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ABSTRACT

Instructional supervision has been identified as an important factor in the improvement of teaching and learning and consequently the achievement of educational goals. The purpose of the study was to find out the impact of head teachers' instructional supervision on performance of K.C.P.E in Kiritiri Division, Mbeere South District, Kenya. Five research objectives guided the study. The study was based on the collegial model of instructional supervision and it applied the descriptive survey design. The study's target population comprised 28 head teachers, 240 teachers and 6306 pupils. Hence a total target population of 6574. The sample of the study comprised of 12 head teachers, 72 teachers and 80 class seven pupils. Data were collected by use of questionnaires and interview guides. Qualitative data were analyzed by use of frequencies, mean and standard deviation while qualitative data were analyzed thematically in line with the study’s objectives. The findings were presented using frequency distribution tables, bar graphs and pie charts. From the study majority of head teachers check schemes of work and lesson plans. They make class visits, walk rounds, provide appropriate feedback after the class visits, and walk rounds. Majority of head teachers also help maintain a suitable learning environment. However, majority do not effectively ensure implementation of the syllabus in their schools and provision of adequate instructional materials. In most schools, learners were given assignments and assignments were marked. Many schools also offered continuous assessment tests and half of the interviewed schools hold academic clinics. It was indicated that many teachers did not observe punctuality. Most head teachers' rate of monitoring instructional programmes was indicated as being poor. Head teachers inculcated a conducive working environment and were democratic in their style of carrying out supervision. Head teachers receive minimal support from the Department of Quality assurance and standards in the division. Teachers viewed instructional supervision as being necessary and that it helps improve standards. On whether head teachers instructional supervision correlates to K.C.P.E. The study found the correlation as being statistically not significant enough. The study came up with recommendation that head teachers should embrace a democratic style in carrying out supervision. The department of quality assurance and standards should offer more support to the head teachers. The government should provide enough funds to schools and also put strict controls so as to ensure the funds are not embezzled. The study suggested that since the study was conducted in one division, there is need to conduct a similar study in other divisions in the County. Studies should also be carried out to investigate the influence of poverty and literacy levels among parents on academic performance in the division.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the study, the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, study assumptions, limitations and delimitations of the study, conceptual framework and the operational definitions of central terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

The school head plays the role of the school manager as well as the lead professional in the school organization. According to Blase and Kirby (2007) strong school leadership is associated with confidence, initiative, analytic abilities, resourcefulness, democratic/participatory style, problem solving, vision, high expectations, curriculum knowledge and the ability to allocate resources fairly. In the leadership role, the administrator is expected to lead and motivate, delegate effectively, deal with staff problems effectively among other responsibilities.

Olembo (1992) outlines tasks that education administrators carry out as being:

i) Curriculum and instruction

ii) The school plant management

iii) Staff personnel management

iv) Finance and business administration

v) The school community relations.

Carrying out the above tasks effectively positively influences the school's effectiveness. Hedley, et al. (1994) have established that excellent schools portray
instructional leadership. i.e. learning and teaching are the main focus of leadership acts in such schools. They (Hedley Beare et al) further contend that instructional leadership involves two interrelated areas of activity namely; fostering of excellence in teaching and the capacity to deal successfully with certain ‘key situations’. Excellence in teaching is associated with teachers who effectively carry out the following activities; clinical assistance, planning instruction, classroom management, monitoring of progress and caring for learners. Key situations which the instructional leader deals with are teacher evaluation, instructional management and support, quality control, coordination and trouble shooting.

The traditional view of supervision had a connotation of direction and control. It was synonymous to inspection. For example the Oxford English Dictionary defines ‘to supervise’ as to oversee, have the oversight of, superintend the execution or performance of (a thing), the movements of work of a person, i.e. the emphasis was on the exercise of authority by the supervisor in a supervisor – supervisee relationship.

In recent times various authors have advanced the following views in their definition of the term ‘supervision’.
Zapenda (2007) has conceptualized supervision as an ongoing process aimed at improving instructions through supervision, professional development and evaluation.

Waweru (2004) defines supervision as the process of working with and through others in a more humane understanding to achieve to the greatest extent possible a quality education for all students.
Olembo (1992) views supervision as that dimension or phase of educational administration which is concerned with improving instructional effectiveness. Glickman, Stephen and Jovita (2001) defines supervision as ‘to watch over’, ‘direct’ or ‘oversee.’

The above definitions therefore points at supervision as having the purpose of developing better education. It is the process of guiding, helping, correcting and showing practicing teachers and learners how to teach effectively.

Supervision can be divided into general supervision and instructional supervision. General supervision subsumes supervisory activities that take part principally outside classroom. Instructional supervision on the other hand is concerned with the pupil learning in the classroom (Okumbe, 2001). Of concern in this research is the instructional supervision offered in Kiritiri Division and its impact on K.C.P.E performance.

Much literature exist that link instructional supervision and learners’ academic performance. In their book, Sergiovani and Starrat (2002) describe instructional supervision as opportunities provided to teachers in developing their capacity towards contributing for students’ academic success. Glickman (1990), views instructional supervision as the actions that enables teachers to improve instructions and as an act that improves relationships and meets both personal and organizational needs.

In a paper presented at the annual conference of the American Education Research Association (AERA) in Chicago, 2007, Glanz and Sullivan indicated that
supervision is purposeful, targeted and central to promoting a school wide instructional program wherein student achievement is always at the forefront. They also stated that though the connection between achievement and supervision is correlative rather than necessarily causal, supervision is critical for enhancing teacher growth and central in promoting student achievement.

Instructional Supervision in Africa is as old as western education in Africa. In Uganda Phelps Stokes Commission established the department of education in 1925. The department had the responsibility of developing the syllabus and supervision of how it was being followed in schools. In his study designed to determine whether instructional processes and supervision have any measurable bearing on the academic performance of secondary schools students in Degema, Rivers state, Nigeria, Okendu found out that regular instructional supervision has a significant bearing on students' performance. Other studies that justify the positive impact that instructional supervision has on learners' performance include; Opare (1999), Oduro (2008) and Sarah & Hovde (2000).

Kenyan scholars and educationists have voiced their observations on the link between instructional supervision and learners' performance. Griffins (1994) observed that it is the head teacher who sets the pace, leading and motivating the staff and pupils to perform to their best. Absence of good school management and organization lead to poor performance. Likewise Musungu & Nasongo (2008) state that in the schools where performance is good the head teacher carries out a lot of instructional supervision.
From the Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies (2012), Charles Too et al. in their study, “The impact of Head teachers’ supervision of teachers on students’ academic performance” observed that supervision had a positive impact on the school overall mean score in the K.C.S.E. performance.

In Kenya for example, the Ministry of Education (M.O.E) has had a department that deals with supervision and monitoring perse since pre-independence. After gaining independence the government of Kenya set up the Kenya Education Commission headed by Professor Ominde in 1964. Following the recommendations of that commission, the Inspectorate Division in the MOE was formed. The Inspectorate Division derived its mandate from the education Act of the Laws of Kenya. The mandate stated that the Minister shall appoint officers with authority to enter and inspect any school or place at which it is reasonably suspected that a school is being conducted at any time, with or without notice and to report to him with respect to the school or any place thereof.

In 2003 the Inspectorate Division was renamed the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards. This was as a result of the rationalization of the MOE headquarters’ staff operations and setting up of five directorates manning education. These five directorates were, “the Directorate of Basic Education, Directorate of policy and planning, Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards, Directorate of Higher Education and the Directorate of Technical Education.

The Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards mandate subsequently changed from that of control to the one of quality audit and quality development with a view
of providing support services to all education institutions and stakeholders. Two of its objectives were;

- To have a regular reporting to the MOE on the general quality of education in Kenya at National, Provincial, District, Division and school levels with reports on specific aspects of education as required.
- To monitor the performance of teachers and education institutions in accordance with all round standard performance indicators.

The Directorate of Quality Assurance and standards derives its core values from the MOE charter and they reflect the directorates' objectives. The core values are; impartial judgment, respect for value added progress, integrity, professionalism, team work, quality assurance, fidelity to law and good rapport.

The enactment of the Basic Education Act, 2013 No 14 of 2013 proposed a change to the Directorate of Quality Assurance and standards. Section 64(1) states;

"There shall be established an Education Standards and Quality Assurance Council (ESQAC). The ESQAC shall:

i) Ensure standards and maintain quality in institutions of basic Education.

ii) Supervise and oversee curriculum implementation and delivery.

iii) Monitor and evaluate standards and quality in basic education."

Of interest in the study was the head teachers' instructional supervision and its impact on K.C.P.E. performance, taking the case of Kiritiri Division of Mbeere South District. According to the office of D.E.O., Kiritiri Division is one of the four educational Divisions that make up Mbeere South District. In comparison to the other three, it has an advantage in that it enjoys an adequate staffing of teachers, the distance between schools is minimal therefore the pupils population in its schools is
manageable and most schools are accessible to the only tarmacked road in the district thus ensuring ease of movement and availability of necessary goods. Despite these advantages, its K.C.P.E. performance has been consistently below average. Therefore the study sought to find out whether the instructional supervision that head teachers of Kirititi Division carryout impacts on the K.C.P.E performance of their schools. Tables 1.1 and 1.2 below reveal the unsatisfactory performance of K.C.P.E in Kiritiri Division in the period of years 2009-2013.

Table 1.1: Mbeere South District K.C.P.E Mean score 2009 – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>2009 m/s</th>
<th>2010 m/s</th>
<th>2011 m/s</th>
<th>2012 m/s</th>
<th>2013 m/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWEA</td>
<td>256.62</td>
<td>261.62</td>
<td>251.98</td>
<td>260.3</td>
<td>254.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GACHOKA</td>
<td>242.73</td>
<td>246.76</td>
<td>246.73</td>
<td>253.27</td>
<td>249.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRITIRI</td>
<td>238.97</td>
<td>241.65</td>
<td>239.32</td>
<td>239.36</td>
<td>237.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAKIMA</td>
<td>235.35</td>
<td>235.50</td>
<td>229.79</td>
<td>231.18</td>
<td>220.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT MEANSCORE</td>
<td>243.26</td>
<td>247.94</td>
<td>243.29</td>
<td>247.64</td>
<td>240.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in table 1.1 shows that Kiritiri Division recorded below average mean scores in the five consecutive years of between 2009-2013. It was also ranked in the fourth position in all the five years. It also continuously registered mean scores below the Districts’ mean in all the five years. The poor performance is also evident as indicated in table 1.2 which sought to find out the above 250 marks pass in that five year period.
Table 1.2: Above 250 marks pass analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>&gt;250 MARKS</th>
<th>TOTAL CANDIDATES</th>
<th>%PASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>KIRITIRI</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>40.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MWEA</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>42.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GACHOKA</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>54.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAKIMA</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>35.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>KIRITIRI</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>43.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MWEA</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>63.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GACHOKA</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>54.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAKIMA</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>36.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>KIRITIRI</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>42.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MWEA</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>54.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GACHOKA</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>46.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAKIMA</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>30.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2 indicates that in the years 2009-2011, Kiritiri Division had less than half pupils who scored above 250 marks in the K.C.P.E. In 2009 only 383(40.50%) pupils scored above 250 mark, and in 2011 only 413(42.14) pupils scored above 250 marks in the K.C.P.E.

