

Investigating the effect of school inspection on teachers' practice in secondary schools: A case study of in Kasese District.

Wilson Mathembele PhD¹

Candidate Department of Educational Foundations and Psychology, Mbarara University of Science & Technology (MUST) P.o.Box 1410, Mbarara, Email: mathembelewilson@gmail.com, 0782439820, Uganda

Dr. Imelda Kemeza (PhD)²

Department of Educational Foundations and Psychology, Mbarara University of Science & Technology (MUST) P.o.Box 1410, Mbarara, Email: ikemeza@must.ac.ug, 0772398823, Uganda

Dr. Richard Twebaze (PhD)³

Bishop Stuart University P.o.Box 09 Mbarara, Email: twebazer@gmail.com, 0772470503, Uganda

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the effect of school inspections towards teachers' practice in secondary schools in Uganda, using Kasese District as a case study. A concurrent parallel design and mixed-method approach were utilized, with only 326 participants being investigated. Questionnaires served as the primary data collection instrument. The data were examined using simple means and standard deviations. The study results revealed that school inspections moderately influence teachers' practice because inspectors spent minimal time in school, mainly observe subjects within their specialty, give short notice to schools before inspection and have limited teachers observed during the year. Based on the findings, the study recommends that school inspection authorities should increase observation frequency, evaluate teaching practices across multiple subjects, enhance feedback mechanisms, provide detailed, actionable feedback supported by mentoring or follow-up sessions, and utilize a data-driven approach to inform current inspections and teacher development plans.

Key words: Inspection, School, Teachers' practices, professional accountability

1. Introduction

School inspection is a global issue that calls for accountability and reflection in education institutions, and is a critical component of educational quality assurance, aimed at evaluating and improving teaching and learning processes (Agut, 2015; Chika, 2019; Ehren & Shackleton, 2016; Fungilwa, 2021). It serves as a mechanism for accountability, professional development, and curriculum implementation in secondary schools (Ehren & Visscher, 2020). Through lesson observations, post-lesson feedback, and book checks, inspections provide teachers with constructive criticism and guidance on improving their instructional methods (Chapman, 2022). Effective inspections should go beyond compliance monitoring and focus on collaborative professional

development, teacher empowerment, and continuous learning (Kafyulilo & Fisser, 2022). The European Union (2015) posits, school evaluation is a comprehensive set of procedures, regulations, norms, standards, techniques, verification instruments, and mechanisms designed to improve the quality of education given. Teachers who employ interactive teaching methods, such as active learning and problem-based approaches, make lessons more interesting and encourage student participation. Additionally, positive reinforcement and personalized feedback help boost students' confidence and willingness to learn (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). However, the extent to which school inspections positively influence teachers' professional practices remains a topic of debate.

School inspection began to be practiced from the initial days of public schooling in the late 18th century, and Napoleon's administration introduced it in France (Grauwe, 2007). The Dutch Inspectorate of Education was established in 1801 and continues to be one of Europe's oldest inspectorates (Ehren and Honingh, 2011). In the United Kingdom (UK), Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) established the first inspection in 1839 (Wilcox, 2000; Macbeath, 2006). The United States of America (USA) developed the concept of accountability in education with the "No Child Left Behind" (NCLB) legislation, which aimed to address each student's unique learning requirements (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 2007).

In Uganda, school inspections are a legacy of British rule that evolved numerous times since the 1920s. Essential social, economic, and political developments in the 20th and 21st centuries have influenced the character of Uganda's educational system. Schools are now under increased scrutiny from the public, calling for accountability and high-quality education due to increased stakeholder involvement, the massification of education, international obligations, and employer expectations (Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES), 2017).

Following the recommendations in the 1989 Policy Review Report and the 1992 Government White Paper on Education, the Education Standards Agency (ESA) was set up in Uganda in July 2001 as a semi-autonomous organization (Ward, Penny, and Read 2006). However, the enactment of the Education Act (2008) to replace the Education Act (1970) formally abandoned the semi-autonomous status of ESA and recognized it as a directorate in MoE&S, thereby renaming it the Directorate of Education Standards (DES) with the mandate of maintaining qualitative academic and disciplinary standards in the education sector and institutions in Uganda. Therefore, the new structure represented a paradigm shift from general inspection to subject teacher inspection to improve teaching quality and, in turn raise secondary school students' achievement standards.

