



INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION PRACTICES OF HEADS OF SCHOOLS AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS: EVIDENCE FROM MBEYA DISTRICT, TANZANIA

Happy Simon Mbonde¹, Supervisors: Dr. Egidio Chaula², Dr. Noel Chaula³

Department of Education, Faculty of Science and Education, University of Iringa, Tanzania

ABSTRACT :

This study examined the instructional supervision practices used by heads of public secondary schools in Mbeya District, Tanzania and their contribution to improving students' academic performance. Guided by Hallinger and Murphy's (1985) Instructional Leadership Theory, the study adopted a mixed-methods descriptive design. Data were collected from 111 respondents comprising 103 teachers, six heads of schools and two District Education Officers through structured questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, observation checklists and document review. Descriptive statistics were computed using SPSS version 25, while qualitative data were analysed thematically. Findings revealed that instructional supervision was conducted infrequently and inconsistently across the six sampled schools. Only 34.9% of teachers were observed in their classrooms at least once per month, only 30.1% had professional documents checked at least every two weeks and only 43.7% rated feedback quality after supervision as good or very good. Only 39.8% of teachers gave overall supervision quality a positive rating. Yet 86.4% agreed that regular classroom observation could improve teaching quality, revealing a critical gap between the recognized potential and the actual delivery of supervision. Administrative overload, teacher shortage and absence of formal supervision schedules were identified as the primary structural constraints. Document review confirmed substantial variation across schools, with two schools showing systematic supervision records and four showing significant documentation gaps. The study concludes that instructional supervision in Mbeya District is insufficient in frequency, depth and consistency. It recommends structured observation schedules, improved feedback quality, protected instructional leadership time and strengthened district-level support for heads of schools.

Keywords: *Instructional supervision, classroom observation, professional documents, feedback, academic performance, Mbeya District.*

1. Introduction

School leadership has been consistently identified in international and regional literature as one of the most powerful determinants of student academic performance, second only to the quality of classroom teaching itself. Among the various dimensions of school leadership, instructional leadership — defined as the direct and active involvement of school heads in supervising teaching, monitoring curriculum implementation, checking teachers' professional documents and providing feedback for professional improvement — has attracted growing attention as a key mechanism through which principals translate educational policy into improved classroom outcomes (Hallinger, 2019; Grissom, Egalite & Lindsay, 2021). In the United States and United Kingdom, research has consistently established that school heads who spend more time on instructional supervision and less time on purely administrative tasks achieve measurably better student academic results (Darling-Hammond, 2020; Ofsted, 2019). In Asia, particularly in China, Japan and Singapore, close classroom supervision and structured teacher feedback have been linked to high national examination performance and sustained teaching quality (Wu & Shen, 2022).

In Sub-Saharan Africa, the relationship between instructional supervision and academic performance remains critically important but is frequently undermined by structural constraints. Bush, Kiggundu and Moorosi (2021) found that heads of schools in many African countries spend the majority of their working day on administrative management, student discipline and compliance reporting, leaving insufficient time for the classroom-based supervisory activities that directly support teaching quality. In Tanzania, studies in Mwanza and Lindi regions have documented that heads of schools often fail to conduct regular classroom observation, fail to check teachers' professional documents systematically and rarely provide constructive feedback after supervision visits, all of which contribute to persistent poor academic performance in public secondary schools (Ngole & Mkulu, 2021; Chiwamba & Sumbizi, 2024).

In Mbeya District, public secondary schools continue to show significant variation in Certificate of Secondary Education Examination results despite

sharing the same national curriculum, the same resource allocation framework and the same district education management structure (NECTA, 2023). While multiple factors contribute to this performance variation, limited localized empirical evidence exists on how heads of schools actually practice instructional supervision in this specific context and how those practices relate to academic outcomes. This study addresses that gap. Guided by Hallinger and Murphy's (1985) Instructional Leadership Theory, which identifies managing the instructional programme — encompassing supervision, evaluation of instruction and coordination of curriculum — as a central leadership dimension, the study examined the instructional supervision practices used by heads of public secondary schools in Mbeya District and their contribution to improving students' academic performance.

2. Methodology

2.1 Study Area

The study was conducted in Mbeya District Council, Mbeya Region, Tanzania. The district comprises 32 public secondary schools in rural and semi-urban areas with documented variation in CSEE academic performance. It was selected because heads of schools in the district carry explicit responsibility for instructional supervision, making it a relevant context for examining how that responsibility is actually discharged and what difference it makes to student outcomes.

