

INFLUENCE OF TYPE OF INTERNAL INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION ON TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS IN ENGLISH IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF KAKAMEGA COUNTY, KENYA

¹Adrum Grace Anyango, ²Prof Indoshi Francis, ³Dr Okwach Tonny O.

^{1, 2, 3}Department of Educational Communication, Technology and Curriculum Studies, Maseno University.

Email: graadra@gmail.com, +25472224917, +254720804832.

Abstract: Instructional supervision is key to effective teaching. Whereas emphasis has been put on external instructional supervision, less attention has been given to Internal Instructional Supervision (IIS), probably because its influence on teaching effectiveness is yet to be established. Kakamega County is the second largest County in terms of population yet achievement in English is low at a mean score of 5.26 in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Examination (2007-2012). The County's Panel of Standards Assessment report, 2010 and 2011 pegged this to weak IIS structures. The purpose of this study was to establish influence of type of IIS on teaching effectiveness. A conceptual framework constituting of type of internal instructional supervision as the independent variables and teaching effectiveness as the dependent variable was used. The study used *ex-post facto*, correlation and descriptive survey designs. Population was 13 Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QUASO), 247 principals, 247 HODs and 494 teachers. It sampled 13 QUASO, 74 principals, 74 HODs and 215 teachers through purposive sampling. Questionnaires, interview schedules and document analysis guide were used. To establish validity, the instruments were given to experts in language pedagogy. A pilot study was conducted using 10% of the population; this gave rise to 24 principals, 24 HODs and 50 teachers to establish reliability. Quantitative data was analysed using frequencies, percentages and Pearson's correlation coefficient and regression. Qualitative data was transcribed, categorized and reported in themes relevant to the study. Findings revealed that 23% of teaching effectiveness could be predicted by types of internal instructional supervision. The study recommends that collaborative supervision be adopted followed by directive informational type. Findings of this study inform school personnel and educational stakeholders to maximise on classroom observation and adopt collaborative and directive informational types of IIS for teaching effectiveness.

Keywords: Internal instructional supervision, influence and teaching effectiveness.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the challenges facing education systems in most countries world over is how to uphold quality of public education amidst the increasing national and fiscal constraints. In 2009, Polish's Ministry of Education (MoE) requested the World Bank's assistance in exploring ways to improve teaching quality and education outcomes through improved systems of supervision and support to schools (Nakpodia, 2006). According to international literature many teachers may not have mastered sufficient skills for effective teaching, hence there is need for instructional supervision (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000). Through this supervision, Eneastor (2001) propounds that, they acquire new teaching skills, classroom management skills and positive attitude towards instruction.

In Africa just as in the international perspective, quality in education is equally prioritized. Nakpodia (2006) emphasized that particular attention should be given to the issues concerning education quality and improvement strategy in the developing world. He further mentioned that there is substantial evidence of decline in education quality in many developing countries even at a time when donor assistance has been directed towards education improvement. Basing on this state of affairs, it is thus possible that various educational aspects that promote quality are at stake, of particular interest to this study is internal instructional supervision.

Findings of many studies conducted in Africa including studies by, Alimi and Akinflorin, (2012), Kipkurui (2012) Odu and Udu (2016), Orenaiya *et al* (2014) Thembinkosi (2013) have supported the fact that effective supervision results to achieving the stated goals of education. Thus, when matters that pertain to IIS are put under perspective then this declining quality in education in Africa can be remedied.

Since 1963, the government of Kenya has made significant strides in providing quality education to its citizens. None the less, The MOE report on the Sector Review and Development (2003) pointed out the problem of quality of teaching and learning in various secondary schools. This was attributed to teacher inadequacy, ineffectiveness and motivation. The report then recommended that supervision of instruction should be used to offer instructional improvement within the education system. In Kakamega County, the performance of English is wanting. The average mean score in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) for the years 2007-2012 was 5.26 an equivalent of C-. The secondary schools' inspection reports of 2010 and 2011 by the County Standards Assessment Panel of secondary schools in the County revealed that the overall performance of subjects is low as quality grades are missing. The weakness that this team pointed out, directly touched on issues concerning internal instructional supervision and monitoring of the curriculum implementation in most schools. Such aspects included poor syllabus coverage; inadequate internal supervision and monitoring of the curriculum implementation in most schools; most of the heads of department assessed in these schools were not effective in curriculum supervision in their departments and there were also cases of teacher absenteeism reported.