2. Statement of the Problem

School inspection is a critical mechanism for monitoring and improving the quality of education by ensuring that teachers adhere to professional teaching standards and best practices (Chapman, 2001). Effective school inspections can enhance teachers' instructional methods, provide valuable feedback, and contribute to improved student learning outcomes (Van Bruggen, 2010). In Uganda, the Ministry of Education and Sports has established school inspection frameworks to oversee teaching and learning processes in secondary schools through the Directorate of Education

Standards (DES). However, the extent to which these inspections influence teachers' classroom practices remain a subject of debate.

Research suggests that while school inspections can promote professional accountability and instructional improvement, their effectiveness depends on factors such as the frequency of inspections, the quality of feedback, and the level of support provided to teachers (Matete, 2009). In many cases, inspections focus more on compliance rather than professional development, limiting their impact on pedagogical improvement (De Grauwe, 2007). In Uganda, particularly in Kasese District, there a number of inspectors from zonal to district, and resources have been allocated to the inspectorate department to execute their mandate. However, there are concerns about irregular inspection visits, inadequate post-inspection feedback, and the lack of follow-up mechanisms to ensure that recommended changes are implemented for effective teachers' practices which may resulted into low students' achievements. As a result, it remains unclear whether school inspections lead to meaningful improvements in teachers' instructional practices for improved learners' achievement or if they are merely bureaucratic exercises with limited practical impact, and this may adversely affect the quality of education if no interventions are made.

This study sought to assess the influence of school inspection on teachers' practices in secondary schools in Kasese District. Specifically, it aims to examine the frequency and effectiveness of inspections, the extent to which inspection feedback informs teaching strategies, and the challenges associated with the implementation of inspection recommendations. Understanding these dynamics is essential for strengthening the role of school inspections in enhancing instructional quality and overall educational outcomes in Uganda.

3. Literature review

3.1 Theoretical review

This study was informed by the accountability Theory, developed by Lerner and Tetlock (1999), which emphasizes that individuals and institutions perform better when they are held responsible for their actions and required to justify their decisions. In the educational context, school inspections serve as a key accountability mechanism by ensuring that teachers and school administrators comply with educational policies, maintain instructional quality, and work towards improved student learning outcomes (Ehren & Visscher, 2008). The theory posits that when individuals anticipate being evaluated by an external authority, they are likely to adjust their behaviors to align with expected standards. This assumption is particularly relevant in the case of school inspections, where teachers may modify their instructional strategies, assessment methods, and classroom management approaches in response to feedback from the inspectors and evaluation criteria set by inspectors (Ehren, Perryman, & Shackleton, 2015). However, Accountability Theory also highlights potential drawbacks, for instance, if inspections are perceived as overly punitive or focused solely on compliance rather than professional growth, teachers may prioritize short-term

adjustments to meet inspection requirements rather than making meaningful, long-term improvements in instructional quality (Perryman, 2009).

Accountability Theory however provides a valuable framework for understanding how school inspections influence teachers' practices in secondary schools in Kasese District because it highlights both the potential benefits such as improved instructional quality and professional development. This theory is applicable to this study because it enabled the researcher to assess whether school inspections in Kasese District serve as effective tools to foster professional development and educational improvement or merely enforce accountability without fostering genuine teaching and learning enhancements.