The unsatisfactory performance in the K.C.P.E over the years was and has been of concern to the researcher, the public and to Kiritiri Divisions’ stakeholders. The poor performance raises concern as to whether head teachers’ instructional supervision in the schools in Kiritiri Division is effective enough to positively affect the academic performance.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Educationists are in agreement that there are numerous factors that can adversely or positively influence the academic performance of a school. Key among the factors is the school’s management. Supervision of instruction and curriculum is a key task of management. Informal discussions among people in Kiritiri Division suggest that poor pupils’ performance in schools is as a result of ineffective supervision of teachers by head teachers. However this assumption by the stakeholders of ineffective supervision is not verified. Yet the fact that many pupils perform poorly in the K.C.P.E is a reality. Poor academic achievement raises concern as to whether head teachers’ instructional supervision in the schools is effective. Head teachers are expected to provide effective supervision of instruction by motivating, stimulating and consulting with teachers in order to improve the pupils’ academic performance. Some researchers have found out that head teachers spent less than a third of their time in supervision (Cooley & Shen 2003) and (Goodwin, Cunningham & Childress 2003). They have been reported to use only 20% of their time for visiting classes, curriculum related tasks and staff development. Effective instructional supervision within a school is expected to affect teaching and learning and ultimately affect pupils performance. A report from the D.E.Os office showed that in Kiritiri Division, there has been no study carried out on head teachers’ instructional supervision and its impact on pupils’ academic performance. This therefore is the problem of the study.
1.3 **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to find out the impact of head teachers' instructional supervision on performance of K.C.P.E. in Kiritiri Division, Mbeere South District, Kenya.

1.4 **Objectives of the Study**

The study sought to achieve the following objectives;

i. To determine head teachers' level of effectiveness in carrying out instructional supervision in the areas of instructional strategies, learners progress, human resource and instructional programmes.

ii. To establish the nature of supervisor – supervisee relationship that head teachers adopt as they carry out supervision.

iii. To determine the support that head teachers receive from the department of quality assurance in the District in carrying out the instructional supervision duties.

iv. To establish teachers views with regard to instructional supervision.

v. To establish whether head teachers' instructional supervision correlates to K.C.P.E performance.

1.5 **Research Questions**

The following questions guided the study;

i. To what extent do the head teachers carry out supervision in the areas of instructional strategies, learners' progress, human resource and instructional programmes?

ii. What kind of relationship do the head teachers adopt in carrying out supervision? Are they collaborative, autocratic or congenial?
iii. In what ways does the department of quality assurance in the district support head teachers so as to carry out the instructional supervision effectively?

iv. What views do teachers hold with regard to instructional supervision?

v. To what extent does a head teacher’s instructional supervision correlate with his/her school’s K.C.P.E performance?

1.6 Basic Research Assumptions

The study was based on the following assumptions

i. That all head teachers carry out instructional supervision.

ii. That the sampled head teachers would volunteer honest information.

iii. The head teachers had the required competence for effective instructional supervision.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

Limitations are aspects of a research that may influence the results negatively but over which the researcher has no control over (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). The following factors were limitations to the study.

i. It was not possible to control the attitudes of the respondent. Some respondents therefore might have given socially acceptable answers to please the researcher.

ii. Time and resources available were limiting.

1.8 Delimitations of the Study

i. The study confined itself to head teachers and teachers leaving out other formally designated supervisors like the T.A.C tutors and D.Q.A.SOs. For more conclusive results all designated supervisors should have been included in the study.
ii. The study confined itself to instructional supervision whereas there are other diverse factors that contribute to poor performance in the K.C.P.E.

iii. The study left out other stakeholders such as the parents who may have views on the quality of instructional supervision carried out in their schools. This affected generalization in that their views may have pointed to the issues that may indirectly affect the instructional supervision offered in the schools.

1.9 Significance of the Study

The study's findings may be useful in a number of ways. They may;

i. Assist head teachers and the quality assurance officers to identify their weaknesses in offering instructional supervision and hence improve on them.

ii. Trigger self-reflection in individual teachers regarding their role in the instructional supervision practice. This may lead to a positive change of attitude towards instructional supervision.

1.10 Theoretical Framework

The study was based on the collegial model of instructional supervision. The collegial approach is based on the view of successful schools as a paradigm shift from conventional and congenial practices of supervision to another orientation that includes;

➢ Emphasize on collegial rather than hierarchical relationship between teachers and the supervisors.

➢ Supervision as the practice of collaborative effort between the teachers and the supervisors.

➢ A focus on teacher growth rather than teacher compliance.
Facilitation of teachers collaborating with each other for instructional improvement.

Teacher involvement in the continuous reflective inquiry.

The collegial model of supervision traces its roots in the writings of John Dewey in 1929. He combined a scientific method of reflective inquiry with democratic principles in creating a co-operative/democratic supervision. He promoted collegial inquiry as a guide to practice in opposition to Fredrick Taylors prescribed method for educational practices. In the mid 1950’s Harvard professors Morris Cogan, Robert Anderson and Goldhammer developed the practice of clinical supervision. In it Cogan insisted on a collegial relationship focused on teachers’ interest in improving students learning and on a non-judgmental observation and inquiry process. Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2007) proposed a developmental model of supervision that is in their terms a collegial model. They clarify collegial as “purposeful adult interaction about school wide teaching and learning.” The collegial supervision model is based on a common vision in the teaching/learning process which is developed corroboratively by the supervisors, teachers and other members of the school community. The people work together to make their vision a reality and build a democratic community in which all members are party to.

Clinical supervision is an example of collegial model of supervision. It involves conducting an observation with the teachers. This theory supports the study in that the study views an effective supervisory practice as one that positively affects student achievement. To do so the supervisor must effectively work to influence teacher behavior that best promotes student learning. The head teacher (supervisor) can only do that by a collegial relationship between him/her and the teachers. The
supervisors' leadership is also essential in establishing a culture of teacher empowerment and collaboration, which ultimately leads to improved students learning and therefore improved academic performance.

1.11 Conceptual Framework

According to Orodho (2004), a conceptual framework is a model of presentation where a researcher conceptualizes or presents the relationship between variables in the study and shows the relationship graphically or diagrammatically.

**INDEPENDENT VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers Instructional Supervisory roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Checking of teachers' professional records i.e Schemes of work, lesson plan records of work covered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classroom visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring of Learners progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision &amp; monitoring of human &amp; instructional resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

- Improved learning and teaching
- Improved K.C.P.E Performance

**INTERVENING VARIABLES**

- Head teacher's Knowledge
  interpersonal skills and technical skills
- Teachers attitude
- DQASO's professional assistance

Figure 1.1: Head teacher's instructional supervision on KCPE performance framework.

Source: Researcher's own, 2015
The conceptual framework of this study is based on the concept that effective head teachers' instructional supervision lead to effective teaching and learning and thus improved academic achievement such as in K.C.P.E. Head teachers' instructional supervisory roles form the independent variables. Checking of teachers' professional records propels the teachers to prepare in advance. A prepared teacher delivers effectively. Classroom visitation reveals what goes on in the classrooms especially in terms of content delivery. Monitoring of learners progress leads to proper guidance and application of corrective measures. In his role as the supervisor an effective head teacher ensures adequacy in provision of instructional resources and equity in sharing the available resources. He also monitors both instructional and human resources.

Other factors intervene in the instructional supervision process. They are; head teacher's knowledge base, interpersonal and technical skills, teachers' attitude and assistance from the DQASO. As the supervisor, the head teacher should be knowledgeable about evidence based practices in supervision. He/she should have the ability to understand interpersonal behaviors and respect diversity in human values. He/she should effectively utilize the skills of planning, observing, analyzing and translating the results of the observation into meaningful feedback that guides and encourages teachers to improve instructions. When head teachers' supervisory roles are effectively done they lead to high performance of pupils in examinations.
1.12 Operational Definition of Central Terms

**Academic performance**  Refers to how well educational tasks that are geared towards improvement of learners’ progress and teachers’ competence are carried out in Kiritiri Division. Examples of these tasks include; assessing learners’ progress, lesson planning, conducting practical sessions and creating suitable learning environment.

**Collegial**  Refers to teachers and their supervisors working collaboratively with an aim of improving educational outcomes for the learners.

**Congenial**  Refers to situations whereby teachers and their supervisors work in a too friendly manner thus the professional relationship that helps establish a boundary between the supervisor and supervisee is blurred.

**Effectiveness**  Refers to the task of instructional supervision being carried out well and therefore enhancing the production of desirable educational outcomes. These educational outcomes are portrayed in the formative evaluation processes such as the continuous assessment tests (C.A.Ts) and in the summative evaluation processes such as the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (K.C.P.E).

**Instructional supervision**  Refers to the task of overseeing or monitoring the proper implementation of instructions in a school. It is
a continuous process aimed at improving learning and teaching. The process involves guiding, helping, correcting and showing student and practicing teachers how to teach effectively. It entails overseeing such tasks as planning and administration of instructions, use of numerous evaluation processes, provision of feedback e.t.c. Instructional supervision is carried out by head teachers though they can delegate the supervisory duties to the deputy head teachers and senior teachers.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
The section explored literature related to instructional supervision in relation to academic performance. The review was focused on the concept of instructional supervision, instructional supervision and performance, quality assurance, teachers’ perception on instructional supervision and finally a summary of the review.

2.2 The Concept of Instructional Supervision
Definition
Okumbe (2009) defines instructional supervision as that dimension or phase of educational administration which is concerned with improving instructional effectiveness. Zapenda (2007) conceptualizes instructional supervision as an ongoing process aimed at improving instructions through supervision, professional development and evaluation. Numerous authors have also brought forth their definitions of supervision of instructions but all the definitions point at improvement of instruction as the main focus of their definitions.

Purpose of instructional supervision
Many researchers believe that instructional supervision has the potential to improve classroom practices and contribute to learners’ performance through the professional growth and improvement of teachers. (Blasé & Blasé, 1999, Musaazi, 1985; Sergiovanni & Starrat, 2002 and Sullivan and Glanz, 1999). Olembo (1992) states that the main purpose of supervision is improvement of teaching and learning. According to J. Glanz & Jeffrey in their paper “impact of instructional supervision
on student achievement; can we make a difference?” Presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research (AERA) in 2007, they noted that several instances of effective models of supervision and professional developments were discovered in New York City public schools. They further observed that these schools had significant increases in students’ achievement levels as reported by state standardized tests. Also, according to a report by United Nations Educational Science and Cultural Organization (UNESCO module 6, 2007, p4), school based monitoring and supervision is seen as a guarantee for not only better quality but also greater relevance to the needs of students.

**History of instructional supervision**

Okumbe (2001) identifies several phases in which supervision has evolved through. These are; the period of administration (1642-1875), the period of efficiency orientation (1876-1936) the period of group effort (1937-1957) to the period of research orientation (1960-present).

1. **The period of administration (1642 – 1875)**

During this period, supervision was synonymous to inspection. It was handled by laymen such as the clergy, school wardens and citizens committees. The functions of the inspector were judicial. The supervisor made judgment about the teacher rather than the teaching or the pupils learning. The supervision during this period was mainly concerned with the management of schools and the fulfillment of prescribed curricular needs rather than the improvement of teaching and learning. (Okumbe, 2001).
2. **The period of efficiency orientation (1876-1936)**

This period saw the emphasis in supervision shift to assisting the teachers to improve effectiveness in their teaching. The supervisors started providing a friendly atmosphere and a warm interpersonal relationship to the supervised teachers.

