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ABSTRACT

The concern of guaranteeing quality education provision in educational institutions has aroused scholarly interests globally. In Kenya, with the creation of the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (DQAS) whose mandate is to act as the national custodian of standards and quality of education in basic education, there are concerns on whether instructional supervision of teachers by Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QASOs) has improved their instructional capacity to offer quality education. The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of instructional supervision by QASOs on provision of quality of education in Nairobi and Machakos Counties. The objectives of the study were: to seek the perceptions of teachers on the instructional supervisory competences of QASOs; to assess the instructional supervisory practices exercised by QASOs in schools; to examine the influences of QASOs instructional supervisory practices on the instructional competences of teachers; and to assess the utilization of the QASOs’ recommendations and reports in public secondary schools. The Collegial theory was selected to guide this study. The study adopted ex post facto survey design and employed both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Target population of this study was 1481 (N) persons (365 school principal teachers, 17 SC-QASOs, 2 C-QASOs, 2 N-QASOs and 1095 HOD teachers; from which a sample of 460 (n-31%) respondents comprising of teachers (110 Principal teachers & 329 HOD teachers) and 21 QASOs were drawn. Purposive sampling was used to select the two counties where the study was conducted while stratified and simple random sampling was used to select the schools where the study was conducted. Respondents for the study were selected purposively because of their relevancy to the study. Data were collected using questionnaires and interview schedules. Content validity of the instruments was determined by seeking expert judgment from specialist in educational management. Reliability of the research instruments was ascertained through Cronbach technique. Qualitative data was analyzed thematically and presented via narration and verbatim while quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages and means and presented using figures, tables and charts. The major finding of this study was that effectiveness of QASOs in teachers’ instructional supervision was found to be inadequate. Specifically, the study established that teachers perceived QASOs as having partial technical and conceptual competences; they don’t do sufficient preparations for conducting instructional supervision in schools and spend most of the time for instructional supervision checking teachers’ professional records; they are unable to adequately enhance teachers’ pedagogy and instructional material utilization competences; and have not spearheaded optimal utilization of their instructional supervision recommendations and reports to enhance provision of quality education. The study recommends that: QASOs should be taken through intensive training in technical subject areas related to their areas of specialization; instructional supervision of schools should always be based on previous recommendations and reports; and QASOs instructional supervision findings should always inform agenda for QASOs’ organized teachers’ seminars and workshops.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This study evaluated the effectiveness of the instructional supervision by Quality Assurance Officers on quality of education in secondary schools in Nairobi and Machakos County. This chapter comprises of: the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose, objectives, significance, limitations and delimitation of the study. The chapter also presents the theoretical framework, conceptual framework and operational definition of terms.

1.1 Background to the Study

According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2000), quality of education is the degree to which education can be said to be of high standard, satisfies basic learning needs, and enriches the lives of learners and their overall experience of living. The contribution of quality education to improving people’s lives and reducing poverty has been summarized in four ways: helping people to become more productive and earn more; improving health and nutrition; enriching lives directly; and, promoting social cohesion and giving more people better opportunities (World Bank, 1999).

The concern for the provision of quality education is apparent in the international and national front. Internationally, the World Bank, UNESCO, and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), have heavily invested in the provision of quality education in the view to seeing their investments being translated into

Indeed, it has been observed that the United Nations efforts pursuant to the world’s concern about the quality of education offered in the 21st Century came up with the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) number four of ‘Ensuring Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education” focusing more on quality of education offered where all Nations worldwide committed themselves to put in place a set of actions that would improve the quality of education. In Kenya, focusing on the effectiveness of the instructional supervisors in the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (DQAS) in delivering their mandate of ensuring that there is quality education provision in educational institutions is a timely move.

Effective instructional supervision of teachers enhances provision of quality education (Aaronson et al., 2007; Servet, 2011; UNESCO, 2012) because it nurtures instructional competences of teachers by enhancing their capacity to offer quality education (Starratt, 2007; Kain, 2005; UNESCO, 2006). Ginsberg (2003) and Card (2006) revealed that indicators of effective instructional supervision in a school-set-up are: instructional supervisory skills; human relations, technical and conceptual of the instructional supervisors; effectiveness of the instructional supervisory practices by the instructional supervisors; and extent of the utilization of the schools’ instructional supervisory reports and recommendations by the various stakeholders in the schools. It is therefore presumed that where effective
instructional supervision manifest itself, instructional competences of teachers is enhanced towards providing quality education.

According to Tyagi (2011), Starrat & Sergiovanni (2007) and Ormond (2004), indicators of quality education provision in schools are; improved pedagogical skills as manifested by teachers while teaching, optimal utilization of available instructional materials by teachers while teaching and improved internal assessments of learners. This implies that for quality education to be offered, the teachers need to have sufficient instructional competences that should be cumulatively gained through effective instructional supervision by instructional supervisors.

UNESCO (2006) observes that the challenges of achieving quality education in schools are related to un-focused training of teachers through instructional supervision. Aaronson (2007) concurs by revealing that it is very difficult to predict how good a teacher will be without observing him in a classroom situation; paper qualifications and personal characteristics reveal very little; gender, race, experience, undergraduate university attended, advanced degrees, teacher certification and tenure explain less than 8% of the teacher quality, while effective instructional supervision of teachers contributes 92% as a means of increasing propensity towards teachers offering quality education. Servet (2011) observes that competent instructional supervisors are the ones who are responsible for the quality of teachers, and therefore, that of education.
Various studies have found that effective instructional supervision has a clear connection with quality of education offered in learning institutions because it addresses teachers’ instructional professional development (Pajak & Arrington, 2004; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007 & Zepeda, 2007). In particular, effective instructional supervision improves teachers by helping them to reflect on their practices, to learn more about what they do (facilitate learning) and why (impact knowledge, skills and attitudes), and how best it can be done. Sergiovanni & Starratt,(2007). Ormond (2004) and Tyagi (2010) summarize effective instructional supervision as that which enables the teachers to offer quality education via: quality pedagogical method teachers; effective and efficient utilisation of available educational instructional materials; improvement in preparation, keeping and utilisation of teachers’ professional records; and improved assessment and evaluation of students. In this regard, effective instructional supervision by education quality assurance should help the teachers adopt best pedagogical practices, empower them with skills of utilization of instructional materials as well impact knowledge of conducting effective assessment of the learners.

Further, research has established that, to improve on the pedagogical skills of the teachers, instructional supervisors should focus on the key variables of of pedagogical skills instruction as has been identified by numerous studies, thus: intellectual student engagement or participation during delivery of instruction (Christenson, Sinclair, Lehr, & Godber, 2001; Elmore et al., 1990); clarity of instruction to enhance students understanding via providing concrete examples and
definitions, and speaking fluently (chesebro, 2002); teacher personality in terms of warmth, enthusiasm, inspiration, caring as well as persistent encouragement of students to do their best (Desimone, Smith, & Frisvold, 2009; Wentzel, 1997); and, academic demand in terms of the teachers giving realistic assignments, tasks and activities based on the entry behavior of the learners (Middleton & Midgely, 2002; Shouse, 1996).

However, Zachariah (2013) observes that for instructional supervisors to be effective in their interactions with teachers, they need to exhibit major desirable instructional supervisory competences of conducting instructional supervision practices such as; knowledge about public relations, ability to lead by example, high integrity, and competence in teaching subjects or technical competences. Stressing on the importance of the teachers instructional supervisors exhibiting desirable instructional supervisory competences, Kutsyuruba, (2003), Sergiovanni & Starratt, (2007) and Zepeda, (2007) note that, the perceptions of teachers towards instructional supervisory competences of instructional supervisors depends largely on availability of supervisory choices based on teachers’ instructional needs (technical competences), a harmonious teacher-supervisor relationship and as well as mutual trust, respect and collaboration among supervisees and supervisors. In this regard therefore effective instructional supervisory practices conducted by instructional supervisors in schools can be assessed using the yard stick of teachers’ perceptions towards instructional supervisors’ competences of conducting instructional supervision, how actual the
instruction supervision is conducted in a school and whether or not it improves the teachers’ instructional abilities to offer quality education.

1.1.1 Global Situation of Instructional Supervision for Quality Education

It has been observed from the global front that the challenges of achieving quality education have not fully focused on training teachers through effective instructional supervisory practices (UNESCO, 2006). However, there is a large body of research work on how important teachers are in enhancing quality education provision and the academic outcomes of their pupils (Rockoff, 2004). Indeed, it has been proven that teachers are the most important factor within schools that policy makers can directly affect to improve student’s achievements (Rivkin, Hanushek and Kain, 2005).

Colasacco, (2011) observes that, there is a consensus among policymakers, researchers, and educational practitioners that the single most important factor contributing to student learning is the quality of teaching as exercised by teachers. Consequently, there is positive relationship between effective instructional supervision of teachers which adds value to the instructional competences of teachers and learners academic achievements. According to Baker (2010), there is consensus in United States that there is need to improve overall student achievement by successfully helping teachers to fulfill their role through effective instructional supervision of teachers and evaluation systems that inform teacher professional development and improve instruction. Consequently, implementation of effective instructional supervisory practices is fundamental in empowering
teacher’s instructional capacities. Indeed, in another study in United Kingdom, it is reported that improving the instructional competences of teachers would have a major impact on the quality of education offered and ultimately the performance of the country’s schools (Sulton, 2011), and that the “difference between a very effective teacher and a poorly performing teacher is large … such that during one year with a very effective maths teacher, pupils gain 40% more in their learning than they would with a poorly performing maths teacher” (ibid, 2).

To improve teacher instructional effectiveness in New York State, the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) regulations, requires a minimum of 31% of a teacher’s end-of-year evaluation to be based on multiple classroom observations (New York State Education Department, August 2012) which is supposed to be a base for providing teachers with constructive feedback towards improving their instructional competences in the areas of pedagogy, instructional materials utilization, and pupils’ evaluation and assessment. However, in a study conducted by Romano (2014), it emerged that one of the most frequent complaints from teachers in respect to the processes of the pre-observation, observation, and post-observation (feedback) cycle, is that it does not help them improve their quality of teaching. This could be an indicator that there are certain weaknesses in these processes. Richard & William (2001) found that poor skills related to instructional supervisor’s effectiveness in conducting conferences in terms of social-emotional and interpersonal communication could lead to the conferences being none productive in teacher instructional improvement and at its worst
interfere with future observations productivity because teachers might form negative perceptions towards being observed in the classroom set-up.

Similarly, in a study conducted in Turkey to explore the external instructional supervisory process from the standpoint of English Language Teachers (Kayaoglu, 2012), it was established that external educational instructional supervisory process did not add any pedagogical or professional value to teachers, mainly because of the manner in which the external instructional supervisory process was conducted in learning institutions. This observation is in tandem with the study findings in another study in Bangladesh schools (Govinda & Tapan 1999), where it was observed that traditional instructional supervision as a means of improving quality education in schools focused on teachers and their performance with little regards to supporting the teachers. The study recommended that there was need for the teacher instructional supervision to focus on supporting the teachers and adopting a participatory approach in supervision where the supervisor directly gets involved in the classroom teaching.

Daresh and Playko, (2002), concurs with these sentiments in a research conducted in Boston on how “professional instructional supervision” of teachers impacted on curriculum implementation in schools. The study reveals that “professional supervision” done in areas of checking on lesson plans, schemes of work, registers and other administrative documents had positive impact in academic performance of pupils. It is in this light of state of affairs that the study sought to investigate whether instructional supervision as exercised by Quality Assurance and Standards
officers (QASOs) has improved the instructional competences of teachers and therefore improved the quality of education in the secondary schools of Nairobi and Machakos Counties.

In African countries, the concern about the quality of education being offered in schools is on the rise because of the growing public perception that educational quality is being compromised in the effort to expand enrollment (Materu, 2007) and the implication of this is that the process of instructional supervision would be compromised which is critical to quality education provision. It is further observed that structured national-level quality assurance processes in African educational institutions are a very recent phenomenon and that most countries face capacity constraints in cost and human capacity requirements (ibid, 4). A study by Ahmed, & Clark (2004) on how training influenced supervisors’ performance in their roles in Lusaka, Zambia revealed that qualification of supervisors had positive correlation with their performance. Hence, effective instructional supervision of teachers would require that the instructional supervisors to possess the requisite competences for conducting the instructional supervision practices to enhance quality education provision in schools.

To improve on the instructional productivity of teachers and enhance the quality of education offered in schools, Akinwumi (2002) established that effective external instructional supervision processes had a greater impact on teachers’ pedagogic productivity in private secondary schools in rural areas of Oyo State in Nigeria, meaning that teachers benefit from effective instructional supervisory practices. Findings
from the study of private schools where instructional supervision was consistently and professionally conducted revealed that the role of inspectors of education is much needed especially in the rural areas. However, this study focused on instructional supervision by QASOs in public schools in both urban and rural set-up.

It is clear that all efforts directed towards the provision of quality education must be sensitive to ensuring that professional instructional supervision of teachers is being exercised via effective instructional supervision practices by QASOs who are competent and keen to empower the teachers with instructional competences.

1.1.2 Kenyan Perspective on Quality Education Provision

In Kenya, the history of instructional supervision to enhance quality of education provision dates back to 1910 when the colonial government appointed the first Director of Education whose duties among others was to “inspect” and “supervise” the provision of quality education service. Since 1910, numerous reforms and innovations have been put in place towards guaranteeing quality education provision. The rationale for enhancement for provision of quality education access through instructional supervision has been one of the major undertakings by the government since independence because education has always been seen as the only means for achieving development (Republic of Kenya, 2005; UNESCO, 2012).

Currently, investment in quality education provision is captured in the Vision 2030; the latest Kenyan developmental blueprint covering the period 2008 to 2030.
In this blueprint, it is envisaged that investment in quality education will significantly enhance the transformation of Kenya into a newly industrialized, “middle-income country providing a high quality life to all its citizens by the year 2030” (Vision 2030; 2008:15). This means that quality education provision is a key driver to this agenda and hence it matters on how instructional supervision enhances realization of quality education.

However, it has been noted that education instructional supervision reforms often fail to achieve desired outcomes due to ineffective and inefficient implementation (Rep. of Kenya, 1988, 1999). This has led to calls for the strengthening of the personnel mandated with the instructional supervision of teachers, particularly in improving the knowledge, skills and attitudes of the officers who carry out the role of instructional supervision of educational institutions (Milcah, Chisikwa & Odwar, 2010). It has also been rightly observed that the necessity of effective and efficient Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (DQAS) in Kenya’s education sector is becoming manifest because of the rapidly increasing transition rates from primary to secondary schools which has impacted negatively on the quality of education in the public secondary schools (Republic of Kenya, 2008).

The efforts by the government towards expanding access to education for all children have included granting free and compulsory basic education as explicitly captured by the constitution (Republic of Kenya, 2010) and further defined by the Acts of parliament (Children’s Act 2001, Part 2 and Basic Education Act 2013). With these legislations in place, the government and the people of Kenya have had
to deliberately invest heavily in education and training to improve access, equity, quality and relevance (Republic of Kenya, National Development Plan 2002-2008).

The most recent report on the status of quality education provision in Kenya “task force on the re-alignment of the education sector to the constitution of Kenya 2010” authoritatively reported that: In spite of the pivotal role DQAS can play in improving the quality, management, provision and output, the Task Force found that this role was weak and ineffective and subjected to severe resource constraints. To maintain standards effectively requires regular institutional visits by trained and well resourced specialists. The challenge in Kenya remains that of addressing the need for an effective and adequately financed sustainable DQAS and support service to teachers and all learning institutions (Republic of Kenya, 2010:46). If this challenge was resolved, this would then have a positive correlation with quality education since the process of supervision would be done effectively

The task force recommended for the establishment of the Educational Standards and Quality Assurance Council (ESQAC) as a semi-autonomous agency whose mandate is to act as a national custodian of standards and quality in education. Educationists have pointed out that “quality of education is the second challenge (after access) facing Kenya education system as evidenced by declining performance, cheating in examinations, shortage of key teaching inputs, and inadequate supervision” (Kilemi, 2010, p.27,29). This is an indication that there is need to assess the effectiveness of the instructional supervision functions of the body charged with education standards and quality assurance in Kenya.
Further, key government documents such as the Master Plan on Education and Training (MPET) for the period 1997-2010 (Republic of Kenya, 2007) and the National Development Plan for the period 2002-2008 on effective management for sustained growth and poverty reduction (Republic of Kenya, 2002), also recognized that despite the major strides made in education and training, challenges of instructional competences of teachers, quality of education offered and relevance of education still persists in the education system. Hence, the researcher wanted to check whether instructional supervision of teachers as exercised by QASOs has had any positive influence on instructional competences of teachers and by extension the quality education offered in schools.

Indeed, the National Development Plan (2002-2008) envisaged that, quality assurance was to be achieved through supervision of educational institutions and reporting this to institutions, Ministry of Education and other stakeholders for appropriate action (Republic of Kenya, 2002:62). However, it is not clear whether these supervisions have been professionally, effectively and persistently conducted, and if the MoEST and other stakeholders have utilized the instructional supervision recommendations and reports effectively as to help in mainstreaming efforts towards uplifting the quality and standards of education.

In a study conducted in Narok County, it was established that “most of the recommendations of supervision reports by the QASOs are never implemented by the teachers”, consequently even “schools that had the highest supervisions experienced only slight improvement in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) results” (Manoti, 2004:74). Indeed, according to the Institute of Policy
Analysis and Research (IPAR), there is no evidence that reports of school supervisions are used to improve performance and therefore, school supervisions by the QASOs are largely ineffective in facilitating formulation of policy guidelines that can go a long way in enhancing quality assurance in curriculum delivery in schools (IPAR 2008:7). These findings are similar to another study by Kamindo (2008) on instructional supervision, where the study found that the actual instructional supervision performance of QASOs does not meet the teachers and head teacher’s expectations, and “that supervisors (QASOs) perform more evaluative/assessment functions than supportive/advisory functions” (Kamindo, 2008:277).

The implications of QASOs not being able to meet the instructional needs of head teachers who are essentially the key internal instructional supervisors in their schools means that, the internal instructional supervision of teachers is not conducted effectively, hence, Flora, (2014) in a study conducted in the public secondary schools of Nakuru Municipality on the effectiveness of Principal teachers competences to conduct instructional supervision in their schools found that all principal teachers used poor methods of conducting instructional supervision in their schools and thus the instructional supervision that was being exercised had no significant influence on school performance in national examinations. This implies it’s in doubt as to whether the instructional Supervisors (QASOs) have not sufficiently impacted knowledge and skills of instructional supervision to the school-based instructional supervisors (School Principal and Heads of department teachers)
In a study conducted by Kiamba (2011) on obstacles to effective instructional supervision in public schools in Mbooni division in Machakos county, it was established that QASOs supervision work was hindered by factors such as; inadequate implementation of their instructional supervision reports and recommendation, teachers taking QASOs’ instructional supervision as an interference and teachers preparing only when they were aware that they were to be supervised. This scenario raises a lot of doubt not only on the instructional competences of QASOs as perceived by teachers and consequently how they conduct instructional supervisory practices in schools but also on whether utilization of QASOs’ instructional supervision reports and recommendations in schools has had any positive effects on improving the quality of education offered. Similarly, Awuor (2007) in a study conducted in Nairobi County public secondary schools found that the instructional supervisory practices conducted by QASOs’ personnel had professional inadequacies and were not optimal therefore raising the question of the perceptions that teachers have towards QASOs instructional competences and whether the instructional supervision of teachers by QASOs improves teachers’ instructional competences and ultimately quality of education offered in schools.