4. Empirical literature

4.1 School inspection and teachers' practice

School inspections have been widely recognized as an essential mechanism for monitoring and improving educational quality. They are designed to hold teachers and schools accountable for delivering quality education, fostering professional growth, and ensuring compliance with national curriculum standards (Ehren & Visscher, 2020). The impact of these inspections on teachers' instructional practices remains a subject of considerable interest and debate in educational research. While some argue that inspections have a positive influence on teaching quality, others suggest that the effects may be more complex, contingent on various factors such as the nature of feedback, the frequency of inspections, and teacher engagement. Studies consistently highlight that feedback is one of the most influential aspects of school inspections in shaping teachers' practices. According to Wilcox & Gray (2020), immediate and actionable feedback following lesson observations is critical for teachers' professional development. Effective feedback allows teachers to reflect on their teaching methodologies, identify areas for improvement, and implement strategies that can enhance student outcomes. Studies have further shown that constructive feedback motivates teachers to make evidence-based changes in their teaching styles, resulting in improved classroom dynamics and student engagement (Chapman, 2022), nonetheless, the type of feedback provided during inspections plays a significant role in determining whether these changes are positive. Ehren et al. (2023) argue that when feedback is too general or overly critical without actionable advice, it can lead to teacher stress and resistance to change. Conversely, supportive feedback that encourages self-reflection and problem-solving helps foster a culture of continuous improvement (Sahlberg, 2021).

According to Kafyulilo & Fisser (2022), inspections that are designed as part of a comprehensive professional development program can enhance teachers' skills by encouraging the adoption of new instructional strategies, assessment methods, and classroom management techniques. The researchers argue that beyond providing feedback, school inspections can play a critical role in fostering long-term professional development, and collaborative inspections, which involve ongoing discussions between inspectors and teachers, offer an opportunity to engage in peer learning, thus leading to improved teaching practices. Maringe & Prew (2021) also argue that

inspections should not be punitive but rather should be focused on building teacher capacity through continuous coaching and mentorship.

Ehren et al. (2023) contend that annual inspections provide valuable insights into teaching practices and allow for systematic monitoring of professional growth, emphasizing that frequency and regularity of inspections are critical in determining their effectiveness. However, Khan & Kazmi (2022) found that inconsistent inspections, where some teachers or subjects are observed more frequently than others, result in inequities in professional support. Teachers who are observed regularly benefit from feedback loops that help them refine their practices, while others may receive little to no feedback for years, limiting their opportunities for improvement. Moreover, Sahlberg (2021) points out that short and infrequent inspections are often superficial and fail to capture the full scope of a teacher's performance and suggests that a more consistent, sustained presence in schools is required to foster meaningful change in instructional practices.

Chapman (2022) revealed that involving teachers in the inspection process has been identified as a key factor in ensuring that inspections are both effective and meaningful. The researcher further maintains that when teachers are included in the planning and preparation for inspections, they are more likely to see inspections as a tool for their professional development rather than as an external evaluation. Kafyulilo & Fisser (2022) further support this claim stating that, teacher engagement in inspections leads to greater buy-in and a higher level of commitment to implementing feedback, that could consequently impact their teaching strategies. However, Ehren et al. (2023) observe that in many education systems, teachers are not sufficiently involved in the inspection process, leading to feelings of exclusion and resistance. Therefore, collaboration between inspectors and teachers is essential to ensure that inspections contribute positively to teachers' practice.

Ojera (2021) highlights that in Uganda, some inspections emphasize checking records rather than engaging with teachers to improve instructional methods, which may not be of help to the teachers in respect to their teaching practices. Equally, in Kenya, Wanzare (2020) found that some teachers perceive inspections as threatening or punitive, leading to increased stress and anxiety. Instead of using inspections as an opportunity for professional growth, some teachers resort to performative teaching where they temporarily adjust their methods to impress inspectors but revert to their usual practices afterward. Ngigi & Koech (2021) similarly found that teachers in Uganda and Kenya expressed concerns that inspections sometimes feel like an exercise in fault-finding rather than a collaborative effort to improve education quality.

Conversely, Ong'ondo & Jwan (2021) found that in Kenya, when inspectors engage teachers in discussions and offer supportive feedback, teachers show higher morale and commitment to implementing new teaching strategies. Moreover, Mosha (2022) highlights that in Tanzania, many teachers associate inspections with punishment, leading to negative attitudes toward the process. In cases where inspectors focus on criticizing teachers without offering guidance, teachers tend to resist changes, fearing that their job security is at stake. Kisémbó (2020) also found similar trends in

Uganda, where teachers expressed concerns that some inspections were conducted inconsistently, leading to confusion and uncertainty about expectations.

