

Instructional Supervision Challenges in Malaysia: A Systematic Literature Review

Logeswari Subramaniam*, Kenny Cheah & Zuraidah Abdullah

Department of Educational Management, Planning and Policy, Faculty of Education Building, University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

The focus of this article is to review Malaysia 's progress on instructional supervision aimed at improving instructional processes and enhancing the quality of student learning based on examining classroom practices needs cooperation between supervisors and teachers. The authors conducted a systematic literature review (SLR) approach by examining the Malaysian literature on instructional supervision and management journal articles written in 2006-2019 by analyzing online repositories mainly Goggle Scholar and Scopus. The SLR examined two major unit of analyses of the study: (a) the current challenges affecting instructional supervision, and (b) the role of teachers for their professional growth and progress in the teaching – learning process in the Malaysian school context. In the findings, the authors found inconsistent illustration of instructional supervision in Malaysian context, and further discusses drawbacks in the research methods and results apparent in Malaysian literature. As implications, the authors concluded that Malaysian scholars would dedicate their future studies to researching and better understanding Malaysia's instructional supervision practices in schools by diversifying their research topics and incorporating more qualitative and mixed-method designs and taking into account the various characteristics of Malaysia 's community and educational system.

Keywords: Instructional Supervision, Systematic Review, School Leaders, Leadership and Learning

INTRODUCTION

As an area of educational practice with distinct roles and responsibilities, supervision gradually emerges as a distinct discipline in relation to the social, academic, cultural and professional complexities traditionally creating the complex educational agenda. Supervision history as a systematic practice by educational administrators in a school scheme only started when the ordinary school was established in the early 1830s (Collins & Halverson, 2018). At the same time, European educators such as Friedrich Froebel, Johann Pestalozzi and Johann Herbart as well as prominent American philosopher John Dewey referred to supervision as administrative inspection and influenced schools as well (Colvin & King, 2018). Obviously, school administrators were also trapped between the need for objective teacher appraisal and the desire to turn teaching into a diverse range of instructional solutions to student interest and varying degrees of willingness (Wanzare, 2012). Recognizing the time limitations of practicing supervisors and attempting to respect the need to foster teacher development, Sergioivanni et al. (2014) recommended a supervisory structure of various supervisory mechanisms, including summative assessment. Such a system would not require each teacher to have a formal supervisor directly involved. The supervisory mechanism may rotate professional-status teachers over a three to five-year period over which they would undergo a standardized assessment annually and a number of other evaluative mechanisms in the other years (e.g. self-evaluation, peer monitoring, instructional development, action research on new teaching approaches, participation in a school transformation program).

The constant emerging idea about instructional supervision is becoming increasingly important due to its potential to bolster efforts towards instructional improvement. With increasing concern over teacher quality and

* Corresponding author: loges.pdpdpu@gmail.com
eISSN: 2462-2079 © Universiti Putra Malaysia Press

the complex process of teaching, instructional supervision is seen as a mechanism to support teachers who are struggling in matters pertaining to instructional aspects and hence, guide them to serve their learners better (Adam et al. 2018; Blase & Blase, 2002; Brandon et al. 2018; Glickman et al. 2018; Ozyildirim & Aksu, 2016; Pajak, 2003; Sergiovanni et al. 2014; Sullivan & Glanz, 2013; Zepeda, 2017). According to Beare et al. (2018), instructional supervision is a function which provides professional development opportunities for teachers to effectively manage teaching and learning process. Similarly, Shakuna et al. (2016) defines the process as a teacher self-development towards effective teaching methods. According to Adam et al. (2018), supervision is closely connected to professional learning and development, which promotes teachers' lifelong learning and growth mindsets. As such, the function of supervision is generally viewed as an approach that can improve their teachers' teaching as well as used as a quality control mechanism to ultimately improve student learning (Glanz & Heimann, 2018).

The past studies mentioned above have provided valuable data to understand the state of teachers' professional growth. All the above studies showed certain relation between supervision, professional learning and teachers' growth (Glanz, 2018). However, none of the selected studies emphasized the instructional supervision process to offer a variety of professional development possibilities to satisfy teachers' professional growth, as well as to gain educational goals and objectives at various levels in school (Ghavifekr et al. 2017). Obviously, part of global studies, the process of implementing instructional supervision in Malaysia appears at formative stages as evidence showed that not many studies were conducted locally. At present, much of this work stays concealed from the eyes of the international community of academics and constitutes just a fraction of the current information on instructional supervision in Malaysia. We believe that studies of Malaysian instructional supervision process literature will offer valuable insights into the strengths and shortcomings of this system, which can help guide future efforts in the right direction, both from Malaysia and other countries where instructional supervision evolves as a research area. Therefore, systematic literature review of these studies plays a significant role of demonstrating to global audience the experience of a non-Western society at a time when focus is put on building regional information base for instructional supervision. Examining Malaysia's existing literature on instructional supervision should add to ongoing attempts to consider how common or contextually restricted instructional supervision activities in schools. Our results will be more useful in future study efforts and form of local literature would also help policymakers understand the implications of global research results for their particular socio-institutional environments (Hallinger, 2011).

