FULL-LENGTH ARTICLE

Empowering Quality Education: The Role of Power in School Supervisory Leadership in Primary Education

Esayas Gorfe Ashagre [1][*] and Kenenissa Dabi Furi [2]

[1]Department of Educational Planning and Management, Institute of Pedagogical Sciences, Mekelle University, Mekelle, Ethiopia
[2]Department of Educational Planning and Management, College ofEducation and Behavioral Studies, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

*Corresponding author: esugts1@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examined the utilization of authority and the implementation of policies in the supervisory leadership within schools to improve the quality of primary education in Addis Ababa City Administration (Ethiopia). The scope of study extended from the Ministry of Education to the individual schools. The research design employed mixed methods incorporating both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The sample included 35 districts, 40 public primary schools, 96 supervisors, and 135 principals. Also, 18 supervisors participated in the interview. Closed-ended questionnaires were administered to supervisors and principals, while interview and document review guides were utilized. Descriptive statistics (percentage, mean, and standard deviation) and inferential statistics (independent sample t-test) were used. The study found a policy framework in place for school supervision, although not consistently executed. The execution of this framework has been informed by various policy documents, namely Business Process Re-engineering, Balanced scorecard, and Job Evaluation Grading Manuals. However, the policies were inconsistent and not uniformly known and accessible to supervisors. The hiring process for supervisors did not comply with the established guidelines, resulting in the dismissal of highly experienced and trained supervisors and their replacement by less experienced teachers. The lack of policies that grant power to supervisors and the shortage of resources hindered the effective utilization of their institutional authority. The existing supervision policies were fragmented, lacked empowerment, and were not effectively implemented. These gaps are unlikely to have a constructive impact on the efficiency of school leadership and the overall setback of schools.

Keywords: School Leaders, School Improvement, Sources of Power, Supervision Policy, School Supervision

INTRODUCTION

Supervision is one of the oldest forms of educational leadership and is a function carried out to achieve the ultimate goal of school improvement, particularly student achievement. One of the most important formal leadership tasks carried out by a professional with supervisory abilities and efforts to better fulfill agreed-upon educational goals is supervision (Adu et al., 2014). Grauwe et al. (2011) study showed that supervision and pedagogical support services are key tools used to carry out quality monitoring in Kenya, Lesotho, and Uganda. Melmer et al. (2008), based on research findings, pointed out that school leaders play an important role in improving instruction and student achievement. Haris et al. (2018) indicate that supervisors are responsible for supporting others in performing their tasks effectively. Supervisors have played a leadership role in guiding instruction to improve education and the performance of students.

The term leadership is often used interchangeably with the term power and influence. Power is associated with leaders and their institutional position. Lunenburg (2012) states that a person's maximum power in organizations stems from his job responsibilities. A leader can influence others because of the formal power associated with his authority. Yukl (2013) indicated that power includes

the leader's ability to influence employees. Power refers to the influence a leader has over one or more employees. It also refers to the potential influence over objects, events, attitudes, and behavior.

In the process of providing supervisory leadership, the use of power options should be considered for the effectiveness of the supervisor or power holder and the followers. Lunenburg (2012) states that leaders sometimes use power sources in different combinations depending on the situation. He indicates that personal bases of power are more closely linked to employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job performance than organizational power sources. Yukl and Falbe (1991) assert that a leader's lawful power, expert power, and persuasive power base are the factors that contribute to followers' compliance with their demands. Raven (2008) indicated the impact that results from the use of power varies with the type and source of power that the leader intends to use.

Even though Lunenburg (2012) suggests that coercive power has a negative relationship with work outcomes, he stresses that different sources of power are not mutually exclusive. Raven (2008) shows that the power bases of coercion and reward (using monitoring as a tool) were not necessary for the effect to occur. However, in situations where a subordinate threatens the success of the organization or the leader's authority, coercive power is appropriate despite short-term resentment on the part of followers.

A wide range of social behaviors fall under the influence of power. In this regard, Raven (2008) suggested that a supervisor should use the most efficient and effective power bases to influence teachers and school leaders. This requires careful evaluation of the relationship, allowing the leader to consider how the leader views the follower and how the follower views the leader, allowing the leader to choose the most important power base. According to Kouzes and Posner (2010), a leader's goal is dynamic and subject to change depending on the followers' maturity. He also mentioned several additional things that could have an impact. However, a leader must employ authority and leadership and his actions must be consistent with his ideals.

For instance, it can be difficult to determine from many points of view if an expert in a supervisory role should just execute control support or both, depending on the circumstances. Frequently, it is a contentious response. Sometimes, supervisors are limited to using a specific power base. However, this puts them in a position where they must rely on an unsuitable power base and neglect their obligations. Since no single ideal power source is appropriate in every circumstance. In other words, the circumstances dictate the most suitable power source. Yukl (2013) observed that studies have started to address the questions of how much total power is required for effective leadership and what kinds of power bases are required. In this sense, Yukl (2013) describes how power is acquired or lost in organizations, citing the theories of social exchange, strategic contingencies, and institutionalization of power as examples of how it shows up. According to G.Northouse (2016), situational theory emphasizes the role of leadership in different situations. The theory suggests that effective leadership requires adapting one's style or power bases to fit the needs of different situations. In other words, Kouzes and Posner (2010) argue that leadership is a dynamic process that is influenced by the circumstances and the maturity level of the followers.

Due to the continuous decline in the quality of education, the supervision system continues to be the focus of policy discussion, practice, and research across many countries. In the current high school accountability setting, for instance, Mette et al. (2017) stated that further research is needed to evaluate how supervision theory and counseling to promote teacher development may be utilized.