3. **The period of cooperate group effort (1937 – 1959)**

The period was characterized by an increasing population which necessitated the employment of a large number of untrained teachers. There was therefore need for supervision of instruction. This period also ushered in the era of democratic relationship associated with coordination, integration, creativity and stimulation.

4. **The period of research orientation (1960 – present)**

In this period organizations began to be subjected to systematic study rather than operation by negotiation. To date, research of effective schools continues to influence supervision and the findings inform supervisory decisions.

In Kenya education supervision traces its roots to the colonial times. The modern Quality Assurance Directorate was initiated through the recommendations of the Ominde commission of 1964. The formerly Inspectorate Division was renamed in 2003 to the present day Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards.

Discussing the history of instructional supervision shows that it has evolved from far and it is still evolving. Instructional supervision to date is seen as being in the period of research orientation. It is worth reflecting to see whether the practice of instructional supervision as carried out in schools align with the research findings of this period hence its relevance in this study.
Approaches to supervision of instruction

Many approaches or models have been developed and applied as a basis to instructional supervision. The traditional methods of supervision are associated to the bureaucratic model developed by Max Weber. Fredrick Taylor of the scientific management principle also contributed to the bureaucratic approach. The model seeks to enforce scientific concepts in teaching and learning and recognize the supervisors as experts in curriculum matters and supervision as teachers. Peer coaching group supervision and team supervision are other examples of approaches to supervision.

The study was however based on the collegial approach to instructional supervision. This approach is a new paradigm for instructional supervision one in which supervision is collegial rather hierarchical, it is a province of teachers as well as supervisors. It focuses on teacher growth rather than compliance, it is based on teacher collaboration and it is characterized by a continuous reflective inquiry. Glickman, et al. (2007).

Having based the study on the collegial approach to instructional supervision, the research findings of the study will help identify the approach to instructional supervision that head teachers mostly apply as they carry out instructional supervision in their schools and whether the approach used impacts positively on the learners’ academic performance.

Areas of supervision

Glickman (2007) observes that successive schools do not happen by accident. Supervision is the force that shapes the organization into a productive unit. The
improvement of instruction and curriculum is the most important task of the head teacher. Numerous writers have recommendation that at least 60% of the head teacher’s time should be devoted to this important role. Neagley, et al. (1964). In carrying out the instructional supervision duty, the head teacher focuses on the following areas.

i) Assessing learners’ progress

This is done by evaluating the planning of various types of instruction and their administration. The teachers should have background information on the learner’s academic level. He/she should utilize information from various sources in the planning of the lesson. The learner’s progress is monitored and evaluated through formative and summative evaluation processes. Learners engage in classroom lessons and practicals are monitored. Use of criteria reference tests and grade level examinations both internal and external is utilized. Feedback from the assessment is communicated to the learner and his/her guardian. The head teacher initiates and oversees the above in collaboration with the teachers.

ii) Instructional strategies

Supervision in this area focuses on the way the teachers plan instruction and the methods they use to disseminate knowledge to the learners. It involves the head teacher reviewing how the teachers plan their lessons, present the lessons in class, conduct practical lessons and establish a suitable learning environment. The head teacher does the above by monitoring the teacher’s professional records, paying class visits and conferencing with teachers. The head teacher should be keen at creating a sense of mutual trust through teacher sensitization and giving objective feedback.
iii) **Instructional programmes**

Instructional programmes are initiatives aimed at improving educational processes and outcomes. They are put in place as interventions to fill identified gaps or offer solutions to identified problems. Examples of these programmes being conducted in schools today are I.C.T. integration, SMASSE and life skills programmes. Crosby (1982) observed that teachers are the primary stakeholders of an instruction programme. When developing an instructional programme they need to take part in the evaluation of needs assessment, evaluation of programme design, evaluation of readiness, implementation, evaluation of outcomes and cost benefit analysis. The head teachers are much involved in the implementation phase. They should support the initiative by overseeing its implementation as intended. As Glickman, et al. (2009) observes one aspect of programme implementation that evaluators are wise to examine is the level of schools administrative support for the programme.

iv) **Human resource**

Supervision should also focus on other staff in the school such as cooks and watchman. This is because their behavior may covertly influence the behavior of learners in the school.

The above reviewed literature on areas of supervision clearly shows the areas the supervisors mostly focus on as he carries instructional supervision. To this study, it implies that if the mentioned areas are not effectively supervised a poor academic performance is realized.
2.3 Instructional Supervision and Academic Performance

Educationists argue out that there are many indicators which can be used as measures of effectiveness in learning institutions. For example the Ministry of Education has in recent years come up with non-academic performance criteria of ranking school.

Over the years diverse models of measuring quality in schools have been developed and used. The criteria, which Ralph and Tennesey (1993) believe pertaining to effective schools includes the presence of high academic achievement as an ongoing quality throughout the school and after controlling other background variables. To many parents and the Kenyan society at large academic achievement is the only indicator of effectiveness of a school. This is well portrayed by the anxiety and excitement that the announcement of Kenya certificate of Primary Education elicits. Dr. Kilemi Mwiria a former Assistant Minister for Higher Education Science and Technology while reviewing the Meru County K.C.P.E. results for 2012 advanced various factors that determine academic performance. The factors he cited were; economic advancement, school management, stakeholders involvement, parents and pupils attitude towards education among others. (Standard on Sunday 2013:24).

Instruction and curriculum is a major task of a school manager. To impart effectiveness in instruction and curriculum the school manager conducts instructional supervision. Dr. Kilemi emphasized on school management and its influence on performance stating that effective school managers are able to interest key stakeholders in what goes on in their school.

A review with principals of top performing secondary schools, (Sunday Nation, 2014 3:9) on the key to their schools academic success pointed at curriculum and
instruction being given maximum attention and time and that effective supervision of curriculum was emphasized in their schools.

According to Hedley, et.al (1994) the late 1970s produced some significant studies aimed at showing that instructional supervision in schools do make a big difference to pupils' academic achievement. The studies were also aimed at showing characteristics common to effective schools. The Rutter studies and the American studies were two examples of those studies. In their study Michael Rutter and a team from the University of London gave the following characteristics of effective schools;

- These schools' lessons are work oriented with time focused on subject matter.
- Teachers work and plan together and there is strong supervision and coordination by senior teachers.
- Home work is set and followed up.
- The schools emphasize on academic performance and students are expected to work hard and succeed. The American studies involved those carried out by Brookover and Lezotte (1979), Edmonds and Frederickson (1979), Phi Delta Kappa (1980), Weber (1971) and Maryland study (1978). In general they showed the following as characteristics of effective schools;
- Effective schools have strong administrative leaders who are curriculum leaders and who give attention to the quality of instruction.
- Schools have principals who have high expectations of themselves, teachers and learners.
• The schools maintain a purposeful climate, which is orderly and generally conducive to the instructional business.

• They ensure that pupil progress is frequently monitored and their achievement frequently evaluated.

Fraze and Hetzel (2002) developed the school management by wandering around (MBWA) concept. They felt that school leaders should be more visible in the school community to be more effective. MBWA practices consider a classroom well managed if there is evidence of discipline, established routines, orderly and business like environment, and appropriate allocation of instruction time and monitoring of student tasks. Sergiovanni and Starrat (2007) defines the term supervision as, to increase the opportunity and capacity of school to contribute more effectively to a student’s academic success while Hoy and Forsyth (1986) states that instructional supervision is any set of activities planned to improve teaching. At its heart it involves a cycle of systematic planning, observation and analysis of the teaching – learning process.

Sarah Mahfooz & Kate Horde carried out a world bank sponsored study entitled ‘Supervision of primary and secondary Education; A five country comparison.’ They were to look into supervision as practiced in five high performing countries in the education sector. These five countries were England, Finland, New Zealand, Netherlands and the Republic of Korea. They came out with the conclusion that, in all five countries examined, school supervision at the primary and secondary levels is mainly concerned with improving educational outcomes for students and that the two primary levels used to improve students outcomes are accountability and
support. A paper presented at the Annual meeting of American Educational, Research Association (AERA) by J. Glanz & Jeffrey, (Chicago, IL April 13, 2007) entitled “impact of instructional supervision on students achievement; can we make the connections?” stated that in New York city public schools several instances of effective models of supervision and professional development were discovered however despite bureaucratic and other non-school related constrains, these school had significant increases in student achievement levels as stated by state standardized tests. Also from the Journal of Emerging Trends in Education, Research & Policy Studies (June 2012, Vol. 3 issues P 299) Too, et al. in their study entitled, ‘The impact of head teachers’ supervision of teachers and students on academic performance.’ The study results revealed that supervision had a positive relationship with a school’s overall mean score in K.C.S.E. examinations. According to Ngozi & Akaraonye in the Journal of Contemporary Research (2011 issue 8,p 55 – 63) their research entitled ‘Perceived influence of instructional supervision on teachers classroom performance in public primary schools in Oweri, Imo state Nigeria’ revealed that supervision of instruction influenced teacher classroom performance leading to improved learners achievement. They also observed that supervised teachers perform better than teachers that are not supervised. Opare, (1999) and Oduro, (2008) are other examples of studies whose review show that instructional supervision impacts positively on learners’ performance.

Eshiwani (1993) attributes poor pupil performance in public schools to ‘arm chair’ head teachers who do not know what goes on in the classrooms. Griffins (1994), adds that head teachers need to observe their teachers formally on regular basis make notes in the classroom and work with a clear commitment. Musungu and
Nasonga (2008) carried out a study in Vihiga District in Western Kenya investigating instructional role of the head teacher in the academic achievement in KCSE. They found out that 80% of the principals in high performing schools checked lesson books, schemes of work and registers of class and school attendance. In his study, Dangara (2014) showed that regular instructional supervision using robust supervision strategies like checking of students' books classroom visitation by school administrators, checking teachers' lesson plans and records had a significant correlation with teachers' performance and academic achievement of students in secondary schools.

The literature above, points at the existence of a strong relationship between effective instructional supervision and pupils' performance. Where the head teacher initiates strong supervision of instruction, academic success is achieved. Glickman (2007) summarizes the above observation by stating that successive schools do not happen by accident. Supervision is the force that shapes the organization into a productive unit.

2.4 Quality Assurance and Standards

The Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards is the professional arm of the Ministry of Education. Its mission is to establish, maintain and improve education standards in Kenya. Examples of its objectives are;

- To have a regular reporting to the Ministry of Education on general quality of education in Kenya at National, Provincial, District and school levels with reports in specific aspects of education as required.
- Ensure that the appropriate curriculum is operational in institutions.
Monitor teachers' performance and education institutions with all standards performance indicators.

The Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards' history dates back to 1927 when formal education was introduced in Kenya. On gaining independence, the government of Kenya set up the Kenya Education Commission headed by Professor Ominde. Following the recommendations of that commission the Inspectorate Division in the MOE was created. It derived its mandate from the Education Act of the Laws of Kenya. In 2003 the Inspectorate Division was renamed. It became the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards. Its mandate also changed from that of control to the one of quality audit and quality development with a view of providing support services to all education institutions and stakeholders.

The Basic Education Act of 2013 No. 14 of 2013 recommends the establishment of an Education Standards and Quality Assurance Council (E.S.Q.A.C). Therefore, once the Basic education Act of 2013 is implemented. The Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards will become the Education Standards and Quality Assurance Council (E.S.Q.A.C).

One of the Quality Assurance and Standards' core values is professionalism. That is, to offer capacity building of the officers on the job and subject mastery and skills upgrading of teachers through in servicing and conducting teachers proficiency course.