Indeed, one of the criticisms of quality assurance systems all over the world has been that quality assurance systems are complicated and costly for educational institutions to implement and that the time and money spent on quality assurance would be better be spent directly targeting factors that affect quality in educational institutions such improving salaries of teachers, improving libraries and facilities
(Stephanie, 2009). Thus, the concern of this study was not only on the instructional supervision competences of QASOs in their supervisory practices but also on how the QASOs supervisory practices affects instructional competences of teachers via enhancing their abilities to offer quality of education. Ultimately, this study attempted to verify whether the existing investment in quality assurance in Kenya has had an improvement on quality of education offered in schools.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Studies from various different parts of the world have demonstrated that effective instructional supervision of teachers translates to enhanced instructional capacity of teachers which leads to improved quality of education and learners’ academic achievements. However, from a global point of view, efforts towards effective instructional supervision have not fully yielded the much envisaged high quality education. In Kenya, despite the establishment of ESQAC which is mandated with the core function of instructional supervision and ensuring maintenance of quality of education is adhered to, there has been an outcry about the declining quality of education which brings about the question of whether the instructional supervision is effective. In the past, stakeholders in education have raised concern about low teaching learning outcomes and whether teachers are effectively supervised. This study therefore sought to determine the perceptions of teachers towards instructional supervision by QASOs, the supervision practices adopted by QASOs and the level to which feedback from QASOs reports are used to improve instruction in effort to maintain quality and standards of education.
1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to establish the effectiveness of the instructional supervision by Quality Assurance and Standards Officers in Nairobi and Machakos County public secondary schools with a view to informing educational practices in Kenya on improving quality of education.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

This study focused on achieving the following objectives:

a) To ascertain the perceptions of teachers towards instructional supervisory competences of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers.

b) To assess the instructional supervisory practices exercised by Quality Assurance and Standards Officers in schools.

c) To examine the influence of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ instructional supervisory practices on the instructional competences of teachers.

d) To assess the utilization of the Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ reports and recommendations in schools.

1.5 Research Questions of the Study

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

a) What perceptions do teachers have towards the Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ instructional supervisory competences?

b) How do the Quality Assurance and Standards Officers conduct instructional supervision in public secondary schools?
c) To what extent do the instructional supervisory practices of the Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ influence the teachers’ instructional competences?

d) To what extent are the reports and recommendations of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ utilized in schools to enhance quality of education in public secondary schools?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study may benefit various stakeholders in the education sector. The MoEST and TSC may find the study relevant because it obtained independent feedback not only from the teachers in the secondary schools but also from QASOs. The feedback is likely to specify how teachers perceive the activities of QASOs in contributing towards the improvement and maintenance of high standards of education. This may be an important feedback for self-evaluation and for further improvement on the task areas of the QASOs in respect to instructional supervision in schools. The findings from this study could be used by the MoEST in enhancing capacity of their staff, improve their induction courses on areas that may be found deficient and inform policy formulation framework in instructional supervision so as to streamline instructional supervisory activities.

Furthermore, this study may bring out the challenges faced by the Quality Assurance and Standards Offices and provide an opportunity to objectively reflect on them so as to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers. This might ultimately lead to high quality and standards of
education in the whole country in line with the Ministry of Education vision of “Quality education for development”.

To the students, parents, guardians and general public, the study may create awareness on the status of how education quality and standards in the public secondary schools are maintained.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

This study was faced with challenge of unwillingness of some respondents to fill the questionnaire or respond to specific items in the questionnaire based on their own unique reasons. The researcher however persistently followed those respondents that were unwillingly or not available to fill the questionnaire until nearly all the questionnaires were returned. Furthermore, some respondents might have not exercised honesty and sincerity when responding to the various items in the research instruments, the effect of this was reduced by having a large sample size. Ultimately, it was difficult for all the respondents to keep to the appointments for interviews as was scheduled and this prolonged the data collection period because the researcher had to make numerous visits to such respondents.

1.8 Delimitation of the Study

Although the mandate of QASOs in terms of quality assurance and standards assessments in schools is broad, this study only focused on instructional supervision process as exercised by the QASOs in the public schools as a guarantee to quality education provision leaving out other areas of their focus and leaving out the private schools, meaning the findings of this study will be
generalized with utmost caution. The study confined itself to the public schools because majority of Kenyan children attend public schools and the government of the day has made policy commitments to provide quality education in these schools. Further, the researcher restricted himself to instructional supervision because it directly or indirectly influences other factors that affect the quality and standards of education like utilization of available human and physical resources in schools.

The teachers who were used in this study included the School Principal and Heads of Department (HOD) teachers of the public secondary because they work hand in hand with QASOs to facilitate quality education provision in their schools. Heads of department teachers used in this study were only in the core departments of Mathematics, Languages, and Sciences. These departments were included because they teach the main externally examined subjects and research has shown that teachers concentrate more on these subject areas (Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development, 2004 and 2005). Lastly, this study restricted itself to external instructional supervision as exercised in schools by QASOs, leaving out internal supervision as carried-out by the Principal and Heads of department teachers of respective schools.

1.9 Research Assumptions

This study was anchored on the following assumptions:

a) The perceptions that teachers have towards Educational Standards and Quality Assurance Personnel determines the quality of instructional
supervision in public secondary schools in Nairobi and Machakos counties.

b) All the QASOs engage in similar instructional supervisory practices in public secondary schools in Nairobi and Machakos counties.

c) That continuous instructional supervision of teachers by QASOs can improve instructional competences of teachers.

d) That effective utilization of QASOs’ instructional supervision reports and recommendations can enhance quality education provision in public secondary schools.

1.10 Theoretical Framework

The Collegial theory of management as expounded by Tony (2007) was selected to guide this study. The Collegial theory explains that management is premised on the notion of shared power within the organization. According to Collegial theory of management, members of an organization engage in discussion in order to reach consensus when making decisions (Tony, 2007).

One major benefit of this theory is the involvement, collaboration and active participation from all stakeholders at all levels concerning them to the welfare of the institution (Tony, 2007). Collegial Theory would require that the key stakeholders involved in ensuring that quality education is provided should embrace and emphasize partnerships. Rue and Byans (1993), affirm that quality assurance and standards should be concerned with encouraging members of a work unit to contribute positively towards accomplishment of goals and objectives of a given organization. In the education sector, Ukeje (1992) observes that
QASOs should foster teamwork so that teachers can appreciate and practice the transition of centrally developed curriculum guidelines into interesting classroom activities, which nurture the initiative and creativity of learners.

Thus, ESQAC should not work in isolation but should actively stimulate team spirit by becoming a team player in putting up quality assurance systems in educational institutions. This can happen when the ESQAC personnel involve all the stakeholders in education towards productive and consistent collaborations at all levels starting from the schools to the MoEST headquarters.

Essentially, this also means that for the QASOs to have positive significant effect on the quality of education provided in the public schools, they should be proactive and be supported by other stakeholders so that its manifest that they have a positive perception about their tasks and further more so that other stakeholders, especially Teachers can have positive perception about them and their tasks. The processes of preparation for conducting instructional supervision, conducting the actual instructional supervision and utilization of supervision reports should constantly be done with the active involvement of all education stakeholders under the leadership of the ESQAC. The collaboration and participation of education stakeholders in activities of quality assurance will not only promote ownership of the various activities but it will also lead to exploitation of diverse innovations for different situations both in time and space, leading to the emergence of the best quality assurance and standards practices that are cost effective for implementation in specific schools or counties and ultimately in the whole nation.
The synergy that comes through active collaboration and participation of all education stakeholders will ensure that all the existing and any emerging challenges affecting QASOs delivery of service both directly or indirectly will be pinpointed accurately and addressed promptly in a cooperative manner. In a nutshell quality education provision in public secondary schools will be progressively be actualised and maintained and this will become manifest through: increased utilisation of education resources; improvement in the quality of teaching; improved curriculum interpretation and implementation; improvement in preparation, keeping and utilisation of teachers professional records; and improved assessment and evaluation of students by the teachers.

1.11 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework presented in figure 1.1 shows the relationship between the independent, intervening and dependent variables for this study. The perceptions that the Teachers have towards QASOs roles, QASOs instructional supervisory practices and implementation of QASOs recommendation reports constitute the independent variables for this study, while the challenges that are faced by the QASOs and provision of quality education constitute the intervening and dependent variables for this study respectively.
Figure 1.1: Relationship between Instructional Supervision and Quality Education; Source, Author
Educational Quality Assurance Instructional Supervisory Competences

The effectiveness of QASOs can be traced right from their competences in terms of the knowledge, skills, attitudes and leadership they have and are able to manifest when conducting instructional supervision (Mohammed and Orodho 2014). Through the interaction with the QASOs, the teachers have formed certain opinions towards the QASOs in terms of their human relations, technical, and conceptual skills. This is because when the QASOs visit school to conduct instructional supervisory practices, they mainly interact with the teachers who could be receptive or not receptive to them based on past experiences of interactions where the teachers either benefited or did not benefit from such interactions.

In terms of human relations skills, Teachers have certain perceptions relating to; whether the QASOs understand the teachers, are able to stimulate health and productive interactions that would benefit and motivate the teachers. The teachers also have certain perceptions regarding the technical skills the QASOs have in terms of their technical knowledge, skills and attitudes as manifested mainly on how they conduct evaluation of teachers and the advice they offer for effective curriculum implementation. Lastly, teachers hold certain perceptions regarding the QASOs conceptual skills of delivering objective and clear findings whose utility would lead to uplifting the quality of education in their institutions

The positive or negative perceptions held by teachers towards QASOs supervisory competences would impact positively or negatively towards implementing their
reports and recommendations, hence, affecting the quality education. Ideally therefore, quality education provision is enhanced where the teachers hold positive perceptions towards QASOs in terms of their technical, conceptual and human relations skills for discharging their duties.

**The QASOs Instructional Supervisory Practices**

The QASOs instructional supervisory practices mainly entail: the preparation for conducting instructional supervision, conducting the actual instructional supervision, delivery of feedback at school, compiling of supervision reports and giving recommendations on how to improve the status quo (Republic of Kenya, 2000). The effectiveness of how QASOs conduct these instructional supervision practices significantly collates to the quality of education provided in public schools. Where there are consistent and effective QASOs instructional supervisory practices, the quality of education is likely to be enhanced.

The influences of QASOs supervisory practices on quality education provision in public secondary schools can be assessed based on whether they conduct their supervisory practices objectively and professionally as judged by the teachers in the respective secondary schools where the QASOs have visited.

**Utilization of QASOs Supervision Recommendations and Reports**

The touchable end products of the QASOs instructional supervisory practices is the supervision recommendation reports which should be sent to the Head of the institution visited within a maximum of 28 days with copies to TSC, Directorate of planning and development, County (previously provincial) QASO, County
(previously Provincial) Director of Education, Sub-county QASO, Sub-county TAC tutor, and Zonal QASO. (Ministry of Education, 2000). At the institution level, Parents Association (PA) and the school staff “must have access to the copies” (ibid, 45) sent to the Head teacher, while at the Sub-county and zonal levels the Sub-County Education Officer (S-CEO) and Area Education Officer (AEO) must have access to copies sent to ESQACO and ZQASO respectively (ibid, 45).

The above dispatch of QASO supervision reports is meant to ensure that all the stakeholders in education receive the report and consequently maximize on the implementation of the supervision recommendations and proposals. In the institutions where QASOs visited, effective implementation of the reports would lead to likelihood of the reports being used as resource material in the formulation of specific action and strategic plans which address the fundamentals of uplifting the quality of education offered. Externally, the institution visited is supposed to benefit from the input of the County Education Officer (CEO) and Sub-County Education Officers (S-CEO). In actual sense, the CEOs and S-CEOs are supposed to use QASO schools’ instructional supervision recommendations and reports to advise the respective schools on implementation.

The QASOs should use the reports for follow-up assessment in schools and consequently, fine tuning their instructional supervisory practices to the felt needs of the specific public schools. The reports for instructional supervision in school act as resource documents for preparing seminars and workshops for capacity
building and professional growth of the teachers. Finally, the QASO reports are supposed to be utilised by MoEST in the formulation of broad spectrum policies, regulations and plans that are meant to improve and maintain high quality education provision in the public secondary schools of the republic of Kenya.

**Challenges Facing Provision of Quality Education**

The efforts towards provision of quality education can highly be weakened by the challenges that are faced by the QASOs as they discharge their responsibilities. Some of these challenges could be limited human and financial resources. Other challenges facing provision of quality education are; limited human resources in schools, motivation of teachers, status of schools leadership and management practices. The existence of these challenges and their gravity should be known so that participatory efforts can be made towards addressing them with a view to improving and maintaining high quality and standards of education offered in the public secondary schools. In this study, these challenges were not be probed.

**Quality Education Provision**

Provision of quality education is the culmination of continues and participatory efforts by all stakeholders in the education sector. In this study, the focus is on the QASOs’ instructional supervision enhancing the instructional capacity of teachers to deliver quality education in public secondary schools. In this regard, instructional capacity of teachers which apparently act as indicators that quality education is being offered in a given schools directly relates to teachers instructional competences in; improved curriculum interpretation and
implementation via application of appropriate pedagogical methods; effective and efficient utilization of available instructional materials while teaching; and improved internal assessment and evaluation of students. In each of these indicators, the QASOs activities in schools should play a significant contribution not just in capacity building but also keeping the Teachers on their toes.

1.12 Operational Definition of Terms

This section gives a definition of the significant terms as used in the context of this study.

**Effective Supervision**- Supervision that uses participatory approach to enhances the ability of the teacher to offer quality education.

**Instructional Supervisory Practices**- Formal activities carried out by the QASOs within and outside the schools with the aim to improve the instructional competences of teachers in providing quality of education offered in schools.

**Instructional Supervisory Skills**- Human relations, technical and conceptual skills needed by QASOs for effective instructional supervision of teachers.

**Teachers**- These refer to all the school principal and heads of department teachers in the public secondary schools.

**Instructional Supervision**- Work of ensuring the implementation of the educational education curriculum of a school by overseeing, equipping, and empowering teachers to provide meaningful learning experiences for students.

**Teachers’ Instructional Competences**- Having appropriate knowledge and skills of pedagogy, utilizing available resources to enhance learning and conducting internal assessments.
Quality Education- Impacting of knowledge to the learner via the use of; learner centered pedagogical method teachers, effective utilization of available instructional materials, and improved internal assessments of pupils.

Quality Assurance Officers- These are the personnel entrusted with instructional supervision of teachers and they are commonly called Quality Assurance and Standards Officers.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents reviews of literature relating to provision of quality education and how instructional supervision has been carried out by QASOs as a means of ensuring that there is provision of quality education in public secondary schools. The literature review is organized on the following sub-themes that were generated from the objectives: quality of education and teacher’s instructional competences; perceptions of teachers towards QASOs’ instructional supervisory skills; the instructional supervision practices by QASOs; and the utilization of QASOs recommendations and reports. The chapter also gives a summary of literature which shows the gaps identified in the study.

2.2 Quality of Education and Teachers’ Instructional Competences

Although education has been defined as development of desirable qualities in human beings (Hirst & Peter, 2000), it is worth noting that there has been no agreements over which are the desirable qualities that should be developed via education. Beeby (2011) conceptualized quality education as having two components: first component is the classroom quality, which is concerned with acquisition of measurable knowledge and learning skills; and the second component of quality has to do with the economic goals of the community in which learners live. Related to this component, is the social criteria, defined as relevance (Hawes and Stephens, 1990) or “external quality” (UNESCO, 2005). This study concerned itself with the classroom component of quality education.
with regard to how QASOs through instructional supervision can enhance its attainment.

Focusing on the classroom quality component of education Ehler, (2009), notes that efforts towards provision of quality education are a function of establishment of a quality education assurance culture that is supported by all stakeholders. Republic of Kenya, (2005), it is observed that QASOs are expected to provide advisory services to school on how best to improve on pedagogical skills. Thus, the role of instructional supervision by QASOs cannot be underestimated in the process of cultivating a quality assurance culture in the education institutions. According to Oz (2003), instructional supervision is a type of supervision carried out by the instructional supervisors and it is aimed at providing guidance, good counsel, support, and continuous assessment to teachers for their professional development and improvement in the teaching-learning process. In this regard, Kutsyuruba (2003) defines professional development of the teacher as:

A major component of ongoing teacher education concerned with improving teachers’ instructional needs, their ability to adapt instruction to meet students’ needs, and their classroom management skills; and with establishing a professional culture that relies on shared beliefs about the importance of teaching and learning and that emphasizes teacher collegiality. (p. 11)

This is consistent with (Tyagi, 2010; Ormond, 2004 & Wendy, 2005) who looks at instruction supervision as an activity that teachers are always looking forward to because when it is effectively conducted it contributes significantly to service delivery and ongoing learning and development of staff competences. Indeed, Ginsberg, (2003) and Card (2006) established that the single most important factor
improving students’ achievements is the quality of teachers in terms of their instructional competences. Hence, the effectiveness of instructional supervision as conducted QASOs is correlated to the quality of education.

According to the European Education Quality Benchmark, the main facet of quality education provision is teaching and learning, and its main focus is on the pedagogical, didactical and content (Kristen, 2007). This facet has five indicators, namely; teaching, learning, curriculum, student assessment, and learning materials. Consequently, a sound quality assurance culture would therefore mainly pay attention on this facet. This study focused on this facet by examining influences of instructional supervision on instructional competences of teachers.

Valerie, Shanta and James (2012) on a study of quality of instruction by teachers and how it affects the student’s achievements, found that learners preferred teachers who: exhibited high level of clarity while teaching; actively engaged students during the lesson delivery; created good student-teacher relationships manifested with warmth, enthusiasm and inspiration; and realistically pushed them to achieve academically. In this respect, effective instructional supervision practices should be planned and executed as to improve the teachers to take care of learners’ perceived preferences in terms teacher instructional competences.

In Kenya, studies shows that the above scenario is in doubt in our public secondary schools. In a study on learning assessment, it was found that children in Kenya are graduating from primary schools but do not have reading and counting skills (Uwezo, 2011). The report reveals that, ‘seventy two per cent (72%) of secondary
schools teachers and some fifty two per cent (52%) of primary teachers emphasize on examinations than learning’ (ibid). Maybe, this scenario has been promoted passively by the QASOs because as a report by (Kitheka, 2011) observed, ‘Quality and Standards Agencies check if syllabus has been covered, but not whether there was learning’.

Sule et al. (2015) revealed that: there was a significant positive relationship between instructional supervisory practice of classroom observation and teachers’ role effectiveness; there was a significant positive relationship between instructional supervisory practice of checking of teachers’ lesson notes and teachers’ role effectiveness; and a closer, regular and continuous instructional supervisory practice rather than snappy, unscheduled and partial supervision is what was urgently needed for effective implementation of any school curriculum.

Specifically, Romano (2014) and Okoro (2004) found that instructional supervisors that identified and recommended to teachers appropriate instructional materials that could be used to enhance the delivery of a given content improved the teacher instructional capacity. This is because effective utilization of instructional resources conveniently promote the ability of a teacher to pass a message to learners in a manner that is accurate, proper, clear and understandable (Saglam, 2011). Stressing on the use of instructional materials to enhance learning, Ballantyne and Packer (2009) found that experienced-based learning resulted in more engaging, effective, and sustained learning experiences. The students attributed more of what helped to them by learning through hands-on (‘what I did’)
and visual (‘what I saw’) experiences than to teacher’s instruction and there were more hands-on experiences remembered three months after the program. However, Tabby (2005) observed that QASOs did not improve the quality of teaching in schools because they failed to address the competences of teachers in the selecting, developing and using the instructional materials. Indeed, a study by Ghanney (2008) revealed that inability of teachers to use instructional materials leads to: pupils becoming passive listeners in class, boredom, poor participation in lesson, lack of interest in the subject, absenteeism and finally poor performance in the subject matter.

