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**Abstract**

*The purpose of this study was to establish the Perceptions of Principals, Heads of Departments and Teachers Regarding Effectiveness of Principals’ Instructional supervisory role with regard to classroom instruction. The study was carried out in public secondary schools in Nairobi and Kajiado counties in Kenya. The study used a sample size of 478 respondents. Qualitative data was analyzed thematically, while Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and presented in frequencies and percentages. Null hypothesis was analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis H test statistics. Based on the findings, the study recommends the need for TSC to introduce a policy on instructional supervision so that the principals who are selected to head schools can gain skills and knowledge to enable them effectively perform their tasks and responsibilities related to instructional supervision.*
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#  Introduction

# Schools have been addressed to be active, appropriate and vital places where formal education can be accessed and sustained. In order to achieve high standards of education in a country, the utmost aim of schools therefore should be to improve the quality of teaching and learning (Usman, 2015). Fullan, Rincon-Gallardo and Hargreaves (2015) suggest that this can only be attained through an effective instructional supervision which should improve teacher performance. The principal’s role as an instructional supervisor cannot therefore be underestimated. Instruction supervision has experienced evolution over the years (Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon, 2014). In the 19th century, supervisors would set strict requirements for the teachers and visit them while in classrooms to ensure that they complied with the set instructions and failure to follow those instructions would lead to dismissal (Glanz, 2018). In some western countries, for example the United Kingdom (UK) and United States of America (USA), and some African countries such as Tanzania, Nigeria, Lesotho and Senegal, the terms “inspection’’ or “inspector” are used (Lee, Dig and Song, 2008; Stoelinga, 2011; Ololube and Major, 2014).

 In Kenya, supervision in schools began in 1911 (Ngelu, 2004) with the position offered to the first directorate of education. The duties of the directorate included inspection organization and supervision of protectorate schools. Later, through the Education Ordinance of 1924, inspection of schools through inspectors was introduced. The school inspectors were in-charge of making sure that quality education was offered in Kenyan schools. Reports based on research (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, 2000a; Republic of Kenya 2003a, 2004a, 2006; Wasanga, 2004) revealed that with time the school inspectors became unethical and their main aim was to find faults. The reports further identified ineffective instructional supervision as the main reason why there was low quality education in Kenya (Wanzare, 2013). Later the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (DQAS) acknowledged the significance of Quality Assurance Standards Officers (QASOs) to perform the role of supervision in order to improve the quality of education in general, but explicitly to improve teachers’ performance in classroom instruction. This acknowledgment has been actualized through monitoring, school visits, instructional guidance and making sure that quality is provided in public secondary schools (Omondi, 2019).

 MoE introduced instructional supervision in schools through a legal notice (MoE Circular No. 2009 QSA/2/1A/VIL.11/86) that recommended school principals to perform the role of instructional supervision and to strengthen the work performed by QASOs. The aim was to create a positive impact on teacher motivation, satisfaction, self-esteem and a feeling of support. The teacher must be the cause of all the efforts to enhance high standards in classroom instruction (Isa and Jailani, 2014). The quality of schools in a nation therefore depends on the high standards of training given to teachers. Students learn what is directly related to how and what teachers teach which highly depends on the skills and the knowledge they have gained through continuous learning and practice (Fullan et al., 2015). Goldhammer (2008) observes that the supervisory process provides teachers with ego support and it is a way of solving classroom problems in order to help them grow and develop as professionals.

 However, a report written after field assessment and visits exposed cases of laxity among teachers in public secondary schools; un updated, unstructured and untimed teaching notes, incomprehensive schemes of work and un updated records concerning learners progress (Republic of Kenya, 2009a). Mobegi, Ondigi and Oburu (2010) explain that head teachers’ instructional supervisory methods were mainly limited to observing professional records belonging to teachers and gave minimal attention to class visits and self-appraisal. This is a reflection of internal supervision failure to impact on teachers’ performance on best practices in teaching.