According to Olembo (1992) some of the problems associated with the Inspectorate Division were; understaffing, untrained personnel, lack of commitment and positive
attitude, irregular inspection and adequate follow up of inspectoral visits and services. Even today these problems are still prevalent in the Department of Quality Assurance and Standards. For instance most teachers in primary schools nowadays hold a degree in education. On the contrary there are supervisors in the Quality Assurance and Standards Directorate who do not have such academic qualifications. This in itself creates a constant cold war between the officers and the teachers.

Head teachers can be regarded as agents of supervision on behalf of the inspectorate Olembo (1992). As one of its core values suggests, the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards is mandated to offer capacity building through in service training and conducting proficiency courses. From observations made in the field the directorate seems to be struggling in its attempt to meet its mandate. When the Directorate fails to effectively carry out its mandate, the education standards are negatively affected.

2.5 Teachers Perception to Instructional Supervision

The way teachers perceive supervision in schools and classrooms is an important factor that determines the outcome of the supervisory process. Oliva (1976). Most teachers consider supervisors as fault finders and supervision as having nothing of value to offer to them (Zapenda.2003). Unless they perceive supervision of instruction as a process promoting professional growth and pupils learning, the supervision practice cannot bring the desired impact. In Kenya for long, a casual talk with teachers portrayed teachers’ negative view towards supervision. To the teachers a visit by a quality assurance officer, previously referred to as inspectors of schools was a dreadful experience. It was associated with harassment, fault finding and
intimidation. This could probably be associated with the original mandate of the Inspectorate Department of the Ministry of Education which stated;

The Minister shall appoint officers with authority to enter and inspect any school or any place at which is reasonably suspected that a school is being conducted, at any time, with or without notice and report to him with respect to the school or any aspect thereof."

The inspectors were therefore dictatorial and controlling. Due to this negative history, head teachers who are keen on carrying out their supervision duties effectively are still viewed with suspicion by the teachers. The negative perception towards supervision of instruction is not limited to Kenya only. For example a study by Alemayehu (2008) in secondary schools in Addis Ababa shows that instructional supervision practice there is exposed to multiple problems one of them being the existence of less mutual professional trust between supervisors and teachers. Moswela (2000), also reports that teachers in Botswana view instructional supervision as being carried out for wrong reasons. Sailesh Sharma of the University of Malaya in Malaysia in his paper, "instructional supervision; a tool for improvement or weapon for punishment," also observes that majority of teachers believe that the purpose of supervision of instruction is for the wrong reasons. That is, they view it as faultfinding and an activity for supervisors to carry out their paper work task.

Many experts and authors of instructional supervision hold contrasting views to the above mentioned observations. In their definitions the authors have teachers' involvement as a part of meaning of instructional supervision. For example
Glickman, et al. (2007) describes instructional supervision as the actions that enables the teachers the quality to improve instruction for students and as an act that improves relationship and meets both personal and organization needs.

Sergiovanni and Staratt (2002) defines instructional supervision as opportunities provided to teachers in developing their capacities towards contributing for students' academic success. Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2009) propose a developmental approach that is in their terms a collegial model. To them supervision is the province of collaborative effort between teachers and supervisors. The clinical supervision models by Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1973) indicates that teachers be involved in the supervision phases. That is, in the pre-conference, conference and post conference phases.

The literature reviewed pointed out at supervision as being a collaborative effort of both the teachers and the supervisors. The active and collaborative involvement of teachers in the supervision practice would gradually change the teachers' perception towards instructional supervision.

In Kenya the renaming of the Inspectorate Division and its change of mandate from that of control to the one of quality audit and quality development and the incorporation of good rapport as one of its core values shows a positive change of focus in that department. It will be worth finding out whether the changes suggested in the Education Act of 2013 will bring positive changes geared towards improving teachers' perception to instructional supervision.
2.6 Summary of the Literature Review

This section started by reviewing the concept of instructional supervision. It firstly reviewed the definition of the terms instructional supervision as defined by different scholars. The purpose of instruction was also reviewed. As Olembo (1992) states the main purpose of supervision is improvement of teaching and learning. The history of instructional supervision was also reviewed. This showed the different phases in which instructional supervision has evolved through. A review of areas of supervision that head teachers mostly focus on was also carried out. Different scholars’ views on the relationship between instructional supervision and academic performance were also looked into. A review on quality assurance and standards and teachers perception to instructional supervision was also carried out.

The literature reviewed illustrated that many scholars are in agreement that a link exists between instructional supervision and academic performance. However the reviewed literature pointed at the link being more indirect rather than direct. This concurs with Basker & Kruger (2003) who stated that making direct connection between supervision and student achievement has been elusive. There having been no research on head teachers instructional supervision and its impact on performance of KCPE in Kiritiri Division – Kenya, a gap existed which the researcher intended to fill with the present research.

Despite the fact that the quality assurance and standard department has mandate of ensuring that high standards of education are maintained, there seems to be a gap between the mandate and the practice. The study therefore sought to find out how supportive the head teachers and teachers find quality assurance department to be. Most literature illustrated teachers as being averse to instructional supervision. The study therefore also sought to find out whether teachers perception towards instructional supervision has changed over the years.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The section describes the procedure and strategies that were used in conducting the study. These are the research design, location of study, target population, sampling and sampling techniques, research instrument, research instruments’ reliability and validity, piloting, data collection and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research Design

The study adopted a descriptive survey design where both qualitative and quantitative data were generated. Orodho (2009) defines a survey as a method of collecting information by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals. The descriptive survey was suitable for the study because the research involved collecting information, opinions and habits of head teachers, teachers and pupils of Kiritiri Division, Mbeere South District.

3.3 Location of study

The study’s location was Kiritiri Division of Mbeere South District in Embu County. Kiritiri Division borders Gachoka Division to the North, Makima Division to the South East and Masinga District of Machakos County to the south. The headquarters of Kiritiri Division are at Kiritiri market which is situated 34 kilometers South of Embu town along Embu- Kamburu - Kiambere road. Kiritiri Division is centrally located in Mbeere south District. It is therefore adequately staffed with teachers in its 28 primary schools. The distance between its schools is minimal thus the pupil population in the schools is manageable. The study settled for
Kiritiri Division as its location of study because according to the D.E.Os (Mbeere South) report, no other similar study had been carried out in the location. Kiritiri Division also has over the years registered a below average K.C.P.E performance as shown in tables 1.1 and 1.2 in the study’s background information section.

3.4 Target Population

In Kiritiri Division there are 28 primary schools. The target population for the study comprised the 28 head teachers, 240 teachers and the 6306 pupils in the 28 primary schools in Kiritiri Division. Therefore the total target population was 6574 as illustrated in table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1: Population Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>6306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

Kiritiri Division, which was the locale of the study, is made up of three zones namely Mavuria, Kinthuthire and Gichiche. In Mavuria zone, there are 11 schools with 108 teachers and 2487 pupils. Kinthuthire zone has 7 schools with 60 teachers and 1644 pupils while in Gichiche zone, there are 10 schools with 72 teachers and 2175 pupils.
Respondents

(a) Head teachers

According to the D.E.O’s office, 12 head teachers in Kiritiri Division had served in their current schools for a period of more than 5 years. These head teachers were well distributed in the three zones. The 12 head teachers were purposively selected for the study due to that common characteristic i.e. they had served in their schools for more than five years. They therefore were likely to have influenced their schools’ K.C.P.E performance. Purposive sampling selects respondent who will provide the information required by the researcher (Ontiria 2003).

(b) Teachers

Seventy-two teachers of the purposively selected 12 schools were randomly selected to be respondents in the study. According to gay (1992), random sampling is the best form of sampling as it allows all members of the population to have an equal and unbiased chance of appearing in the sample. Stratified sampling was used to proportionately allocate the 72 teachers to the three zones. Proportional allocation was suitable to ensure unbiased representativeness of the population. It also ensures that the sub-groups in the population are represented in the sample in proportion to their numbers in the population itself. Orodho (2009). Simple random sampling was then used to select the teachers from the individual schools to participate in the study.

(c) Pupils

The researcher settled for 10% of the total class seven pupils in Kiritiri Division. This percentage is advocated by Gay (2009), who states that a sample is representative if it contains at least 10% of the whole population. Therefore 80 class
seven pupils were respondents in the study. The pupils were selected from the 12 purposively selected schools. Simple random sampling was then used to select the pupils from the participating individual schools. The researcher settled for class seven pupils to participate in the study because they were not due for a national examination. They could therefore give a true picture of what goes on in their school.

Table 3.2: Sampling Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Sample Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>Purposive sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>Automatic inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Stratified sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>6306</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Purposive, stratified sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple random sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>6574</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.86%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Research Instruments

The research instruments used were a questionnaire for the teachers and interview guides for the head teachers and the pupils.

3.6.1 Questionnaire for Teachers

The researcher used questionnaires which consisted of questions printed in a definitive order (Kothari, 2004). They were a mixture of closed ended, unstructured open ended and matrix questions. The questionnaire helped the researcher to collect
a relatively wide range of information from a large sample within a short time and a reasonable low cost (Orodho, 2006).

3.6.2 Interview Guide for Head Teachers

An interview guide made of open ended questions was used to complement the teachers' questionnaire. Interviews also allowed a wide range of participants understanding to be explored and therefore reveal important aspects of the problem under study (Cohen et al, 2000).

3.6.3 Interview Guide for Pupils

The interview guide for pupils was made up of 20 questions. A mixture of closed ended and open ended questions were used. The direct verbal interaction enabled the interviewer to observe and probe the interviewee and therefore obtain research relevant information.

3.7 Piloting

After designing the questionnaires, the researcher piloted the questionnaires. It was done by interviewing 2 head teachers and 10 class seven pupils and also giving questionnaires to 10 teachers from two schools that were not part of the sample. Piloting helped establish whether questions measured what they were supposed to, checked whether the wording was clear, whether the questions provoked responses and whether the respondents would interpret all the questions in the same way.

3.7.1 Validity of the Instruments

Orodho (2009) contends that a research instrument is said to be valid if it measures what it is supposed to. Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) define validity as the accuracy
and meaningfulness of inferences that are based on the research results. To ascertain the validity of the research instruments, the researcher made sure that the questionnaire and the interview guides covered the breadth of the content area and that, they were completely aligned to the objectives of the study. The researcher also had the questionnaire and the interview guides reviewed by her research supervisors who are experts in the area of study. They helped ensure that the content area was adequately sampled.

3.7.2 Reliability of the Instruments

According to Orodho (2009), reliability of an instrument is the consistency in producing a reliable result. To verify the reliability of the research instrument, a Test-retest method was used. The research instruments were administered twice to a group that consisted of one head teacher, 5 teachers and 5 class seven pupils. A two week lapse between the first and the second test was allowed. The scores from both tests were correlated to get the coefficient of reliability using Pearson’s coefficient of correlation method. The correlation coefficient of the study was 0.8. Thus the instruments were considered reliable for the study.

3.8 Data Collection

An introductory letter from Kenyatta University was obtained. Then, a research permit was obtained from the National Council for Science and Technology. The researcher also reported to the County Commissioner, Embu County, the Sub-County Commissioner and the District Education Officer (D.E.O) Mbeere South District. The researcher also obtained permission from each head teacher to conduct the research in their schools. Questionnaires were personally administered and interviews also personally conducted by the researcher.
3.9 Data Analysis

After collection of questionnaires and the responses to the interview guides, the researcher read them through to ascertain their number and whether all the items had been responded to. The instrument generated both quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data was analyzed using the descriptive statistics. That is, frequencies, means and standard deviation. To determine correlation, Pearson's coefficient of correlation method was used. The formula for Pearson's coefficient of correlation, \( r \), is:

\[
r = \frac{\sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)/N}{\sqrt{(\sum x^2) - (\sum x)^2/N} \cdot (\sum y^2) - (\sum y)^2/N}
\]

The above was done with the aid of SPSS – X, a computer programme commonly used in educational and social sciences research.