In this regard, the current study used systemic literature review (SLR) methods (Cooper & Hedges, 2009) to define and synthesize features of Malaysian instructional literature. This study focuses mainly on presenting a concise overview of Malaysia's instructional supervision studies, rather than a comprehensive synthesis of empirical research findings. Therefore, the reviewers assembled a detailed collection of 41 journal articles written in 2006-2019. The review dealt with the following research questions:

1. What are the existent challenges of instructional supervision in Malaysia?
2. What is the distribution of research methods used in the relevant research?

Malaysian Instructional Supervision

Effective instructional supervision has the potential to allow teachers to examine their own classroom practices with and through the assistance of the supervisors (Zepeda, 2017), with the notion to promote growth, development as well as instill fear-free interaction that aims at problem solving and capacity building. Nevertheless, effective instructional supervision requires teachers as well as the supervisors to implement it in an effective manner (Ghavifekr et al. 2019). Hence, the success of instructional supervision process is very much dependable on how the teachers view the practice and the level of participation for the realization of the aim of the function. According to scholars, unless teachers perceive instructional supervision as a process of promoting teacher professional growth which suits according to their learning needs, the act will not yield the desired outcome (Arong & Ogbadu, 2010; Kotirde & Yunos, 2015; Kutsyuruba, 2003; Tassisa et al. 2018). In addressing the issues pertaining to the implementation of instructional supervision, it is crucial to discuss about the literature in Asia, especially in Malaysia.

Expectations to excel in education in Malaysian context are clearly articulated in Malaysian Education Blueprint 2013-2025 (MEB) (Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2012). The MEB had stated one of the educational aspirations of the nation is to be ranked as top third countries in the global arena, specifically in Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) and the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) by 2025. As such the role of the teachers and their instructional practices are crucial to make this aspiration a reality. Acknowledging the fact that teacher quality is the most significant school-based factor in determining student outcome, teachers must be constantly supported for a quality teaching service and optimal student outcome. As a developing country, Malaysia consist of 50-60% of teachers who will be serving the education system for the next 20-30 years to come, hence a workforce which is relatively young. It is important

for the system to identify an effective mechanism (Harris et al. 2019; Tee et al. 2018) that is embedded and closely related to teachers' daily routine to sustain quality instructional practice.

In Malaysia, the process of instructional supervision is a process that is embedded in the education system which involves ministry, state, district and schools. The Inspectorate Division of the Ministry of Education heads the entire team pertaining to matter of supervision and inspection. They play the role of an evaluator and an education support-provider. The existence of the component in various tiers of the education landscape indicates it is an important function in Malaysian context. The circular letter of SPI Bil.3/1987 is the document that empowers education officers to visit schools as well as the school principals to implement instructional supervision in their respective schools. As a mandated act, it places great responsibility on the school principals to instructional supervision is carried out accordingly. The circular letter had stated four broad purpose of the process which are (a) to enhance the professionalism of principals/teachers, (b) share knowledge and experience to extend information resources to principals/teachers to improve teaching-learning processes, (c) nurturing, maintaining and strengthening positive professionalism and positive relationship, and (d) help teachers work their daily tasks more effectively and shape teachers' attitude towards being more positive. Based on the purpose of the process stated, the institutionalization of instructional supervision in schools, had in a way, granted autonomy to schools to monitor, evaluate, guide and support teachers at school level as an instructional improvement effort.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This article follows measures introduced by Hallinger (2013) to perform systematic assessments in the area of instructional supervision. In this context, a systematic review analysis starts by identifying the key topics of concern, research issues and goals; then draws on a methodological viewpoint to define, identify, assess and interpret related publications; clarifies the origins of the data used and how these data are interpreted and synthesized; and finally examines conclusions, shortcomings and significance.

Identification of Sources

We conducted a three-stage literature search on instructional supervision in Malaysia. Such phases represented an "exhaustive search approach" (Hallinger, 2013), in which we tried to classify the extremely applicable sources considered satisfactory. We limited our scope to 2006-2019 years. Our original literature search found the first Malaysian publication on instructional supervision in 2006. We set this as the starting date for our analysis. Our quest included both English and Malay written publications to obtain a wider view of instructional supervision, as Malaysian literature is somewhat limited. Furthermore, reviewing literature only on English-language publications does not pose a clear image of this literature in Malaysia.

The first phase of our search involved analyzing online repositories using "instructional supervision" descriptor. We searched for articles in journals or conference proceedings. Our quest also included online format student dissertations. Articles written in Malaysia and published in Malaysia were found by searching using the "Ministry of Education, Malaysia, Malaysian Online Journal of Education, Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences and *Jurnal Kepimpinan Pendidikan*" index. For search engines like "ERIC, ProQuest, and Google Scholar," as well as key publications on administration, management, and instructional supervision in Asia Pacific and beyond, we used the same term to find articles written in English. We agreed to use nine main international journals, including "Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Asia Pacific Educational Researcher, Asia Pacific Educational Review, Educational Administration Quarterly, Educational Management Administration and Leadership, International Journal of Educational Management, Journal of Educational Administration, International Journal of Leadership in Education, and School Leadership and Management." However, we couldn't find any article on instructional supervision in any of these nine international journals.