## Statement of the Problem

Findings from studies done by scholars, research by MoE and study locations covered in the background to the study, have cited inadequate and poor instructional supervisory practices and insufficient funds for training teachers in public secondary schools. School teachers expressed their dissatisfaction with the way principals play their role in instructional supervision. They mainly complained about lack of adequate supervision and proper supervisory skills required of the principals. With the interventions put in place by the ministry of education, this study found it reasonable and indeed necessary to establish why questions remain concerning the effectiveness of principals’ instructional supervision in improving teacher performance in classroom instruction in public secondary schools.

## Research Objective

Establish the effectiveness of principal’s instructional supervision regarding classroom instruction as perceived by principals, HoDs and teachers in public secondary schools.

## Research Hypothesis

There is no significant difference between principals, HoDs and teachers regarding their perceptions on principals’ effective instructional supervision in improving teachers’ classroom instruction.

##  Literature Review

The study was guided by a developmental supervision model by Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2015). Every country aims to achieve quality education. In order to realize this goal, instructional supervisors should possess knowledge, skills and experience that they can utilize to provide support and guidance for continuous staff development. This statement reflects the goals of the developmental supervision model by Glickman and his colleagues. The scholars note that successful supervision is what can harmonize individual teacher’s goals with those of the school. It means that when supervision is implemented successfully, it goes without being seen, but when there are inadequacies in the supervision process, errors of transferring skills and competencies will be compounded over time and therefore become magnified disproportionately.

 The model adds that the supervisors in a school set up should also have knowledge of the culture and work environment of the school. For example, how teachers conduct teaching on a daily basis, about the available resources, the induction for newly employed teachers and how adults and teachers develop. The supervisors should then apply the relevant strategies to enhance teachers’ professional development. Alkrdem (2013) also concurs with the model and holds that instructional supervisors should have prior knowledge concerning the school and students. Ousman and Mukuna (2013) add that the principal must have a clear focus on the mission of the school and expectations for the staff and the students.

 Developmental supervision model takes interpersonal behaviour into account, which is a significant skill in supervision. The model matches approaches used in supervision with that of the development level and characteristics of an individual teacher. According to Glickman et al. (2015), the model asserts that developmental stages and characteristics of individual teachers are different, and therefore supervisors should strive to choose approaches that best suit the teachers accordingly. It goes further to identify the following primary approaches associated with developmental supervision: directive and non-directive approach.

 These approaches may be effective in whatever supervisory roles and strategies a principal puts in place to improve instructional supervision (Pfeifer, 2011). Non-directive supervision involves listening, clarifying, encouraging and reflecting while directive supervision includes problem solving, directing, negotiating, standardizing and reinforcing. The supervisors must acquire this knowledge and be aware how their interpersonal behaviours influence teachers and then adopt the behaviours that can promote positive relationships with an aim to perform effectively in instructional supervision (Glickman et al., 2015).

 Baffuor-Awuah (2011) also contends that interpersonal skills are mandatory for they promote respect and trust between the supervisor and the supervisee. According to him, the knowledge on interpersonal skills will enable the supervisee to feel secure and in turn cooperate during the observation process. Wanzare (2013) adds that interpersonal skills will help the head teachers to develop good public relations with teachers, which may lead to a cohesive working team.

 The model also advocates for technical skills that involve observing, planning, assessing and evaluating. Ousman and Mukuna (2013) concur and emphasize that principals need technical skills in order to empower teachers to be significant, competent and committed. The model holds that planning and assessing enables the instructional supervisor to account for the present conditions, analyze the results and select resources and activities accordingly. The instructional supervisor through classroom observation should therefore be able to describe a classroom scene and then interpret the meaning of what he/she has observed (Glickman et al., 2015).

 Osman and Mukuna (2013) also highlighted that the main purpose of observation in the classroom is to find out how classroom activities can be described vividly and accurately. The model also points out that, in order to decide on the level at which teachers perform, instructional supervisors have to facilitate evaluation as one of the components of technical skills.

Armed with knowledge about teachers and the school, interpersonal skills and technical skills, the instructional supervisor can then function skillfully and knowingly in the following strategies as listed down by Glickman et al. (2015) in their model: direct assistance; group development; curriculum development and action research. According to the developmental supervision model, direct assistance provides results or feedback to teachers while group development on the other hand involves solving problems through meetings and discussions among teachers themselves. In order to improve teachers professionally, there should be learning opportunities offered to teachers by the instructional supervisor.

