.63	.0327	*
3.Recognize individual when need arises.	T (97) C (9)	52.58 63.44	.3066	NS
4.Be available to teachers who desire advice.	T (95) C (9)	51.25 65.67	.1689	NS
5.Provide comfortable environment.	T (97) C (9)	52.75 61.61	.4058	NS

Note: R = respondent
C = Campus chief
T = Teachers

Supervisory activities sub Item no 1,3,4,5 were not significantly different. On the average teachers perception was almost extremely well done, while campus chiefs perceived them as extremely well done. The reason for similar views between campus chiefs and teachers is that both were satisfied with the work of campus chiefs.

Although campus chiefs perception was higher than the teachers, teachers view was almost the same. This may be because campus chiefs helped the new teachers and were available whenever they needed help and provided a comfortable environment.

Item no. 2 was significant because teachers perception score was just extremely well done whereas campus chiefs perception was extremely well done. Campus chiefs and teachers agreed in assisting new teachers in their work, but orientation of the new teachers was different. Since teachers did not agree that campus chiefs helped the new teachers in orienting them to the new environment. The highest Mean score of Mean Rank of campus chiefs was 73.63 and lowest Mean Rank was 61.61.

The highest Mean score of teacher was 52.58 and lowest Mean Rank was 50.18.

Table 2.5 A Responses of campus chiefs and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the campus chief in the area of curriculum study.

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN	SEM.	95 % CI.
1. Advise teachers study curriculum change.	T(99) C(9)	8.61 10.25	2.51 .46	8.11- 9.11 9.86-10.63
2 Preparation of curriculum guide.	T(94) C(8)	8.74 9.25	2.46 2.05	8.23- 9.24 7.53-10.96
3 Motivate teachers to use new content.	T(96) C(9)	14.06 15.88	2.95 1.45	13.46-14.66 14.77-17.00

Note: R = respondent C = Campus chief T = Teachers

Table 2.6 B Result of Mann-whitney U-wilcoxon response of campus chiefs and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the campus chiefs in the area of curriculum study

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN RANK	P-VALUE	SIG.
1. Advise teacher study curriculum change.	T(99) C(9)	52.33 74.63	.0476	*
2. Preparation of curriculum guide.	T(94) C(8)	51.12 55.94	.6547	NS
3. Motivate teachers to use new content.	T(96) C(9)	51.26 71.56	.0522	*

Note: R = respondents
C = Campus chiefs
T = Teachers

Supervisory activities of item no. 1 is significant because in average teachers perception it was just extremely well done where as campus chiefs perceived it as almost extremely well done. Campus chiefs perception was high but teachers did not agree because teachers were not getting enough advice about studying curriculum changes. The reason for not getting advice was that curriculum could not be changed when it need to be change. In the preparation of curriculum guides, teachers perception was just extremely well done and campus chiefs perceived it as almost "extremely well done". They had a similar view. The campus chiefs supervision and guidance were provided to the teachers.

In motivating teachers to use new content, campus chiefs rated themselves "extremely well done" where as teachers rated them just extremely well done. The difference here was marginal. They was different to some extent but teachers was quite pleased with campus chiefs in this area.

The average highest score of Mean of Mean Rank of campus chief were 74.63 and lowest Mean Rank campus chief was 51.26.

The highest score of Mean of Mean Rank of teachers

was 52.33 and teachers lowest Mean of Mean Rank were 51.12

Table 2.7 A Responses of campus chiefs and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the Campus chief in the area of instructional means.

