

Instructional Supervision in Public Secondary Schools in Kenya

Educational Management
Administration & Leadership
1–29

© The Author(s) 2011

Reprints and permission:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1741143211427977

emal.sagepub.com



Zachariah Wanzare

Abstract

This article reports some findings of study regarding practices and procedures of internal instructional supervision in public secondary schools in Kenya. The findings are part of a large-scale project undertaken in Kenya to determine the perceptions of headteachers, teachers and senior government education officers regarding the practices of internal instructional supervision and staff development in Kenyan public secondary schools. Findings indicated that instructional supervision was viewed as a process of checking other people's work to ensure that bureaucratic regulations and procedures are followed and that loyalty to the higher authorities is maintained. The benefits of supervision practices included facilitating students' academic performance, improving the quality of teachers and teaching, and enabling instructional supervisors to monitor teachers' instructional work. The major problems frustrating the practices of instructional supervision were those associated with a lack of consistency, questionable supervisor practices and lack of resources. Suggestions for change included developing clear policies on instructional supervision and providing needed resources, feedback and follow-up support.

Keywords

administration, leadership, schools

Introduction

Background

One of the critical challenges facing teacher education, especially in Kenya, is how to improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools. Concerns regarding the improvement of the quality of teaching are central to the broader question of improving the quality of education (National Board of Employment, Education, and Training, 1994; UNESCO, 1996). A major factor associated with education quality relates to teacher quality (Sergiovanni, 2001; UNESCO, 1996), which is important in several ways: (1) it is key to the development of the principal's attitudes toward learning and self-image of learners; (2) it determines the foundation on which subsequent learning will be built;

Corresponding author:

Zachariah Wanzare, Maseno University, Maseno, Kenya

Email: zwanzare@yahoo.com

and (3) it is central to the improvement of the quality of schooling (National Board of Employment, Education, and Training, 1994; UNESCO, 1996). The need to improve the quality of teaching and learning through instructional supervision is well documented. For example, Sergiovanni (2001) asserted that teacher supervision and evaluation should help teachers grow, improve basic teaching skills, and expand knowledge and use of teaching repertoires.

Beach and Reinhartz (2000) viewed instructional supervision as a process that caters for instruction and provides teachers with feedback on their teaching so as to strengthen instructional skills to improve performance. According to Wanzare and da Costa (2000), the purpose of instructional supervision is to focus on teachers' instructional improvement which, in turn, improves student academic achievement.

In Kenya, instructional supervision has often been seen as the main vehicle through which to improve teaching and learning in schools, with headteachers as instructional supervisors. As the Republic of Kenya Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (2003) noted, headteachers as the managers of their schools have the responsibility to ensure that teachers implement the set curriculum and that learning is actually taking place.

In this study, *instructional supervision* embraces all activities that are directed specifically toward establishment, maintenance and improvement of the teaching-learning process in schools. This improvement often occurs in a formal context of supportive teacher-supervisor interactions.

Supervision in Kenyan secondary schools is entrusted to the Ministry of Education in accordance with the provision of the Education Act Cap 211 of 1968 revised 1970 (Republic of Kenya, 1980), which empowers the Minister for Education to promote the education of the people of Kenya. The main purpose of such a legal provision is to enable the Minister for Education as a representative of the government and the Kenyan people to satisfy himself/herself that educational standards are being maintained.

To achieve this objective, the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (formerly known as the Inspectorate) has endeavored to arrange some visits to schools by Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QASOs), formerly known as school inspectors, to carry out general supervision. The following activities are typically conducted during external supervision (Chabala, 1994; Ministry of Education, 1994; Republic of Kenya Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 1999, 2003): (1) checking on educational facilities; (2) monitoring, reviewing and assessing how well educational standards are being maintained and educational standards implemented by teachers and school administrators; and (3) observing classroom teaching by individual teachers to assess their professional competence. Additionally, arising from supervision, it is expected that the in-service training needs of teachers and headteachers will be identified.

However, the following major constraints have been associated with external supervision by QASOs (Chabala, 1994; Republic of Kenya Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 1999): (1) inadequate supervisory personnel; (2) limited resources, such as funds and equipment; (3) a lack of transportation or flexible mobility; (4) incompetent supervisory personnel, who lack training specifically in instructional supervision; (5) a lack of meaningful feedback to schools on supervisory matters; and (6) inadequate legal provision, which limits enforcement of inspection recommendations.

Therefore, supervision by Ministry of Education personnel, in the main, has not been productive. As Republic of Kenya (1999), commonly known as the Koech Report, concluded, the Ministry's provision of professional guidance to teachers has not been forthcoming, and, consequently, teachers have developed low morale.

In view of the above constraints, alternative ways to improve the quality of teaching and learning in Kenyan secondary schools are urgently being sought. Various government statements have proposed internal or school-based supervision to supplement the work done by external supervisors. For example, Republic of Kenya (1998) recommended the use of school-based supervisors—such as headteachers, departmental heads and subject heads—in instructional supervision. Therefore, the overall view of the Kenyan government and of Kenyans in general is that internal instructional supervision in secondary schools should be promoted, with headteachers taking the major role. Instructional supervision embraces all activities that are directed specifically at the establishment, maintenance and improvement of the teaching-learning process in the school. This improvement often occurs in a formal context of supportive teacher-supervisor interactions. Moves toward school-based arrangements relative to supervision of teaching are more cost effective than maintaining a team of external school inspectors who do not function effectively (Lodiaga, 1995).

There are numerous challenges that school-based instructional supervision will be expected to address (Beach and Reinhartz, 2000; Oliva and Pawlas, 2001):

- (1) assisting the various categories of teachers (for example, newly qualified teachers; marginal teachers; veteran teachers) to better their teaching;
- (2) helping school administration in planning the participation of individual teachers in staff development and, thus, preparing teachers for different or increased responsibilities;
- (3) assisting schools in selecting relevant instructional materials;
- (4) helping schools to implement government curriculum;
- (5) improving the relationship between teachers and headteachers.

In order to improve instructional supervision, it is necessary to know how it is conducted and perceived and what its current purposes are. A review of the literature and research revealed little information to indicate that researchers have given much attention to the opinions of headteachers, teachers and senior government education officers regarding the current state of internal instructional supervision practices in secondary schools in Kenya. To move toward greater autonomy for school units or empowerment for teachers, it would be logical to ask headteachers, teachers and senior government education officers, including QASOs, to comment on the current and preferred practices of instructional supervision in Kenyan secondary schools. Teachers' perceptions of instructional supervision may be in sharp contrast to those of headteachers and government education officers, and may determine whether or not teachers will respond positively to supervision. Furthermore, teachers must be recognized as the key players in the process of instructional supervision who ultimately must adopt educational practices that will increase student achievement.

For the purposes of this study, internal instructional supervisors include personnel such as headteachers, deputy headteachers, departmental heads and subject heads, who are based within the institutions in which supervision takes place. The terms *principal*, *headteacher*, *headmaster* and *headmistress* will be used interchangeably to refer to an individual who occupies the highest official position in the school organization and whose responsibility is, among others, to manage the school. Senior government education officers include the following (Ministry of Education, 1994).

- (1) Director of quality assurance and standards, formerly known as the chief inspector of schools (CIS), who is the chief advisor to the Ministry of Higher Education on matters relating to education standards.

- (2) Provincial directors of education (PDEs), education officers responsible for maintaining educational standards in the various provinces in Kenya.
- (3) District education officers (DEOs), the chief education officers responsible for managing and administering education matters in the various districts in Kenya.
- (4) QASOs, senior education officers whose responsibilities include, among others, to visit schools and to carry out general supervision.

In the Kenyan context, *school* 'means any institution in which not less than ten pupils receive regular instruction, or an assembly of not less than ten pupils for the purpose of receiving regular instruction' (Republic of Kenya, 1980: 5). The term *secondary school* refers to the second level of the 8 + 4 + 4 system of formal education—8 years of primary education, 4 years of secondary education and 4 years of university education (Republic of Kenya Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 2003).

As Republic of Kenya Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology explained, primary education caters for 6–13-year-olds leading to the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education while secondary education caters for 14–17-year-olds leading to the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education. University education takes a minimum of 4 years leading to a undergraduate degree; some professional degree programs take up to 6 years.

In this study, practices of internal instructional supervision in public secondary schools in Kenya were examined in the context of teacher–supervisor interactions and the Kenyan Ministry of Education teacher supervision policy. The practices of instructional supervision as identified by Oliva and Pawlas (1997), Glickman et al. (1998) and Beach and Reinhartz (2000) served as the framework for examining instructional supervision in Kenyan public secondary schools.

Existing Research and Literature

Supervisory Practices. A survey of the literature reveals a variety of practices and procedures that instructional supervisors, such as school principals, may employ as they work with teachers. *Supervisory practices* refer to specific procedures and techniques that supervisors use when working with teachers and which are essential to supervisors in the observation and documentation of teaching–learning behaviors and which contribute to the overall effectiveness of the instructional supervision process (Beach and Reinhartz, 2000).

