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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 5.03 in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Examination (2007-2018) The County’s Panel of Standards Assessment report of 2010 and 2011 pegged this to weak IIS structures. The purpose of this paper is to establish influence of frequency of checking teachers of English professional documents on their teaching effectiveness. The study used ex-post –factual, correlation and descriptive survey. Population was 13 Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QUASO), 247 principals, 247 HODs and 494 teachers of English (TOEs). It sampled 13 QUASOs, 74 principals, 74 HODs and 215 teachers purposively. 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. 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 lesson attendance records and records of work are checked regularly while the least checked is the lesson plan. None the less schemes of work, lesson plan and academic results reports have a weak positive significance with teaching effectiveness. The study thus recommends that professional documents should be checked on a weekly basis with particular interest on the three specified entities as stipulated by Teachers Service Commission (TSC)'s Teacher Performance Appraisal and Development Tool TPAD in Kenya.
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I. Background to the Study

Quality in education is greatly enhanced through focus on teachers. Odo and Udu (2016) underscore the importance of teachers by opining that teachers 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 teaching 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 as propounded by Assefa, (2016) and Wanzare (2011). It is the process through which principals, deputy principals and HODS attempt to work with teachers collaboratively to improve teaching and learning in the school (Wanzare, 2011). This implies that through Internal Instructional Supervision (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 confirmed bySergiovanni and Starrat (2006) who assert that when a school’s instructional capacity improves teaching improves, leading to improvement in students’ performance.

It is achieved when school principals and department heads closely and periodically assist teachers in their teaching within the school level (MOE, 2004: 25). This is mainly through classroom observation of these teachers as well as scrutiny of the teachers’ professional documents. Eya and Leonard (2012) are of the opinion that IIS is more conversant as it helps teachers to be dedicated to their duties and helps the less effective and inexperienced teachers to improve their teaching. Also, Jonesboro (2013) found that IIS is effective because it
relies heavily on the sense of voluntary shared responsibility and on mutual shaping of goals and patterns in order to attain them.

This set apart a supervisor as an important personality in the sense that they have designated functions. Assefa (2016) outlines these functions as: seeing teachers’ lesson notes; checking their instructional materials; watching teachers do the actual teaching; evaluating the ability of teachers; identifying instructional problems; introducing changes; helping teacher realize their potential to improve instruction; ensuring that teachers keep accurate and up to date records as well as mandating teachers to provide students with feedback on their performance.

In view of this, Eneastor (2001) underscores certain guidelines that need to be put into consideration in supervision if at all it will achieve its desired objectives. Under this, he outlines three aspects. First, the mention of the input variable (teacher) which consist of qualification, experience, textbook in use, syllabus in use, schemes of work, lesson notes, time allotment, books on the subject and availability in the library and instructional materials. Secondy, there is the process variable (Teaching) which encompass teacher demeanor, pupils or students written work in form of assignments, corrections, continuous assessment and practice. Lastly, he points out output variables (Achievement) which is the standard of the subject at certificate examination, in this case the KCSE examination results. It is thus, upon such a framework that variables such as schemes of work, lesson plan, and records of work covered, teachers’ attendance to lessons and academic performance reports of the current study have been drawn from.

English, in particular, being a language subject requires close supervision of the teacher and checking of their professional documents so as to ensure proficiency that is evident in effective teaching. For instance, a teacher who himself has difficulty in speaking the language he teaches is not going to succeed in giving his students a command of spoken language. Through close classroom observation of teachers teaching and their teaching tools, a discrepancy such as incompetence on the part of the teacher of English can be detected in good time and appropriate guidance given to such a teacher. In this case then, Orenaiya et al., (2014) confirm that such discrepancies noted concerning content of instruction, methodology and teaching skills must be followed with guidance and support services and improvement after careful planning through interpersonal relation and effective communication between supervisor and teachers.

Professional documents are the documents that are used by a teacher in the preparation, implementation and evaluation of teaching and learning. As outlined by (Fischer, 2011) these include schemes of work, lesson plan, records of work covered, mark books, progression record book and attendance registers.