Gordon (2019) asserts that the time has come to support and facilitate the development of shared platforms and increased dialogue within the supervision community. In other words, to close the gaps in research, practice, and policy, scholars in the field of supervision must find policy realities that contradict those of practitioners. Thakral (2015) emphasized that to guarantee the efficacy of supervision; nations ought to carry out additional research investigations.

In general, efforts to improve the quality of primary education in Addis Ababa City administration involve different organizations, roles, and sources of control and support. The Addis Ababa City

Administration Education Bureau (AACAEB) has developed and implemented a policy document on how educational supervisors work, a manual that contains detailed guidelines for cluster school, district, sub-city, and city administration supervision implementation. The Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureau (2022), for instance, noted that the district, sub-city education offices, and city administration levels make up the city's external supervisory structure. Particularly, the general education supervision cluster group organization at the district level is organized as a resource center and groups 10 to 12 private and public primary schools into a cluster by selecting the best school in terms of input, output, and performance (Translation).

However, there are worrying reports that the quality of education at all levels needs more attention. For instance, the recently revised Education and Training Policy Federal Ministry of Education (2023) of Ethiopia claimed that the quality of education has been declining and cited the following as proof: the majority of students at all levels are unable to meet the policy's expectations for at least 50% of the educational outcomes; teachers' ability to comprehend and assist students by raising their level of competency is restricted (Translation). According to the Federal Ministry of Education (2021a), the sixth Education Sector Development Program (ESDP) report mentions the following among the many problems that may be responsible for low student achievement: lack of qualified teachers and other staff, inadequate teaching planning and supervision, and inconsistent implementation of continuous professional development programs. Additionally, most students were found unable to read enough words or letters per minute (Ministry of Education, 2022) which did not improve upon the results of earlier Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) studies. The Ministry of Education should develop plans to strengthen the commitment of education actors and put accountability systems in place in the education sector, according to one of the main recommendations.

The general objective of this study is to contribute to improving the quality of education by identifying and suggesting alternative solutions related to the use of power, policy, and implementation challenges of supervisors working under the City Government of Addis Ababa Education Bureau.

Thus, the investigation responded to the fundamental inquiries of research:

(1) What are the specific policies in place for school supervision?
(2) What are the existing policy and practice gaps that hinder supervisors' use of power?
(3) To what extent do principals have significantly different perspectives on the supervisors' leadership behaviors as measured by items on leadership roles?
(4) How can supervisors be empowered to utilize their institutional authority effectively?

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Study design
A mixed methods design was used in the study to gather both quantitative and qualitative data. This strategy is highly effective in gathering and analyzing data to develop a robust understanding of research problems.

Sources of data
Both primary and secondary data sources were used. Original information gathered from first-hand sources that can offer first-hand knowledge for the study is known as primary data. These are official policy documents (such as frameworks, manuals, guidelines, directives, BSC, BPR, experts, supervisors, and principals). Those who are not actively involved in the research phenomenon prepare secondary data sources. These consist of ESDP publications, annual abstracts for education data, and reports.

Population, sample, and sampling techniques
The sampling strategy utilized in this investigation was multistage. Thus, from the entire population of the Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureau, sub-cities, districts, and cluster schools were chosen using a three-stage simple random selection design (lottery method). Specifically, five sub-cities (or 60%) out of the eleven sub-city education offices were included in this study. Arada-Kirkos, Nifasilk-Lafto, Aqaki Qaliti, Bole and Yeka.

Using a simple random selection design, sample participants were chosen from each district and cluster school center. The study included five districts, seven public primary schools, twenty cluster supervisors, and thirty principals under Aqaki-Qaliti sub-city; six districts, seven public primary schools, eighteen cluster supervisors, and twenty-three principals under Nifasilk-Lafto sub-city; ten districts, thirteen public primary schools, twenty cluster supervisors, and thirty principals under Arada-Kirkos sub-city; five districts, six public primary schools, twenty cluster supervisors, and eight principals were included in Yeka sub-city. A total of 135 school principals, 40 public primary schools, 96 cluster supervisors, and 35 districts were included in the sampling. The sample size directly affects how accurate the sample estimates Koul (2019). Less than thirty is regarded as a small sample, and thirty or more is considered a large sample. Both individuals and institutions are involved in the acquisition of this qualitative data. As a result, the researchers used a purposive sample approach to choose the Education Bureau and the Federal Ministry of Education. Four participants involved from the Ministry of Education: one expert from education programs and quality improvement, two experts from the teachers' and education leaders' development and management desk, and the head of that desk. In addition, there were five district or cluster supervision coordinators, four general education supervisors, one supervisory team leader, and four AACAEB cluster supervisors involved. With the conviction that these participants were professionals or high-level managers in charge of creating and carrying out national policies, strategies, standards, and practices, they were chosen by purposive sampling.

Data collection instruments
Closed-ended questionnaires, interviews, and document review guides were used to collect data. Therefore, two closed-ended questionnaires for cluster supervisors and principals were prepared. While the format and substance of the questionnaires vary, they all have easy-to-read text that is catered to the respondent's level of responsibility. Additionally, checklists and interview guides with the same content have been prepared for MoE experts, AACAEB supervisors, district supervisors, and cluster supervisors. The only changes made to the guides' content were to adapt it slightly to the interviewees' duties, primarily related to the questioning style. Furthermore, qualitative data was gathered using document review guidelines. Additionally, the MoE expert and the Cluster Supervisors were given semi-structured interview questions; their feedback was later incorporated into the instruments to improve them. Ten principals and ten supervisors from districts (clusters) that were not in the sample then carried out the pilot research. Since the questionnaire proved to be reliable, the researcher and assistant data collectors engaged in the study and the sample of respondents, drawn from cluster school centers and schools, filled out the whole questionnaire.