Several terms have been used to refer to supervisory practices: (1) mechanics of supervision (Beach and Reinhartz, 2000); (2) styles of supervision (Gleave, 1997); (3) orientation to supervision (Glickman et al., 2009); (4) supervisory behaviors (Glickman et al., 2009); (5) ways of doing supervision (Glanz, 1997); (6) supervisory strategies (Wiedmer, 1995); (7) supervisory options (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 2002); and (8) models of supervision (Beach and Reinhartz, 2000).

Glickman et al. (2001) suggested that supervisors should use different supervisory practices derived from their own philosophies and beliefs. However, as Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) noted, the choice of a particular supervisory practice will depend on unique teacher characteristics as well as school context. Since supervisory practice is a matter of choice, the supervisor should select a practice to match the needs of the teacher (Kosmoski, 1997). Teachers might react more positively to a supervisory practice that is responsive to their needs and professional aspirations.

Instructional supervisors may work with teachers either directly or indirectly, methods that direct and significantly affect teacher instruction and, as a result, student learning.

Direct Supervisory Practices. Direct instructional leadership practices include the immediate interactions with teachers and other personnel to address classroom teaching, student performance and curricular concerns. These practices can be grouped into two broad categories relative to supervision: curriculum supervision and instructional supervision (Drake and Roe, 2003).

Curriculum encompasses (1) all in-school experiences, including classroom, learning experiences, student activities, use of learning resource center, assemblies, use of the cafeteria and social functions; and (2) out-of-school learning experiences directed by the school, including homework, field trips and use of community resources (Oliva and Pawlas, 2001). A principal's most important responsibilities regarding curriculum supervision include (1) providing the forum to facilitate teacher curriculum discussion, (2) ensuring curriculum implementation, (3) promoting teacher reflection on key components and (4) helping teachers to select appropriate concepts to be taught and the methods for implementation (Curtis, 2002; Robbins and Alvy, 2003).

Research reports indicate that curriculum supervision is a key component of the principal's instructional leadership role. For example, Meyer and Macmillan (2001), in a study that explored the views of in-service administrators in Nova Scotian (Canada) school boards regarding principals' tasks, reported that curriculum development was cited as one of the principal's major tasks geared toward instructional improvement in Nova Scotian schools.

According to Drake and Roe (1999), instructional supervision is the process through which the principal attempts to work with teachers and other staff members cooperatively to improve teaching and learning in the school. Used in this sense, supervision of instruction, by design, is a developmental process through which instructional leaders can reinforce teaching practices that improve student learning. Effective principals provide leadership in instruction, coordinate instructional programs and emphasize high academic standards and expectations (DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran, 2003).

Direct supervisory practices have two major advantages (Blase and Blasé, 1999; Oliver and Pawlas, 2001). First, they engage instructional supervisors and teachers in shared work central to curriculum and instruction and, second, they help to ensure that management and policy decisions will be implemented collaboratively. However, direct supervisory practices tend to constrain instructional supervisors who usually have other administrative matters to address (Meyer and Macmillan, 2001).

Indirect Supervisory Practices. Indirect supervisory activities are concerned with the school's internal and external environments, physical and internal contexts of the classrooms, teaching, curriculum, and the meaning of the instructional supervisor's actions for teachers (Kleine-Kracht, 1993). Instructional supervisors involved in indirect supervisory practices facilitate leadership in other personnel in the schools (for example, teachers and departmental heads) in the following major ways (Wanzare and da Costa, 2001; Zheng, 1996): (1) by improving teaching and learning conditions (for example, by ensuring clean, safe, healthy, and productive learning environments, being aware of and dealing with minor problems and issues before they become major problems, and providing teaching and learning resources, materials, and incentives to pursue new ideas and create new options); (2) by helping to set school-level instructional standards; (3) by gaining an understanding of teachers' instructional concerns and classroom conditions and offering needed assistance to address them; and (4) by delegating some of their responsibilities to other personnel, such as departmental heads, vice-principals, colleague teachers and curriculum specialists (Wanzare and da Costa, 2001; Zheng, 1996). As Yerkes and Guaglianone (1998) noted, instructional

leadership is a shared responsibility in which decisions are made through collaboration shared decision making.

A growing number of researchers (Deborah, 2002; Elmore, 2000; Wanzare and da Costa, 2001) also assert that instructional leadership is a shared responsibility distributed across the school community, with principals, vice-principals, departmental heads, teachers and policymakers having complementary responsibilities. According to James et al. (2000), distribution of instructional leadership role does not mean that key players work isolated; instead their efforts are interdependent, frequently spanning boundaries.

Problems Associated With Instructional Supervision

Supervisor Incompetence. Garubo and Rothstein (1998) observed that initial problems of instructional supervisors are usually related to their own sense of competence. Chapman and Burchfield (1994), in reflecting specifically on the African situation, observed that those individuals selected for headship may lack formal training in instructional supervision and, consequently, they may not command sufficient respect among teachers to operate effectively as instructional supervisors. A supervisor unfamiliar with proven supervisory techniques and strategies will perform poorly or will slide into 'supervision avoidance' (Kosmoski, 1997: 25).

Time Constraints. Instructional supervision is often a secondary task for many school principals who may not have time to devote to curriculum and instructional leadership because they are too busy with other day-to-day operations in their schools which tend to be much more 'do-able' than the demands for instructional leadership (Oliva and Pawlas, 2001). In reporting the state of teacher evaluation in the state of Connecticut, USA, Iwanicki and Ridone (1995) observed that the administrators studied experienced difficulty in managing a teacher evaluation program and in evaluating meaningful professional development growth plans for all teachers because of time constraints. And, more recently, Curtis (2002), in a study of the issues high school principals encounter with instructional supervision in the state of Georgia, US, reported that the principals studied unanimously agreed that time constraints and unexpected interruptions frustrated their endeavors to effect meaningful teacher supervision.

Teachers' Attitudes Toward Instructional Supervision. Research indicates that teachers do not always readily accept instructional supervision by principals. For example, findings in Curtis' (2002) study indicated that none of the principals studied believed teachers viewed supervision by principals as a positive process, and that for many teachers, supervision was a meaningless exercise that had little value to them other than completion of their evaluation forms.

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998) observed that teachers' encounters with their supervisors lead directly to evaluative judgments based on the skimpiest of evidence. Such encounters, they argued, are destructive of autonomy, self-confidence and personal integrity. And, more recently, Sullivan and Glanz (2000) noted that the evaluation function of instructional supervision is rooted in bureaucratic inspectional—type supervision the function of which is to fulfill organizational requirements—to measure and to assess teaching effectiveness.

Other potential problems that may frustrate instructional supervision include the lack of agreed-upon definition of instructional supervision (Waite, 1995) and insufficient incentives for instructional supervision on the part of school principals (Wanzare and da Costa, 2001).

Facilitating Instructional Supervision

Supervisor–Supervisee Relations. Sergiovanni and Starrat (2002) suggested that the exchange between supervisor and the teacher must be trusting, open and flexible to allow both to speak from their own sense of integrity and that a human relations supervisor should adopt shared decision-making practices to facilitate teacher satisfaction. Trust implies friendliness and mutual acceptance and enables supervisors, teachers and students to know one another better (Garubo and Rothstein, 1998).

Collaboration. Instructional supervisors should endeavor to work collaboratively with teachers to establish supervisory support and coaching teams that can provide confidence and reduce anxiety often experienced by teachers in response to supervision (Wanzare and da Costa, 2001). Blasé and Blasé (1999a) observed that effective instructional leaders should work to create a cooperative and non-threatening partnership with teachers that encourage openness, creates and provides freedom to make and to admit mistakes in the interest of improvement.

Ovando and Harris (1993), in a study designed to determine perceptions of teachers of a school district in Mid-East Texas, USA, regarding the post-observation conference, observed that, in general, teachers studied supported an open, collaborative relationship with their supervisors to achieve high quality teaching for successful learning and to promote teacher development.

Tsui (1995) highlighted four ingredients of successful collaboration between teachers and their supervisors: (1) the supervisor's willingness to try and understand the teachers' world and to refrain from imposing supervisor's own world on teachers; (2) the supervisor's sensitivity to changes that take place in teachers; (3) the supervisor's patience in helping teachers articulate the thinking behind these changes; and (4) the teachers' open mindedness about supervisor's comments and criticisms.

As Marsh (1997) recommended, successful principals should work hard to help teachers build a professional learning communities at the school. To Marsh, capacity building includes training that incorporates modeling, collaboration, planning and problem solving.

Communication. Frequent open communication between teachers and supervisors regarding supervisory experiences and expectations can usually remedy the problem of teachers exhibiting negativity toward supervision (Kosmoski, 1997). Beach and Reinhartz (2000) suggested that, as supervisors work with teachers, the goal of interaction should be open and honest dialogue which leads to mutual understanding and continued professional development.

As Cross and Rice (2000) suggested, school principals need to spend the majority of their time in classrooms talking to teachers and students about teaching and learning. And, according to Drake and Roe (2003), school principals and teachers should exchange ideas, brainstorm, trade experiences, discuss alternatives and generate data about areas of interest.

