



PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TOWARDS THE ROLE OF DEPARTMENTAL COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION ON THEIR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KENYA.

**Dr. Napwora
Wekesa Jesse**

Tom Mboya University College, P.O Box 199-40300, Homabay- Kenya.

ABSTRACT This paper highlights the results of a research conducted in Bungoma County, Kenya between 2017 and 2018. The purpose of this study was to investigate the Perceptions of Teachers of English language towards the role played by Departmental Collaborative Supervision on their Professional Development in Secondary Schools in Kenya. The study was based on the Mixed Methods Research Approach; it adopted the Constructivist, Cognitivist and Transformational theories of adult learning and the Pragmatic Philosophical Paradigm and the Explanatory Design. Proportionate stratified random sampling, simple random sampling and purposive sampling techniques were used to get the sample. The questionnaire and interview schedule were used to collect data from teachers of English and heads of department (HoD) from selected secondary schools in Bungoma County. The sample involved 216 participants. The data were analysed using descriptive statistics. Findings revealed that teachers of English language and their HoD have positive perceptions of the role Departmental Collaborative Supervision plays on their professional development in terms of their knowledge, skills and experience; pedagogy; cognitions and meeting learners' needs. It can be concluded that DCS improves the cognitions of the Teachers of English Language and helps them develop professionally. Consequently, it is recommended that teachers of English, departments/schools and the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology should adopt and support collaborative supervisory practices in order to improve students' learning and teachers' professional development.

KEYWORDS : Departmental collaborative supervision, professional development, perceptions, role, teachers of English language.

1. INTRODUCTION

In order to be an effective teacher of English, it requires a commitment to keep up with the developments in the field and a willingness to engage in continuous professional development through collaboratively getting involved in many professional activities. This study is about Departmental Collaborative supervision, which refers to the process through which the Subject supervisor (HoD) and the ToEL (supervisees) mutually involve each other in the supervision practices both within and beyond the classroom in order to improve the quality of teaching and develop professionally.

The aim of teacher education is to produce quality teachers who can facilitate the acquisition of knowledge, skills and attitudes by the learners. The teacher is an essential facilitator in the implementation process of the curriculum. In education, therefore, the importance of the teacher takes second place only after that of the learners so that the quality of the teacher is of great concern to the education system. Quality in education is considered as the most important element. Improving quality according to UNESCO (2000) is as equally important as ensuring the education for all (EFA) goals are attained. The overall education policy of the government of Kenya is to achieve education for all. The priority is to ensure equitable access and improvement in quality and efficiency at all levels of education with the ultimate goal of being to develop an all quality education that is accessible and relevant to all Kenyans for self reliance. This guided by the understanding that good education can significantly lead to economic growth, improved employment prospects and income generating opportunities for sustainable development (Republic of Kenya, 2005a). It is no wonder, that the teacher is usually blamed for low pupil achievement. Proponents of teacher education distinguish it from teacher training. They argue that teacher education embraces a wider perspective of continued learning within the teaching process. They also perceive teaching as a profession where there is initial and in-service training (Borg, 2006).

It is necessary that teachers at all levels should have the capacity, relevant skills, knowledge and attitudes to subscribe to educational objectives and make them a reality. Then by implication and extension most countries see the necessity to educate and not just to train teachers. This means that teacher education should form the basis for reflective practice which goes beyond "the illusion of technical mastery." This involves developing a personal educational philosophy and competence to increasingly match one's practice to it" (Barasa, 2005).

The Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Higher Education Science and Technology Policy Framework for Education and Training (2012) states that the government will develop and implement a balanced education curriculum aligned to the

achievement and attainment of vision 2030. This will require the development of teachers with a different mind - set; that focuses on core educational outcomes, based on developing a repertoire of skills and competencies required by all learners and teachers. Besides teacher development, the policy puts emphasis on subject mastery, pedagogical skills and upgrading of school based quality assurance. In order to achieve the above objectives of teacher quality, professional development and effectiveness, the government should ensure that quality staff is recruited and effectively utilized to safeguard and maintain the highest possible standards of the teaching and learning process.

The Ministry of Education through the Education Standards and Quality Assurance Commission should do routine and advisory standards assessment in Kenyan schools and tertiary institutions in order to assess the levels of achievement in curriculum delivery, supervision, evaluation and resource management (Republic of Kenya, 2012). This standards assessment should be centralized at institutional level where school principals and heads of department (HoD) ensure school effectiveness and effective classrooms respectively. In the context of this study, this is departmental collaborative supervision (DCS). Several reasons have been cited for the importance of supervision. They include monitoring or providing mentoring of beginning teachers to facilitate a supportive induction into the profession; bringing individual teachers up to a minimum standard of effective teaching (Quality assurance and maintenance functions of supervision); improving individual teachers' competencies, no matter how proficient they are deemed to be; working with groups of teachers in collaborative effort to improve student learning; working with groups of teachers to adopt the local curriculum in line with state and national standards ; and relating teachers' efforts to improve their teaching to the larger goal of school wide improvement in the service of quality learning for all children (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998).

Despite this realization, there has been a persistent outcry from the Ministry of Education, and other stakeholders about inadequacy of graduate teachers. Republic of Kenya Report of the Public Universities Inspection Board (2006, p.113) argues that some graduate teachers from public universities and public teacher colleges did not have the expected depth in content of their teaching subjects and were not well grounded in teaching methodology. The concerns have increased over the years regarding the falling standards of education, professionalism, teacher effectiveness and students' low achievement scores in many school subjects in general and English in particular (KNEC, 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015; Cheserek, 2013). This might to some extent be due to the lukewarm attention paid to institutional supervision in general and departmental collaborative supervision in particular or the slow pace at which it is being embraced.

Although studies have been done on supervision, there is a paucity of research on the perceptions of ToEL towards the role of departmental collaborative supervision on their professional development. Wangari (2009) researched on effects of quality assurance assessment visits (external supervision) on instructional media adoption and performance in English, Wanzare (2009, 2012) researched on internal instructional supervision, while Ong'ondo (2009) researched on student teacher learning, collaboration and supervision during the practicum.

2.0 Literature Review

Literature on supervision, models of supervision, collaborative supervision and professional development are briefly reviewed below.

2.1 Supervision

Historically, the first function of supervision was *inspection*. That is, control-based/maintenance of standards. This is what we can call directive/external/ministerial supervision. Later on, supervision was aimed at leadership, programme development, instructional development, interpersonal relationships, collaborative professional development among others. Richards and Nunan (2000) argue that the main purpose of supervision is to ensure that goals of education are being achieved. Supervision is supposed to maintain standards and improve the entire practice of the teaching profession. Supervision involves advising teachers, directing or guiding the teacher's teaching, offering suggestions on the best way to teach, model teaching, evaluate teacher's teaching. This is also what supervision in Kenya aims to achieve.

2.2 Models of In-service supervision in ELT

There are at least seven models of supervision in English Language Teaching (ELT). These include: directive, alternative, collaborative, non-directional, creative, self-help explorative and developmental supervision (Gebhard, 1984; Richards & Nunan, 1990, 2000; Richards, 1994; Seins, 1996; Baecher & Thuy, 2011). In the Kenyan context, the supervision of in-service teachers may fall under the following categories: self supervision, institutional supervision and external (ministerial) supervision.