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN	SEM.	95 % CI.
1. Inform teachers about availability of instructional media.	T(99) C(9)	8.39 10.25	2.55 .46	7.88- 8.90 9.86-10.63
2. Provide adequate books and journals.	T(93) C(9)	13.73 15.22	2.63 1.78	13.18-14.27 13.84-16.59
3. Encourage teachers for new instructional materials.	T(90) C(9)	9.04 10.00	2.17 1.58	8.58- 9.50 8.78-11.21
4. Advise teachers to utilize community resources.	T(91) C(9)	9.13 11.11	2.29 1.36	8.65- 9.60 10.06-12.15
5. Invite outside experts as consultant service.	T(93) C(9)	8.27 9.44	2.86 2.24	7.68- 8.87 7.72-11.16

Table 2.8 B Result of Mann-Witney U-wilcoxon response of campus chief and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the campus chiefs in the area of instructional means

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN RANK	P-VALUE	SIG.
1. Inform teachers about availability of instructional media	T(99) C(8)	53.05 65.81	.2570	NS
2. Provide adequate books and journals.	T(93) C(9)	50.18 65.11	.1453	NS
3. Encourage teachers for new instructional materials.	T(90) C(9)	48.88 61.22	.2122	*
4. Advise teachers to utilize community resources.	T(91) C(9)	47.91 76.72	.0037	NS
5. Invite outside experts for consultant service.	T(93) C(9)	50.53 61.56	.2810	

Supervisory Activities Item no 1,2,3,5 were not rated significantly different. Teachers rated them almost well done while campus chiefs rated them almost extremely well done. Teachers were satisfied because most times campus chiefs were able to guide and give information about instructional means and supplied enough books as well as invited outside experts whenever needed for the teachers.

Regarding advise teachers to utilize community resources, there was a significant difference in ratings. Campus chiefs rated themselves "extremely well done" whereas teachers rated them "just well done". Teachers were not pleased because it was sometimes difficult to get information about community resources according to objectives of curriculum. Curriculum was good but difficult to put into action to meet the objectives. The overall highest Mean of mean Rank campus chiefs was 76.72 and lowest Mean Rank of campus chiefs was 61.22. Teachers highest Mean of Mean Rank was 50.53 and teachers lowest Mean of Mean Rank was 47.91.

Table 2.9 A. Responses of campus chiefs and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the campus chiefs in the area of inservice education.

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN	SEM.	95 % CI.
1. Advise teachers to observe class room teaching.	T(93) C(8)	17.60 21.00	4.14 2.61	16.74-18.45 18.81-23.18
2. Hold group conference to discuss problems.	T(96) C(9)	22.47 26.44	5.60 2.29	21.34-23.61 24.67-28.21
3. Encourage teachers to attend workshop and conferences.	T(93) C(8)	17.90 20.62	4.63 2.92	16.94-18.85 18.17-23.07

Table 2.9 A (Continued)

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN	SEM.	95 % CI.
4. Provide library facilities for teachers.	T(90) C(9)	32.47 36.77	5.51 3.80	31.32-33.63 33.85-39.69
5. Encourage teachers to do advanced study.	T(91) C(8)	20.51 24.87	5.82 3.22	19.30-21.72 22.17-27.57
6. Provide adequate teaching material.	T(97) C(9)	8.92 9.77	2.06 1.30	8.51- 9.34 8.77-10.77

Table 2.10 B. Result of Mann-Witney U-wilcoxon responses of campus chiefs and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the campus chiefs in the area of inservice education.

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN RANK	P-VALUE	SIG.
1. Advise teacher to observe class room teaching.	T(93) C(8)	48.87 21.00	.0121	*
2. Hold group conference to discuss problems.	T(96) C(9)	50.84 76.00	.0174	*
3. Encourage teachers to attend workshop and conferences.	T(93) C(8)	49.57 67.63	.0933	NS
4. Provide library facilities for teachers.	T(90) C(9)	48.01 69.94	.0283	*

Table 2.10 B (Continued)

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN RANK	P-VALUE	SIG.
5. Encourage teachers to do advanced study.	T(91) C(8)	48.08 71.88	.0143	*
6. Provide adequate teaching material.	T(97) C(9)	52.43 65.06	.2298	NS

Supervisory activities Item no 3,6 were not rated significantly different. Teachers rated their campus chiefs just extremely well done while campus chiefs rated themselves almost extremely well done. Teachers were satisfied with the opportunities for workshops and conferences provided by the campus chiefs. Also they provided adequate teaching materials to prepare lesson plans. However Item no 1,2,4,5 were rated significantly different. Teachers rated them "just well done" where as campus chiefs rated themselves "extremely well done". Teachers were not satisfied because campus chiefs had no time to observe classroom teaching. There was lack of motivation for advanced study. Campus chiefs needed to provide support in these areas. The highest Mean of Mean Rank of campus chiefs was 76.08 and lowest Mean of Mean Rank campus chiefs was 65.06. Teachers highest Mean Rank and lowest Mean Rank was 52.43 and 48.0 respectively.