The qualitative data were presented thematically in line with the study's objectives. The results were analyzed using frequency distribution tables, bar graphs and pie charts.

3.10 Logistics, Ethical, Human Relations and Legal Issues

The information below stipulates how the above issues were addressed in the study process.

Logistical issues

Logistical issues were observed by maintaining a careful layout and handling of research instruments, obtaining a research permit, preparing a research protocol and budget, pre-testing of research instruments and finally making reconnaissance visits to the respondents' schools.
Ethical and Human Relations issues

Appropriate public relations methods were used so as to gain consent from the respondents. Assurance of confidentiality and anonymity was emphasized and the proper chain of command in the course of obtaining consent for collecting the research data was carefully observed.

Legal issues

To observe adequate safeguards against plagiarism, other researchers or authors works used in the research were adequately acknowledged. Data were collected by the researcher herself as a measure to safeguard the research against research fraud.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The chapter presents the findings, interpretations and discussion according to the objectives and research questions of the study. The data presented is in form of tables, pie charts and bar graphs, showing responses in frequencies and percentages to the research questions and interviews posed. The statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) was used in the analysis of the collected data.

The presentation is conducted under the following main sections which reflect the objectives of the study.

- To analyze the head teachers' level of effectiveness in carrying out instructional supervision in the areas of instructional strategies, learners' progress, human resource and instructional programmes.
- To examine the nature of supervisor-supervisee relationship that head teachers adopt as they carry out supervision.
- To analyze the support that head teachers receive from the Department of Quality Assurance in the District in carrying out the instructional supervision duties.
- To analyze teachers' views with regard to instructional supervision.
- To examine the head teachers instructional supervision and its relation to K.C.P.E. performance.
4.2 General and Demographic Information

4.2.1 General Information

The study was wholly carried out by the researcher without any research assistance. The administration of the schools involved showed great cooperation in assisting the researcher. The return rate of the questionnaires was high with over three quarters of the teachers involved filling in the questionnaires. A rate of above three quarters of the head teachers and pupils also willingly participated in the interviews.

4.2.2 Demographic Data

The researcher sought to establish the respondents' characteristics in terms of gender, work experience and educational background as presented in table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex of the respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 5 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - 20 yrs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 &amp; above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Educational background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI certificate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4.1 shows that;

(a) **Gender**

The gender ratio of head teachers in Kiritiri division is, male 8(66.7%) and female 4(33.3%) respectively. This indicates that male head teachers dominate the leadership responsibility in the division. There are also more male teachers than female teachers in the division.

(b) **Work experience**

Experience is a factor that has been observed to affect performance. Hence the more experience one has the more effective he/she is expected to be in implementation of duties. Most head teachers and teachers in Kiritiri division were indicative of having above 10 years experience in their work. Despite their experience the performance in KCPE in the division was below average.

(c) **Educational background**

Professional academic qualification is deemed to influence leadership effectiveness thus improved academic performance. 7(58.3%) head teachers held a diploma in education while 5(41.7%) a bachelor degree as their academic qualification. The number of teachers also who held either a diploma or a degree was also high. The fair level of education among the head teachers and teachers did not seem to positively affect the KCPE performance in Kiritiri.
4.3 Head teachers' level of effectiveness in carrying out instructional supervision in the areas of instructional strategies, learners' progress, human resource and instructional programmes

The first objective of the study was to determine the head teacher's level of effectiveness in carrying out instructional supervision in the areas of instructional strategies, learners' progress, human resource and instructional programmes. To address this objective the study sought to breakdown the analysis into subsections namely; instructional strategies, learners progress, human resource and instructional programmes.

4.3.1 Instructional Strategies

This sub-section analyses responses of teachers, head teachers and pupils on how effective they find their head teachers to be in offering instructional supervision on areas that relate to instructional strategies. These areas are checking of teachers schemes of work, lesson plans, records of work, making class visits, syllabus implementation, provision of instructional materials and maintaining a suitable learning environment. The responses are shown in tables 4.2 – table 4.9 and figure 4.1

The study sought to establish head teachers and teachers' views on the frequency of checking of schemes of work. Their responses are as indicated in table 4.2
Table 4.2: Head teachers' and teachers' response on checking of teachers' schemes of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times head teachers check or have their schemes of work checked per term</th>
<th>Number of times teachers schemes of work are checked per term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 illustrates that 10 (83.3%) head teachers check their teachers' schemes of work once in a term and 2 (16.7%) stated that they check the scheme of work more than once in a term.

This implies that many head teachers appreciate that preparing schemes of work is necessary for orderly and systematic teaching. Therefore checking of professional records such as schemes of work is a supervisory duty which leads to effective teaching and learning. As indicated by Musungu (2008), 80% of principals in high performing schools often check schemes of work, lesson plans and attendance registers. The study also sought to find out how often head teachers check teachers' lesson plans. The responses are indicated in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3: Head teachers and teachers’ response on checking of teachers’ lesson plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of times Head teachers check or have their lesson plans checked</th>
<th>Number of times that teachers said their lesson plans are checked per term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in table 4.3, 9(75.0%) head teachers and 39(57.4%) teachers indicated that teacher’s lesson plans are checked either once or more than once in a term. This indicated that head teachers are aware of the importance of lesson planning as a means of enhancing effectiveness in teaching and learning. The findings are in conformity with Too, Kimutai & Kosgey (2012), who established that there is a positive relationship between the inspection of teachers’ records such as lesson plans and academic achievement.

Records of work covered helps indicate how far the syllabus has been covered in each subject. The study sought to find out whether head teachers check the records of work covered as shown in Table 4.4.
Table 4.4: Checking of the teachers' records of work covered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times the head teachers check the teacher's records of work covered per term.</th>
<th>Number of times the teachers said their records of work are checked per term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 illustrates that 8(66.7%) head teachers check the records of work covered at least once in a term while 20(29.4%) teachers said that their records of work covered are checked once in a term. A significant number of teachers indicated that their records of work covered are never checked. The apparent discrepancy between the teachers and the head teachers, responses implies that many head teachers do not consistently check the records of work. For effective teaching and learning to occur, teachers are required to make and retain records (Ficsher, 2011). Failure to effectively supervise the area of record keeping adversely affects syllabus coverage and therefore academic performance.

Making class visits and walk rounds keeps the head teacher aware of how learning and teaching is being carried out in the school. Table 4.5 shows whether head teachers in Kiritiri Division make these supervisory activities.
Table 4.5: Responses on head teachers class visits or walk rounds to observe syllabus coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you make class visits to observe the syllabus coverage?</td>
<td>Does your head teacher make class visits or walk rounds to observe syllabus coverage?</td>
<td>Do you see your head teacher making walk rounds or class visits to observe how you learn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All head teachers responded that they make class visits and walk rounds to observe the syllabus implementation. The table also shows that 60 (90.9%) teachers also concurred with that while 42 (53.2%) pupils agreed that their head teachers make the class visits or walk rounds. Class visits and walk rounds give the head teacher an overview of how learning and teaching is being carried out in the school. When carried out in a mutual and corroborative manner between the teacher and head teacher it helps improve academic standards. As observed by beach and Reinhartz (2000), instructional supervision is a process that focuses on instructions and provides teachers with information about their teaching so as to develop instructional skills to improve performance. The observations made from the visits and walk rounds provide teachers with such information. Walk rounds also makes head teachers more visible in the schools which contributes to effectiveness Fraze & Hezel (2002).
On making class visits effective, head teachers make appropriate follow up actions. The study sought to find out the follow up action taken by head teachers in Kiritiri division after making class visits. The responses were as shown in Table 4.6

Table 4.6: Follow up action made after class visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow up action</th>
<th>Head teachers' response</th>
<th>Teachers response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving a written report to the concerned teacher.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses with the teacher so as to come up with improvement strategies.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps the report for further reference.</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 shows that 9 (81.8%) head teachers responded that after making class visits, they discuss their observations with the concerned teacher so as to come up with improvement strategies. The response was supported by 32 (62.7%) teachers. However 17(33%) teachers indicated that their head teacher keeps the observation for future reference. Class visits and walk rounds are integral parts of instructional supervision. Observation made should be discussed with the concerned teacher. This is because the primary purpose of supervision is to help and support teachers as they adapt, adopt and refine their instructional practices in their classrooms. MCQuarrie and Wood (1991).
Ensuring that the syllabus is implemented and the covered is a necessary supervisory duty of the head teacher. Table 4.7 illustrates the research findings concerning syllabus implementation in their schools.

### Table 4.7: Head teachers' and teacher's view on the rate of school implementation of the syllabus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in table 4.7, all the head teachers interviewed said that the syllabus is effectively covered in their schools while 40 (61.5%) teachers said that the syllabus is ineffectively covered. Head teachers being the immediate supervisors in the school, their response may not be completely honest. The high number of teachers who indicated that there is ineffectiveness in the syllabus implementation implied that many head teachers in Kiritiri Division are ineffective in ensuring that the syllabus is effectively covered in their schools. As a review with principals of top performing schools indicated, key to their schools academic success pointed at curriculum and instruction being given maximum attention,(Sunday Nation, 2014 3:9). Attention to curriculum and instruction implies that the syllabus is effectively implemented. The discrepancy in responses as indicated in Table 4.7 points at existence of a problem in syllabus implementation in Kiritiri Division.
Adequate instructional materials assist in effective syllabus implementation. The study sought to find out the adequacy of instructional materials in Kiritiri Division. The findings were as shown in Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1: Adequacy of Instructional Materials

Figure 4.1 show that most schools lack adequate instructional materials as reported by 9(75.00%) of head teachers and 46(65.20%) of teachers. Instructional materials such as text books are very crucial in learning and teaching. Due to the free primary education policy, schools are provided with funds for acquiring and maintaining instructional materials. Inadequacy of instructional materials indicated that, either schools do not acquire the instructional materials or they do not maintain them as required. This is a reflection of head teachers’ ineffectiveness. As indicated by Jerayinga (2004), adequate instructional resources have significant effects on students’ performance. Lack of adequate instructional materials in the schools was supported by pupils as shown in table 4.8
Table 4.8: Pupils response on adequacy of instructional materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 book for 3 pupils</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 book for 2 pupils</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 book for more than 3 pupils</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On being interviewed, 39 (49.4%) of the pupils said that one text book is shared among three pupils in their school while 11 (13.9%) of the pupils said that a book is shared by more than three pupils. The pupils’ response on the adequacy of instructional materials confirmed that there is an adequacy of instructional materials in the schools in Kiritiri Division.