2.2 Research Approach and Design

A mixed-methods research approach combining quantitative and qualitative data was employed. The quantitative component enabled measurement of the extent and frequency of supervision practices, while the qualitative component provided detailed explanations of how supervision is experienced and constrained in real school settings (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). A descriptive research design was used, appropriate for describing existing supervision practices without manipulating study variables (Kothari, 2004).

2.3 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

From a population of approximately 710 teachers and 32 heads of schools in Mbeya District, a sample of 128 teachers was calculated using Yamane's (1967) formula at an 8% margin of error. Six public secondary schools were selected through simple random sampling. Teachers were selected by simple random sampling within each school, while heads of schools and two District Education Officers were selected purposively because of their direct knowledge of and responsibility for instructional supervision. Of 116 targeted respondents, 111 participated fully, yielding a response rate of 95.7%.

2.4 Data Collection Methods

Four instruments were used. Structured questionnaires administered to 103 teachers covered frequency of classroom observation, professional document checking, feedback quality, academic meeting regularity and perceptions of supervision impact on academic performance, using a five-point Likert scale alongside closed-ended frequency items. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with six heads of schools and two education officers, exploring how supervision was practiced, the reasoning behind different approaches and the challenges affecting implementation. A classroom observation checklist was used during school visits to record the availability of supervision-related documentation. Document review examined lesson observation forms, signed lesson plans and schemes of work, supervision schedules, written feedback files and academic meeting minutes across all six schools.

2.5 Data Analysis

Quantitative data were coded and analysed in SPSS version 25 using frequencies and percentages. Qualitative data from interviews were analysed thematically, with codes grouped into themes aligned to the study objective. Triangulation across all four data sources ensured credibility and consistency of findings.

3. Results

3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Of 103 teacher respondents, 64 (62.1%) were male and 39 (37.9%) female, reflecting Tanzania's male-dominated secondary teaching workforce. The majority (45.6%) were aged 30–39 years, with 66.0% holding a Bachelor's degree and 10.7% a Master's degree. In terms of experience, 36.9% had 6–

10 years of teaching experience and 28.2% had 1–5 years, making this a predominantly young and moderately experienced workforce. By position, 55.3% were classroom teachers, 20.4% academic teachers and 17.5% heads of departments. The six heads of schools had between 2 and 12 years of leadership experience, with two holding Master's degrees and three Bachelor's degrees. Both education officers were aged 40–49 years, holding Master's and Bachelor's degrees respectively with 3–5 years in their current roles.

3.2 Frequency of Classroom Observation

Table 1 presents teacher-reported frequency of classroom observation by heads of schools.

Table 1: Frequency of Classroom Observation by Heads of Schools as Reported by Teachers (n=103)

Frequency of Classroom Observation	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Very often at least once every two weeks	9	8.7
Often at least once per month	27	26.2
Sometimes once per term	38	36.9
Rarely less than once per term	22	21.4
Never I have never been observed	7	6.8
Total	103	100.0

Source: Field Data (2026)

Only 34.9% of teachers were observed at least once per month, while 65.1% were observed only once per term, rarely, or never. Seven teachers (6.8%) reported having never been observed despite at least one year in their school. This finding reveals that in the majority of classrooms, the head of school is largely absent as a supervisory presence, meaning that teaching weaknesses, syllabus gaps and student disengagement can persist undetected for entire terms.

Interview data provided structural explanations for this pattern. HS-03 described his situation directly: daily demands of writing reports, attending meetings, managing disciplinary cases and receiving district visitors consumed all available time, leaving classroom observation to occur only about once per term per teacher. HS-01 explained that he had delegated classroom observation to heads of departments, but that this system frequently broke down because heads of departments carried full teaching loads alongside their leadership responsibilities, making sustained observation equally difficult for them.

HS-04 offered a contrasting account, describing a diary-based supervision schedule in which he committed to at least four lesson observations per week, treating observation as a non-negotiable professional duty comparable to any official meeting. He managed to observe each teacher at least twice per term and sometimes three times, a frequency substantially higher than any other participating head of school. His conviction that "you cannot improve what you don't know about" captures the fundamental logic of classroom observation as an improvement tool.