Our second phase included reviewing the research index parts to find any related studies. We received a list of fewer than 100 sources that meet our standards. The third phase consisted of choosing research, using various parameters, from those obtained in the first and second stages. First, we mainly picked articles for empirical studies. Second, we focused our emphasis to observational analyses of principal and teacher supervision, not classroom management or other school leadership. Third, we reviewed all the articles identified which were conducted using qualitative, quantitative and mixed method research including distribution of survey questionnaires to principals and teachers. Nevertheless, we did not have research including creating metrics to assess principals and teachers as instructional supervisors. Fourth, we only picked studies when complete article was accessible. Fifth, any research in book chapters, proceedings, systematic literature review and dissertation form were removed from our list. Therefore, our final sample of scientific studies used in this article is just 41 studies in Malay and English languages.

Sources of Information

Our search revealed interest in instructional supervision in Malaysia began in the 2006s, and the first published study on instructional supervision was conducted in Malaysia in 2006. From 2006-2010, a total of 7 instructional supervision studies were conducted. Around 2011-2015, a total of 11 studies were conducted; while another 23 were conducted performed from 2016-2019. Based on the sequential of articles published, it clearly suggested that instructional supervision studies are currently a focal study subject in Malaysia. Table 1 reveals the overall research distribution by years and source.

TABLE 1
Overall Instructional Supervision Research Distribution from 2006 to 2019

Description	2006 -2010	2011-2015	2016-2019	Total
Journals	7	11	23	41
Dissertations/Thesis	7	9	5	21
Systematic literature review	-	-	3	3
Proceedings	2	2	4	8
Book Chapter	-	1	2	3
Total	16	23	37	76

Data Extraction

In the data extraction phase, each of the 41 articles extracted information related to our research questions. Data is coded to allow systematic analysis (Gough, 2007) and stored in a database. For example, the "analysis process" column coded quantitative studies as 1, qualitative as 2 and mixed methods as 3. Two researchers checked each article's content, and created separate lists of codes. These two lists were then compared, to address discrepancies. In case of dispute between the two researchers, expert perspectives in the field were pursued to decide the appropriate definition for each article before data analysis.

Data Analysis

To make our review more comprehensive, we analyzed qualitative, quantitative and mixed method research. First, based on Hallinger (2013) and Hallinger and Walker (2017) suggestion, we termed a "vote counting" approach to summarize findings, including counting studies using the same methodology, the same theoretical and conceptual structure, the same instructional supervision tool, and similar outcomes. Second, as trends appeared, we reread studies, particularly those involving qualitative and mixed method analysis techniques, to add significance to numerical results. We created additional tables and spreadsheets to coordinate our information, which included extending our data counting and coding.

Conceptual Framework

To make our review more comprehensive and meaningful, we concentrated on two main categories: (a) The challenges faced on instructional supervision in Malaysia; and (b) The distribution of methods, statistical analyses, and data collection tools used in instructional supervision in Malaysia research.

RESULTS

In this segment of the article, we present our findings on each of the research questions posed at the outset.

1. The Challenges Faced on Instructional Supervision in Malaysia

Our exploration of past studies had presented four challenges in the area of research and direction of instructional supervision in Malaysia. The existing challenges of instructional supervision process have not been examined in Malaysian secondary schools. Therefore, the possible contribution to the research field lies in the practical contribution standpoint towards understanding how the implementation process of the instructional supervision and to what extent the teachers' professional growth resulting from the implementation process of instructional supervision in Malaysia. Therefore, under those circumstances, below sub-section highlighted the challenges explored in instructional supervision in Malaysia.

Challenge 1: Ambiguity of the Term

Six Malaysian studies revealed the ambiguity of the term as the first challenge in instructional supervision in Malaysia. Sidhu et al. (2010), Malakolunthu and Vasudevan (2012), Abdullah et al. (2017), Sharma et al. (2011)

and Sharma et al. (2016) portrays the views of principals and teachers pertaining to the policy and the implementation process. Sidhu et al. (2010) specifically found that school heads had limited knowledge and understanding of formative clinical supervision and could not tell the difference between teacher evaluation and teacher supervision. Sharma et al. (2011) criticized that the purpose of supervision is not understood by school heads and teachers, while Sharma et al. (2016) echoed that one of the major problems of instructional supervision in Malaysian schools is hanging around teachers' feelings of supervision that are carried out for wrong reasons. Malakolunthu and Vasudevan (2012) and Abdullah et al. (2017) highlighted the lack of expertise, lack of comprehension of supervisory principles and appraisal among administrators. They also stressed that a misunderstanding among head teachers regarding the principles of formative teacher assessment and clinical supervision.