2.1.3 External/directive supervision and the Professional Development of teachers

To begin with, many teachers all over the world in general and Kenya in particular do not view external (ministerial) supervision as a means of improving their effectiveness and professionalism and a continuation of their professional development due to the negative attitudes they have towards the ministerial supervisors who are perceived as unprofessional and judgmental. Yet supervision in whatever form means that the teacher is continually engaged in improving his or her practice, as is required of all professionals (Glickman, et al., 2004, 2007).

Second, the Ministry of Education through the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (2009) indicates that there is a general teacher inadequacy and lack of professionalism among teachers in schools and tertiary institutions in Kenya and gives out circular directives on what needs to be done to improve teacher effectiveness and professionalism in all these institutions. The Ministry of Education (2009; 2013) argues that due to the many schools, it is not possible to do regular supervision in each school. It therefore recommends regular internal quality assurance mechanisms to address this problem where school principals and heads of department ensure school effectiveness (institutional supervision) and effective classrooms (DCS) respectively in order to improve teacher professionalism and job effectiveness.

2.1.4 Departmental Collaborative supervision (DCS) and the PD of ToEL

AACTE (2010) argues that 21st century students and teachers must possess learning and innovation skills, which are often referred to as the 21st century skills, in order to be well equipped for more and more complex life and work environments. These skills include critical thinking and problem solving; communication; *collaboration*; and creativity and innovation skills.

If teachers are to improve in their effectiveness, if there is to be quality teaching and learning in Kenyan schools and tertiary institutions, then the problems of teacher inadequacy and ineffectiveness, lack of professionalism and lack of regular supervisions by the Ministry of Education must be addressed. As one of the way forward to address

these problems, then it is imperative that departmental collaborative supervision in Kenya must be embraced by all educational institutions as is the case with many educational institutions in Europe and USA, where it has yielded positive results. Therefore, the current study sought to investigate the perceptions of ToEL towards the role played by DCS on their PD.

Teachers in the department can collaborate at the level of preparation, execution and evaluation and this depends on their context. Pfeiffer & Dunlap (1982) cited in Bezzina (2002) noted through their research that instructional supervision is needed to help teachers improve their instructional performance, motivate their professional growth and implement their curricular development. They concluded that the ultimate goal of instructional supervision is to improve student development that may be achieved through changing teacher behavior, modifying the curriculum or restructuring the learning environment. As Danielson and McGreal (2000) stated, supervision is needed for all teachers in schools- the new, the inexperienced and the able. Staff development programmes would be more effective when tied to a systematic programme of in-class supervision to assess what in-service activities might be needed and when such activities are likely to be productive. The focus is on the job-embedded learning. The type of instructional support/supervision that is most likely to yield productive professional development is one of *collaboration*. Collaboration implies collegiality, co-operation, teaming and networking. It refers to a process by which people with diverse expertise (teachers, heads, supervisors and others) work jointly with equal status and shared commitment in order to achieve mutually beneficial instructional goals. The major characteristics of collaboration, in Harris' and Ovando's view, include mutual respect, tolerance, acceptance, commitment, courage, sharing of ideas and information, adherence to laws, regulations and rules, a philosophy of shared decision-making, teaming as the central mode of organization for action, and a 'we' paradigm as opposed to 'I' or 'you' paradigm.

Bezzina (2002) notes that there is a growing body of literature, gained from research into practice, that has documented the importance of teachers' growth and development when they work together in communities teaching each other, learning together and focusing on the success and challenges of educating their students (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Shaps et al, 1996; Wenger, 1998). People in a group are united by more than membership; they are involved in practices that bind them together. If people are a valid part of the decision making process, they become committed in a way that allows others to make claims on them. They become a community with practices that reinforce what they share. This concept, which reflects the wisdom of many writers, has recently been crystallised in a conceptual framework called a 'community of practice' (Wenger, 1998).

This idea of belonging to a community changes the way we think about teacher learning. Its importance lies in the fact that it changes the relationship of teachers to their peers, breaking the isolation that most teachers have found so devastating. In supportive communities, teachers reinforce each other in a climate that encourages observing students, sharing teaching strategies, trying out new ways of teaching, getting feedback and redesigning curriculum and methods of instruction. Teachers' professional communities serve as important mediators for teachers' interpretations and analyses of student learning. In communities where reform, restructuring and school transformation are the vision, teachers learn to make public their challenges as well as their successes. Teachers receive support, learn from one another, and gain confidence for changing their practice to better meet their students' needs (Lieberman, 1995).

Within such a context empowerment is taking place and empowerment of teachers and all educational leaders, for that matter, is essential if schools are to improve. As long as teachers are not adequately valued by themselves and by others, they are not apt to perform with the necessary assurance and authority to do the job as well as they can (Goodlad, 1994).

Bezzina (ibid) argues that in recent decades there has been a growing trend towards decentralization and hence school-site management (Herman & Herman, 1993; Mohrman et al, 1994; David, 1995-1996). One of the major implications behind decentralization and devolution of authority to schools is teacher empowerment (Weiss, 1993; Steyn & Squelch, 1996). As Schmoker (1997), among others, have pointed out, teacher empowerment is the way forward and the only way the organization can truly learn and improve.

Collaborative teacher development (CTD) is an increasingly common kind of teacher development found in a wide range of language teaching contexts. In the past, teaching has traditionally been an occupation pursued largely in isolation from one's colleagues—Donald Freeman (1998) famously described it as an “egg box profession” in which each of us is carefully kept separate from our fellow teachers. A crucial component of teacher development has been to overcome this isolation with collaborative endeavors both within and beyond the classroom (Johnston, 2011).

The most important thing about CTD lies deeper, in the *values* that underlie collaboration as a wellspring of teacher professional development. First, CTD arises from, and reinforces a view of teacher learning as a fundamentally social process—in other words, that teachers can *only* learn professionally in sustained and meaningful ways when they are able to do so together. As Edge (1992) puts it, “[S]elf-development needs other people. By co-operating with others, we can come to understand better our own experiences and options” (p.3-4). Second, CTD supports a view of teachers both individually and as a community, as producers, not just consumers of knowledge and understanding about teaching (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson, 2003). Third, CTD arises from a belief that teaching can and should be a fundamentally collegial profession. Sockett (1993) argues that “[C]ollaboration” and an implicit move toward a common professional community is justified morally because of its power in strengthening professional development and increasing professional dignity” (p.25). Thus overcoming professional isolation is of benefit not just to the individual teachers concerned, but to the entire context in which they teach—in other words, students and schools also stand to gain from teachers engaging in CTD.

Collaborative teacher development is any sustained and systematic investigation into teaching and learning in which the teacher voluntarily collaborates with others involved in the teaching process, and in which professional development is a prime purpose. Though this definition leaves room for many different forms that CTD can take, two features are crucial: first, the teacher or the teachers concerned must have, or share, control over the process. That is, this is not something one can “do” to teachers. Second, although professional development (however the term is understood) can occur alongside other processes such as curricular innovation or action research focused, for instance, on instructional improvements, the goal of teacher professional development for its own sake must be clearly stated, a central component to such endeavours for them to constitute CTD. In other words, professional development should not be seen merely as a by-product of other development processes, but needs to be built into them as a core component (Johnston, 2011).

There are four major options for collaboration in educational settings: 1. Teachers collaborating with fellow ToEL. The teachers of language who are peers, collaborate with their fellow teachers. This is the most balanced relationship in terms of power. Collaboration among language teachers may well focus on instructional issues such as materials exploitation, classroom management, classroom language use, and so on. Of course, they are by no means restricted to such topics. Nevertheless, the shared professional understanding of teachers of language are likely to point them toward certain common concerns and interests.