It was in the light of the above concerns that this study examined whether the QASOs had enhanced quality education provision via impacting instructional competences to teachers on the most efficient and effective instructional materials to use when teaching.

2.3 Teachers’ Perceptions towards QASOs’ Supervisory Competences

Although a great deal of attention has been given to the nature of teaching and the skills a good teacher ought to possess, there has been little emphasis on the specific skills and competencies that instructional supervisors should have (Servet, 2011) and the attitudes that teachers have towards instructional competences of instructional supervisors (Lilian, 2007). In this regard, Zachariah (2013) established that for instructional supervisors to be effective they needed to exhibit major desired skills and attributes such as; knowledge about public relations, ability to lead by example, high integrity, and competence in teaching subjects. In
a study conducted by Milcah, Chisikwa and Odwar (2010) on the extent to which
the QASOs feel competent in the five skills of: human relations, knowledge of the
subject, supervision approach, report writing and action research, all which directly
relates to their work performance, it was found that the competence of QASOs on
the five skills was average and consequently, the study recommended the need for
further training in all these areas. This implies that continuous capacity building for
QASOs in the domain of instructional supervision can increase their effectiveness
in their instructional supervisory practices. This study found that QASOs still need
capacity building specifically in technical and conceptual skills.

According to Kutsyuruba, (2003), Sergiovanni & Starratt, (2007) and Zepeda,
(2007), the attitude and satisfaction of teachers toward instructional supervision
depends largely on several factors, such as a harmonious teacher-supervisor
relationship and availability of supervisory choices based on teachers’ needs, as
well as mutual trust, respect and collaboration among supervisees and supervisors.
Perceptions are important in instructional supervision because they determine the
outcomes of supervision process (Oliva, 1976). In this regard, research conducted
by Kutsyuruba (2003) on beginner teachers’ perception of instructional
supervision revealed that “beginning teachers desire more frequent use of
instructional supervision that meets their professional needs, that promotes trust
and collaboration, and that provides them with support, advice and help” (p. 4).

In a study conducted in Kenya public secondary schools to determine the
perceptions of head teachers, teachers and senior government education officers
regarding the practices of internal instructional supervision, Wanzare, Z. (2012) found that internal instructional supervision was viewed as a process of checking other people's work to ensure that bureaucratic regulations and procedures are followed and that loyalty to the higher authorities is maintained. For the QASOs to have significant effect on quality of education, they need to exhibit high level of competences in human relations, technical and conceptual supervisory skills. Given the relevance of this skills in ensuring that instructional supervision is smoothly conducted, this study is designed to examine the teachers’ perceptions towards QASOs instructional supervisory skills of; human relations, technical and conceptual skills.

2.3.1 Human Relations Skills

According McMahon & Patton (2002) the quality of the human relations between the supervisee (teacher) and supervisor (QASO) is the most important determinant of the effectiveness of instructional supervision exercise. Human relations skills are those skills that enable the supervisors to ‘understand the teachers and to interact effectively with them’ (Republic of Kenya, 2000) during the supervision process. Such skills enable the supervisors ‘to act both officially and humanely … so that teachers can be milked dry of their professional potentials’ (ibid). This implies that a prerequisite condition for effective supervision to take place is that, the supervisor should create a mutual friendly atmosphere devoid of fear and coercive language.
However, behavior of QASOs towards teachers in general has been reflected as unprofessional by numerous studies, for example, Wanzare (2005) revealed that some QASOs while carrying out teachers’ assessment bossed and harassed the teachers, Ondicho (2004) and Rugut (2003) established that QASOs needed to improve on their communication skills and be friendlier to teachers if they had to make an impact in the supervision process.

Masara (2007) describes the relationship between the teachers and the QASOs as being poor, more specifically, it has been previously established that there is a tendency of teachers to mistrust QASOs (Republic of Kenya, 1999). Both poor relationship and mistrust between the teachers and the QASOs is indicative of negative perceptions that could be there between the teachers and the QASOs, this could be one of the causes of poor effect of the instructional practices of the QASOs in the public secondary schools.

Teachers have always regarded supervision as a stressful experience due to fear of the unknown (Ndegwa, 2001). Indeed, Kamuyu (2001) observes that head teachers and teachers are normally thrown into a panic any time QASOs are mentioned. Consequently, when teachers and head teachers are informed of an impending supervision, they are likely to be apprehensive and decide to put something like a show to impress QASOs (Gabriel, 2005). With this kind of a relationship between teachers and QASOs, Ndegwa (2001) acknowledges that education standards have been compromised because teachers are not given a chance to disapprove inappropriate policies forced on them by QASOs.
Romano (2014) revealed that both teachers and instructional supervisors view professional trust as an important behavior of the classroom observation process as it relates to the improvement of teacher effectiveness. When teachers have high trust on instructional supervisors, they are more likely to adopt changes proposed by them and this helps raise student achievement (Bryk & Schneider, 2003). For example, during the teacher observation and conferencing phases, if the teachers believe that they will have an opportunity to objectively and frankly discuss with their instructional supervisor what is working in their classroom during observations, they are likely to look forward to being given feedback and implement the agreed consensus outcomes of such discussions. Latest studies by Mohammed, M. M., and Orodho, J.A., (2014) indicates that the relationship between QASOs and teachers was positive, the interaction and attitude between the teachers and the QASOs has immensely improved

The concern of this study was to establish the type of perceptions teachers have towards the QASOs human relations skills because such perceptions can have tendencies of influencing the relationships between teachers and QASOs and ultimately effecting the quality education provision in schools.

2.3.2 Technical Skills

Naci (2012) observes that, one of the philosophical foundations of instructional supervision of teachers is based on the need to technically support teachers. Technical skills are those skills that enable a supervisor to understand and be able to perform effectively the specific processes, practices and techniques required of
his/her specific job (Republic of Kenya, 2000). The supervisor needs ‘an overall knowledge of the functions they supervise and sources of specific information’ (ibid). This implies that QASOs should be resourceful by having technical answers in their areas of specialization.

Ayeni (2012) contends that for instructional supervisors to be effective they need to perform their specialized roles effectively. The study further highlighted some of the specialized roles of instructional supervisors as; checking and ensuring adequate preparation of lesson notes, checking and ensuring adequacy of scheme of work and record of work. Consequently, QASOs that have sufficient technical skills are likely to detect any deficiencies in teachers’ professional records and be in a position to promptly and humanely advice the concerned teachers and this would translate into quality education. However, Griffin (1994), observed that inspectors (QASOs) do not provide expert knowledge and guidance to teachers due to poor preparation in formal training and this indeed a factor that would influence quality of education offered in schools. Similarly, Kimathi (2013) established that most QASOs in Tigania East District, Kenya had high academic qualifications but this failed take care of their need for professional training to enable them provide required technical knowledge in their areas of specialization. In cognizance of this fact, MoEST introduced induction courses for the QASOs (Republic of Kenya, 2000). This study established that teachers perceive QASOs as not completely equal to their task of offering technical expert knowledge on issues related to curriculum interpretation and implementation.
2.3.3 Conceptual Skills

Conceptual skills are those skills that relate to the ability of the supervisor ‘to acquire, analyze and interpret information in a logical manner’ (ibid). These skills enable the supervisor to deliver their findings in an objective, clear and concise manner which ultimately improves the teachers’ ability to teach. The conceptual skills enable a supervisor to divide a complex situation into its component parts and study the characteristics of the components in order to understand the characteristics of the whole situation (Sanaika 2008).

Commenting on the conceptual skills of QASOs, Wasanga (2004) maintained that quality assurance officers should have good academic qualification and specialized skills for analyzing and interpreting information related to instructional supervision. He contends that the department of Quality Assurance is hampered due to inadequacies in conceptual skills. Tabby (2005) had established that although QASOs considered themselves as good communicators of their ideas and intentions, teachers felt that QASOs they needed to improve on the same to come to the level of the teacher. This study evaluated the conceptual competences of QASOs and establishes whether it enhances or it delimits the effect the QASOs have on quality education provision.

2.4 The Instructional Supervision Practices by QASOs

According to the Handbook for supervision of educational instructions the inspectors (QASOs) are responsible for numerous roles, key among them being; Advising the Government on the type and quality of education being offered in the country; inspecting all educational institutions regularly and compiling appropriate
reports; advising the Government on the trends observed in the learning institutions in the areas of equity, access, equality, gender, curriculum delivery, learning, teaching materials, leadership staffing governance, health care, career guidance, discipline, curriculum evaluation, pre-service and in-service training of teachers; advising on curriculum evaluation in collaboration with Kenya National Examination Council; and advising the stakeholders on education matters pertaining to curriculum delivery, assessment and the provision of resource. (Republic of Kenya, 2000:7).

From the above roles, it’s evident that the ESQAC have been mandated to carry out supervisory, evaluative and advisory roles, all in furtherance to quality education provision. Thus, if the ESQAC were vibrant through their field officers (QASOs), their impact would be felt in the public secondary schools as far as ensuring education quality development and assurance is concerned. Nonetheless, many are times is when teachers in public schools are wholesomely blamed for low quality education provision, leaving out the QASOs primarily because they don’t deal directly with the students. In fact at this era of transparency and accountability, it’s unfortunate to note that the public does not know the existence of QASOs or their roles because they are sparingly visible on the ground (Okumbe 1987 & Muchanje 2004).

In a study conducted in Turkey on the necessity and benefits of education supervision, it was established that, teachers and administrators felt that education supervision was essential for “exploring to what extent educational aims are
attained and diagnosing educational issues and troubleshooting” Hasan, (2012:151). However, in the same study, it was established that educational supervisors restrictively focused on control, evaluation and these lead to supervised teachers being self-defensive and concealing errors, and ultimately creating communication barriers and poor trust between supervisors and teachers. The study recommended that instructional supervisors needed to be trained first on; instructional leadership, coaching, mentoring and on-the-job training before they could be trusted to act as guides for teachers instructional improvement.

Similarly, in Addis Ababa government secondary schools, Tesfaw and Hofman (2012) found that teachers wished to be supervised by professionals who had knowledge and skills of supervision, and who exhibited collaborative and friendly approaches in instructional supervision exercise. In Kenya, Kimuya (2004:65), revealed that “teachers and supervisors were not working in collaboration to improve teaching in schools…” and that lack of teacher-supervisor collaboration was mainly due to teachers’ lack of trust and confidence on instructional supervisors coupled with negative approach to supervision. Thus, this study probed the effectiveness of QASOs on quality education provision in the light of their supervisory, evaluative and advisory roles.

2.4.1 Preparation for Conducting Instructional Supervision by QASOs

For the supervision excise to be productive, the QASOs must plan their school visits well in advance. The Handbook for supervision of educational institutions (Ministry of Education, 2000) talks of prior plans, where preparations are made at the levels of QASOs themselves and in the institutions to be visited. Indeed, Tyagi
(2011) established that effective instructional supervision in schools needed a thorough review of previous supervision reports and recommendations as a preparation aspect for supervision. This may reveal the existing gaps in the implementation of previous instructional supervision reports and recommendations which need to be objectively addressed for continuous improvement both in instructional supervision and in efforts to offer quality education.

The QASOs should have an annual costed strategic plan for supervision for the whole county where all the human and financial resources are effectively and efficiently mobilized towards achieving conducting meaningful instructional supervision. As part of preparation, the QASO Panel should aim to arrive at and report to the school they intend to inspect early (7.45 to 8.00) a.m. (ibid) so that they can maximize on what they see, hear and read in the specific school.

At the institution level, the schools should be informed formally on the areas to be inspected by being given two to three months notice to prepare for documents to submit to the panel chairperson, unless the supervision is of an emergency type (ibid). In his study, Thembinkosi, T., (2013) found that the majority of teachers wanted to be notified about the classroom visits by supervisors well in advance to prepare for the exercise of supervision. Indeed, previously, Olembo et al., (1992:148) noted that; ‘Supervision has, at times been marked by impromptu, irregular visits by inspectors aimed at ‘catching’ the teacher doing wrong’. Such an approach of conducting supervisory practices has adverse effects on the teachers because they feel mistrusted, unloved and spied on. Further, it’s assumed by the
supervisors that teachers are the main culprits of lowering the quality of education which might not be the case.

When institutions are informed in advance that they will be inspected, this provides the school with ‘an opportunity to engage itself in a thorough review and puts teachers on their toes to prepare adequately for the inspectors, thus making the pupils benefit even before the supervision takes place’ (Ministry of Education, 2000). This study evaluated the level of preparedness made by the QASOs before they visit schools and specifically the instructions they give to schools so that they can prepare for instructional supervision process.

2.4.2 Conducting Instructional Supervision

In a study of instructional supervision and teacher satisfaction, Fraser (1980:224) found that “the improvement of the teaching learning process was dependent upon teacher attitudes toward supervision”. Fraser further noted that unless teachers perceive instructional supervision as a process of promoting professional growth and student learning, the supervisory practice would not bring the desired effect. In this regard, Kutsyuruba, (2003), Sergiovanni & Starratt, (2007) and Zepeda,(2007) are in consensus that, the attitude and satisfaction of teachers toward instructional supervision depends largely on such as a harmonious teacher-supervisor relationship and availability of supervisory choices based on teachers’ needs, as well as mutual trust, respect and collaboration among supervisees and supervisors. In a study conducted in Botswana to determine how instructional supervision was carried out in schools (Moswela, 2010), it was found that the environment in which
instructional supervision took place in schools was rather hostile and intimidating to teachers to make any meaningful impression on the improvement of teaching standards. Thus, effectiveness of instructional supervisors was impeded by the environment which they had knowingly or unknowingly actively created in schools. The instructional supervision process can be conducted through two broad approaches, that is; scientific and bureaucratic, and the democratic and humane management approach of supervision. The scientific and bureaucratic approaches of supervision are authoritarian in nature because they mainly cultivate an environment of manager-subordinate relationship (Sergiovanni & Starrat, 2002). In this approach, the teachers are seen as workers to be directed and monitored and the role of supervisor is viewed as that of ensuring that schools comply with the set rules and regulations (Sergiovanni & Starrat, 2002; Bolin & Panarities, 1992).

From this perspective, it can be noted that supervisors visit schools to mainly inspect, assess or peruse documents and records such as; lesson plans, lesson notes, record of work, schemes of work, registers, etc so as to ascertain whether effective learning has been taking place. Perusing of documents and records constitute “what you see” and “what you read” and when over-emphasized at the expense of “what you hear” it can be detrimental. Okumbe, (1998:25) notes that, ‘excess paper work and rigid rules, leads to inefficiency’. Thus, making the supervision process to be centered on whether teachers have unkempt/kept and un-updated/updated records which cannot be considered to be effective supervision process. When this approach of supervision is used, supervisors make irregular and inadequate inspectoral follow-up as a means of ensuring that teachers do the routine tasks and
not necessarily to improve the teacher. However, as found by Usman (2015) regular professional instructional supervision using robust supervision strategies like checking of students’ notebooks, checking teachers’ lesson plan/notes and inspection of teachers’ record keeping have significant correlation with teachers’ performance and academic achievement of students in Secondary Schools. Similarly, Njiru (2014) established that instructional supervision by supervisors improved the teachers’ abilities in the preparation of curriculum documents and ultimately timely coverage of the syllabuses.

In the democratic and humane management approach of supervision, the concern for the “human factor” in organization became paramount (Okumbe, 1998). Mary Follett (1868-1933), as quoted by (Knezevich, 1975) emphasizes that this approach advocated for ‘greater attention on obtaining cooperation of employees and helping them identify more closely with the organization and its goal.

Thus, through this approach, the supervisor would pay attention to the concerns of the teachers and will exhibit deliberate effort to improve the teachers’ ability in handling learners and delivering content (Okumbe, 1998). This approach is also based on the fact that ‘teachers would do their best in a supportive environment’ (Tracy, 1995:323). One would therefore, assume that supervisors using this approach will inform the schools as to when they will visit them so that they prepare themselves and that when the supervisors visit the schools, the teachers will raise worthwhile issues of quality education provision in critical areas of concern and through discussion, way forward would always emerge.
Maybe, it’s through such a premise that the teachers will feel valued and recognized and consequently, a cordial relationship between the teacher and the supervisor can be established right from the time the supervisors arrive in the schools. This study probed the extent to which the QASOs cultivate an atmosphere of democracy and human understanding so as to guide the interactions between the teacher and the supervisor, so that the teacher feels free to air his or her views and does not become defensive.

Different models of supervision exist from which education supervisors can borrow from in different times. These models include; the developmental model, differentiated model, collaborative model and the clinical model which is the latest (Okumbe, 1998). Supervision models are blue prints of the dynamics of the supervisory transactions between the instructional supervisor and the teacher (Miller & Moreetsi, 2008) and the transactions vary according to the different instructional supervisors and teachers expectations, relationships and anticipated outcomes (Stoller, 1996). However, it is usually left to the discretion of the instructional supervisor to determine the model(s) of supervision rely on when conducting instructional supervision.

In the developmental model, the teachers are seen as individuals undergoing continuous growth and development in their career (Zepeda, 2007). The growth and development of the individual teacher can be perceived as the increase in experience accumulated over time and strengthening of the teachers’ abilities in dealing with learners in varied environments year after year. Based on this model
therefore, the role of the supervisor when dealing with teachers would require him to first identify the needs of the teacher so as to effectively assist the teacher towards accelerated growth and development (Glickman et al., 2007). This means that QASOs should not only peruse individual professional documents of teachers but also always strive to observe individual teachers in classrooms while teaching so as to offer individualized instructional advisory feedback during instructional supervision exercises. However, the Task Force on Alignment of the Constitution with Education 2010 established that Quality Assurance Services in Educational Institutions is manifested with uncoordinated decision-making at all levels, hampered by inadequate data and lacks enough sense of urgency on follow-ups (Republic of Kenya, 2011). This implies that the effectiveness of instructional supervision in enhancing quality education provision was in doubt.

In the Kenyan context, one would advise that, before the QASOs visit a school, they need to peruse the teachers files and have a sitting with the respective teachers, just to be briefed objectively on the professional growth and development status of the teachers. It’s from such a background that the interaction between the supervisor and the teacher can be more productive. But because time is always a limitation, the supervisors are advised to ‘observe teachers teaching or working … discuss with the teacher his or her ideas about students, teaching, and instructional improvement’ (Glickman et al., 2007).

Through the above avenues, the supervisor is well-placed to advise the teacher even sometimes unaware that she or he is actually offering advisory service. It’s
also through such engagement that the supervisor will have deeper insights of the weaknesses of the teachers and even strong points of the specific teachers which can be used elsewhere to other teachers.

In the differentiated model, teachers are viewed as professionals who are experts in instruction (Glatthorn, 1998) and the role of the supervisor is that of facilitating teachers to work professionally. In this respect then, QASOs should be proactive in facilitating existence of excellent conducive environments in schools; the officers should be keen in ensuring the Teachers embrace good working environments by promoting participatory and democratic principles of leadership where all teachers and other stakeholders can cooperatively interact and benefit from one another.