Thus quality in education cannot be upheld without focus on teachers. Odo and Udu (2016) underscore the importance of teachers by opining that teachers occupy (and of course will always occupy) a prominent position in the teaching and learning process. They are as a matter of fact, the bedrock upon which this process rests. This has the implication that when teachers are sharpened in terms of enhancing their effectiveness then out rightly the goals of education are upheld.

There are numerous ways of sharpening teachers in terms of their productivity and effectiveness. This study contends that supervision surfaces as an important tool to be used to equip teachers. Supervision is not merely about the act of teachers instructing or teaching students but also the action that enables teachers to improve instruction for students (Glickman *et al*, 2004 & Wanzare, 2011). It is the process through which principals, their deputies and HODS attempt to work with teachers collaboratively to improve teaching and learning in the school (Wanzare, 2011). This implies that through IIS students' achievement is enhanced. When the teachers' delivery of instruction is put under scrutiny, their attention towards students' academic welfare is heightened. This is reiterated when Sergiovanni and Starrat (2006) reinstate that when a school's instructional capacity improves teaching improves, leading to improvement in students' performance.

Improved instruction implies that teaching is effective since teachers will attain better results. Osaе (2012) observes that supervision aims at facilitating learning through planning and devising ways of improving teachers professionally and releasing their creative abilities and talents so that they willingly improve the learning situation. Ryan (2004) adds that supervision is an enquiry into practice. Practice here implies the act of teaching. Osaе (2012) further qualifies that this ought to be a compassionate appreciative enquiry.

There is therefore need to improve upon the quality of teaching in secondary schools through effective internal supervision of teachers. One of the major causes of the poor academic performance can be ineffective (internal) instructional supervision (Alimi & Akinfolarin, 2012). As a result of this IIS must be made a priority. Thembinkosi (2013) contends that it is generally believed that if teachers are left on their own they may not try to develop their teaching skills. The main objective of supervisory practice in schools is to improve instruction, which is, teaching and learning. According to Pearson, (2009), when supervising in the educational realm, supervisors should seek to help those being supervised realize their possibilities and usefulness.

This is opposed to the traditional perspective, in which such persons were autocratic in nature, rigid, fault finders, police officer- like, poor listeners and persons who did not include the element of professional guidance of teachers (Grauwe, 2004 & Kipkurui, 2012) hence the term inspector. Consequently, teachers tended to shy away from interacting freely with the inspector for fear of fault finding and victimization (Wanzare, 2006).

There are different types of supervision. Glickman (1990) points out four supervisory approaches within the clinical supervision. Their difference, he adds, is in the power and control accorded to the teacher. First, is the non-directive supervision. This occurs when the teacher formulates his or her own plan about future development. The teacher has the liberty of framing the supervisory interaction, and the supervisor is available to give advice.

Second, there is collaborative supervision. In this approach, the supervisor and the teacher share decision making about future improvement. Ebmeier (2003) adds on to Glickman's argument that collaborative supervision enhances peer shaping. The supervision process should be collaborative; the researcher sought to find out the extent to which this collaboration is enforced in internal instructional supervision of English subject in secondary schools of Kakamega County. For instance, whether or not principals, HODs collaborated with TOE in order to boost teaching effectiveness in the subject. Then it went ahead to establish the influence of type of IIS on teaching effectiveness.

Third, Glickman (2006), mentioned directive- informational approach. This occurs when the supervisor frames the supervisory plan and expects the teacher to follow the plan. Lastly, the directive control approach in which the supervisor frames the supervisory plan and the teacher decides whether to follow it or not.

This study adopted the non –directive, collaborative and directive- informational approach. This was mainly based on the three clear perspectives that in the first instant, the teacher is in charge, in the second, both teacher and supervisor share ideas and finally in the last approach, the supervisor is in charge. This study sought to find out which of these three approaches was used, the extent to which it was used, which of the three approaches was preferred, the reason why the respondents preferred it over the rest and finally the influence of each type upon teaching effectiveness.