Data collection procedures
The interview was conducted in the Amharic language. Individual interviews lasted between one and a half to two hours. The given interview was completed within the allotted time. The researchers used Google Translate and the relevant language teachers to edit the data collection instruments that were translated from English to Amharic. Finally, the researchers prepared the final report in English. Researchers reached the respondents with the help of former university graduate students and former colleagues working at different levels of the educational system where the study was conducted. Researchers administered the questionnaire by giving information about the purpose and contents of the data collection tools to the research participants. Assistant data collectors have been trained to participate in managing data collection processes.

Pilot test
A pilot test was conducted targeting 10 cluster supervisors and 10 principals to measure the reliability of the written questionnaires. Participants of the pilot test were selected from cluster school centers and schools that were not sampled in the main study. Alpha (α), the general formula of Cruder-Richardson formula 20, was calculated to measure the internal consistency (reliability) of the attitude scale. Two types of written questionnaires are prepared for testing, each containing 25 items. The results obtained are 0.86 for cluster supervisors and 0.92 for principals. These results show that the questionnaires are reliable. This study interpreted alpha based on the following five-point reliability scales: poor <0.67, fair 0.67 – 0.80, good 0.81 – 0.90, very good 0.91 – 0.94, and Excellent > 0.94 Ghazali, 2008 cited in (Mohamad et al., 2015).

Methods of data analysis

SPSS version 20 was used to calculate both descriptive and inferential statistics to ascertain whether there were differences in mean scores in the respondents' responses to the problem. That is, descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, and grand mean are calculated to identify the average position of the respondents. Also, inferential statistic (an independent sample t-test) was calculated to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in the responses of primary school supervisors and principals. Results of descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation and results of inferential statistics or independent sample t-tests such as t, df, and p values were presented and interpreted. Also, the Levene test was computed to assess an assumption that the variances of the two groups are equal. If p is greater than .05, the F test will not be significant and the equal variances assumed line for the *t-test* was used. However, if Levene's F is statistically significant ($p<.05$), variances are significantly different and, the equal variances are not assumed the line was used. For analysis purposes, responses to each questionnaire item were categorized into five five-category Likert scale in light of Likert, 1952 cited in (Linacre, 2002). They were labeled as Strongly Agree = 4.51 – 5.00, Agree = 3.51 – 4.50, Undecided = 2.51 – 3.50, Disagree = 1.51 – 2.50, and Strongly Disagree = 1.00 – 1.50. Analysis was made in line with $df = 229$ at p / $\alpha < 0.05$, two-tailed.

The qualitative data was analyzed by organizing, coding, translating, and interpreting them thematically, using quotations or narrations. The document analysis and interview analysis findings were presented first, followed by the quantitative results, and eventually, were presented. In the discussion section, findings obtained from the three data sources were integrated to relate to the research questions and answer the formulated research questions.

Ethical considerations

The researchers carried out the tasks by carefully planning all the safeguards and training the data collectors to manage the serious problem of confidentiality among the research participants (Marczyk et al., 2005). Participants were informed that they had the right to refuse to participate at any time or withdraw their participation without retaliation. Where necessary, efforts were made to ensure the anonymity of study participants. Therefore, the participants were asked to read and sign the terms and conditions of the given consent form.

RESULTS

Findings from Assessment of policy documents

An analysis of the recruitment policies being implemented by supervisors was conducted to determine the available policies and their practical application. Accordingly, the recruitment process was guided by several policy documents, including the education and training policy, job evaluation grading manual, balanced scorecard, public servant's deployment guideline, Addis Ababa city administration employee's deployment implementation guideline, and the general education supervision directorate business process re-engineering manual.

As per the documents, applicants for supervisory positions are required to have a first degree or higher (translation) (Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureau, 2022). The revised Education and Training Policy further specifies that a bachelor's degree is the minimum educational requirement for leaders in pre-primary to middle schools in Ethiopia (translation) (Federal Ministry of Education, 2023).

Furthermore, those seeking to apply for the positions of primary and junior secondary school supervisors will be eligible for consideration in the competition provided that they meet the stipulated recruitment criteria. These criteria include a minimum of six years of experience to become a school supervisor, eight years to become a cluster supervision coordinator, and 10 years to qualify as a director of education bureau supervision directorate (Translation) (Addis Ababa City Administration

Education Bureau, 2022). Additionally, a minimum of ten years of experience is required to attain the position of supervisor in the school improvement unit within the MoE.

The policy under analysis indicates that, while the Federal Ministry of Education (2023) allocated 40% of the weight for educational preparations and 30% for work experience, the Addis Ababa City Administration Public Service and Human Resource Development Bureau (2022) allocated 10% for educational preparations and 5% for work experience. So, the policies differ. Additionally, while the federal civil service commission assigned a fifteen percent score for work experience, the city administration public service bureau only assigned a five percent score. A 12.5 score (percent) is awarded for seven to ten years of experience, while a 15 score (15%) is granted for more than for example 25 years of experience.

According to the Federal Ministry of Education (2017) and the Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureau (2022), experiences relating to teaching, principalship, and supervisorship are used as prerequisites to assume supervisory positions.

High-ranking executives are vested with the power to evaluate employee efficiency, up to a maximum of 35 percent (Federal Civil Service Commission, 2021). Similarly, Top-tier leaders are authorized to assess employees' work efficiency by as much as 30 percent (Addis Ababa City Administration Public Service and Human Resource Development Bureau, 2022).

Findings from Interviews
Demographic information
A total of 18 individuals, including senior education officials, experts, and cluster supervisors from the FMoE, AACAEB, district education offices, and cluster school centers participated in the interview.