Table 2.11 A Responses of campus chiefs and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the campus chiefs in the area of group process.

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN	SEM.	95 % CI.
1. Encourage cooperative group.	T(94)	8.40	2.61	7.86- 8.94
	C(8)	10.75	1.38	9.58-11.91
2. Promoting coordinating meeting between hospital and campus.	T(89)	13.92	3.39	13.20-14.63
	C(9)	16.66	1.50	15.51-17.81
3. Assist teachers to develop good relationship.	T(86)	26.74	6.11	14.20-15.63
	C(8)	32.62	3.20	16.52-18.8

Table 2.12 B Result of Mann-Witney U-wilcoxon responses of campus chiefs and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the campus chiefs in the area of group process

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN RANK	P-VALUE	SIG.
1. Encourage cooperative group.	T(94)	49.16	.0050	*
	C(8)	78.94		
2. Promoting coordinating meeting between hospital and campus.	T(39)	47.02	.0061	*
	C(9)	74.06		
3. Assist teacher to develop good relationship.	T(86)	44.98	.0032	*
	C(8)	74.63		

Supervisory Activities Item no 1,2,3 were significantly different. Teachers perceived these as " just well done" where as campus chiefs perceived them as " extremely well done". Teachers were not pleased because campus chief did not encourage cooperative groups, nor provide coordinating committee between nursing campuses and hospitals, nor assist the teachers in developing good relationships with other instructors. These were the main problems of campus chiefs. Therefore campus chiefs supervisory activities were considered important in solving the above problems.

The highest Mean of campus chiefs was 78.94 and lowest Mean was 74.06. The highest Mean of teachers was 49.16 and lowest was 47.02.

Table 2.13 A Responses of campus chiefs and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the campus chiefs in the area of research.

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN	SEM.	95 % CI.
1. Inform teachers about research.	T(92) C(9)	67.10 7.66	3.30 3.35	6.03- 7.40 5.08-10.24
2. Advise teachers to use new ideas.	T(97) C(9)	8.34 7.66	2.83 3.35	7.76- 8.91 5.08-10.24
3. Involve teachers in research.	T(82) C(8)	9.32 11.37	4.96 4.24	8.23-10.41 7.82-14.92

Table 2.14 B Result of Mann-Witney U-Wilcoxon responses of campus chief and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the campus chief in the area of research.

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN RANK	P-VALUE	SIG.
1. Inform teachers about research.	T(92) C(9)	50.06 60.61	.2942	NS
2. Advise teachers to use new ideas.	T(97) C(9)	51.96 60.61	.2180	NS
3. Involve teachers in research.	T(82) C(8)	44.54 55.38	.2579	NS

Supervisory activities Item no 1,2,3 were not significantly different. Teachers rated them almost "extremely well done" while campus chiefs, rated them "extremely well done". Campus chief and teachers views were similar here . Teachers were satisfied that campus chiefs provided information about research to teachers they also as involved teachers in research.

The highest Mean of Mean Rank campus chief was 65.56 and lowest was 50.06. The highest Mean of Mean Rank teachers was 51.96 and the lowest was 44.54.

Table 2.15 A Responses of campus chiefs and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the campus chiefs in the area of evaluation.

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN	SEM.	95 % CI.
1.Encourage teachers in evaluation.	T(92) C(9)	11.11 12.00	4.76 4.61	10.13-12.10 7.72-16.27
2.Encourage teachers to evaluate the campus activities.	T(98) C(9)	14.91 15.66	3.15 2.29	14.28-15.55 13.90-17.42

Table 2.16 B Result of Mann-Witney U-wilcoxon responses of campus chief and teachers regarding supervisory activities of the campus chief in the area of evaluation.

