

Pedagogical Instructional Supervision in Public Secondary Schools in Kenya

Omondi A. Everlyn, Tikoko J. Betty.

School of Education, Kabarak University, P.O. Private Bag 20157. Kabarak, Kenya.

ABSTRACT :

Schools are considered to be suitable places where recognized formal education can be easily accessible. The quality of education in schools therefore should be of utmost importance in a country. This can only be achieved through effective classroom instructional supervision which may enhance teacher professional development and as a result improve the quality of teaching and learning. The purpose of this study was to establish the effectiveness of principals' instructional performance in classroom instruction with an aim to find solution through perceptions of Principals, Heads of Departments and Teachers. Descriptive survey design was used. The study was carried out in public secondary schools in Nairobi and Kajiado counties in Kenya. The sample size was as follows: 38 principals, 151 heads of departments and 289 teachers. This gave sample size of 478 respondents. Stratified random sampling was used in selecting schools. Simple random sampling was used to select teachers for the study. The instruments used to collect data were: Interview guide for principals and Questionnaire for Heads of Departments and teachers. Qualitative data was analyzed thematically, while Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and presented in frequencies and percentages. Null hypothesis was analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis H test statistics. The key finding of this study was that, majority of principals performed diligently but did not use appropriate skills or lacked knowledge on how to conduct effective classroom instructional supervision. The finding also established that principals' performance in instructional supervision was not effective on how to assist teachers to plan lessons and demonstrate teaching in classroom instruction. Based on the findings, the study recommends the need for Teachers Service Commission to introduce a policy on instructional supervision so that the principals who are selected to head schools can gain skills and knowledge to enable them effectively perform their tasks and responsibilities related to classroom instructional supervision.

KEYWORDS: Pedagogy; effectiveness; perception; instructional supervision.

Date of Submission: 20-05-2021

Date of Acceptance: 05-06-2021

I. INTRODUCTION

Global competition mostly focusses on teacher quality and teacher professional development. For a country to achieve high standards of teaching and learning, an effective Instructional supervision in a school's instructional program must be put in place (Fullan, Rincon-Gallardo and Hargreaves, 2015). Teachers are expected to be responsible for how and what students learn (Mumo, 2010). This can only be achieved if effective training and instructional supervision takes place. The principal's role as an instructional supervisor cannot therefore be underestimated (Omondi, 2019).

Instructional supervision activity consists of three phases; pre-observation conference, observation conference and post-observation conference. During the pre-observation conference, the teacher and the instructional supervisor decide on the technique of the observation conference to be used. The decisions made give direction and lucidity to the whole process. The pre-observation phase also helps the instructional supervisor and the supervisee who is the teacher; to bond and establish a rapport of respect and mutual trust (Allida et.al, 2018). They may also discuss about the lesson plan, lesson objectives, relevance and appropriateness of the content, teaching aids, evaluation criteria and time allocation (Glickman et al., 2017).

The observation conference takes place when the instructional supervisor and the teacher enter the classroom. This phase can either be formal or informal. During formal class observation, it is advisable that the instructional supervisor sits at the back of the classroom to conduct lesson observations (Arlestig and Tornsen, 2014). The instructional supervisor then records the teacher's presentation on the layout of the lesson plan, its appropriateness, lesson objectives, reinforcement and classroom discipline, teacher's capability to provide proper feedback, among various things concerning pedagogical practices. Informal classroom observation can also be conducted whereby the principal makes an impromptu visit while the teacher is conducting a lesson. In such a scenario the principal does not evaluate the teacher, but to gather information concerning the curricular

and also pedagogical practices (Malunda et.al, 2016). According to Zepeda (2017), observation stage in instructional supervision also entails portfolio supervision where the teacher's work of art or artifacts are reviewed. This may include the teacher's mission and vision concerning teaching, lesson plan samples, records of students' work, lesson notes, achievements for example awards, career goals and journals.