 In Kenya, the principal plays the most significant role in instructional supervision. The principal therefore requires proper training on prerequisite skills as described in this model in order to be able to facilitate the implementation of the curriculum in the school (Wanzare, 2013). Skills learnt will enable the principal to be able to perform the supervisory tasks efficiently and effectively (Dawo, 2011). Similarly, when supervisory tasks are diligently performed, the goals of a school and the teachers’ needs will be met.

 Looking at the demographic data in this study and relating it to the use of approaches as advised by developmental supervision model, the highest number 82(33.5%) of teachers recorded have teaching experience of less than 5 years. The model is applicable in the sense that the principals may use a directive approach in their instructional supervisory role more than collaborative approach in such a case. In the same data, only seven (2.9%) teachers had experience of more than 30 years; in this case, the principal may use more of a non-directive approach than directive approach.

 Desimone’s (2009) conceptual framework further supported this study on teacher professional development. In her conceptual framework, she defines professional development as a process designed to improve teachers’ attitude and beliefs, as well as knowledge and skills. The model explains that the instructional supervisor has to focus on the subject content in order to enhance teachers’ knowledge and reform teaching practice. The model also holds the view that the extent of professional development should be in line with the teachers’ knowledge and beliefs for it to be effective. It also highlights the duration or the length of time spent for professional development, which has an association with teachers’ preparedness and attitude.

Desimone’s conceptual framework advocates for collective participation of teachers. This encourages teamwork in enhancing teacher professional development. Desimone further argues that the only way teacher professional development can be enhanced is through classroom observation by instructional supervisors.

 In summary, the model proposes that in order to experience teacher professional efficacy in schools, the following instructional supervisory activities should be included: lesson observation and demonstration, use of instructional resources and training.

## Classroom Instruction

Instructional supervision in a classroom is a well-structured and progressive procedure that starts before the actual classroom instruction, and ends after the observation of an actual classroom instruction (Tesema, 2014). This activity consists of three main phases, namely; pre-observation conference, observation and post-observation conference. The pre-observation conference involves planning the classroom observation by the instructional supervisor and the teacher. They discuss the kind and amount of information to be gathered during the observation-period and methods to be used to gather the information (Ekpoh and Eze, 2015). During pre-observation meetings, the instructional supervisor and the teacher discuss instructional instruments such as the lesson plan by stressing on the lesson objectives, its relevance and appropriateness of content, time allocation, teaching aids, and the evaluation criteria (Glickman et al., 2017).

 The observation phase occurs when the instructional supervisor and the teacher enter the classroom. During this phase of the observation, the instructional supervisor observes the teacher based on areas agreed upon, and collects as much information as possible about the classroom instruction, and learning situations (Gurnam and Chan, 2010). The instructional supervisor also records the teacher’s performance on the format of the lesson plan, its appropriateness, lesson objectives, and the teacher’s ability to provide appropriate feedback, reinforcement and classroom discipline among other things. During class observation, it is advisable that the instructional supervisor sits at the back of the class, so as to enhance his, or her own attention, and take note of what is happening (Arlestig and Tornsen, 2014).

 The post-observation conference is an opportunity and setting stage for the instructional supervisor and the teacher to exchange information about what was intended by a given lesson, and what actually happened (Gurnam and Chan, 2010). This conference helps the instructional supervisor and the teacher to measure strengths and weaknesses and further identify any gap regarding the observation in classroom teaching as far as the needs of the learners were concerned. The post-observation conference enhances the teacher’s ability to improve the classroom instruction. The feedback during the post observation conference should focus on modifying teaching behaviours. In doing this, teachers should not be asked to do things which are outside their scope of responsibility (Portin, Schneider, DeArmond and Gundlach, 2013). The three phases of observation are processes of clinical supervision.

 Moswela and Mphale (2015) in their research study warn that for clinical supervision to be effective, it should be guided by a well-designed objective agreed upon by the instructional supervisor and his or her protégé. Secondly, they also caution that, effective classroom supervision can be achieved solely if hindrances such as; incompetent instructional supervisors supervising subjects without having knowledge in the subject content are either assessed or removed. Thirdly, the instructional supervisors performing clinical supervision should undergo training on clinical supervision activities and not to perform this important task and responsibility as simply part of their administrative work.