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES (Sub Items)	R	MEAN RANK	P-VALUE	SIG-
1.Encourage teachers in evaluation.	T(92) C(9)	49.56 55.79	.5775	NS
2.Encourage teachers to evaluate the campus activities.	T(98) C(9)	53.54 59.00	.6082	NS

For supervisory activities Item nos. 1,2 teachers rated them "almost well done", where as campus chief rated them "exactly well done". These items are not rated

significantly different. Teachers were satisfied that campus chiefs always encouraged teachers in evaluation of campus activities.

Highest mean of Mean Rank of Mean of campus chief was 59.00 and the lowest was 55.79. The highest Mean rank of Mean of teachers was 53.54 and the lowest was 49.56.

SECTION III: Analysis of the prioritization of the supervisory activities.

Seven headings of supervisory activities were measured by using rating ordinal scale of priority basis in the following categories.

Category	Symbol	Score (grading)
Most important	A	6
Just important	B	5
Average	C	4
Not important	D	3
Not important at all	E	2
Not necessary	F	1

As done in section II, for prioritization the Mean (M), Standard Error of Mean (SEM) and the 95 percent confidence interval ($M + 2 \text{ SEM}$) were calculated and the significance of difference between average scores of teachers and campus chiefs were determined by using the

Mann-Whitney U Test. The results were as follows.

Table 3.1 Average score of priority for meeting the individual teacher needs.

Respondent	Sample (n)	M	SEM	95% CI
Teachers	87	5.40	0.11	5.18 - 5.62
Campus Chiefs	8	5.75	0.14	5.47 - 6.03

On average, teacher assigned the activities as just most important whereas the campus chiefs prioritized as almost most important. Therefore campus chiefs perceived their supervisory activities higher than the teacher perceived them.

Table 3.2 Average score of priority for curriculum study

Respondent	Sample (n)	M	SEM	95% CI
Teachers	86	5.20	30.1	15.01 - 5.45
Campus chiefs	8	5.62	0.1	75.28 - 5.96

On the average, teachers prioritized this activity as just most important and campus chiefs prioritized as almost most important. Therefore the perception of campus chief was higher than the teachers.

Table 3.3 Average score of priority for instructional means

Respondent	Sample (n)	M	SEM	95% CI
Teacher	80	5.10	10.13	4.55 - 5.37
Campus chief	8	5.50	0.18	5.14 - 5.86

On the average, teachers and campus chiefs both prioritized this activity as just most important.

Table 3.4 Average score of priority for inservice education

Respondent	Sample (n)	M	SEM	95% CI
Teachers	82	5.12	0.12	4.88 - 5.36
Campus Chiefs	8	5.50	0.18	5.14 - 5.86

On the average both teachers and campus chiefs were pleased, ranking this activity just most important.

Table 3.5 Average score of priority for group process

Respondent	Sample (n)	M	SEM	95% CI
Teachers	77	4.90	0.12	4.66 - 5.14
Campus Chiefs	8	5.50	0.18	5.14 - 5.86

On the average teachers, prioritized it as only under important whereas campus chiefs prioritized as just most important. However their views were not different.

Table 3.6 Average score of priority for research

Respondent	Sample (n)	M	SEM	95% CI
Teacher	83	4.41	0.18	4.05 - 4.77
Campus chief	8	5.25	0.15	4.95 - 5.55

On the average teachers prioritized this activity as just important and the campus chiefs prioritized it as just most important. Their prioritization was almost the same.

Table 3.7 Average score of priority for evaluation

Respondent	Sample (n)	M	SEM	95% CI
Teacher	81	5.31	0.13	5.05 - 5.57
Campus chief	8	5.62	0.17	5.28 - 5.96

On the average teachers prioritized this activity as just most important whereas campus chiefs prioritized it as almost most important. However their views not significantly different.

Table 3.8 Ranking position of different activities by teachers and campus chiefs.

