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ABSTRACT

The principal’s role is to promote academic performance. The success or failure of a school is usually attributed to the principal. He or she is the pivot around which many aspects of the school revolve, being the person in charge of every detail of running the school, be it academic or administrative. Schools can make a difference to students’ achievement and the principal’s leadership is one factor determining that success. It is therefore important that the performance of a school is appraised against the performance of the person who leads it. The researcher was prompted to carry out this study because of the persistent poor performance in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education examinations in many secondary schools in Tigania West Sub-county. The objectives of the study were to: find out the instructional leadership activities the principal engages in to improve students’ academic performance, determine the approaches the principal uses to supervise instruction in order to improve students’ performance, find out the approaches the principal uses to supervise instruction in order to improve students’ performance, find out the extent to which principals involve teachers in decision making in order to improve students’ performance, and find out the challenges principals encounter in improving students’ performance. The study was guided by the systems theory of organizations which postulates that schools are like open systems and emphasizes the consideration of the relationships between the school and its environment as well as what goes on within the school. The study used descriptive survey research design. The study sample composed of 10 schools out of 26 Public secondary schools in the Sub-county. Each school yielded 24 students and 5 teachers selected through systematic sampling plus the principal purposively selected giving a total of 300 respondents. The researcher collected data using questionnaires. Data was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The results were presented in summary form using frequency distribution tables, bar charts and pie charts. The study established that there was an association between the school’s performance and its principal’s instructional management practices. Findings also revealed that principals used several approaches in supervising the implementation of instructional practices. Some approaches like use of students to monitor teacher lesson attendance and visiting class to observe a teacher were rarely used. Most principals involved their deputies, and teachers in decision making. Schools faced challenges that include inadequate trained teachers and learning/teaching materials, irregular fees payment, inadequate science laboratories and lack of time to check on the teachers’ and students’ work by principals. Study recommends that the ministry of education provide more learning materials and facilities like science laboratories and libraries. The Teachers Service Commission should deploy/employ more teachers to the schools with understaffing in order to relieve the current teacher of the work load and ensure timely syllabus coverage as this will significantly impact to students’ performance. Principals should delegate more duties to their deputies and teachers in order to save time to assess both the students’ and teachers’ commitment to their work. Further research should be conducted to identify the major contributing factors in secondary school performance for schools in Tigania West Sub-County.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background to the Study

A growing body of evidence underscores a significant and positive relationship between effective leadership and student learning and achievement. Leithwood et al (2004) states that among school-related factors; leadership is second only to classroom instruction in its contribution to student learning. The head teacher’s skills in school management influences the behaviour of the school in terms of how teachers teach, how much students learn and the overall school performance. This is because the significant properties of key decisions made within the schools are made with the consent of the head teacher (Charles et al, 2012). Many scholars have acknowledged that the role of school principal is the most significant in enhancing school performance and students achievements (Walker and Stoot, 2000; Fisher & Frey, 2002; Mulford, 2003; Dinhan, 2004; Kearney, 2005; Gamage, 2009). It has been found that effective leaders develop school climates and cultures that help motivate both the students and teachers leading to the creation of better teaching and learning environments (Gamage et al, 2012). Besides, in most school systems, the principal is required by the systematic authorities to improve student learning and is held accountable for it by building commitments in developing a shared vision for motivating and energizing the teachers and students (Ross and Gray, 2006, cited in Gamage et al, 2012).

Lydia and Nasongo, (2009) say that the quality of leadership makes the difference between the success and failure of school. They further explain that research and inspection clarify the extent to which the quality of school leadership is crucial to
improvement. In highly effective schools, as well as schools which have reversed a trend of poor performance and declining achievements, it is the head teacher who sets the pace, leading and motivating pupils and staff to perform to their highest potential. According to Davies (2005) schools depend on leadership to improve their academic performance. An effective principal is committed to the improvement of academic performance of learners. He/she has to organize the curricular and instructional programme. He/she establishes clear, specific learning objectives for each class level and for each subject.

Research linking high-quality school leadership to better school performance has a sustained history in educational administration (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). More recently, several studies leveraging rich panel data on student outcomes have demonstrated this linkage as well. For example, Branch, Hanushek, and Rivkin (2012) estimate that a school with a principal whose effectiveness is one standard deviation above the mean will have student learning gains improve from 5% to 10% standard deviations greater than average. This shows that the principal effects apply to every student in the school. These differences in principal effectiveness across schools raise the question of what factors lead some principals to be more effective than others. While there are a large number of answers researchers have provided to this question, one echoed most often is that effective principals are effective instructional leaders (Grissom, et al, 2013). Instructional leadership generally is defined as the class of leadership functions directly related to supporting classroom teaching and student learning (Grissom and Loeb, 2013).
Most commonly, instructional leadership is operationalized as defining and communicating the school’s mission; managing the school’s instructional program by supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, and monitoring student progress; and creating a learning climate by for example, protecting teacher instructional time and providing incentives for learning (Hallinger, 2005). This characterization, suggests that behavioral markers of effective instructional leadership “on the ground” might include visiting teachers’ classrooms, talking about school goals, analyzing student data, or coordinating teacher professional development. The idea that principals should be frequent visitors to teachers’ classrooms has become particularly identified with instructional leadership. Indeed principals show higher involvement in classroom observations and feedback in higher-performing schools (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008).

In Sri Lanka school principals are increasingly held accountable for the quality of learning outcomes of schools, resource mobilization, and resource management, school quality monitoring and associated staff development programmes (Lekarage, 2010). In order to fulfill these responsibilities they work collaboratively and effectively with students, school management committees, teachers and school communities. The school principal is therefore expected to be a strong instructional leader, and team player.

As such the principal is considered as the, resource provider, instructional supervisor, and vision setter, without which the students performance can never be improved or even achieved. A number of studies in several African countries found a strong relationship between resources and students achievement. They gave the laboratory a central and distinctive role in education. In addition, studies done in less
developed countries such as Uganda, India Ghana, Brazil and Malaysia, indicated that access to textbook availability is positively related to students achievement (Mutua, 2011).

According to research carried out in Botswana secondary schools on instructional supervision by Moswela (2010), the environment in which instructional supervision takes place in schools is rather hostile and intimidating to teachers to make any meaningful, impression on the improvement of teaching standards. However a research conducted by Mutua (2011) in Matungulu, Machakos County, indicated that most teachers had benefited professionally from head teacher’s instructional supervision. Through this they had confirmed that students’ performance in their subject area had improved; they had improved their classroom instructions, felt more motivated, worked without close supervision and were kept on their toes.

Tigania West sub-county has recorded poor performance in KCSE for consecutive number of years. Very few schools post a mean score of above 6 (C plain). The sub-county was ranked position 173 out of 280 sub-counties in 2012 nationally and position 148 out of 283 sub-counties in 2013 (KNEC, 2012 - 13). This is quite a low performance even compared to its neighbouring sub-county Tigania East which was seven positions above it in 2013. Murithi (2010) reports that principals in Tigania District have experienced various discipline problems leading to students’ strikes and poor performance. It is thus very crucial that principals in Tigania West sub-county perform their role more effectively in order to improve the academic performance of this sub-county.
Ponnnusamy (2010) asserts that we cannot deny the fact that school leadership influences the teacher’s achievement. She reiterates that teachers are influenced by their schools’ leadership and they then have a direct influence on students’ achievement. Lunenburg, (2010) concurs with this when he says that teachers need to be provided with training, teaching tools and the support they need to help all students reach high performance levels. Specifically, teachers need access to curriculum guides, textbooks or specific training connected to the school curriculum.

1.1 Statement of Problem

The principal has the pivotal role of providing the leadership for the school and its wider community. Review of research on the principal’s role in school effectiveness concluded that “strong administrative leadership was among those factors within a school that make a difference in student learning” (Poirier, 2009). The principal’s role is a complex one, which includes being accountable to the public, building community relations, dealing with crises and political issues, overseeing discipline, enhancing instruction, resolving managerial problems and creating school culture. The principal’s unique role in the school is that they have an influence on student achievement (Poirier, 2009).

Since head teachers play a significant role in school due to their varied tasks and roles, their tactful fulfillment of their roles together with their constant supervision of the teachers determines the level of teacher input and academic achievement of the students. Gorton et al (2007) says that because of their key role in school improvement, principals need training that prepares them for the multiple expectations that are on their shoulders today. Marwinga (2010) however, asserts that most of the head teachers are not well prepared for their present jobs hence do
not execute their tasks and roles as expected leading to poor students’ performance. The reasons for this poor performance cannot be easily discerned without focused investigation. Poor performance among secondary schools in the Sub-county undermines students’ chances of joining institutions of higher learning and jeopardized opportunities for job placement and thus reduces the students’ active participation in national development. As earlier noted principal play a significant role in determining academic performance in a school due to their varied tasks and roles. It was important therefore to investigate the role of the principal in promoting students’ performance in Tigania West Sub-county.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role the principal plays in promoting students’ academic performance in KCSE in Tigania West Sub-county, Meru County.

1.3 Research Objectives

The study was guided by the following objectives

i. To investigate the instructional leadership activities the principal engages in to improve students’ performance.

ii. To determine the approaches the principal uses to supervise instruction in order to improve students’ performance.

iii. To find out the extent to which the principal involves the teachers in decision making in order to improve students’ performance.

iv. To find out the challenges principals encounter in improving students performance.
1.4 Research Questions

The study sought to answer the following research questions

i. What instructional leadership activities do the principal engages in to improve students’ performance?

ii. What approaches does the principal use to supervise instruction in order to improve students’ performance?

iii. To what extent does the principal involve the teachers in decision making in order to improve students’ performance?

iv. What challenges do principals encounter in their effort to improve students’ performance?

1.5 Assumptions of the Study

The study made the following assumptions:

i. The principal was the central factor determining academic achievement in the school.

ii. The Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education examination is a reliable and accurate instrument for measuring student achievement at the secondary schools level.

iii. The principals provided necessary guidance, support and supervision for effective performance of the school.

iv. Principals, teachers and students’ gave honest and reliable responses.
1.6 Limitations

The study encountered the following limitations

i. Due to financial constraints the study covered a small sample of secondary schools in Meru County.

ii. It was not easy to cover the opinions of B.O.M members and parents because tracing them required considerable time, resources and other logistics.

1.7 Delimitations

The following were the delimitations of the study

i. Performance was only limited to KCSE examination results. Formative evaluation was not put into consideration.

ii. The research limited itself to only those secondary schools that had posted KCSE results for at least four consecutive years.

iii. Private schools were precluded in this study.

1.8 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study have both theoretical and practical implications for the future of secondary school education in the country. Theoretically, the study contributes to the advancement of knowledge on the role of the principal in determining the academic performance of the students. On the practical significance, the findings help the principals to know their instructional role in school, the importance of involving teachers in decision making to improve performance and some factors that hinder students’ academic performance.
1.9 Scope of the Study

The study included a sample of boarding schools, day schools, single and mixed schools in Tigania West Sub-county, Meru County. The principals, teachers and students were among the respondents. They provided information on their perception towards the role of the principal in promoting students performance.

1.10 Theoretical Framework of the Study

This study was guided by the systems theory of organizations developed by Ludwig Von Bertalanffy in the early 1950s. Systems theory is an alternative to the classical and neo-classical organizations theories which the researcher felt cannot suffice because of their emphasis on schools as fragmented and closed social units independent of external forces (Backer, 1973, cited in Oso and Onen, 2005). The only meaningful way to study an organization (including a school) is to regard it as a system (Oso and Onen, 2005).

Schools are social systems in which two or more persons work together in a coordinated manner to attain common goals (Norlin, 2009). This definition is useful, for it specifies several important features of schools: (1.) they consist, ultimately, of people; (2.) they are goal-directed in nature; (3.) they attain their goals through some form of coordinated effort; and (4.) they interact with their external environment. Social systems theory generally deals with open systems because it is almost impossible to envisage a social system, such as a school, that is not interactive with its environment (Owen & Valesky, 2011). They hold the view that an education institution is an open system that receives resources (inputs) from the environment and transforms (process) them into products (outputs). As depicted in
Figure 1.1, an open system consists of five basic elements (Scott, 2008): inputs, a transformation process, outputs, feedback, and the environment.

![Diagram of School as an Open System](image)

**Figure 1.1: School as an Open System**
Adapted from: Fred C. Lunenburg (2010). Schools as open systems

Lunenburg (2010) says that: systems such as schools use four kinds of inputs or resources from the environment: human resources and information resources. Human resources includes administrative and staff talent, labour and the like. Financial resources are the capital the school uses to finance both ongoing and long-term operations. Physical resources include supplies, materials, facilities, and equipment. Information recourses are knowledge curricula, data and other kinds of information by the school.