2. Collaboration between teachers and university-based researchers. Such collaborations are more commonly initiated by the researcher(s), and for this reason tend to focus on the kinds of issues dealt with in educational research. They also tend to be more methodologically and/or theoretically sophisticated than teacher-teacher collaborations. Since researchers often have, or have access to, greater resources including time, a precious commodity for classroom teachers and to have a bigger interest in theorization for its own sake. It is also the case that such relations can be more problematic in terms of inequities of power and status (Auerbach and Paxton, 1997; Cormany, Maynor, & Kalnin, 2004; Toohey & Waterstone, 2004). Zeichner (2010) state that research into collaborative partnership model between university-based and school-based teachers who share responsibility for the student teachers' learning can trigger enthusiasm, involvement and participation which in turn can benefit the true value, neutrality and to some extent the applicability of research.

3. Teacher collaborating with their students

This, too, of course, usually involves a significant power differential. Yet at the same time such arrangement offers fascinating possibilities

for learning in depth about one's own classroom and who is in it (Johnston, 2011).

4. ToEL collaborating with others involved in teaching and learning

The teachers collaborate with administrators, supervisors, parents, material developers, and so on. Gebhard & Oprandy (1999) look at teacher supervision interactions and how they can be structured for teacher development. Kafu (2011) holds the same view that Kenya needs to adopt collaborative and co-operative strategies with relevant/global stakeholders in teacher education and institute national concerted efforts to promote the quality and image of this programme of education.

Sergiovanni & Starratt (1998) argue that the overreaching purpose of supervision is to help teachers improve. The focus of this improvement may be on what the teacher knows, the development of teaching skills, the teacher's ability to make more informed professional decisions, to problem solve better, and to inquire into his or her own practice. They further argue that commitment to teacher growth requires much more than in-service programmes and suggests a framework for growth which includes in-service, staff development and renewal approaches to teacher development. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) state that effective professional development (EPD) is a structured professional learning that results in changes in teacher practices and improvements in student learning outcomes. EPD should incorporate content learning; active learning; support collaboration; use models of effective practices; provide coaching and expert support; offer feedback and reflection; and provide effective time for teachers to learn, practice, implement and reflect upon new strategies that facilitate changes in their practice.

In this study, it was found out that ToEL collaborated with their colleagues within and without their departments in order to develop professionally. They engaged in peer coaching, peer observation, team teaching, departmental professional meetings, discussions/informal talks, co-operating to make schemes of work, co-operating to set and mark exams, seminars, workshops, conferences, action research, bench marking, journal writing among others as some forms of collaborative supervision. Other options of collaboration like collaborating with their students, Board of Management (BoM), parents or university lecturers and researchers were rare.

3. METHODOLOGY

The research was based on the *constructivist*, the *cognitivist* and the *transformative theories* of adult learning. The study adopted the *Mixed Methods Research Approach*. As a methodology, it involves philosophical assumptions that guide the direction of the collection and analysis of data and the mixture of qualitative and quantitative data in a single study or series of studies. Its central premise is that the use of qualitative (qual) and quantitative (quan) approaches in combination provides a better understanding of research problems that either approach alone cannot. The study was conceptualized from a *Pragmatic Philosophical Paradigm* (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2004; Fraenkel & Warren, 2010). The central notion of pragmatism holds that truth is found in “what works” and that truth is relative to the current situation. Pragmatism provides an ontological (nature of reality, knowledge—nature of being) bridge within its philosophy and holds that we and reality “make” truth. They (pragmatists) take a philosophical viewpoint and position their probe at the intersections of subjectively and objectively held knowledge seeking to *understand* the nature of reality, whereas traditional qualitative and quantitative approaches take the epistemological view point. The pragmatists take a *holistic* or *ontological* approach (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2010). The study was carried out on teachers of English language (ToEL) and heads of department (HoD) in selected secondary schools in Bungoma County, Kenya.

The independent variables of the study were *departmental collaborative supervision* (DCS) practices: departmental professional meetings; co-operating to make schemes of work; co-operating to set and mark exams, peer observation; team teaching; peer coaching; organizing of workshops, seminars and symposia; attending workshops, seminars and symposia; attending conferences; informal talks/discussions; mentoring; long distance collaboration (bench-marking); journal writing; action research while the dependent variables were *professional development* (PD) of ToEL in terms of their knowledge, skills and experience; pedagogy; cognitions; and meeting of learners' needs.

This study adopted the mixed methods approach (QUAN+qual). In the quantitative (QUAN) approach, the researcher used the questionnaire to obtain data and there was a potential risk of a non-response error. The researcher mitigated this by making pre-visits to the sample schools, getting the mobile phone contacts of the participants and arranging the suitable time for the researcher to administer the questionnaires. With a few exceptions, the questionnaires were administered, filled in the presence of the researcher who collected them the very day. In the qualitative (qual) approach the interview guide was used to collect data from the participants (ToEL). The study was confined to ToEL in Bungoma County, Kenya. The uniqueness of the study within a specific context makes it difficult to replicate it exactly in another context (Creswell, 2003). Participants' responses were reflections of, and confined to their personal experiences involving self-assessment component.

4.0 Study Findings

4.1 Teachers' Questionnaire

One hundred and twenty six (126) participants were requested to respond to the closed-ended questions that were on a Five Point Likert Scale. The main objective of the questionnaire was to identify the perceptions ToEL and HoD had towards the role of DCS on their PD in terms of: developing their knowledge, skills and experience; pedagogy; cognitions and meeting students' needs.

4.1.1 ToEL perceptions towards the role played by DCS on their PD in terms of knowledge, skills and experience

As can be seen from Table 4.7 of the questionnaire, for most of the statements, the majority of the participants' responses of the positive statements are like 1, 2, 4, 7 are of the agree side and the average mean of the 1st domain on ToEL knowledge, skills and experience is 3.650 out of 5.000 which shows that most of the ToEL contend the positive effect of DCS on developing their knowledge, skills and experience in the field. When we look specifically at the first item, 98% believed that DCS supports ToEL learning and profession development/growth. In the second item, 99% perceived that: "DCS encourages ToEL to be aware of the latest educational issues in ESL in order to exchange successful experiences with their colleagues." In item four, 84% of the

ToEL from national, 68.7% from county and 58% from district schools agreed that: "the subject supervisor (HoD) holds regular meetings with colleagues in the department to reflect on their professional practices, share ideas and build skills." However, in item 9, only 50% of the ToEL agreed that the principal supported DCS teachers in his/her school while 25% disagreed and 25% were undecided.

On the other hand, items 3, 5, 6, 8 and 10 had negative statements. In 3, 67% agreed while 27% disagreed with the statement that: "the English department is not actively involved in collaborative supervision and this hampers their learning on the job." In item 5, 94% disagreed while 6% agreed with the statement that: "the HoD does not work together with his/her colleagues in the department to solve problems in the teaching and learning process." In item 6, 75% agreed while 22% disagreed with the statement that: "ToEL do not participate in organizing educational workshops, seminars, conferences and symposia which affects their professional development." In item 8, 72% of the participants agreed while 25% disagreed with the statement that, "teachers in the department have not been encouraged to enroll for further studies in order raise their professional/academic levels." In item 10, 61% disagreed while 33% agreed with the statement that: "The HoD does not ensure that all materials and professional records are provided and prepared respectively."