 In support, Gurnam and Chan (2010) add that, in order to succeed in classroom observation, the instructional supervisor should have full knowledge of the activities to be carried out, including what to evaluate, how to observe and analyze classroom observation, the information on how to translate the results of the observation and the summary of data into meaningful conference, feedback that guides and encourages teachers to improve instruction.

Effective instructional supervisors should work relentlessly to improve achievement of instruction by focusing on the quality of instruction. They should also help teachers to define and promote high expectations and connect directly with teachers and the classroom (Portin et al., 2013).

 Literature reviewed has well-articulated how classroom instructional supervision should be carried out in stages in order to enhance instructional supervision and to improve classroom instruction. However, there has been an outcry by teachers that principals only observe classroom instruction for the sake of fault-finding. Moswela (2010) in his study also confirms and concludes the following: that instructional supervision continues to follow the old practices affiliated to inspection, with the aim to punish the teachers; that the principals who were interviewed confessed that they lacked time to perform their task and responsibility in observing classroom instruction.

 This study therefore intended to fill the gap by establishing the effectiveness of principals’ instructional performance in classroom instruction with an aim hopefully, to find solutions through perceptions of principals, HoDs and Teachers.

## Research Methodology

Descriptive survey design which embraces both quantitative and qualitative approaches was used to carry out the study. The sample consisted of 38 principals, 151 heads of departments and 289 teachers in Nairobi and Kajiado counties, totaling 478 respondents. Stratified random sampling was used in selecting schools according to the following strata: boys’ public secondary schools, girls’ public secondary schools and mixed public secondary schools. Simple random sampling was used to select principals, heads of departments and teachers for the study. The instruments used to collect data were: Interview guide for principals, Questionnaire for principals, heads of departments and teachers. Qualitative data was analyzed thematically, while Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and presented in frequencies and percentages. The Null hypothesis was analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis test statistics.

## Research Findings and Discussions

**Principals’ perception on how effective they performed in Instructional Supervision regarding Classroom Instruction**

According to Tesema (2014), classroom instruction is a well-structured and progressive procedure where the principal’s role entails observing the skills applied by teachers while teaching and interacting with students in the classroom, direct teachers to do need assessment based on their classroom instruction, involve teachers on how to implement activities to improve classroom instruction and to evaluate the outcome of the implemented activities. Based on the following indicators of Effectiveness, the researcher sought the perceptions of the respondents to indicate their responses on a three-point Likert scale as follows: **3-Effective (E) 2-Somewhat effective (SE) 1-Ineffective (I)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1 indicates that a large proportion of the principals perceived their performance as effective in the following tasks and responsibilities: 31 (91.2%) in encouraging teachers to evaluate themselves in order to improve teaching and learning, 25 (73.5%) in evaluating the outcome of the implemented activities, 22 (64.7%) in facilitating brain-storming activities involving needs assessment and involving teachers to participate in planning on how to solve the problems identified in classroom instruction, 20 (58.8%) in involving teachers on how to implement activities to improve classroom instruction and 18 (52.9%) in involving teachers in joint decision making. This was further indicated by a mean of between 2.5 and 2.9 which represents an effective performance. However, 17 (50.0%) of the principals perceived their performance as somewhat effective in directing teachers to do needs assessment based on classroom instruction.

Head of departments were also required to rate principals’ performance on instructional supervision with regard to classroom instruction. The results are presented in Table 2.

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Tasks** | **Mean** | **Effective****3** | **Somewhat effective****2** | **Ineffective****3** |
|  |  | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| * Involve teachers in joint decision-making.
 | 2.3 | 59 | 44 | 51 | 38.1 | 24 | 17.9 |
| * Direct teachers to do need assessment based on their classroom instruction.
 | 2.3 | 51 | 38.1 | 67 | 50.0 | 16 | 11.9 |
| * Facilitate brain-storming activities involving needs assessment.
 | 2.0 | 28 | 20.9 | 80 | 59.7 | 26 | 19.4 |
| * Involve teachers to participate in planning on how to solve the problems identified in classroom instruction.
 | 2.1 | 38 | 28.4 | 66 | 49.3 | 30 | 22.4 |
| * Involve teachers on how to implement activities to improve classroom instruction.
 | 2.1 | 41 | 30.6 | 61 | 45.5 | 32 | 23.9 |
| * Evaluate the outcome of the implemented activities.
 | 2.3 | 53 | 39.6 | 70 | 52.2 | 11 | 8.2 |
| * Encourage teachers to do self-evaluation for the improvement of teaching and learning.
 | 2.4 | 69 | 48.5 | 60 | 44.8 | 9 | 6.7 |