Nine supervisors from five sub-cities were involved. Three supervisors held advanced degrees, while the others had undergraduate degrees. Half of the supervisors had received some form of leadership education and training. The majority of cluster supervisors had more than six years of teaching experience, however, they had no school principalship experience. More than half of them had more than six years of supervisory experience.

Five education bureau supervisors were analyzed; three of them held second degrees in EdPM. Two of them had business management expertise, which is unrelated to school leadership. Three had worked as teachers for more than six years, but two had no prior teaching experience. Three of the supervisors had more than six years of principal-ship experience, while the other two lacked such experience. All of them had more than six years of experience in supervisory positions.

Three out of four experts from the MoE had second degrees in educational preparation in specific subject teaching. All of the experts had no leadership training. Except for one three had teaching experience greater than six years. One person had one to five years of job experience. One participant had experience in school principalship, while the other three had no experience. Three had between six to twelve years of experience in school supervisory leadership.

Policies for School Supervision
During the interview, the participants were asked about the policies that guide and coordinate the supervision of primary education. They shared that various policies, such as Business Process Re-engineering (BPR), Job Evaluation Grading (JEG) manuals, the Education and Training Policy (ETP), the primary school curriculum, the supervisor's professional competencies, the school improvement framework, and the education roadmap, are used to guide supervision implementation in Addis Ababa city administration. However, they did not mention important guidelines related to supervision, including the (Federal Civil Service Commission, 2021), (Federal Ministry of Education, 2017) Blue Print, and (Federal Ministry of Education, 2021b) Recruitment and Professional Development Implementation Guide for Teachers and Supervisors.

During the interview with cluster supervisors, we inquired about the implementation of recruitment policies for supervisors. The proper person was not put in the right place, according to five cluster supervisors. In particular, the recruitment rules did not respect work experience, educational preparation, or degree of education. Five years of teaching experience, as opposed to other factors, was given more weight. Furthermore, they stated that supervisors with more work experience are valued approximately equally to supervisors with less work experience when it comes to recruitment criteria. Aspiring supervisors without prior experience in leadership roles were hired.

Eight cluster coordinators and supervisors reported that the removed supervisors had been relocated to directorships or teaching positions. Supervisors are being demoralized by this act. For instance, roughly thirty supervisors with professional licenses were assigned to teaching duties, while other supervisors who lacked training were given the same responsibility. But after being removed from their positions of political leadership, those who had previously been nominated to them were given unopposed assignments as supervisors. They added that it is unfair for senior executives to fill in thirty percent of supervisors' evaluations. They claimed that because the top-level leaders utilized the criteria to benefit their cliques, it was subjective. Similarly, Haris et al. (2018) showed, based on actual data, that political concerns and nepotism frequently take precedence over competencies and qualifications when hiring school supervisors in Indonesia

In contrast, an expert from the Ministry of Education and four participants from the Education Bureau stated that the current guidelines, which are based on the recently approved Job Evaluation Grading (JEG) system, are sufficient for the recruitment of supervisors. In other words, there were job postings, work experience, written and oral exams, and neatness checks on files. Two supervisors of the education bureau and five supervisors of clusters reported that newly appointed supervisors receive no training at all. There is no evaluation of training needs. Despite serving as a supervisor for almost two years, they did not participate in any extended or short-term training. The other three interviewees stated that ministerial and education bureau levels offer brief training. But there was no ongoing instruction provided. Three years ago, assigned supervisors had been doing their duties with little to no confidence because they had not received any relevant training.

Power sources for school supervisory leadership
When asked about the power bases they used to influence school communities and implement policies, whether positional, personal, or both, five cluster supervisors' coordinators and four cluster supervisors say that the authority they gain from being supervisors (legitimate powers) has little influence. When the circumstances allow, they work with their human abilities. In addition, there is no authority on which they cannot enforce.

Three cluster supervisory coordinators and three supervisors stated that supervisors have no institutional, coercive, or reward authority. Supervisors requested what they needed for work. Supervisors were influenced by principals. If teachers and leaders don't believe in supervisory authority, they won't follow it. They also stated that earlier assessments of principals were filled out by supervisors. They did not know why it was left. The cluster's supervisor also said, "I don't know why appraising principals is continuing to be the neglected role of the supervisor. I have never evaluated their performance. I realized that the head of the education office assesses the evaluation of the principals." Another cluster supervisor said, "I have not appraised the principal's duties. "I only evaluated it once, three years ago.".""

According to five supervisors, one way for supervisors to gain control over principals is to allow them to evaluate the tasks of principals, but the current situation does not create that potential. Since the principal gives the property and resources needed to carry out his duties, if the principal takes action, he cannot continue to work together. A cluster supervisory coordinator said, "If the principal shows weakness, reduces working performance, or even does not achieve the minimum 60 percent passing score, it will be changed as a political decision of the head of the education office. In addition, the cluster's supervisor said, "I respect my boss and feared he would punish me rather than reward me." In addition, four cluster supervisors said inspectors were better accepted and influential than supervisors

because they had the authority to determine school performance levels. According to the supervisors, schools will respect the inspector's opinion to avoid consequences.

The three cluster supervisory coordinators and the four cluster supervisors said teachers and principals did not respect the supervisor's suggestions because they knew that the supervisor did not have the power to enforce policies. Supervisors cannot exercise power if employees cannot carry out their duties. As reported by these supervisors, teachers and principals are recruited for short and long-term training. However, supervisors are not required to participate in the recruitment process. However, the district education office and the education bureau participate in the recruitment of workers and decide on their training and development. Thus, this gives them more legitimate powers than supervisors.