Staff Development. Garubo and Rothstein (1998) observed that improving the relations between supervisors and teachers requires better staff development and more realistic analysis of how they see each other and work together in their schools. New South Wales Department of Education (1995) recommended that all teachers should have the benefit of ongoing professional development, which includes a variety of activities, both inside and outside their schools, to assist them in enhancing student outcomes, reaching their full potential as teachers and increasing their job satisfaction.

Gleave (1997) observed that supervision as staff development supports teachers in studying and learning their own experience as well as from current educational theory and research in enhancing their continued growth and development, and in improving their knowledge in curriculum design and instructional methods.

Feedback. Providing accurate feedback and thoughtful classroom analysis in a manner that makes corrective strategies for teaching and learning acceptable to teachers is one of the most visible ways principals can demonstrate instructional leadership in their schools (Wanzare and da Costa, 2001). Mo et al. (1998), in a study designed to examine the effectiveness of teacher appraisal programs as perceived by teachers in Hong Kong self-managing schools, underscored the need to provide frequent feedback to teachers.

As Beach and Reinhartz (2000) and Marczely (2001) recommended, supervisors should give feedback to teachers to facilitate effective desirable pedagogical skills. Teachers are interested in feedback and constructive criticisms that would encourage them to improve their classroom teaching, to question, appraise, reflect and to adapt their current instructional practices (Marczely, 2001).

Managing Time. The successful management of time enhances the headteachers' instructional leadership role (Wanzare and da Costa, 2001). This is best addressed by establishing a long-range plan that provides for classroom observation, for student visits, for parent meetings, for teacher professional development activities, for curriculum meetings and for other activities (Alvy and Robbins, 1998). According to Kosmoski (1997), school principals can manage their time by prioritizing their tasks; listing in order of importance, those tasks that will positively promote success.

Rationale

The purpose of this study was to examine the current state of internal instructional supervisory practices and procedures in public secondary schools in Kenya from the perceptions of headteachers, teachers and senior government education officers. Such perceptions will help to inform current practice.

Methodology

Research Questions

The research questions focused on the following major areas: (1) the meaning, purposes, foci and practices of internal instructional supervision; (2) problems associated with practices of internal instructional supervision; (3) documents and guidelines on internal instructional supervision provided by the Ministry of Education; (4) skills and attributes of internal instructional supervisors; (5) changes needed to improve internal instructional supervision practices and procedures; and (5) staff development programs for teachers and headteachers.

Population and Sample

The study population included active secondary teachers, secondary headteachers and senior government education officers. A sample of 200 public secondary schools was selected randomly to participate in the study. Because participation was voluntary, some schools chose not to

participate, and usable data were received from 136 schools (68 percent). The sample consisted of 136 teachers and 56 headteachers surveyed by questionnaire, and 5 teachers, 5 headteachers and 11 senior government education officers surveyed through interview, for a complete sample of 213 participants.

Data Collection

Data collection of this study took place between January and November 2000. The research design utilized both qualitative and quantitative approaches in an attempt to understand the perceptions of the study participants regarding internal instructional supervision practices and procedures. The procedures for collecting data included primarily survey techniques: questionnaires and interviews.

The first part of the study included a survey of opinions through questionnaires that were distributed to the participating 146 teachers and 56 headteachers sampled randomly. The second part of the study was qualitative, involving in-depth interviews conducted with 21 participants who included 5 teachers, 5 headteachers/deputy headteachers and 11 senior government education officers. Interview participants were selected by convenience sampling based on (1) time available for participants and (2) participants' willingness to participate in the study.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed in two major ways: by using descriptive statistics (for example, percentages, relative frequencies, means, medians and standard deviations) to describe the raw data based on semi-structured questions in the questionnaires, and through content analysis in which qualitative data based on the interviews and open-ended responses from the questionnaires were sorted into appropriate categories according to the purpose of the study and research questions.

Findings

What were the perceptions of teachers, headteachers and senior government education officers regarding the following aspects:

- (1) the meaning of instructional supervision;
- (2) the major advantages of existing practices and procedures of internal instructional supervision;
- (3) problems associated with existing practices and procedures of internal instructional supervision;
- (4) the changes needed to improve internal instructional supervision practices and procedures?

For the purpose of this paper, only findings related to the above-mentioned specific research question have been reported. Findings regarding other aspects of the study, such as the foci of internal instructional supervision, documents and guidelines on internal instructional supervision provided by the Ministry of Education, skills and attributes of internal instructional supervisors, and staff development programs for teachers and headteachers are, however, beyond the scope of this article.

The results obtained from this study are presented below under relevant sub-headings based on the above-mentioned specific research question of the study. The findings reported are based on analysis of both questionnaire and interview data.

Meaning of Instructional Supervision

Findings revealed mixed views regarding the meaning of instructional supervision. According to teachers instructional supervision is a process by which headteachers and heads of departments facilitate teaching and learning in the schools by monitoring teachers' work. Conversely, headteachers and education officers perceived instructional supervision as a process of ensuring that students are actually taught by their teachers as mandated by the school authority. Furthermore, deputy headteachers regarded instructional supervision as a process of checking how instruction is conducted in the school.

The statements below typify respondents' views of instructional supervision a teacher shared:

It simply means devices put in place to enhance proper learning process and the monitoring process as I understand. Monitoring here would involve checks put by the headteacher to ensure that teachers carry on with their teaching-learning process. They give assignments to students; they test the students; they mark the same; and they release the results and maybe they end up carrying out certain duties which relate to their work, like supervising the games activities and the like.

Supporting the view above, a headteacher stated:

Finding out generally what is taking place within the school in terms of the curriculum and extra-curricular activities. For example, it is very important to know how the teachers attend lessons, those that are not attending, or the general attendance of coming to school and also to find out whether the students are being taught all the subjects.

Advantages of Existing Practices and Procedures of Internal Instructional Supervision

The participants in this study highlighted numerous advantages of the current practices and procedures of internal instructional supervision. Four categories of perceived advantages are listed in Table 1. Under each category, a subset of specific aspects of the advantages is given as well as frequency of mention. The specific areas relating to the benefits of instructional supervision practices and procedures include curriculum and instruction, quality of teaching and teachers, academic programs and monitoring teachers' work.

Curriculum and instruction. Curriculum and instruction was by far the most often cited category. Participants talked about effective curriculum implementation, syllabus coverage and provision of instructional resources as the major achievements resulting from practices and procedures of instructional supervision. Ten participants also agreed that practices of supervision had helped in coordinating instructional programs, defining instructional methods and strategies, evaluating instructional methods, promoting high quality instruction and monitoring classroom teaching. As one education officer said: 'Instructional supervision practices have made it possible for headteachers to ensure that teachers implement the required curriculum content in the schools. The heads have also ensured that the right curriculum content is taught as required.'

Quality of Teaching and Teachers. Participants, in general, agreed that supervision practices and procedures had improved the quality of teaching by enabling teachers to identify teaching-learning problems, address their areas of weakness and improve teaching effectiveness. They also agreed that practices had motivated teachers and enabled them to plan their teaching effectively. As one

Table 1. Catalogue of perceived advantages of internal instructional supervision practices and procedures

Theme	Specific aspects of the advantages	f
Curriculum and instruction	Effective curriculum implementation Timely syllabus coverage Identification and provision of instructional facilities	42
Quality of teaching and teachers	Effective curricular and instructional development Improvement of quality of teaching and teachers Identification of teaching-learning problems Effective teacher self-evaluation and reflection Teachers' awareness regarding areas of instructional weakness Alignment of teaching with school timetable Improvement of teaching effectiveness Effective preparation and planning of teaching Assessment of adequacy of instructional materials and equipment Teachers' attention to teaching-learning inadequacies Attainment of instructional goals Improvement and maintenance of teaching and learning schools	35
Academic programs	Enhancement of students' academic performance Effective evaluation of students' academic performance Maximum attention given to students Effective monitoring of students' academic programs Effective management of academic programs	31
Monitoring teachers' work	Close monitoring of teachers' work Reduction of teachers' anxiety in teaching Ensuring teacher performance of mandated duties Effective team building among teachers Identification of marginal teachers for special coaching Teachers' awareness regarding their professional obligations Effective management of instructional time Teachers' attendance to scheduled duties	29

teacher remarked: 'I believe that, through supervision, the quality of teaching in our schools has been greatly improved. This one I am sure about. This has also led to improvement of the performance of pupils in the national exams.'

Academic Programs. Participants agreed, in general, that supervision practices had facilitated students' academic achievement., enabled teachers to pay maximum attention to students' academic welfare and to monitor their academic programs in the schools. One teacher remarked: 'In our schools, students' academic programs have improved a lot due to supervision carried out by our heads of schools. Secondary school teachers have been able to help in managing academic programs with the advice of the heads.'