Other research has produced contradictory or unfavorable findings. De Wolf and Janssens (2007), for instance, looked at the effects of school inspection and discovered that the literature had conflicting findings, with some studies showing positive effects and others showing negative effects. Research, mostly from the UK, indicates that inspections lead to modifications in instructional methods, and as a result to an improvement in schools. De Wolf and Janssen's examination of the literature does, however, emphasize actual evidence of the negative impacts of inspection, such as stress and training to appease inspectors. De Wolf and Janssen advocated for more research on the effects of inspection using improved methodology due to significant variances in the conclusions of the examined literature and methodological variations. The current investigation was partly in response to this invitation. What influence then does school inspection have on teachers' practice in secondary schools in Uganda, Kasese District in particular?

The available research on inspection and instructional practice has been reviewed. The examined research focused primarily on inspection in industrialized countries. This study aimed to expand on the limited work done in Uganda by testing the impact of inspection on a considerably bigger number of teachers, headteachers, and inspectors using mixed research methodologies.

5. Research Methodology

Pragmatism is the philosophical foundation for this study. Pragmatic researchers adopt methodologies that provide the best answers to research questions rather than representational accuracy, allowing them to reach richer conclusions (Creswell, 2009). Therefore, the Concurrent Parallel Research Design was chosen to thoroughly investigate the problem being studied. This design used both qualitative and quantitative methods to assess the breadth, depth, and validity of the findings. Both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered in this design at the same time, but they were analyzed independently and separately using the conventional methods for each type of data.

To investigate the problem under study, a sample of 01 District Education Officer, 07 inspectors, 30 headteachers and 30 deputy headteachers, 30 Directors of studies, and 228 teachers from 30 secondary schools in Kasese, district of Western Uganda. Stratified Proportionate Sampling was used to choose the schools. The District Education Officer, the Inspectorate Officials, Headteachers, Deputy Headteachers, and Directors of Studies were purposefully chosen, whilst teachers were chosen at random. The secondary schools in the district were classified in two ways. The initial categorization was based on school location, and it included both rural and urban schools. The second level of grouping was based on school status, which ensured both public and private secondary schools were represented. After sampling the schools, the researchers selected the teachers using Simple Random Sampling. The selection of schools automatically included the appointment of headteachers, deputy headteachers, and directors of studies.

To acquire relevant data from respondents, the study employed questionnaires and an interview guide. Respondents were given a standardized 5-point Likert scale questionnaire, and key informants' data was collected using an interview guide. Validity was determined using the Content

Validity Index (CVI). The S-CVI/Ave technique returned values of 0.83 and 0.86 for the questionnaire and interview guide, respectively. As a result, the instruments were rated as having excellent content validity. To determine reliability, a pilot test was done, and Cronbach's Alpha was calculated, yielding a value of 0.853, suggesting strong internal consistency.

Data from the questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The data were described using means and standard deviations. IBM SPSS 26.0 was utilized to facilitate the analysis procedure. Interview data were subjected to thematic content analysis.

5.1 Ethical Consideration

Confidentiality, anonymity, and privacy were assured in that the participants' identities, as information sources, were not revealed to anyone and the information obtained from them was used only for the purpose of the study. All other sources of information were acknowledged.

6. Results and findings

Table 1 below presents mean and standard deviation (Std) values for various aspects of school inspection practices and their influence on teachers' practice. The mean scores indicate the frequency or effectiveness of each inspection practice (on a scale of 1 to 5, where higher values suggest stronger agreement or more frequent occurrence), while the standard deviation measures variability in responses.