Based on feedback from four cluster supervisors and five coordinators, their objective is to encourage decentralization while avoiding the use of force or coercion. However, this approach can lead to confusion regarding the principle of self-governance. Consequently, supervisors must respectfully apply their expertise and influence when exercising their authority. This perspective fails to take into account the impact of situational factors on supervisory leadership. It overlooks the concept that there is no one-size-fits-all leadership style, as it depends on the circumstances. An education bureau supervisor stated, "My work is based solely on personal relationships and I do not have the power to influence others beyond those relationships".

When asked about to what extent they utilize their expert power, an education bureau supervisor responded, "I feel like my voice is heard and respected. Whenever I inform school management that I'm visiting from the office, they give me a warm welcome and make me feel valued." Three education bureau supervisors stated that although their staff listens to them and accepts their advice, they rarely implement their suggestions.

Three cluster supervision coordinators and four supervisors stated that they can only influence teachers or principals through their interpersonal skills. Even if they do not comply with their orders, they cannot take any action as they do not have the institutional authority to dictate. Especially at the cluster center level, they are not allocated an institutional resource or a budget to carry out work, so they cannot pressure or penalize.

Findings from questionnaires
Demographic information

Table 1: Respondents by educational level, preparation, and work experience

Participants		Level of Education			Educational preparation			Work experience as a teacher				Work experience as a principal or vice principal				Work experience as a supervisor			
		2nd degree	Bachelor degree	Bachelor degree + PGDSL(PGCPSS)	EdPM	Subject Type	Bachelor degree PGDSL(PGCPSS)	0 year	1-5 year	6-12-year	>12 year	0 year	1-5 year	6-12-year	>12 year	0 year	1-5 year	6-12-year	>12 year
Supervisor	n	22	70	4	23	69	4	2	14	58	22	56	33	5	2	0	68	21	7
	%	23	73	4	24	72	4	2	15	60	23	58	35	5	2	0	71	22	7
Principal	n	25	109	1	24	107	4	4	35	77	19	16	83	31	5	-	-	-	-
	%	18	81	1	18	79	3	3	26	57	14	12	61	23	4	-	-	-	-

The majority of respondents on the questionnaire, specifically 70 percent supervisors and 81 percent principals, hold a first-degree qualification, while the rest have a second-degree.

A significant number of supervisors (72%) and principals (79%) have had subject-specific teaching in their educational preparation, but they did not receive any additional training in educational leadership.

Most (60 percent) of supervisors had between 6 to 12 years of teaching experience, while a small percentage (15 percent) had below 5 years or no experience at all (2 percent). Similarly, most principals (57%) had between 6 to 12 years, while (26%) had less than 5 years of teaching experience. Individuals with extensive teaching experience exceeding twelve years are scarce in number - only accounting for approximately 23% of supervisors. The majority of supervisors (58%) did not possess any prior leadership experience as a school principal.

The majority (71%) of supervisors had less than 5 years of school supervisory experience. The remaining supervisors possessed supervisory experience exceeding greater than five years.

Domains from which school supervisors derive their power sources

Table 2: A supervisor's use of legitimate power to influence policy and employees

No	Item	Supervisors n=96		Principals n=135		t-test		
		M	SD	M	SD	df	t	p
1	Explain the reasons for an order to the school community.	4.364	0.859	3.318	1.237	228.89	7.579	.000
2	Doesn't interfere with the school community's authority.	4.052	1.117	3.563	1.188	229	3.159	.002
3	Considers the feelings of the school community.	4.562	0.594	3.385	1.239	204.576	9.589	.000
4	Makes follow-ups to verify compliance with rules.	4.479	0.680	3.777	1.176	220.808	5.714	.000
5	Emphasizes obedience to regulations if appropriate.	4.312	0.824	3.659	1.240	228.317	4.804	.000
	Overall Aggregate Mean for Legitimate Power Source	4.354	0.503	3.540	0.828	224.11	9.252	.000

The supervisors weighed the second item (M=4.052), fourth item (M=4.479), and fifth item (M=4.312) behaviors. The principals also gave scores of (M=3.563), (M=3.77), and (M=3.669), respectively.

On the contrary, supervisors rated item 1 (M=4.364) and item 3 (M=4.562). The principals rated these similar items (M=3.318) and (M=3.385), respectively. In addition, the principal values of the same elements are (M=3.318) and (M=3.385), respectively.

Supervisors were significantly different from principals in their perceptions of the five leadership behaviors describing supervisors' use of legitimate power to influence the school community $t = 9.252$, *degrees of freedom* 224.11, and p.000. The aggregate means given by the principals (3.540) is significantly lower than the aggregate mean given by the supervisors (4.354).

Table 3: A supervisor's use of expert power to influence policy and employees

No.	Item	Supervisors n=96		Principals n=135		t-test		
		M	SD	M	SD	df	t	p
1	Explain the reasons for an order to the school community.	4.406	0.840	3.607	1.252	228.32	5.798	.000
2	Provides evidence to staff that his order will be successful.	4.166	0.913	3.600	1.241	228.70	3.996	.000
3	Shows respect for the school community.	4.770	0.422	3.918	1.113	183.17	8.111	.000
4	Acts confidently and decisively in difficult conditions.	3.666	1.358	3.288	1.274	229	2.160	.032
5	Do not exaggerate or misinterpret facts.	4.500	0.767	3.474	1.208	226.41	7.879	.000
	Overall Aggregate Mean for Expert Power Source	4.302	0.598	3.577	0.937	226.61	7.159	.000

Item 1 (M=4.406) and item 2 (M= 4.166) were rated by supervisors. Also, principals rated these same items (M=3.607) and (M=3.600) respectively. The t-test results show significant differences between supervisors' and principals' opinions.

Although principal respondents rated item 3 (M=4.770), principals rated the same item (M=3.918). Conversely, supervisors rated item 5 (M=4.500) and item 4 (M=3.666) respectively. The values given by principals for the same item were (M=3.474) and (M=3.288) respectively.