Acknowledging the fact that the instructional supervision at school level demands a greater interaction between the supervisors and the supervisee, several aspects need to be aligned in articulating the focus, purpose and implementation of the component. According to Crutchfield et al. (2018), acceptance of the process, interaction and the attitude of those involved in the process determines the success of the supervisory task. Thus, unanimous understanding between various parties involved such as the policy makers, the principals and the teachers' must be aligned. Without getting the principals and teachers to understand the main aims, an effective outcome cannot be yield. Without having a clearly articulated policy and implementation guidelines, the policy makers cannot witness an impact out of the act. Though the act is rigorously implemented (Harris et al. 2017; Sim, 2011), the ambiguity of the term can exhaust the education team and thus, deemed as a meaningless effort for many.

Challenge 2: Bureaucratic Demand and Principals' Roles

Bureaucratic demands and principals' roles were revealed as some of the instructional supervision challenges in several studies in the Malaysian instructional supervision literature. Ibrahim (2010) indicated time constraint and administrative tasks disrupts the supervision schedule whereas, Sharma et al. (2011) reported that supervision in schools is just an eyewash, a paper completion and punitive process. Sim (2011) suggested that administrators concentrate on improving teaching and learning in schools and patrols from class to class to track teaching and learning processes. A particular research finding, noted that 50% of teachers indicated that they had never seen principals teach before and concentrated less on the position of providing more guidance and supervision to teachers who experienced difficulties in teaching. Malakolunthu and Vasudevan (2012) observed that reports were required by some states to be submitted to the State Education Department.

Interestingly, Sharma et al. (2016) highlighted that most of the principal's time is used in meetings, followed by 19.8% in office-related activities, 7.6% in walk about in school, 4.3% in telephone calls, 1.1% in teaching and only 1.07% in classroom teaching. Harris et al's. (2017) study showed that a routine of monitoring and supervisory practices and the role of monitoring and evaluating teachers is taken seriously. Ibrahim (2017) stated that a mechanism for accountability needed, whereas Mislinah (2008) confirmed that limited content related to supervision course provides exposure to potential leaders about supervision as a preparation for them once they become school leaders. The current training provided to the principals does not equip them with the reality of their duties as instructional supervisors. Sharma and Al-Sinawai (2019) mentioned that procedures such as 'prepared' schedule, and requirement of every teacher subjected to supervision twice a year, preparation for observation before the visit school inspectorate or the state education department and treated as an evaluation practice should be in order for successful instructional supervision.

Based on the above study's outcome, supervision which is too prescribed in manner can impede the of notion learning process that it aims to foster. Supervisors who carry out the supervision process must realize teachers as adults cannot be treated as equally or expected to be at similar readiness level for the process. Teachers come from various background knowledge, academic qualification and working experiences, hence the supervisors must be ready to support teachers by catering to these differences. Supervisors cannot treat teachers as if they are all the same. Novice and experienced teachers must be supervised differently and this cannot be achieved by patrolling and monitoring approach. Mislinah (2008) had cautioned the exposure during leadership preparation course about supervision may not be sufficient to equip principals to face the real scenario at school level. As such, although the bureaucracy demand must be adhered to, principals need to balance their administrative task with supervisory task (Sidhu et al. 2010). It is crucial the supervision process improve of teaching and learning activities and support teachers who are struggling in instructional aspects. Principals as the head of the supervisory team, must be able to build and bridge the interaction and support effort and set examples for the other supervisors in the team. Patrolling and monitoring will embrace the notion of quality control and hence, evaluate and oversee teachers. However, in reality the actual support needed is the continuous and consistent support to enhance their instructional practices.

Challenge 3: Negative Perceptions from Teachers

As in the third challenge, we identified negative perception from teachers on instructional supervision as one of the challenges. Said and Sukor (2011) opined that teachers disagree that supervision enable teachers to utilize a variety of teaching approaches, enhances teacher confidence and facilitates teachers to utilize a variety of teaching techniques. On the other hand, Sharma et al. (2011) claimed that the supervisory process is not advantageous to teachers, as they claim that supervisors do not find instructional supervision as a forum for teachers to build a sense of autonomy and professional development and are not at all empowered by the procedure. The literature also reveals that teachers perceive instructional supervision as a threat to their teaching profession (Khun-Inkeeree et al. 2019). They equate the function as a measure of evaluation and a control mechanism (Abdullah et al. 2017; Sharma & Al Sinawai, 2019; Malakolunthu and Vasudevan, 2012). Due to the autocratic approach of the supervisors, teachers felt uncomfortable and 'phobic' with the mention of the term such as "catching, witch hunting, fault finding, subjective, not fair, spotting weaknesses" (Malakolunthu & Vasudevan, 2012), "punish, demoralize and insult" (Sharma et al. 2011) and "*sangat 'panik', 'tidak selesa', 'bosan', 'kebencian', 'menyeronokkan', 'marah terhadap penyelia', dan 'bimbang'*" (Abdullah et al. 2017). This has led teachers to perceive this process negatively as they associate strong uncomfortable and 'phobic' vocabulary. Furthermore, the data presented by Darishah et al. (2017) made sense as we examined the syntax when only 12 percent of teachers admitted they liked to be supervised while 87.8 percent disliked it.