Commenting on the collaborative model of supervision in schools, Harris and Ovando, (1992:13), observe that, collaborative supervision is whereby; ‘people with diverse expertise work jointly’. In a collaborative system, all stakeholders in education in a school set up work jointly, sharing experiences in different forums and consequently improving the productivity of one another collectively. The role of the supervisor in the collaborative supervision model would be that of encouraging and motivating all the stakeholders towards moving to higher heights of team-spirit whose focus is to make teaching-learning process more effective. In this study, attempts will be made to probe how efficiently the QASOs have been able to influence all stakeholders in public secondary schools towards working as a team so as to uplift the standards of education.
According to Goldhammer (1980), Clinical supervision as practiced in the education sector can be defined as ‘That phase of instructional supervision which draws its data from first hand observation of actual teaching events, and involves face to face interaction between the supervisor and the teacher in the analysis of the teaching behaviors and activities for instructional improvement’

Clinical supervision yields data from the events that take place in classroom and the data are analyzed to form the basis of designing programmes, procedures and strategies of improving the student’s learning via improving the teacher (Okumbe, 1998; Cogen, 1973). To illustrate the importance of the events that take place in the classroom, the Handbook for supervision of educational institutions (Ministry of Education, 2000:34), contends that ‘what happens in the classroom, lecture theatre or play area, should be the central concern of any supervision’. In a study by Arsayathamby V, Mary M. A, Rozalina K., (2013) on the influences of clinical supervision on the teaching performance of secondary school teachers of Malaysia found that clinical supervision helped instructional supervisors indentify teachers’ classroom shortcomings and consequently, help address them ultimately teachers’ ability to facilitate teaching and learning for more effective and enhanced students' understanding.

From the foregoing explanation, it’s noted that clinical supervision emphasizes on data collection based on “what you see (observation), hear (discussion), and read (documentation)”. A basic prerequisite for the process to proceed successfully is for the teachers to have a positive mind-frame towards being observed by the
supervisor when the actual teaching is taking place. In fact, Okumbe, (1998:186), compares the application of clinical supervision to the teaching practice undertaken by all the teacher trainees. Like the teaching practice, a positive supervisory relationship grounded by trust, respect, rapport, and empathy. This study examined how effectively clinical supervision has been conducted in schools as a means of obtaining data to help teachers become better teachers. Maybe, also it’s the high time such data are used as a reference during promotions of teachers. An article in the Standard Newspaper of Wednesday 27th, October 2010 on education argue that the “Medicine for the failing quality of education in public schools is tying pupil’s performance to teacher’s promotion”. The gist of this article was that teachers would be proactive when they are instructionally supervised so as to obtain valuable feedback which they would utilize to perform better in facilitating learning and ultimately be promoted.

2.4.3 Delivery of Supervisory Reports to School

Delivery of the feedback occurs during the final meeting between the QASO panel, the principal and the staff. During these meetings, major highlights or findings of the supervision are discussed and ‘the discussion should be professional and friendly’ (Ministry of Education, 2000:13). Numerous studies have established that productive feedback and follow-up initiatives relative to supervision are lacking in the Kenyan supervision system (Olembo, Wanga, & Karagu, 1992; Wanga, 1988). As Wanga noted, opportunities for follow-up regarding recommendations based on supervision, such as the need for in-service training of teachers are badly lacking. This is despite research on professional development suggesting that the right kind

In a study titled “Education Supervisors’ Views Regarding Efficiency of System and In-service Training Courses” established that; most (30.76%) of educational supervisors supported authorization and enforcement of their reports in schools that they had supervised as a means of improving quality of education offered in their schools. This is justified, because school inspectors are not members of these schools and their attempts to provide follow-up initiatives, for example, in facilitating in-service training programs based on their recommendations, are highly limited.

The problem of the lack of feedback is not unique to Kenya. In a study that examined primary and secondary teachers’ and head teachers’ perceptions of supervision in 5 local authorities in UK, Dean (1995) reported that lack of feedback to teachers was a major cause of frustration among teachers. Also, teachers in this study agreed that they were disturbed whenever an inspector simply left the lesson without saying anything. However, in Australia a study by Naci (2012) established that, from the view point of English Language Teachers, supervision is not of any pedagogical or professional value because its feedback does not have a positive effect on teachers’ performance.

2.5 Utilization of QASOs Recommendations and Reports

Instructional supervisory reports are the ultimate physical product of an instructional supervision exercise of teachers. Conley & Dixon, (2000), observes
that when these reports are properly integrated into a growth-oriented system, they can be a powerful force that can help promote instructional improvement of teachers. Indeed, in United States the need to improve overall student achievement is successfully achieved by using data from teacher supervision to derive professional development programmes for the teachers (Baker et al, 2010). Hence data emanating from professional supervision of teachers should be thoroughly and objectively analyzed so that it can be used at various levels and ultimately narrow down in making a classroom teacher better in curriculum implementation. Kutsyuruba (2003) observed that data from an instructional supervision should be closely connected to their professional development of teachers in terms of enabling them provide quality education for students.

In Kenya, after the school visits, the QASOs are supposed to compile reports on their findings in the field and dispatch these reports to the schools, CEO, S-CEOs, CQASOs, S-QASOs and in the Planning and development department of the MoEST. The Handbook for Supervision of Educational Instructions’, notes that the collection and collation of data by QASOs are mainly done by use of the detailed schedules which are considered objective, reliable, comprehensive, and focused (Ministry of Education, 2000:14). It’s expected that from these schedules, the QASOs can compile appropriate supervision reports bordering on quality education provision that can benefit the specific school and other schools, and further advise the Government on the type and quality of education being offered in the country. From these quality assurance reports, policy guidelines on quality education provision can be drafted and or existing policies on quality education
provision can be refined. This study established that the schools inspected by QASOs did not all promptly receive implementable reports from the QASOs each time there is supervisions. Further, it was found that teachers hardly perceived these reports as valuable in helping to uplift the quality of education in the schools. On a large scale, this study established that QASOs reports are hardly used in policy and guidelines formulation towards promotion of quality education in the education sector.

From the Kenyan context therefore, one would wonder whether there has been optimal utilization of QASOs supervision reports as the main resource material towards efforts of improving quality of education provided in the public secondary schools. According to the Handbook for Supervision of Education Institutions, the QASOs’ supervision reports are supposed to be used by four main stakeholders; the institution where the QASOs visited, the Teacher Advisory Centers like Teachers Resource Centers, and at the ESQAC headquarters. (Ministry of Education, 2000:12).

The Principal of the institution that has been visited by the QASOs should receive a copy of the QASO summary report within 28 days (ibid, 45) and the report should be tabled to the Parents Association (PA), School Board of Management (BOM), sponsor and Area Education Officer (AEO) so as to produce an action plan within two months of the receipt of the report (ibid, 46). This study established that not all school principal teachers promptly received QASOs’ summary reports within the prescribed timeframes.
The Handbook for Supervision of Education Institutions also provides that the key stakeholders who play advisory roles to the schools be provided with copies of QASOs school supervision reports (Ministry of Education, 2000: 45). Such stakeholders are referred to as “advisors” (ibid, 45) and they include County (previously Provincial) Director of Education, Sub-county TAC tutor, and Sub-County Education Officer (S-CEO) and Area Education Officer (AEO). The advisors are supposed to “assist the institution in the implementation of the recommendation” (ibid, 46).

Through the teachers, this study established that the QASOs reports and recommendations have been important resource material for the advisors in helping the schools implement efforts towards uplifting the standards and quality of education offered in secondary schools. However, it was revealed that QASOs hardly conduct follow up supervision to determine the extent to which recommendations made in an earlier supervision have been implemented (Republic of Kenya, 2000). Lastly, this study will probe on the extent to which QASOs supervisory reports have been used in formulation of policies and plans on quality education provision by Ministry of Education.

2.6 Summary

This chapter has reviewed literature on perceptions held by the Teachers towards the QASOs, instructional supervisory practices carried-out by the QASOs, and the extent of the utilization of QASOs supervision reports at various levels in attempt to uplift and maintain high quality secondary education. The literature has revealed
that the perceptions being held by Teachers towards the QASOs as far as their human, technical and conceptual skills is concerned might not be favorable and could be impacting on the quality of education offered. It has emerged that the instructional supervisory practices of: preparation for conducting instructional supervision, conducting the actual instructional supervision, delivery of feedback at school, and compiling of supervision reports are wanting and could also be impacting negatively on the quality of education offered in public secondary schools.

The literature reviewed also indicates that there is insufficient evidence to show that the QASOs supervision reports have been used optimally in the schools in the formulation of actions plans tailored towards education quality improvement. The literature has revealed that evidence is lacking on the extent to which QASOs reports has informed formulation of policies and plans on quality education provision by MoEST.

From the literature review it’s clear that most of the studies conducted on supervision are largely from the developed nations. In Kenya, studies conducted on QASOs have mainly focused on their roles and challenges they encounter as they discharge their roles with no regard on whether or not their supervisory activities has had an impact on quality of education offered as judged by the Teachers. This study specifically narrowed down and probed into the effect QASOs instructional supervisory activities have had on quality education provision in the public secondary schools given the challenges they face and the amount of resources available at their disposal. The study fills the gap by analyzing the perceptions held
by the teachers towards the instructional competences of QASOs and establishes whether QASOs’ instructional supervisory practices enhances teachers' instructional competences and quality of education in public secondary schools.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter is organized under the following sections: research design, variables, location of study, target population, sampling procedure, sample size, research instruments, piloting, validity, reliability, data collection techniques, data analysis, and lastly logistical and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research Design
This study adopted ex post facto survey design, which combines both qualitative and quantitative approaches in data collection and analysis techniques to achieve the objectives of the study. Ex post facto survey design involves a systematic, empirical inquiry in which the researcher does not have control of the independent variable because their manifestations (dependent variable) have already occurred (Kerlinger 2002). Orodho (2009) observes that in ex post facto research design variables occur in their natural setting and the researcher attempts to determine the effects between the variables. Survey research focuses on people, their beliefs, opinions, attitudes, motivations and behaviour (Kerlinger, 2002) and addresses points of views or attitudes that are held, processes that are going on and effects that are being felt and trends that are developing or have already developed (Best and Kahn, 2004). This design was appropriate for the study because the researcher was interested in determining the status quo with regard to effects of instructional supervision by the QASOs on quality of education in public secondary schools.
Quantitative approach in research provides ‘numerical data’ (Bryman, 2004:62), while qualitative approach in research provides participants’ perspectives of the topic under study (Bryman, 2004; Creswell, 2009). The qualitative approach was chosen so as to give the respondents an opportunity to express their views more deeply and exhaustively by the use of an interview schedule and open ended items in the questionnaires, while the quantitative approach was chosen so as to generate numerical data that was to be used in statistical analysis.

3.3 Variables
This study had two types of variables; independent and dependent. The independent variable was the instructional supervision by QASOs in the public secondary schools. The outcome of effective instructional supervision leads to effective curriculum implementation by Teachers which would further lead to provision of quality education, the dependent variable for this study. Hence, this study is premised on the effects of independent variable on the dependent variable.

3.4 Location of the Study
This study was carried out in Nairobi and Machakos counties. Nairobi is the capital city of Kenya and the headquarters of Nairobi County. Machakos County borders Nairobi County on the eastern side and although Machakos County has a moderately diverse micro-climate, the close proximity between the two counties and the accompanying good infrastructure in the two counties makes the two counties similar in numerous respects. The number of Educational Standards and Quality Assurance personnel serving the two counties is almost equal given Nairobi and Machakos has eight and nine sub-counties respectively.
Further, the Nairobi and Machakos counties were chosen because of the performance of the two counties in KCSE. The performance trends of the two counties for the last six year as shown in table 3.1 indicates that, the two counties had been posting slightly below average performance in KCSE. This may suggest that the implications on the effectiveness of instructional supervision by QASOs were to a greater extent similar. Thus, the researcher wished to establish whether instructional supervisory practices exercised in the two counties had an ultimate effect on the KCSE performance.

Table 3.1: Performance of Nairobi and Machakos Counties in KCSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/ Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>4.314</td>
<td>4.833</td>
<td>5.465</td>
<td>5.674</td>
<td>5.638</td>
<td>5.506</td>
<td>5.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machakos</td>
<td>4.098</td>
<td>3.967</td>
<td>4.401</td>
<td>5.314</td>
<td>5.042</td>
<td>5.012</td>
<td>4.639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EMIS; Nairobi and Embu (2013)

3.5 Target Population

3.5.1 Institutions

The target population for this study comprised of three hundred and sixty five, (365) public secondary schools, out of which seventy-five (75) public schools were from the nine (9) administrative sub-counties of Nairobi county and two hundred and ninety (290) public schools were from the eight (8) administrative sub-county of Machakos county.
3.5.2 Respondents

The total number of respondents for this study was one thousand, four hundred and eighty one (1481) respondents, comprising of: personnel from ESQAC, School Principal and Heads of department teachers (HOD teachers) of public secondary schools in Nairobi and Machakos counties. Specifically, this study targeted 365 principal teachers (75 and 290 form Nairobi and Machakos respectively) and 1095 HOD teachers (225 and 870 from Nairobi and Machakos respectively). From the ESQAC personnel, this study targeted 21 QASOs (9 and 8 from Nairobi and Machakos respectively), 2 Heads of Subjects QASOs at the ESQAC headquarters, and 2 County Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (CQASOs) in Nairobi and Machakos counties. This target population was chosen because the study aimed to establish the status of quality and standards of education, and it is therefore, important to get information from those who perform the functions of ensuring that there is quality education being offered in schools, together with those who actually manage the schools and ensure that curriculum is continuously being implemented effectively in schools.

3.6 Sampling Techniques

In this study, both probability and non-probability sampling techniques were used because they gave each unit of the respondent a chance of being selected and therefore, being part of the sample (Hopkins et al., 1996; Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). The population from which the sample was obtained was considered homogeneous in the sense that; all schools were subjected to the same external instructional supervision by the QASOs. Using probability sampling techniques, the researcher
was able to draw a representative sample from the two main categories of respondents. The first group constituted QASOs based at the Nairobi and Machakos counties, while the second group of respondents was head teachers and teachers from the secondary schools of the two counties.

The probability sampling strategies of simple random sampling and stratified sampling were used at various stages in the course of obtaining the study sample. These strategies have been preferred because they have a higher likelihood of yielding a representative sample as compared to the non-probability sampling techniques (Babblie, 2005; Kemple et al., 2003).

Through stratified sampling, this study aimed to have the secondary schools from each of the nine (9) and eight (8) sub-counties of Nairobi and Machakos counties respectively being part of the sample. Stratified sampling was used because it allowed the researcher to divide the study population into strata (sub-groups) and then select the sampling units from each of the sub-group for representation (Kombo and Tromp, 2006; Frankfort & Nachmias, 1996). The criterion for stratification for this study was the sub-county which is manned by two sub-county QASOs entrusted with instructional supervision of teachers. In Nairobi and Machakos counties, there are seventy-five (75) and two hundred and sixty-two (290) public secondary schools spread in the nine (9) and eight (8) administrative sub-counties (strata) respectively. Within each stratum, stratified sampling techniques were used to obtain a proportionate representative sample of the secondary schools which this study used. Proportionate stratified sampling,
ensured that certain sub-groups (strata) in each of the sub-county is represented in the proportion to their numbers in the population itself (Kombo & Tromp 2006; Orodho, 2009; Frankfort 2005 and Gay, 1992). In each of the sub strata 30% of the population of schools was included in the study. This sample size is above the minimum acceptable sample size of 20% for a small population (Gay, 1992). Table 3.2 shows the sample schools selected for this study.

Table 3.2: The Sample Secondary Schools for the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-county/Stratum</th>
<th>Nairobi County</th>
<th>Machakos County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Schools in the Strata</td>
<td>No. of the Schools to be Sampled (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Langata</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dagoretti</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Embakasi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kasarani</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Starehe</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ngiru</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Westlands</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N=75 n=23 Total N=290 n=87

Source: EMIS; Nairobi and Embu (2013)

Through simple random sampling techniques, the specific secondary schools used in the study were identified in both Nairobi and Machakos counties. Simple random sampling procedures were used because it gives all individuals in a defined population an equal and independent chance of being selected as a member of the
sample (Orodho, 2008). At the selected sample schools level, the principal
teachers were selected purposively for this study because they were to give first-
hand information on how the Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ activities
have affected the quality of education in their schools.

Further, in each of the sample school, three (3) HOD teachers in the areas of
Mathematics, Sciences and Languages were purposely selected and used in this
study to represent the views and the perceptions of the teachers as far as their
assessment of the activities of the QASOs in augmenting their efforts towards
maintaining and improving the quality of education is concerned. Purposive
sampling was used because it is the most ideal sampling technique when a
researcher identifies participants who can provide in-depth information on a given
topic (Gay & Airasian, 2003).

All the QASOs used in this study were selected purposively because the study
focused on their main mandate of instructional supervision. At the headquarters of
ESQAC, the study focused on the two (2) National Subject Heads in the areas of:
sciences and languages. While at the County level, the study used the two (2)
CQASOs (Nairobi and Machakos) and seventeen (17) S-CQASOs in the two
counties (9 Nairobi and 8 Machakos). The table 3.3 shows how the sample size
was derived from the target population.

3.7 Sample Size
In total, out of a target population of one thousand four hundred and eighty one
respondents (N=1481) the researcher focused on a sample size of four hundred and
sixty respondents (n=460) comprising of: two (2) National Subject QASOs in sciences (Biology, Chemistry and Physics) and Languages (English and Kiswahili) from the DQAS headquarters; seventeen (17) were S-CQASOs in the seventeen (17) combined Sub-counties of Nairobi and Machakos counties (one from each Sub-county); two (2) were the CQASOs also in the two county regions, and four hundred and thirty nine (439) were teachers in categories as shown in the table 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Target Respondents</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Percent Sampled (30%)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi (9 Sub-counties/Strata)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOD teachers</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCQASOs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CQASO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NQASOs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machakos (8 Sub-counties/Strata)</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HOD teachers</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCQASOs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CQASOs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=1481</td>
<td></td>
<td>n =460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 Research Instruments

This study used questionnaire and interview schedules, the researcher chose to use questionnaire because; the respondents’ anonymity was ensured and therefore, they were likely to give honest answers, respondents had time for reflection before answering questions hence avoid hasty responses and that the target populations under the study was covered within a short time and with limited personnel thus reducing cost (Orodho, 2009). An interview allows for an intensive investigation of a particular topic by clarifying the importance of a given research so that the
respondents can give more complete and honest information (Muganda, 2003)

The researcher used the following three sets of questionnaires and one interview schedule:

a) School Principals’ and Heads of Departments’ Teachers’ Questionnaire
b) Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ Questionnaire
c) County Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ Interview Schedule

(i) School Principals’ and Heads of Departments’ Teachers’ Questionnaire

This questionnaire was administered to the School Principal and Heads of Department teachers. The first section of the questionnaire explained the purpose of the study and requested the respondents to follow the instructions and be honest. Section A sought to establish background information of the respondents. Section B concentrated on perceptions held by teachers towards QASOs instructional competences while section C and D focused on instructional supervisory practices of QASOs and instructional competences respectively. Lastly, Section E touched on the utilization of QASOs reports and recommendations.

The questionnaires had items that were either structured closed-ended, unstructured open-ended, contingency or in form of matrix. The structured closed-ended and contingency items were mainly used in section one and two in all the questionnaires, where the respondents were provided with well thought out possible alternative versions of responses to a question and they were expected to select the best option which describes their opinions on a specific issue (Verma & Mallick, 1999). Structured closed-ended items had the advantage of generating
responses that can be subjected to statistical treatment (Cohen et al., 2004) and such responses were also be easy to compare since they had little variations (Bryman, 2004).