Supervisors are different from principals in their views on the implementation of the five supervisor leadership characteristics *t* = 7.159, *degrees of freedom* 226.61, and *p*.000. That is, the overall mean given by principals (M=3. 577) was significantly lower than that of supervisors (M=4.302).

Table 4: A supervisor's use of referent power to influence policy and employees

N o.	Item	Supervisors n=96		Principals n=135		t-test		
		M	SD	M	SD	df	t	p
1	Use personal attractions (charisma) when necessary.	4.364	0.809	3.348	1.323	224.46	7.224	.000
2	Does not use his relationship with the school community for personal gain.	4.562	0.868	3.577	1.162	228.41	7.369	.000
3	Provides an example of appropriate behavior to the school community.	4.406	0.889	3.563	1.169	227.93	6.222	.000
	Overall Aggregate Mean for Referent Power Source	4.444	0.628	3.500	0.994	226.154	8.869	.000
4	Does not keep his promises and commitments.	1.458	0.993	2.451	1.195	223.38	-6.877	.000
5	Does not make self-sacrifices to benefit the school community.	2.718	1.366	3.222	1.090	175.06	-2.995	.003

While supervisors rated item 2 (4.562), principals rated the same item (3.577). Supervisors assessed item 3 (4.406), and principals assessed the same item (3.563).

Supervisors gave a high rating to item 1 (4.364) while principals gave a lower rating for the same item (3.348). Supervisors rated item 5 (2.718), while principals gave it (3.222). The supervisor rated item 4 with an average score of (1.458), while the principals rated the same item with an average score of (2.451).

Supervisors and principals have different perceptions regarding the implementation of referent power $t = 8.869$, *degrees of freedom* 226.154, and *p*.000. Principals gave a significantly lower overall mean (3.500) compared to supervisors (4.444) for items 1, 2, and 3. Responses to items 4 and 5 indicated that they strongly agree and agree, respectively.

Table 5: A supervisor's use of coercive Power to influence Policy and employees

No.	Item	Supervisors n=96		Principals n=135		t-test		
		M	SD	M	SD	df	t	p
1	Informs the school community of the rules and penalties of the school.	4.135	1.032	3.422	1.312	226.64	4.616	.000
2	Gives adequate pre-warnings to the school community before punishing.	3.687	1.371	3.459	1.182	229	1.352	.178
3	Is calm and helpful, not aggressive to the school community.	4.593	0.761	3.696	1.002	227.94	7.728	.000
4	Encourages improvement rather than punishment.	4.760	0.429	3.525	1.268	174.22	10.494	.000
5	Manages discipline privately.	4.520	0.695	3.370	1.238	218.59	8.984	.000
	Overall Aggregate Mean for Coercive Power Source	4.339	0.568	3.494	0.897	226.23	8.748	.000

Supervisors rated item 1 (M=4.135) and item 5 (M=4.520), while principals rated these same items (M=3.422) and (M=3.370) respectively. Supervisors rated item 3 (M=4.593) and item 4 (M=4.760), while principals rated these items (M=3.696) and (M=3.525) respectively. The results of the t-test indicate a significant difference between the responses of supervisors and principals. In addition, item 2 was rated by supervisors with an average score of 3.687, while principals gave it an average score of 3.459. The t-test results indicate no statistically significant difference.

There is a difference in the way supervisors and principals perceive the use of five leadership attributes that represent coercive power $t = 8.748$, *degrees of freedom* 226.23, and $p < .001$. Principals gave a lower overall mean (3.494) compared to supervisors (4.339).

Table 6: A supervisor's use of reward power to influence policy and employees

No.	Item	Supervisors n=96		Principals n=135		t-test		
		M	SD	M	SD	df	t	p
1	It gives rewards that the school community desires.	2.041	1.065	2.763	1.235	229	-4.627	.000
2	Does not promise more than what he can provide.	4.395	0.989	3.407	1.108	229	6.981	.000
3	Explain the criteria for giving rewards.	2.083	1.366	3.348	1.199	229	-7.453	.000
4	Provides rewards as per his promise if the order is met.	1.958	1.113	2.918	1.222	229	-6.104	.000
5	Takes advantage at the expense of other people.	1.229	0.687	2.266	1.179	221.41	-8.406	.000
	Overall Aggregate Mean for Reward Power Source	2.341	0.638	2.940	0.837	229	-5.894	.000

Supervisors rated items 1 (M=2.41), 3 (M=2.083), and 4 (M=1.958), while principals rated them (M=2.763), (M=3.348), and (M=2.918). A significant difference exists between the responses of supervisors and principals.

Supervisors gave a higher mean value (4.395) for item 2 compared to principals (3.407). Supervisors and principals gave different mean values for item 5, with supervisors strongly disagreeing (1.229) and principals disagreeing (2.266). There are significant differences between supervisors' and principals' responses.

There was a difference in opinion between the supervisors and principals regarding the use of reward authority $t = -5.894$, *degrees of freedom* 229, and *p*-value of 0.000. Supervisors' mean score (2.341) was significantly different from that of principals (2.940).

DISCUSSION

This study emphasized the role of power in school supervisory leadership to empower the quality of primary education. Power is instrumental in the school's supervisory leadership to enforce policies and influence people to improve student achievement. School leaders possess different power bases that they use to influence the effectiveness of their schools. According to Nir and Hameiri (2014), a passive leadership style has a negative relationship with school effectiveness, which can be moderated by the use of power bases. To improve the quality of leadership that focuses on school improvement, it is crucial to devise and apply appropriate empowering policies for the right candidates to take on and play the role. Additionally, it is important to recognize that moving from practice to policy requires considering the context and challenges of implementation (Pont, 2014). Supervisors are responsible for supporting others in performing their tasks effectively, and they play a leadership role in guiding instruction to improve education and students' performance (Haris et al., 2018). The authors emphasized key issues by which school supervisors could be empowered. The main issues are those mentioned above related to power sources for school supervisors. These assumptions were framed in written questionnaires that were filled out by school supervisors and principals. Thus, the data collected were analyzed and interpreted.