The above findings indicate that the HoD collaborate with colleagues in the departments to solve problems in the teaching and learning process by ensuring that teaching/learning materials are provided in the departments and professional records are prepared. The findings also suggest that enough has not been done by the school principals and to some extent the HoD to fully embrace DCS practices and the ToEL agree that it hampers their learning and PD while on the job. ToEL PD is also hampered because they are rarely involved in organizing for workshops, seminars, symposia and conferences. Their passive participation in these supervisory approaches/practices organised by others negatively affects their professional development. Finally, the majority of the ToEL and HoD have positive perceptions towards the effect of DCS that on their PD. They contend that DCS helps them to develop professionally.

Table 4.7: Participants' perceptions towards the role played by DCS on their PD in terms of knowledge, skills and experience

NO	Domain	SA	A	U	D	SD	MEAN
1. Developing ToEL knowledge, skills and experience							
1	Departmental collaborative supervision (DCS) supports ToEL learning and professional growth.	54%	44%	-	1%	1%	4.49
2	Departmental collaborative supervision encourages ToEL to be aware of the latest educational issues in ESL in order to exchange successful experience with their colleagues.	68%	31%	.	-	1%	4.64
3	The English department is not actively involved in collaborative supervision and this hampers teachers' learning on the job.	16%	51%	6%	20%	7%	3.48
4	The subject supervisor (HoD) holds regular meetings with colleagues in the department to reflect on their professional practice, share ideas and build new skills.	24%	64%	3%	9%	-	4.02
5	The HoD does not work together with his/her colleagues in the department to solve problems in the teaching and learning process.	.	5%	1%	54%	40%	1.72
6	ELTs do not participate in organizing for educational workshops, seminars, symposia and conferences.	39%	37%	3%	13%	8%	3.85
7	The department nominates teachers to attend educational workshops and seminars to encourage them to develop professionally.	30%	64%	3%	2%	1%	4.19
8	Teachers in the department have not been encouraged to enroll for further studies to raise their academic and professional levels.	37%	35%	3%	17%	8%	3.80
9	The principal supports departmental collaborative supervision among teachers in his/her school.	18%	55%	8%	12%	7%	3.67
10	The HOD does not ensure that all materials and professional records are provided and prepared respectively.	7%	26%	6%	44%	17%	2.64
							AV.MEAN =3.650

4.1.2 ToEL perceptions towards the role played by DCS on their PD in terms of Pedagogy

As can be seen from Table 4.8 of the questionnaire item 11, 13, 16, 17 and 19 have positive statements. The majority of the participants' responses are on the agree side and the average mean of responses to the statements in this 2nd domain on ToEL pedagogy is 3.398 out of 5.000. When we specifically look at each of the above items, we see that in item 11, 94% of the participants agreed while 5% disagreed with the statement: "DCS trains teachers to use modern teaching approaches/methods and techniques. In item 13, 93% of the participants agreed while 5% disagreed with the statement that: "DCS helps teachers to discuss ways of solving any problem in the

curriculum." In item 16, 49% agreed while 44% disagreed with the statement: "members of the department observe colleagues while teaching the lesson." In item 17, 66% agreed while 28% disagreed with the statement that stated: "team teaching, which is encouraged in the department, helps teachers' pedagogical development." In item 19, 91% agreed while 9% disagreed with the statement: "DCS makes teachers to be familiar different techniques of classroom management." Lastly, in item 20, 14% of the participants agreed while 84% of them disagreed with the statement that: "members of the department do not self-assessment/supervision (reflection) of their lessons." This implies that as much as the ToEL agree that DCS trains them to use modern approaches, methods and techniques (see item 11), most of them do not learn/read about the recent researches that have

been done in the field of ESL/EFL. When we critically look at the responses to item 16, both who agreed and disagreed with the statement were below 50% and almost equal in number.

The findings suggest that as much as some English departments in different institutions try to observe colleagues while teaching a lesson, most of them have not generally embraced peer observation. Also, most ToEL have not fully embraced peer coaching as one of the DCS practices to update their knowledge about techniques used for assessment since they have been changed in the recent past. As a result,

it negatively affects their pedagogical development. Furthermore, the findings indicate that the majority of ToEL do team teach, do self supervision/reflection of their own lessons to reflect on their practices while workshops and seminars are minimally organized in their institutions and this negatively affects their PD. From these findings, it can be observed that most ToEL and HoD perceive that DCS practices like organizing and attending workshops and seminars; peer observation; self supervision and team teaching help them to develop professionally. In sum, ToEL and their HoD have positive perceptions towards the effect of DCS on their PD.

Table 4.8: ToEL perceptions towards the role played by DCS on their PD in terms of Pedagogy”

NO	Domain	SA	A	U	D	SD	MEANS
	2. Developing ToEL pedagogy	/////	/////	/////	/////	/////	
11	Departmental collaborative supervision trains teachers to use modern teaching methods/techniques.	44%	50%	1%	3%	2%	3.80
12	Departmental collaborative supervision does not direct the teachers to learn about the results of educational researches turn on teaching approaches, methods and techniques to use the most appropriate ones in their teaching.	23%	42%	3%	21%	12%	3.44
13	Departmental collaborative supervision helps teachers discuss ways of solving any problem in the curriculum.	63%	30%	2%	5%	-	4.50
14	The department does not conduct workshops and seminars to the English language teachers in the school and this negatively affects their pedagogical development.	40%	40%	5%	14%	2%	4.01
15	The department does not conduct peer coaching.	18%	35%	2%	37%	8%	3.20
16	Members of the English department observe colleagues while teaching a lesson.	3%	50%	7%	28%	12%	3.06
17	Team teaching, which is encouraged in the department, helps teachers' pedagogical development.	41%	28%	2%	21%	8%	3.72
18	Departmental collaborative supervision does not make teachers to be familiar with the assessment techniques (continuous assessment, formative evaluation and summative evaluation)	2%	8%	5%	64%	21%	2.07
19	Departmental collaborative supervision makes teachers to be familiar with different techniques of classroom management.	37%	54%	2%	7%	-	4.27
20	Members of the department do not do self assessment (supervision) of their lessons.	5%	8%	3%	48%	35%	1.91

4.1.3: ToEL perceptions towards the role played by DCS on their PD in terms of cognitions

As can be seen from table 4.9 of the questionnaire, items 21, 22 and 24 have positive statements while item 23 has a negative statement. In item 21, 96% of the participants agreed while 1% disagreed with the statement that “DCS helps to change ToEL cognitions about teaching.” In item 22, 97% of the participants agreed while 2% disagreed with the statement that: “DCS positively influences ToEL perceptions towards their professional development.” In item 24, 94% of the participants agreed while 2% disagreed with the statement: “DCS is more effective than external (ministerial) supervision in enhancing teachers’ professional development and job effectiveness.” On the other hand, in item 23, 48 % of the participants disagreed while 45% agreed with the

negative statement: “school culture does not promote DCS and professional development of teachers.” The above findings imply that ToEL have positive cognitions towards the role DCS plays in enhancing their PD than ministerial supervision and that school culture is a very important factor that affects the PD of teachers in any institution. If the school culture promotes collaborative supervision, then it will have a positive effect on teachers’ PD. On the other hand, if it does not promote collaborative supervision, then it will impact negatively on ToEL PD in terms of their cognitions. The average mean of responses to the statements in the 3rd domain is 4.059 out of 5.000. This finding reveals that a majority of the ToEL have positive perceptions towards the effect of DCS on their PD in terms of cognitions.