Contingency questions were used hand in hand with the structured closed-ended items. Orodho, (2009) observes that, contingency questions are used when some specific questions are only applicable to certain groups of respondents and in such cases follow-up questions are needed to get further information from the relevant sub-group only. In the unstructured open-ended items, the respondents are given complete freedom to express their views about a particular issue (Orodho, 2009). Though such items have the disadvantage of yielding diverse responses that may be difficult to categorize quantitatively, (ibid: 160), they have a major advantage of providing the respondent an opportunity to give in-depth and personal responses beyond the researcher preconceived imaginations (Chava & David, 1996). The unstructured open-ended items will be mainly used in section three and four of all the questionnaires. Unstructured questions allowed the respondents to answer the items in their own words and without limitations, therefore explaining and clarifying answers in a qualitative manner (Crewswell, 2005; Gall et al., 1996; Verma & Mallick, 1999). Closed-ended questions with likert scale were also used with four to five choices (Cohen et al., 2004).

(ii) Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ Questionnaire

This questionnaire was administered to the QASOs at the sub-county and national level. The first section of the questionnaire explained the purpose of the study,
requested the respondents to follow the instructions and respond to the various items honestly. Section A focused on the background information of the QASOs while Section B sorted information on instructional competences of QASOs. Lastly, Section C addressed itself to utilization of QASOs reports and recommendations. The questionnaire had open-ended and closed ended questions. Justification for the choice for the questionnaire as an appropriate instrument to solicit information for the study is justified above.

(iii) County Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ Interview Schedule

Interview schedule was the other instrument that was used to gather information for the study. The researcher conducted face to face interview with the CQASOs’ with an aim to probe further on the instructional competences of the QASOs. The interview schedule had guiding questions to allow the researcher to intensively focus on this topic as justified above.

3.8.1 Pilot Study

Bryman (2001), Gorard (2001) and Cohen et al., (2001) agree on the need of conducting a pilot study before the actual research in order to ensure that all the research instruments collect the information needed. In this study, two-stage pre-testing process was carried out as recommended by Gorard (2001) and Robson (2002). In the first stage of initial pre-testing, the researcher consulted subject matter specialist; for instance, the teachers of English and other PhD students of educational administration in Kenyatta University. Ultimately, the sentiments of University supervisors were significantly paramount in shaping the instruments by
ensuring and enhancing the clarity and flow of items in the questionnaires for all respondents.

In the second stage of pilot study, the actual pilot study was conducted by administering the instruments in four schools (2 in Machakos and 2 in Nairobi) to establish whether the instruments would collect the anticipated data. From each of the county, one of the piloted schools was based in the town (urban) while the other one was rural based, this ensured that the sentiments of respondents for the two geographically differently located schools are captured and represented. Respondents were encouraged to explain whether the items contained were complicated, difficult or ambiguous and also comment on the length of the instruments and the space provided for writing in the questionnaires. The respondents gave their suggestions on areas of the instruments to be revised and their responses and comments were used to fine tune the questionnaires. For example, in the questionnaire for Principal and Heads of Department teachers: the concepts “instructional materials”, “pedagogical skills” and “teaching career” were substituted with “teaching aids”, “teaching skills” and “teaching profession” respectively; areas to increase writing spaces were indicated; ranking as poor, fair and good was changed to “1 (lowest ), 2 (average) and 3 (highest). In the likert scale, the term “moderately” agree or “moderately” disagree was changed to simply agree or disagree. Repeated items that were making the instrument very lengthy were also deleted. The respondents used in the pilot study were not be used in the final research.
3.8.2 Validity

Validity of a research instrument is the ability of the instrument to help the researcher draw meaningful and justifiable conclusions from a sample from which the data are obtained (Bryman, 2004; Creswell, 2005; and Patton, 2000). For the purposes of this study, content validity was achieved by mainly using expert review of the research instruments as proposed by Burns, (2000) and Mertens, (2005). Hence, to ensure that the two sets of questionnaires used in this study have high degree of validity and therefore measured what they were supposed to measure, the researcher mainly depended on the expert judgment from his supervisors and other lecturers. This did not only increase the content validity of the instruments but also helped the researcher to remain focused on the purpose of the study as well as clarify the items.

The items in the questionnaires were also be highly related to the research questions and the specific objectives of the study. The researcher aimed to start with items that were focusing on the background information of the respondent and progressively move on to the specific areas.

3.8.3 Reliability

To ascertain the reliability of the two instruments that were used in data collection, Cronbach’s alpha reliability analysis was used. Cronbach’s alpha measures the internal consistency ‘reliability” of all items in an instrument where multiple likert questions have been used. The researcher had constructed most of the items relating to: perceptions that teachers have towards QASOs using 4-point Likert item from "very good", to "Unsatisfactory”; how QASOs conduct supervisory
practices using 5-point Likert item from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" and how QASOs’ recommendations and reports are utilized also using 5-point Likert item from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"

The value of the alpha coefficient ranged from 0 to 1 and was used to describe the reliability of factors extracted from dichotomous (that is, questions with two possible answers) and/or scales (i.e., rating scale: 1 = strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree; or 1 = unsatisfactory, very good = 4). A higher value shows a more reliable generated scale. Since, the alpha coefficients were all greater than 0.5, the researcher concluded that the instruments had an acceptable reliability coefficient and hence appropriate for the study. Table 3.4 and 3.5 indicates the reliability statistics for questionnaire that was used for the QASOs and that one used to collect data from the school principal and HOD teachers respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.4: Reliability Statistics for QASOs’ Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.5: Reliability Statistics for School Principals’ and Heads of Departments’ Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results shown in Tables 3.4 and 3.5 the reliability statistics indicates that the Cronbach's alpha was 0.827 and 0.869 for the QASOs’ and School Principas’/HOD teachers’ teachers’ questionnaires. These were high levels of internal consistency because they fall within the range recommended by Gay, (1992) of correlation coefficient of more than (.07) and Orodho (2008) correlation coefficient of about 0.80 can be deemed reliable.

3.9 Data Collection Techniques

Data collection was carried out in three specific phases, Orodho (2008) notes that there are three logistical phases for data collection.

**Pre-Field Logistics Phase:** This was the first stage where the researcher laid out the research instruments by verifying their completeness, physical layout, identification and clear instructions. The researcher obtained the letter of approval from the university to certify that consent had been granted. Further, the researcher applied for the permit from the National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). Finally, the researcher drew a work plan, prepared a budget detailing implementation plan of action to guide the research process and did a reconnaissance visit to the study location for familiarization.

**Field-Work Logistic Phase:** This was the second stage phase and it involved actual visits to the sampled schools. The researcher established a good rapport with the respondents for easy administration of the research instruments. Once good rapport was created with the respondents, they were issued with a copy of the questionnaire which had attachments of letter of introduction, research
authorization and permit from NACOSTI. In case of interviews, interviewees were only interviewed after signing the letter of consent for interview as an assurance of an informed consent. Duly filled questionnaires were then be picked after a period of two to three weeks. To increase confidentiality and return rate, all questionnaires at the school level were given with unsealed envelopes and each respondent were requested to put their filled questionnaires inside the envelope and seal it before they hand over the same.

**Post-Field Logistics Phase:** This was the third stage where the researcher collected the instruments from the field, edited and coded them. This phase also comprised of assembling of the research instruments in readiness for data analysis.

### 3.10 Data Analysis and Presentation

The analysis of the data collected was done using descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages and mean) based on the objectives of the study. The questionnaires were first be checked for completeness, and then behavioral responses in the open ended items were scored accurately and consistently coded into numeric system using one criterion. After scoring the instruments, the data obtained was coded and tabulated. Gay, Mills & Airasian (2009) observes that, tabulation involves organizing the data systematically, such as by subgroups or individual.

In all the questionnaires, the demographic characteristics of each group of the respondents were organized and tabulated into the subgroups of: years of experience, academic qualifications, county, and Sub-county. The organized and
tabulated data was then analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and presented quantitatively in form of frequencies, percentages, tables and figures. Data from the other sections of the different questionnaires was analyzed and presented as per the four objectives of the study:

a) Objective one; to ascertain the perceptions of teachers towards instructional supervisory competences of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers. This objective generated both qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative data was analysed thematically while quantitative data was analysed descriptively with the help of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to generate various statistics such as means, percentages and frequencies. The results were presented using tables and figure where possible.

b) Objective two; to assess the instructional supervisory practices exercised by Quality Assurance and Standards Officers in schools. This objective also yielded qualitative and quantitative data. Whereas Qualitative data analyzed thematically, quantitative was analyzed descriptively with the help of SPSS to generate various statistics such as means, percentages and frequencies. The results were presented using tables and figures where possible.

c) Objective three; to examine the influences of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ instructional supervisory practices on the instructional competences of teachers. This objective also generated both qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative and quantitative data was analysed thematically and using descriptive statistics respectively. The results were presented using tables and charts.
d) Objective four; to assess the utilization of the Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ reports and recommendations in schools. This objective just like objective one, two and three, yielded qualitative and quantitative data. While qualitative data was analysed thematically, quantitative data was analysed using descriptive statistics to generate statistics such as means, percentages and frequencies.

3.11 Ethical Considerations

This study was conducted in an ethical manner where all the participants at all stages of the study were treated with dignity, respect, and their privacy highly respected. Bassey (1999) contends that the researcher should have ethical consideration when conducting and reporting research work through ensuring that there is democracy and respect for both the truth and persons involved in a study.

Right from the on-set, the researcher acknowledged all writings and research work cited in the study, whose findings and sentiments have shaped this study. These eliminated research plagiarism and uphold the integrity of the researcher in the research process. Research fraud was also be avoided by ensuring that the researcher does not fake data which has not actually been collected. Actual collection of data will be done.

The researcher obtained letter of authorization to conduct the study and research permit from NACOSTI. Further, with the letters of introduction and informed consent, the researcher visited all the stations where the respondents were and sought permission to administer the research tools. In the respondents sites, the
researcher also explained to the respondents why they had been chosen for this study and the significance of the study, this did not only increase the confidence of the respondents but it also increased the likelihood of getting honest and truthful data from the field.

To ensure privacy and confidentiality of all the participants involved in this study, the participants were not be asked to write their names or describe themselves in any manner that would have revealed their identity during the process of conducting the study or in future. To further boost the respondents’ confidentiality, the researcher purposely administered the researcher tools as a means of increasing confidence between him and the individual respondents.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDING, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents findings, interpretation and discussion according to the study objectives. The objectives of this study were:

a) To ascertain the perceptions of teachers towards instructional supervisory competences of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers.

b) To assess the instructional supervisory practices exercised by Quality Assurance and Standards Officers in schools.

c) To examine the influences of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ instructional supervisory practices on the instructional competences of teachers.

d) To assess the utilization of the Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ reports and recommendations in schools.

This chapter begins with a presentation of the general and demographic information of the respondents followed by findings of the study based on the research objectives.

4.2 Demographic Information

This study used questionnaires and interview schedules as the tools for collecting data from the various categories of respondents that were used in the study. Questionnaires were used to collect data from: Principal and Heads of department teachers at the school level, and Sub-County QASOs at the county level. Interview
schedules were used for collecting data from the County QASOs of Nairobi and Machakos counties.

### 4.2.1 Return Rate

The return rate for the questionnaires used in collection for data for this study is presented in table 4.1

#### Table 4.1: Teachers’ Questionnaire Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Teachers Category</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Teachers Respondent</th>
<th>Return Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heads of Departments</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machakos</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heads of Departments</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>439</strong></td>
<td><strong>403</strong></td>
<td><strong>91.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 indicates that the return rate for teacher respondents in the categories of principal teachers in both Nairobi and Machakos counties was very high 23(100%) and 87(100%) respectively. Equally, the return rate for heads of department teachers was high with Nairobi being at 68(100%) and Machakos at 225(86.2%).

The average response rate of teachers respondents used in this study was high 403(91.8%). This implies that almost all schools principal and heads of department teachers constituting the sample size for this study availed themselves for the study. The return rate for the QASOs is presented in table 4.2.
Table 4.2: QASOs’ Questionnaire Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Category of QASOs</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Responded</th>
<th>Return Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Sub-County QASOs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National QASOs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machakos</td>
<td>Sub-County QASOs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that the return rate for Sub-County QASOs in Nairobi and Machakos counties was high (88.8%) and 7(87.5%) respectively. Table 4.2 also indicates that the response rate for the National QASOs was 2(100%) and the average return rate for the QASOs was 17(89.5%). This shows that almost all QASOs that constituted the sample size of this study availed themselves for the study, meaning that the researcher was able to get all the information that was anticipated.

According to Curtin, Presser & Singer (2000) a return rate of 55% and above is acceptable in ensuring that the data collected for a given study is not biased and will yield useful and credible results. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) observed that a response rate of 70 percent and above was very good in assuring high reliability and accuracy of research findings. As indicated in tables 4.1 and 4.2, this study had an average return rate of 91.8% and 89.5% for the teachers’ and QASOs’ respondents respectively, implying that the data collected was sufficient to give credible results related to the objectives of this study. To get the true picture of
each item in the questionnaires, the means and percentages of responses were based on the number of participants who actually responded to the item as opposed to the total number of respondents.

4.2.2 Background Information of the Respondents

Section (A) of the questionnaire for teachers and QASOs sought to lay foundation for the study by establishing background information of the respondents for the purpose of ensuring that respondents from whom the data was collected had the necessary competences to give responses that are reliable in line with the objectives of the study. The first item of the school principals’ and heads of departments’ questionnaire sought to establish the administrative position held by these key respondents for this study as compared to the QASOs. The responses are presented in Figure 4.1

![Figure 4.1: Administrative Position Held by Respondents](image-url)
Out of all the four hundred and twenty (420) respondents used in this study, majority 293(69.7%) were heads of department teachers whereas 110(25.9%) were school principal teachers and minority 17(0.04) were QASOs. This indicates that the bulk of the respondents used in this study were heads of department teachers who normally have to interact with QASOs when they visit schools to conduct instructional supervision and are also in charge of other teachers in their specific areas of specializations and because of this, they (HOD teachers) play a critical role in the instructional supervision process as they are immediate teacher supervisors. The sentiments of the HOD teachers would therefore be significant in releasing the study objectives on perceptions of teachers towards QASOs’ instructional supervisory processes and how instructional supervision is conducted.

The study sought to establish the academic qualifications of the various respondent groups. The results are reported in table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Qualification</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HOD teachers</th>
<th>QASOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Education</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Education</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD in Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (BSC, BA, MBA)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>293</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 reveals that majority of school principal teachers 59(54.1%) and heads of department teachers 190(64.8%) had bachelor of education degree as their highest level of academic qualification followed by 37(33.9%) of school principal teachers and 33(11.3%) of heads of department teachers who had masters of education. Majority 12(70.6%) of QASOs had masters of education as their highest level of education followed by 3(17.6%) who had bachelor of education degree. Only 1(0.9%) of the principals, 1(0.3%) of the heads of department teachers and 1(5.9%) of the QASOs had PhD level of education. This indicates that the bulk of the respondents for this study had either bachelors or masters degree as the highest level of academic qualification.

Considering that the minimum academic qualification required by Teachers Service Commission (TSC) and Public Service Commission (PSC) for one to be employed as a teacher and QASOs is a Diploma in education and bachelors’ in education respectively, then all the respondents for this study had met the basic academic qualifications to occupy the positions they were in at the time of conducting the study. According to Okoro (2004), education personnel with higher qualifications display more confidence in their workplace because higher qualifications enables them to perform better in the field than those with lower qualification. In this respect, because the majority of the respondents had higher qualifications than the basic minimum, this implied that they understood and were able to interpret policies governing education quality. This meant that data collected from these respondents was reliable and reflected the situation on the ground.
To establish the experience the respondents had in discharging their responsibilities, the researcher sought to find out the years of service the various respondents had in their current positions. The results are illustrated in Figure 4.2

**Figure 4.2: Respondents Years of Service as Principals and HOD teachers or QASOs**

From figure 4.2, it is clear that most 49(44.5%) of principal teachers and most 120(40.9%) of HOD teachers had working experience of above 10 years and 5 years and below years respectively. It is only a small percentage 22(20.0%) of principal teachers who had experience of 5 years and below. Further, majority 11(64.7%) of QASOs reported that they had been in that position for 6-10 years while the rest 6(35.3%) of the QASOs said that they had held the position for more than ten years.

Given that experience is a major factor contributing to the effectiveness of an employee performance, it’s clear that the respondents of this study had the requisite professional experiences and therefore it was envisaged that they could
provide credible supervision of the curriculum. This scenario is similar to what is found in the European Union member countries; where the Education Quality Assessors must have a certain number of years of professional experience in a school other than just having a teaching qualification and in a management position (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2015).

In respect to QASOs, this study sought to find out the substantive positions held by QASOs prior to appointment as QASOs. This is shown in table 4.4

Table 4.4: Position Held by QASOs Prior to Appointment as QASOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Subject</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoD</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher in Secondary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows that majority, 9(52.9%) followed by 6(35.3%) of the QASOs were HOD teachers and Heads of Subjects in their areas of specialization respectively before appointment as QASOs. This implies that most of the QASOs in the field and were used in this study; had risen up the instructional supervision ladder, have experiences of being instructionally supervised and know whether instructional supervision adds value to quality education provision in schools. This scenario is similar to what is found in the European Union member countries; where the Education Quality Assessors must have a teaching qualification and a certain
number of years of professional experience in a school, as a teacher or in a management position (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2015).

The researcher further sought to establish the number of years that QASOs had actively spent as classroom teachers in their areas of specialization before appointment as QASOs. The responses are shown in Figure 4.3

Figure 4.3: QASOs’ Years of Experience as Teachers before Appointment as QASOs

Figure 4.3 indicates that an equal majority, 8(47.1%) of the QASOs reported that they had been actively teaching in their area of specialization in secondary schools for more than ten years and between 6-10 years before their appointment as QASOs. Only one 1(5.9%) QASOs said that he/she had actively taught in secondary school for 5 years and below. Generally, therefore majority of the QASOs used in this study had progressively advanced from classroom teachers, heads of subjects and HOD teachers before being appointed as QASOs. This
would imply that they have accumulated requisite experiences on issues of instructional supervision.

These findings agree with Mohammed & Orodho (2014) and Ogandoh (2015) who found that majority of the QASOs in the field did not only have the required academic qualifications but had relatively long periods of experience of being exposed to instructional supervision practices in various capacities in public schools. Consequently, this meant that they had requisite exposure on issues related to instruction as exercised by teachers in schools and they are well placed to be proactive agents of positively transforming the status quo of instruction in schools.

4.3 Perceptions held by Teachers towards QASOs Competences

The first objective of this study was to find out the perceptions that teachers hold towards the QASOs instructional supervisory competences in terms of human, technical and conceptual skills. To address this objective the study used the research question: What perceptions do teachers have towards the QASOs’ instructional supervisory competences?

To begin with, the researcher sought to find out generally the perceptions that teachers had towards the QASOs’ instructional supervisory competences. The results are reported in Figure 4.4
According to Figure 4.4 it is evident that majority, 94(86.2%) of school principal teachers and 229(78.7%) of HOD teachers reported that they felt that QASOs’ competency in instructional supervision was partially effective, while only 15(13.8%) of school principal teachers and 62(21.3%) of HOD teachers reported that QASOs’ instructional supervisory competences were very effective. This indicates that school principal teachers and HOD teachers never rated the instructional supervision competency of QASOs highly. This may imply that the instructional competences of QASOs have certain overt deficiencies.

These findings are in agreement with Awuor (2007) who found that the instructional supervisory practices conducted by QASOs’ personnel had inadequacies arising from the question of the perceptions that teachers had towards QASOs instructional competences and whether the instructional supervision of
teachers by QASOs improves teachers’ instructional competences to ultimately enhance quality of education offered in schools. Indeed, Chisikwa and Odwar (2010) found that QASOs felt that they had average competences in respect to skills of: human relations, knowledge of the subject, supervision approach and report writing. When majority of school principal teachers and heads of department teachers hold the perception that QASOs have partial competences in instructional supervision, it is indicative that according to school principal teachers and heads of departments, the QASOs needs to improve their instructional competences to ultimately be more effective in their work of instructional supervision.