The study also sought to find out whether schools maintain a suitable learning environment. The findings are shown in Table 4.9

Table 4.9: Head teachers and teachers’ response in regard to the extent to which schools had maintained a suitable learning environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Head teacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Head teacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Head teacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Head teacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Head teacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low Good high Total</td>
<td>low good High Total</td>
<td>low Good high Total</td>
<td>low good High Total</td>
<td>low Good high Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable classroom</td>
<td>10 2 12 8 55 4 67</td>
<td>(83.3%) (16.7%) (100%) (11.9%) (82.08%) (6.0%) (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean, orderly classrooms</td>
<td>10 2 12 4 55 8 67</td>
<td>(83.3%) (6.7%) (100%) (6.0%) (82.08%) (11.9%) (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good work behavior e.g.</td>
<td>11 1 12 4 53 9 66</td>
<td>(96.7%) (3.3%) (100%) (6.0%) (80.3%) (13.6%) (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9 shows that majority of the head teachers and teachers rated their schools as having established a good learning environment. However a few teachers rated their schools as having not established a suitable learning environment. A conducive learning environment bears a positive impact on learners’ performance (Hedley et al 1994). Fraze and Hetzel (2002), the proponents of management by wandering around (MBWA) concept considered a classroom well managed if there is evidence of discipline established routines, orderly and business like environment. The study portrays that most of the head teachers in the interviewed schools have to an extent established a suitable learning environment in their schools.

4.3.2 Learner’s Progress

This sub section analyses responses made by head teachers, teachers and pupils regarding the extent of effectiveness they observe in their head teachers in carrying out instructional supervision in the area of learners’ progress.

The study sought to find out whether teachers give assignments as a way of checking learners’ progress. The findings were as shown in figure 4.2

Figure 4.2: Pupil’s response on teachers giving of assignments
As shown in figure 4.2, 64(80.80%) of the pupils interviewed responded that assignments were given and were marked. Only a small number responded that assignments given were not marked. Any activity that goes on in a school reflects the head teachers' rate of effectiveness in supervision. The fact that assignments are given and marked reflects the head teachers' interest in pupils learning progress. According to Neagley (1964), assessing learners' progress is an important area of focus for the head teacher. Assignments give the teachers a feedback on learners' progress. Continuous assessments tests too offer feedback on learners' progress.

Table 4.10 shows responses on rating of C.A.Ts as offered by schools in the division.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.A.Ts</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not offered</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely offered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently offered</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in table 4.10, 10 (83.3%) head teachers responded that CATs are frequently offered and 34 (54.8%) teachers were also of the same opinion. However, 26(41.9%) teachers said that CATs are rarely offered. This implies that some schools do not offer Continuous Assessment Tests. This is a failure of the head teachers in their supervision duties. Head teachers should ensure that pupils are continuously assessed for the assessment provides a feedback on their progress.
Many high performing schools hold academic clinics. The clinics create a forum for the teacher, parents and learners to focus on individual learners' progress.

Figure 4.3 shows the findings on whether schools in Kiritiri Division hold such clinics.

![Figure 4.3: Holding of academic clinics](image)

As illustrated in figure 4.3, 9 (81.80%) head teachers said that their schools usually hold academic clinics whereas only two head teachers said that their schools do not. However, 30 (52.60%) teachers said that their schools do hold academic clinics while 27 (47.4%) said that their schools do not hold academic clinics. The apparent discrepancy in responses implies that some schools do not hold academic clinic. Olembo (1992) outlines one task of a school administrator as curriculum and instruction, Head teacher’s supervision of curriculum and instruction focuses on learners’ progress. One way of exposing the learners’ progress is by holding of academic clinics. Therefore schools that holds academic clinics points at their head teachers’ effectiveness in the instructional supervisory roles.
Human resource

This sub section gives an analysis of teachers and pupils responses regarding how effective they view their head teachers as being in dealing with all the human resource found in the school i.e teachers, watchmen, cooks etc.

There are many supervisory duties in regard to human resource that a head teacher engages in. Table 4.11 illustrates the responses from teachers on how effective they find their head teachers as being in carrying out the mentioned supervision duties.

Table 4.11: Teachers response on effectiveness of their head teachers in carrying out the indicated supervisory duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>NE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support to teaching and learning.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(17.6%)</td>
<td>(55.9%)</td>
<td>(26.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the school system</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13.6%)</td>
<td>(43.9%)</td>
<td>(39.4%)</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a good relationship between the school</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and its stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td>(30.9%)</td>
<td>(45.6%)</td>
<td>(23.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging a nurturing system among teachers, support</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11.76%)</td>
<td>(27.94%)</td>
<td>(60.29%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  VE – Very effective  LE: A little effective
      E – Effective  NE – Not effective
As shown in table 4.11, majority of teachers viewed their head teachers as just being effective in the various areas mentioned. A large number also said that their head teachers were ineffective in the areas of encouraging a nurturing system in the school. The above analysis is an indication that head teachers need to improve supervision of all the areas shown in the table. Staff personnel management is a major task of an education administrator. (Olembo, 1992). Therefore ineffective supervision of human resource ultimately translate to poor academic achievement.

Effective head teachers ensure that there is proper time management in their schools. The study sought to find out how punctual pupils find their teachers.

Table 4.12: Pupils response regarding teachers' punctuality in arriving at school and attending classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers punctuality</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punctual</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some are punctual and others are not.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly, not punctual</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On being interviewed about their teachers punctuality, 38 (48.1%) pupils said that their teachers were punctual while 34 (43.0%) said that some teachers were punctual while others were not. Time keeping in schools is very important for pupils also learn through observation. Time just like other resources in a school needs to be managed well. Foller (1995) and Eshiwani (1993) argued that resources such as instructional materials and time affect the quality of academic achievement. The responses implies at the existence of inconsistence in time keeping in schools in
Kiritiri Division. This portrays a failure by head teachers to effectively supervise time management.

4.3.3 Instructional Programmes

Instructional programmes are initiatives aimed at improving educational processes and outcomes. Head teachers bear the responsibility of supervising the implementation of the programmes in the schools. This sub-section analyses responses in regard to head teachers’ supervision of instructional programmes in the schools.

The study sought to find out how the head teachers rate their supervision of instructional programmes. The findings were as indicated in Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional programmes</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMASSE, life skills, ABY,</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>6(54.5%)</td>
<td>5(45.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio broadcasting programmes e.t.c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 illustrates that 6(54.5%) head teachers rated poorly in their monitoring of instructional programmes. Only 5(45.5%) rated their monitoring of the programmes as being good. Therefore head teachers do not effectively supervise instructional programmes. Crosby (1982) observed that teachers are the primary stakeholders in professional development and need to take part in evaluation and implementation of
educational programmes. Since many instructional programmes are put in place as intervention to fill identified gaps in the education system there is need of supervising them. The study also sought to find out from the teacher how effective the head teachers are in monitoring instructional programmes. The findings were as shown in Table 4.14

Table 4.14: Teachers rating of their head teachers monitoring of instructional programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional programmes</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMASSE, life skills, ABY, PPI Radio broadcasting programmes e.t.c</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>12(17.6%)</td>
<td>47 (69.19%)</td>
<td>9 (13.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results presented in table 4.14 shows that more than half of the teachers interviewed rated their head teachers’ supervision of instructional programmes as being either good or very good. This was a contrast to the head teachers self rating of the same in table 4.14. However, since 12(17.6%) of teachers rated their head teachers’ supervision of instructional programmes as being poor, head teachers ought to improve their supervision of instructional programmes.

4.4 The nature of supervisor – supervisee relationship that head teachers adopt as they carry out instructional supervision

The second objective of the study was to establish the nature of supervisor – supervisee relationship that the head teachers adopt as they carry out instructional supervision. The section analyses responses of both head teachers and teachers to questions posed that reflect on the relationship the head teacher adopts as he/she
carries out instructional supervision. The leadership style a head teacher adopts affects the schools working environment and therefore the supervisory process.

Table 4.5 shows the terms the head teachers and teachers use to describe their schools working environment.

**Table 4.15: Term(s) used to describe the working environment in the school.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducive and friendly to both teachers and pupils</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not friendly/good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 4.15 illustrates 4 (33.3%) head teachers described their schools' working environment as being friendly. A few said that the working environment was either conducive or friendly. 34 (50.0%) teachers interviewed referred to their schools working environment as conducive and friendly while 20 (29.4%) of the teachers said that the working environment was just good. In their study on the effect of teachers working conditions on their professional satisfaction and their students' achievement, Susan Moore et.al found out that although a wide range of working conditions matters to teachers, the social conditions i.e. the school culture, the principals' leadership and relations among colleagues predominately predicts teachers job satisfaction and ultimately contributes to improved student achievement. The information in table 4.15 implies that head teachers in Kiritiri...
Division appreciate the importance of creating a supportive working environment. To a large extent they have effectively created a conducive working environment in their schools. A conducive working environment makes it easy for supervisors to effectively carry out instructional supervision. The study also sought to find out how teachers describe their head teachers supervisory style as indicated in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16: Terms teachers use to describe their head teachers’ style in carrying out supervisory duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hands off leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues orders and expects them to be followed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and dominates the thinking of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates actions and constantly seeks others</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 shows that 47 (72.3%) teachers described their head teachers as being democratic in carrying out their instructional supervisory duties. i.e. the head teachers initiates action and constantly seeks others opinions. However, despite the head teachers adopting a democratic model of supervision as proposed by Glickman, Gordon and Ross _ Gordon (2007) the K.C.P.E. performance in most schools involved in the study was below average.
4.5 Support that head teachers receive from the Department of Quality Assurance in the District in carrying out instructional supervision duties

The third objective of the study was to determine the support that head teachers receive from the Department of Quality Assurance in the District in carrying out instructional supervision duties. The analysis of their responses was as shown in tables 4.17 and 4.18 and figure 4.4.

The study sought to find out whether head teachers and teachers attend capacity building seminars. The findings were as indicated in Figure 4.4

Figure 4.4: Attendance of work related seminars/workshops or conferences in the ongoing year

Slightly above half of head teachers and teachers interviewed said that they had attended a work related seminar, workshop or conference. Only about twenty percent of both teachers and head teachers said that they had not attended any work related seminars in the year. Professional seminars, workshops and conferences offer teachers an opportunity of building their capacity. It also gives them a chance of interacting with their colleagues so as to exchange ideas. Table 4.17 shows the organizers of workshops and seminars that teachers had attended.
Table 4.17: Organizers of work related seminars, workshops and conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizers</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.E.O</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.D.F./MP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.E.O</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEPSHA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in table 4.17 shows that most workshops that the head teachers attended were organized by either the D.E.O or by KEPSHA. However, most teachers said that the seminars, workshops or conferences that they had attended were mostly organized by the CDF/MP. The D.E.O and A.E.Os offices should be at the forefront of organizing capacity building workshops. This is because according to the basic Education Act of Kenya (2013), maintenance and improvement of education standards is entrenched in the Quality and Standards Department. These findings therefore show that the department is not committed in building capacity in the teachers. This agrees with the observation made by Olembo (1992) that the inspectorate Division is associated with problems such as lack of commitment and positive attitude. Lack of effectiveness in the Quality and Standards department in the division is also illustrated in table 4.18.
Table 4.18: How often the Quality Assurance and Standards officers in the division visit schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/twice per term</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once in a year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only when there is an issue that calls for their attention</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18 shows that 7(58.3%) head teachers responded that the DQASOs rarely visit their schools while 5(41.7%) said that the officers visit once or twice per term. Half of the teachers interviewed said that the DQASOs rarely visit schools or they do so once or twice per term. However a small number of teachers responded that the officers visit schools once in a year or only when there is an issue that calls for their attention. This implies that the DQASOs do not effectively monitor schools. They therefore do not offer the head teachers and teachers the necessary supervisory support. Inadequate support from DQASOs contributes to the poor academic performance in the Division. Further illustration of inadequate support from the DQASOs was as shown in figure 4.5.