Glickman et al. (2018) had elaborated that the process of instructional supervision should be seen as "a collegial rather than a hierarchical relationship between teachers and the formally assigned supervisors" (p.7), hence the function cannot operate in its' conventional manner. However, findings the term did reflect the latter as it connoted a bureaucratic fulfillment (Sharma et al. 2011; Abdullah et al. 2017). They opined that the process of instructional supervision did not embrace the notion of teacher professional development platform. Hence, the implementation was carried out in a haphazard manner with no proper feedback to teachers – which did not enhance teacher confidence neither did it help it help the experienced teachers (Ariffin et al. 2015; Taib et al. 2015; Khun-Inkeeree et al. 2019). With these negative perceptions lingering around teachers, the task will not be able to produce an impact in the effort to improve instructional practices through supervisory tasks. Hence, the need to change teachers' mind set is crucial as they need to accept the term as what Pajak (2000) had described "a vehicle for developing responsible teachers who are capable of analyzing their own performance" (p.5).

Challenge 4: The Implementation of Supervision

Some scholars have highlighted the practice of instructional supervision is at high level amongst principals (Hamzah et al. 2013, Vijayamalar & Suhaida, 2013, Taib et al. 2015; Yusoff et al. 2010). These scholars had highlighted that the implementation is carried out in a systematic manner. Additionally, scholars such as Makin et al. (2018) and Khun-Inkeeree et al. (2019) had posited that supervisory competence such as knowledge technical skills and interpersonal skills had created a positive attitude amongst teachers about the process. Interestingly, some scholars in Malaysia also had reported of the implementation that has not been beneficial for teachers (Sharma et al. 2011; Malakolunthu & Vasudevan, 2012; Abdullah et al. 2017). In criticising Abdullah et al. (2017) quoted that supervision process merely as "*tiada proses pembelajaran dan lebih kepada proses dokumentasi sahaja.*" This significantly gave the impression that the supervision process is executed just to complete the documentation requirement.

In addition, Vijayaamalar and Suhaida (2013) noted that some teachers may need more guidance and support as compared to others and Sharma et al. (2011) mentioned that supervisors play an important role in the implementation process. They should have the content knowledge for an effective supervision process. The good content knowledge will enable the teachers to gain constructive feedback. Lastly, the data compiled from implementation process of the supervision has to be utilised to plan for teacher professional growth. Findings suggest that the data gained from the process of supervision is mainly documented in the office or at some instances compiled to be sent to the state education department (Malakolunthu & Vasudevan, 2012; Sharma & Al-Sinawai, 2019). The rich data can be a good evidence for the principals and school supervisory team to plan how they could further support and guide teachers.

Teachers need to understand the purpose of the process to clear the negative perception in them. A systematic planning which emphasizes on constructive feedback is crucial. Teachers need to know the weakness of the lesson observed and how can the improve the lesson (Johari & Rabiatal-Adawiah, 2017). Only then, the aim to improve the weaknesses can be transparent. Teachers would feel supported and guided. Hence, the implementation cannot be predetermined to only twice in a year for a teacher. Thus, when the implementation process is haphazardly conducted, teachers feel the process is a 'fault finding mechanism or is just completion a paperwork. An effective process has to be followed by an analysis session and then followed by appropriate training to support teachers in the areas of weaknesses. The MOE has to provide a clear framework to all schools as per how an effective implementation is like to gain optimal outcome.

2. Distribution of Research Methods

In addressing the issues pertaining to the implementation of instructional supervision, it is crucial to discuss about the literature in Malaysia. The following table provides a summary of studies empirical findings pertaining to instructional supervision in Malaysia from 2006 to 2019:

TABLE 2
Distribution of Malaysia's Instructional Supervision Articles by Research Method

Methodology	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Qualitative			1		3	2	2					2	1		11
Quantitative	1	1			1			3	2	2	4	6	2	6	28
Mixed-method												1	1		2
Total															41