3.3 Frequency and Quality of Professional Document Checking

Table 2 presents how often heads of schools checked teachers' professional documents lesson plans, schemes of work and records of work.

Table 2: Frequency of Professional Document Checking by Heads of Schools (n=103)

Frequency of Document Checking	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Every week	12	11.7
Every two weeks	19	18.4
Once per month	34	33.0
Once per term	28	27.2
Rarely or never	10	9.7
Total	103	100.0

Source: Field Data (2026)

Only 30.1% of teachers had documents checked at the minimum expected frequency of at least every two weeks. The majority (69.9%) experienced checking only monthly, termly, or rarely. When teachers were asked whether document checking was both regular and helpful, Table 3 reveals that

only 41.8% agreed or strongly agreed, while 40.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Table 3: Teacher Responses on Whether Document Checking is Regular and Helpful (n=103)

Response	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	11	10.7
Agree	32	31.1
Neutral	18	17.5
Disagree	29	28.2
Strongly Disagree	13	12.6
Total	103	100.0

Source: Field Data (2026)

HS-02 described a genuinely developmental approach to document checking, writing detailed comments on lesson plans, identifying structural weaknesses such as missing introduction activities and discussing findings personally with teachers transforming what could be bureaucratic compliance into genuine professional dialogue. In contrast, HS-05, with only two years of leadership experience, described collecting schemes of work at the beginning of each term and signing them without always having time to write detailed comments, acknowledging explicitly that she needed to improve this practice and that her predecessor had set a weak supervisory precedent that she was working to overcome.

3.4 Quality of Feedback After Supervision

Table 4 presents teachers' ratings of feedback quality following classroom observation and document checking.

Table 4: Teacher Ratings of Feedback Quality After Supervision (n=103)

Rating of Feedback Quality	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Very good specific, constructive and timely	14	13.6
Good generally helpful, though not always detailed	31	30.1
Fair sometimes useful but often vague or general	34	33.0
Poor rarely useful or rarely given	18	17.5
No feedback I have never received any feedback	6	5.8
Total	103	100.0

Source: Field Data (2026)

Only 43.7% of teachers rated their feedback as good or very good. A combined 56.3% described feedback as fair, poor, or entirely absent. Six teachers (5.8%) reported never having received any feedback from their head of school. The finding that 33.0% described feedback as vague or general points to a quality deficit as well as a frequency deficit. Feedback that says "your lesson needs improvement" without specifying what to change, why the current approach is ineffective, or what a better approach would look like is not actionable and therefore cannot improve teaching.

Open-ended questionnaire responses illustrated both ends of the feedback quality spectrum powerfully. One teacher wrote that after every observation, the head of school sat with them to identify specifically what worked well and what needed to change in one instance helping the teacher recognise that too much time was being spent on teacher-centred explanation rather than student practice, a change that subsequently improved both student engagement and class test scores. A second teacher described the opposite experience: the head of school observed the lesson, signed the observation form, said "it was good," and offered no further comment, leaving the teacher unable to identify strengths or areas for growth and concluding that the observation had been conducted to fulfil a requirement rather than to help teaching improve.

3.5 Frequency of Academic Meetings on Instructional Matters

Table 5 shows how frequently schools held academic meetings focused on teaching and learning rather than purely administrative matters.

Table 5: Frequency of Academic Meetings Focused on Instructional Issues (n=103)

Frequency of Academic Meetings	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Monthly or more frequently	22	21.4

Once per term	44	42.7
Once per year	19	18.4
Rarely or irregularly	14	13.6
Never	4	3.9
Total	103	100.0

Source: Field Data (2026)

Only 21.4% of teachers were in schools where academic instructional meetings happened monthly or more frequently. The majority (78.6%) experienced such meetings only once per term, annually, rarely, or never. HS-01 described a layered structure combining termly whole-staff academic meetings with monthly departmental meetings that he occasionally attended himself, providing a system through which instructional issues could be discussed regularly across multiple levels of the school. EO-01 observed from the district level that schools with a culture of regular academic discussion consistently outperformed those where staff interactions focused mainly on administrative matters, framing the academic meeting as not only a coordination mechanism but a cultural practice that signals to the entire school community that teaching quality is the institution's highest priority.

3.6 Overall Teacher Perceptions of Supervision Quality

Table 6 presents teachers' holistic rating of instructional supervision quality in their school.