Numerous studies have found that teachers prefer collaborative type of supervision to other types of supervision (Acheson & Gail, 2003, Ebmeir, 2003 Glatthorn, 2007, Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2001). On the contrary few studies have indicated teachers' preference of directive informational type of supervision (Kipkurui, 2012) nor the non- directive type of supervision. There is therefore, need to establish which of these types of supervision significantly relates to teaching effectiveness so that the choice among them can be based on scientifically proven data and not merely on preference or guess *workper se*.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. Establish the type of internal instructional supervision used in English in Kakamega County of Kenya.
2. Determine teaching effectiveness in English in Kakamega County of Kenya.
3. Establish influence of type of internal instruction used on teaching effectiveness in English in Kakamega County.

3. METHODOLOGY

Design

The study used *ex- post- facto*, correlation and descriptive survey.

Population

Population was 13 Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QUASO), 247 principals, 247 HODs and 494 teachers.

Sample and Sampling

It sampled 13 QUASO, 74 principals, 74 HODs and 215 teachers purposively.

Data Collection

Data for this study was collected by use of questionnaires, interview schedules and document analysis

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Type of internal instructional supervision

The results of this response is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: TOEs response on Type of IIS used

Statements on	N	Type	VLE		LE		NS		SE		VSE		MEAN
			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
You request to be observed	215	ND	37	17	54	25	22	10	49	23	53	25	3.13
You come up with areas to be observed	215	ND	26	12	47	22	32	15	55	26	55	26	3.31
You inform the supervisor what you would want the observation to be like	215	ND	14	7	55	25	37	17	47	22	62	29	3.41
You solely inform the supervisor what the observation process was like	215	ND	22	10	60	28	20	9	71	33	42	20	3.24
You state to your supervisor the way forward for future observations	215	ND	49	23	47	22	23	11	42	20	54	25	3.02
Average mean score for non-directive												3.22	
Both you and your supervisor agree on when you should be observed	215	C	60	28	62	29	26	12	41	19	26	12	3.41
You both come up with the specific areas to be observed	215	C	47	22	51	24	20	9	53	25	44	20	3.02
Both of you give your suggestions on how the process should be like	215	C	39	18	59	28	34	16	41	19	42	20	3.06
Both of you give your views on how the classroom teaching was done	215	C	69	32	82	38	19	9	22	10	23	11	3.71
Both agree on the way forward for better teaching	215	C	74	35	70	33	19	9	16	7	36	17	3.61
Average mean for collaborative												3.36	
You are informed when the observation will be done	215	DI	55	25	73	34	24	12	16	7	47	22	2.66
You are informed of the areas to be observed	215	DI	31	14	50	23	24	12	41	19	69	32	3.31

Your supervisor informs you how the observation process will be like	215	DI 36 17 70 33 37 17 25 12 47 22	2.89
Your supervisor informs you on what you needed to do	215	DI 64 30 61 28 30 14 16 7 44 21	2.61
Your supervisor informs you what you should do to improve your teaching for the next observation	215	DI 96 45 51 24 22 10 16 7 30 14	2.22
Average mean score for directive informational			2.74
Overall mean			3.11

Table 1 shows TOE's response on the type of supervision used during internal instructional supervision in schools. Results show that the mean scores for all the aspects of type of supervision used during classroom observation ranged between 2.22- 3.71. The overall mean of non- directive type was 3.22, the mean score of the collaboration type was the highest at 3.36 while the directive informational mean trailed at 2.74. The overall mean for all the forms of type of supervision was 3.11. This results implied that collaborative type of supervision was widely used, it was followed by the non- directive whereas directive- informational approach was the least common.

These results also reveal that most of the attributes of type of supervision outlined had fair extent of usage except two attributes of collaboration: both of you give your views on how observation was and both of you give your views on way forward for future observation which had a great extent. On the contrary, one attribute of the directive- informational approach: your supervisor informs you what you should do to improve your teaching for the next observation had little extent. This result is confirmed by 63 (85.1%) principals and 68(91.8%) HODs who pointed out that they used collaborative approach during their observation.

The interview schedules with both principals and QUASOS brought to the fore that collaborative type of IIS was the most preferred as it yielded better results. There were some principals who however, felt that TOEs were sufficient in themselves and would be allowed to formulate their own plan for observation. On the contrary, other principals strongly felt that left on their own some TOEs would not achieve much. The reason they gave for this opinion was that some TOEs lacked self-drive and had wrong attitude towards IIS and therefore being the ones charged with ensuring quality of education in their stations was enhanced, they drew out this plan for TOEs who in turn had no choice but to comply.