According to data presented in Table 2, 27.0 percent of the 41 articles based on qualitative, 68.0 percent quantitative and 5.0 percent mixed-method research method approach. These include measures on quantitative approach (e.g. Ghavifekr & Ibrahim, 2014; Yusof & Daud, 2017; Daud et al. 2018; Makin et al. 2018; Sharma & Al-Sinawai (2019), qualitative approach (e.g. Malakolunthu & Vasudevan, 2012; Abdullah et al. 2017) and mixed method approach (e.g. Ahmad & Salamun, 2017). The benefit of these analyses is their potential to test several parameters involve teachers' gender, expertise, etc. as independent variables to evaluate a single dimension, such as supervision or teachers' behaviour based on supervision results. As such, based on the findings, Malaysian scholars have not been conducting qualitative or mixed-method research designs to advance their research models by adding additional dimensions, such as educational backgrounds or school administrators' supervision.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Through this comprehensive and systematic analysis of literature, we have been able to address a range of problems concerning instructional supervision and their effect on school outcomes. We found that majority of the topics researched are on instructional supervision, particularly on supervisory effectiveness, teachers' performance and academic achievement of students are being focused upon. We find a significant number of studies reviewing instructional supervision practices (e.g., Sharma et al. 2011; Sim, 2011; Malakolunthu & Vasudevan, 2012; Vijayamalar & Suhaida, 2013; Ariffin et al. 2015; Abdullah et al. 2017; Mislinah, 2008; Khun-Inkeeree et al. 2019), where such research does not offer a clear description of principal and teacher supervisory procedures. Several of these studies identified moderate to high rates of instructional supervision in shaping and transmitting school goals. However, other research showed poor awareness of the head and low levels of supervisory instruction. Several researchers noticed the lack of listening abilities and motivation in supplying teachers with input on their instructional supervisory behavior. (Malakolunthu & Vasudevan, 2012; Sharma et al. 2016; Darishah et al. 2017). Also, we discovered that instructional supervision had indirect effects on students' academic achievement (Sharma et al., 2016), teachers' self-efficacy and competencies (Veloo et al. 2013; Ariffin et al. 2015), as well as teachers' attitudes towards change (Khun-Inkeeree et al. 2019). Thus, our systematic review process could not get a complete and consistent picture of instructional supervision practices of principals and teachers in Malaysia.

However, the contradictions and inconsistent representation of instructional supervision practices in Malaysia has raised questions about the approaches used in the studies that we analyzed to collect data. The results are collected by the principals who are solely responsible for the answers, as the researchers in Malaysia have to turn over the survey to the principal and have it performed by the teachers and collect it from the principal after it has been completed. Data monitoring is not important when interviewing teachers as interviews are done face-to-face and between the interviewer and the respondent (teacher), separately. Moreover, most work did not reflect instructional supervision from the points of view of principals themselves; instead, the study reflected the teachers' interpretation of instructional supervision of principal subjects. Therefore, it is important to learn how these principals exercise their supervision.

Our observation led to the fact that all the quantitative studies carried out in Malaysia employed survey method for collecting data and used the perspective of one type of respondent teachers alone which leads to biases or prejudices which is main reason for inconsistent picture for the issue (Abdullah et al. 2017; Ariffin et al. 2015; Daud et al. 2018; Ghavifekr, 2019; Khun-Inkeeree et al. 2019; Makin et al. 2018; Sharma & Al-Sinawai, 2019;

Taib et al, 2015; Veloo et al. 2013; Yusof & Daud, 2017). Moreover, the nature of data collected by the researchers in their studies lacked explanation on statistical accuracy of analysis in most of the studies. We therefore highly advocate that future research of school instructional supervision require a range of approaches, including explanatory, exploratory, blended approaches and even 360 assessments, and should include a number of respondents such as principals, vice-principals, classroom representatives, supervisors and even students, and seek to address influences that affect teaching supervision practice. The studies need to compare responses from the above approaches to produce the true picture of the essence of instructional supervision in Malaysian schools.

Finally, there is yet any praxis of the implementation process and the existent challenges of instructional supervision and its implementation process in the schools. Another point is that Malaysia's instructional supervision study field is minimal in scope. Past studies are generally based on the implementation of the training program, the management of the classroom environment, the management of the curriculum, the application of program monitoring and the introduction of incentives for teachers (Abdullah et al. 2017; Ariffin et al. 2015; Makin et al. 2018). Most of the Malaysian past studies emphasized on supervision process and teachers' professional growth, and none of them significantly discussed the implementation process and the existent challenges of instructional supervision and its implementation process in the schools in Malaysia thoroughly. In summary, even though empirical studies provided evidence that the instruction supervision offers a robust account on teachers' professional growth and the challenges remain in the quality of instructional practices.