Monitoring Teachers' Work. A final area to which participants paid attention was concerned with monitoring teacher performance. Participants agreed that, through supervision practices,

Table 2. Catalogue of perceived problems of existing practices and procedures of internal instructional supervision

Theme	Specific	f
Supervision practices	Lack of appropriate definition, underlying purpose, foci, and professionalism Prevalence of discrimination, subjectivity, biases, favoritism, corruption, confusion, dishonesty, witch-hunting, intimidation, harassment, and victimization of teachers on flimsy grounds Lack of free environment for teachers to share instructional concerns with supervisors	28
Instructional supervisors	Lack of necessary supervisory skills and abilities Lack of confidence to supervise teaching and teachers Inadequate knowledge about instructional methods in all subjects Lack of meaningful formal teacher evaluation experiences given to teachers Classroom observation used as forums for parading teachers' shortcomings Unnecessary strictness with teachers	28
Feedback and follow-up	Lack of feedback and follow-up on essential aspects regarding instructional supervision (e.g. teachers' tools of work, such as lesson plans, and schemes of work) Lack of specific forms designed for reporting supervisory feedback to teachers	16
Teachers' attitudes toward supervision	Persistent negativity toward supervision Negative perspectives toward supervision Lack of trust regarding the practices of supervision	10

headteachers addressed teachers' instructional work and ensured that teachers attended their scheduled classes by monitoring them closely. As one headteacher explained: 'Monitoring teachers' work involves headteacher closely observing teachers in their classrooms, checking their artifacts of teaching, ensuring that they mark students' work, and keeping them on their toes.' Another headteacher commented: 'our work as teachers is normally monitored by heads of schools. They look at our schemes of work, teaching notes, and lesson plans. They also examine students' note books. This is a good move for us for the benefit of pupils.'

Problems of Existing Practices and Procedures of Internal Instructional Supervision

Participants expressed their concern regarding internal instructional supervision practices and procedures. In Table 2, four categories of perceived problems relating to supervision practices and procedures are listed. Included under each category is a subset of specific aspects of the problems as well as the number of instances that these problems were mentioned.

As Table 2 indicates, the major problems were those associated with supervision practices, instructional supervisors, feedback and follow-up, and teachers' attitudes toward supervision.

Supervision Practices. The most commonly cited concerns regarding the practices and procedures included their perceived lack of consistency and professionalism, marked by discrimination, subjectivity, favoritism, biases, corruption and dishonesty. According to the participants, supervision practices were merely witch-hunting exercises. Instructional supervisors, especially headteachers, deliberately frustrated teachers by victimizing them on flimsy grounds.

For the majority of participants, questionable supervisory practices and procedures that teachers experienced demoralized, stressed, and embarrassed them.

Instructional Supervisors. Participants argued that instructional supervisors lacked the necessary supervisory skills, were not actually prepared to supervise effectively, and were always busy with other non-instructional concerns. Some participants complained that instructional supervisors used classroom observations as occasions for parading teachers' shortcomings. As one teacher said: 'Heads not sufficiently prepared to supervise teachers. They lack supervisory skills, knowledge and sometimes fear their supervisory roles. Actually, some heads tend to frustrate teachers deliberately and, therefore, do not carry out professional supervision.' Comments regarding deliberate neglect of supervisory roles on the part of supervisors appeared to be on the minority, but by no means exceptional.

Feedback and Follow-up. Sixteen participants regretted the lack of feedback and follow-up on matters regarding supervision of instruction. Participants specifically concurred that feedback and follow-up regarding teachers' essential tools of work such as lesson plans and schemes of work, were not included in supervision practices and procedures. Others wondered as to why supervisors did not provide teachers with written comments relevant to supervision of teaching and learning.

By way of illustration, one teacher lamented as follows: 'Once teachers have been supervised by whatever practice, no supervisory reports are made, not at school level. May be the headteacher would have his or her own reports.'

Teachers' Attitudes. Teachers' negative attitudes toward supervision practices and procedures were considered a major stumbling block to successful school-based supervision. Teachers viewed the practices of supervision as fault-finding exercises aimed at catching teachers doing the wrong. As one teacher noted:

I would imagine it is just the attitude that perhaps if a headteacher comes to my class, he is on a fault-finding mission, which may not be the case. The attitude of many teachers, I believe, is that if I see the headteacher coming into my class, I see the head of department coming to sit in my lesson, then they want to corner me somehow. This attitude has to be corrected.

Two participants specifically noted that many teachers, especially the lazy ones, were against the checking of teachers' administrative tools, such as lesson notes, schemes of work and records of work covered, and, as a result, they resisted any attempts by headteachers to examine their artifacts of teaching. One teacher, in a general remark, commented: 'Those heads who pose as inspectors have had resistance from teachers. Teachers have rebelled against such heads.'

Suggested Changes in Practices of Internal Instructional Supervision

Classroom Observation

Participants suggested frequent classroom observation was required, especially undertaken by headteachers and colleague teachers, and that workable modalities regarding classroom observation be worked out. As one teacher recommended: 'It would be good if a headteacher visits teachers in their classrooms to see how they teach because some teachers go into their classrooms only to tell students irrelevant stories about their past personal experiences at their universities.' A deputy headteacher echoed:

Classroom visitation by headteachers would be very good and beneficial if used carefully; could be employed so long as students and teachers understand the reasons behind the practice. But, has potential problem of breeding problems if misinterpreted. The reasons for potential problems is that students may feel that the head is following teachers to find out if they teach well.

Also expressed was the need to explain to all the key stakeholders, such as students and teachers, the purpose of classroom observation to avoid potential confusion, especially among students who may feel that the headteacher is on a fault-finding mission.

Student Involvement. Twenty-five of participants suggested a need to involve students in the practices and procedures of supervision of instruction and proposed several ways in which students could participate in supervision exercises. The most frequently cited strategies for student involvement included allowing students to comment about their teachers' instructional effectiveness using a specially designed evaluation form and interviewing students about the performance of their teachers. Commenting on this issue, one teacher stated: 'Use of rating forms by students to rate teachers is a good idea and should be encouraged. But the possibility of negative reactions from teachers cannot be ruled out.'

One deputy headteacher concurred:

I think students should be allowed to give some feedback to the administration because sometimes students have genuine complaints. You find a teacher who does not go to class in time. So if you have that feedback you can also check the teacher and find out, for example, today you had a double lesson at this time, you taught only one. I think feedback from students should just be verbal because when it is written—maybe you have a suggestions box—somebody can put information which is not correct. The role of class monitors is very crucial in this regard.

A teacher cautioned that some confidentiality should be observed regarding the involvement of students in addressing teachers' shortcomings and that headteachers should not discuss teachers' weaknesses openly with students because doing so would most likely demoralize the teachers.

Instructional Supervisors. Suggestions were made regarding the personnel that participants would wish to see as internal instructional supervisors. The most frequently cited individuals in this regard included headteachers and heads of departments.

Thirty participants suggested that headteachers should take the leading role in internal instructional supervision by: (1) developing an interest in the major subjects being taught at secondary school level; (2) teaching a few lessons; (3) allowing themselves to be supervised by other internal

supervisors; (4) becoming more strict on supervision; (5) delegating supervisory duties accordingly; (6) becoming competent in their teaching subjects; (7) being role models; (8) encouraging teachers to observe their lessons as a way of modeling; and (9) being present in school most of the time to offer adequate supervision. In several cases, the headteacher was described variously as 'inspector on the ground' and 'teacher number one'.

However, one teacher was concerned about the possibility of headteachers being biased in their practices of supervision and, instead, proposed supervision by a panel of supervisors consisting of individuals drawn from among experienced teachers and other internal supervisors. This teacher commented as follows:

The headteacher should not be let to make overall judgments on teachers alone. This is because they may tend to be biased, especially when it comes to recommending teachers for promotions. There should be a panel concerned with internal supervision. This panel should include heads of departments and teachers.

Eight participants proposed that matters regarding internal instructional supervision be delegated to heads of departments who are normally in close contact with fellow teachers. As one teacher remarked:

Given the fact that heads of departments are constantly in contact with fellow teachers and they teach the same subjects with teachers, they are able to understand the teachers better. They can also develop rapport that would enable them to supervise subject teachers better than the headteacher. Heads of departments should be more involved in internal instructional supervision because the headteachers are mostly busy with other administrative duties.

In addition to the two types of individuals cited above as potential internal instructional supervisors, a few participants concurred that deputy headteachers, subject teachers and students should be involved in instructional supervision.

Attitudes Toward Supervision. Another area in which the participants expressed a desire for change concerned teachers' attitudes toward instructional supervision. Twenty participants, in acknowledging the prevalence of teachers' negativity toward supervision of instruction, advocated for a change in this attitude to facilitate the implementation of supervision programs in the schools.

Several strategies to change this attitude were proposed by teachers: (1) encouraging teachers to carry out their instructional duties well; (2) facilitating open discussions between teachers and internal instructional supervisors; (3) educating teachers about instructional supervision practices; and (4) encouraging teachers to regard instructional supervision as a normal administrative procedure and as one of the means through which teacher performance can be upgraded. Advocating for change relative to teachers' negative attitudes, one education officer commented as follows: 'I would say that teachers should regard instructional supervision as a normal administrative procedure, not necessarily to find faults. They should come to regard it as one of the means through which the headteacher, can upgrade the performance of teachers.'