The school administrators (principal) job involves combining and coordinating these various resources to attain the school’s goals - Learning for all (Lunenburg, 2010). The interaction between students and teachers is part of the transformation or learning process by which students become educated citizens capable of contributing to society. How do school principals accomplish this? Work of some kind is done
in the system to produce output. The system adds a value added to the work in process (Shaw; 2006). Tasks performed by school principals within the organizations structure will affect the school outputs.

Lunenburg (2010) further stresses that it is the principal’s job to secure and use inputs to schools, transforms them –while considering external variables to produce outputs. In social systems, outputs are the attainment of goals or objectives of the school and are represented by the products results, outcomes or accomplishments of the system. Feedback is crucial to the success of the school operation because it serves as a control mechanism. This underscores the importance of communication in a school. Negative feedback, for example, can be used to correct deficiencies in the transformation process or the inputs or both, which in turn will have an effect on the school’s future outputs.

The environment surrounding the school includes the social, political, and economic forces that impinge on the organization. The social, political and economical contexts in which school principals work are marked by pressure at the local aside state levels. Thus school principals today find it necessary to mange and develop “internal” operations while concurrently monitoring the environment and anticipating and responding to “external” demands. Principals are also faced with a number of challenges that are exclusively local in nature (emanating within the school) such as difficult school boards, uncooperative teachers, lack of resources, students indiscipline and the like. Yet they are faced with ongoing pressures to show good results in national examinations while at the same time dealing with a growing number of management duties such as budgeting, hiring personnel, mobilizing
resources etc and regardless of the challenges they face. Thus only the principal who played his/her role skillfully led to improved students academic performance.

1.11 Conceptual Framework

In the context of this study the conceptual framework showed the relationship between the principal’s instructional leadership activities, instructional supervision approaches, involvement of teachers in decision making and the challenges he/she encounters in improving student’s academic achievement.

This conceptual framework had four composite variables mediated by teacher and students characteristics to see their effect on the dependent variable as shown in Figure 1.2. It was conceptualized that student academic performance was influenced by a combination of various variables, namely: instructional leadership activities, instructional supervision approaches, involvement of teachers in decision making and certain challenges that may hinder the effectiveness of the principal. The focus was on the principal who was the central independent variable. An effective principal ensured he/she has utilized and harmonized the above four variables in order to improve students’ academic performance.
Figure 1.2: Conceptual Framework relating the role of the Principal to Academic Performance

Source: Researcher's Own
As it can be seen in Figure 1.2, the effect of the four composite variables namely: principal’s instructional activities, his/her approaches in supervising instruction, involvement of teachers in decision making and the challenges he/she faces are mediated by two intervening variables namely teachers and students characteristics which most directly effects academic performance. However, students’ academic performance on the other hand is indirectly influenced by the four composite variables. In the context of the above conceptual framework, the theoretical underpinning of the study is that improved students academic performance is a complex process that only a system will work.

As Magolis (2012) observes “The performance of the system depends on how the elements work together and not how each element works independently”. For a school to achieve improved academic performance the principal needs to harmonize the four composite variables since the school is an open system rather than a closed entity. Has Hanson (1996) asserts “the focus of the leader is on the whole, all parts, and relationship among all parts.” The study was guided by the variables indicated in the conceptual framework.
1.12 Operational Definition of Central Terms

**Academic performance** refers to the scholastic accomplishment of a student. This accomplishment is measured through continuous assessment conducted in subjects offered at school. In this study it will be measured by the final grade in KCSE.

**Role** is a part played by someone in an organization. In this study, role is defined as a function of the principal in promoting academic performance of students.

**Instructional leadership** - in this study; instructional leadership will mean all those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning. It will comprise the following tasks: Setting school wide goals; providing teaching and learning resources, supervising teachers; coordinating staff development programmes; hiring of teachers; checking students’ and teachers work.

**Supervision** is an act by the principal of managing, overseeing and giving direction to teachers. In this study; supervision means the act of the principal ensuring that teaching and learning is taking place through checking that teachers attend all their lessons, in time and well prepared.

**Challenges** – in this study, challenges mean the constraints which principals face while trying to improve students’ academic performance.

**Instruction** – in this study means teaching and learning

**Approaches**- methods the principal uses to ensure that teaching and learning is taking place effectively
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In the contemporary world, improvements in student achievements are recognized as the foremost objective of school reforms and restructuring efforts. With this objective in mind, many different reform packages are being implemented while the key focus of the reforms is more or less the same. The legislation on No child is left Behind by 2020 signed into law in January 2002 in the USA is one of the most prominent and visible action taken by any government, towards achieving this goal. In the meantime, many scholars have acknowledged that the role of the school leadership is the most significant in enhancing school performance and student achievement (Gentilucci and Muto, 2007, Gamage, 2009).

It has been found that effective leaders developed school climates and cultures that help motivate both the students and teachers leading to the creation of better teaching and learning environments which are more conducive to higher levels of students’ achievements. Besides, in most schools systems, school principal is required by the systemic authorities to improve student learning and is held accountable for it by building commitments in developing a shared vision for motivating and energizing the teachers and students (Ross and Gray, 2006). In this chapter the author proposes to explore the literature to examine whether there is sufficient evidence to sustain this claim.
2.2 Instructional Leadership Activities the Principal Engages in

It has been reported that the leadership behaviour of a principal and his/her role as an instructional leader has a significant impact on creating more effective schools leading to higher levels of student achievements (Quirin, 2002; Gold, et al). As instructional leader, the principal is the pivotal point within the school who affects the quality of teacher instruction, the height of student achievement, and the degree of efficiency in school functioning. Findley and Findley (1992) state that “If a school is to be an effective one, it will be because of the instructional leadership role of the principal” Research on effective schools indicates that the principal is pivotal in bringing effective schools.

Gamage et al (2009) claim that although the principal must address certain managerial tasks to ensure an efficient school, the task of the principal must be to keep focused on student achievement. If our goal is to have effective schools, then we must look at ways to emphasize instructional leadership. Various instructional activities that influence students’ performance include provision of teaching and learning resources supervision of teaching/learning processes, visiting classrooms and checking teachers and students work, employment of teachers, motivating students’ progress and promoting teachers’ development among others.

Principals influence classroom instruction by supplying teachers with necessary resources. Providing resources includes more than just monetary resources and materials. According to Duke (cited in Lineburg, 2010) providing resources includes “(a) Scheduling, (b) Developing the school calendar, (c) Hiring and correctly placing teachers, (d) Adopting textbooks and (e) Purchasing necessary
materials to support instruction.” Principals influence student achievement through helping teachers acquire necessary resources to support instruction.

The lack of resources may be a barrier to the use of some instructional strategies by teachers. For instance, the lack of science equipment and reference materials was found by Appleton and Kindt (1999) to dictate how teachers taught their students. Schools did not have the necessary resources to support certain instructional strategies and activities. The researchers cited the school and school system as the reason for the lack of science resources. This places responsibility for not providing adequate resources on principals and administrators at the central office level.

Providing resources is viewed by teachers as effective leadership by principals (McGhee & Lew, 2007).

Gorton et al. (2007) asserts that the burden falls on the principal to provide the instructional acumen, curriculum support, professional development opportunities, data-driven decision making, and visionary perspective to mold a faculty of teachers into a unified force to advance; academic achievement for all students. Professional development is essential in preparing teachers for their role as partners with administrators in leadership for change. Therefore, in order to promote student performance, principals should not only provide teaching and learning resources/materials but also offer teachers opportunities for professional development for instance by sponsoring them to attend seminars and academic workshops.

Research shows that in schools where students are achieving at high levels, principals structure time to evaluate and monitor students; progress, and lead staff
effort in designing focused instructional approaches to meet the special and specific needs of students. Venezky & Winfield (in Gamage et al 2009) reported that in successful schools, ‘careful monitoring of students progresses took place. A study conducted by Fisher and Frey (2002) at Hoover High School in San Diego reveals that the principal as an instructional leader led to increased student academic achievements while decreasing drop-out rates. In this context, the principal regularly modeled lessons in front of teachers and students and interacted with students to provide encouragement and strategies to achieve success.

Another study by Gentilucci and Muto (2007) focused on the students perceptions on instructional leadership behaviours of principals which most positively influenced their learning and academic achievements. The findings demonstrated that instructional leaders positively influenced students’ academic achievement and met the students formally and informally for discussions. Further, the principals who visited classrooms regularly for longer periods and did so interactively were perceived as more influential than those who visited less frequently for short periods and were passive.

2.3 **Approaches the Principal uses to Supervise Instruction**

Improving supervision of instruction is of great concern to educational authorities worldwide. Effective instructional supervision is considered vital for school effectiveness. Yunas (2013) says that supervision is one of the roles of principal, which is concerned with the improvement of instructional effectiveness. This means that to have effective teaching and learning within the school; the principal needs to supervise the process. He notes that the role of the principal is characterized by frequent classroom observations; supervision; effective feedback to teachers and
involvement of staff in school-based activities. Principal is instrumental in successful curriculum implementation in school. The instructional supervision also takes cognized of the timely implementation of curriculum, improvement of programme and monitoring of the planned objectives of the school.

According to Wehmeier (2004) quoted in Charles et-al (2012) supervision is the act of being in charge and making sure that everything is done correctly and safely in our contemporary society, schools are considered as schools are considered as social systems, because they are bounded by sets of elements (subsystems) and activities that interact to constitute a single social entry. The effective functioning of every social system, Schools included, is assumed to be dependent on the quality of their leadership. Thus the principal is the key to successful curriculum implementation in school through supervision of instruction.

Khan (2009) asserts that as instructional leader the principal is the pivotal point within the school who affects the quality of individual teacher instruction, the height of student achievement, and the degree of efficiency in school functioning. He makes frequent observations of classroom instructional programme, teachers’ involvement in decision making regarding instructional programme, active participation in planning and evaluating the instructional programme. Supervision improves teaching and learning through a deliberate emphasis on ways and means of instilling excellence in the quality of instruction. It is through supervision that teachers are guided and influenced to strive towards the desired educational goals and objectives.
Charles et al (2012) suggests that head teachers need to supervise teachers by ensuring that lessons are planned early; lessons are structured with an interesting beginning; revision of previous knowledge and teachers’ use of voice variation and summary of major points at the end; teachers use backups/teaching aids properly; teachers have a good relationship with their students and teachers follow up curriculum strictly. Okumbe (1999) considers supervision as an administrative strategy aimed at stimulating teachers towards greater pedagogic effectiveness and productivity. This is usually aimed at enhancing excellence in examinations. Instructional supervision aids head teachers in coordinating, improving and maintaining high teaching and learning standards in schools. According to Sweeney (cited in Musungu & Nasongo, 2008), it is time head teachers were accountable for the academic achievement of their students as well. The head teacher is legally seen as the first supervisor because he/she has to play the role of supervision from time to time by checking the teachers’ classroom work and assessing their overall performance based on pupil achievement.

When principals (as instructional leaders) know what is happening in classrooms, they are better able and willing to provide resources and materials that support teachers’ instructional efforts. This is what some researchers have described as ‘mobilizing resources’. Gamage et al (2009) reported that one of the variables determining high achieving schools was the principals’ assistance to teachers in acquiring needed resources to achieve maximal students’ outcomes.

When principals frequently visit classrooms, they provide attention to teachers’ efforts and progress in instructional matters. To gain knowledge of what is occurring in classrooms and the materials being used, effective principals frequently
observes teachers’ instructional methods, Gamage et al (2009) used the label of ‘vigorous supervision’ and discussed the importance of established routines such as “the supervision of teacher and staff performance by daily visitations, private conferences, prompt evaluations and provision of assistance.” Heck & Larsen (1990) reported that one of the leadership behaviours common in high achieving schools was the principals’ direct supervision of instructional strategies. They described the principals as ‘a visible presence’ in the classroom.

Opportunities to interact with teachers on instructional issues increase as principal becomes frequent visitor in the classroom. Gamage et al (2009) analysis of teacher and principal interactions demonstrated that teachers in schools with improved student performance more frequently requested the principal’s help on instructional matters than the teachers in low performing schools. Providing follow-up comments to teachers improvement was one of the variables characterizing high achieving schools reported by Heck, Larsen, and Marcoulides (1990). In addition to gaining first-hand knowledge of the daily challenges and constraints those teachers encounter; this information enhances the principals’ ability to practice instructional leadership that leads to students’ academic gains.

Castro (2004) reports that most researchers are in agreement about the importance of supervision in the delivery of education; and the key person in the supervision exercise is the principal. However, the principals can also supervise instruction through their deputies, head of departments, head of subjects and or career/curriculum department. As Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) notes, what is important in supervision of instruction is not the person’s title or designation, but rather his/her responsibility [in supervision]. In fact, Awuah (2011)
says that the head of school, his/her assistant and other teachers are responsible for improving classroom instruction.