Table 6: Teachers' Overall Rating of Instructional Supervision Quality (n=103)

Overall Rating	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Very good thorough, regular and helpful	11	10.7
Good generally adequate and useful	30	29.1
Fair exists but not consistent or deep enough	41	39.8
Poor rare and does not help teaching improve	17	16.5
Very poor almost no meaningful supervision at all	4	3.9
Total	103	100.0

Source: Field Data (2026)

Only 39.8% of teachers gave supervision a positive overall rating. A combined 60.2% rated it as fair, poor, or very poor indicating that more than three in five teachers were dissatisfied with the supervision they experienced. This majority negative perception has implications beyond individual job satisfaction, since research consistently shows that teachers who view supervision negatively become defensive and less responsive to whatever guidance they do receive, undermining even the limited supervisory contact that does occur.

3.7 Teacher Perceptions of Supervision's Relationship with Academic Performance

Table 7 presents teacher responses to statements linking supervision practices to actual and potential academic outcomes.

Table 7: Teacher Agreement on the Relationship Between Instructional Supervision and Academic Performance (n=103)

Statement	SA (%)	A (%)	N (%)	D (%)	SD (%)
Regular classroom observation improves teaching quality	47.6	38.8	6.8	5.8	1.0
Checking lesson plans and schemes improves syllabus coverage	39.8	42.7	9.7	6.8	1.0
Feedback after supervision helps me improve my teaching	44.7	36.9	8.7	7.8	1.9
Supervision in my school has contributed to improving results	18.4	31.1	22.3	20.4	7.8

Source: Field Data (2026). SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, N=Neutral, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree

The contrast between the first three statements and the fourth is this study's most critical quantitative finding. Between 82.5% and 86.4% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that classroom observation, document checking and post-supervision feedback have the potential to improve teaching quality and syllabus coverage. Yet when asked whether actual supervision in their school had contributed to improved student results, only 49.5% agreed or

strongly agreed, while 42.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed. This gap of over 35 percentage points between recognized potential and perceived actual impact confirms that the problem in Mbeya District is not teachers' attitudes toward supervision they are overwhelmingly convinced it works but the failure to implement it with sufficient frequency, depth and quality to deliver the improvements teachers know it is capable of producing.

3.8 Document Review Findings on Supervision Evidence Across Six Schools

Table 8 presents a summary of documentary evidence of supervision activities found during school visits.

Table 8: Summary of Document Review Findings on Instructional Supervision Across Six Schools

Evidence Sought	School A	School B	School C	School D	School E	School F
Completed classroom observation forms	Yes	Yes	Partial	No	Yes	Partial
Lesson plans checked and signed by HoS	Yes	Partial	Partial	Yes	No	Partial
Schemes of work checked and signed	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Partial
Supervision schedule in office	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Written feedback notes to teachers on file	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Academic meeting minutes covering teaching	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	No

Source: *Observation Checklist Records (2026)*

Schools A and D showed the strongest documentary evidence of systematic supervision, possessing all six categories of supervision records in reasonable condition. Significantly, these were also the schools whose heads (HS-01 and HS-04) described the most systematic and scheduled approaches to supervision during interviews. School E showed the weakest documentation with no observation forms, no signed lesson plans and only partial meeting minutes. School F showed the second weakest profile. Schools B and C occupied intermediate positions. This cross-school variation in documentation provides objective, researcher-verified confirmation that supervision quality differences across Mbeya District schools are real and substantial, not merely differences in reporting style or perception.

4. Discussion

4.1 Inadequacy of Classroom Observation Frequency

The finding that only 34.9% of teachers were observed at least once per month and that 6.8% had never been observed is consistent with and extends existing evidence on the infrequency of instructional supervision in Tanzanian public secondary schools. Ngole and Mkulu (2021) found similar patterns of rare and irregular classroom observation in Mwanza Region, attributing them to heavy administrative workload and insufficient supervision training. Chiwamba and Sumbizi (2024) documented comparable weaknesses in Lindi Region, confirming that this is a national pattern rather than a district-specific anomaly. The regional African evidence is equally consistent: Bush et al. (2021) across multiple African countries and Gumbo and Moyo (2023) in Zimbabwe both identify administrative displacement of instructional responsibilities as the primary structural driver of inadequate classroom supervision.