Feedback and Follow-up. Six participants expressed a need to provide teachers with feedback, especially written reports on matters regarding supervision of instruction. Others specifically advocated

for constructive feedback on teaching strategies and techniques, especially after classroom visits by the headteachers. Commenting on this issue, one teacher suggested:

Teachers need to be told the outcome of such internal assessment because teachers most likely might not be conversant with the new instructional techniques and methods. Therefore, reports on internal instructional supervision should be given to individual teachers as feedback on instructional concerns.

An education officer echoed: 'The headteacher should call teachers, give them the necessary feedback on what is observed in the class, counsel them on deficiencies noted and praise them for a job well done.'

Collaboration and Teamwork. Nineteen respondents, in general, agreed that any successful implementation of an instructional supervision program is dependent upon collaboration and teamwork among the key stakeholders. For example, some participants spoke about shared decision making between internal instructional supervisors and teachers regarding the purposes of supervision and the roles of the various individuals in supervision process. Other participants shared the view that teachers' input into matters regarding supervision of instruction should be encouraged, that heads of departments, especially, should endeavor to facilitate collaboration between teachers and internal instructional supervisors, and that all teachers and internal supervisors should work as a team. A comment made by one education officer may be the most succinct statement on this issue: 'Teachers and heads working together on instructional supervision; success of schools depends on teamwork involving determination of duties; comradeship very important.'

Twelve participants proposed the aspects of collaboration that they would like to be established in the schools: (1) a harmonious, close working relationship; (2) an atmosphere of freedom of expression; (3) concern for each other; (4) proper channels of communication; and (5) a good understanding between teachers and headteachers.

Table 3 summarizes the major problems associated with the practices and procedures of internal instructional supervision identified in this study and the corresponding suggested changes for improvement.

Discussion

The research described above has attempted to provide the views of Kenyan secondary headteachers, teachers, as well as senior government education officers regarding the: (1) meaning of instructional supervision; (2) advantages of existing practices and procedures of instructional supervision; (3) problems associated with practices and procedures of instructional supervision; and (4) proposed changes for effectiveness of instructional supervision. The discussion of the findings presented in this section is organized along the above major themes.

Meaning of Instructional Supervision

Findings revealed considerable discrepancy among teachers, headteachers and senior government education officers regarding the meaning of instructional supervision. However, the three groups of professionals agreed that instructional supervision includes strategies put in place by the headteachers, deputy headteachers and heads of departments to monitor the teaching and learning process in the school, and is a way of checking other people's work to ensure that

Table 3. Problems in the practices and procedures of internal instructional supervision and suggested changes for improvement

Problems	Suggested changes for improvement
1. Lack of consistency and professionalism (prevalence of subjectivity, discrimination, biases, witch-hunting, and victimization).	1. Ensuring consistency and a great deal of professionalism in the practices of supervision; for example, by being objective and teacher friendly and by discouraging witch-hunting, discrimination, and fault-finding practices.
2. Instructional supervisors' lack of supervisory skills and competencies.	2. Ensuring that instructional supervisors acquire the necessary supervisory skills and competencies through participation in in-service training programs.
3. Teachers' persistent negativity toward instructional practices of supervision.	3. Changing teachers' negative attitudes towards supervision; for example, by facilitating open discussions regarding supervision and educating teachers about supervision practices.
4. Lack of feedback and follow-up support on supervisory matters.	4. Providing feedback and follow-up support to teachers on matters regarding instructional supervision.
5. Lack of free environment for teachers to share instructional concerns with supervisors.	5. Facilitating collaboration, team work, and shared decision making between teachers and instructional supervisors.
6. Instructional supervisors often use classroom observation as occasions for parading teachers' shortcomings, victimizing and intimidating them on flimsy grounds.	6. Encouraging instructional supervisors to motivate teachers by encouraging and praising them for a job well done and to treat them with the necessary dignity and respect they deserve as professionals.
7. Instructional supervisors, especially headteachers are often not prepared to supervise teachers and teaching effectively and appear always busy with non-instructional concerns.	7. Encouraging instructional supervisors, especially the headteachers to (1) delegate some of their supervisory duties to heads of departments who are normally in close contact with teachers and (2) be exemplary and role models as instructional leaders and policy implementers.
8. Teachers' lack of commitment to internal instructional supervision.	8. Encouraging teachers to regard instructional supervision as a normal administrative procedure geared toward helping them to improve instruction and as a means of upgrading their performance.

bureaucratic regulations and procedures are followed and that loyalty to the higher authorities is maintained.

While some of these professionals were pleased with the current practices of instructional supervision and viewed them as productive, others saw little progress in instructional supervision practices in the schools. It remains unclear why such discrepancy existed. However, one might contend that there is considerable and continuing diversity of perceptions of instructional supervision and good teaching among teachers and instructional supervisors and that stakeholders in education, such as teachers and principals, have differing quality standards against which to judge an educational program (Oliver and Pawlas, 2004). Teacher and headteacher perception of instructional supervision is an important area because it is closely linked to students' academic performance. The success of the instructional supervision program depends on teachers' and supervisors' understanding of the meaning of supervision. Only then can these professionals have productive supervisory relations.

Advantages

Academic Progress. The participants believed that instructional supervision contributed to students' academic performance in national examinations as well as to the overall results for the schools. These findings suggest that the participants had a great deal of confidence in the practices and procedures of internal instructional supervision and considered them important in facilitating students' academic development. These responses also converge on the notions that headteachers' instructional leadership was a significant factor in facilitating, improving and promoting students' academic progress and that effective instructional leadership had, as its major foci, high expectations for students, provision of quality instruction to students, and efficient use of appropriate strategies to monitor and to evaluate students' progress.

These findings are congruent with the belief held by many of the recent writers in instructional supervision that leadership which focuses on instruction has a strong purpose and commitment to student learning, and that increasing attention should be paid not only to how teachers teach students, but also to how teachers assess and evaluate students' learning (Neuman and Simmons, 2000; Robbins and Alvy, 2003; Zepeda, 2003).

Quality of Teaching and Teachers. The participants in this study concurred that internal instructional supervision practices had improved and maintained the quality of teaching in the schools and facilitated teachers' performance by (1) enlightening them about instructional methods, (2) helping them to identify their areas of weaknesses and to address them and (3) encouraging them to prepare and to plan their teaching effectively. These findings support the views of several writers cited earlier in the literature who affirmed that instructional supervision facilitates teaching and learning by helping teachers to improve teaching and to implement new instructional ideas and by providing them with feedback on effective teaching (Chell, 1995; Drake and Roe, 2003; Nolan and Hoover, 2004; Wanzare and da Costa, 2001). These findings are also consistent with similar study conducted in Namibia in which high school teachers indicated that instructional supervision enabled them to develop confidence in teaching to improve subject matter content, and to use new instructional strategies (Murangi, 1995). High school supervisors in Murangi's study similarly considered providing guidance and professional support to teachers to be the most representative of the supervisory discourse in Namibian high schools and had a great deal of confidence in the effectiveness of supervision, especially in building teacher' confidence in their own teaching abilities. As Wiles and Bondi (2004: 67) noted, 'the heart of supervision will always be the improvement of classroom teaching'.

The improvement of the quality of teachers and teaching has been a major concern for the Kenyan government in its measures to address the quality of Kenyan education. According to Republic of Kenya (1999), providing quality education to increasing numbers of students and using the available resources is both a challenge and an opportunity. First, it is a challenge because of the inadequacy of the available government resources. And second, it is an opportunity because of the possibility of viewing education as both a service and an industry, which is marked to widen the resource mobilization base.

Monitoring Teachers' Work. The role of instructional supervision in enabling headteachers to monitor teachers' instructional performance closely, to keep teachers on their toes and to identify marginal teachers with teaching difficulties were considered important by the participants. These findings suggest that the role of internal instructional supervision in ensuring that teachers actually

performed their professional duties were at the core of participants' responses. Several writers in the literature have also highlighted the importance of monitoring teachers' instructional performance. Less uniformly agreed on is what the specific practices of monitoring function ought to be. Various alternatives have been suggested. For example, Southworth (2002), in a study designed to investigate into successful leadership in small primary schools in England, reported that the headteachers studied were involved in monitoring teachers' work by looking at teachers' weekly plans, visiting classrooms, examining samples of pupils' work, observing the implementation of school policies, reviewing test and assessment information, and evaluating pupils, class, and school levels of performance and progress.

Curriculum and Instruction. The participants, in general, agreed that through instructional supervision (1) teachers were able to implement the school curriculum more effectively by covering subject syllabuses on time, (2) headteachers were able to identify and to provide needed instructional materials and (3) teachers were introduced to current developments in curriculum and instruction. These findings support the notions that principals play a crucial role in facilitating curriculum coverage and implementation and that instructional leadership provides for coordination, maintenance and improvement of instructional program (Blasé and Blasé, 1999b).