Table 4.9: ToEL perceptions towards the role played by DCS on their PD in terms of cognitions

NO	Domain	SA	A	U	D	SD	MEANS
	3. ToEL cognitions.	/////	/////	/////	/////	/////	
21.	Collaborative supervision helps to change English language teachers' cognition about teaching.	52%	47%	-	1%	-	4.50
22.	Collaborative supervision positively influences English language teachers' perceptions towards their professional development .	62%	35%	-	1%	2%	4.58
	School culture does not promote collaborative supervision and professional development of teachers.	16%	29%	7%	37%	12%	2.78
24.	Departmental collaborative supervision is more effective than external (ministerial) supervision in enhancing teachers' professional development and job effectiveness.	52%	42%	4%	2%	-	4.375 AV.MEAN =4.059

4.1.4 : ToEL perceptions towards the role played by DCS on their PD in terms of meeting learners' needs

In table 4.10 of the questionnaire, we have items 25, 27 and 29 that are stated positively while item 26 and 28 are stated negatively. The majority of the responses in items 25, 27 and 29 are on the agree side. Looking specifically at each item, we observe that in item 25, 98 % of the participants agreed , 2% were undecided while none disagreed with the statement: “DCS helps teachers to identify the learners' developing characteristics to create positive learner attitudes towards learning.” In item 27, 92% of the participants agreed while 8% disagreed with the statement: “DCS directs teachers to use classroom activities, resources and assignments that meet learners' language needs.” In item, 29, 98% of the participants agreed while 2% disagreed with the statement: “DCS creates an effective teaching/learning climate thus improving learners' performance in their internal and external examinations.” On the other hand, in item 26, 82% of the participants disagreed while 13% agreed with the statement: “DCS does not guide teachers to use effective methods to help learners to overcome the difficulties that they

face in language learning.” In item 28, 57% of the participants disagreed while 25% agreed with the statement: “DCS does not help teachers to teach their learners language learning strategies.” The responses to the statements in the 4th domain on the perceptions of ToEL towards the effect of DCS on their PD gave an average mean of 4.034 out of 5.000. These findings imply that majority of the participants contend the positive effect of DCS on their PD in terms of meeting their learners' needs. What is striking in this section is that there are very few responses on the disagree and strongly disagree side in items 27 (8%) and 29 (2%) while there are no negative responses in item 25 which absolutely proves the previous perceptions about the positive effect of DCS on the PD of ToEL. The responses from these two statements show that teachers really expect to collaborate with their colleagues in the department or from other schools in order to help their learners to overcome their learning problems and teach them language learning strategies. Teachers collaborate in order to solve problems related to their students through discussions and this will help them to develop professionally.

Table 4.10: ToEL perceptions towards the role played by DCS on their PD in terms of meeting learners' needs

	Domain	SA	A	U	D	SD	MEANS
	4. Meeting learners' needs	//////	//////	//////	//////	//////	
25	DCS help teachers to identify the learners' developing characteristics to create positive learner attitudes towards learning.	56%	42%	2%	-	-	4.54
26	DCS does not guide teachers to use effective methods to help learners to overcome the difficulties that they face in learning.	5%	7%	5%	46%	37%	4.01
27	DCS direct teachers to use classroom activities resources and assignments that meet learners' needs.	28%	64%	6%	2%	-	4.19
28	DCS does not help teachers to teach their learners language learning strategies.	9%	16%	18%	41%	17%	2.85
29	DCS creates an effective teaching/learning climate thus improving learners' performance in their internal and external examinations.	63%	35%	-	2%	-	4.58
							AV.MEAN= 4.034

In sum, the majority of the responses to the statements in the questionnaire point to the fact that most of the ToEL and HoD perceive that DCS has a positive role towards their professional development in terms of their knowledge, skills and experience; pedagogy; cognitions and meeting of their learners' needs.

4.2 Teachers' Interviews

The researcher interviewed 30 participants: 18 ToEL and 12 English HoD who had participated in filling the questionnaires as a follow-up so as to reveal their specific perceptions (opinions) regarding the role/effect of DCS on their professional development (PD), the information that may not have been possible to find only through the questionnaires. Interview guide contained six items. Interview questions were posed to each teacher. The researcher transcribed each teacher's responses/data. The codes were created from the transcription of the interviews. The codes were then grouped in a number of categories and themes for each participant teacher in the study and finally the interviews' report was produced. The interview schedule included the following questions:

1. Which approaches/practices of DCS are you familiar with?
2. Which of these approaches/practices are used in your department?
3. Do you think that DCS plays a role in your PD?
4. How do you compare the effectiveness of DCS and ministerial/external supervision in terms of your PD?
5. Do you give priority to you PD? If no, what impedes you from engaging in Continuous Professional Development (CPD)?
6. What factors affect DCS in your school/department?

In response to question 1 regarding the DCS approaches/practices they were familiar with and which ones were used in their departments, majority indicated the use of team teaching, co-operating to make schemes of work, departmental professional meetings/discussions and attending workshops/seminars, peer observation, benchmarking/collaborating with colleagues from other institutions/ exchange visits as practices they are familiar with. Those practices most frequently used by ToEL were team teaching, co-operating to make schemes of work, departmental professional meetings and attending workshops/seminars and reporting back the department. Only two participants and one department(s) were familiar with the use of journal writing and action research respectively. For example:

We are six colleagues in the department and we have developed a culture of team teaching. Each teacher handles an area he/she is most competent and comfortable with hence each part of the curriculum is taken care of (Teacher 1).

My HOD teaches Kiswahili. I am the only teacher of English. If we are talking about English, then I go out to attend workshops and meet there with colleagues from other schools (Teacher 11).

We do meet as colleagues in the department and co-operate to make schemes of work. With the changes in set books, this must be taken care of as we update from the previous schemes of work (Teacher 9).

We have been two ToEL in the department. Unfortunately, my colleague transferred at the beginning of last term. I'm the only one in the department. I like to team teach but how can I collaborate alone? How can I be effective when I'm teaching 28 lessons per week? (Teacher 17).

When the researcher probed a member of one department who had stated that they used action research, he explained:

In our school we do collaborate to set and mark exams and team teach. Last year, one class completely failed poetry section in English Paper 2 on literary devices and section 3 of Paper 1 on oral skills-performance of poetry. It was discovered that instead of the subject teacher of the affected class looking at oral performance skills differently from literary devices, she was treating them as one. We corrected this through peer coaching but she was given another class (Teacher, 28).

Question 3, which asked if ToEL think DCS played a role in their PD, majority of them (27) 90% believed that it can help them to grow professionally while 10% (3) thought that it might not be in any way significant. Those who faulted DCS cited it as just a form of routine and being in good books with the HoD and the principal and nothing beyond that. Those who responded that it played a role in their PD argued that they developed their skills on the job when they viewed their colleagues teach, in co-operating to make schemes of work, team teaching, having professional meetings and exchanging their views and attending seminars/workshops which helped them gain knowledge and skills and adapt to changes in the curriculum/syllabus.

For instance,
DCS (internal supervision) can help teachers to grow professionally so long as the HoD acts as a servant (Jesus Christ's example) and not a boss and not a principal's spy and also be a team player (Teacher 3).