It is therefore worth noting that supervision is the key to the principal’s role in the effective classroom. Class visits and lesson observation form the bases of the principal’s supervision practices. This clearly indicates that supervision is focused on improving professional performance so as to deliver the valued outcomes of the school which includes increase student achievement. It is central to the improvement of the quality of teaching in a school and if teachers are well led and aware of the benefit in supervision, they need to be amenable towards supervision, they need to be amenable towards supervision.

2.4 Principal Involvement of Teachers in Decision Making

A participatory approach in decision making has been acknowledged as an essential ingredient in the quest for better schools (Blasé, 2010). In schools, effective teacher involvement in decision making can be an approach of practicing participatory management. According to Mueller & Gorkturk (2010), teachers can play a greater role in the overall success of the school when they commit to being active participants in decision making process. Kiprop & Kandie (2012) says that teachers are the key figures in implementing the curriculum which at the school level curriculum planning involves taking decisions on what to teach, how to teach it and who to teach. This concurs with Mualuko et al (2009) who asserts that among other groups, very important group to involve in making decisions in schools are teachers who are custodians of instruction, implementers of school policies and co-organizers for school activities along with head teachers. Further, the decisions made in schools affect them and as professionals and specialists in different subject areas, they are
better suited to make the correct decisions having in mind what is required of them as teachers.

Okumbe (1998) suggests that educational managers need to be conversant with fundamental processes by which decisions are made in organisations so as to improve teaching and learning effectiveness. He further states that effective teacher participation is very important if maximum output is to be realised from them. Research conducted by Mualuko, Mukesa and Achoka (2009) on teacher participation in decision making in Makueni district revealed that teachers desired greater involvement than they were currently involved. In their comments teachers desire to participate in decision-making committees composed of experts and in staff meetings. It is therefore important to involve departmental committees in making decisions like selection of textbooks and evaluation of the examination results. Teachers’ views must be taken seriously especially in examination matters. Mullins (2005) states that staff participation in decision making leads to higher performance which is necessary for survival in an increasingly competitive world.

Principals who make decisions using only their own knowledge run the risk of reaching only partial solutions. This may also cause resentment among staff members who are deprived of participating in the decision (Fawcett, 2008). Participative decision making provides teachers the opportunity to be involved in and exert influence on decision making processes. Gorton et al (2007) say that if the members are permitted to be involved, they will be self-motivated in their participation because the final determination may affect them in some significant manner. If excluded from the decision-making process, they may feel deprived, and dissatisfaction with the administrator or the decision is likely to result.
Mpungose (1999) says that when decisions are taken collaboratively by teachers and management team, the scope for tension is minimized. Furthermore, team spirit is enhanced. Findings of his study on participative decision making in South Africa revealed that seventy percent of the respondents argued that involving teachers in the decision making process make them own their decisions. He argues, that one of the advantages of participative decision making is the increased ownership that the group members feel concerning decisions that they helped to make, thus deepening the commitment to make the decision relevant to their working environment are motivated to take ownership of the decision and ensure that its desired outcomes are realized.

Gorton et al (2007) say that the goal for the administrator should be to involve people in the process of decision making when their involvement could improve the quality, acceptance, or implementation of the decision and when the involvement is based on people's desired level of involvement. Bhengu (2002) argues that shared decision-making is of primary importance to holistic approach to school improvement. Through shared decisions he believes, there will be a better practice of integration leading to progress of the reform embarked upon.

Making the correct decision is of great importance for effective education and the achievement of educational objective. Christian Organisation Research and Advisory Trust, CORAT (2011) citing advantages of participatory decision-making says that the greater the number of people involved in decision making, the less the possibility of important factors being overlooked. Teachers are also more motivated in their work if they can take part in decisions. CORAT further adds that is important that educational managers be conversant with the fundamental processes
through which decision are made in organizations so that they can effectively improve teaching and learning processes. Participatory or consensus decision-making is shown to boost the probability for reaching better decisions and having those decisions carried out as planned (CORAT, 2011:74).

Gorton et al (2007) say that teachers should have an impact on policy decisions and should work in a collegial relationship, ‘sharing power’ with administrators. Through this relationship, principals become facilitators of school goals, empowering them and allowing them to generate their ideas. This, in turn, gives more dignity to the profession of teaching. Lydiah & Nasongo (2009) in their research on the role of the head teacher in academic achievement, Vihiga District; reported that over 70 percent of head teachers in the high performing schools encouraged teamwork in schools by having a get together to celebrate and review any achievement, ensuring regular staff meetings and constant briefings and consultation, appreciating each others’ contribution and participation in decision making.

2.5 Challenges the Principals Encounter in Improving Students’ Performance

The principal’s efforts to improve students’ academic performance are not an easy task. It may be hindered by several factors which the principal needs to wrestle with. Njuguna (2004) research in her in Gatanga Division, Thika District, found out that some of the factors that have negative impact on students’ performance in KCSE examination were:- (i) inadequacy of some teaching/learning resources, (ii) lack of efficient school based curriculum monitoring, (iii) inability by the teachers to complete the syllabuses in time, (iv) students’ characteristics such as
indiscipline, poor entry behaviour and frequent absenteeism, and (v) inadequate parents’ participation in school affairs due to poverty. Amukowa and Karue (2012) in their research in Embu District found similar factors as contributing to poor performance in day secondary schools. Among the factors they identified were lack of reading materials, bad company, chronic absenteeism emanating from lack of school fees, admission of weak students at form one entry, inadequate instructional materials and physical facilities. They also state that the type of leadership provided by head teachers is variable that affect students’ performance.

Inyeiga (1997) observes that the resources and facilities that a school would need for the achievement of schools mission are qualified teaching staff, support staff, physical facilities furniture, stores and enough play ground. Mutua (2011) concurs that there is acute shortage of physical facilities and equipment in many secondary schools. Insufficient educational facilities, equipment and supplies lead to over use of the facilities that are available in the schools. Most schools lack enough classrooms which lead to overcrowding of students during learning.

Commission of inquiry into the education system (Koech Report, 1999) received views from the members of the public to the effect that the standard of educational attainments which the standard of educational attainments were failing were attributed to various problems such as inadequate and unsuitable physical facilities, equipment, learning and teaching materials and in appropriately trained teachers as well as overloaded curriculum.

Nzambi (2012) says that lack of resources is a dilemma faced by school heads in Africa. Teachers work under deplorable conditions, are overworked, underpaid and
as in some countries not paid at all for months. There is also lack of enough teachers to handle the various subjects (Otunga et al, 2008). Amukowa and Karue, (2012) for example reported from their research in Embu District Day Schools; that there were few science teachers and this made the art subject teachers to double as science teachers having studied science at high school. They found out that some of the schools had also recruited, untrained graduate BSc. Holders to alleviate the shortage of science teachers.

Teachers’ lack of commitment and uncooperative attitudes, coupled with lateness and alcoholism which affects the output negatively is a challenge for head teachers today (Kusi, 2008). Lack of commitment among teachers directly affects students’ academic performance in the sense that the students’ may end up sitting their final examination having not covered the syllabus. Students’ absenteeism is another challenge caused by factors such as sexual maturity of especially girl-child. A study on needs assessment done by girl-child Network (2010) on gender equity and equality, established that a girl is absent from school due to menses for 4 days in 28 days. Majority of girls in secondary schools are already menstruating.

Students riots which causes destruction to property, increased costs on parents and guardians lead to poor examination results is another challenge (Bomett, 2011). Mutua (2013) asserts that strikes hamper learning and teaching processes, causing financial difficulties to schools and parents and creating bad relationship between teachers, students and parents. They disrupt the teaching programme making it difficult for the teachers to cover the syllabus and effectively prepare candidates for national examinations. Examination performance and curriculum supervision by the principal will be low unless a systematic and consultative way of solving students’
problems is practiced. Otunga et al (2008) say that violence disrupts the smooth running of schools in Africa and this also has an impact on the effectiveness of schools head. Bomelt (2011) also indicates that the principals may be faced with lack of support from parents who have no respect for the education system and this too may affect the principal’s role in improving students’ performance.

The fact that the principal is overloaded with administrative duties is a challenge that may hinder him/her in supervising teaching and learning process. For instance Mulanda (2008) analyzed head teachers constrain to effective supervision of curriculum in public secondary schools in Kakamega south District. Analysis indicated that most head teachers do not carry out clinical supervision because of many administrative duties that they have to perform. Similarly, Kimosop (2002) found out in Karbanet & Salawa Divisions of Baringo District that the frequency of performance in instructional supervisory practices by head teachers’ were low especially in the areas of classroom observation, checking students notes and teaching lessons. Without proper supervision of teaching and learning process, the academic performance of the students will automatically be low.

2.6 Summary

It has emerged from the literature review that the leadership roles of the principal greatly affect students’ academic performance. The role of the principal as an instructional leader was identified as second only to classroom instruction in influencing students’ performance. Principals as instructional leaders engage in certain activities among them being provision of teaching and learning materials, supervision of teaching and learning processes, employment of teachers, staff development, monitoring students’ progress and visiting classrooms to gain
knowledge of what is happening there. The main role of an instructional leader is concerned with students learning.

Involving teachers in decision making has been shown to motivate them to take ownership of the decision and ensure that their desired outcomes are realized. Therefore, in order to accomplish the educational goals of a school without failure or sabotage it is important for the principal to involve teachers in decision making. However there are challenges that the principal encounters in the effort to promote students’ performance. Among them are inadequate learning and teaching resources, inadequate teachers, lack of teachers commitment to their work, students’ indiscipline, and lack of parents’ commitments to their children’s learning.

From the literature reviewed it is evident that the principal plays a critical role in enhancing students’ performance. However, there exists a gap since a study to establish the role of the principal in promoting students performance has not been done in Tigania West Sub-county. The study therefore seeks to establish the role of the principal in promoting students’ performance in secondary schools in Tigania West Sub-county. Owing to the fact that principals do not operate in seclusion, the study will also focus on the contribution and suggestions by the teachers and students on the role of the principal in promoting students performance. Little is known about the role of the principal in improving students’ performance and the constraints they face in their roles in Tigania west Sub-county and thus the need for this research to be undertaken.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a detailed description of research methodology. Methodology is the detailed procedure used to answer the research questions (Oso and Onen, 2005:74). Methodology includes a description of research design, research site (locale of the study), population, sampling techniques, research instruments, and data collection procedures and data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

The research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in the procedure (Orodho, 2008:36). Therefore, decisions regarding what, where, when, how much, by what means concerning an inquiry or research study constitutes a research design.

The study used descriptive survey design. Descriptive survey is a method of collecting information by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals (Orodho, 2003). It can be used when collecting information about people’s attitudes, opinions, habits or any of the variety of education or social issues (Orodho and Kombo, 2002). The main advantage of this type of design is that it enables the researcher to access the situation within the study area at that time (Kothari, 2003). The research project purported to determine the role of principal on the learner academic performance through the use of a survey. Survey research typically employs questionnaires and interviews in order to determine the opinions,
attitudes, preferences and perceptions of the persons of interest to the researcher (Mkhize 2005:45).

The choice of this design was also informed by Cooper, (1996) who says a descriptive survey study is concerned with finding the who, what, where and how of a phenomenon which is the concern of this study. Further Kerlinger (cited in Kombo and Tromp, 2006:71) argues that descriptive studies are not only restricted to fact findings, but may often result in the formulation of important principles of knowledge and solution to significant problems. The choice of the design is therefore appropriate since the study is also interested in formulating important principles on the role of the principal in school performance and helps alleviate the problems of low performance in secondary schools.

3.3 Location of the Study

The location of the study was Tigania West Sub-county in Meru County. It borders Tingania East Sub-county to the North, Imenti North to the South, to the East Tharaka Sub-county and to the West Isiolo Sub-county. The district was selected due to its poor performance in KCSE in the last six years and also due to the fact that no research had been done in this region to determine the role of the principal in enhancing students’ academic performance.

3.4 Target Population

Target population is defined as all the members of a real or hypothetical set of people, events or objects to which a researcher wishes to generalize the results of the research study (Borg & Gall, 1989).
The population must have at least one outstanding characteristic which makes it distinct from any other population. The target population consisted of all the 26 public secondary school in Tigania West District which had presented candidates for the KNEC examination between 2010-2013. The district has 5 girls’ boarding schools, 5 boys’ boarding schools, 4 mixed boarding school and 12 mixed day schools. The district has more mixed day schools than single sex boarding schools. This could be attributed to the average economic status of the district that makes boarding fees too high for most parents.