Policies were being relied upon by supervisors. The policies were set by various government agencies. The BPR, BSC, and JEG documents were frequently used. Some of the policies were not reachable and comprehensive. Most had minimal school supervisory experience of less than five years. The weight given to teaching experience was exaggerated. The city government places less weight on educational qualifications. The policies indicate a glaring discrepancy between the weights assigned to work experience. The findings demonstrated that work experience and educational preparation were given less weight by the policy. Senior executives are granted permission to appraise employee performance up to a margin of 35 percent with less objective criteria. Appraisal criteria involved subjective statements. Thus, supervisors with professional licenses were deposed and assigned to teaching duties, while other supervisors who lacked training and experience were assigned to supervisory positions. According to Patrick (2009), expert knowledge and experiences are considered essential prerequisites for the supervisory practice. Recruitment processes have an impact on school leadership quality, as it is an important decision in the selection of the best possible candidates. While school-level involvement is critical to contextualize recruitment, at the system level policies need to ensure that procedures and criteria are, transparent, consistent, and effective (Pont, 2014). Effective selection methods are necessary for hiring competent school principals and supervisors (Haris et al., 2018).

Supervisors were confronted with various factors capable of diminishing their authority. Since cluster supervision was not reinforced with the necessary budget and facilities to undertake planned tasks, supervisors were obliged to ask for support from schools for the required resources. The lack of resources deprives supervisors of their reward and coercive powers. The existing rules did not grant supervisors to use positional power to their full potential. The supervisors were not empowered to appraise principals' efficiency. They have not participated in the recruitment process of teachers and principals short and long-term training opportunities. This has potential consequences for supervisors. Their suggestions were not implemented by schools. Haris et al. (2018) indicated that the authority given to school supervisors involved evaluating the performance of supervised staff; implementing an empowerment program; and doing the empowerment.

The majority of the supervisors had no training in educational leadership. Those who had teaching experience exceeding twelve years were scarce in number. Most of them did not have prior experience in school principalship. Studies pointed out that there is a directive that states that a supervisor must complete training to become a professional school supervisor and that they must be chosen from a pool of qualified teachers and principals (Haris et al., 2018). However, the supervisors are tasked with guiding schools by assessing school quality, identifying strengths and areas for school improvement, resolving students' achievement gaps, and improving students' performance. It was found that supervisors were doing their duties with little to no confidence because they had not received any

relevant training. Building a leader's skills and competencies is necessary for professional school leadership. Professionalizing leadership is broader than specific training programs and requires formal and informal development processes (Pont, 2014).

The results revealed that supervisors were significantly different from principals' perceptions of the leadership attributes describing supervisors' use of legitimate, expert, and referent powers. Supervisors were more likely to rely on their personal than positional power. Yukl (2013) suggested that leaders can derive their influence over followers from their task expertise and the friendship and loyalty shown to them by their followers, which are regarded as personal power sources. Principals had undecided perceptions regarding supervisors' use of coercive power sources. Supervisors and principals have different perceptions regarding the use of reward powers. Supervisors were not able to use these two positional sources of power. This implies that they were not empowered to use their positional power bases necessary to perform their duties and responsibilities. Raven (2008) suggested that coercion may be necessary if an employee threatens the success of the organization or the authority of the leader, despite short-term complaints from followers. As Yukl (2013) points out, the leader's legitimate authority over resources, rewards, punishments, information, and the physical working environment is seen as a source of power from which the leader can derive his positional power to influence his followers.

The current state of high accountability compels the supervisor to exercise leadership responsibilities not only through communication but also through the use of punishment or reward options. Positional power must complement the personal power to flexibly use their authority according to the changing needs of followers and the situation. (Lee & Tui Low, 2008) study results suggest that expert, referent, and reward power are effective in gaining subordinate acceptance. Coercive power should only be used in crises or during low performance. According to these findings, it can be argued that it's not possible to completely avoid certain power bases at the cost of others. It's important to acknowledge that all power bases have their significance and should be utilized in different situations.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The different school supervision policies in operation were vertically and horizontally inconsistent or misaligned with each other. Some of the policies drafted by the Ministry of Education were not readily available to supervisors, were unknown to supervisors, and were still in the draft stage or had not yet been approved and implemented. Interviewees (supervisors and experts) were not sufficiently familiar with the relevant school supervision policies in operation. Therefore, the policies issued by the Ministry should be made accessible to all lower structures and the policies issued by the Education Bureau should be consistent with the policies of the Ministries. The education bureau and the district leaders have ignored the guidelines and fired trained and highly experienced supervisors. Thus, experienced, trained, and licensed supervisors are replaced by inexperienced and untrained teachers. Besides wasting our limited resources, these actions had the potential to oust competent supervisors and frustrate potential applicants for supervisory positions. The district and education bureau officials need to respect the existing supervisor recruitment policies and should be accountable for their actions. The lack of supervision policy which give power to supervisors and lack of resources to implement supervision services hinders supervisors from using necessary power bases. A budget should be allocated considering that facilities and financial resources are the key resources to realize the supervision function. It can be concluded that school supervisors enforce policies and exercise influence over staff members by utilizing their expert power source. Also, supervisors did not use their referent and positional power to influence the school community and policies. Therefore, considering that the ability and motivation of employees change over time, supervisors should adjust their leadership style to meet the changing needs of employees by using the command level based on the position and the support level based on personal power. This research can help policy-makers, scholars, and practitioners rethink how school supervisors derive their authority and use it to

implement policy and the school community's current high level of academic and professional accountability.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

Addis Ababa City Administration Education Bureau. (2022). *Yateqalay Timhirt suprvision dayrektoret Yemeseretawi Yesira Hidet Lewt Tinat [General Education Supervision Directorate Business Process Re-engineering]* (pp. 1–135).