Central to the success of curriculum implementation is the need for headteachers to provide teachers with materials and other necessary resources, to promote the use of new ideas and instructional methods, to devise ways of improving curriculum and instructional approaches and to determine professional learning activities that strengthen teachers' instructional efforts and skills (Gullet and Lofton, 1996; Terry, 1996).

Problems

Supervision Practices. The findings suggest that the participants had no confidence in supervision practices because they were inconsistent, biased and subjective, and that the practices generally stressed and frustrated teachers. These findings are congruent with the following notions in the literature on teacher supervision (Tsui, 1995): (1) supervision is a highly stressful experience for both teachers and supervisors; (2) the experience of being supervised is even more stressful for teachers, especially when supervisors have 'economic power' over them in the sense that their professional growth depends on the approval of their supervisors; (3) teachers have the tendency to regard comments and suggestions made by their supervisors as negative criticisms rather than alternatives for them to consider; and (4) teachers tend to justify their own classroom practices rather than keep an open mind about alternatives, especially those offered by their supervisors.

Instructional Supervisors. Findings revealed that instructional supervisors were ill-prepared for supervision, rarely conducted meaningful supervision and generally preoccupied themselves with other non-instructional responsibilities, to the extent that they failed to provide adequate professional help to teachers. Taken together, these problems were probably the cause of continued conflict and poor relations between teachers and their internal instructional supervisors.

These findings are congruent with reports from similar studies done elsewhere. For example, Kutsyruba (2003), in a study that explored the perceptions of Canadian and Ukrainian novice teachers regarding instructional supervision in Canada, reported that, in general, the Ukrainian teachers studied expressed the view that supervisors did not always have the experience, knowledge and ability to provide effective feedback and select professional development activities for

teachers. However, these findings contradict those of Curtis (2002), cited earlier, which revealed that all the principals studied considered themselves to be the experts in all situations and were confident in their abilities to evaluate teachers and to supply them with strategies and advice to 'fix' their problems.

It appears that the Kenyan secondary instructional supervisors, especially headteachers, place little emphasis on instructional supervision. Perhaps instructional supervision is not a priority area in professional preparation programs for Kenyan secondary headteachers. It seems evident that Sullivan and McCabe (1988) were right when they stated that supervising professional others is not easy; and that successful supervision of professional teachers is a very complex process, which often depends upon the principal's ability and knowledge and, as a result, many principals avoid one-to-one supervision when possible.

Attitudes Toward Supervision. The participants in this study seemingly regarded teachers' attitudes toward instructional supervision as an important factor in successful supervision of instruction. Teachers' negative attitudes toward supervision as perceived by the participants are not surprising because the literature and research have consistently indicated that teachers exhibit attributes ranging from apathy to dislike with respect to supervision. For example, Lunenburg (1995) observed that most teachers do not like to be evaluated and never find evaluation helpful to them professionally. These findings are congruent with reports by other writers in the literature. For example, Zepeda and Ponticell (1998: 80), in reporting their findings regarding teachers' views about supervision, observed that the teachers they studied viewed supervision as a 'fix-it list, a series of items or behaviors on an evaluation checklist that teachers were directed to "fix" or correct for the next evaluation' (p. 80).

The experience of being supervised is stressful for teachers when supervisors have 'economic power' over them (Tsui, 1995). Teacher opposition to instructional supervision is often a threat to successful supervision and can be damaging to supervisory activities (Daresh and Playko, 1995; Kosmoski, 2000).

It is appears that teachers' perceptions and responses to supervisory practices have not fared well in the research. Moreover, the 'portraits' of those who have been involved in supervising teachers has similarly fared in unpopular terms (Reitzug, 1997). However, how teachers perceive supervision is vital to the success of the supervision process (Zepeda and Ponticell, 1998). These observations converge on the notion that tensions between teachers and supervisors have persisted over the years. Blumberg (1980; as cited in Oliva and Pawlas, 2004: 14) described tensions between supervisors and teachers as a 'private cold war'.

Feedback and Follow-up. The participants believed that meaningful feedback and follow-up support with respect to instructional supervision were not provided to teachers, and, consequently, they were not assisted adequately. These findings contradict those of Blasé and Blasé (1999b) who examined principal characteristics in elementary, middle and high schools in diverse regions of the USA. Teachers in the this study agreed that effective principals gave specific feedback, which focused on classroom behavior, concerns about students and problem solving, and which stressed principals' availability for follow-up talks.

The importance of providing feedback to teachers cannot be overemphasized. For example, the national Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policymaking, and Management (1999) observed that becoming a true instructional leader means that leaders will provide teachers with feedback, guidance, support and professional development that will help them

do their jobs better. And, more recently, Sergiovanni (2001) advised supervisors that when giving feedback to teachers, they should endeavor to: (1) be descriptive rather than judgmental; (2) be specific rather than general; (3) concentrate on things that can be changed; (4) consider their own motives; and (5) give the teachers feedback at a time as close to the actual assessment as possible.

Suggested Changes

Supervision Practices. The participants suggested that classroom observation by internal supervisors, such as headteachers and colleague teachers, should be a major means of addressing teachers' instructional concerns and that all the stakeholders in the school, including students, should be educated about this supervisory practice to avoid potential confusion.

These findings are congruent with the Republic of Kenya Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology's (1998) view that the headteacher, as inspector of the school, should be involved in visiting, observing and keeping a record of learning sessions in classrooms, laboratories and workshops.

The participants agreed that examining teachers' artifacts of teaching, such as lesson plans and lesson notes, should be a viable alternative strategy for monitoring teachers' level of preparedness for classroom teaching. This finding is congruent with the views of several writers in the literature regarding teachers' artifacts of teaching. For example, Wanzare (2002) observed that an analysis of teaching artifacts is an important process of collecting information about teachers. Similarly, Republic of Kenya Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (1998) underscored the importance of examining teachers' artifacts of teaching when they recommended that the headteacher should check periodically the teaching standards by referring to the artifacts of teaching, such as schemes of work, lesson notes, records of work done, pupils' exercise books, projects, practical work and assignment scripts, to ensure regular making and systematic use in guiding learning.

Instructional Supervisors. The participants concurred that headteachers and heads of departments would be the most suitable internal instructional supervisors. The involvement of headteachers, deputy headteachers and departmental heads, especially in school-based instructional supervision is not unique to Kenya; it is also found elsewhere. For example, findings of Scott's (2001) study done in Canada, sited earlier, revealed that the principals, vice-principals and heads of departments were singled out by all teachers studied as the primary individuals responsible for supervising them.

However, because the principal is overburdened with other responsibilities, it is important that the principal share supervisory roles with other personnel in the school. Wanzare and da Costa (2001), in crediting the works of Hoerr (1996), shared the view that, although the school principal is ultimately responsible for ensuring the quality of teaching and learning in the school, it is necessary and appropriate for the principal to share instructional leadership responsibilities with other individuals in the school, such as departmental heads, colleague teachers and the vice-principal.

Attitude Toward Supervision. The participants concurred that changing teachers' negative attitudes toward supervision of instruction would enable teachers to view supervision as being beneficial to them, thus facilitating their receptivity to supervision practices and their overall job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with the view held by Kosmoski (2000) that successful supervision must confront negative attitudes toward the practice of supervision.

I believe that if teachers are positive about supervision of instruction, it will be much easier to assist them with their teaching competency. The message is simple, the prevalent negative associations that derive from the myriad behaviors that, to teachers, represent control supervision must give way to behaviors that promote collegiality among teachers and headteachers as well as among teachers themselves. Issues for headteachers include: Whether supervision programs as presently practiced benefit teachers and students or do they simply frustrate the relationships between teachers and instructional supervisors? Whether supervision practices contribute to instructional improvement, that is, do the instructional benefits outweigh the negative teacher attitudes the practices may create?

Feedback and Follow-up. The participants believed that feedback and follow-up support given to teachers, especially through shared discussions, will facilitate their awareness about their instructional performance, techniques and methods. These findings are consistent with Blasé and Blasé's (1999a) study in the USA, which revealed that, by visiting classrooms and giving feedback to teachers, effective instructional supervisors 'hold up a mirror', serve as 'another set of eyes' and are 'critical friends' who engage in thoughtful discourse with teachers about what was observed for instructional improvement.

These findings also endorse recommendations by other writers and researchers (Larry, 1995; Mo et al., 1998), which underscored the need to provide teachers with continuous feedback from supervision, based on observation meetings and visitations in order to improve performance and strategies in classroom. Kutsyuruba (2003) noted that the skills, strategies and feedback obtained during supervisory process should be supported by the appropriate professional development activities.

Collaboration and Teamwork. The participants advocated a collaborative form of instructional supervision in which teachers and headteachers work as a team to devise strategies for improving teacher performance for the benefit of students. The benefits of collaboration and teamwork in supervision of instruction has been underscored in similar studies. For example, Southworth's (1999) study in the UK reported that headteachers studied indicated that (1) their schools' successes were dependent on everyone pulling their weights, supporting one another and working together, (2) improving the performance of the school rested on the teaching staff functioning as a combined unit and (3) professional dialogue was developed through, among other strategies, general teamwork.