Post-observation conference is held as an opportunity to share the observed data and analysis after the observation phase. According to Allida (2018), the instructional supervisor meets the supervisee equipped with the observation form, analysis, and the selected interpersonal approach. This is done for the main aim of producing a plan for improving classroom pedagogy (Glickman et al., 2018). The stage is set for the instructional supervisor and the teacher to compare notes about what was intended by a given lesson, and what actually happened during the lesson. This conference helps the instructional supervisor and the teacher to measure strengths and weaknesses and further identify any gap regarding the observation in classroom teaching as far as the needs of the learners are concerned (Omondi, 2019). The post-observation conference enhances the teacher's ability to improve classroom instruction. In doing so, teachers should not be asked to do things which are outside their scope of responsibility (Portin et. al., 2013). They further argued that for instructional supervision to be productive, instructional supervisors must work relentlessly and focus mainly on the quality of instruction. They should also connect directly with teachers and the classroom.

Scholars in the literature reviewed; have well-articulated how instructional supervision should be carried out in stages in order to improve pedagogical practices. However, there has been an outcry by teachers that principals only observe classroom instruction for the sake of fault-finding. This study therefore intended to fill the gap by establishing the effectiveness of principals' instructional performance in classroom instruction with an aim hopefully, to find solution through perceptions of principals, HoDs and Teachers.

The main objective of this study was to establish the effectiveness of principal's instructional supervision regarding classroom instructional supervision as perceived by principals, HoDs and teachers in public secondary schools. To further interrogate the effectiveness of principals' instructional supervision regarding their tasks as perceived by principals, HoDs and teachers in public secondary schools, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested: There is no significant difference between principals, HoDs and teachers regarding their perceptions on principals' effective instructional supervision in improving teachers' classroom instruction.

II. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Descriptive survey design which embraces both quantitative and qualitative approaches was used by the researcher to carry out the study. This is because according to Orodho (2012), descriptive survey designs are used for exploratory studies in order to give room for sampling people's attitudes, views, habits and social issues. According to Borg and Gall (2007), descriptive survey involves collecting information from head teachers, teachers, students and stakeholders who are associated with education procedures (Borg and Gall, 2007). The sample size was as follows: 38 principals, 151 heads of departments and 289 teachers. This gave a sample size of 478 respondents. Stratified random sampling was used in selecting schools according to the following strata: boys' public secondary schools, girls' public secondary schools and mixed public secondary schools. Simple random sampling was used for the study to select principals and teachers. The instruments used to collect data were: Interview guide for principals and Questionnaire for teachers. Cronbach's alpha was used to measure reliability or internal consistency of the instruments. According to Sekaran and Bougie (2016), Cronbach's alpha provides a unique, quantitative estimate of the internal consistency of a scale. The following formula was used to test the reliability of the instruments:

$$\alpha = \frac{N \cdot \bar{c}}{\bar{v} + (N-1) \cdot \bar{c}}$$

Where: N = the number of items
 \bar{c} = average covariance between item-pairs
 \bar{v} = average variance

(Bonnet and Wright, 2014).

The reliability of the instrument was found to be 0.854, which is above the threshold of 0.7. A correlation coefficient (r) of approximately 0.75 is considered good and high enough for the reliability of the instruments (Bonnet and Wright, 2014). Qualitative data was analyzed thematically, while Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and presented in frequencies and percentages.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the following indicators of Effectiveness, the researcher sought the perceptions of the respondents to indicate their responses on a three-point Likert scale as follows: **3-Effective (E)** **2-Somewhat effective (SE)** **1-Ineffective (I)**

3-Effective (E) - Other than using appropriate skills and knowledge in performing tasks and responsibilities in instructional supervision, the principal is able to constantly assess, guide and counsel teachers; evaluate their pedagogical work and give teachers support in order to enhance their professionally growth and development.

2-Somewhat effective (SE) - A part from working diligently in instructional supervision, if the principal does not use appropriate skills and knowledge in assessing, guiding and counseling teachers, evaluating their pedagogical work and giving them support; the teachers may not grow and develop professionally.