In scripted within the Performance Contract between the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in Kenya and principals of secondary school is the mandate to ensure that teachers prepare, use and maintain updated professional documents. This is a way to maintain teaching standards in the implementation of the curriculum. The TSC has also mandated heads of institutions through the Head Teacher’s Appraisal and Development Tool to ensure that all the required professional records are maintained. These persons are required to use the checklist of teacher professional documents, Lesson Attendance Register among other tools. All these teacher professional documents should be checked on a weekly basis.

Professional documents are very important and must be prepared by TOE and checked by internal instructional supervisors for effective implementation of the curriculum. The TPAD pin points various teacher performance competency areas. Top on this list is professional knowledge and application. This involves preparation of professional records as already noted. In addition, Thuo and Mugo (2017) indicated that before and after training, teachers are expected to prepare the following teaching instruments, schemes of work, lesson plans, record of work and students continuous assessment, to ensure adherence to the syllabus and monitoring of content coverage.

In view of this, this paper considers various professional documents of IIS that need to be checked at least once per week. These include: schemes of work, lesson plan, records of work covered, TOE attendance to lesson, students’ notes, personal visitation to classes and perusal of academic results report. The study then went ahead to determine the influence of each of this on teaching effectiveness.

Orenaiya et al., (2014) observe that schemes is a teacher’s plan of work derived from the syllabus. It shows what is to be covered within a specific period of time, it gives a suggested allocation of time, the teaching of each section of the syllabus and perhaps gives the recommended textbook.Chenge and Syomwene (2016) confirmed that records of work were available, they were regularly updated and checked by principals.

II. Teaching Effectiveness of TOE

The focus on the classroom teacher is moving away from the highly qualified to the highly effective teacher. Orenaiya et al., (2014) propounds that the most significant criteria or factor directly influencing the quality of education a child receives is the quality of his teacher. There are many criteria that can be used to gauge the most effective teacher. These include deep understanding of subject matter, learning theory and student differences, planning classroom instructional strategies, knowing individual students and assessment of
students’ understanding and proficiency with learning, a teacher’s ability to reflect, collaborate with colleagues and continue ongoing professional development.

Researchers agree that teaching effectiveness mainly involves student learning which can be measured in terms of student scores and grades. In view of this, Barry (2010) observes that studies and models for teaching effectiveness have subtle differences but all of them agree that the gauge for teaching effectiveness is student learning. Yet again, there are numerous indicators of student learning that may be used to evaluate a teacher’s effectiveness. However, the most predominant is students’ performance as evident through results of standardized tests.

Teaching effectiveness in this study refers to individual teachers of English 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 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Score Range</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5- 4.99</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>39.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00- 5.99</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00- 6.99</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00-7.99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00-8.99</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00-9.99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00-10.99</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-12.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>214</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Table 1 show that 60.74 % of teachers of English have fair and low teaching effectiveness, only 20.57% of them had good teaching effectiveness and only 5.14% of them had excellent teaching effectiveness. This implies that there is therefore something amiss in the performance of this subject. This could be as a result of different factors. This paper fronts the possibility of weak internal instructional supervision with regard to frequency of checking these teachers’ professional documents as one of the causes of this ineffectiveness.

### III. 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 QUASOs, 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.