DCS practices have not been fully embraced by most schools in Kenya. In this school we team teach, attend workshops, and hold departmental professional meetings and discussions. These help a lot in improving our teaching skills and acquiring new knowledge about the curriculum. But practices such as action research, peer observation, peer coaching and mentoring are uncommon yet I believe they are very important in our professional growth (Teacher 13).

However some participants who thought DCS had no significant role in their PD argued:

In our school we co-operate to make schemes of work, set exams and mark them, hold meetings and team teach. This in my view is just to fulfill the school's culture and organizational requirements and not to offend the HOD or number 1. It has little to do with one's professional development (Teacher 10).

If DCS practices have any role to play in a teacher's PD, then I'd like to say it is a minor one. Serious teachers will attend workshops or conferences of over one month or go for further studies in order to develop professionally ... and that is what I am doing (Teacher, 22)

The above interview findings imply that whereas almost all of the teachers (27) considered DCS as playing a significant role in their PD and only 3 opposed this view, this reflects the diversity of the ToEL cognitions about the effect of DCS on their professional development.

In relation to question 4, regarding their comparison of the effectiveness of DCS and ministerial supervision in relation to their PD, most ToEL stated that DCS was more effective than ministerial supervision. To illustrate this, here are some of the participants' responses:

In DCS, the teacher agrees with his/her colleagues on what needs to be done in the department so that they can be more effective in their jobs and improve students' learning and performance. This makes teachers to come up with solutions to their teaching problems unlike in ministerial supervision where a supervisor uses less than 30 minutes to faulty-find or witch-hunt on the teacher. This demoralizes the teacher a lot! (Teacher 4)

DCS, which is school-based, can be more effective than ministerial supervision because it unites teachers and causes them to supervise their own work daily or rather regularly unlike external supervisors who visit the school only once after three or so years... (Teacher 24)

Discussion of findings

The main purpose of this study was to find out the perceptions of ToEL towards the role played by DCS on their PD through use of questionnaire and teachers' interview.

Findings of the closed-ended questionnaire

The questionnaire had 29 items. Each item was accompanied by a Five-Point Likert Scale. It included four domains which represented main professional development (PD) areas: *knowledge, skills and experience; pedagogy; cognitions and meeting learners' needs*. The findings of the research reveal that ToEL and English HoD have positive perceptions towards the effect of Departmental Collaborative Supervision (DCS) on their professional development (PD). A majority of them contend that DCS plays a major role in their PD.

First, from the findings, majority of the participants had *positive perceptions* towards the role\effect of DCS on the PD of ToEL in terms of *developing their knowledge, skills and experience*. Most of the participants perceived that DCS encouraged them to be aware of the latest educational issues in order to encourage them to exchange useful experiences and knowledge with their colleagues; DCS helps them to hold regular meetings in the department to reflect on their professional practices, share ideas and build new skills; it helps the HoD to work together with his/her colleagues in the department to solve problems in the teaching and learning process and it encourages them to continue to learn and develop professionally. These findings agree with Downey et al. (2004); Glickman et al (2007) who argue that educational supervision brings about emergent outcome to the overall teaching and learning community in case it provides a continuum of collaborative relationship where teaching experiences are reflected upon and shared with other staff in providing a community of practice. This also matches with Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu (2010) who contend that education supervision, a co-operative problem solving process, can be regarded as a key concept in English language teachers' professional development and with Freeman (2002) who emphasise that reflection must become a central pillar in teacher development.

It was also found out that a half of the participants perceived that school principals supported DCS. This indicates that school principals do not give full support needed in DCS. This agrees with findings of Mosha (2006) who found out that institutional management in Tanzania is not always supportive and sometimes lacks the expertise to properly manage professional development programmes. Also, Johnson (2011) sees the negative role of school administration towards EFL teachers' PD does not help teacher development.

A majority (55%) of the participants agreed with the statement that: "ToEL do not participate in organizing for educational workshops/seminars, conferences and symposiums in their institutions, which affected negatively their PD." This shows that ToEL PD is hampered because they are not actually involved in organizing for workshops/seminars, conferences and symposiums. Their passive participation in these supervisory approaches/practices organized by others (book publishers and education officers) negatively affected their PD because they do not meet their individual or school needs. These findings agree with Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002) who state that the "one-shot" workshops are meant to help teachers to acquire prescribed skills and knowledge. But this approach is seen to be less helpful to the PD of teachers because many teachers find these workshops to be boring, irrelevant and they claim to forget more than ninety five per cent of what they learn (Robb, 2000) while Gaies and Bowers (1990) note that PD which is limited to workshops and seminars do not attend to individual needs of individual teachers. Francis and Mazany (1998) state that schools should be viewed as a learning organization while Wilson (2000) points out that in-service programmes that are divorced from the work context and take place outside school or even overseas makes teachers to find difficulties in applying what they learnt when they return to their classrooms. This also matches with Bezzina (2002) who argue that heads and teachers have little input in the selection and design of course content and therefore these in service training programmes do not meet the needs of most participants. Pham (2001) findings in Vietnam show that the organizing of in service training/education by ToEL is still not the norm.

Most of the participants argued that enough had not been done by the school principals and HoD to encourage colleagues in the school to go for further studies and that affected their PD in terms of knowledge, skills and experience and a majority of them perceived that the HoD tried to ensure that teaching and learning materials were provided in the department and most of the professional records needed in the department were provided. This matches with Broughton et al (1994) who state that the English head of department should co-ordinate the identification and procurement of appropriate materials and supplies, tools, equipment and other facilities in order to improve and uphold high teaching standards and ensure that schemes of work and lesson plans are prepared and adhered to in the course of teaching (Silsil, 2009).

Second, a majority of the participants had *positive perceptions towards the role\ effect of DCS on their pedagogical development*. Most of the participants agreed that DCS trains teachers to use modern teaching approaches/methods and techniques; helps teachers to discuss ways of solving any problem in the curriculum; and makes teachers to be familiar with different classroom management and assessment techniques. The findings are in agreement with Johnson (2011) who argues that collaboration among language teachers may well focus on instructional issues such as material exploitation; classroom management; classroom language use and so on and the shared professional understanding of language teachers are likely to point to them toward certain common concerns and interests.

As much as most of the participants agreed that DCS trained them to use modern approaches / methods and techniques (Item 11), most of them did not learn/read about the recent researches that have been done in the field of ESL/EFL. Yet ToEL need knowledge on how to incorporate research in their teaching. Day (1997) states that research needs to be used much more as a means of informing teachers' judgments about the contexts; purposes, craft, science and art of their profession and teaching; and alongside this, as a means of assisting them in revisiting these at different times across the span of their careers.

It was found out that a majority (60%) of the participants did self-assessment (supervision) of their lessons. Over 90% agreed that team teaching was encouraged in their departments; a majority of them disagreed with the statement that: "the department does not conduct peer coaching" and less than a half (49.8%) of the participants agreed that members of the English department observe colleagues while teaching a lesson. This implies that most toEL have embraced self-supervision of their lessons, team teaching and peer coaching while peer observation has not been fully encouraged and embraced by the ToEL. From the findings, it was observed that many teachers felt uncomfortable with peer observation and thought it was a way of undermining or witch hunting them. These findings agree with Viet (2008) who found out that many Vietnamese teachers feel uncomfortable or reluctant when their colleagues attend their classes.