From the perspective of Hallinger and Murphy's (1985) Instructional Leadership Theory, the finding represents a critical deficit in the managing the instructional programme domain, which assigns classroom observation and teacher evaluation as core leadership functions. Grissom et al. (2021) established quantitatively that principals who invest more time in instructional supervision produce measurably better student outcomes — precisely the mechanism that these findings suggest is not operating effectively in most Mbeya District schools. The contrast between HS-04's diary-based weekly observation schedule and HS-03's once-per-term frequency demonstrates that more systematic supervision is achievable within the same institutional context, not through access to additional resources but through deliberate priority-setting and structural self-discipline. This finding has direct implications for how professional development for heads of schools should be designed: time management, priority protection and delegation of non-instructional administrative tasks are leadership skills that formal training programmes should address explicitly.

4.2 Document Checking as Compliance Versus Development

The finding that only 41.8% of teachers experienced document checking as both regular and helpful reveals a qualitative dimension of supervision weakness that frequency data alone cannot capture. A head of school who collects and signs lesson plan books without reading them and writing meaningful comments is performing document checking as bureaucratic compliance rather than as professional development. HS-02's account of

writing detailed comments, discussing findings personally with teachers and framing the process as a collaborative improvement exercise represents a model of developmental document checking that is consistent with what Darling-Hammond (2020) describes as the most effective forms of instructional supervision. HS-05's honest acknowledgment of signing documents without detailed engagement illustrates how institutional culture where previous leaders set weak supervisory precedents can normalize inadequate practice even when newer leaders recognize the deficiency.

This finding connects to Hallinger's (2019) argument that the quality of supervision matters as much as its frequency. A developmental document-checking culture in which teachers expect their plans to be read carefully and responded to substantively changes the nature of lesson planning itself: teachers who know their plans will receive informed professional feedback are incentivised to invest more carefully in their preparation, creating a positive cycle of planning quality, feedback quality and instructional improvement. The present study's finding that only four in ten teachers experienced this quality of engagement suggests that this positive cycle is not yet established in most Mbeya District schools.

4.3 The Feedback Gap as a Critical Implementation Failure

The finding that 56.3% of teachers rated feedback quality as fair, poor, or entirely absent and that 5.8% had never received any feedback despite extended service, is consistent with Mulkeen's (2022) regional observation that supervision in Sub-Saharan African schools frequently lacks the feedback mechanisms necessary to convert observation into improvement. Hallinger and Murphy (1985) identify evaluating instruction, which includes providing specific, constructive feedback, as a foundational function within the managing the instructional programme domain, arguing that observation without feedback is institutionally incomplete because it fails to close the professional development loop. The two contrasting teacher accounts one describing feedback that produced specific, immediately actionable improvements in classroom practice and another describing a signed observation form with no comment illustrate precisely the difference between feedback that functions as a professional development tool and feedback that is a bureaucratic formality.

Muyunda (2022) in Zambia found that heads of schools with limited instructional leadership training struggled to provide meaningful feedback even when they conducted classroom observations, because they lacked the pedagogical knowledge base to identify specific teaching weaknesses and articulate alternative approaches. This finding directly corresponds to the challenge identified by HS-05 and others in this study: heads of schools who lack formal pre-service training in instructional leadership cannot reasonably be expected to provide high-quality supervisory feedback through good intentions alone. This is a training and capacity gap that professional development must address systematically.

4.4 The Gap Between Potential and Actual Supervision Impact

The most theoretically significant finding in this study is the 35-percentage-point gap between teachers' belief in supervision's potential (86.4% agreeing it could improve teaching) and their assessment of its actual impact in their schools (49.5% agreeing it had contributed to better results). This gap precisely mirrors what Grissom et al. (2021) describe as the implementation deficit in instructional leadership research: the mechanisms through which supervision improves performance are well understood theoretically and are recognized by practitioners, but they are not consistently activated in practice because structural constraints particularly administrative overload and inadequate training prevent heads of schools from implementing supervision with the frequency, depth and quality required. The implication is that the solution to poor academic performance in Mbeya District does not require new supervision models or new theoretical frameworks it requires structural conditions that allow existing knowledge and motivation to translate into consistent practice.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study examined the instructional supervision practices used by heads of public secondary schools in Mbeya District, Tanzania. The findings establish that instructional supervision is insufficient in frequency, depth and quality across the majority of sampled schools. Less than one third of teachers are supervised at the minimum expected frequency, less than half experience document checking as both regular and helpful and more than half rate their feedback as vague, infrequent, or entirely absent. Academic meetings focused on instructional matters occur far less frequently than is needed to sustain teaching improvement momentum. Documentary evidence confirms that supervision quality variation across schools is real and substantial.