3.5 Sample and Sampling Techniques

Sampling means selecting a given number of subjects from a defined population as representative of that population. Any statements made about the sample should also be true of the population (Orodho, 2002). The researcher drew a sample from the 26 secondary schools in Tigania West Sub-county though stratified sampling based on the criteria of the performance of schools.

The secondary schools were stratified into high performing schools (HPS) with a mean of 6.00 and above in KCSE examinations, average performing schools (APS) with a mean of 5.00 to 5.9 in KCSE examinations and low performing school (LPS) with a mean of 4.9 and below in KCSE examinations (of 2010 to 2013). The identification of schools was based on the mean examination scores posted in KCSE for the four years of study.

The study focused on three high performing schools, three average performing school and four low performing schools selected on the criteria of the type of school. Only public schools were selected. This gave a sample of ten schools. Each school
provided 5 teachers and 24 students who were selected by systematic sampling. Orodho (2008) says that systematic sampling involves selecting members at equal intervals. This assumes the existence of a list of members (i.e. the register of students or nominal roll). The researcher obtained the list of teachers and selected the first name maintaining an interval of one until he got the five (5) teachers. For the students; the admission register was obtained and the fifth name selected. The interval of five was maintained until eight students were obtained from every class i.e. Form 2, 3 & 4. The researcher did not seek the opinions of the form ones, since they had not stayed in school long enough to understand its culture, programmes and other information relevant to the study. The reasons for using admission register rather than the class register was because some schools have more than one stream. The sample for this study thus consisted of 10 principals purposively selected, 50 teachers and 240 students from the selected schools, giving a total of 300 respondents.

3.6 Research Instruments

The researcher opted for the questionnaire for data collection because of its effectiveness in eliciting the respondents’ feelings, beliefs and experiences. Gay (1992) maintains that questionnaires give respondents freedom to express their views or opinions and also to make suggestions. It is also anonymous. Anonymity helps to produce more candid answers than is possible in an interview. In this study three types of questionnaires were used. They included:

- Questionnaire for principals
- Questionnaire for teachers
- Questionnaire for students
The questionnaires contained both open-ended questions and close-ended questions. Open-ended questionnaires gave the respondents an opportunity to express their views, experiences and suggestions. The closed-ended questionnaires are easier to code responses and analyze them by use of computer. They also make numerical comparison relatively easy while allowing a high degree of respondents’ objectivity.

3.6.1 Questionnaire for Head teachers

The questionnaire for head teachers comprised six sections. Section A collected the background information of the school and the head teacher. Each of the other five sections collected information related to the principal’s role in enhancing students’ academic performance.

3.6.2 Questionnaire for Teachers

The questionnaire for teachers comprised six sections. Section A collected the background information of teachers. Each of the other five sections collected information related to the principal’s role in enhancing students’ academic performance.

3.6.3 Questionnaire for Students

The questionnaire for students comprised three sections. Section A collected the background information of students while the other two sections collected information related to the role of the principal in enhancing students’ performance.
3.7 Validity and Reliability

3.7.1 Validity

One of the criteria a measuring instrument must meet is that of validity. According to Anastasia cited in Kasomo (2006:72) validity refers to the quality that a procedure or an instrument (tool) used in the research is accurate, correct, true, meaningful and right. Validity therefore implies that we want to obtain what we are supposed to measure. So if whatever we use in the study enables us to get what we want to get there is validity.

This means that the test must measure the characteristics which it was intended to measure. In this research it was necessary to ascertain the validity of questionnaire so that the research findings would be valid. There are four types of validity, namely: content validity, predictive validity, and concurrent validity and construct validity. Of interest to the researcher is content validity. Kasomo (2006:73) defines content validity as ‘the degree to which the research instrument measures what it should measure. The question that might be asked to gain insight into content validity is: How well do items in this test represent the universe of all items which might be asked on this subject?

In order to ascertain content validity, the questionnaires were presented to the supervisors for scrutiny and advice. The content and impressions of the instrument were improved based on their advice and comments. Kasomo (2006:73) observes that content validity of an instrument is determined through expert judgment by carefully examining or inspecting the items that make the instrument.
The questionnaire items were then constructed in a way that they were better related to each question. This ensured that all research items were covered. A pilot study was used to ensure that the questionnaires were directed to respondents who are qualified to give information and that the information obtained was representative of information elicited from the entire population. Data obtained from the pilot study was tested for response relevance, before the format and content of the questionnaire was finalized.

3.7.2 Reliability

According to Kasomo (2006:76) reliability refers to how consistent a research procedure or instrument is. It therefore, means the degree of consistency, demonstrated in a study. Hence, reliability implies stability or dependability of an instrument or procedure in order to obtain information.

Orodho (2008:41) states that reliability of measurement concerns the degree to which a particular measuring procedure gives similar results over a number of repeated trials. To ensure reliability of the instruments the researcher conducted pilot study in two secondary schools in Tigania West Sub-county before the actual study. The two secondary schools were not included in the main study. The reason behind pretesting was to improve reliability of the instruments. The research assessed the suitability and clarity of the questions in the questionnaires. Those found to be inadequate of vague were modified to improve the quality of the research instrument thus increasing reliability.

Reliability in this study was determined using split-half procedure. The split-half procedure involves scoring two halves (usually odd items versus even items) and
then calculating a correlation coefficient for the two halves computed. The formula given below was used:

i) \[ r = 1 - \frac{6 \sum (D)^2}{N (N^2-1)} \]

where:
- \( r \) = Correlation coefficient
- \( N \) = Sample
- \( \sum \) = Summation of scores
- \( D \) = Deviation

ii) \[ SH = \frac{2R}{1+ r} \]

where:
- \( SH \) = split half
- \( R \) = Correlation coefficient

According to Orodho (2005) a correlation coefficient (\( r \)) of about 0.75 and above should be considered high enough to judge an instrument as reliable. A reliability coefficient of 0.82 was obtained for the teachers’ questionnaires, 0.78 for the student questionnaires and 0.85 for the head teachers’ questionnaire and hence the tools were considered acceptable for this study.

### 3.8 Pilot Study

The pilot study is a preliminary testing of the questionnaire items on a few subjects. The pilot study uses similar questions and similar subjects as in the final survey. Kidder and Judd (1986 cited in Mkhize 2005) suggest that the basic purpose of a pilot study is to determine how the design of the subsequent study can be improved and be used to identify flaws in the measuring instrument. Mkhize (2005:60) thus justifies a pilot study by saying it is usually desirable to run pilot test on a questionnaire and to revise it based on the result of the test.
A pilot study was conducted in two schools in Tigania West Sub-county. These schools were part of the general population from which the sample was drawn, but not part of the sample itself. The pilot study involved 10 teachers, 48 students and 2 principals. The purpose of piloting was to assess the instrument’s clarity and suitability of the language used in reference to the different respondents. The researcher made improvements on the questionnaire based on the results of the pilot study.

3.9 Data Collection Procedures

After the approval of the research by the University supervisors, the researcher obtained permission to carry out the study from the MOEST. An endorsement from Kenyatta University authorizing the research was also be obtained. The researcher personally visited the sampled schools and introduced himself to the principal, explaining his mission. The researcher then administered the questionnaires to the principal and the teachers. He then arranged an appropriate day with the school head on which to administer the questionnaires to the students. The respondents were assured of strict confidentiality in dealing with the responses. The head teachers and the teachers were given about one hour to fill-in the questionnaires. The researcher advised the teachers against discussing the questionnaire so as to get honest and objectives responses that reflect the respondent’s own feelings, attitudes, perceptions, views and opinions.

3.10 Data Analysis

Kasomo (2006:123) defines analysis as the process of bringing order to the data and manipulating it. Organizing what is in the data into patterns, categories and basic descriptive units. After collection, the completed questionnaires were checked for
completeness. The aim here was to eliminate unusable data, interpret ambiguous answers and contradictory data from related questions. A coding scheme was developed for the responses to each question. The coding scheme facilitated the development of an appropriate data structure to enable its entry into the computer.

Data entry and analysis was done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for windows version 17.0. This was useful in arranging, summarizing and presenting the major characteristics of key variables as well as relationships among the said variables. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were used to analyze data. The quantitative data was analysed using descriptive (including frequency counts, means and percentages) and inferential statistics (specifically using Chi-square) with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17. As Martin and Acuna (2002) observes, SPSS is able to handle large amounts of data and given its wide spectrum of statistical procedures purposely designed for social sciences, it is also quite efficient.

Qualitative data was analysed qualitatively using content analysis of meanings and implications emanating from respondents’ information. The results were then reported by descriptive narratives. As observed by Gay (2004), qualitative data provides rich descriptions and explanations that demonstrate the chronological flow of events as well as often leading to serendipitous (chance) findings. Results were presented in form of frequency tables, bar graphs, pie chart and percentages from which inferences and conclusions were drawn.
3.11 Ethical Issues

The researcher secured an introduction letter from the university and the MOEST prior to conducting the research in the targeted schools. He obtained informed consent from the respondents before administering the questionnaire and assured them of total confidentiality. The researcher accepted individual responsibility for the conduct of the research and as far as foreseeable, the consequences of the research.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
This section provides a detailed presentation of the data analysis, presentation and the interpretation of findings. Data analysis was guided by the four study objectives. These were the instructional leadership activities that Principals engaged into improve students’ performance, the approaches that Principals use to supervise instruction in order to improve students’ performance, the extent to which Principals engage teachers in decision making and challenges that face the Principals in their effort to improve their school’s performance.

4.1.1 Questionnaire Return Rate
The study sample consisted of 240 students, 50 teachers and 10 principals giving a total of 300 respondents. Out of 300 questionnaires distributed and filled for the study, only 260 were accepted for analysis representing 86.7% return rate which is statistically acceptable representation of the target population.

4.2 Demographic and Background Information of the Respondents
Demographic and background information of the respondents was based on gender, education qualification, teaching experience as well as the school size.

4.2.1 Gender of Respondents
A background section of the research sought to establish the gender distribution of the Principals, teachers and students in Tigania West Sub-County. There were generally more male principals (60%) than their female counter parts (40%).
Analysis also revealed that there were more male teachers who constituted 56% while female teachers made up 44%. The scenario was different for students. In this study, 112 out of the 200 student respondents were females. This presented an insight that there are lesser boys (44%) than girls (56%).

These results succinctly indicate that there is gender bias in terms of responsibility allocation. The fact that there are more male head teachers would mean that women’s ability in administrative roles has really not fully been appreciated. This is supported by the findings of Kibe and Kiumi (2013) who found that there was no gender parity in headship position in their study area. This violation is further enhanced by the presence of more male teachers than the female teachers which portray a gender imbalanced scenario in job allocation.

On the other hand, the boy-child has been neglected or else is getting involved in other activities which are non-academic. This study indicates that there are more female children in school than the male children. This is in line with the research
findings by Chege et al (2014) in Langata District of Nairobi County that showed that more girls than boys remained in the primary school system during the 5 years leading to the study period. Similarly, Uwezo Kenya (2010) confirmed the apparent lagging behind of the boys in literacy.

4.2.2 Education Qualification

Principals and teachers were requested to indicate their education qualification. Their responses are summarized in table 4.1 and figure 4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 4.1, majority (78%) of the teachers had a bachelor’s degree with 12% of them having diplomas in education. The table further shows that 8% of the teachers had a master’s degree with the minority (2%) having a post graduate diploma in education. This finding implies that teachers in secondary schools in the sub county were well trained and qualified to produce good academic results. Figure 4.2 presents the results of the level of education among the school principals.
The results in Figure 4.2 show that 70% of the school Principals had bachelor’s degree while 30% had Masters Degree. This was perceived as crucial characteristic of a secondary school administrator to enable them perform their duties effectively and take the schools into high performance levels. It was also important to realize that most teachers held a Bachelors Degree, a qualification that made them capable teachers.

### 4.2.3 Work Experience

Principals were asked to indicate their administrative experience while the teachers were requested to give their teaching experience. Figure 4.3 shows the respondents’ experience.
From Figure 4.3, most teachers (68%) had a teaching experience of not more than 6 years. Similarly, most principals (60%) had an experience of between 3-6 years. The results suggest that majority of the head teachers had sufficient experience to carry out instructional leadership roles effectively to improve students’ performance while the teachers’ experience show that they were experienced enough to implement the curriculum effectively. This is in line with the findings of Nambuya (2013) who found that performance of teachers as reflected by level of training and teaching experience will determine the quality of grades attained in an examination. A trained teacher will have necessary pedagogical skills which will promote students’ understanding, motivating students to learn, thereby promoting academic performance.