Conclusion

In this article, I have presented some findings of a study regarding internal instructional supervision practices and procedures in public secondary schools in Kenya. Overall results indicate the following perceived advantages of internal instructional supervision practices: They facilitate curriculum implementation and students' academic performance, and they enable instructional supervisors to monitor teachers' instructional work. Findings further indicate the following perceived major problems associated with the practices and procedures of internal instructional supervision: (1) lack of consistency and professionalism; (2) lack of productive feedback and follow-up support on matters regarding supervision of instruction; and (3) teachers' general negativity to practices of supervision. And, the following were the major proposed changes to improve practices of internal instructional supervision: (1) facilitate classroom observation and student involvement in supervision practices; (2) encourage supervision by headteachers and heads of departments; (3) facilitate

change in teachers' persistent negative attitudes toward instructional supervision practices; (4) provide adequate supervisory feedback and follow-up support to teachers; and (5) foster collaboration and teamwork among teachers and instructional supervisors.

Findings of this study indicated that a great deal of importance was attached to examining teachers' artifacts of teaching. An examination of such artifacts, especially lesson plans, will enable supervisors to judge on-the-spot adjustments in the lesson plans made by teachers while the lesson is underway to accommodate ongoing behavioral cues from students or as the need for such adjustments become necessary.

It seems that the practices and procedures of internal instructional supervision led to overall school improvement by enhancing the quality of teaching and learning, curriculum implementation and student performance. The literature on the school improvement research (Hopkins et al., 1994, as cited in Glickman et al., 2001) suggested that (1) school improvement efforts should be directed toward student outcomes, (2) the primary focus on school improvement should be teaching and learning and (3) school improvement should focus on school development as a whole.

Participants in this study expressed their frustration regarding the current practice of supervision of instruction, which primarily involves inspection of teachers' instructional work. Teachers will most likely continue to be frustrated and to lose their motivation and confidence in teaching performance should this style persist in the schools and, as a result, the current practice will not benefit teachers as professionals.

It seems that feedback and follow-up are considered central to the practices and procedures of internal instructional supervision. Feedback provides an open channel for discussion and evaluation of instructional supervision.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, I offer the following recommendations for practice and for research.

Practice

Collaborative Supervision. Given the crucial importance of professional supervision in the facilitation of teachers' positive attitudes toward instructional supervision practices, there is a need for internal instructional supervisors to develop consistent assessment procedures for teacher performance. One logical strategy toward this end would be for instructional supervisors to work collaboratively with teachers to develop appropriate assessment procedures for teacher performance. Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) noted that, in implementing supervisory options (1) supervision should be viewed as a process that is equally accessible to teachers and administrators, (2) supervision should not monopolize supervision process by excluding teachers and (3) principals should endeavor to build a culture of shared responsibility for learning and instructional improvement. Assessment procedures may include frequency of classroom observation, methods of recording classroom teaching, when and how to provide feedback on teacher performance, and how data collected about teachers should be used. In defining the procedures, teachers' experience and levels of competence should be considered. Incompetent and inexperienced teachers should be observed more frequently than competent and more experienced teachers.

Clearly defined assessment procedures may serve as guides for both teachers and instructional supervisors, should be the foundation for assessment, and should facilitate teachers' confidence in

the practices and procedures of internal instructional supervision. Most important, how the data collected are used by internal instructional supervisors should be clarified. Assessment data may be used for (1) discussion with teachers, (2) the creation of a professional development assistance plan and (3) personnel decisions regarding, for example, merit pay, career ladder, change of assignment, increased responsibilities, retention and dismissal (Oliva and Pawlas, 2001). Headteachers need to use an appropriate supervision model. The participants in this study indicated satisfaction with a collaborative form of supervision model. The key is most likely the use of any model with the ingredient of high.

Professional Supervision. Internal instructional supervisors, especially headteachers, should endeavor to adopt and to foster professionalism as a cultural norm in the practices of internal instructional supervision. It is important for headteachers, as internal instructional supervisors, to recognize that teachers come to teaching with a wide range of professional training backgrounds as well as personal notions on how best to carry out teaching responsibilities, and, as a result, they expect to be treated as true professionals.

As teachers as professionals tend to work most effectively within the context of a collegial environment that supports professionalism, they must be given the opportunity to prioritize their own instructional areas and to plan the pace of change in their classrooms, and to discuss and to adopt professionalism as a cultural norm in their schools to further their professional development in their learning communities. According to Eraut (1995), being a professional practitioner implies three things: (1) a moral commitment to serve the interests of students by reflecting on their well-being and their progress and deciding how best it can be fostered or promoted; (2) a professional obligation to review periodically the nature and effectiveness of one's practice in order to improve the quality of one's management, pedagogy and decision making; and (3) a professional obligation to continue to develop one's knowledge both by personal reflection and through interaction with others.

To Speck (1999) professional culture is associated with a sense of collegiality, trust, respect and reflection within the professional learning community. As Republic of Kenya (1999) concluded, when teaching is professionalized, teachers will be expected to be efficient and effective in their delivery of educational services. Republic of Kenya also recommended that the concept of teacher as a professional be defined within acceptable academic and professional principle and that a comprehensive criteria for professionalizing the teaching career be defined. Toward this end, instructional supervisors should endeavor to work with teachers strictly within the context of teaching and learning and the overall welfare of students and the schools. Instructional supervisors should recognize and acknowledge the professional autonomy and authority of teachers because, as professionals, teachers are best placed to identify students' needs and the most effective teaching and learning strategies. The supervisor's role in professional supervision is to provide assistance, support and professional development opportunities (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 20002).

Further Research

Long-term Effects of Instructional Supervision. Findings of the study have indicated clearly that internal instructional supervision appeared to have contributed to the overall school improvement. Therefore, it is recommended that studies be conducted that would determine the long-term effects of the practices of internal instructional supervision and staff development on school improvement. Do these practices actually lead to school improvement? How does school improvement come about?

Investigations should consider how different practices of instructional supervision and staff development affect individual schools, teachers and students. Sample schools may be selected to determine the progress regarding instructional supervision and staff development within a specified time period after the implementation of the action plans.

Such investigations may be enhanced through extensive, thoughtful dialogue with the key stakeholders in the schools (for example, headteachers, teachers and students) and critical examination and analysis of improvement efforts in terms of teacher quality and instructional approaches, as well as students' learning.

Observational Study of the Practices of Instructional Supervision. This study revealed a variety of practices of internal instructional supervision, such as checking teachers' potential tools of work, examining students' exercise books and observing teachers in their classrooms. These findings suggest that internal instructional supervisors apparently recognized the need to facilitate teacher performance through differential supervisory strategies. It is, therefore, logical to recommend that observational study that focuses on the current practices and procedures of internal instructional supervision be conducted. This should include watching headteachers in their supervisory practices to determine what they do and how they do it.

A major advantage of observational study, as explained by Gall et al. (2003), is its potential to yield more accurate data than other research strategies.

Acknowledgement

This study was supported by Fund For Support of International Development Activities (FSIDA), University of Alberta, for which I am extremely grateful.

Notes

1. Please, note that this is the most recent study regarding school-based instructional supervision in Kenya.
2. The study will provides headteachers with another source of information regarding internal instructional supervision in addition to that provided by the Directorate of Quality Assurance and standards. This information may be used by secondary teachers in assessing how instructional resources could be used appropriately and developed for effective teaching.
3. Findings of this study gives a clear picture of the current status of internal instructional supervision practices and procedures in secondary schools. This information should enable school administrators to create new instructional conditions under which headteachers and teachers can work more effectively.
4. At the Ministry of Education level, educational leaders may refer to the findings emerging from this study as an educational rationale for developing and adopting guidelines, standards, and regulations concerning effective internal instructional supervision in secondary schools.
5. The findings can also be used by the Ministry of education to improve headteachers' performance in internal instructional supervision by identifying the areas needing improvement. This improvement may be conducted through training and professional development programs.

References

- Alvy HB and Robbins P (1998) *If I Only Knew: Success Strategies For Navigating the Principalship*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Beach DB and Reinhartz J (2000) *Supervisory Leadership: Focus on Instruction*. Toronto, ON: Allyn and Bacon.