Table 1 Mean and Standard Deviation showing stakeholders' perceptions about the influence of school inspection on teachers' practices

| Item | Mean | SD |
|---|------|-------|
| Inspectors provide immediate feedback to teachers following lesson observations in your school | 3.67 | .795 |
| Inspectors hold post-observation meetings with all teachers who were observed teaching in this school | 3.88 | 1.008 |
| Inspectors check learners' books during classroom observations in this school | 3.09 | 1.238 |
| Inspectors observe every teacher at least once every year in this school | 2.11 | 1.001 |
| Inspectors only observe lessons for subjects of their specialty in this school | 2.06 | 1.044 |
| Inspectors observe the entire period of the lesson in this school | 3.30 | .914 |
| Inspectors spend at least two days in this school | 1.36 | .771 |
| Inspectors work with teachers in this school to develop performance-related targets | 2.27 | 1.134 |
| Inspectors consult previous inspection reports in preparation for inspection in this school | 3.29 | 1.048 |
| Inspectors involve headteachers and teachers in planning for inspection in this school | 2.14 | 1.063 |

| | | |
|---|------|-------|
| Inspectors give at least two weeks' notice of inspection to this school in preparation for the inspection | 1.69 | .854 |
| Pooled mean | 2.62 | 0.143 |

Note: SD (Standard Deviation)

The stakeholders' perceptions of the influence of school inspection on the teachers' practice provide insights into how school inspections are conducted and their potential impact on the teaching practices. The results in Table 1 above reveal a mean score ranging from 3.88-1.69. The overall mean score (2.62 (52.4%)) suggests that teachers perceive school inspections as moderately effective in influencing their teaching practice but with significant areas for improvement, implying that some aspects are effective, while others need improvement. The pooled standard deviation (0.143) indicates relatively low variability across the responses, meaning there is a general agreement among teachers on these issues.

Items that received the lowest rating were; minimal time spent in school Mean = 1.36 (32%), SD = 0.771). This lowest mean indicates that inspections are often short, which may limit their depth and effectiveness, suggesting that evaluations may be rushed or superficial, and therefore not adequately have meaningful impact on the teachers' practice. Also, inspectors mainly observe subjects within their specialty received Mean = 2.06 (41.2%), SD = 1.044), suggesting that there is a lack of holistic evaluation across all subjects, schools short notice before inspection Mean = 1.69, SD = 0.854), which may prevent teachers from adequately preparing for the evaluation process, limited teacher observation Mean = 2.11 (42.2%), SD = 1.001), meaning that some may go years without feedback, limited involvement of school teachers in planning (Mean = 2.14 (42.8), SD = 1.063) teachers and headteachers are not sufficiently engaged in the inspection process, performance-related target setting is minimal (Mean = 2.27 (45.4%), SD = 1.134), reducing the long-term impact of inspections, inspectors check learners' books (Mean = 3.09, Std = 1.238). This practice is moderately implemented, but the high standard deviation (1.238) indicates inconsistency. Book checks are essential for assessing student progress, lesson planning, and teacher effectiveness. Whereas, holding post-observation meetings, Mean = 3.88, (77.6%) SD = 1.008, meaning that inspectors frequently hold debriefing meetings, reinforcing the importance of reflection and continuous improvement, providing immediate feedback, Mean = 3.67 (73.4%), SD = 0.795) meaning that teachers generally agree that inspectors offer prompt feedback after lesson observations, which is crucial for professional development. Moreover, Feedback is crucial for improving teaching practices as it allows teachers to make timely adjustments. Observing the full lesson period, Mean = 3.30 (66%), SD = 0.914), suggesting that inspectors take a comprehensive approach rather than partial evaluations. This ensures inspectors gain a full understanding of teachers' instructional methods. The standard deviation is relatively low, suggesting consistent implementation. Consulting previous inspection reports, Mean = 3.29 (65.8%), SD = 1.048), indicates that inspectors attempt to build upon past evaluations, though responses vary, received moderately higher rating.

In support of above findings, the interviews with the headteachers indicated that;

Inspectors come to school without any notification, and they spend limited time that may not allow them to conduct classroom observations. On many occasions they stop in office after looking at some of the documents. Even when they observe some teachers teaching in class, they rarely conduct post observation meetings with all the teacher claiming to have limited time, apart from the observed teachers.