When Principal teachers and HOD teachers were asked whether they perceived the QASOs as equal to the task of enhancing the quality of education through instructional supervision of teachers in public schools, their responses were as presented in Figure 4.5.

![Figure 4.5: QASOs’ Abilities to Enhance Provision of Quality Education](image-url)
From Figure 4.5, it is clear that majority, 58(53.2%) of school principal teachers and 137(47.9%) of HOD teachers said that they were partially capable of enhancing provision of quality education via instructional supervision, while 44(40.4%) of school principal teachers and 110(38.5%) of the HOD teachers reported that they were equal to the task of enhancing quality of education through instructional supervision. A minority 7(6.4%) of the school principal teachers and 39(13.6%) of the HOD teachers felt that QASOs were incapable of enhancing quality education provision through instructional supervision of teachers in public secondary schools. This implies that as much as instructional supervision has contributed towards influencing provision of quality education, its’ influence is not very significant in schools as per the majority of school principal teachers and HOD teachers. These observations are confirmed by one of the County QASO who reported that;

Truth be told; instructional supervision has some impact (influence) on quality education provision. The challenge would be going to a school … with a population of 40–50 teachers and the panel consists of 5–6 each member getting to see one lesson, implying only 5–6 teachers who are present in class will be seen and have a thorough discussion … In general, there may be an impact (influence) though not properly felt if you only see 5 teachers you have been able to guide them individually where they went right or wrong what they can do to improve their lessons but others may not have interacted with any officer and the next visit will be 2–3 years and those that you met may have forgotten.

These findings are in agreement with Daresh & Playko (1992), Pajak & Arrington, (2004), Sergiovanni & Starratt, (2007) and Zepeda, (2007), who in different studies had established that effective instructional supervision has a clear connection with quality of education offered in learning institutions.
These findings however disagree with the work of Kayaoglu, (2012) who found that external educational instructional supervisory process did not add any pedagogical or professional value to teachers, mainly because of the manner in which the external instructional supervisory process was conducted in learning institutions. As rightly highlighted by one County QASO, the challenge of having few QASOs and consequently reduced frequency of schools visits by QASOs can have an effect of reducing the effectiveness of QASOs in schools and therefore reducing the impact of QASOs in enhancing provision of quality education in schools.

In an open ended item, this study also sought from the QASOs whether they perceived themselves as equal to the task of maintaining quality education in public secondary schools, they all reported that they perceived themselves as equal to the task and they gave numerous reasons for this. While most felt that they are: “professionally qualified academically; have requisite teaching skills, training, and instructional supervisory experience”. Others felt that they are; “conversant with the curriculum and am in touch with modern trends in education” and have “undergone capacity building trainings on curriculum implementation, instructional supervision and quality education provision”. It's clear from these findings that literally all QASOs felt that they not only had necessary academic and professional qualifications that goes with effective instructional supervision but they also perceived themselves as having requisite experiences, training and exposure to conduct instructional supervision of teachers and impact positively on provision of quality education in schools.
However, it should be noted that whereas QASOs perceived themselves as having competences of enhancing quality of education in public secondary schools through instructional supervision, most 58(53.2\%) of Principal teachers and HOD teachers 137(47.9\%) as indicated by Figure 4.5 thought that QASOs are partially capable of enhancing provision of quality education via instructional supervision. This imply that while QASOs maybe be having the persuasion that they are competent and offering the best service to schools in terms of instructional supervision, the teachers in schools have the persuasion that QASOs needed to generally improve in their instructional supervision approaches in order to enhance provision of quality education via instructional supervision.

The finding that QASOs are not fully capable of enhancing provision of quality education through instructional supervision are in agreement with the work of Kamindo (2008) who had found that the actual instructional supervision performance of QASOs did not meet the teachers and head teacher’s expectations as much as QASOs thought otherwise. Similarly, an earlier study by Govinda and Tapan (1999) had established that instructional supervision as a means of improving quality education in schools focused on teachers and their performance with little regards to supporting the teachers’ competences. Apparently therefore, to progressively address teachers’ expectations, every QASO’s instructional supervision exercises in schools should focus on value addition to teachers’ instructional competences.
This study specifically narrowed down to establishing the perceptions of Principal teachers and HOD teachers in respect to the QASOs’ human, technical and conceptual skills which are paramount in effective instructional supervision Kutsyuruba, (2003), Sergiovanni & Starratt, (2007) and Zepeda, (2007)

4.3.1 Human Relations Skills

The study sought to establish the perceptions of Principal teachers and HOD teachers on human relations skills competences of QASOs in terms of their abilities to cultivate friendly interactions with teachers when they visit schools when conducting instructional supervision. Figure 4.6 reports the perceptions of Principal and HOD teachers on human relations skills competences of QASOs.

![Bar chart showing perceptions of Principal and HOD Teachers on QASOs Human Relations Skills](image)

**Figure 4.6: Perceptions of Principal and HOD Teachers on QASOs Human Relations Skills**

As indicated in Figure 4.6, most (60)55.6% of school principal teachers and (192)68.3% of HOD teachers felt that QASOs were partially effective in their human relations skills competences when they visited school for instructional
supervision. This means that most principal and HOD teachers felt that QASOs needed to improve on their human relations skills competences.

The finding of this study on the human relations skills competences of QASOs are consistent with the studies of Milcah, Chisikwa and Odwar (2010) who found that QASOs had average human relations skills and had recommended for further training in human relations skills. As noted in the literature review; Republic of Kenya (2000) a prerequisite condition for effective supervision to take place is that, the supervisor should create a mutual friendly atmosphere devoid of fear and coercive language. When majority of the heads of department and principal teachers reported that QASOs are partially effective in human relations competences, it implies that the environment under which instructional supervision is conducted in schools is not very teacher friendly and these may have the negative effect of reducing the effectiveness of the whole instructional supervision processes in schools, this inevitably impacts negatively on the quality of education being offered in schools in the long run.

To have a clear picture on the status of human relations skills of QASOs, the researcher sought to establish the perceptions of Principal teachers and HOD teachers on the extent to which they perceived QASOs exhibiting certain human skills relations variables when conducting instructions supervision in schools. Table 4.5 reports the sentiments of principal and HOD teachers.
Table 4.5: Perceptions of Principal and HOD Teachers towards QASOs’ Human Relations Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Relation Skill</th>
<th>School Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Heads of Departments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To some little extent</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To some little extent</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect teachers</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have faith in teachers</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly to teachers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliment teachers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in table 4.5, majority 74(67%) of the school principal teachers and 174(59%) of heads of department teachers reported that QASOs had respect for teachers when they visit their schools, most 61(56%) of the school principal teachers and 131(45%) of heads of department teachers said that QASOs had faith in teachers. However, it’s evident that while majority, 54(49.1%) of school principal teachers felt that QASOs handled teachers only in a little friendly manner, majority 139(48%) of heads of department teachers felt that QASOs handled teachers in a friendly manner.

This would imply that when QASOs visit schools for instructional supervision, they establish a friendly rapport with teachers through such avenues as; extending warm greetings, being polite and generally being courteous. Indeed, one County QASO described the relationship between QASOs and teachers as “… normally a very healthy interaction and at the end of the day I normally leave a very knowledgeable teacher …” Finally majority, 49(45%) of school principal teachers and 128(44.4%) heads of department teachers reported that QASOs complimented teachers. This implies that there are generally healthy interactions between QASOs and principals/HOD teachers during instructional supervision exercises in schools.

This is evident because although most (60)55.6% of school principal teachers and (192)68.3% of HOD teachers felt that QASOs were partially effective in their human relations skills competences with teachers when they visited school for instructional supervision as shown in figure 4.6, the table 4.5 shows that actually most school principal teachers and head teachers considered QASOs as respectful,
friendly and as positively complimenting teachers. This indicates that there is conducive environment for conducting instructional supervision in schools.

Maybe the above variance in perceptions on the relationship between QASOs and teachers can be explained by a comment made by one of the County QASO, who lamented that:

It is good depending on whether you have had an interaction with them in recent years. Those that have not interacted with Quality Assurance (recently) still have a lot of fear, with a perception that they are harassed, but for the teachers that we have interacted with they appreciated and after the exercise they always tell us to come back. Lack of interaction creates fear.

These findings on human relations competences of QASOs tend to agree with Mohammed & Orodho (2014) and Karugu (2015) who found that the relationship between QASOs and teachers was positive, the interaction and attitude between the teachers and the QASOs had immensely improved in terms of friendliness and respect. This is as opposed to studies by Ondicho (2004) and Rugut (2003) who had found that, QASOs were very unfriendly when conducting instructional supervision in schools. Maybe the differences in the findings of these studies can be explained by positive reforms in QASOs as a result of capacity building in the domain of human relations. Indeed, Ndegwa (2001) had established that teachers regarded instructional supervision as a stressful experience because of the fear of unknown. As Tesfaw and Hofman (2012) had found, teachers wished to be supervised by professionals who had knowledge and skills of supervision, and who exhibited friendly approaches in instructional supervision exercise.

It can therefore be observed that the existing human relations skills of QASOs’ relating to; being generally friendly, respectful and being able to compliment
teachers have to some great extent enabled teachers to build professional trust in the whole exercise of instructional supervision by QASOs in schools. This most likely has created fertile ground for QASOs to interact with teachers during instructional supervision process whose net effect could be value addition on how quality education can be offered in schools.

### 4.3.2 Technical Skills

The study required the principal and HOD teachers to give their perceptions in respect to how they perceived QASOs as being competent in technical skills related to teaching and learning process. The results are captured by Figure 4.7

![Figure 4.7: Principals’ and HOD teachers’ Perception towards QASOs Technical Skills](image)

From Figure 4.7, it is evident that three quarter 81(75.0%) of the school principal teachers and 191(68.5%) of the heads of department teachers said that QASOs were partially effective in their ability to engage teachers in technical knowledge related to teaching and learning processes. Only a quarter 27(25%) of school
principal teachers and 88(31.5%) of the heads of department teachers reported that QASOs were very effective in technical skills. This means that generally principal teachers and HOD teachers do not think QASOs measure-up in their instructional supervision technical competences despite the fact it had earlier been shown that most QASOs had sufficient qualifications and accumulated years of experience as indicated in table 4.3 and figure 4.2 respectively. This imply that sufficiency in academic qualifications and accumulated years of experience does not necessary translate into effectiveness in demonstrated instructional technical competences by the QASOs.

These findings concur with Kimathi (2013) who found that all QASOs did not have sufficient technical knowledge in their areas of specialization. As Naci (2012) had established, conducting of effective instructional supervision required instructional supervisors to have technical skills in their respective subject areas because technical skills empowers the teacher to present content in different ways to cater for learners with varied learning styles (Desimone, 2009 & Koehler, 2011). The finding from this study implies that most of the school principal teachers and of the heads of department teachers may not have benefited from technical skills of QASOs during instructional supervision. This state of affairs is not good because teachers with technical weakness or challenges in their areas of specializations might only improve minimally even after being supervised by QASOs and this could be affecting the quality of education being offered in public schools.
To further probe on the QASOs technical skills competences, the researcher evaluated the opinions of Principal and HOD teachers on how QASOs utilized their technical skills while conducting instructional supervision. Their responses were categorized as: **VG - Very Good, G - Good, S – Satisfactory and US – Unsatisfactory.** This is presented in table 4.6
Table 4.6: Principals’ and HOD Teachers’ Perceptions towards QASOs’ Utilization of Technical Competences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability of QASOs’</th>
<th>School principal teacher</th>
<th>Heads of Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VG n  %</td>
<td>G n  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in technical issues</td>
<td>12 11 30 27.5</td>
<td>39 35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective evaluation of teaching-learning</td>
<td>7 6.6 26 24.5</td>
<td>55 51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline issues of teaching and learning</td>
<td>9 8.2 33 30.8</td>
<td>51 47.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VG - Very Good  G - Good  S - Satisfactory  US - Unsatisfactory
Table 4.6 shows that, most 119(42.5%) of heads of department teachers and 39(35.8%) of the school principal teachers said that QASOs had satisfactory technical skills to effectively assist teachers on technical issues. Similarly, slightly over half 55(51.9%) of the school principal teachers and 100(36.1%) of the heads of department teachers felt that QASOs technical abilities to conduct of evaluation of the teachers was satisfactory and good respectively. On QASOs technical competence to effectively help schools streamline issues of teaching and learning processes, 51(47.7%) of school principal teachers and 106(38.0%) of heads of department teachers felt that it was satisfactory. As captured in the literature review, technical skills competences exhibit themselves through ones’ ability to understand and effectively facilitate learning of the unique content of a given subject.

These findings imply that generally school principal teachers and HOD teachers consider QASOs’ applications of their technical skills during instructional supervision as being satisfactory meaning that they have satisfactory abilities to understand unique content matter of various subjects, detect anomaly in the teaching and consequently offer appropriate technical advice to teachers to enable them facilitate the learning processes in their subject areas. On the technical competences of QASOs, the findings of this study are consistent with the studies by Griffin (1994) and Zachariah (2013) who noted that most inspectors (QASOs) do not exhibit sufficient technical competences and therefore can hardly provide expert knowledge and guidance to teachers, meaning that the quality of education can be compromised. According to the findings of this study; although most
81(75.0%) of school principal teachers and 191(68.5%) of heads of department teachers had the perception that QASOs were partially effective in their technical competences as shown in figure 4.7, they were in consensus that QASOs were satisfactory in; assisting teachers in technical skills, conducting effective evaluation of teaching-learning process, and streamlining issues of teaching and learning processes in public schools. The implications of these is that although teachers gain some value addition in respect to technical skills through instructional supervision of schools by QASOs, the QASOs’ have not fully met the needs of technical skills for teachers in public schools as to enable teachers to discharge their professional technical instructional duties in schools. This implies that the QASOs may need more empowerment in technical skills so that they can be able to cascade the same skills to teachers during instructional supervision.

### 4.3.3 Conceptual Skills

This study sought to establish the perceptions that Principal teachers and HOD teachers have towards the QASOs ability to observe and make clear findings which can enhance teachers teaching abilities. The responses are as presented in Figure 4.8
Figure 4.8: Principals’ and HOD Teachers’ Perceptions towards QASOs’ Conceptual Skills.

From Figure 4.8, it is clear that majority, 69(63.9%) of school principal teachers and 173(61.8%) of heads of department teachers hold the opinion that QASOs were partially effective in conceptual skills, with 39(36.1%) of school principal teacher and 107(38.2%) of the heads of department teachers reporting that they were very effective. This means that as much as most principal teachers and HOD teachers hold the opinion that QASOs don’t have optimal conceptual competences related to instructional supervision, quite a sizable percentage of principal teachers and HOD teachers hold the view that QASOs have sufficient conceptual skills.

These findings on the conceptual skills of the QASOs are in agreement with the findings by Kinayia (2010) who established that among the problems experienced by QASOs in their job included poor skills in observing and recording what they came across during instructional supervision. It is worth noting that although
previous studies by Wasanga (2004) and Awuor (2007) had found that the
department of Quality Assurance was hampered due to inadequacies in conceptual
skills, these inadequacies may have subsided over time as evidenced in this study
due to such reasons as capacity building of QASOs. As highlighted in the literature
review, the conceptual skills of observing and making clear findings are very
essential in instructional supervision of teachers because it determines the
substance of what will be communicated as feedback towards the end of an
instructional supervision exercise. To this end, it can be insinuated that many
teachers might have some doubt on the objectivity of the feedback given by the
QASOs at the end of instructional supervision given that majority of the teachers
hold the opinion that QASOs are partially effective in the conceptual skills of
observing and recording.

Further, the Principals’ and HOD teachers’ were asked about QASOs ability to
communicate their findings in an objective and clear way. Their responses were
categorized as: **VG - Very Good, G - Good, S – Satisfactory and US – Un satisfactory.** This is summarized in table 4.7.
Table 4.7: Principals’ and HOD Teachers’ Perceptions on QASOs’ Communication Competences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>School Principal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Heads of Departments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VG</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate findings objectively and clearly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication between teachers and QASOs is</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>VG - Very Good</td>
<td>G - Good</td>
<td>S - Satisfactory</td>
<td>US - Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7 indicates that, majority 49(46.2%) of the school principal teachers and 103(36.3%) of heads of department teachers felt that QASOs capability to communicate their findings of instructional supervision exercises in an objective and clear way was satisfactory followed closely by 34(32.1%) of school principal teacher and 102(35.9%) of heads of department who felt that it was good. Further, table 4.7 shows that majority, 110(38.6%) of the HOD teachers and most 41(38.3%) of school principal teachers reported that there were satisfactory and good clear communication between the teachers and QASOs respectively. This implies that during instructional supervision, the intentions of instructional supervision that may be brought out at the stages of pre-observational, post-observational and plenary conferences are to some large extent always captured and communicated accordingly to the success of the instructional supervision process. Where there are good intentions in form of innovations from the QASOs, these can be passed to the teachers and this can eventually improve the quality of education offered.

These findings are contrary to Ogandoh (2015) who found that most of the teachers judged QASOs as exercising negative interactive communication that could not help teachers improve their performances in schools. Although most principal teachers and heads of department teachers had indicated that QASOs had partial conceptual skills (Figure 4.8); the same respondents are in consensus that QASOs have satisfactory to good abilities to communicate clearly and objectively during pre-observational, post-observational and plenary conferences. Good communication skills for QASOs facilitate smooth interactions between teachers
and QASOs especially when the QASOs are collecting instructional information and giving feedback to the teachers.

The researcher sought to establish from the QASOs themselves on how they perceived their ability to deliver instructional findings in the teachers during the instructional supervision. Figure 4.9 reports on the QASOs opinions.

![Figure 4.9: QASOs Opinions of their Ability to Deliver Instructional Findings](image)

As indicated by Figure 4.9, majority 12(70.6%) of QASOs reported that they delivered their instructional supervision findings at post-observational and plenary conferences in an objective, clear and concise manner. Hence QASOs consider themselves competent in delivery of instructional supervision findings. This is in close agreement to what Principal teachers and HOD teachers had reported (satisfactory to good) as shown in table 4.7.

These findings are consistent with Tabby (2005) who established that although QASOs saw themselves as good communicators of their ideas and intentions, teachers felt that QASOs needed to improve on the same to come to the level of the
teacher. This is especially so because as affirmed by Sanaika (2008) the supervisors’ conceptual skill should enable him to divide a complex situation into its components as judged by the supervisee. In this respect, the QASOs should be very conscious of the language that they use and should always encourage dialogue in the instructional supervision process so as to be able to demystify any mis-conceptions that may be prevailing amongst teachers.

Lastly, this study also sought to establish the perceptions that QASOs have about themselves in regards to specific aspects of conceptual competences of instructional supervision. This is reported in Table 4.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Data collection and analysis</th>
<th>Interpreting and reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially effective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to Improve</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 indicates that, most 9(52.9%) of QASOs felt that they were highly effective in data collection and analysis followed by an equal number 4(23.5%) of them who felt that they were partially effective and needed to improve on data collection and analysis. Similarly, most 11(64.7%) of QASOs said that they were highly effective in report writing and presentation skills, and only 2(11.8%) of QASOs felt that they needed to improve on their report writing and presentation skills in respect to instructional supervision. This indicates that QASOs consider
themselves as having requisite skills in conceptual skills of: data collection in respect to the existing instructional abilities of teachers in schools; logically analyzing these data; appropriately interpreting and reporting these data to teachers and other stakeholders for instructional improvement in schools.