Figure 4.5: How supportive head teachers consider the Quality Assurance and Standards Department in the District
Figure 4.5 shows that majority of head teachers in Kiritiri Division viewed the Quality Assurance and Standards Department as being fairly supportive. Only a few of the interviewed head teachers said that the DQAS office was very supportive. For head teachers to be effective in their task of instructional supervision they require the DQAS to fully play its part as dictated in the basic Education Act 2013, Section 64 (1).

4.6 To establish teachers views with regard to instructional supervision

The fourth objective of the study sought to find out views that teacher's hold concerning instructional supervision. To address this objective, head teachers and teachers interviewed were asked to give their views concerning instructional supervision. Their responses are as illustrated in table 4.19

Table 4.19: Head teachers' and teachers' view concerning instructional supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly necessary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps improve standards</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 4.19 shows, 66(98.3%) of teachers said that instructional supervision helps improve standards. That was unlike the head teachers responses for 4(33.3%) viewed instructional supervision as just being fairly necessary while others gave completely different responses. This illustrates that most teachers in Kiritiri Division hold a positive attitude towards instructional supervision.
It is therefore important for head teachers to take advantage of that positive attitude. This is because the way teachers perceive instructional supervision is an important factor that determines the outcome of the instructional supervision process (Oliva1976). However other studies such as those carried out by Alemayehu (2008) and Moswela (2000) have indicated that instructional supervision is exposed to multiple problems such as the existence of lack of mutual trust between the supervisor and supervisee with teachers viewing it as a fault finding exercise. As the results in table 4.19 implies these problems can be overcome.

4.7 To establish whether head teachers' instructional supervision correlates to K.C.P.E performance

The purpose of the fifth objective in the study was to examine head teachers instructional supervision and whether it relates to their schools K.C.P.E. performance. To do so a statistical comparison of schools that held academic clinics and their K.C.P.E performance in the years 2010 to 2013 was carried out. The results of the comparison are as indicated in the tables 4.20 and 4.21.
Table 4.20: Relationship of mean scores between schools that held academic clinics and those that did not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does school academics hold clinics</th>
<th>What were your KC.P.E. mean scores in 2013</th>
<th>What were your KC.P.E. mean scores in 2012</th>
<th>What were your KC.P.E. mean scores in 2011</th>
<th>What were your KC.P.E. mean scores in 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mean 239.6578</td>
<td>242.8644</td>
<td>226.8067</td>
<td>226.3233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std 42.45206</td>
<td>33.64148</td>
<td>41.64025</td>
<td>46.95625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum 188.04</td>
<td>209.58</td>
<td>167.47</td>
<td>168.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 325.89</td>
<td>293.76</td>
<td>300.77</td>
<td>315.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mean 195.0350</td>
<td>196.8600</td>
<td>216.5000</td>
<td>224.7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std 12.77742</td>
<td>23.84364</td>
<td>7.77817</td>
<td>22.99511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum 186.00</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>211.00</td>
<td>208.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 204.07</td>
<td>213.72</td>
<td>222.00</td>
<td>241.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean 231.5445</td>
<td>234.5000</td>
<td>224.9327</td>
<td>226.0355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std 42.23624</td>
<td>36.17420</td>
<td>37.55743</td>
<td>42.62862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum 186.00</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>167.47</td>
<td>168.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 325.89</td>
<td>293.76</td>
<td>300.77</td>
<td>315.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20 shows the statistics on mean scores for K.C.P.E results from the year 2010 to 2013 in comparison to whether the schools held academic clinics or not. It was evident that schools which held academic clinics had higher mean scores than those schools which did not hold academic clinics. This is an indicator that instructional supervision of learners' progress through academic clinics had a positive impact on their performance. However to test whether the difference was
statistically significant an analysis of the variance was carried out. Table 4.21 shows the results of the analysis of the variance.

Table 4.21: Statistical significance of differences in mean scores of schools that held academic clinics and those that did not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What were your K.C.P.E scores in 2013? Does your school hold academic clinics?</td>
<td>3258.315</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3258.315</td>
<td>2.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were your K.C.P.E scores in 2012? Does your school hold academic clinics?</td>
<td>14580.683</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1620.076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17838.997</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were your K.C.P.E scores in 2011? Does your school hold academic clinics?</td>
<td>3463.215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3463.215</td>
<td>3.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9622.511</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1069.168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13085.725</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were your K.C.P.E scores in 2010? Does your school hold academic clinics?</td>
<td>173.827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>173.827</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13931.783</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1547.976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14105.609</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were your K.C.P.E. means scores in 2010? Does your school hold academic clinics?</td>
<td>4.102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.102</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data from table 4.21 shows that the analysis of variance gave a P-value that was greater than the level of significance which is 0.05 in all the sampled years. This implies that there was no statistically significant relationship between supervision through academic clinics and the means scores for pupils for the years 2010 - 2013.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations generated from the research findings of the study.

The purpose of the study was to look into head teachers instructional supervision and its impact on performance of K.C.P.E. A case of Kiritiri Division, Mbeere South District, Embu County, Kenya.

The study was guided by the following five objectives; to determine head teachers level of effectiveness in carrying out instructional supervision in areas of instructional strategies, learners progress, human resource and instructional programmes, to establish the nature of supervisor – supervisee relationship that head teachers adopt as they carry out supervision, to determine the support that head teachers receive from the Department of Quality Assurance in the District in carrying out the instructional supervision duties, to establish teachers views with regard to instructional supervision and to establish whether head teachers instructional supervision correlates to K.C.P.E. performance. The study was based on the collegial model of instructional supervision. The study Target population comprised of 6574 head teachers, teachers and pupils. Sample size of 164 respondents took part in the study. Data were collected using questionnaires and interview guides and analyzed using frequencies, percentages bar graphs and pie charts. Data were presented in relation to the study’s findings and in line with the study’s objectives.
5.2 Summary of Findings

In line with objective one that stated; To determine head teachers’ level of effectiveness in carrying out instructional supervision in the areas of instructional strategies, learners’ progress, human resource and instructional program. The findings revealed that; head teachers in Kiritiri Division fairly carry out their professional duties in terms of checking of teachers schemes of work, lesson plans and records of work covered. However, there was need for the head teachers to scale up their checking of lesson plans and records of work covered. The study also came up with the findings that head teachers do make class visits and walk rounds and majority held discussions of their observations after class visits although a significant number of head teachers just kept the observations to themselves. Many teachers responded that the rate of syllabus implementation in the schools was not effective. The study also came up with the findings that schools in Kiritiri Division lacked adequate instructional materials and that most schools in the Division had inculcated a suitable learning environment. However, although the findings are indicative of head teachers who carry out instructional supervision fairly effectively in the area of instructional strategies, the performance of their schools in the K.C.P.E. is below average.

The analysis of whether head teachers effectively carried out instructional supervision in the area of learners’ progress. The study came up with the findings that majority of the learners in Kiritiri Division were given assignments and the assignments were marked. Approximately slightly more than half of the schools offered C.A.Ts while slightly less than half of the schools either rarely offered
C.A.T.s or did not offer them at all. The analysis also found out that about half of the schools held academic clinics.

On the extent to which head teachers offered instructional supervision in the area of human resource; the study came up with the findings that head teachers were effective in providing assistance and support to teaching and learning, improving the school system and maintaining a good relationship between the schools and the stakeholders but most schools were found as not being effective in encouraging a nurturing system among teachers, support staff and pupils. On the area of time keeping, pupils interviewed responded that their teachers were not consistently punctual.

The analysis of the extent to which head teachers supervised instructional programmes came up with contradictory findings in that although most head teachers rated themselves poorly in their monitoring of instructional programmes, most teachers rated most head teachers in the Division as doing a good job of monitoring instructional programmes. With regard to objective two that stated; To establish the nature of supervisor – supervisee relationship that head teachers adopt as they carryout supervision.

The study sought to find out term(s) head teachers and teachers used to describe their schools' working environment. It also sought to find out from the teachers the most appropriate term(s) they could use to describe their head teachers' style in carrying out instructional supervisory duties. The analyses came up with the findings that half of both head teachers and teachers considered their school working environment as being conducive and friendly to teachers and learners. More than a
quarter of head teachers and about a quarter of teachers described the working environment in their schools as being friendly or good, majority of teachers described their head teachers' style in carrying out instructional supervision as one who initiates actions and constantly seeks others opinions. In general, the analysis indicated that most schools in Kiritiri division exhibit a conducive working environment and the head teachers are shown as being democratic and collaborative as they carry out instructional supervision. However, even with the above positive findings the performance of schools in Kiritiri Division is still below average.

With regard to objective three that stated; To determine the support that head teachers receive from the Department of Quality Assurance in the District in carrying out the instructional supervision duties; the study came up with the following findings. Most head teachers and teachers had either attended a seminar, a workshop or a conference that related to learning and teaching in the ongoing year. The seminar/conference or workshop the head teachers had attended were organized by either the D.E.O. or KEPSHA while those that teachers had attended were mostly organized by the area MP and a few by the A.E.O. or the D.E.O. The study also found out that the Quality Assurance and Standards officers rarely visited schools and if they paid visits it was either once or twice per term. Most head teachers interviewed described the department as just being fairy supportive. In general the study came up with the findings that the Department of Quality Assurance and Standards in the district did not offer as much support to the head teachers as it is expected of them.

Objective four in the study stated; to establish teachers views with regard to instructional supervision. Contrary to the long held belief that most teachers hold a
negative attitude towards instructional supervision, the study came up with the findings that, most teachers interviewed viewed instructional supervision as necessary and that it helps improve standards.

In line with objective five of the study that stated; to establish whether head teachers’ instructional supervision correlates with his/her schools K.C.P.E performance; the study made the following findings.

To compare whether a head teacher’s instructional supervision correlates to his/her schools performance, the study compared the KCPE performance of schools that held academic clinics with those that did not in the period between 2010 and 2013. It was found out that those schools that held academic clinics consistently produced higher mean scores in all the indicated years than those that did not hold academic meetings. However, on carrying out an analysis of variance the study found out a modest correlation, which was not significant enough to show that schools that hold academic clinics produce higher results in K.C.P.E.

5.3 Conclusions

The following section draws conclusions from the analysis of the research findings. The conclusions are organized in sub-sections with each sub-section reflecting each of the study’s research questions.

- Head teachers in Kiritiri Division, Mbeere South District, Embu County effectively carry out instructional supervision in some areas that relate to instructional strategies. That is, they check teachers’ schemes of work and lesson plans, they make class visits and walk rounds and provide appropriate feedback and they also create a suitable learning environment. However, they do not


frequently check teachers’ records of work covered. They did not effectively
effect syllabus implementation in their schools and they did not acquire adequate
instructional materials for their schools. The head teachers supervised their
learners’ progress in that most schools offered assignments, CATs and half of
the schools held academic clinics. The head teachers in Kiritiri Division were
fairly effective in offering support to the human resource in their schools.
However, they were in effective in encouraging a nurturing system among the
teachers, support staff and pupils. The head teachers did not effectively monitor
instructional programmes.

- Most head teachers were collaborative in how they carried out their supervisory
duties. They did so by being democratic in their supervisory style and providing
a conducive working environment in the schools.

- The department of Quality Assurance and standards in Mbeere South District did
not offer adequate support to the head teachers as they carry out instructional
supervision.