- Blasé J and Blasé J (1999a) Effective instructional leadership through the teachers' eyes. *The High School Magazine* 7(1): 16–20.
- Blasé J and Blasé J (1999b) Principal's instructional leadership and teacher development: teachers perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 35(3): 349–378.
- Chabala HH (1994) Inspection services for teacher education: critical issues. In UNESCO (ed.) *Initial and Continuing Education of Teachers: Kenya*. Geneva: Author, 132–136.
- Chapman DW and Burchfield SA (1994) How headteachers perceive their role: a case study in Botswana. *International Review of Education* 40(6): 401–419.
- Chell J (1995) *Introducing Principals to the Role of Instructional Leadership: SSTA Research in Brief*. Regina, SK: Saskatchewan School Trustee Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 391 222.)
- Cross CT and Rice RC (2000) The role of the principal as instructional leader in a standard-driven system. *NASP Bulletin* 84(620): 61–65.
- Curtis GG, Sr (2002) A case study of the issues high school principals encounter with instructional supervision. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.
- Dareh JC and Playko MA (1995) *Supervision as a Proactive Process, Concept, and Cases*, 2nd edn. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Deborah KI (2002) The changing shape of leadership. *Educational Leadership* 59(8): 61–63.
- DiPaola M and Tschannen-Moran M (2003) The principalship as crossroads: a study of the conditions and concerns of principals. *NASSP Bulletin* 87(634): 43–65.
- Drake TL and Roe WH (1999) *The Principalship*, 5th edn. Columbus, OH: Prentice-Hall.
- Drake TL and Roe W (2003) *Principalship*, 6th edn. Columbus, OH: Merrill, Prentice-Hall.
- Elmore RF (2000) *Building a New Structure for School Leadership*. Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute.
- Eraut M (1995) Developing professional knowledge within a client-centered orientation. In: Guskey TR and Huberman M (eds) *Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practice*. London: Teachers College Press, 27–252.
- Gall MD, Gall JP and Borg WR (2003) *Educational Research: An Introduction*, 7th edn. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Garubo RC and Rothstein SW (1993) *Supportive Supervision in Schools*. London: Greenwood Press.
- Garubo RC and Rothstein SW (1998) *Supportive Supervision in Schools*. London: Greenwood.
- Glanz J (1997) The Tao of supervision: Taoist insights into the theory and practice of educational supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 12(3):193–211.
- Gleave D (1997) Bifocals for teacher development and appraisal. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 12(3): 269–281.
- Glickman CD, Gordon SP and Ross-Gordon JM (1998) *Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach*, 4th edn. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Glickman CD, Gordon SP and Ross-Gordon JM (2001) *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach*, 5th edn. Toronto, ON: Allyn and Bacon.
- Glickman CD, Gordon SP and Ross-Gordon JM (2009) *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach*, 5th edn. Toronto, ON: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hoerr TR (1996) A new way to define instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77(5): 380–381.
- Iwaniski EF and Rindone DA (1995) Integrating professional development, teacher evaluation, and student learning: The evaluation of teacher evaluation policy in Connecticut. In: Duke DL (ed.) *Teacher Evaluation Policy: From Accountability to Professional Development*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. 65–980.

- James SP, Halverson R and Diamond JB (2000) *Toward a Theory of Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective*. Evanston, IL: Institute For Policy Research.
- Kleine-Kracht P (1993) Indirect instructional leadership: an administrator's choice. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 29(2): 187–212.
- Kosmoski GJ (1997) *Supervision*. Mequon, WI: Stylex.
- Kosmoski GJ (2000) *Supervision*, 2nd edn. Mequon, WI: Stylex.
- Kutsyuruba B (2003) Instructional supervision: perceptions of Canadian and Ukrainian beginning teachers. Unpublished MEd thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK.
- Larry L (1995) Can instructional leaders be facilitative leaders? ERIC Digest Number 98. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearing House on Educational Management.
- Lodiaga J (1995) Continuing education for teacher supporters and facilitators. In: Republic of Kenya (ed.) *Reporting the Proceedings of the Third Teacher Education Conference*. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation, 116–27.
- Lunenburg FC (1995) *The Principalship: Concepts and Applications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Marsh DD (1997) Educational leadership for the 21st century: integrating three emerging perspectives. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, 24–28.
- Marzcely B (2001) *Supervision in Education: A Differentiated Approach with Legal Perspectives*. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen.
- Meyer MJ and Macmillan RB (2001) The principal's role in transition: instructional leadership ain't what it used to be. *International Electronic Journal For Leadership in Learning* 5(13): 1–4. Available at: <http://www.ucalgary.ca> (accessed 29 January 2003).
- Ministry of Education (1994) *Education in Kenya: Information Handbook*. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.
- Mo KW, Connors RD and McCormick J (1998) Teacher appraisal in Hong Kong a self-managing secondary schools: factors for effective practices. *Personnel Evaluation in Education* 12(1): 19–42.
- Murangi VK (1995) Instructional supervision in Namibia: a study of high school teacher and supervisor perceptions. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Columbia University, Columbia, OH.
- National Board of Employment, Education, and Training (1994) *Workplace Learning in Professional Development of Teachers: Commonwealth Report No. 24*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Nolan J, Jr and Hoover LA (2004) *Teacher Supervision and Evaluation: Theory Into Practice*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Neuman M and Simmons W (2000) Leadership for student learning. *Phi Delta Kappan* 82(1): 9–12.
- New South Wales Department of School Education (1995) *Performance Appraisal Scheme For Teachers and Executive Staff Other Than Principals*. Sydney: New South Wales Department of School Education.
- Oliva PF and Pawlas GE (1997) *Supervision For Today's Schools*, 5th edn. New York: Longman.
- Oliva PF and Pawlas GE (2001) *Supervision For Today's Schools*, 6th edn. Hoboken, NY: Wiley.
- Oliva PF and Pawlas GE (2004) *Supervision For Today's Schools*, 7th edn. Hoboken, NY: Wiley.
- Ovando MN and Harris BM (1993) Teacher perceptions of the post-observation conference: implications for formative evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 7: 301–310.
- Reitzug UC (1997) Images of principal instructional leadership: from super-vision to collaborative inquiry. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 12(4): 324–343.
- Republic of Kenya (1980) *The Education Act Chapter 211*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya (1998) *Master Plan on Education and Training 1997–2010*. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.

- Republic of Kenya (1999) *Totally Integrated Quality Education and Training (TIQET): Report of the Commission of Inquiry Into the Education System of Kenya* Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (1998) *Responsibilities and Duties in Schools/Educational Institutions: For Chief Principals, Senior Principals, Headteachers, Deputies, Senior Teachers, and Class Teachers*, rev. edn. Nairobi: Republic of Kenya Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology.
- Republic of Kenya Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (1999) *Handbook For inspection of Educational Institutions*. Nairobi: Republic of Kenya Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology.
- Republic of Kenya Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (2003) *Report on the Status of Teachers in Kenya: A National Case Study Coordinated by Kenya Education Staff Institute*. Nairobi: Republic of Kenya Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology.
- Robbins P and Alvy HB (2003) *The Principal's Companion: Strategies and Hints to Make the Job Easier*, 2nd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Scott DT (2001) Instructional supervision: the policy-practice rift. *Journal of Educational Thought* 35(1): 83–108.
- Sergiovanni TJ (2001) *The Principalship: A Redefinition*, 7th edn. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sergiovanni TJ and Starratt RJ (1998) *Supervision: A Redefinition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sergiovanni TJ and Starratt RJ (2002) *Supervision: A Redefinition*, 7th edn. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Southworth G (1999) Small successes: what lessons can be learned from successful heads of small primary? *Managing Schools Today* 9(2): 59–61.
- Southworth G (2002) Instructional leadership in schools: reflections and empirical evidence. *School Leadership and Management* 22(1): 73–91.
- Speck M (1999) *The Principalship: Building a Learning Community*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Sullivan S and Glanz J (2000) *Supervision that Improves Teaching: Strategies and Techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Sullivan K and McCabe D (1988) The missing factor for effective instructional leadership. *Texas Study of Secondary Education Research Journal*: 42: 20–24.
- Terry PM (1996) The principal and instructional leadership. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Professors in Educational Administration, Corpus Christ, TX.
- Tsui AB (1995) Exploring collaborative supervision in in-service teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 10(4): 346–371.
- UNESCO (1996) *Learning: The Treasure Within. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission of Education For the Twenty-First Century*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Waite D (1995) *Rethinking Instructional Supervision: Notes on Its Language and Culture*. London: Falmer.
- Wanzare ZO (2002) Rethinking teacher evaluation in the third world: the case of Kenya. *Educational Management & Administration* 30(2): 213–229.
- Wanzare Z and da Costa JL (2000) Supervision and staff development: overview of literature. *NASSP Bulletin* 84(618): 47–54.
- Wanzare Z and da Costa J (2001) Rethinking instructional leadership roles of the school principal: challenges and prospects. *Journal of Educational Thought* 35(3): 269–295.
- Wiedmer TL (1995) Instructional improvement: goal of clinical supervision. *Teacher Educator* 3(3): 6–18.
- Wiles J and Bondi J (2004) *Supervision: A Guide to Practice*, 6th edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, Prentice Hall.
- Yerkes DM and Guaglianone CL (1998) Where have all the high school administrators gone? *Thrust For Educational Leadership* 28(2): 10–14.

- Zepeda SJ (2003) *The Principal as Instructional Leader: A Handbook For Supervisors*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Zepeda SJ and Ponticell JA (1998) At cross-purposes: what do teachers need, want, and get from supervision? *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 14(1): 68–87.
- Zheng HY (1996) School context principal characteristics and instructional leadership effectiveness: a statistical analysis. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Biographical Note

Zachariah Wanzare is a senior lecturer and Chair, Department of Educational Management and Foundations, Maseno University, Kenya. His field of interest is Educational Administration and Leadership with special interest in the principal professional development and instructional leadership.