RANK	BY teachers	By campus chiefs
1.	- Meeting the individual teachers needs	- Meeting the individual teachers needs
2.	- Evaluation	- Curriculum study - Evaluation
3.	- Curriculum study	- Instructional means - Inservice education - Group process
4.	- Inservice education	- Research
5.	- Instructional means	
6.	- Group process	
7.	- Research	

B. Reasons giving for high priority (as most useful) of the different Supervisory activities.

Activities	Reason given by	
	Teacher	Campus Chiefs
1. Meeting in the individual teacher needs	- Individual needs are primary	- Personal development is essential
	- Explore the problems	- Help teacher
	- Cooperate the teachers	
	- Regular feedback	
	promote the personal relationships	
	- Guides for teachers	

(Continued)

Activities	Reason given by	
	Teacher	Campus Chiefs
2. Curriculum study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update the knowledge - Meet the objectives - Promote teaching/ learning activities - Meet the needs of people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meet the objectives - Make teaching/ learning process effective
3. Institutional materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote the skill of teaching - Cooperate with the teacher - Guide the teacher - Create the interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make teaching/ learning process effective - Achieve the objective
4. Inservice education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote knowledge - Develop new skill of teachers - Update the knowledge - Satisfy the teacher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Help the teacher - Update the knowledge
5. Group process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourage teacher and students - Interpersonal relationship among teachers - Explain the problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Help teacher and students - Obtain feedback
6. Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide suggestion for the teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide knowledge

(Continued)

Activities	Reason given by	
	Teacher	Campus Chiefs
	- Encourage the teachers	
	- Promote knowledge	
	- Promote the creativity of teachers	
7. Activities evaluation	- Provide fair judgement	- Help the teacher
	- Evaluation of teachers	
	- Evaluation of staff	

C. Reasons given for low priority (least useful) of the different supervisory activities.

Activities	Reason given by	
	Teacher	Campus Chief
1. Meeting the individual teachers needs	- Individual need is least in comparison to other activities	- Difficult to fulfill the individual needs
2. Curriculum study	-	- Curriculum will not change when needed
3. Instructional means	- Instructional means not useful because not available in time	- May not want to work according to instructional means

(Continued)

Activities	Reason given by	
	Teacher	Campus Chief
4. Research	- Research is not in certificate level teachers group	- Difficult to get research find/guide
5. Evaluation	-	- Difficult to evaluate anyone

D. Activities suggested by teachers and campus chiefs to make the work of campus chiefs more effective.

1. Suggestions collected from teachers.

1.1 To make work of campus chiefs effective, the campus chief should do the following:

- Organize meetings with teachers.
- Provide the physical facilities for the teachers.
- Relate the teachers in good manner.
- Be impartial in evaluating the teachers.
- Give equal chance to all teachers for further education, attending workshops, and awarding research funds.
- Make recommendations for the promotion of teachers.

- Know the problems of campuses.
- Satisfy the teacher.
- Check the students performance.
- Establish the interpersonal relationship.
- Keep the records of teachers.
- Do preplanning in doing any work.
- Be a cooperative coordinator between teachers and students and higher authority.
- Be able to work with team spirit.
- Be able to rate the teacher and give good feedback to teachers/staff.
- Be able to solve the problems.
- Give the orientation on curriculum.
- Give orientation for job description of teachers and staff.

1.2 The qualities of a good campus chief. The campus chief should be as follows:

- Good manager
- Good communicator
- knowledgable
- Highly educated
- Good evaluators
- Good coordinator
- Good decision maker
- Tactful

- Experienced
- Good listener
- Flexible
- Good personality
- Good planner

1.3 Authorities roles. The campus chief should be as follows:

- Provides on adequate staff
- Delegates with full power
- Provides on adequate budget
- Provides on adequate library
- Provides on adequate teaching/learning materials

2. Suggestions obtained from campus chiefs, campus chief should be as follows:

- Keep up-to- date knowledge.
- Be cooperative.
- Be aware of individual teachers/staff needs.
- Do good assessment/planning/organization/evaluation.
- Keep interpersonal relationships.
- Be clear job description.
- Have a sufficient budget.
- Be equipped with power through decentralization.
- Have sufficient teaching learning materials.