### 4.2.4 Size on the School

Principals were requested to indicate the size of their schools in terms of the number of streams. Table 4.2 presents the findings.
Table 4.2: Size of the School and School Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of streams</th>
<th>HPS (N=3)</th>
<th>APS (N=3)</th>
<th>LPS (N=4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four streams</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three streams</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two streams</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One stream</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from table 4.2 indicates that most of the high and the average performing schools had four or three streams, while most (75%) of the low performing schools had one stream. This implies that as the performance improves, the streams increase. In the real world context, this is true because when schools perform well they attract more students. Most of the schools that had one stream were day secondary schools. The results would suggest that few students are enrolled in day- secondary schools mostly because these schools lack various learning facilities that could be the main reason for the poor performance.

4.3 Principal’s Instructional Leadership Activities

This section presents an analysis and interpretation of the different activities that principals engage in while seeking to improve their school’s performance. These leadership activities are believed to have a significant impact in creating a conducive and enabling environment to make the school more effective and hence realize higher levels of student performance.
4.3.1 Providing Textbooks and other Learning/Teaching Materials

This study revealed that 80% of the school principals in high performing schools provided teaching and learning materials while 60% of the head teachers in average performing schools provided adequate teaching and learning resources compared to the less than half (40%) of the principals in low performing schools. Figure 4.4 presents the findings.

![Figure 4.4: Provision of Textbooks and other Learning Materials](chart)

Results in figure 4.4 depict that, principals in high performing schools provided textbooks and other learning and teaching materials to a greater extent as compared to their counterparts in the average and low performing schools. This indicates that the good academic performance in high performing schools could be attributed to the adequate teaching and learning resources provided by their school principals. These findings are supported Adewale(2014b) who points out that teaching and learning materials are determinants of quality of education, thus it is essential for quality teaching materials to be made available to teachers and students in adequate quantity to support teaching and learning processes.
4.3.2 Ensuring that all Subjects Have Enough Teachers

In relation to ensuring that all subjects have enough teachers, 100% of the principals of the high performing schools indicated that they ensured that all subjects have enough teachers, while 66.7% and 25% of the principals of the average performing schools and low performing schools respectively indicated they ensured that all subjects have enough teachers as shown in figure 4.5.

![Figure 4.5: Principals ensuring that all subjects have enough teachers](image)

These results show that principals of the high performing schools ensured that all subjects have enough teachers to a greater extent as compared to their counterparts in the average and low performing schools. The findings imply that having enough teachers in all subjects contributes positively to students’ performance and these accounts for the difference in academic performance between the high and the low performing schools which are mostly understaffed. Opudo and Bore (2012) found that low levels of staffing significantly lowered the quality of learning since the few available staff are overworked. They also noted that understaffing affected instructional supervision negatively through increased workload amongst available staff.
4.3.3 Ensuring Teachers Prepare Schemes of Work, Lesson Notes and Fill Records of Work

In relation to ensuring teachers prepare schemes of work, lesson notes and fill records of work, head teachers, 100% of the principals of the high performing schools indicated that they ensured that teachers have these documents, while 68% and 50% of the principals of the average performing schools and low performing schools respectively indicated they ensure teachers have these documents as shown in figure 4.6.

![Figure 4.6: Ensuring Teachers Prepare Schemes of Work, Lesson Notes & Fill Records of Work](image)

The results from Figure 4.6, suggest that practice of ensuring that teachers prepare schemes of work, lesson notes and fill records of work has a positive impact on students’ performance, and this could account for the difference between the high performing schools and the low performing ones. This agrees with the findings of Musungu and Nasongo (2008) who found that over 80% of the head-teachers in high performing schools in Vihiga district checked lesson books, schemes of work while,
71.4% of them checked records of work covered. On the contrary, they established that only 60% of the head-teachers checked lesson plans, schemes of work, and records of work covered in the average and low performing schools.

4.3.4 Making Frequent Class Visits to Check Students’ Notebooks

In relation to the principal making frequent and formal class visits to check students’ notebooks and assignments, it was identified that 90% of the principals heading high performing school conducted class visits, while 70% and 60% of the principals of the average performing schools and low performing schools respectively visited classrooms to check students’ notebooks and assignments. The principals usually go round the classrooms during prep times and free lessons. They pick students’ exercise books at random and check what they have been writing. Figure 4.7 presents the findings.

![Figure 4.7: Relationship between Class Visits and School Performance](chart.png)

The findings from Figure 4.7 show that the principal’s effort to visit classrooms to check students’ notebooks and assignments has a positive impact on their academic performance. These findings concur with the findings of Sabitu and Ayandoja.
(2012) who revealed that there was a significant impact of class visitations by principals on students’ academic performance in English Language in Senior Secondary Schools in Ondo State, Nigeria.

4.3.5 Motivating Students to Work Hard by Rewarding the Top Performers

The results on the extent to which principals motivated students by rewarding top performers are shown in figure 4.8

Findings in Figure 4.8 reveal that at least all principals motivated their student to some extent. However comparing different categories of schools, majority (70%) of the school heads from the high performing schools did motivate their students, 40% of the heads from average performing schools did motivate their students and only 20% of the heads from low performing schools did motivate their students. The motivation is given in form of presents like revision books and stationery or academic trips.
These findings demonstrate that student motivation is important in student’s academic performance. This implies that rewarding top performing students has a positive effect on students’ performance. The findings are supported by Peklaj and Puklek (2009) who say that motivation plays a major role in students’ academic work and in their achievement. It reflects in students’ choices of learning tasks, in the time and effort they devote to them, in their persistence on learning tasks, and in their coping with the obstacles they encounter in the learning process.

4.3.6 Monitoring Students’ Academic Progress

In relation to monitoring students’ academic progress, it was established that 90% of the principals in high performing schools monitored students’ academic progress, while 60% and 50% of the principals of the average performing schools and low performing schools respectively monitored students’ academic progress.

![Figure 4.9: Principals Monitoring Students’ Academic Progress](image-url)
Study findings in Figure 4.9 indicate that the principals from high performing schools monitored the academic progress of their students to a greater extent than those of schools from other categories. The results show that there is a connection between this practice and schools performance. In Figure 4.9, most of the principals (90%) of the high performing schools highly monitored students’ academic progress as reflected in their high academic performance than their counterparts in average performing schools (60%) and the low performing schools (50%). These findings agree with the findings of Njagi, et al (2013) who found out that head teachers’ inspection of students’ progress reports had a positive relationship with performance of students in national examinations. The positive relationship meant that the extent to which head teachers inspected students’ progress reports predicted performance of students in national examinations.

4.3.7 Principals Encourage Teachers to use Different Teaching Methods

With regard to principals encouraging teachers to use different teaching methods to cater for specific needs of students, the study established that 60% of the principals in high performing schools encouraged their teachers to use different teaching methods such as demonstration while only 20% of the principals in both average performing schools and low performing schools did this. The average performing schools and low performing schools widely used lecture method. The results are shown in Figure 4.10.
The findings of this study therefore generally show that principals do not encourage their teachers to use different teaching methods despite its importance in enhancing students’ performance. This is likely to be as a result that teachers have a better and more regular interaction with students than the principal. Hence they are in a better position to identify the specific student’s needs and react to them accordingly by employing different teaching methods without having to be notified by the principal. However, at least 60% of the principals mainly from the high performing schools encourage teachers to use different teaching methods and this might be a contributing factor to their good academic performance compared to the average performing schools and low performing schools.

In Tigania sub-county the researcher established that lecture method was more widely used than demonstration method across all schools especially the average and low performing schools. Research studies have demonstrated that the type of teaching methods employed influence students’ academic performance. Nzoka and...
Orodho (2014) in their study in Embu North District found that the teaching methods used in most of the sampled schools encouraged students to be passive. This could have contributed to poor performance because student passivity does not enhance learning and active learning helps students to learn independently and perform well (Machemer & Crawford, 2007). Mutisya (2010) reports that the practice of the ASEI-PDSI methods of teaching [advocated through SMASSE project] which emphasize on learner-centered preparation and presentation of lessons, have shown students to have interests in science subjects therefore leading to better performance. Teachers who practice these methods have been posting good results in the KCSE Results. In general SMASSE Project has improved performance in all the districts where the project has been initiated. According to Mobegi et al (2010) principals should ensure that there is adequate departmental organization and supervision and engage in classroom supervision to ensure that a variety of teaching methods are used.

4.3.8 Sponsoring Teachers to attend Academic Workshops and Seminars

In relation to sponsoring teachers to attend academic workshops and seminars the study established that 80% of the principals in high performing schools sponsored their teachers, while 60% and 50% of the principals of the average performing schools and low performing schools respectively sponsored their teachers.
From Figure 4.11, the results suggest that those schools that regularly sponsored their teachers to attend academic workshops and seminars resulted in high performance. The results also show that the average and low performing schools mostly offered low number of sponsorship to their teachers. Perhaps this is a contributing factor to their weak performance. Professional development can help overcome shortcomings that may have been part of teachers' pre-service education and keep teachers abreast of new knowledge and practices in the field (UNICEF, 2000). This ongoing training for teachers can have a direct impact on student achievement. A programme in Kenya, the Mombasa School Improvement Project, on professional development showed that teachers supported with in-service as well as external workshop training improved significantly in their abilities to use child-centered teaching and learning behaviours (Anderson, 2000).

4.3.9 Principals Teach their Subjects

With relation to principals teaching their subjects, the study found that only 10% of the principals of the high performing schools taught their subjects. On the other
hand, 50% and 40% of the principals of the average performing schools and low performing schools respectively taught their subjects. Figure 4.12 shows the results.

![Figure 4.12: Teachers Rating of how Often Head Teachers Taught their Subjects](image)

**Figure 4.12: Teachers Rating of how Often Head Teachers Taught their Subjects**

Results from figure 4.12 indicate that all principals from high performing schools lowly taught their subjects while more of those from average and low performing schools taught their subjects. This is possible because most heads in average and low performing schools will have the determination to even engage personal efforts in improving the performance. The results also suggest that the high number of principals with low teaching habits is likely to be caused by their administrative roles placing them at the centre of many obligations to attend to.

School heads address issues from all areas regarding the progress of the school and may sometimes be overwhelmed by activities ending up missing classes. This agrees with Nzambi (2012) who observed that the head teacher was overloaded as the manager; implementer and evaluator of all activities pertaining to the day to day running of the school hence sometimes may fail to check on curriculum delivery effectively. A Research by Isaiah and Isaiah (2014) also indicated that School Heads
are more bound to office work than to instructional leadership. Thus, their impact or influence is hardly felt on teaching and learning in the school.

4.3.10 Principal as an Instructional Leader

This variable was computed as an average of all the responses in all the variables in this section. This was to give an overall rating of the principals as instructional leaders. Figure 4.13 presents the results.

![Figure 4.13: Teachers Rating of Principal’s Instructional Leadership Ability](image)

Results from Figure 4.13 indicate that none of the principals was rated as a weak instructional leader. Most of the principals were average instructional leaders (50%) especially from the average and low performing schools. From the figure, majority (90%) of the school principals from high performing schools were excellent instructional leaders. This finding indicates that there is a relationship between the principal’s ability as an instructional leader and his/ her school’s performance.
4.4 Approaches the Principal uses to Supervise Instruction

This objective sought to establish the approaches the principal uses to supervise instruction in order to improve students’ academic performance.

4.4.1 Conducting Classroom Visits to Observe a Teacher

In relation to the principal conducting classroom visits to observe a teacher during a lesson it was established only 1 (33.3) of the principals in high performing schools, and the average performing schools visit classroom to observe a teacher during a lesson. Again only 1(25%) of the principals from low performing schools conducted classroom visits to observe a teacher during a lesson as shown in Figure 4.14.

![Figure 4.14: Conducting Classroom Visits to Observe a Teacher](image)

The results in Figure 4.14 show that very few principals conducted classroom visits to observe a teacher during a lesson. This implies that most of the principals were conscious of maintaining a collaborative and friendly working environment; a working environment free of intimidation where people are guided by the set objectives. The findings of this study are supported by the findings of Jared (2009)
who found that 60% of interviewed teachers reported that they have never seen their head teachers come to supervise them in classroom, apart from checking their pedagogic documents. These findings however contradict the findings of Nike (2013) who found that Principals’ frequent visitations of teachers in the classrooms during lesson significantly impact on student’s academic performance.

4.4.2 Hold Productive Discussions with Teachers after Classroom Visits

A large number of principals (70%) responded that they rarely held productive discussions with teachers after classroom visits. This result is consistent with the findings on principals not conducting classroom visits to observe a teacher. Failing to hold classroom visits results to lack of the basis to conduct the productive post-observation discussions. Consequently, this denies both the teacher and the principal an important opportunity to identify the possible class weaknesses that would result to poor academic performance. The findings of this study contradict the findings of Blaise & Blaise, 2004(9), who found that frequent visits/visitation to classroom assist in boosting teachers morale, put teachers on alert to make good use of instructional time, and feedback from such visitation help to implement new ideas, planning and achieving better goals and objectives of teaching and learning.