1-Ineffective (I) - The principal lacks knowledge and skills on how to perform tasks and responsibilities in instructional supervision. He/she does not at all; assess, guide or counsel teachers, evaluate their pedagogical work or give them support in order to grow or develop professionally.

An effective performance was further measured by a mean average between 2.5 and 3.0; somewhat effective - 2.0 and 2.4; while ineffective - 1.5 and 1.9

This section sought the principals' perception on Instructional Supervision with regard to their performance in classroom instruction. Table 1 presents the results.

Table 1: Principals' perception on Instructional Supervision regarding their performance in Classroom Instruction

Principals were required to rate their performance on instructional supervision with regard to classroom instruction. The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Principals' perception on Instructional Supervision regarding their performance in Classroom Instruction

Tasks	Mean	Effective 3		Somewhat effective 2		Ineffective 3	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
• Involve teachers in joint decision-making.	2.5	18	52.9	15	44.1	1	2.9
• Direct teachers to do need assessment based on their classroom instruction.	2.5	17	50.0	17	50.0	-	-
• Facilitate brain-storming activities involving needs assessment.	2.6	22	64.7	10	29.4	2	5.9
• Involve teachers to participate in planning on how to solve the problems identified in classroom instruction.	2.6	22	64.7	10	29.4	2	5.9
• Involve teachers on how to implement activities to improve classroom instruction.	2.6	20	58.8	13	38.2	1	2.9
• Evaluate the outcome of the implemented activities.	2.7	25	73.5	8	23.5	1	2.9
• Encourage teachers to do self-evaluation for the improvement of teaching and learning.	2.9	31	91.2	3	8.8	-	-

Table 1 indicates that a large proportion of the principals perceived their performance as effective in the following tasks and responsibilities: 31 (91.2%) in encouraging teachers to evaluate themselves in order to improve teaching and learning, 25 (73.5%) in evaluating the outcome of the implemented activities, 22 (64.7%) in facilitating brain-storming activities involving needs assessment and involving teachers to participate in planning on how to solve the problems identified in classroom instruction, 20 (58.8%) in involving teachers on how to implement activities to improve classroom instruction and 18 (52.9%) in involving teachers in joint decision making. This was further indicated by a mean of between 2.5 and 2.9 which represents an effective

performance. However, 17 (50.0%) of the principals perceived their performance as somewhat effective in directing teachers to do needs assessment based on classroom instruction.

Head of departments were also required to rate principals' performance on instructional supervision with regard to classroom instruction. The results are presented in Table2.

Table 2: Heads of departments' perception on Instructional Supervision regarding Principals' performance in Classroom Instruction

Tasks	Mean	Effective 3		Somewhat effective 2		Ineffective 3	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involve teachers in joint decision-making. Direct teachers to do need assessment based on their classroom instruction. Facilitate brain-storming activities involving needs assessment. Involve teachers to participate in planning on how to solve the problems identified in classroom instruction. Involve teachers on how to implement activities to improve classroom instruction. Evaluate the outcome of the implemented activities. Encourage teachers to do self-evaluation for the improvement of teaching and learning. 	2.3	59	44	51	38.1
2.3	51	38.1	67	50.0	16	11.9	
2.0	28	20.9	80	59.7	26	19.4	
2.1	38	28.4	66	49.3	30	22.4	
2.1	41	30.6	61	45.5	32	23.9	
2.3	53	39.6	70	52.2	11	8.2	
2.4	69	48.5	60	44.8	9	6.7	

Results in Table2 shows that HoDs perceived principals' performance as effective in the following areas: 69 (48.5%) in encouraging teachers to do self-evaluation in order to improve teaching and learning, 59 (44%) in involving teachers in joint decision-making and 53 (39.6%) in evaluating the outcome of the implemented activities. Table2 further shows that 80 (59.7%), 70 (52.2%) and 67 (50.0%) of the HoDs perceived principals' performance as somewhat effective in facilitating brain-storming activities involving needs assessment, evaluating the implemented activities and directing teachers to do need assessment based on their classroom instruction respectively.