These results confirm assertions in many studies that the most preferred methodology of IIS is collaborative (Ebmeier, 2003; Ekundayo, 2013, Glickman, 1990 and Wanzare, 2006). Thus, many respondents seem very comfortable with the collaborative type of approach. On the other hand, other studies have also portrayed directive informational as preferable (Thobega, 2003) while others have preferred Non- directive. This implies that many schools are inclined towards working together for the common good of all parties, which in this case is to achieve the objectives of IIS which is effective teaching and learning.

Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness refers to individual teachers' 2013 KCSE examination mean scores. Any mean score below 4.99 implied low teaching effectiveness, those between 5.00- 6.99 was fair teaching effectiveness, those between 7.00- 8.99 implied good teaching effectiveness while all those above 9.00 reflected excellent teaching effectiveness. This is presented in Table 2

Table 2: Teaching Effectiveness

Mean Score Range	<i>f</i>	Percentage
2.5- 4.99	89	39.72
5.00- 5.99	45	21.02
6.00- 6.99	29	13.55
7.00-7.99	20	9.35
8.00-8.99	24	11.22
9.00-9.99	11	5.14
10.00.10.99	-	-
11.00-12.00	-	-
TOTAL	214	100

Table 6 shows teaching effectiveness. Results show that 89 (39.72 %) of teachers have low teaching effectiveness, 74(39.57%) of them have fair teaching effectiveness, 44(20.57%) others have good teaching effectiveness and only 11 (5.14 %) of them have excellent teaching effectiveness. The average mean score for all the schools in the study was 5.75 which translates to a C grade. This implies that teaching effectiveness is below average since the schools have not attained the minimum requirement entry for university which is a C+. This is of great concern since English is a compulsory subject and the mean grade that a student acquires in this subject can either qualify them or disqualify them from admission to university. There is therefore something amiss in the subject which could be as a result of weak IIS structures, particularly with reference on the type of IIS used.

Influence of type of supervision on teaching effectiveness

Table 3 shows this influence.

Table 3: The Regression Model of predicting Teaching Effectiveness in English using various Types of supervision

Aspect of Types of IIS used	<i>B</i>	SEB	<i>βp</i>	Value
1.049 -284000				
You request to be observed	-0.26	.051	-.037	.607
You come up with areas to be observed	-.162	.057	-.201	.005
You inform supvr. how observation should be like	-.028	.024	-.080	.251
You inform supvr. how observation was like	-.015	.062	-.018	.811
You state the way forward for future Observation	.056	.057	.077	.327
Both come up with when to be observed	.008	.065	.010	.902
Both give areas to be observed	.018	.058	.024	.759
Both give suggestions how to be observed	-.018	.061	-.023	.764
Both give views how observation was like	.143	.063	.185	.025
Both give views on way forward	.144	.062	.196	.022
Supervisor informs when observation will be	.049	.053	.069	.372

Supervisor informs of areas to be observed	.065	.060	.086	.280
Supervisor informs how observation will be	.074	.068	.095	.282
Supervisor informs what was to be done	.012	.056	.016	.832
Supervisor informs of way forward	.059	.064	.080	.358

Note: $R^2 = .226$: significant variable in bold

Results of table 3 indicate that in the model, types of supervision accounted for 23% of the variance teaching effectiveness. Moreover, looking at the standardized β , it is observable that five aspect of the attributes of types of supervision have negative weak relationships with teaching effectiveness. All the rest have weak but positive significant relationships with teaching effectiveness. There are weak but significant positive relationships for ten of the predictors. This finding implies that all aspects of directive informational type of supervision and four aspects of collaborative type of supervision are contributing most in predicting teaching effectiveness in English. Furthermore, only two aspects of collaborative supervision type: both of you give your views on how observation was and both of you give your views on way forward for future observation show a significant positive relationship with teaching effectiveness ($\beta = .185, p = .025$) and ($\beta = .196, p = .022$) respectively. This means that collective observations on how the classroom teaching was and collective views on how future classroom observations should lead to teaching effectiveness. This implies that internal instructional stake holders should invest greatly in thoroughly observing teachers teaching and capture details of the classroom proceedings so that these will act as a basis for the post feedback report and then they should use this report as a spring board for subsequent classroom observations.

5. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

As pertained the influence of type of IIS used on teaching effectiveness it is evident that a number of things can be concluded. First, collaborative type of supervision is the most preferred. This is because it is a means of team work; is all inclusive; less intimidating; not punitive and allows creativity among other reasons. It was equally the most significant in as far as teaching effectiveness is concerned. Thus it should be adopted by all schools. Secondly, the non- directive type was preferred after the collaborative type because it gives monopoly to the teachers of English and allows them to be creative in as far as dealing with their own students is concerned. On the contrary, in terms of effectiveness it is the least effective as all its various variables had a negative relationship with teaching effectiveness except only one: you state the way forward for future observations. Therefore it should only be used after the other two types have been used. Lastly, this study concludes that the directive informational type which was rated least in terms of respondents preference and usage because of the fact that it is intimidating is second after the collaborative type in terms of teaching effectiveness and should therefore be considered second and be adopted by schools.

This study recommends that

- a) All internal instructional supervisors in secondary schools should fully embrace collaborative type of supervision during classroom observation of teachers. This is because it is the most preferred by teachers, principals and HODs and it is significant to teaching effectiveness.
- b) Internal instructional supervisors need to prioritize directive informational type of supervision after collaborative and before the non- directive type since it is more significant than the later.

REFERENCES

- [1] Acheson, K. & Gall, M. (2003). Clinical supervision and teacher Development pre service and in-service application (5th Ed.). New York: John Wiley & son Inc.
- [2] Akinwumiju, J. A., & Ajabi, C.O. (2008). *Foundations of School Management*. Port Harcourt: university of Port Harcourt Press.

- [3] Alimi, P., Olatunji, S & Akinfolarin, C. A. (2012). *Impacts of selected modes of Instructional supervision activities on student academic performance in senior Secondary schools in Orido state, Nigeria*. Department of Education
- [4] Ebmeier, H. (2003). *How Supervision Influences Teacher Efficacy and Commitment: An Investigation of the Path Model*. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 18(1)110-141. Economic Survey, (2003). *Quality in Education*. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- [5] Ekundayo, H.T., Oyerinde, D.O., and Kolawole, A. O. (2013). *Effective Supervision of Instruction in Nigerian Secondary Schools: Issues, Challenges and the Way Forward*. Retrieved June 12, 2015 at 2.00 pm; from www.iiste.org Journal Of Education and Practice ISSN 2222.1735(paper) ISSN 222-288X (on line).
- [6] Glatthorn, A. A. (2007). *Co-Operative Professional Development Peer Centered Options for Teacher Growth*. New York: Educational Leadership.
- [7] Glickman, C.D. (1990). *Supervision of Instruction: a developmental approach*. (2nd Ed.). Boston, M.A: Allyn & Bacon.
- [8] Glickman, C. D., Gordon, P.S. and Ross, G. M. J. (2004). *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach* (6th Ed.). New York: Pearson Education Inc.
- [9] Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross- Gordon, J. M. (2001). *Supervision and instructional leadership*. Needham Height, M. A: Allyn and Bacon.
- [10] Grauwe, A. (2004). *Reforming School Supervision and Support for quality improvement*. Paris: UNESCO.
- [11] Kipkurui, A.L. (2012). Role Performance of Quality assurance and Standards officers In Instructional Supervision, Bureti district, Kenya. An Unpublished Master Thesis
- [12] Odo, M.E & Udu, G. O. C. (2016). BEST: International Journal of Management, Information, Technology and Engineering (BEST: LIMITED). Vol.4 Issue7 Pp. 55-56.
- [13] Olorunfemi, D. O. (2008). Challenges of instructional supervision in the new millennium: Implication for effective planning. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies* 3(2):68-80
- [14] Osa, J.A. (2012). *The Effect of Supervision and Staff Performance in GA South Municipal Education Directorate*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology.
- [15] Ryan, S. (2004). *Vital Practice*. Portland, U. K: Sea Change Publication.
- [16] Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starrat, R.J. (2006). *SuperVision: a redefinition*. NY: McGrawHill.
- [17] Thobega, G, M. (2003). Journal of Agricultural Education Vol44, No. 4: 2003
- [18] Wanzare, Z.O. (2011). Journal of Educational Management Administration and Leadership. 40(2) 188-216.