4.4.3 Ensuring that Teachers have Lesson Notes

With relation to ensuring that teachers have lesson notes the study established that 70% of the principals of the high performing schools ensured teachers have these documents, while, 50% and 30% of the principals of the average performing schools and low performing schools respectively ensured teachers have these documents. Figure 4.14 show the results.
Figure 4.15: Principals Ensuring Teachers Have Lesson Notes

The study findings in Figure 4.15 show that majority (70%) of the principals from high performing schools ensured that teachers had lesson notes compared to their counterparts in average performing schools and low performing schools. The results suggest that there is some connection between this practice and academic performance. The finding is supported by Nike (2013), whose study revealed that supervision of lesson notes and scheme of work significantly impact on students’ academic performance in secondary schools in Kwande Local Government Area. The finding is also in line with the views of Ada (2010) who stated that the schemes of work and lesson notes exerts some impact on the academic performance of students in school.

4.4.4 Principals Advising Teachers on School Curriculum and Teaching Methods

With regard to advising teachers on school curriculum and teaching methods 70% of the principals in the three categories of schools responded they advised teachers on what students should be taught especially with regard to syllabi changes and
teaching methods as shown in Figure 4.16

**Figure 4.16: Principals Advising Teachers on Curriculum and Teaching Methods**

The results in figure 4.16 indicate that most principals are aware of their role as instructional leaders in secondary schools which is a positive gesture towards academic performance. The results are in line with the views of Fadipe in Bua & Ada (2013) who posited that principals being instructional leaders are in a good position to supervise, visit, monitor, assess, evaluate and disseminate current information on educational issues and modern teaching techniques to teachers in order to stimulate them.

**4.4.5 Requesting the Deputy/ HODS to Supervise Class Attendance by Teachers**

In relation to the principal requesting the deputy/ HODs to supervise class attendance by teachers, 100% of the principals of the high performing schools delegated supervision to deputies and or HODs, while, 70% and 20% of the
principals of the average performing schools and low performing schools respectively delegated their duties to their deputies and or HODs as shown in figure 4.17.

![Delegation of Duties to Deputies and HODs](image)

**Figure 4.17: Delegation of Duties to Deputies and HODs**

The results in Figure 4.17, shows that all head teachers (100%) in high performing schools know the significance of teamwork and hence they said that they highly delegated their duties especially when absent. These results suggest that there is a positive impact on academic performance when principals delegate some of their duties to deputies and or HODs as reflected in the deference in performance among the three categories of schools. By delegating some duties, the principal shows that he has trust and confidence in his/her deputy/HODs. This will promote responsibility appreciation among the deputy and HODs.

Moreover, delegation of duties means that the principal will have lesser needs to attend to and thus do so effectively and timely. The findings are in line with Ghavifekr and Ibrahim (2014) whose study revealed that it is important for the Head
of Departments of the school to play the role of the instructional leader as it possesses good characteristics in enhancing better teaching and learning for both leaders and the subordinates. The findings also agree with the views of Adewale (2014a) who says that involving heads of departments in the linking chain of instructional supervision under the guidance and direct coordination of the principals and vice-principals can assist teachers and improve the quality of instruction and promote improved performance of teaching and learning that is most beneficial to the students.

4.4.6 Asking for Syllabus Coverage Reports from HODs

In relation to the principal asking for syllabus coverage reports from HODs, this study revealed that 100% of the head teachers of the high performing schools asked for syllabus coverage reports from HODs. 70% of the head teachers of the average performing schools asked for syllabus coverage reports from HODs while 60% the head teachers of the low performing schools said they sought reports from their HODs as shown in Figure 4.18.

Figure 4.18: Whether principals asked for syllabus coverage reports from HODs
The results in Figure 4.18 show that all the principals were keen to follow up on syllabus coverage, however, those in high performing schools were more committed to in this practice and this might be one the contributing factor to their high academic performance.

### 4.4.7 Prefects Marking of Teachers’ Class Attendance

Head teachers were requested to indicate whether they instructed class prefects to mark teachers who attend and those who fail to attend lessons. Figure 4.19 presents the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Principals Who Co-worked with Prefects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High performing schools: 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average performing schools: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low performing schools: 40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.19: Prefects Marking of Teachers’ Class Attendance**

From Figure 4.19, 70% of the school heads from high performing schools instructed class prefects to mark teachers who attended and those who failed to attend lessons, while 50% and 40% of the principals used this approach in the average and low performing schools respectively. A note should be taken on the large number of principals (60%) who would not wish to involve their prefects in monitoring teacher class attendance in the low performing schools. In so doing, the principal is likely to be creating a displeased attitude in teachers whose whatever sort of retaliation would
have detrimental effects on the students’ performance. Apparently it was difficult to relate this finding with recent study findings in the field of education in regard to methods of instructional supervision.

4.5 Involving Teachers in Decision Making

Principals were requested to indicate whether they involved their teachers in making important decisions regarding the school.

4.5.1 Setting the Minimum KCPE entry marks

Principals were asked to indicate whether they involved teachers in setting minimum KCPE entry marks, it was established that (90%) of the school principals from the high performing schools involved their teachers in setting minimum KCPE entry marks to form one. There were 70% of the school principals from low performing schools and another 70% from the average performing schools who indicated that they involved their teachers in setting minimum KCPE entry marks to form one. The results are shown in figure 4.20

![Figure 4.20: Principals’ Responses on Involving Teachers in Setting Entry Marks](image)
The results from figure 4.20 show some underlying relationship between involving teachers in setting the minimum KCPE entry marks to form one and the school’s performance. The results tally with the findings of Wakoli, (2014) who reports that poor performance of students in KCSE examinations is as a result of Principals not using inclusive management style (democratic) where all stakeholders in schools are involved in school management.

4.5.2 Involving Teachers in Making Decisions on School Improvement Measures

Figure 4.21 presents finding of the extent to which head teachers involved teachers in making decisions regarding school improvement measures.

Figure 4.21: Involvement of Teachers in decisions on School Improvement

From figure 4.21, 100% the principals from high performing schools involved teachers in making decisions regarding school improvement measures. Furthermore 66.7% of the principals from average performing schools indicated that they involved teachers in making decisions regarding school improvement while only 50% of the principals from low performing schools indicated that they involved
teachers in making decisions regarding school improvement. The results suggest involving teachers in making decisions regarding school improvement measures as positive impact on students’ performance as reflected in the findings of these three categories of schools. These findings are supported by Mullins (2005) who states that staff participation in decision making leads to higher performance which is necessary for survival in an increasingly competitive world.

4.5.3 Involving Teachers in Selecting Teaching and Learning Materials

In relation to involving teachers in selecting teaching and learning materials 66.7% of the principals from high performing and average performing schools indicated that they involved their teachers in selecting teaching and learning materials. Only 50% of the principals from low performing schools indicated that they involved their teachers in selecting teaching and learning materials. The findings are represented in Figure 4.22.

Figure 4.22: Involvement of Teachers in Selecting Teaching and Learning Materials
These findings imply that involving teachers in the selection of teaching and learning materials positively impacts on academic performance of the students. Teachers have a deeper understanding of the students’ capabilities and specific needs hence more suitable in deciding which teaching and learning materials to use on them. The MoE (2010) expects that schools will set up school management committees that engage in planning, budgeting and involvement of subject teachers in textbook selection. However, a study by Kiai and Maroko (2013) on Textbook Selection Experiences among Secondary School Teachers of English in Kenya found that none of the teachers in the study had experienced as rigorous a process of textbook selection as laid down by the MoE.

4.5.4 Involving Teachers in Setting School Rules

With regard to involving teachers in setting school rules the study established that all the principals (100%) from both high and average performing schools involved their teachers in this practice, while 75% of the principals of the low performing schools involved teachers in setting school rules. The results are shown in Figure 4.23.

![Figure 4.23: Involving Teachers in Setting School Rules](image-url)
The results in Figure 4.23 indicate that principals of the high and average performing schools fully involved their teachers in setting school rules. Further the results generally show that almost all principals are to be highly involving their teachers in setting school rules which area positive gesture towards arriving at well-thought decisions on curbing students’ indiscipline; especially as a collective responsibility of all teachers and not just the principal and the deputy. This finding agrees with Fawcett (2008) who observes that principals who make decisions using only their own knowledge run the risk of reaching only partial solutions. This may also cause resentment among staff members who are deprived of participating in the decision.

4.5.5 Involving Teachers in Preparing School Budget

Teachers were requested to indicate whether their principals involved them in preparing the school budget, the study established that 40% of the principals of the high performing schools involved teachers in preparing the school budget. There were another 40% of the principals of the average performing schools and 20% of the principals of the low performing schools who engaged teachers in budgeting as shown in figure 4.24.
Figure 4.24: Teachers’ Responses on Involvement in School Budgeting

Results from figure 4.24 shows that principals of the high performing schools and the average performing schools involved their teachers in preparing the school budget to a greater extent than those of the low performing schools. The findings suggest that the principals of the high performing schools and the average performing schools appreciate the need for consultative budgeting more than the low performing schools. Their involvement of teachers in budgeting could account for their better academic performance compared to the low performing schools.

4.5.6 Involving HODs in Tender Committees

In relation to involving HODs in tendering committees, the study found out that all principals (100%) of the high performing schools and the average performing schools involved their teachers in tender committees while only 50% of the principals of the low performing schools involved their teachers in tender committees as shown in figure 4.25.
These results suggest that principals of the high performing schools and the average performing schools have fully embraced the practice of involving HODs in tender committees while the low performing schools have not.

4.5.7 Involving HODs in Interview Panels

This study required principals to indicate the extent to which they involved their HODs in interview panels to recruit new teachers. Figure 4.26 shows the findings.
According to Figure 4.26, almost all principals appeared to be highly involving their HODs in interview panels. The figure shows that most of the schools where HODs were involved in this practice were high performers and average performers (100%). At least 75% of principals from low performing schools involved their HODs in interview panels. These are both high numbers of involvement and this shows that principals are aware of the underlying benefits of doing so. Involving HODs in interviews to recruit new teachers is a vital move in ensuring that qualified teachers are allowed to join the teaching staff which is a good step towards improving academic performance.

4.5.8 Teachers being Coaches and Trainers of Co-Curricular Activities

In relation to involving teachers in being coaches and trainers of co-curricular activities, this study established that 100% of the principals of the high and the average performing schools involved their teachers in being coaches and trainers of co-curricular activities in school while 75% of the principals of the low performing schools did this. Figure 4.27 presents the findings.

![Figure 4.27: Teachers being Coaches and Trainers of Co-Curricular Activities](image)
This practice increases the social bond between the teachers and student by availing an interactive environmental different from the classroom. The teachers have a better chance to understand the attitudes and behaviour of their students and students learn how to interact with their teachers both inside and outside classroom. These results agree with Wangai (2012), who established that teachers thought that their involvement in co-curricular activities builds the students self confidence. From the data collected he deduced that teacher involvement is important in development of students’ talents in co-curricular activities.

4.5.9  Involving Teachers in Decision Making

This was a variable computed from the responses of all the other variables in this section. Its importance was to rate the principals as either High, Moderate or Low involvers of teachers in the decision making processes.

Figure 4.28: Involvement of Teachers in Decision Making and School Performance
There appears to be a positive relationship between involvement of teachers in decision making and school performance. Findings in Figure 4.28 show that all head teachers (100%) in the high performing schools involved teachers to a great extent in the decision making process as compared to the average performing schools (66.7%) and low performing schools (50%). This concurs with findings by Bhengu (2002) who found that shared decision-making is of primary importance to holistic approach to school improvement. According to Mueller & Gorkturk (2010), teachers can play a greater role in the overall success of the school when they commit to being active participants in decision making process. Ukeje [1992] believed that participation in decision making affects teachers’ performance and their performance eventually affects students’ performances.