The above findings is contrary to Wasanga (2004) who had found that Quality Assurance Officers were hampered due to inadequacies in specialized skills for collecting, analyzing and interpreting information related to instructional supervision in schools. Conceptual skills enable instructional supervisors to be able to collect, analyze and interpret information related to instructional supervision in a logical manner (Republic of Kenya, 2000). The implications of QASOs having effective skills in: data collection and analysis; and, report writing and presentation all contributes to effective instructional supervision which benefits the teachers.

4.4 Instructional Supervisory Practices Exercised by QASOs in Schools

Having established the perceptions of school principal teachers and heads of department teachers towards the QASOs, the second major objective of the study was to assess how the QASOs exercised the instructional supervisory practices in public schools. This objective was guided by the research question: How do the Quality Assurance and Standards Officers conduct instructional supervision in public secondary schools? To achieve this, the study focused on the various activities that the QASOs are engaged in course of conducting instructional supervision in schools. These includes: preparation for conducting instructional supervision; conducting the actual instructional supervision in schools; and
compiling of preliminary instructional supervision reports together with delivery of feedback at the school.

### 4.4.1 Preparation for Conducting Instructional Supervision

The study sought to establish how the QASOs prepared themselves and the teachers before engaging in the actual exercise of conducting instructional supervision in schools. To this effect, the study first sought to establish whether QASOs wrote letters to learning institutions notifying them that they will be visiting them as required (Ministry of Education, 2000) and whether QASOs used previous instructional supervision reports and recommendations for the various respective schools as reference documents for preparing to conduct instructional supervision in a given school. The results of these is reported in table 4.9.
### Table 4.9: Notification to Schools of Supervision Visits and Utilization of Previous Supervision Reports by QASOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>School Principal</th>
<th>Heads of Department</th>
<th>QASOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To some little extent</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify schools at least three weeks before the visit.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use previous supervision reports.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From table 4.9, it is observed that, majority 15(88.3%), 72(65.5%) and 119(41.0%) of QASOs’, school principal and heads of department teachers respectively indicated that QASOs hardly notified schools at least three weeks in advance that they were due to visit them, only 18(16.7%) of school principal teachers and 64(22.1%) of the heads of department indicated that they receive letters informing them that they will be visited by QASOs. This means when such visits are actualized, teachers are unaware and unprepared for them a situation that may make them not to perform very well.

These findings are consistent with Mwaura (2014) who found that QASOs hardly issued notices to schools to be visited, hence most head teachers and teachers were caught unawares. However, according to the findings of Thembinkosi (2013), majority of teachers wanted to be notified about the school or classroom visits by supervisors well in advance because as Ogandoh (2015) had noted, the effects of not informing the schools to prepare for instructional supervision makes the teachers feel; mistrusted, spied on, threatened and this can reduce the productivity of an instructional supervision exercise because teachers perceive QASOs conducting instructional supervision as being on a fault finding mission. Maybe the reason why QASOs are unable to inform schools of impending visits can be explained by what one of the County QASO had indicated:

...there are numerous activities that QASOs are supposed to undertake and given that they face financial constrains; they are not able to plan schools visits accurately.

Indeed, the Handbook for supervision of educational institutions (Ministry of Education, 2000) talks of prior plans, where preparations are made both at the
levels of QASOs’ themselves and in the institutions to be visited. However, as one County QASO justified or observed:

“...if instructional supervision is for the purpose of establishing what is happening in the school, giving notice to a school will not yield results because what will be observed will be staged managed…”

The documented adverse effects of not formally informing schools of instructional supervision visits by QASOs as provided for is so bad that the justifications given by one of the County QASO should not hold. Indeed, Thembinkosi (2013) established that majority of teachers like to be notified about classroom visits by supervisors well in advance to prepare for the exercise of supervision. Effective instructional supervisors should not only be able to uncover any “stage managed” preparations which does not benefit the instructional process but should also be able to advice accordingly. Indeed, when schools are notified in advance of an impending instructional supervision exercise, part of the preparations in the schools should aim to do “things” right and ultimately improve quality of education.

In respect to utilization of previous instructional supervision reports as an avenue of preparation for conducting instructional supervision, table 4.9 indicates that many 114(39.2%) of heads of department teachers and 37(34.3%) of school principal teachers felt that previous supervision reports were hardly used and only used to a little extent respectively to inform the preparation for instruction supervision of schools by the QASOs. However, majority 12(70.6%) of the QASOs reported that they hardly used previous instructional supervision reports
when preparing to conduct instructional supervision in a given school. This implies that generally there are minimal utilization schools’ previous instructional supervision reports in terms of checking of implementation of QASOs recommendations as a preparation for subsequent instructional supervision exercises in schools. This essentially denies the QASOs the opportunity to verify the extent of implementation of their previous instructional supervision recommendations and appropriately refine how they will conduct their current instructional supervision exercise for optimal instructional benefit of a given school.

These findings are contrary to Tyagi (2011) who established that effective instructional supervision in schools needed a thorough review of previous supervision reports as a preparation aspect. When QASOs make impromptu schools visits for intensive instructional supervision without having perused through previous instructional supervision reports conducted in the respective schools, this is unlikely to show progress or lack of it in terms of improving teachers’ instructional competences. In the European Union countries, preparation for conducting schools evaluation starts with a preliminary phase of collecting and analyzing information data on schools by Education Quality Personnel, which allows evaluators to establish the profile of the school to be visited and better focus the evaluation (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2015). One would therefore advise that for monitoring and effectiveness purposes, previous instructional supervision reports should form base-line reference documents for preparing for instructional supervision.
The researcher also wished to establish the status of the various preparatory activities or measures that the QASOs put in place to increase the propensity of having effective instructional supervision in schools. This is summarized in table 4.10.

Table 4.10: QASOs Preparation Activities for Instructional Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have schedule for visiting institutions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Assessor allocates duty to QASOs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 shows that while 9(52.9%) of QASOs indicated that there were no written schedules for visiting schools in their county, another 8(47.1%) indicated that there were such schedules. This divided opinion indicates that there is uncertainty amongst QASOs on the existence of written schedules for regularly visiting schools to specifically conduct instructional supervision as provided for by the Handbook for Supervision of Education Institutions (2000).

These findings agree with the work of Kamindo (2008) who found that QASOs did not put a lot of weight in formulating their own schedules of work because their work depended on the instructions they received from the DEOs which was unpredictable. Absence of work schedules may imply that there is no much preparations that are carried out when QASOs decide to visit a school for instructional supervision, this may actually explain why there was almost consensus (as presented in table 4.9) by school principals, heads of department
teachers and QASOs that mostly schools are hardly notified of impending instructional supervision exercises.

Further, table 4.10 above indicates that while most 9(52.9%) of QASOs reported that Lead Assessor allocated duties to other QASOs for effective preparation of an instructional supervision exercise, 8(47.1%) of the QASOs were of the view that Lead Assessor hardly allocated duties before an impending instructional supervision exercise. This indicates that while most Lead Supervisors allocates duty to QASOs before instructional supervision exercises are held as a means for preparing for such exercises, an equally significant proportion of Lead Supervisors don’t allocate duties at all. This implies that a significant number of the visits were not planned for thoroughly and this could reduce the effectiveness of instructional supervision exercises in schools.

The findings on the status preparedness of QASOs’ before conducting instructional supervision in schools is contrary to Burrow (2012) who had found that in the Mombasa County Kenya, QASOs appeared unprepared when they visited an institution for instructional supervision because of poor preparation for such exercises and this resulted to poor service delivery. However, it should be noted that the Task Force on Alignment of the Constitution with Education had established; “Quality Assurance Services in Educational Institutions is manifested with uncoordinated decision-making at all levels” (Republic of Kenya, 2011). This apparently, indicates that QASOs were not doing very sufficient preparations before visiting a school for instructional supervision.
Allocation of duties to QASOs by Lead QASO Assessor is a prerequisite of effective preparations for effective instructional supervision of schools (Ministry of Education, 2000). When the allocation is totally not done or it is done too late, then the implications are seen via ineffective instructional supervision exercises in schools.

4.4.2 Conducting Actual Instructional Supervision

This study sought to find out the main approach used by QASOs to engage the school principal teachers and HOD teachers while conducting actual instructional supervision. The responses are presented in Figure 4.10

Figure 4.10: Approaches used by QASOs when Handling Principal and HOD teachers

Figure 4.10 indicates that majority, 13(76.5%) of QASOs reported that they used collegial approach when handling teachers. In other words, QASOs believe that they treat Principal teachers and HOD teachers as colleagues while conducting
instructional supervision. In this respect QASOs consider themselves as engaging and consultative in the whole process of instructional supervision. This is consistent with the study by Lews, (2002) who found that most educational instructional supervisors considered themselves as exercising collegiality in course of their instructional supervision.

However, Figure 4.10 indicates that; according to most 49(45.4%) of the school principal teachers and 109(36.4%) of heads of department teachers the democratic approach was mostly used by QASOs when handling teachers and autocratic approach came closely second as reported by 103(35.4%) of the heads of department and 36(33.3%) of the school principals. This implies that generally most principal teachers and heads of department teachers consider QASOs as exercising democratic tendencies while conducting instructional supervision. This in essence means that, in terms of what need to be done in respect to improvement of instructional competencies of teachers, the majority has their way and minority have their say. This type of approach of instructional supervision is inferior to collegial approach because it does not engage stakeholders (QASOs, Principal teachers and heads of departments) in discussion in order to reach consensus when making (instructional) decisions (Tony, 2007) and therefore there is no complete ownership of decisions or actions being implemented.

The findings of this study also tends to be in agreement with Okendu, (2012) who found that in contemporary Nigeria, instructional supervision through democratic interactions between the Teacher and the Supervisor was found to be the most
dominant approach of enhancing the professional growth and improving the techniques of teachers. However, these findings are contrary to Kamindo (2008) and Moswela (2010) who found that teachers seemed to view QASOs as being autocratic and that the environment in which instructional supervision took place in schools was rather autocratic with manifestations of silent hostility and intimidation to teachers.

As captured by one of the County QASO during the interview, thus; “…after assessing a teacher, most of them ask me to assess them in the next lesson…”

This may indicate that an experience of an interaction with the QASOs could be what is missing for teachers who hold the view that QASOs are autocratic. Further maybe lack of complete involvement of teachers at all stages of instructional supervision could also explain why few principal teachers and head teachers have the perception that QASOs don’t use collegial approach during instructional supervision. To move towards collegiality, the QASOs need to be more conscious and involve the input of teachers during the stages of: preparation for conducting instructional supervision; initial meeting; pre-observational, observational and post observational conferences; and final plenary meeting in the school. As Sergiovanni & Starratt, (2002) found, when teachers’ belief that QASOs are collegial they tend to be; positive towards instructional supervision, become open-minded and trusting which contributes to successful instructional supervision sessions.

This study also wished to establish from the principals, heads of department teachers and QASOs themselves which activities the QASOs preferred to
concentrate on more between evaluative and advisory services, they responded as reported in table 4.11

Table 4.11: QASOs, Principal and HOD teachers Views on Services QASOs should concentrate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HOD TEACHERS</th>
<th>QASOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 indicates that, slightly above half 59(54.6%) of school principal teachers and 130(45.0%) of Heads of department teachers reported that QASOs to concentrated on both advisory and evaluative service when they visit schools. A good percentage 36(33.3%) of school principal teachers and 128(44.3%) of the Heads of department teachers said that they would prefer them to concentrate on advisory. However, majority 8(47.1%) of QASOs reported that they would prefer to concentrate on advisory roles. This shows that as much as majority of principal teachers and HOD teachers were in consensus that QASOs should concentrate on both evaluate and advisory roles, all the respondents (principals, HOD teachers and QASOs) were of the opinion that QASOs should lay more emphases on advisory roles when they visit schools.

According to Government of Kenya, (2001a), QASOs have been mandated to carry out evaluative and advisory roles in furtherance to quality education provision in schools. While the evaluative roles has to do with identification of instructional
deficiencies of teachers like poor classroom control and lack of stimulus variation while teaching, the advisory roles has to do with addressing presumed or indentified teachers’ instructional deficiencies like how to take care of learners’ individual differences while teaching.

The sentiments of the majority of principal teachers and HOD teachers on the preferred areas that QASOs should concentrate on agrees with Glickman et al., (2007) that the role of the supervisor when dealing with teachers would require him to first identify the needs of the teacher (evaluation) so as to effectively assist the individual teacher towards accelerated growth and development (advisory) using the developmental model of instructional supervision. However, the findings of this study in regards to QASOs preferring to concentrate on advisory roles are contrary to the findings of Kamindo (2008) who found that QASOs rated evaluvative roles functions higher than advisory functions. As advocated by Okumbe, (1998), instructional supervision should be based on: “what you see”- observation (evaluative); “hear”- discussion (advisory); and “read”-documentation” (evaluation) which should be analyzed to form the bases of designing strategies of improving the teacher(advsiory), an instructional supervision approach he called clinical supervision. One would only hope that QASOs are able to strike a balance between evaluation and advisory activities (Glickman et al., 2007).

The researcher sought to find, not only the arrival time for the QASOs but also how they conducted actual instructional supervision in the schools at various
stages as judged by the Principal teachers and HOD teachers. Table 4.12 presents these sentiments.

### Table 4.12: Principal and HOD teachers Responses on QASOs Conducting Instructional Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conduct</th>
<th>School Principals</th>
<th>Heads of Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School arrival before 8.30AM.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial meeting</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-observation conferences</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation conferences</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post observation conference</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of improvement are discussed.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.12, numerous observations can be made; first, while the majority, 57(52.8%) of the school principal teachers are of the opinion that QASOs arrival at the schools before 8.30am, majority 189(65.8%) of the heads of department teachers reported that QASOs hardly arrived at the schools before 8.30am. Maybe the difference in opinion between principal teachers and HOD teachers can be explained by the fact that, when QASOs arrive in the school they first report to the office of the Principal after which HOD teachers and teachers are informed of their presence. To this extent, it can be said that QASOs are able to arrive at the schools for instructional supervision at 8.30am which ideally gives them ample time to conduct thorough instructional supervision. Republic of Kenya, (2000) provide that the QASOs are supposed to arrive early (before 8.30am) at the school they are
scheduled to conduct instructional supervision so as to maximize on what they see and hear. When QASOs arrive early in schools, they are likely to maximize on what they “see”-observation; “hear”-discussion; and “read”-documentation (evaluation) which eventually makes the instructional supervision exercise successful.

Secondly, table 4.12 indicates that, majority 57(52.8.5%) and 52(47.7%) of principals, and majority 140(48.6%) and 188(65.3%) of HOD teachers are in agreement that that: QASOs explains clearly issues to be assessed during the initial meeting, and that during the final meeting between QASOs and teachers there are healthy discussions on the findings of instructional supervision highlighting areas that need improvement respectively. As captured in the literature review during the initial meeting, QASOs clearly explains their instructional supervision mission, objectives and goals, while during the final plenary meeting the QASOs provide feedback of the conducted instructional supervision exercise highlighting areas of improvement. The success of these two meeting can therefore be an indicator of effective instructional supervision by the QASOs.

The findings of this study on how initial and final plenary meeting are conducted is in agreement with the works of Early (1998) and Chapman (2001a) who had found that teachers are always eager to be engaged in discussions and meetings on their instructional supervision before and after being supervised. Ideally, the involvement of teachers during the initial meeting before instructional supervision commences in a given school is generally likely to create a conducive environment for instructional supervision because they are informed of what to expect in the
whole process. Ultimately, when the final meeting between the QASOs and teachers is healthy, this would imply that feedback offered at the school level is well discussed and way forward on instructional improvement is agreed.

Thirdly, table 4.12 indicates that most 57(52.8%) of principal teachers and 154 (52.7) of HOD teachers reported that during pre-observational conference teachers are not engaged in a discussion to establish how the actual classroom assessment will be conducted. This means that most of the teachers that are observed in class teaching during instructional supervision are hardly informed on the major variables (interaction between the teacher and pupils, involvement of all pupils, teaching from known to unknown, use of instructional materials, masterly of subject etc) that the QASOs focus on while observing the way they conduct their classes. Ginsberg (2003) found that mutual expectations and goals between the teacher and instructional supervisor as established during the pre-observational conference helps to foster an environment where teachers can grow and where teachers are not briefly informed in advance of QASOs observational expectations in an ideal class, this may create uncertainty and they might not display their real self.

The finding of this study on pre-observational conference confirms Romano (2014) assertion that one of the most frequent complaints from teachers in respect to the process of the pre-observation is that it is never held. When the QASOs fail to conduct the pre-observational conference, they deny themselves and the teacher(s) to be supervised an opportunity to create a personalized rapport based on the nitty-
gritty of how the actual class instructional supervision will be conducted which significantly can reduce any tension which could be there between the QASO and the teacher, consequently making the teacher behave normally when be supervised and ultimately bringing-out his/her strong and weak points. The net effect of this is that, the instructional supervisor is likely to note the right observations during observational conference and ultimately give the right feedback in terms of instructional improvement during the post-observational conference.

Lastly, table 4.12 shows that: vast majority, 200(69.2%) and 180(62.5%) of HOD teachers; and 79(71.8%) and 64(58.7%) of the school principal teachers were in agreement that: QASO conduct observational conference professionally without humiliating the teachers; and post observational conference is also professionally done, appropriately addressing areas of improvement respectively. This indicates that majority of principal teachers and HOD teachers are in agreement that QASOs are humane, understand the various instructional weakness that teachers might have and are professional (respect teachers, maintain confidentiality etc) while conducting observational and post observational conferences.

These findings are contrary to the works of Romano (2014), Kisirkoi (2014) and Ogandoh (2015) who found that most QASOs gave ambiguous statements and comments during the post-observational conference and that many teachers did not professionally benefit from observations made by supervisors in the classroom observation. These imply that there is variance in the instructional supervision practices of conducting observational and post observational conferences. The
variance maybe due to differential level of knowledge among the QASOs on how observational and post observational conferences should be conducted

When observational and post-observational conferences are professionally done, it implies that to a greater extent right observations are noted when the teacher are being observed while facilitating teaching and based on these observations right feedback on areas to improve are highlighted in the post-observational conference. This culminates in instructional improvement to the concerned teacher.

The researcher sought to find out from principal and HOD teachers which areas the QASOs concentrated on when they visited schools. To achieve this, both were required to rank (1- Most concentrated, 2- Moderately Concentrated and 3- Least Concentrated) identified areas that QASOs concentrate on during for instructional supervision. This is reported in table 4.14
Table 4.13: Principals’ and HOD Teachers’ Ranking of the Areas That QASOs Concentrate on During Instructional Supervision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concentration</th>
<th>School Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>HOD teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 n</td>
<td>2 n</td>
<td>3 n</td>
<td>1 n</td>
<td>2 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking; schemes of work, lesson plans, registers &amp; lesson notes</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing teachers in classrooms</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1- Most concentrated, 2- Moderately Concentrated and 3- Least Concentrated
As shown by table 4.13, three quarter 81(75.0%) of the school principal teachers and 159(60.7%) of the heads of department teachers ranked checking records like schemes of work, lesson, plans, registers, lesson notes etc. as the most important area where QASOs mostly concentrate on when conducting instructional supervision. This implies that according to principal teachers and HOD teachers, when QASOs visit schools for instructional supervision, they mostly concentrate on checking records like schemes of work, lesson, plans, registers and lesson notes. Therefore might indicate that most of the findings and recommendations on instructional supervision may be dominated by issues relating to the status of the teachers professional records. Maybe the reasons as to why QASOs concentrate on checking teachers’ professional records might be motivated by the fact that it’s the fastest indicator of what has been transpiring in classroom as far as teaching in concerned.