Addis Ababa City Administration Public Service and Human Resource Development Bureau. (2022). *Beadis Abeba Ketema Astedader Peblik Servisna Yesew Habt Limat Biro Yeserategnoch Yedilidil Afetsatsem Memeria [Addis Ababa City Administration Public Service and Human Resource Development Bureau: Employees Deployment Implementation Guideline]* (pp. 1–33). Public Service and Human Resource Development Bureau.

Adu, E. O., Akinloye, G. M., & Olaoye, O. F. (2014). Internal and External School Supervision: Issues, Challenges and Wayforward. *Int J Edu Sci*, *7*(2), 269–278.

Federal Civil Service Commission. (2021). *Yemengist Serategnoch Yedildil Afetsatsem Memeria [The Federal State Bureaus Business Process Re-engineering Public Servants Deployment Implementation Guideline]* (pp. 1–22).

Federal Ministry of Education. (2017). *the analyzed Teachers, Principals and Supervisors' Development Blue Print (2017)* (pp. 5–43). Ministry of Education.

Federal Ministry of Education. (2021a). *Education Sector Development Programme VI (ESDP VI) 2020/21 – 2024/25* (Issue Esdp Vi).

Federal Ministry of Education. (2021b). *Yereisememhiran ena Yesupervayzeroch Yemilmelana Dereja Idget Afetsatsem Memeria [Principals and Supervisors Recruitment and Carrier Development Implementation Guideline, First Draft]* (pp. 3–29). Federal Ministry of Education.

Federal Ministry of Education. (2023). *Yeetiopya Federalawi Demokrasiyawi Ripeblik Ytimhirtina Siltena Polisi [The Ethiopian Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Education and Training Policy]* (pp. 1–23).

G.Northouse, P. (2016). Leadership: Theory and Practice. In M. Stanley, A. Rickard, N. Mangona, & L. Larson (Eds.), *SAGE Publications, Inc.* (Seventh). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2010). *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach* (S. D. Dragin, A. Whittaker, & C. Parsons (eds.); Eighth Edi). Allyn & Bacon.

Gordon, S. (2019). Educational Supervision: Reflections on Its Past, Present, and Future. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, *2*(2), 27–52. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.2.2.3

Grauwe, A. de, Lugaz, C., Barasa, T., Lefoka, P. J., Tsepa, M., Kayabwe, S., & Asiimwe, W. (2011). *Strengthening local actors: The path to decentralizing education Kenya, Lesotho, Uganda*. International Institute for Educational Planning 7–9 rue Eugène Delacroix, 75116 Paris, France. www.iiep.unesco.org

Haris, I., Naway, F. A., Pulukadang, W. T., Takeshita, H., & Ancho, I. V. (2018). School Supervision Practices in the Indonesian Education System; Perspectives and Challenges. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research Sosyal*, 9(2), 366–387.

Koul, L. (2019). *Methodology of Educational Research*. Vikas Pub. House Pvt. Ltd.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2010). The Leadership Challenge Activities Book. In L. Shannon, S. Rachmeler, & R. Taff (Eds.), *Activities Book* (pp. 1–671). Pfeiffer An Imprint of Wiley.

Lee, K. L., & Tui Low, L. G. (2008). Bases of Power and Subordinates' Satisfaction with Supervision - The Contingent Effect of Educational Orientation. *International Education Studies*, 1(2), 3–13. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v1n2p3

Lunenburg, F. C. (2012). Power and Leadership : An Influence Process. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT, BUSINESS, AND ADMINISTRATION*, *15*(1), 1–9.

Marczyk, G., DeMatteo, D., & Festinger, D. (2005). *Essentials of Research Design and Methodology*

(A. S. Kaufman & N. L. Kaufman (eds.)). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Melmer, R., Burmaster, E., James, T. K., & Wilhoit, G. (2008). *Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008* (pp. 1–24). Beacon Printing, Inc. https://doi.org/www.ccsso.org

METTE, I. M., DOTY, J., RANGE, B. G., ANDERSON, J., & NIEUWENHUIZEN, L. (2017). The Wicked Problem of the Intersection between Supervision and Evaluation. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 9(3), 709–724.

Ministry of Education. (2022). *EARLY GRADE READING ASSESSMENT (EGRA 2021) REPORT*.

Nir, A. E., & Hameiri, L. (2014). School principals' leadership style and school outcomes: The mediating effect of powerbase utilization. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *52*(2), 210–227. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-01-2013-0007

Patrick, E. A. (2009). STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING SUPERVISORY SKILLS FOR EFFECTIVE PRIMARY EDUCATION IN NIGERIA. *Edo Journal of Counselling*, *2*(2), 235–244.

Pont, B. (2014). School leadership: from practice to policy. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 2(1), 4–28. https://doi.org/10.4471/ijelm.2014.07

Raven, B. H. (2008). The bases of power and the power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 8(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-2415.2008.00159.x

Salvador, J. T. (2016). Integrated Development Model (IMD): A Systematic Review and Reflection. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, *12*(19), 244. https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2016.v12n19p244

Thakral, S. (2015). The Historical Context of Modern Concept of Supervision. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS)*, 6(1), 79–88.

Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations* (Eighth Edi). Pearson Education, Inc., publishing as Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1991). Importance of Different Power Sources in Downward and Lateral Relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(3), 416–423. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.76.3.416