4.6 Challenges Encountered by Principals in Improving Students’ Performance

In this section, the researcher sought to establish some of the major challenges facing principals in their endeavor to improve their schools performance. Table 4.3 summarizes the challenges encountered by the school principals in improving students’ performance.
Table 4.3: Challenges Encountered by Principals in Improving Students’ Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges encountered by principals</th>
<th>HPS N=3</th>
<th>APS N=3</th>
<th>LPS N=4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers not attending classes</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate TSC teachers</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers not completing syllabus in time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission of students with low marks at KCPE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strikes and high student indiscipline</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate textbooks and revision books</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate science laboratories</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to check teachers’ schemes and records of work</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to check students’ work</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parents’ commitment to paying fees</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from Table 4.3 indicate that all the principals encountered some challenges in one way or the other. The effects of these challenges however were different for the different principals. High performing schools rated inadequate textbooks and revision books (33.3%), inadequate science laboratories, (33.3%), lack of parents’ commitment to paying fees (33.3%), inadequate TSC teachers (33.3%), lack of time to check teachers’ schemes and records of work (33.3%), lack of time to check students’ work (33.3%) as the main challenges. The average performing schools rated inadequate TSC teachers (66.7%), inadequate textbooks and revision books (66.7%), lack of parents’ commitment to paying fees (66.7%) as
the most common challenges. All the principals from low performing schools rated inadequate trained teachers, (100%) admission of students with low marks at KCPE (100%) and parents’ inability to pay their children’s fees (100%) as the most highly prevalent challenges, while teachers not attending classes, teachers not completing syllabus in time, inadequate textbooks and revision books, inadequate science laboratories were rated at 75% which shows that these challenges are still very high in low performing schools.

On the other hand, the least common challenges reported in high performing schools were teachers not attending classes (0%), admission of students with low marks at KCPE (0%), teachers not completing syllabus in time (0%), strikes and indiscipline (0%). While the least common challenges reported in the average performing schools were teachers not attending classes (33.3%), teachers not completing syllabus in time(33.3%), admission of students with low KCPE marks (33.3%), strikes and students’ indiscipline (33.3%), inadequate textbooks and revision books (33.3%), and Lack of time to check both teachers’ schemes/records of work and students’ work (0%). The least common challenges experienced by the low performing schools were strikes and high students’ indiscipline (50%) and lack of time to check teachers’ schemes/records of work and students’ work (25%).

These findings also indicate that inadequate textbooks and science laboratories are being experienced to a low extent in high performing schools (33.3%) and average performing schools (33.3%) but it is experienced to a high extent (75%) in the low performing schools which could be a major contributing factor to their difference in academic performance. The findings imply that the absence of major challenges in high performing schools allows them enough time to concentrate in their studies and
hence result in high performance. It is also worth noting that most challenges such as inadequate textbooks and revision books, lack of parents’ commitment to paying fees, inadequate trained teachers, admission of students with low marks at KCPE and inadequate laboratories were more prevalent in average and low performing schools which probably accounts for their low performance compared with the high performing schools.

These overall results indicate the main challenges that Principals face in all the categories of secondary schools are inadequate teachers, low parental co-operation in fees payment, inadequate science laboratories and inadequate teaching and learning materials. These challenges could be the main contributing factors to low performance among the schools in Tigania sub-county. The challenge of parents not paying school fees and not getting fully involved in their children’s education is supported by the findings of Dladla (2014) who found that most parents do not support schools with school fees.

The findings on the challenge relating to lack of enough teachers is supported by the findings of Njagi, et al (2013) schools with a substantial number of teachers employed by BOM registered lower mean grades compared to schools with teachers employed by the TSC. This is so because they do not wholly commit themselves, since they have no security of tenure. The findings on the main challenges faced by principals in promoting students performance succinctly concur with the findings of Wakoli (2014) who found that the major challenges faced by Principals in managing schools for improved performance were; inadequate teaching staff, lack of parental cooperation in fees collection, inadequate teaching and learning facilities and teacher lateness in reporting to school for duty.
4.6.1 Strategies Principals have put in place to Improve Students’ Performance

The question sought to find out the things the principals had done to improve students’ performance. Table 4.4 gives a summary of the major strategies that principals had put in place to improve their school’s performance.

Table 4.4: Strategies principals have put in place to improve students’ performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies to improve performance</th>
<th>HPS N=3</th>
<th>APS N=3</th>
<th>LPS N=4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduced Remedial classes</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment of BOM teachers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled KCPE marks</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased textbooks/ revision books</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent testing (CATs)</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding syllabus coverage</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced discussion groups</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of students caught up in indiscipline cases</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results in table 4.4 we find that all the high performing schools had put more effort in employment of BOM teachers (100%), increasing textbooks and revision books (100%), speeding syllabus coverage (100%), controlling KCPE entry marks (100%), and introduction of discussion groups (100%), more than the average and the low performing schools. These strategies agree with the findings of Lydia and Nasongo (2009) who found out that the head teachers’ use of quality improvement measures influenced the results of schools. They reported that the high
performing schools indicated that they strongly put into consideration frequent testing and giving of feedback, remedial teaching, and controlled entry marks for students joining the school and provision of learning resources as measures to improve students’ performance in the KCSE examinations. On the other hand, in the low performing schools, these measures had not taken root adequately.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This section gives a summary of the main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The purpose of the study was to determine the role of the Principal in promoting students’ performance in secondary schools in Tigania West Sub-County. The objectives of the study were to: find out the instructional leadership activities the principal engages in to improve students’ academic performance, determine the approaches the principal uses to supervise instruction in order to improve students’ performance, find out the extent to which principals involve teachers in decision making in order to improve students’ performance, and find out the challenges principals encounter in improving students’ performance.

The study used descriptive survey research design. The study sample consisted of 240 students, 50 teachers selected through systematic sampling and 10 principals purposively selected giving a total of 300 respondents. Out of 300 questionnaires distributed and filled for the study, only 260 were accepted for analysis representing 86.7% return rate.

5.2 Summary Findings of the Study

This section gives the summary of the findings based on the objectives of the study. The demographic information of the respondents was based on gender, education qualification, and teaching experience. The research report had four objectives. The first objective of the study sought to investigate the instructional leadership activities the principal engages in to improve students’ academic performance in KCSE in
Tigania West Sub-County, the study established that the principal’s instructional leadership activities have a positive impact on the students’ academic performance. The principals of high performing schools were rated as better instructional leaders than their counterparts in average and low performing schools. This is because majority of the respondents (90%) rated the principals of high performing schools as good instructional leaders, while 50% of the principals of the average and low performing schools were rated as average instructional leaders. A general assessment however, rated all principal in Tigania West Sub-County as good and average instructional leaders. Some of the instructional leadership activities they engaged in to improve students’ academic performance were provision of textbooks and other learning and teaching materials, ensuring that all subjects have enough teachers, ensuring that teachers have schemes and records of work and checking students’ notes and assignments among others.

The second objective of the study was to determine the approaches the principal used to supervise instruction in order to improve students’ academic performance Tigania West Sub-County. The researcher established that the most common approaches used by the principals to supervise instruction were ensuring that teachers have schemes of work, lesson notes and fill records of work. This approach was used by 70% of the principals of the high performing schools, 50% of the principals of the average performing schools, and only 30% of the principals of the low performing schools. The other approach was advising teachers on curriculum matters and teaching methods. This approach was used by 70% of the principals in the three categories of schools. Making frequent class visits to check students notebooks was also widely used by the principals. This approach was used by 90%
of the principals of the high performing schools, 70% of the principals of the average performing schools, and 60% of the principals of the low performing schools. The researcher established that some approaches such as making classroom visits to observe teachers, holding a productive discussion with the teachers after class visit, and instructing class prefects to mark teachers who attend lessons and those who do not attend; were rarely used by the principals to supervise instruction. This is possibly because the use of these approaches may imply that the principal has little confidence in the teachers. Thus the use of these approaches may create a very negative attitude towards the role of the principal as instructional supervisor and consequently undermine academic performance.

The third objective of the study was to find out the extent to which the principal involves the teachers in decision making in order to improve students’ academic performance Tigania West Sub-County. It was established that majority of the principals (100%) in the high performing schools involved teachers to a great extent in the decision making process as compared to the average performing schools (66.7%) and low performing schools (50%). Some of the areas the principals involved the teachers in making decisions are setting school rules and regulations, setting minimum form one entry marks, selecting learning/teaching materials and involving them in school budgeting.

The fourth objective of the study was to find out the challenges principals encounter in improving students’ academic performance Tigania West Sub-County. The main challenges facing high performing schools were inadequate textbooks and revision books (33.3%), inadequate science laboratories, (33.3%), lack of parents’ commitment to paying fees (33.3%), inadequate TSC teachers (33.3%), lack of time...
to check teachers’ schemes and records of work (33.3%), lack of time to check students’ work (33.3%) as. While the most common challenges facing the average performing schools were inadequate TSC teachers (66.7%), inadequate textbooks and revision books (66.7%), and lack of parents’ commitment to paying fees (66.7%). All the principals from low performing schools rated inadequate trained teachers, (100%) admission of students with low marks at KCPE (100%) and parents’ inability to pay their children’s fees (100%) as the most highly prevalent challenges, while teachers not attending classes, teachers not completing syllabus in time, inadequate textbooks and revision books, inadequate science laboratories were rated at 75% which shows that these challenges are still very high in low performing schools.

The least common challenges reported in high performing schools were teachers not attending classes (0%), admission of students with low marks at KCPE (0%), teachers not completing syllabus in time (0%), strikes and indiscipline (0%). While the least common challenges reported in the average performing schools were teachers not attending classes (33.3%), teachers not completing syllabus in time (33.3%), admission of students with low KCPE marks (33.3%), strikes and students’ indiscipline (33.3%), inadequate textbooks and revision books (33.3%),and Lack of time to check both teachers’ schemes/records of work and students’ work (0%). The least common challenges experienced by the low performing schools were strikes and high students’ indiscipline (50%) and lack of time to check teachers’ schemes/records of work and students’ work (25%).
5.3 Conclusions of the Study

Based on the findings, the study has come up with the following conclusions regarding the role of Principals in promoting performance for secondary schools in Tigania West Sub-County: All Principals in charge of schools in Tigania West Sub-County are able instructional leaders and that any poor performances by their schools are caused by factors other than Principal’s capabilities. This study also found that there was an association between the schools performance and its Principal’s instructional leadership practices.

The study concludes that principals use several approaches in supervising teaching and learning processes. Some of these approaches are frequent class visits to students work, ensuring that teachers have professional documents such as schemes of work, lesson notes and records of work, asking for syllabus coverage reports from the HODs and requesting the deputies/HODs to supervise class attendance by teachers when the principal is absent. However some approaches such as asking class prefects to monitor teacher lesson attendance and visiting classrooms to observe a teacher is practiced by very few principals.

The study also concludes that most principals make decisions about the school’s key aspects such as selecting teaching/learning materials, setting school rules and regulations and budgeting with close consultation with their deputies, HODs and teachers.

Further the study concludes that all the principals in Tigania West Sub-County faced various challenges like parents not paying school fees, indiscipline cases, inadequate learning/ teaching materials and inadequate number of trained teachers, admission of
students with low KCPE marks, teachers failure to attend all their lessons, teachers not completing the syllabus in time and principals lacking time to check teachers’ professional documents and students work. Some of these challenges such as parents not paying school fees, inadequate number of trained teachers, and admission of students with low KCPE marks were however, more prevalent in low performing schools. These challenges have played a big role in undermining the schools’ academic performance.

5.4 Recommendations of the Study

Based on the findings of this research, the following recommendations are proposed:

i. The ministry of education should undertake development projects that will empower schools by availing learning materials for example text books and facilities like science laboratories and libraries.

ii. TSC should deploy/ employ more teachers to the secondary schools in Tigania West Sub-County in order to relieve the current teacher of the work load and ensure timely syllabus coverage as this will significantly impact on students’ performance.

iii. Principals should improve their instructional supervision skills through attending management courses such as those organized by KESI and other professional development workshops as a way of ensuring that teaching and learning processes take place smoothly in order to improve students’ performance.

iv. Principals should delegate more duties to their deputies and HODs in order to save time to assess both the students and teachers commitment to their work.
5.5 Areas of Further Research

i. Further research should be conducted to identify the major contributing factors to secondary school performance for schools in Tigania West Sub-County.

ii. A study on the constraints faced by secondary school head teachers in instructional supervision can be done in Tigania West Sub-County.

iii. Similar studies could be carried out in other Counties in Kenya to find out the challenges faced by principals in secondary schools in promoting students’ academic performance.
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APENDICES

Appendix I: Introduction Letter

P. O. Box 102,
Kianjai.

4th February 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: THE ROLE OF PRINCIPAL IN PROMOTING STUDENTS ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN TIGANIA WEST SUB-COUNTY, MERU COUNTY, KENYA

The researcher is a student at Kenyatta University taking a Masters degree in Education. The purpose of this research is to determine the role of principal in promoting students academic performance in secondary schools in Tigania West Sub-county, Meru County, Kenya. This is an academic study that is part of partial fulfillment for the award of a Masters degree in Education of Kenyatta University.