Another respondent indicated that;

Inspectors are infrequent in our school; they can spend the entire term or year without visiting our school. On many occasions they come without any notification and may find when the school has some activities that may not allow teachers to engage the learners in class, for instance sports day. In this case they will just look at some documents and move around the school. This may not help the teachers in their practice at all.

Other respondents mentioned that;

Inspectors come to school and report to office without any prior information regarding their visitation. They observe some of our teachers teaching who are on the timetable, and share with them their observations. However, they normally spent limited time claiming that they are under staffed and have many schools to inspect.

The inspectorate officials interviewed confirmed the above by indicating that;

We do not give any notification for inspection to schools save for rare cases where there is a particular follow up. Additionally, given the huge number of schools that are under our jurisdiction, it becomes difficult to conduct classroom observations each time we visit schools. However, on some occasions we conduct classroom observation with a few teachers from limited schools and share our observations with the respective teachers. Sometimes we conduct general meeting with the teaching staff after the inspection exercise to share with them our observations and recommendations. It is hoped that this can gradually cause an impact in regard to their teaching practices and general school improvement.

7. Discussion

The study sought to understand the stakeholders' perceptions about the influence of school inspections on teachers' practice. School inspections play a critical role in shaping teachers' practices by providing feedback, ensuring accountability, and fostering professional development. However, the effectiveness of inspections depends on how they are conducted, their duration, the level of teacher involvement, and the consistency of feedback mechanisms. The findings of this

study highlight both strengths and weaknesses in the current school inspection process, which align with existing research on educational evaluation and teacher practice. The results from Table 1 indicate that school inspections are perceived as moderately effective in influencing teaching practices Mean = 2.62 (52.4%), with low variability in responses (Pooled SD = 0.143), suggesting general agreement among teachers. According to Chapman, (2020), school inspection is a critical mechanism for maintaining education quality, improving teaching standards, and ensuring compliance with policies.

The findings further reveal that inspectors providing immediate feedback (Mean = 3.67) and holding post-observation meetings (Mean = 3.88) were among the most positively rated aspects of inspection. Research highlights that constructive feedback from inspectors enhances teachers' professional growth and instructional practices (Ehren & Visscher, 2021). Feedback mechanisms allow teachers to reflect on their instructional strategies and make improvements, aligning with formative assessment principles that emphasize ongoing professional learning (Santiago et al., 2018). However, the effectiveness of feedback largely depends on its specificity, timeliness, and follow-up support (Darling-Hammond et al., 2022). If feedback is too general or lacks actionable recommendations, its impact on teaching practice may be minimal. According to Sharma et al. (2023), timely and constructive feedback enhances reflective practice among teachers, enabling them to modify their teaching strategies effectively. However, Maringe & Prew (2021) warn that if feedback is overly critical rather than supportive, it can lead to teacher anxiety and resistance to change. The moderate standard deviations in these findings suggest that while feedback mechanisms exist, their implementation varies across schools.

A notable concern from the results is that not all teachers are observed annually (Mean = 2.11) and that inspectors mainly focus on their subject specialty (Mean = 2.06). This aligns with Wilcox & Gray (2020), who argue that unequal observation practices create disparities in teacher development opportunities. Teachers who are frequently observed benefit from feedback, while others who may go years without any formal evaluation will not professionally grow which may adversely impact on their teaching practices. This is consistent with findings from Ehren et al. (2020), which suggest that limited observation reduces the ability of inspections to drive sustained improvements in teaching quality. Moreover, research indicates that holistic inspections that consider all subjects and teaching aspects rather than focusing solely on the inspector's expertise leads to more comprehensive improvements in teaching standards (Chapman et al., 2019).