- Teachers’ attitude towards instructional supervision is gradually changing. This
is because most teachers interviewed viewed instructional supervision as being
necessary and that it helps improve standards in education.

- Based on the findings of the study’s fifth research question which sought to
establish whether head teachers’ instructional supervision correlates to K.C.P.E.
performance, the study carried out a comparison of KCPE performance of
schools that regularly hold academic clinics with those which do not hold
academic clinics over a period of five years. The relationship between schools’
holding of academic clinics and the schools’ K.C.P.E. performance although
statistically significant showed quite a modest correlation. We can therefore
conclude that a combination of many other variables in a school all take part in influencing a school's K.C.P.E. Performance.

5.4 Recommendations

From the findings and conclusions of the study, the researcher came up with the following recommendations;

5.4.1 Practice Recommendations

1. Head teachers should scale up instructional supervision in all areas of instructional strategies that were revealed as not being effectively supervised. They should also be more aware of their learners' progress and enhance their supervision of this area.

2. There is need for the Departments of Quality Assurance and Standards to offer more support to the schools. Their officers should make visits to the schools more often. They also should offer more capacity building activities for both teachers and head teachers.

3. Since majority of the teachers interviewed saw instructional supervision as being necessary and that it helps improve standards of education, the head teachers should take advantage of that positive attitude in the teachers and entrench effective instructional supervision in their schools.
5.4.2 Policy Recommendations

1. The government through the Ministry of Education should allocate more funds to schools for the provision of instructional materials.

2. The government should come up with strict control measures to ensure that funds provided to schools are not mismanaged but are used for the intended purpose.

3. The Ministry of Education should see to it that the department of quality assurance and standards effectively implement their mandate of monitoring schools as stipulated in the education Act of the laws of Kenya.

5.4.3 Recommendations for Further Research

1. The study needs to be replicated in other Divisions in Embu County in order to compare the findings.

2. Studies should be carried out to investigate the influence of poverty and literacy levels among parents on academic performance in Kiritiri Division of Embu County.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

TEACHER’S QUESTIONNAIRE

One of the many tasks that a head teacher carries out in a school is monitoring teaching and learning i.e. instructional supervision. Many educationists are of the opinion that effective instructional supervision greatly influences the quality of education offered in a school.

The researcher seeks to look into how instructional supervision is carried out in your school. The researcher therefore submits her request for you to assist her gather information by filling in the below questionnaire. You are assured that, the information that you will provide will be treated with maximum confidentiality and that, the information is for the purpose of her Masters in Education Study only.

1. Supervision of instructions is an administrative activity that a head teacher carries out so as to ensure that quality education is offered in his/her school. To do so he ensures proper formulation and implementation of professional records such as schemes of work and lesson plans

Kindly tick the number of times your professional records are checked in a term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>More than once</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Schemes of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Records of work covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Class register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How many staff meetings in the ongoing term have you held to plan on how to improve pupils' performance?

Two  □  None  □
One □  More than two □

3. Does your head teacher make class visits walk around to observe the syllabus implementation?

4. If your headteacher makes the mentioned class visits, what follow up action does he/she take?

   - Gives a written report of his observation to the concerned teacher □
   - Discusses his observation with the teacher so as to come up with improvement strategies □
   - Keeps the observations findings to himself □
   - None of the above □

5. How often in a month does the head teacher carry out the class visits?

   - Once □
   - Never visits □
   - Twice / thrice □
6. From your experience how thorough is your head teacher in carrying the following supervisory duties?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Duties</th>
<th>Very thorough</th>
<th>thorough</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring lessons are attended and missed lessons are made up for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring adherence to prescribed lesson time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring there is a timeframe within which teachers mark examinations and give the pupils feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that teachers observe punctuality in reporting to school and in attending lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Does your school have a syllabus coverage policy? ..........................................................

8. If it has a syllabus coverage policy, kindly write it down ..........................................................

9. In your opinion how effective is your head teacher in making sure that the syllabus coverage policy is implemented?

   Very effective  □  Effective  □  Ineffective  □

10. How often does the head teacher check pupils’ books to verify the syllabus coverage?

    Monthly  □  Once in a term  □  At the end of the year  □  I don’t know  □
11. Does your school have subject panels? ..............................................

12. How often do the subject panels meet to strategize on their subject improvement?
   Once per year □ Once per term □ They never hold meetings □

13. Kindly rate the following evaluation methods as offered in your school in a term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No offered</th>
<th>Rarely offered</th>
<th>Frequently offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A.Ts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Does your school hold academic clinics? ............................................... if so how often?

15. Kindly rate your head teacher as far as monitoring of the following is concerned;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils academic progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategies i.e. schemes of work, lesson plans, class visits e.t.c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of instructional materials such as text books.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional programmes e.g. SMASSE, life skills etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. How effective do you find your head teacher to be in carrying out the following supervisory duties?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>effective</th>
<th>A little effective</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance and support to teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the school system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining good relationship between the school and its stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the timetable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. What term/terms can you use to describe your head teachers style in carrying out supervisory duties?

- Hands off furnishes leadership when asked to
- Issues orders and expects them to be followed and dominates the thinking of others
- Initiates action and constantly seeks the opinion of colleagues
- None of the above

18. What motivational activities does your school engage in so as to encourage both teachers and pupils to achieve their potential? (Write them down)
19. In your opinion to what extent has your school established and maintained a suitable learning environment in the areas names below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suitable classroom routines and standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean, orderly, safe classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good work behavior e.g. punctuality &amp; respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. In your opinion how much of instructional materials such as text books does your school have?

Adequate □ In adequate □

21. How is the selection of instructional materials carried out in your school?

- All the teachers are involved □
- The head teacher does it alone □
- The head teacher together with a few teachers decides on the resources to procure □
- I don’t know □

22. How often do the officers from the quality Assurance and Standards department in the Division visit your school?

- Rarely □
- Once/twice in a term □
- Once in an year □
- Only when there is an issue that demands their attention □
23. In the course of this year, have you attended any work related seminar, workshop or conference?

24. Who were the organizers of the seminar, workshop or conference?

25. How supportive are the teachers in your school to the head teacher as he/she carries out instructional supervision?
   - Very supportive
   - Supportive
   - They are ambivalent about supervision
   - Not supportive

26. What term/terms can you use to describe the working environment in your school? (Kindly write the down)

27. What are your views as far as supervision of teaching and learning is concerned.
   - Unnecessary
   - A fault finding exercise
   - Helps improve standards
   - Others
APPENDIX II

HEAD TEACHER'S INTERVIEW GUIDE

One of the instructional supervisory duties that head teachers' carries out is to ensure proper formulation and implementation of professional records such as schemes of work and lesson plans. Kindly tell me the number of times you check or have the teachers professional records checked in a term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>More than once</th>
<th>Any other answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schemes of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records of work covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How many staff meetings in the ongoing term have you held to plan on how to improve pupils' performance.

   Two  □  One  □  
   None □  More than two □

2. Do you make class visits or walk rounds to observe the syllabus implementation?

3. In a months period how often do you carry out the class visits or walk rounds?

   Once  □  Never visit □
   Twice/thrice □  Any other answer □
4. After making the class visit what follow up action do you take?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives a written report of the observation to the concerned teacher</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses with the concerned teacher so as to come up with improvement strategies</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the observations for future reference for instance for use when carrying out performance analysis</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other answer</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Kindly gauge yourself as far as carrying out of the following supervisory duties is concerned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Duty</th>
<th>Very through</th>
<th>Through</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring maximum attendance of lessons and making up of missed lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring adherence to prescribed lesson time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring there is a deadline for exam marking and that the deadline is observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring punctuality of both teachers and pupils in reporting to school and attending lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Does your school has a syllabus coverage policy? ..................................................
7. If it has a syllabus coverage policy, what does it state

8. Kindly rate your school as far as implementation of the syllabus coverage is concerned
   - Very effective
   - Effective
   - Ineffective

9. How often do you check pupils' books to verify the syllabus coverage?
   - Monthly
   - Once in a term
   - At the end of the year
   - Never

10. Does your school have subject panes?

11. How often do the subject panels meet to strategize on their subjects?
    - Once per year
    - Once per term
    - When reminded to do so
    - They rarely hold meetings

12. Kindly rate the following evaluation methods as offered in your school in a term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Not offered</th>
<th>Rarely offered</th>
<th>Frequently offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A.T's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Does your school hold academic clinics? if so, how often?
14. Kindly rate your monitoring of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils’ academic progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional strategies i.e. schemes of work, lesson plans,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class visit etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision and maintenance of instructional materials such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text books.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional programmes e.g. SMASSE, life skills. Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What motivational activities does your school engage in so as to encourage both teachers and pupils to achieve their potential? ..................................................

16. In your opinion to what extent has your school established and maintained a suitable learning environment in the areas named below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suitable classroom routines and standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean, orderly and safe classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good work behavior e.g. punctuality, respect, pupils discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. In your opinion how much of instructional materials such as textbooks does your school have?

Adequate ☐ Inadequate ☐

18. Explain how selection of instructional materials is carried out in your school?

........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
19. In the course of this year have you attended any work related seminar, workshop or conference?

20. Who were the organizers of the seminar, workshop or conference?

21. How often do the officers of the Quality Assurance and Standards Department in the Division visit your school?
   - Rarely
   - Once/twice in a term
   - Once in a year
   - Only when there is an issue that calls for their attention

22. How supportive do you consider the Quality Assurance and Standards office in the District to be?
   - Not supportive
   - Fairly supportive
   - Very supportive

23. From your observation, kindly state the views teachers in your school hold as far as instructional supervision in concerned?

24. What were your KCPE mean scores in the years mentioned below?
   - 2013
   - 2012
   - 2011
   - 2010

25. What term/terms can you use to describe the working environment in your school? (Kindly state)
APPENDIX III

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR THE PUPILS

1. In the last two weeks have you been given assignments? .................................................................

2. In which subjects have you been given assignments? .................................................................

3. Were the assignments marked? .................................................................................................

4. In the case of an assignment that was unsatisfactory done did the teacher concerned follow up? .................................................................................................

5. Do you have enough text books? ............................................................................................

6. On average, a book is shared by how many pupils? .................................................................

7. What activities do you do during the free time such as after lunch or after the last lesson of the day before 5:00 p.m. .................................................................................................

8. Do your teachers hold meetings with your parents to discuss your performance? ................................................................. How often do they do so? .................................................................

9. Do your teachers give you class tests for example after completing a unit? .................................

10. Do all of your teachers give such tests or some do while others don’t? .................................................................

11. During the on going term have had any education officer visit the school? ................................. Did he/she visit any class? ................................................................. Did he talk to pupils? .................................................................
12. What is your observation on time keeping? Do most pupils arrive at school punctually? After the breaks and after lunch is punctuality observed in your school?

13. How punctual are your teachers in arriving at school and attending classes?

14. Does your head teacher check your exercise books?

15. During this term has he/she checked any of your exercise books?

16. Do you see your head teacher going around the classes observing how you are learning?

17. How many examinations have you sat for during this term?

18. Did the teachers analyze the results with you? Were your parents informed of the results?

19. How disciplined do you consider your school to be?

20. In the past two weeks has your head teacher talked to you about working hard at school work and maintaining high standards of discipline?
## APPENDIX IV

### WORK PROTOCOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument and piloting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May - July
June
Aug - Sept
APPENDIX V

BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Ksh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial expenses</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft project</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final project</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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