Third, a majority of the participants perceived that *DCS had a positive role\effect on their professional development in terms of their cognitions*. A majority of the participants had positive perceptions towards the effect (role) of DCS in developing their cognitions. They perceived that DCS developed them professionally more than external (ministerial) supervision. Many of the participants also perceived that school culture affected DCS and PD of ToEL. This shows that school culture is a very important factor that affects the PD of teachers in the institution. If school culture supports DCS, then it will have a positive effect on teachers' PD. On the other hand, if it does not support DCS then it will impact negatively on ToEL PD in terms of their cognitions. School culture affects how ToEL view themselves and their practice (work). So the knowledge of teacher cognitions is a very important component of current conceptualizations of SLTE. This encompasses the mental lives of teachers, how these are formed, what they consist of, and how teachers' beliefs, thoughts and thinking processes shape their understanding of teaching and their classroom practices (Borg, 2006). Most of the participants perceived that DCS was more effective than ministerial (external) supervision in enhancing their job effectiveness and PD. Richards (2011) argues that a central aspect of teacher cognition is the role of teacher's pedagogical reasoning skills which teachers possess and make use of in planning and conducting their lessons.

Fourth, a majority of the participants contend the *positive role\effect of DCS on their professional development in terms of meeting their*

learners' needs. A majority of the participants agreed with the statements that: "DCS helps ToEL to identify the learners' developing characteristics to create a positive learner attitudes towards learning the language", that " DCS directs them to use classroom activities, resources and assignments that meet the learners' needs", that " DCS creates an effective teaching and learning climate thus improving learners' performance in their internal and external examinations", that " DCS guides teachers to use effective methods to help learners to overcome the difficulties they face in language learning" and that "DCS helps ToEL to teach learners language learning strategies".

This implies that ToEL really expect to collaborate with their colleagues in the department and/or from other schools in order to help learners to overcome their learning strategies and solve problems related to their students through discussions and this will help them to develop professionally. These findings matches with Randall and Thornton (2001); Lucas, Villegas Freedson-Ganz (2008) who state that teachers should develop an awareness about the familiarity with one's own students, their learning strategies, problems and needs in learning in order to know how to cater for all learners' differences. Freeman (2001) argues that this area has often been neglected in L2 teacher education. He states that this knowledge of learners and learning- the child and adolescent development knowledge can be applied to educator preparation and education policy. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) found out that effective professional development should be a structured collaborative professional learning that results in changes in teacher practices and improvement in student learning outcomes.

In sum, majority of the participants' responses to the statements in the questionnaire point to the fact that most of the ToEL and their HoD perceived that DCS had a positive effect on their PD in terms of their knowledge, skills and experience; pedagogy; cognitions and meeting of learners' needs. This matches with Sergiovanni et al (1998) who state that the cornerstone of a comprehensive teacher growth and development programme for any school or district is a supervisory system of staff development with shared responsibility.

5. CONCLUSION

From the above findings, it can be concluded that teachers of English language (ToEL) and English HoD have positive perceptions towards the role played by Departmental Collaborative Supervision (DCS) on their Professional Development (PD) in terms of their knowledge, experience and skills; pedagogy; cognitions and meeting of learners' needs. During DCS teachers bring with them their knowledge, experiences, skills and they share and reflect upon. So an effective PD programme should exploit fully the knowledge, skills and experience teachers bring with them. DCS also helps ToEL to develop their pedagogy through discussing the use of modern teaching methods and techniques, problem solving techniques, classroom management and assessment techniques and to reflect upon recent researches that have been done in the field of ELT.

The researcher also thinks and believes that if the ToEL in particular and teachers in general view DCS more positively than ministerial supervision and the government's view currently is that DCS is the way to go to due to some failures in external (directive) supervision, then teachers, school heads, TSC and the Ministry of education should embrace and promote DCS in our institutions for our teachers to inspire their learners to learn the language, grow professionally and be more effective in their jobs.

6. Recommendations

In the light of the conclusion, the research recommends the following:

- ToEL and their HoD should embrace and promote collaborative supervision in their departments and with colleagues from other institutions in order for them to create a community of practice and develop professionally.
- ToEL and HoD should be trained/educated on the use of different DCS practices in order for them to be embraced and promoted in their institutions.
- School principals and Boards of Management (BoM) should fully support DCS programmes in their institutions in terms of finances and leadership and should attend refresher courses on institutional leadership and collaborative supervision.
- ToEL should collaborate with language educators and researchers in the universities through doing research, writing journals and holding conferences with the prime purpose of professional development.

- The government through the TSC and the Ministry of Education should employ more teachers in general and ToEL in particular in order to make DCS a reality in learning institutions, for it is impossible for institutions with one teacher in the department to collaborate!
- The Ministry of Education should come up with clear, consistent and sensible policies on DCS and provide needed resources, feedback and follow-up support in order to improve students' learning, teacher effectiveness and their professional development.

7. Suggestions for further research

- Further research is required in Kenya and other countries in order to generate the empirical insights required for informed decision-making about appropriate ways of organizing language teacher supervision in general and DCS in particular at all levels of learning: pre-school, primary, secondary, tertiary and university.
- Further research is needed on the effect of each of the DCS practices on the professional development of ToEL in Kenya and elsewhere.
- It is important to conduct other studies to check the weaknesses and effectiveness of each DCS Practice separately.

REFERENCES

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) (2010). *21st Century Knowledge and Skills in Teacher Preparation*. New York: Pearson.
- Auerbach, E.R. & Paxton, D. (1997). "It's not the English thing" Bringing Reading Research into the ELS Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 237-261.
- Baecher, L.H. and Thuy, D.T.B. (2011). 'Supervision of Instruction in English as a Foreign Language: A Vietnamese Perspective' *TESOL JOURNAL*, Vol. 5, pp 3-20 retrieved from <http://www.tesol-journal.com>. Time Taylor.
- Bezzina, C.(2002). Rethinking Teachers' Professional Development in Malta: Agenda for the Twenty-First Century. *Journal of In-Service Education, Volume 28, Number 1*.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching : A Review of Research on What Language Teachers Think, Believe, Know and Do. *Language Teaching* 36, 81-89.
- Borg, S. (2006). The Distinctive Characteristics of Foreign Language Teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(1), 3-31.
- Broughton, G. et al., (1994). *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (Second Edition)*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Cheserek, E. " Poor Results blamed on Teacher Low Morale" *The Standard* 22nd May, 2013:28
- Cormany, S., Maynor, C., & Kalnin, J. (2004). Developing Self, Developing Curriculum and Developing Theory: Researchers in Residence at Patrick Henry Professional Practice School. In D.J. Tedick (Ed). *Language Teacher Education International Perspectives on Research and Practice* (pp.231-255). Mahwah, N J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Danielson, C. & Mcreal, T.L.(2000). *Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L.(1997). *The Right to Learn: a Blue Print for Creating Schools that Work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M.E. & Gardner, M. (2017) *Effective Teacher Professional Development*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- David, J.L. (1995-1996). The Who, What and Why of Site-based Management, *Educational Leadership*, 53(4), December-January, pp.49.
- Day, C. (1999). *Developing Teachers: the Challenges of Life Long Learning*. London; Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.
- Edge, J.(1992). *Cooperative Development*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Fraenkel, J.S. and Wallen, N.E. (2010). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (Seventh Edition)* New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Francis, S.D. & Mazany, P.C. (1998). Developing Elements of a Learning Organisation in a Metropolitan Ambulance Service, *Continuing Professional Development*, Editorial, 1, p.v.
- Freeman, D. (1998). *Doing Teacher Research: From Inquiry to Understanding*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Freeman, D. (2001). Second Language Teacher Education. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.) *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages*. Cambridge : Cambridge University press.
- Freeman, D.(2002). The Hidden Side of the Work: Teacher Knowledge and Learning to Teach. *Language Teaching*, 35, 1-13.
- Freeman, D and Johnson, K.E (1998). Reconceptualizing the Knowledge of Language Teacher Education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(3)397-417
- Gebhard, J. G (1999). Seeing Teaching Differently through Observation. In J.G. Gerbhard and R. Oprandy (Eds.). *Language Teaching Awareness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ghapanchi, Z & Baradaran, M. (2011). "English Language Teachers' Perceptions of Educational Supervision in Relation to their Professional Development: a Case study of Iran" Ferdows: University of Mashhad-Iran.
- Glickman, C. D.(2004). *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Development Approach (6th ed)*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Glickman, D.C., et al., (2007). *Supervision and Instructional Leadership*. Pearson Education Inc.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1984). *A Place called School: prospects for the Future*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Herman, J.J. & Herman, J.L. (1993). *School-Based Management: Current Thinking and Practice*. Springfield IL: Thomas C. Publishers.
- Hismanoglu, M. & Hismanoglu, S.(2010). English Language Teachers' Perceptions of Educational Supervision in Relation to their Professional Development: a Case of Northern Cyprus. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 4(1), 14-34.
- Johnson, C.(2011). School Administrators and the Importance of Utilizing Action Research, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 14(1), 78-84.
- Johnston, B. (2003). *Values in English Language Teaching*. Mahwah, N J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kafu, P.A. (2011). 'Teacher Education in Kenya: Emerging issues' *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, Vol1(1), pp.43-52 Available online at <http://www.muk.ac.ke/ijci>
- Lieberman, A. (1995). Practices that Support Teacher Development-Transforming conceptions of professional Learning, *PhiDelta Kappan*, 76, pp.591-596