The findings also show concerns regarding the limited time inspectors spend in schools (Mean = 1.36) and their lack of involvement in collaborative performance target setting (Mean = 2.27). Studies by Clarke & O'Donoghue, (2020) suggest that short, one-time school visits have very minimal long-term impact because they do not allow for deeper engagement or sustained professional development. According to Sahlberg (2021), effective inspections require sufficient time to observe teaching, interact with students, and evaluate classroom conditions. Short

inspections often result in superficial evaluations, leading to inaccurate assessments of teacher effectiveness (Brunton & Smith, 2023).

In contrast, effective school inspection models involve ongoing mentoring, coaching, and support for teachers (Earley, 2018). Advance notice before inspections (Mean = 1.69) is also an issue, as unannounced or last-minute visits can create stress and limit meaningful engagement. According to Tobin et al. (2022), inspections that provide adequate notice and clear expectations lead to better teacher preparation, more authentic classroom observations, and greater long-term improvements.

The moderate rating for inspectors consulting previous reports (Mean = 3.29) suggests that while past evaluations are somewhat considered, they may not be consistently used to guide future improvements. Research suggests that a data-driven approach, where past performance is analyzed to tailor current inspections, leads to more meaningful teacher development (Hulme et al., 2021). Similarly, limited involvement of school teachers and headteachers in planning (Mean = 2.14) raises concerns. Studies show that collaboration between inspectors, headteachers, and teachers enhances the effectiveness of inspections by ensuring shared goals and clear action plans (OECD, 2021). When teachers feel that inspections are imposed upon them without prior consultation, they are more likely to resist change (Chapman, 2022), but when school leaders actively participate in the inspection process, the likelihood of sustained improvements in teaching practice increases (Chapman et al., 2019).

8. Conclusion

The evidence of this study shows that school inspections have a moderate influence on teachers' practices, given that some aspects are effective, while others need significant improvement. There is therefore need for a more systematic, collaborative, and sustained inspection approach that can cause sufficient influence on teachers' practice.

9. Recommendations

Based on the findings, the study recommends that;

Inspectors should increase observation frequency to ensure that every teacher is observed at least once per year to ensure continuous monitoring for enhanced teaching practice.

Inspectors should evaluate teaching practices across multiple subjects, not just their areas of expertise.

Inspectors should enhance feedback mechanisms and provide detailed, actionable feedback supported by mentoring or follow-up sessions.

Spending more time in schools allows for deeper engagement and meaningful support.

Headteachers and teachers should be actively involved in planning and responding to inspections.

A data-driven approach should inform current inspections and teacher development plans.

References

- Aguti, S. (2015). School inspection and its influence in the quality development in inclusive education practices in Uganda. Unpublished M. Phil thesis. University of Oslo.
- Brunton, S., & Smith, P. (2023). *Effective Educational Supervision: Best Practices for School Inspectors*. Routledge.
- Chapman, C. (2022). *Accountability and School Improvement: A Systematic Approach to Inspection*. Springer.
- Chapman, C., Muijs, D., Reynolds, D., Sammons, P., & Teddlie, C. (2019). *The Routledge International Handbook of Educational Effectiveness and Improvement*. Routledge.
- Chapman, C. (2001). *Improving school effectiveness: The role of school inspection*. *School Leadership & Management*, 21(1), 59-73.
- Clarke, S., & O'Donoghue, T. (2020). *School Inspection & Teaching: Policy and Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (3rd Editio). Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore: SAGE.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2022). *Implications for Educational Practice of the Science of Learning and Development*. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97-140.
- De Grauwe, A. (2007). Transforming School Supervision into a Tool for Quality Improvement. In *International Review of Education*, p. 709-714.
- De Wolf, I. F., & Janssens, F. J. G. (2007). Effects and Side Effects of Inspections and Accountability in Education: An Overview of Empirical studies. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-448X\(89\)02006-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-448X(89)02006-6)
- Earley, P. (2018). *School Leadership and Inspection: The Experiences of Headteachers*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Education (Pre-Primary, Primary and Post-Primary) Act, 2008. Acts Supplement, 44 UPPC §(2008). Uganda.
- Ehren, M. C., & Visscher, A. J. (2020). *School Inspections and Educational Quality: International Perspectives*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ehren, M., Altrichter, H., & McNamara, G. (2023). "The Impact of School Inspections on Teaching and Learning." *Educational Policy Review*, 40(2), 145-162.
- Ehren, M. C., & Visscher, A. J. (2008). The relationship between school inspections, school characteristics, and school improvement. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 56(2), 205-227.
- Ehren, M. C., Perryman, J., & Shackleton, N. (2015). Setting expectations for teacher impact: The role of school inspections. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 26(4), 1-21.
- Ehren, M. C., & Visscher, A. J. (2021). *School Inspections: Effects, Side Effects, and Future Directions*. Springer.