However, 32 (23.9%), 30 (22.4%) and 26 (19.4%) of the HoDs perceived principals' performance as ineffective in the following tasks and responsibilities: involving teachers on how to implement activities to improve classroom instruction, involving teachers to participate in planning on how to solve the problems identified in classroom instruction and facilitating brain storming activities and involving needs assessment. This was further indicated by a mean of between 2.0 and 2.4 out of the highest mean of 3.0.

Teachers were also required to rate principals' performance on instructional supervision with regard to classroom instruction. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Teachers' perception on Instructional Supervision regarding Principals' performance in Classroom Instruction

Tasks	Mean	Effective 3		Somewhat effective 2		Ineffective 1	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involve teachers in joint decision-making. Direct teachers to do need assessment based on their classroom instruction. 	2.2	96	39.2	112	45.7
2.1	70	28.6	132	53.9	43	17.6	

• Facilitate brain-storming activities involving needs assessment.	2.0	60	24.5	133	54.3	52	21.2
• Involve teachers to participate in planning on how to solve the problems identified in classroom instruction.	2.0	70	28.6	117	47.8	58	23.7
• Involve teachers on how to implement activities to improve classroom instruction.	2.2	88	35.9	119	48.6	38	15.5
• Evaluate the outcome of the implemented activities.	2.4	115	46.9	108	44.1	22	9
• Encourage teachers to do self-evaluation for the improvement of teaching and learning.	2.2	100	40.8	83	33.9	62	25.3

Results in Table 3 reveals that 115 (46.9%), 100 (40.8%) and 96 (39.2%) of the teachers perceived principals' performance as effective in evaluating the outcome of the implemented activities, encouraging teachers to do self-evaluation in order to improve teaching and learning, and involving teachers in joint decision-making.

Results in Table 3 further reveals that 133 (54.3%) and 132 (53.9%) of the teachers perceived principals' performance as somewhat effective in directing teachers to do needs assessment based on curriculum instruction and facilitating brain-storming activities involving needs assessment among other activities. This was further indicated by a mean of between 2.0 and 2.4 out of the highest mean of 3.0 which shows that principals' performance was generally somewhat effective.

However, teachers perceived principals' performance on the following tasks and responsibilities as ineffective: 62 (25.3%) in encouraging teachers to do self-evaluation in order to improve teaching and learning, 58 (23.7%) in involving teachers to participate in planning on how to solve the problems identified in classroom instruction, 52 (21.2%) in facilitating brain-storming activities involving needs assessment, 43 (17.6%) in directing teachers to do needs assessment based on their classroom instruction and 38 (15.5%) in involving teachers on how to implement activities to improve classroom instruction.

With regard to classroom instruction, although 17 (50%) and above of the principals perceived their performance as effective in all the tasks and responsibilities, HoDs' and teachers' perception was in agreement with the principals' only in one task and responsibility: involving teachers in joint decision-making.

However, there seems to be a deviation on HoDs' and teachers' perceptions from that of the principals' on the following tasks and responsibilities: facilitating brain-storming activities involving needs assessment, involving teachers to participate in planning on how to solve the problems identified in classroom instruction and involving teachers on how to implement activities to improve classroom instruction of which they perceived principals' performance as ineffective.

The findings of this study involving teachers in joint decision-making concur with Moswela and Mphale (2015) research findings. The scholars' advice is that, for an effective instructional supervision to take place it has to be guided by a well-designed objective agreed upon by the instructional supervisor and his or her protégé. Although principals were perceived to have performed effectively in the following task: involving teachers in joint decision-making, it is not clear whether or not what was decided upon was put in practice or implemented by all the respondents and the objectives achieved.