33. MoEST (2005). "Sessional Paper No. of 2004 on a Policy Framework for Education and Training and Research in the 21st Century"
34. Mohamed, N. (2006). "An Exploratory Study of the Interplay Between Teachers' Beliefs, Instructional Practices & Professional Development" Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Thesis in Language Teaching and Learning, The University of Auckland.
35. Mohrman, S.A., Wohlstetter, P. & Associates (Eds.) (1994). *School-based Management Organising for High Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
36. Mosha, H.J. (2006). *Planning Education Systems for Excellence*. Dar es Salaam: E & D Limited.
37. Newmann, F. & Wehlage, G. (1995). *Successful School Restructuring*. Board of Regents, University of Wisconsin System.
38. Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2004). *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
39. Ong'ondo, C.O & Jwan J.O. (2009). 'Research on Student Teacher Learning, Collaboration and Supervision during the Practicum: A Literature Review' *Educational Research and Review Vol.4 (11)* pp.515-524, UK: The University of Leeds.
40. Ong'ondo, C.O. (2010). 'The Influence of Supervision on the Practice of English Language Student Teachers in Kenya'. Doctor of Philosophy Thesis. UK: University of Leeds.
41. Pfeiffer, I.L. & Dunlap, J.B. (1982). *Supervision of Teachers: a Guide to Improving Instruction*. Phoenix : Oryx Press.
42. Pham, H. H. (2001). Teacher Development: A Real Need for English Departments in Vietnam. *English Teaching Forum*, 39(4). Retrieved from <http://eca.state.gov/forum/vols/vol39/no.4/p.30.htm>.
43. Randall, M. & Thornton, B. (2001). *Advising and Supporting Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
44. Republic of Kenya (2005a). *Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP) 2005-2010*. Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Government Printer, Nairobi.
45. Republic of Kenya (2005b). Sessional Paper No.1 of 2005: *A Policy Framework for Education, Training and Research: Meeting the Challenges of Education, Training and Research in Kenya in the 21st Century*. Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Government Printer, Nairobi.
46. Republic of Kenya (2012). *A Policy Framework for Education, Training and Research: Meeting the Challenges of Education, Training and Research in Kenya in the 21st Century*. Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Government Printer, Nairobi.
47. Republic of Kenya (2013). 'Task Force Final Report for New Education System and Vision 2030'. Nairobi; MoE: Government Printer.
48. 296.
49. Richards, J. C. (1991). Reflective Teaching in TESOL Teacher Education (FL022034). *Issues in Language Education Anthology Series 30*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED370357).
50. Richards, J. C., & Farrel, T.S.C. (2005). *Professional Development for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
51. Richards, J.C. & Nunan, D. (Eds.) (2000) *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
52. Robb, L. (2000). *Redefining Staff Development*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
53. Schmoker, M. (1997). Setting Goals in Turbulent Times, in A. Hargreaves (Ed.) *Rethinking Educational Change with Heart and Mind*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, pp.128-148.
54. Seins, C. (1996) Developmental Supervision and Reflective Thinking of Teachers. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 11, 299-319.
55. Sergiovanni, J. T., & Starratt, R.J. (1998). *Supervision: a Redefinition*. Boston. MA: McGraw.
56. Shaps, E., Watson, M. & Lewis, C. (1996). A Sense of Community is Key to Effectiveness in Fostering Character Education. *Journal of Staff Development*, 17(2), pp.42-47.
57. Sockett, H. (1993). *The Moral Base for Teacher Professionalism*. New York: Teachers College Press.
58. Steyn, G. M. & Squelch, J. (1996). Exploring the Perceptions of Teacher Empowerment in South Africa: a Small Scale Study, Paper Presented at the BEMAS Research Conference: Partners in Change: Shaping the Future, 25-27 March, Robinson College, Cambridge.
59. Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2002). *Handbook for the Mixed Methods*. London: Sage.
60. Toohey, K. & Waterstone, B. (2004). *Negotiating Expertise in Action Research Community*. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.) *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning* (p.291-310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
61. TSC (2013). "Teachers Image" *A Quarterly Magazine, Volume 19*, p 12,17.
62. UNESCO (2000). Education for All, Dakar. Framework for Action world Education Forum Dakar Senegal 26-28th April 2000 Retrieved 17th, from http://www.unesco.org/education/efal/ed_forall/dakarfram-eng.shtml
63. Viet, K. A. (2008). Imperialism of Communicative Language Teaching and Possible Resistance against it from Teachers in Vietnam as an English Foreign Language Context. *Vietnam National University Journal of Science, Foreign Languages*, 24, 167-174.
64. Wangari, E. G. (2009). 'The Influence of Education Quality Assessment on the Adoption and use of Instructional Media in English: a Case of Uasin Gishu District'. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Degree Thesis, Moi University, Eldoret.
65. Wanzare, Z. (2012). Instructional Supervision in Public Secondary Schools in Kenya. *Educ. Manage. Adm. Leadershi.* 40 (2), 188-216
66. Weiss, C. H. (1993). Shared Decision Making about What? A Comparison of Schools with and without Teacher Participation, *Teachers College Record*, 95(1), Autumn, pp.69-92.
67. Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: learning Meaning and Identity*. London: Cambridge University Press.
68. Zeichner, K.M. (2010) Rethinking the Connections between Campus Courses and Field Experiences in College- and University-Based Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61 (1-2), 89-99