I kindly request your input through filling this questionnaire. Please note that your honest responses will be in strict confidence and will purely be used for academic purpose. Any additional information you may consider relevant to this research will be most welcome. The results of the study may also be availed to you on request, after completing the study.

Your acceptance to complete this questionnaire is therefore, greatly appreciated. Thanking you in advance for your co-operation

Yours truly,

David Murithi
Appendix II: Questionnaire for Principals

This research is meant for academic purpose and seeks to find out the role of principal in promoting students academic performance. You are kindly requested to provide answers to these questions as honestly and precisely as possible. Responses to these questions will be treated as confidential. Please tick (√) where applicable or fill in the required information on the spaces provided.

SECTION A: Background information of the school

a) i) Category of school
   Boy boarding [ ]            Mixed boarding [ ]
   Girls boarding [ ]          Mixed day [ ]

   ii) Size of the school:
       One stream [ ]          Two streams [ ]
       Three streams [ ]       Four streams [ ]

b) Background information of the principal
   i) Gender: Male [ ]       Female [ ]

   ii) Academic qualification
       Diploma [ ]            Bachelors degree [ ]
       BA/BSC with PGDE [ ]   Masters [ ]

       Any other specify

   iii) For how long have you been a principal
       1 -3 years [ ]           3 – 6 years [ ]
       7-10 years [ ]          11 and above [ ]
SECTION B: Principal’s instructional leadership activities

By means of a tick (✓), please indicate the frequency with which you perform the following instructional leadership activities listed below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Providing textbooks and other teaching/learning materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ensuring that all subjects have enough teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ensuring that teachers prepare schemes of work, lesson notes and fill records of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Making frequent and formal class visits to check students’ notebooks, assignments etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Motivating students to work hard by rewarding top performers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Monitor students’ academic progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Encouraging teachers to use different teaching methods to cater for specific needs of students’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sponsoring teachers to attend academic seminars, workshops etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teaching your subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION C: Approaches the principal uses to supervise instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I hold a classroom visit to observe a teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I hold productive discussion with the teachers after classroom visit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I ensure that teachers have lesson notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I advise teachers on issues related to school curriculum and teaching methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I request my deputy/HODs to check if teachers attend lessons when am absent/busy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I frequently visit classrooms to check students notebooks, assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I ask reports from HODs on syllabus coverage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I instruct class prefects to mark the teachers who attend lessons and those who fail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D: Involving teachers in decision making

Kindly tick (✓) the extent to which you involve teachers in the following decision making practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Setting the minimum KCPE entry marks for students joining form one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Making decisions regarding students’ improvement measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Selecting teaching and learning materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Setting school rules and disciplinary measures on errant students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervising the school routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Preparing the school budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. HOD’s are involved in tender committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HOD’s are involved in interview panel to recruit teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I involve teachers in interview panels to admit new students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Allowing teachers to act as coaches/trainers to various Co-curricular activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION E: Challenges encountered by principals in improving students’ performance

To what extent do you face the following challenges in your attempt to improve students’ performance? Kindly tick (✓) as applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers not attending lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inadequate number of trained teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers not completing syllabus in time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Admission of students with low marks at KCPE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strikes or high students’ indiscipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inadequate textbooks and revision books.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Inadequate science laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of time to check teachers’ schemes of works, lesson plans, records of work and lesson attendance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of time to check students notes, assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lack of parents’ commitment to their children’s education e.g. not paying school fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION F

1. As a principal what things have you done that you think have contributed positively to students’ performance?

..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................

2. What are the main challenges that you face in your effort to improve students’ performance?

..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................

THANK YOU FOR TAKING TIME TO FILL THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
Appendix III: Questionnaire for Teachers

This research is meant for academic purpose. It intends to find out the role of the principal in promoting students’ academic performance. Kindly provide honest answers to these questions. The responses to these questions will be treated as confidential. Do not write your name or that of your school on this questionnaire. Please tick (√) where appropriate or fill in the required information on the spaces provided.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION.

1. Gender:
   - Male [ ]
   - Female [ ]

2. Level of education
   - Diploma [ ]
   - Bachelor's degree [ ]
   - Masters degree [ ]
   - Any other specify

3. How long have you been teaching?
   - 5 years and below [ ]
   - 6 – 10 years [ ]
   - 11 - 15 years [ ]
   - 16 and above [ ]

4. For how long have you taught in your current school?

   ..............................................
SECTION B: Principal’s instructional leadership activities

Please indicate by ticking (√) the extent to which your principal performs the following roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Providing textbooks and other teaching/learning materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ensuring that all subjects have enough teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ensuring that teachers prepare schemes of work, lesson notes and fill records of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Making frequent and formal class visits to check students’ notebooks, assignments etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Motivating students to work hard by rewarding top performers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Monitor students’ academic progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Encouraging teachers to use different teaching methods to cater for specific needs of students’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sponsoring teachers to attend academic seminars, workshops etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teaching his/her subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION C: Approaches the principal uses to supervise instruction

Please indicate by ticking (√) the extent to which the principal uses the following approaches to supervise teaching and learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Holds classroom visits to observe a teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Holds a productive discussion with the teacher after class visit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ensures that teachers have lesson notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advises teachers on matters related to curriculum and teaching methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Requests the deputy/HODs to check if teachers attend lessons when absent/busy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Frequently visits classroom to check the students notebooks, assignments etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asks reports from HODs on syllabus coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Instructs class prefects to mark teachers who attend lessons and those who fail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D: Involving teachers in decision making

Please tick (✓) the extent to which you feel that, the following statements describe your principal’s involvement of teachers in decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Setting the minimum KCPE entry marks for students joining form one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Making decisions regarding students’ improvement measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Selecting teaching and learning materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Setting school rules and disciplinary measures on errant students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervising the school routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Preparing the school budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. HOD’s are involved in tender committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HOD’s are involved in interview panel to recruit new teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I involve teachers in interview panels to admit new students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Allowing teachers to act as coaches/trainers to various Co-curricular activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION E: Challenges encountered by principals in improving students’ performance

To what extent does your principal face the following challenges in the attempt to improve students’ performance in your school? Kindly tick (√) as applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers not attending lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inadequate number of trained teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers not completing syllabus in time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Admission of students with low marks at KCPE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strikes or high students’ indiscipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inadequate textbooks and revision books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Inadequate science laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of time to check teachers’ schemes of work, lesson notes, records of work &amp; lesson attendance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of time to check students notes, assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lack of parents’ commitment to their children’s education e.g. not paying school fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION F

1. What things have been done by your principal that you feel have contributed positively to the performance of this school? .................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

2. What do you think are the main challenges facing your principal in improving students’ performance in your school? .................................................................
.................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

THANK YOU FOR TAKING YOUR TIME TO FILL THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
Appendix IV: Questionnaire for Students

This questionnaire seeks to gather information to be used to establish the role of the principal in promoting students’ academic performance. You are kindly requested to fill this questionnaire. Your responses will be used for study only. Do not write your name anywhere on this questionnaire. Please tick (✓) where appropriate or fill in the required information on the spaces provided.

SECTION A:
1. i) Gender:  Male [  ]   Female [  ]
   ii) Indicate your class .................................................................

SECTION B:
The table below has some statements related to the role of the principal in students’ performance. Indicate the extent to which you rate each of the statements as it applies to your principal and your school. Read and tick (✓) once for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 a)</td>
<td>Principal provides teaching/learning materials e.g. textbooks, revision books, charts etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Principal employs enough teachers for all subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Principal supports teachers to attend academic seminars and workshops e.g. SMASSE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Teachers use different methods to teach us e.g. forming discussion groups, explaining hard topics to slow learners at his/her own time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Principal visits our classroom to check our exercise books to see if we write notes and do assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Principal knows students who keep performing well in examinations, those who remain constant, and those who deteriorate in their examinations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Principal rewards students who do well in examinations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Principal teaches some classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a)</td>
<td>Principal visits our classrooms to observe a teacher teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Principal comes round our classes to check if teachers have attended their lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Principal asks students how far their teachers have covered syllabus in various subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>When principal is not in, the deputy principal goes round classes to check if teachers have attended lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Principal authorizes class prefects to note teachers who fail to attend their lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a)</td>
<td>Principal and teachers set the mean score of our school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Principal communicates things he/she will do to improve academic performance of our school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>The principal and the teachers set school rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Teachers supervise school routine e.g. duties, preps, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>HODs are involved in interview panels to recruit new teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Principal and students set the minimum KCPE marks for students joining form one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Teachers are involved in interview panels to admit new students (new comers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Teachers coach/train students in co-curricular activities such as ball games, drama, music, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a)</td>
<td>Some teachers do not attend their lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Our school does not have enough trained teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Most teachers do not complete syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>We experience student strikes in our school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Our school admits students with low marks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>We do not have enough science laboratories.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Our school does not have enough textbooks and revision books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Students are often sent home for school fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Principal does not visit classrooms to check our exercise books.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Principal does not come round classes to check if teachers have attended their lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C:

1. What things has your principal done that you feel have improved the performance of your school?

..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................

2. What do you think are the main challenges facing the principal in improving the performance of your school?

..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................

THANK FOR TAKING YOUR TIME TO FILL THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
Appendix V: Tigania West Sub-County KCSE Results Analysis

2009 -2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MIATHENE BOYS</td>
<td>6.872</td>
<td>7.039</td>
<td>7.503</td>
<td>7.818</td>
<td>8.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ST. CLARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. KANJALU GIRLS</td>
<td>6.325</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5714</td>
<td>6.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ST. LUKES SEC</td>
<td>6.124</td>
<td>6.406</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MIATHENE DAY</td>
<td>5.071</td>
<td>5.241</td>
<td>5.677</td>
<td>6.065</td>
<td>6.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ST. FRANCIS OF ASSIS</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.923</td>
<td>5.769</td>
<td>5.707</td>
<td>5.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. AKITHII GIRLS</td>
<td>4.571</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.951</td>
<td>5.351</td>
<td>5.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. KIBULINE SEC</td>
<td>4.489</td>
<td>5.292</td>
<td>4.938</td>
<td>5.787</td>
<td>5.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. KITHEO SEC</td>
<td>5.205</td>
<td>5.265</td>
<td>4.891</td>
<td>5.358</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. KIMACHIA SEC</td>
<td>4.897</td>
<td>4.685</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. NKANGA SEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ATHWANA SEC</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>5.135</td>
<td>4.973</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. MITUNTU GIRLS</td>
<td>4.364</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>4.5135</td>
<td>4.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ST JOHN’S SEC</td>
<td>3.391</td>
<td>3.366</td>
<td>3.884</td>
<td>4.166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. THINYAINE SEC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.235</td>
<td>4.894</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. KUNENE SEC</td>
<td>5.124</td>
<td>4.272</td>
<td>3.848</td>
<td>3.804</td>
<td>4.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. LACIATHURIU SEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7692</td>
<td>3.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. KALIATI SEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. THAU SEC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.178</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. MACHAKU SEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6905</td>
<td>3.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. LUBUNU SEC</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.656</td>
<td>4.757</td>
<td>3.343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. KIANJAI GIRLS</td>
<td>3.813</td>
<td>4.312</td>
<td>3.672</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. URINGU GIRLS</td>
<td>2.706</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>4.033</td>
<td>3.414</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. KIANJAI BOYS</td>
<td>3.813</td>
<td>4.312</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. MACHEGENE SEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>3.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. MUCUUNE SEC</td>
<td>3.824</td>
<td>3.824</td>
<td>3.311</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. MUTONJURI SEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4737</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI: KCSE Average Mean-scores (2010-2013) for the 10 Schools involved in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MIATHENE BOYS’</td>
<td>7.039</td>
<td>7.503</td>
<td>7.818</td>
<td>8.492</td>
<td>7.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. KANJALU GIRLS’</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5714</td>
<td>6.241</td>
<td>6.2956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ST. LUKES BOYS’</td>
<td>6.406</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MIATHENE DAY</td>
<td>5.241</td>
<td>5.677</td>
<td>6.065</td>
<td>6.208</td>
<td>5.79775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. AKITHII GIRLS’</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.951</td>
<td>5.351</td>
<td>5.485</td>
<td>5.17425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. KITHEO SEC</td>
<td>5.265</td>
<td>4.891</td>
<td>5.358</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>5.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. URRU DAY SEC</td>
<td>3.515</td>
<td>3.643</td>
<td>3.914</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. KUNENE DAY SEC</td>
<td>4.272</td>
<td>3.848</td>
<td>3.804</td>
<td>4.204</td>
<td>4.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. KIANJAI GIRLS’</td>
<td>4.312</td>
<td>3.672</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. KIANJAI BOYS’</td>
<td>4.312</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.7455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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