When asked in an interview about instructional supervision in the classroom as a core skill in improving classroom instruction, some of the principals admitted that they did not perform effectively as expected. They had the following to say:

Principal 1:

It's a good thing for a principal to do but so demanding! I don't have time to observe teachers while teaching in the classroom. In a term I can do it once or sometimes not at all...

Principal 2:

I usually do this once in a term or when there is a problem, I just go and sit at the back of the classroom and watch while the teacher is teaching. If I see a problem, I call the teacher aside or later on, and we discuss the problem. Mostly, randomly call any teacher and ask for the lesson plan and schemes of work...

The principals' comments contradict Glickman et al (2017) findings on an effective classroom observation. According to the scholars, before class observation meeting, the instructional supervisor and the teacher should discuss instructional instruments such as the lesson plan by stressing on the lesson objectives, its relevance and appropriateness of content, time allocation, teaching aids, and the evaluation criteria.

In support, Allida et.al. (2018) emphasized that, in order to succeed in classroom observation, the instructional supervisor should have full knowledge of what the curriculum entails and be able to plan on the activities to be carried out in the classroom. The observation stage is the most critical stage in classroom supervision. During this phase the instructional supervisor observes the teacher based on areas agreed upon, and collects as much information as possible about the classroom instruction, and learning situations. When principals were asked during the interview how they evaluate teachers' performance on classroom instruction, majority of the principals commented:

I get feedback from students who write appraisal report about how the teacher has taught them. Sometimes I do evaluate teachers but only when there are complaints from the students.

The principals' comment on how they evaluate teachers' is contrary to Gurnam and Chan (2010) who in their findings about classroom observation emphasized that teacher evaluation should be done at the end of the lesson and that instructional supervisor is supposed to hold a post observation conference in order to identify any gap regarding the observation in classroom teaching.

This study also sought to establish whether perceived differences among principals', HoDs' and teachers' on principals' performance in classroom instruction was statistically significant. To achieve this, the following hypothesis was tested: "there is no significant difference in principals', HoDs' and teachers' perception on principals' effective instructional supervision on improving teachers' classroom instruction", in order to assist in analysis, Kruskal-Wallis was used. Table 4 presents the results.

The formula below was used to test the hypothesis

$$H = (N - 1) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^g n_i (\bar{r}_i - \bar{r})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^g \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (r_{ij} - \bar{r})^2}, \text{ where:}$$

n_i is the total number of all observations in i group

r_{ij} is the total rank among all observers of j observation from group i

N is the total of all the numbers observed in all the groups

$\bar{r}_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} r_{ij}}{n_i}$ is the total average rank which include observations in i group

$\bar{r} = \frac{1}{2}(N + 1)$ is the total average including all the r_{ij} .

P-value was estimated by $\Pr(\chi_{g-1}^2 \geq H)$ (Kothari and Garg, 2014).

Table 4: Kruskal-Wallis Test on Principals', HoDs and Teachers' perceptions on Classroom Instruction

Tasks	Nairobi County		Kajiado County		Combined	
	Chi-Square	P-Value	Chi-Square	P-Value	Chi-Square	P-Value
• Involve teachers in joint decision-making.	5.710	0.105	3.100	0.185	3.731	0.155
• Direct teachers to do need assessment based on their classroom instruction.	12.100	0.000	12.112	0.004	12.116	0.002
• Facilitate brain-storming activities involving needs assessment.	25.119	0.000	22.007	0.004	22.456	0.000
• Involve teachers to participate in planning on how to solve the problems identified in classroom instruction.	14.321	0.000	19.433	0.000	17.634	0.000
• Involve teachers on how to implement activities to improve classroom instruction.	13.001	0.001	13.986	0.005	13.154	0.001
• Evaluate the outcome of the implemented activities.	12.778	0.006	11.677	0.001	11.640	0.003
• Encourage teachers to do self-evaluation for the improvement of teaching and learning.	34.007	0.000	35.711	0.000	34.887	0.000