Results in Table 2 shows that HoDs perceived principals’ performance as effective in the following areas: 69 (48.5%) in encouraging teachers to do self-evaluation in order to improve teaching and learning, 59 (44%) in involving teachers in joint decision-making and 53 (39.6%) in evaluating the outcome of the implemented activities. Table 2 further shows that 80 (59.7%), 70 (52.2%) and 67 (50.0%) of the HoDs perceived principals’ performance as somewhat effective in facilitating brain-storming activities involving needs assessment, evaluating the implemented activities and directing teachers to do need assessment based on their classroom instruction respectively.

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

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Tasks** | **Mean** | **Effective****3** | **Somewhat effective****2** | **Ineffective****3** |
|  |  | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| * Involve teachers in joint decision-making.
 | 2.2 | 96 | 39.2 | 112 | 45.7 | 37 | 15.1 |
| * Direct teachers to do need assessment based on their classroom instruction.
 | 2.1 | 70 | 28.6 | 132 | 53.9 | 43 | 17.6 |
| * Facilitate brain-storming activities involving needs assessment.
 | 2.0 | 60 | 24.5 | 133 | 54.3 | 52 | 21.2 |
| * Involve teachers to participate in planning on how to solve the problems identified in classroom instruction.
 | 2.0 | 70 | 28.6 | 117 | 47.8 | 58 | 23.7 |
| * Involve teachers on how to implement activities to improve classroom instruction.
 | 2.2 | 88 | 35.9 | 119 | 48.6 | 38 | 15.5 |
| * Evaluate the outcome of the implemented activities.
 | 2.4 | 115 | 46.9 | 108 | 44.1 | 22 | 9 |
| * Encourage teachers to do self-evaluation for the improvement of teaching and learning.
 | 2.2 | 100 | 40.8 | 83 | 33.9 | 62 | 25.3 |

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

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

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

With regard to classroom instruction,although17 (50%) and above ofthe principals perceived their performance as effective in all the tasks and responsibilities, HoDs’ and teachers’ perception was in agreement with the principals’ only, in one task and responsibility: involving teachers in joint decision-making.

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

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

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

Principal 1: 

 Principal 2:



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

In support, Gurnam and Chan (2010) emphasized that, in order to succeed in classroom observation, the instructional supervisor should have full knowledge on the activities to be carried out. According to the scholars, the observation phase occurs when the instructional supervisor and the teacher enter the classroom. During this phase of the observation, the instructional supervisor observes the teacher based on areas agreed upon, and collects as much information as possible about the classroom instruction, and learning situations.

When principals were asked during the interview how they evaluate teachers’ performance on classroom instruction, majority of the principals commented:



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

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

The formula below was used to test the hypothesis



 is the total number of all observations in group

is the total rank among all observers of  observation from group 

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

is the total average rank which include observations in  group

is the total average including all the 

P-value was estimated by 

 (Kothari and Garg, 2014).

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

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

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

## Conclusion

The study concluded that the principals worked diligently on their tasks and responsibilities but did not use appropriate skills and knowledge while conducting instructional supervision in improving classroom instruction.

## Recommendations

Principals’ instructional supervisory methods were mainly limited to observing professional records belonging to teachers and checking on learner’s progress records, giving minimal attention to class visits and self-appraisal. Principals instead relied heavily on students’ appraisal report on teachers. As a result, internal supervision has failed to impact on teachers’ development on best practices in teaching.

This study therefore recommends that the education policy makers (TSC and MoE) to put in place a policy on instructional supervision and to guide on how instructional supervision could be made more effective in public secondary schools.

The T.S.C strategic plan 2015-2019 should implement the policy on standards assessment and instructional supervision of curriculum delivery in public secondary schools.
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