- Ehren, M. C., Perryman, J., & Shackleton, N. (2020). The Impact of School Inspections on Teaching and Learning: A Review of International Research. *Oxford Review of Education*, 46(1), 40-58.
- Ehren, M. C. M., & Honingh, M. E. (2011). "Risk-based school inspections in the Netherlands: A critical reflection on intended effects and causal mechanisms". *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 37(4), 239-248.
- Ehren, M. C. M. (2016). *Methods and Modalities of Effective School Inspections*. London: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31003-9>
- Grauwe, Anton (2007). Transforming School Supervision into a Tool for Quality Improvement. In *International Review of Education*, P. 709-714
- Gray, A. (2020). *Supporting school improvement: The role of inspectorates across Europe*. Brussels. Retrieved from <http://www.sici-inspectorates.eu>
- Hattie, J.A.C., & Timperley, H (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Kafyulilo, A., & Fisser, P. (2022). "The Role of School Inspections in Enhancing Teacher Professional Development." *Journal of Education Policy*, 37(3), 234-250.
- Khan, M., & Kazmi, S. (2022). "Evaluating the Role of Book Checks in Educational Supervision." *Journal of Educational Evaluation*, 29(2), 45-62.
- Lerner, J. S., & Tetlock, P. E. (1999). *Accounting for the effects of accountability*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(2), 255-275.
- MacBeath, J. (2006). *School Inspection & Self-Evaluation: Working with the New Relationship*. London: Routledge.
- Maringe, F., & Prew, M. (2021). *Transforming Educational Accountability through School Inspections*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Matete, R. E. (2009). The impact of primary school inspection on teaching and learning in Tanzania: A study of Mbeya City District (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oslo).
- Ministry of Education and Sports. (2012). *How we inspect: A Guide to External Evaluation*. Kampala: Ministry of Education and Sports.
- Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). (2017). *Education Sector Strategic Plan 2017/18 - 2019/20*. Kampala: Ministry of Education and Sports.
- Mosha, H. J. (2022). "Perceptions of Teachers on the Effectiveness of School Inspections in Tanzania." *International Journal of Education Research*, 39(3), 77-95.
- OECD (2021). *School Inspections and Improvement: An International Perspective*. OECD Publishing.
- Ong'ondo, C., & Jwan, J. (2021). "The Role of School Inspections in Teacher Performance Improvement in Kenya." *Kenyan Journal of Educational Policy*, 19(1), 55-73.
- Perryman, J. (2009). Inspection and the fabrication of professional and performative processes. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(5), 611-631.
- Sahlberg, P. (2021). *Inspecting Schools: International Trends and Perspectives*. Oxford University Press.

- Santiago P., Donaldson G., Herman J., *et al.* (2018) *OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education: Australia*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Sergiovanni, T., & Starratt, R. (2007). *Supervision: A redefinition*. McGraw-Hill Humanities, Social Sciences, Languages.
- Ward, M., Penny, A., & Read, T. (2006). *Education Reform in Uganda 1997 to 2004: Reflections on Policy, Partnerships, Strategy Implementation*. London: DFID.
- Wanzare, Z. (2020). *The Role of School Inspectors in Education Quality in Kenya*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.
- Wilcox, B., & Gray, J. (2020). *School Inspection and Educational Change: Lessons from International Research*. Routledge.
- Wilcox, B. (2000). *Making school inspection visits more effective: The English experience*. Paris: UNESCO.