Table 4 reveals that all the P-values were less than the level of significance of 0.05, except in one task and responsibility under classroom instruction. The study therefore rejects the null Hypothesis in all the tasks and responsibilities with a P-value of between 0.000 and 0.003 but accepts the null Hypothesis in one task with a P-value of 0.155 which is greater than the significant level of 0.05. This means that there was no statistical difference in principals', HoDs' and teachers' perceptions on principals' performance in involving teachers in joint decision-making.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concluded that the principals worked diligently on their tasks and responsibilities but did not use appropriate skills and knowledge while conducting instructional supervision in improving classroom instruction. Principals' instructional supervisory methods were mainly limited to observing professional records belonging to teachers and checking on learner's progress records, giving minimal attention to class visits and self-appraisal. Principals instead relied heavily on students' appraisal report on teachers. As a result, internal supervision has failed to impact on teachers' development on best practices in teaching. This study therefore recommends that the education policy makers (TSC and MoE) to put in place a policy on instructional supervision and to guide on how instructional supervision could be made more effective in public secondary schools. The TSC strategic plan 2015-2019 should implement the policy on standards assessment and instructional supervision of curriculum delivery in public secondary schools.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Allida, Olela, Ogwari & Minja (2018). Best practices in Instructional Supervision: A study of Adventist Secondary Schools in Kenya. *Baraton Interdisciplinary Research Journal* 8, 4-7.
- [2]. Arlestig, H., & Tornsen, M. (2014). Classroom observations and supervision: Essential dimensions of pedagogical leadership. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 28(7), 856-868.
- [3]. Borg, W.R., J.P., & Gall. M.D. (2007). *Educational Research. An introduction*, 8th ed. Boston: Pearson.
- [4]. Egwu, S.O. (2015). Principals' performance in supervision of classroom instruction in Ebonyi state secondary schools. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6 (15), 99 -105.
- [5]. Fullan, M., Rincon-Gallardo, S., & Hargreaves, A. (2015). Professional capital as accountability. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 23(15), 1-22.
- [6]. Glickman, C.D., Gordon, S.P., & Ross-Gordon, J.M. (2017). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (10th ed.). New York: Pearson.

- [7]. Glickman, C.D., Gordon, S.P., & Ross-Gordon, J.M. (2018). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (10th ed.). New York: Pearson.
- [8]. Gurnam, K. S., & Chan, Y. F. (2010). Formative supervision of teaching and learning: Issues and concerns for the school head. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 39 (4), 589-605.
- [9]. Kothari, C. R., & Garg, G. (2014). *Research methodology methods and techniques* (3rd ed.). New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.
- [10]. Malunda, Onen, Musaazi & Oonyu (2016). Instructional Supervision and the Pedagogical Practices of Secondary School Teachers in Uganda. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(30), 177-187.
- [11]. Moswela & Mphale (2015). Barriers to Clinical Supervision Practices in Botswana Schools. Retrieved September 14, 2017, from DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v3i6.1054>
- [12]. Mumo C. (2010). Ill-equipped headteachers running down institutions. *Daily Nation: Blackboard*. Retrieved March 17, 2016, from <http://www.nationaudio.com>.
- [13]. Omondi, E. A. (2019). Effectiveness of principals' instructional supervision in enhancing teacher professional development in public secondary schools in Nairobi and Kajiado counties, Kenya. Kenyatta University Unpublished Ph.D Thesis.
- [14]. Pfeifer, D. (2011). Transforming staff through clinical supervision. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 20(2), 29–33.
- [15]. Portin, B. S., Schneider, P., DeArmond, M. & Gundlach, L. (2013). *Making sense of leading schools: A study of the school principalship*. Washington: University of Washington.
- [16]. Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research Methods for Business: A skill building Approach* (7th ed), London: Wiley & Sons.
- [17]. Usman, Y. D., (2015). The Impact of Instructional Supervision on Academic Performance of Secondary School. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(10), 160-167.
- [18]. Zepeda, S.J. (2017). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.