REFERENCE

- Abdullah, Z., Manaf, Z. A., Ail, N. M. M., & Ramzy, M. I. (2017). Pemeraksanaan guru bahasa melayu melalui penyeliaan kembang tumbuh dan komuniti pembelajaran profesional (KPP) di lima sekolah menengah daerah Kuala Lipis. *JuPiDi: Jurnal Kepimpinan Pendidikan*, 3(2), 42-59.
- Adams, P., Mombourquette, C., Brandon, J., Hunter, D., Friesen, S., Koh, K., ... & Stelmach, B. (2018). A Study of Teacher Growth, Supervision, and Evaluation in Alberta: Policy and Perception in a Collective Case Study. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 1(2), 1.
- Ahmad, R. H., & Salamun, H. (2017). Moral Commitment in Rabbani Leadership of National Islamic Secondary School Principals in Malaysia. *MOJEM: Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management*, 1(2), 41-63.
- Ariffin, A. K., Idris, A. R., & Abdullah, Z. (2015). The Relationship between Teaching Supervision with Teachers' Motivation in Secondary Schools. *Journal of Advanced Research in Social and Behavioural Science*, 1, 1-11.
- Arong, F. E., & Ogbadu, M. A. (2010). Major causes of declining quality of education in Nigeria from administrative perspective: a case study of Dekina local government area. *Canadian Social Science*, 6(3), 183-198.
- Beare, H., Caldwell, B. J., & Millikan, R. H. (2018). *Creating an excellent school: Some new management techniques*. Routledge.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2002). The micropolitics of instructional supervision: A call for research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(1), 6-44.
- Brandon, J., Hollweck, T., Donlevy, J. K., & Whalen, C. (2018). Teacher supervision and evaluation challenges: Canadian perspectives on overall instructional leadership. *Teachers and Teaching*, 24(3), 263-280.
- Johari, M. & Rabiatal-Adawiah (2017). Hubungan Kualiti Penyeliaan Pengajaran Dengan Efikasi Kendiri Guru. *JuPiDi: Jurnal Kepimpinan Pendidikan*, 3(3), 1-16.
- Collins, A., & Halverson, R. (2018). Rethinking Education in a Technological World. *Thinking about Schools: A Foundations of Education Reader*.
- Colvin, R., & King, K. M. (2018). Dewey's Educational Heritage: The Influence of Pestalozzi. *Philosophy &*, 45.
- Cooper, H., Hedges, L. V., & Valentine, J. C. (2009). The handbook of research synthesis and meta-analysis 2nd edition. In *The Hand. of Res. Synthesis and Meta-Analysis, 2nd Ed.* (pp. 1-615). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Crutchfield, J., Crutchfield, J., & Buford, J. (2018). A Strengths-Based Multidisciplinary Leadership Team: A Case Study in an Urban Middle School. *Urban Social Work*, 2(2), 106-122.
- Darishah, P., Daud, Y., & Omar, F. M. S. (2017). Teaching and learning supervision by school management, attitude of teachers and competency of teaching. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 6(10), 1367-1381.
- Daud, Y., Dali, P. D., Khalid, R., & Fauzee, M. S. O. (2018). Teaching and Learning Supervision, Teachers' Attitude towards Classroom Supervision and Students' Participation. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(4), 513-526.

- Ghavifekr, S., & Ibrahim, M. S. (2014). Head of departments' instructional supervisory role and teachers' job performance: Teachers' perceptions. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Management Studies*, 1(2), 45-56.
- Ghavifekr, S., Husain, H., Rosden, N. A., & Hamat, Z. W. (2019). Clinical Supervision: Towards Effective Classroom Teaching. *Mojes: Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7(4), 30-42.
- Ghavifekr, S., Ibrahim, M. S., Chellapan, K., Sukumaran, K., & Subramaniam, A. (2017). Instructional Leadership Practices of Principal in Vocational And Technical College: Teachers' Perception. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management*, 3(1), 48-67.
- Glanz, J. (2018). Chronicling perspectives about the state of instructional supervision by eight prominent scholars of supervision. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 1(1), 1.
- Glanz, J., & Heimann, R. (2018). Encouraging reflective practice in educational supervision through action research and appreciative inquiry. *The Wiley Handbook of Educational Supervision*, 353.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *SuperVision and Instructional Leadership: A developmental approach* (Tenth Edition). New York, NY: Pearson
- Gough, D. (2007). Weight of evidence: a framework for the appraisal of the quality and relevance of evidence. *Research papers in education*, 22(2), 213-228.
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of educational administration*.
- Hallinger, P. (2013). A conceptual framework for systematic reviews of research in educational leadership and management. *Journal of Educational Administration*.
- Hallinger, P., & Walker, A. (2017). Leading learning in Asia—emerging empirical insights from five societies. *Journal of Educational Administration*.
- Hamzah, M. I. M., Wei, Y., Ahmad, J., Hamid, A. H. A., & Mansor, A. N. (2013). Supervision Practices and Teachers' Satisfaction in Public Secondary Schools: Malaysia and China. *International Education Studies*, 6(8), 92-97.
- Harris, A., Jones, M., Adams, D., & Cheah, K. (2019). Instructional leadership in Malaysia: a review of the contemporary literature. *School Leadership & Management*, 39(1), 76-95.
- Harris, A., Jones, M., Cheah, K. S. L., Devadason, E., & Adams, D. (2017). Exploring principals' instructional leadership practices in Malaysia: insights and implications. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(2), 207-221
- IBRAHIM, M. S. (2010). Analisis Kompetensi Pengetua Berdasarkan Kualiti Peribadi, Pengetahuan, Kemahiran dan Amalan dalam Bidang Pengurusan Sekolah Menengah Malaysia. Dicapai dari: [http://www.ukm.edu.my/jurfpemd/Jilid,2035\(1\),202010](http://www.ukm.edu.my/jurfpemd/Jilid,2035(1),202010).
- Ibrahim, M. S. (2017). Peranan Guru Kanan Mata Pelajaran Dalam Mempertingkatkan Kualiti Pengajaran Guru-Guru. *JuKu: Jurnal Kurikulum & Pengajaran Asia Pasifik*, 1(1), 28-41.
- Khun-Inkeeree, H., Dali, P. D., Daud, Y., Fauzee, M. S. O., & Khalid, R. (2019). Effects of Teaching and Learning Supervision on Teachers Attitudes to Supervision at Secondary School in Kubang Pasu District, Kedah. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 1335-1350.
- Kotirde, I. Y., & Yunos, J. B. M. (2015). The Processes of Supervisions in Secondary Schools Educational System in Nigeria. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 204, 259-264.
- Kutsyuruba, V. V. (2003). *Instructional supervision: Perceptions of Canadian and Ukrainian beginning high-school teachers* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Saskatchewan).
- Makin, M., Abdullah, Z., & Shafee, S. (2018). The Art of Supervision: Role of Supervisory Skills in Developing Teacher Capacity. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management*, 6(4), 37-55.
- Malakolunthu, S. & Vasudevan, V. *Asia Pacific Educ. Rev.* (2012) 13: 449. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-012-9207-z>
- Ministry of Education Malaysia (2012). *Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025*. Putrajaya: Ministry of Education Malaysia, Government of Malaysia.
- Mislinah, M. (2008). *The Impact of Instructional Supervision in Enhancing Teachers Capacity*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya, Malaysia.
- Ozyildirim, G., & Bilgin Aksu, M. (2016). An Investigation on Developmental Supervision Model: Supervisors' and Administrators' Opinions and Teachers' Expectations. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 6(3), 125-146.
- Pajak, E. (2003). *Honoring diverse teaching styles: A guide for supervisors*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Said, H. B., & Sukor, M. A. B. (2011). *Penyelidikan pengajaran di sekolah-sekolah kebangsaan daerah Johor Bahru*.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., Starratt, R. J., & Cho, V. (2014). *Supervision: A redefinition* (9th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Shakuna, K. S., Mohamad, N., & Ali, A. B. (2016). The effect of school administration and educational supervision on teachers teaching performance: training programs as a mediator variable. *Asian Social Science*, 12(10), 257-272.