The study further concludes that this insufficiency is not rooted in heads of schools' indifference or ignorance. All participating heads of schools recognized supervision's value and 86% of teachers confirmed they believe in its potential. The problem is structural and institutional: administrative overload systematically displaces instructional leadership time, the absence of formal supervision training limits heads of schools' capacity to deliver quality feedback and the absence of institutional structures such as written supervision schedules and delegation frameworks leaves supervision vulnerable to daily management pressures.

The study recommends that the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology develop and mandate a formal pre-service instructional leadership

training programme for all newly appointed heads of public secondary schools, covering classroom observation methodology, constructive feedback writing, professional document review and academic meeting facilitation. MoEST should also revise the official job description of heads of schools to designate a minimum of 30–40% of the working week as protected instructional leadership time, defended from administrative displacement by structural policy mechanisms. The Mbeya District Council Education Office should require all heads of schools to maintain written termly supervision schedules with documented observation records and should incorporate supervision quality assessment as a core criterion of all school inspection visits. Heads of schools should institutionalize written post-observation feedback within 48 hours of every observation, establish monthly departmental academic meetings with minuted discussions of teaching and learning issues and develop systematic delegation frameworks for non-instructional administrative tasks that protect supervisory time. Teachers should be encouraged to view instructional supervision as a professional development support and to engage constructively with post-observation feedback discussions, while holding heads of schools accountable for providing the quality of feedback to which they are professionally entitled.

REFERENCES

- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40.
- Bush, T., Kiggundu, E., & Moorosi, P. (2021). *School leadership and management in Africa: Developing a new understanding*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Chiwamba, R., & Sumbizi, L. (2024). Instructional leadership practices and academic performance in public secondary schools in Lindi Region, Tanzania. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 12(1), 45–58.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2020). *Teaching for meaningful learning: A review of research on teacher effectiveness*. New York, USA: Teachers College Press.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). London, UK: SAGE Publications.
- Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). *How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research*. New York, USA: The Wallace Foundation.
- Gumbo, M. T., & Moyo, T. (2023). Challenges facing school heads in practising instructional supervision in secondary schools in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 7(2), 33–49.
- Hallinger, P. (2019). Instructional leadership: A review of research and practice. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(1), 1–20.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247.
- IOSR. (2024). Monitoring learners' progress and academic performance in secondary schools in East Africa. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 29(3), 15–27.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (2nd ed.). New Delhi, India: New Age International Publishers.
- Maingi, L. (2019). Monitoring students' learning progress and academic performance in Tanzanian secondary schools. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(12), 112–120.
- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST). (2022). *Basic education statistics in Tanzania (BEST) 2022*. Dodoma, Tanzania: Government of Tanzania.
- Mulkeen, A. (2022). *Teachers and supervision in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington, DC, USA: World Bank Publications.
- Mulokozi, P., & Mwemezi, J. (2024). Leadership culture and academic performance in public secondary schools in Tanzania. *Tanzania Education Research Journal*, 6(1), 20–36.
- Muthoni, J. N. (2023). Instructional supervision and academic performance in Kenyan secondary schools. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 14(4), 55–69.
- Muyunda, P. (2022). School leadership and monitoring of learners' progress in Zambian secondary schools. *Zambia Journal of Education*, 7(2), 90–105.
- Muteti, S., & Okendo, J. (2024). Instructional materials provision and academic performance in Tanzanian public secondary schools. *African Journal of Educational Studies*, 7(1), 45–60.
- National Examinations Council of Tanzania (NECTA). (2023). *Certificate of Secondary Education Examination results report*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: NECTA.
- Ngole, M. W., & Mkulu, D. G. (2021). The role of instructional leadership in improving academic performance in public secondary schools

in Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, 8(3), 72–83.

- Ofsted. (2019). *School inspection framework and leadership supervision*. London, UK: Office for Standards in Education.
- Wu, H., & Shen, J. (2022). Instructional leadership, monitoring of learning progress and student achievement: Evidence from Asian school systems. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 50(2), 245–263.
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). New York, USA: Harper and Row.