### IV. Results

Frequency of conducting IIS was measured using a 5-point *Likert* scale of weekly, monthly, termly, annually and never. Any mean score that fell between 0-2.49 implied a rare check, 2.5- 3.49 mean scores implied the variable had a fair check, that between 3.5-4.49 indicated there was frequent check while any mean score that fell between 4.5- 5.00 indicated that area of IIS was checked always. This result is presented in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Check</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Termly</th>
<th>Annually</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schemes of work</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>34 15.8</td>
<td>50 23.2</td>
<td>122 56.7</td>
<td>- 4.3</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>113 52.5</td>
<td>41 19.1</td>
<td>19 8.8</td>
<td>1 0.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records of work covered</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>127 59</td>
<td>58 27</td>
<td>29 13.5</td>
<td>- 1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance to lessons</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>186 87</td>
<td>14 6</td>
<td>13 6.1</td>
<td>- 2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows the results of the frequency of principals and deputy principals or HODs checking professional documents. The first item on this list was teachers’ schemes of work. Results indicate that generally different schools check schemes of work within different durations. More specifically, the majority of the respondents that is 122 (56.7%) TOE reported that schemes of work are checked on a termly basis that is there is fair check of schemes of work. These were then followed in number by those who pointed out that it is checked monthly 50(23.2%) and this equaled to frequent check and very few respondents reported that it was checked weekly and as such schemes of work are not always checked. Finally, 9(7.9%) respondents reported that their schemes of work were never checked implying a no check of this professional document while none reported that it was checked annually. Principals and HODs confirmed the teachers response when 55 (74.3%) and 42 (56.8%) respectively pointed out that this document was checked on a termly basis. The teachers’ result gave rise to a mean score of 3.47 which was an improvement of the preceding item. This implies that schemes of work are fairly checked. This result is similar to that of a study conducted by Kariuki (2013) and Kipkurui (2012) in which the head teachers reported that they do not regularly check teachers’ schemes of work covered but that they checked them occasionally implying that they do not also have good check. The teachers result are similar to Kimutai and Kosgei (2012) which found that 50% of head teachers checked schemes of work.

The second item under professional documents was the lesson plan. Results on supervisors’ frequency of checking it reveals that 113(52.5%) respondents reported that it was checked on a weekly basis which corresponds to being checked always. Another 41(19.1%) teachers reported that it was not checked at all thus a no check frequency and an equal number reported that it was fairly checked. Finally, 19 (8.8%) TOE indicated that it was checked termly which amounted to frequent check. This result tallied with that of 39 (52.7%) HODs who reported that it was checked on a weekly basis unlike only 27 (36.2%) principals who assigned it the same frequency. The teachers’ result culminated to a mean of 3.86. This implies that according to these respondents the lesson plan is checked frequently. This result contradicts with the findings of Kariuki (2013) in which forty percent of head teachers indicated that they never checked this professional document.

The third professional document whose frequency had to be ascertained was the records of work covered. Results indicate that over 50% of the respondents, that is 127(59%) TOEs reported that it was checked weekly implying that it was always checked. Then, 58(27%) TOE reported that it was checked monthly hence according to this number of teachers this document was frequently checked. Results also indicate that the records of work of 29(13.5%) TOE were checked termly which implies that there were fairly checked. Finally, only 10(5.0%) TOE’s records of work was not checked and none of the TOEs records of work was checked annually. This was in tandem with the results of principals and HODs in which 40 (54.1%) and 50(67.6%) of them respectively assigned its frequency to weekly. The teachers’ overall mean score surmounted to 4.44 which is frequent check of records of work covered, although it does not hit the 5.0 mean score target. This results are generally different from those of Atieno (2015) Kimutai and Kosgei (2012) in which forty percent of head teachers indicated that they never checked this professional document.

The fourth professional document whose frequency of checking needed to be established was teachers’ attendance to lessons. Results reveal that a majority of respondents 186 (87%) indicated that this checking was done on a weekly basis which implies that it was always checked while few assigned it to monthly and term wise that is 14 (6%) and 13(6.1%) respectively. No respondent reported that it was checked on a yearly basis while only 2(0.9%) of them indicated that it is not checked at all. Overwhelmingly also, 69(93.2%) principals and 67(83.7%) HODs agreed with teachers that it was checked on a weekly basis. This item yielded the highest mean score of 4.78, an indication that teachers’ attendance to lessons was always checked.