- Sharma, S., Mannan, F., & Veeriah, J. (2016). Instructional Leadership in Malaysia-The Literature Gaps. *Journal of Global Research in Education and Social Science*, 6(3), 162-167.
- Sharma, S., & Al-Sinawai, S. (2019). Attitudinal Differences towards Instructional Supervision: A Study of Teacher Beliefs and Supervisory Behaviour in Malaysia. *International Education Studies*, 12(8), 106-115.
- Sharma, S., Yusoff, M., Kannan, S., & Baba, S. B. (2011). Concerns of teachers and principals on instructional supervision in three Asian countries. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 1(3), 214.
- Sidhu, G. K., Fook, C. Y., & Kaur, S. (2010). Instructional Practices in Teaching Literature: Observations of ESL Classrooms in Malaysia. *English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 54-63.
- Sidhu, Gurnam & Chan, Yuen Fook. (2010). Formative supervision of teaching and learning: Issues and concerns for the school head. *European Journal of Scientific Research*. 39. 589-605.
- Sim, Q. C. (2011). Instructional leadership among principals of secondary schools in Malaysia. *Educational Research*, 2(12), 1784-1800
- Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2013). *Supervision that improves teaching and learning: Strategies and techniques* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Taib, M. R., Abdullah, Z., Ail, N. M. M., Yahya, M. R., & Jusoh, N. M. (2015). Clinical Supervision of Teaching Mara Junior Science College (MJSC), Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 191, 452-458.
- Tassisa, W., Kenea, S. A., & Seyoum, Y. (2018). *School Based Supervision and Its Contribution to Students' Academic Achievements in the Secondary Schools of Harari Regional State, Ethiopia* (Doctoral dissertation, Haramaya University).
- Tee, M. Y., Tan, S. Y., & Symaco, L. P. (2018). Socio-historical transformation and classroom discourse in Malaysia. *Espacio, Tiempo y Educación*, 5(2), 123-142.
- Veloo, A., Komuji, M. M. A., & Khalid, R. (2013). The effects of clinical supervision on the teaching performance of secondary school teachers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 35-39.
- Vijayaamalar, G., & Suhaida, A. K. (2013). Sikap guru terhadap penyeliaan pengajaran yang dijalankan di sekolah menengah kebangsaan, zon Bangsar, Kuala Lumpur. *School of Education, University Putra Malaysia (GREDEC)*, 1.
- Wanzare, Z. (2012). Instructional supervision in public secondary schools in Kenya. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(2), 188-216.
- Yunus, Y. I., Yunus, J. N., & Ishak, S. (2010). The school principal's roles in teaching supervision in selected schools in Perak, Malaysia. *Asian Journal of business and management sciences*, 1(2), 50-55.
- Yusof, H., & Daud, S. H. S. (2017). Aplikasi analisis modifikasi kepentingan-prestasi amalan penyeliaan pengajaran ketua panitia seperti sedia ada dan yang diperlukan oleh guru. *Geografia-Malaysian Journal of Society and Space*, 12(8).
- Zepeda, S.J. (2017). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.