Lastly, there was an item that sought to find out the frequency of principals, deputy principals and HODs checking through academic exam reports. Results reveal that 117(54.4%) TOE indicated that it was checked termly. This corresponds to being fairly checked. Another, 57(26.5%) assigned it to monthly which is a frequent check. Only 17(7.9%) assigned it to annually which corresponds to rare check while fewer numbers of TOE 15 (7%) indicated that this document was never checked and the fewest of them 9(4.2%) pointed out that it was checked weekly. This result was confirmed by that of principals and HODs. This culminated to a mean score of 3.19 implying that academic exam reports have fair check. Of all the professional documents, it was the least checked, no wonder performance of English is low.

The last part of this result conveys the response on frequency of principals, deputy principals and HODs checking students’ notes. These results reveals that 84(39.1%) TOEs reported that these were checked monthly, that is, they were fairly checked. Then, 75(34.9%) TOE assigned them to weekly which corresponded
to being checked always. For 34(15.8%) TOEs these were checked termly while for 16(7.4%) of them student
notes were never checked and for only 6(2.8%) TOEs it was checked annually which translates to a rare check.
These gave rise to a mean score of 3.91 for teachers, which implies the students' notes were frequently checked.
Principals and HODs confirmed this result when an equal number of both groups of respondents 35(47.3%)
assigned this checking to monthly. These results tally with those of Kariuki (2013) which showed that head
teachers were not consistent in checking student notes. They contradict with Kimutai and Kosgei (2012) in
which principals rarely checked students’ books.

Table 3: Linear Regression of frequency of conducting IIS as a Predictor of Teaching Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RR Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.300ª .090</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results generated from the data show:

a) Predictors (constant), aspects of IIS

b) Dependent variable: Teachers’ means scores in 2013 KCSE

Results of table 3 indicate that the frequency of checking the aspects of IIS is a significant predictor ($R^2=0.300$, $F (7, 202) =2.657$, $p=0.007< 0.05$) of teaching effectiveness in English. Similar to One Way Analysis of Variance results, linear regression ($p=0.007$) is lower than the acceptable confidence level of 0.05. Thus, there is a significant relationship between the frequency of checking of aspects of checking aspects of IIS and the teaching effectiveness in English and .058 that is 6% teaching effectiveness can be predicted from frequency of checking aspects of IIS. This is in tandem with Odo and Udu (2016) that IIS has influence on development of teaching effectiveness. This has an implication that its supervisors should step up its frequency.

The regression model was as in Table 4

Table 4: The Regression Model of Predicting Teaching Effectiveness in English by using Frequency of IIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of IIS</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model intercept</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal visitations to classes</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes</td>
<td>-.187</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plan</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records of work</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOE attendance to lessons</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students notes</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perusal of academic reports</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results shown in Table 4 reveal that lesson plan, personal visitations to classes and perusal of academic results reports have a weak positive relation with teaching effectiveness, thus are statistically significant with teaching effectiveness in English. This has an implication that these three variables influence teaching effectiveness. Further, of the three aspects only personal visitations to classes show a significant positive relationship with teaching effectiveness ($\beta=.281, p=0.001$). This is in line with in Assefa (2016) which established that frequent classroom observation of teachers leads to students getting high grades in exam. Thus, personal visitations by supervisors to classes is the main predictor of teaching effectiveness and as such IIS stakeholders need to invest more into it. However, in this County respondents results revealed that professional documents are checked more frequently than classroom observation is conducted and yet the later has a positive significance to TE unlike the former. This is the reason why performance of English is barely at average and below average.

V. Conclusion

The frequency of checking professional documents was higher than that of classroom observation. Among the professional documents, teacher attendance to lessons and records of work were the most checked while lesson plan and academic results reports were the least checked. Also, there is lack of uniformity in the frequency of checking students’ notes. In addition, regression analysis revealed that lesson plan, schemes of work and perusal of academic results are statistically significant to teaching effectiveness.
VI. Recommendations

a) All the documentations in IIS should be checked regularly at a frequency of weekly with particular emphasis on schemes of work, lesson plan and perusal of academic results reports.

b) Internal instructional supervisors should be more concerned with the quality of teaching but should not merely check the professional documents and teacher classroom attendance as a routine in order to enhance teaching effectiveness.
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