This finding in regard to checking teachers’ professional records concurs with Okumbe (1998) who observed that there is excess paper work and rigid rules in the process of supervision making the supervision process to be centered on whether teachers have updated or un-updated records. However, as Daresh and Playko, (1992), noted “professional supervision” done in areas of checking on lesson plans, schemes of work, registers and other administrative documents had positive impact in academic performance of pupils. Indeed, Usman (2015) affirmed that regular instructional supervision using robust supervision strategies like checking of students’ notebooks, checking teachers’ lesson plan/notes and inspection of teachers’ record keeping have significant correlation with teachers’ performance
and academic achievement of students in secondary schools. In this respect, (Ministry of Education, 2000) advices the QASOs to maximize on what they “see, hear and read” during instructional supervision exercise. One would therefore caution that overconcentration in checking teachers’ professional records amounts to “reading” to much at the expense of “seeing and hearing”.

Indeed, Wanzare (2012) observed that overconcentration in checking teachers’ professional records amounted to establishing bureaucratic regulations and procedures which does not promote effective instructional supervision practices.

Observing teachers in classrooms was ranked as least concentrated area by most 50(47.6%) of school principal teachers and moderately concentrated area by most 123(46.8%) of the heads of departments. This implies that school principal teachers and heads of department teachers are in agreement that QASOs do not concentrate most on observing teachers in classrooms as they do when it comes to checking teachers’ professional records. Maybe the reason why QASOs don’t concentrate a lot on observing teachers in classroom is because it’s tedious and time consuming exercise in the many number of teachers in a given school.

However, it should be noted that observing teachers in classroom provides primary raw data on the status of an individual teacher’ instructional abilities as compared to checking teachers’ professional records. Indeed, in advocating for a balance between checking of teachers’ professional records, observing teachers in classroom, McLaughlin & Zarrow (2001) established that most useful instructional supervision occur when there are meaningful interactions between teachers and
supervisors; hence observing teachers in classroom teaching and holding discussions with them in their departments should be balanced with checking of professional records. In New York State, the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) regulations, requires that to improve teacher instructional effectiveness a minimum of 31% of a teacher’s end-of-year evaluation to be based on multiple classroom observations (New York State Education Department, August 2012). This is supposed to be a base for providing teachers with constructive feedback towards improving their instructional competences in the areas of pedagogy, instructional materials utilization, and pupils’ evaluation and assessment.

The success of instructional supervision exercise depends heavily on the cooperation between the principals, HOD teachers and QASOs, in this connection therefore the study sought to establish whether the key participants felt that there existed cooperation when instructional supervision was being conducted. This is presented in the Figure 4.11
Figure 4.11: Principals’, HOD teachers’ and QASOs’ Responses on Cooperation between QASOs and Teachers

Figure 4.11 indicates that majority 14(82.4%), 57(52.8%) and 154(52.7%) of QASOs, school principal teachers and HOD teachers respectively are in agreement that there is cooperation between QASOs and teachers during instructional supervision exercise in public schools. This means that the instructions, directives and requests given by QASOs to teachers during instructional supervision are adhered to and that QASOs pay attention to any requests given by teachers in course of conducting instructional supervision. Such an environment enables the process of instructional supervision to be conducted smoothly in schools.

These study findings are in agreement with Karugo (2015) who found that generally there was cooperation between QASOs and teachers in terms of their interaction and relations during the conduct of the instructional supervision visits. Such cooperation imply that teachers not only avail themselves as required but they also avail needed documents for the instructional supervision, all which
makes the supervision exercises successful because the status quo of the instructional practices in a school can be established and hopefully professionally corrective measures are identified and implemented, which can go a long way in improving the quality of education offered in schools.

4.4.3 Preliminary Instructional Supervision Reports and Feedback

A key component of effective instructional supervision is the collection of requisite data to be used in informing the type of feedback to be given at the end of instructional supervision exercise. This study sought to establish whether; QASOs are able to pick out key findings of instructional supervision, if the findings are well argued with supportive evidence and finally if QASOs spare enough time to give feedback to the teachers at the school level. This is presented in table 4.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>School Principals</th>
<th>Heads of Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes n %</td>
<td>No n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlight areas for improvement</td>
<td>52 47.7</td>
<td>32 29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiency time for delivering feedback</td>
<td>39 35.5</td>
<td>48 43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argued with supportive evidences</td>
<td>37 33.6</td>
<td>34 30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126 43.9</td>
<td>77 26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 indicates that the majority, 52(47.7%) of school principal teachers and 188(65.3%) heads of department teachers said that during the final meeting between the QASOs and the teachers, the QASOs present their main findings of
instructional supervision highlighting areas that needed improvement. However, majority 48(43.6%) of the school principal teachers and 150(51.9%) of the heads of the departments reported that there was usually no sufficient time for delivering feedback and engaging teachers at the end of the instructional supervision. This implies that there is a culture of QASOs to present their final findings of an instructional supervision in schools during the final plenary session as provided by the ESQAC guidelines (Government of Kenya, 2001a). However, during these final plenary sessions there is hardly enough time for the teachers to interrogate the findings or recommendations presented by the QASOs. May a lot of time is allocated to other instructional supervision activities at the expense of the final plenary meeting or the QASOs dominate the final meeting; both of which should not be the case.

These findings are consistent with Ogandoh (2015) who found that although most teachers found Educational Supervisors highlighting areas that needed to be improved after supervising teachers, majority of the school principal teachers found QASOs allocating insufficient time for interacting with teachers at the end of an instructional supervision exercise. This implies that the QASOs dominate the final plenary session and teachers’ sentiments are hardly given an opportunity to be heard, consequently there is no ownership on the proposed way forward on how to generally improve instruction in the school given the findings of an instructional supervision exercise. Lack of ownership on proposed way forward of improving instruction in a school can be a recipe for failure of implementation.
Also captured in the table 4.14, although majority 126(43.9%) of heads of department teachers said that the report presented by QASOs at final meeting were always well argued where supportive evidences were collated, most 39(35.5%) school principal teachers were not sure on the same. Studies by Juvenale, 2017; Kayaoglu, 2012; and Kutsyuruba, 2003 indicates that instructional supervision is likely to reach its expected goal when the relations between the supervisors and teachers are collegial and teachers have an opportunity to discuss aspects of their teaching with supervisors during the plenary meeting in a secure and nurturing climate. Ministry of Education (2000) provides that comprehensive and teacher centred feedback sessions should occur during the final meeting between the QASO panel, the principal and the staff. During these meetings, major highlights or findings of the instructional supervision are supposed to be discussed and ‘the discussion should be professional and friendly’. To this effect, the contradicting sentiments expressed by principal teachers and HOD teachers tend to imply that the competences of QASOs in preparing agenda and facilitating for the final plenary meeting may be described as satisfactory.

4.5 Influences of QASOs’ Instructional Supervisory Practices on Competences of Teachers

The third objective of this study sought to establish the influences the QASOs instructional supervisory practices have on instructional competences of teachers. This was investigated by focusing three main areas, namely: enhancement in pedagogical competences; improvement in utilization of available instructional
materials in the schools; and improvement in assessment and evaluation of students.

To begin with, the researcher wished to establish whether principal teachers and HOD teachers looked forward to be visited by QASOs and if principal teachers and HOD teachers had colleagues whose instructional competences was superior to those of QASOs. The results are presented in table 4.15.

Table 4.15: Principals’ and HOD Teachers’ Responses on QASOs Visits and Comparison with their Colleagues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>School Principal</th>
<th>HOD teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes n %</td>
<td>No n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers look forward for QASOs visits</td>
<td>78 72.2</td>
<td>30 27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are more qualified and competent</td>
<td>86 81.1</td>
<td>20 18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than QASOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on table 4.15 indicates that a vast majority, 78(72.2%) of school principal teachers and 186(66.4%) of heads of department teachers reported that teachers looked forward to be visited by QASOs. This implies that Principal teachers and HOD teachers accept the fact that instructional supervision is important and fundamental in improving them. This is consistent with (Tyagi, 2010; Ormond, 2004 & Wendy, 2005) who found that teachers are always looking forward to instructional supervision activity. The main reason why teachers could be looking forward to instructional supervision is that; when it is effectively conducted, it positively influences effective service delivery, ongoing learning and development of teachers’ instructional competences. Further, as established by Chika (2015);
when instructional supervision reports of teachers is used as one of the bases for appointments and promotion of school administrators and teachers, it makes teachers to look forward to be supervised.

Similarly, table 4.15 shows that a majority, 86(81.1%) of school principal teachers and 239(81.6%) of the heads of department teachers reported that they had teachers amongst their staff whom in their opinion they thought were more qualified and competent than an average QASO. This implies that as much as schools had instructionally qualified and competent teachers, teachers in such schools still looked forward to being visited by QASOs, meaning that QASOs instructional supervision exercises is a service to reckon with in terms of influencing teachings towards improved instructional competences. Further, presence of more qualified and competent teachers than an average QASO in some schools would justify for strong collegiality between QASOs and teachers in the instructional supervision exercises. Through collegiality spirit QASOs and teachers (especially HOD teachers) can be able to share instructional supervision knowledge and experiences both of which can help improve internal instructional supervision of teachers and therefore quality education provision.

4.5.1 Enhancement in Pedagogical Methods

In respect to pedagogical skills, the researcher sought first to know from the principal teachers and HOD teachers whether the instructional supervision by QASOs has improved their pedagogic skills. The results are presented in Figure 4.12.
Figure 4.12: Effect of QASOs’ Instructional Supervision on Teachers’ Pedagogic Skills

Figure 4.12 shows that, while slightly over a half 45(50.7%) of heads of department teachers said instructional supervision exercises by QASOs helped them improve their pedagogic skills, majority 60(55.0%) of school principal teachers reported that QASOs instructional supervision sessions of teachers in schools did not help teachers in improving their pedagogic skills. This means that as much as majority of principal teachers are not in agreement with majority of HOD teachers, it is clear according to the principal teachers and HOD teachers, that instructional supervision exercises in schools has a positive influence in the improvement of teachers’ pedagogic skills. However, lack of consensus between principal teachers and HOD teachers on the effect of QASOs’ instructional supervision exercises on their pedagogic skills maybe an indicator that instructional supervision is not conducted effectively in schools and this could have an implication on quality education provision.
This finding of this study is in agreement with the findings of Akinwumi (2002) who established that instructional supervision has a great positive on teachers’ pedagogic productivity in secondary schools in Oyo State in Nigeria. Ironically, the sentiments of school principal teachers are also in agreement with the findings of Kayaoglu (2012) who had established that external educational instructional supervisory process did not add any pedagogical to teachers. These almost divided opinions by school principal teachers and HOD teachers would imply that a lot need to be done by the QASOs during instructional supervision so as to convincingly positively influence school principals’ pedagogical skills.

To further probe on whether instructional supervision by QASOs had enhanced the pedagogical skills of principal teachers and HOD teachers, the researcher wished to establish the effect that the instructional supervision by QASOs had on the principals’ and HOD teachers’; instructional teaching skills, and their ability to interpret and implement the curriculum. The responses were indicated on a 5 point likert scale (1-Strongly Agree, 2- Agree, 3-Neutral, 4- Disagree, 5- Strongly disagree. This is shown in table 4.16.
Table 4.16: Influences of QASOs Supervision on Teachers’; Teaching Skills, Interpretation and Implementation of Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Supervision</th>
<th>School Principals</th>
<th>Heads of Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve teachers’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructional skills</td>
<td>108 11 10. 34 31. 19 17. 24 22. 20 18.</td>
<td>287 32 11. 99 34. 71 24.7 43 15.0 42 14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during post-conference</td>
<td>2 5 6 2 5</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve teachers’</td>
<td>109 14 12. 36 33. 18 16. 30 27. 11 10.</td>
<td>290 59 20. 83 28. 60 20.7 39 13.4 49 16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum interpretation and implementation</td>
<td>8 0 5 5 1</td>
<td>3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>A - Agree</td>
<td>N - Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>D - Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD-Strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD - Strongly Agree A - Agree N - Neutral D - Disagree SD-Strongly
It is evident from table 4.16 that most 34(31.5%) and 99(34.5) of school principal teachers and heads of department teachers respectively reported that QASOs improved the instructional teaching skills of teachers during the post-conference meetings. Similarly, most 36(33%) and 83(28.6%) of the school principal teachers and heads of department teachers indicated that QASOs aided teachers in interpreting and implementing the curriculum. This means that QASOs’ instructional supervision in schools and especially post-conference sessions usually has an impact on teachers’ teaching skills and ability to interpret and implement the curriculum.

These findings tend to be in agreement with Modebela (2008), Walker 2016 and Ikegbusi & Eziamaka (2016) who found that external instructional supervision helps the teachers to handle the pupils effectively, it has great impact in improving teaching skills of teachers and it promotes effective learning of pupils. However, these findings are contrary with the work of Kisirkoi (2014) who found that external educational instructional supervisory process did not add any professional value to teachers, mainly because of the manner in which the external instructional supervisory process was conducted in learning institutions. The findings also negate Flora (2014) who observed that principal teachers used poor method teachers of conducting instructional supervision in their schools because of poor pedagogical skills that had been gradually cascaded to them by the QASOs. Therefore maybe the differences in the outcomes of instructional supervision in terms of improving the teachers’ pedagogic skills depend on how the instructional supervision is conducted in schools. Essentially, the sentiments of HOD teachers
as expressed in table 4.16 are consistent with their earlier sentiments as shown in Figure 4.12 that; instructional supervision by QASOs improves teachers pedagogically.

It’s evident that the instructional supervision sessions conducted by the QASOs impacted some pedagogic skills to teachers that lead to improvement in teaching skills, enhancement in interpretation and implementation of the curriculum. To this end it can be said that QASOs instructional supervisory activities in schools has a positive influence on teachers’ pedagogic skills.

Finally, the researcher wished to established whether the benefits associated with instructional supervision by QASOs on improvement of the pedagogic skills of Principal teachers and HOD teachers, were significant as to improve the academic performance outcomes of their schools. These responses in captured in Figure 4.13

![Figure 4.13: Benefits of QASOs' Instructional Supervision Exercises on Academic Performance of Schools](image-url)
Figure 4.13 indicates that majority, 70(65.4%) of school principal teachers and 178(61.8%) heads of department teachers reported that they did not benefit much from QASOs visits in terms of improved pedagogic skills as to improve their schools’ academic performance. However, a significant proportion 28(25.7%) and 74(20.6%) of principal teachers and HOD teachers respectively felt that instructional supervision was very much instrumental in improving pedagogic skills of teachers which is finally reflected in improved academic performances of learners.

Although the findings of this study is contrary to the findings by Aaronson et al., (2007) and Servet (2011) who had found that instructional supervision was solely responsible for the quality of teachers which should be reflected in the academic performance of learners, important to note that a significant proportion 28(25.7%) and 74(20.6%) of principal teachers and HOD teachers respectively considered instructional supervision as being very much instrumental in improving pedagogic skills of teachers as to improved academic performances of learners. This means that instructional supervision of teachers in schools is positively felt in the learning outcomes of learners.

4.5.2 Improvement in Utilization of Available Instructional Materials

This study was also interested in determining whether the Instructional Supervision exercises by QASOs were able to influence Principal teachers and HOD teachers towards utilization of available instructional materials in schools. To this extent, the researcher was first concerned with finding out whether instructional
supervision by QASOs enhanced the ability of Principal teachers and HOD teachers towards utilizing instructional materials while teaching. The results are as reflected in Figure 4.14

![Figure 4.14: Principals’ and HOD teachers’ Enhancement in Utilization of Instructional Materials](image)

The results in Figure 4.14 shows that majority, 70(64.2%) of school principal teachers and 154(53.1%) of heads of department teachers reported that QASOs instructional supervision sessions with teachers in schools had hardly helped them to improve their ability in using teaching aids. This implies that QASOs’ instructional supervision exercises in schools have not adequately enhanced principal teachers and HOD teachers abilities in the use of instructional materials while teaching and could be negatively affecting the quality of teaching in schools and therefore reducing the quality of education offered.

This study finding tends to be in agreement with Tabby (2005) who observed that QASOs did not improve the quality of teaching in schools because they failed to
address the competences of teachers in selecting and developing the instructional materials. As Olawole (2009) had found “use of instructional materials suggested by the instructional supervisors influenced to a great extent teachers’ classroom performance” this is because inability of teachers to use instructional materials leads to: pupils becoming passive listeners in class, boredom, poor participation in lesson, lack of interest in the subject, absenteeism and finally poor performance in the subject matter (Ghanney, 2008).

Therefore during instructional supervision, QASOs should be keen to observe whether teachers are using instructional materials while facilitating teachers, and if they are using, they should note whether the instructional materials are correctly used to optimally enhance the teaching-learning process. Ultimately, appropriate advise should be given to teachers on which instructional materials should be used and how for optimal enhancement of teaching-learning process.

Apart from determining whether QASOs are able to enhance the ability of Principal teachers and HOD teachers on the use of instructional materials, this study also wanted to find out from QASOs whether they felt that they had been able to influence the Principal teachers and HOD teachers towards utilizing instructional materials in teaching. The respondents responses were in form of; Strongly agree, Agree, Neutral and Disagree as captured in Figure 4.15.
Figure 4.15: QASOs Influence on Principals’ and HOD teachers’ Ability to use Instructional Materials

Figure 4.15 indicates that most 8(47.1%) and 2(11.8%) of QASOs agreed and strongly agreed respectively that they were able to influence teachers to use available teaching aids. It is clear from Figure 4.15 above that 3(17.6%) and 4(23.5%) of the QASOs were neutral and disagreed with this opinion respectively. This implies that as much as majority of the QASOs were of the opinion that they were able to positively influence teachers towards using available instructional materials, a significant proportion of QASOs were not of that opinion.

It is evident from the data in figure 4.15 and 4.14 that; the impact of the majority, {8(47.1%) agree and 2 (11.8) strongly agree} of QASOs who are of the opinion that they influence teachers towards using instructional materials is felt by 39(35.8%) of school principal teachers and 136(46.9%) of the heads of department who had indicated that QASOs instructional supervision had enhanced their
abilities in the utilization of instructional materials. This can be judged as satisfactory because as Romano (2014) had found, instructional supervisors that identified, recommended and influenced teachers towards appropriate use of instructional materials improved the teacher instructional capacity. Indeed, therefore more effort should be put in place by the QASOs on enlightening and influencing teachers towards using instructional materials while teaching.

Use of instructional materials is highly correlated to the use teachers’ professional records in the sense that what the teacher plans to use in class must be carefully planned for through proper documentation. In this regard therefore, the study sought to establish whether instructional supervision by QASOs had improved teachers’ abilities in updating professional records in the use of instructional materials. The responses were indicated on a 5 point likert scale with; 1 being strongly agree, 2 being agree, 3 being neutral, 4 being disagree, and 5 being strongly disagree. This is shown in table 4.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HOD teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.17 indicates that majority \{39(35.8\%)\, and \,37\, (33.9\%)} \, and \,89(31.0\%)}\, of school principal teachers and heads of department teachers respectively reported that they strongly agreed and agreed respectively that instructional supervision by the QASOs had improved them towards proper keeping and up-dating professional records in respect to instructional materials. This implies that instructional supervision has had a positive influence of improving teachers’ competences in professional record keeping and up-dating.

These findings are in agreement with Njiru (2014) who had established that instructional supervision by supervisors improved the teachers’ abilities in the preparation of curriculum documents and ultimately timely coverage of the syllabuses. Indeed, as earlier shown by table 4.13; majority 81(75.0\%) of the school principal teachers and 159(60.7\%) of the heads of department teachers had reported that checking of records like schemes of work, lesson plans, registers, lesson notes etc. was the most important area that QASOs mostly concentrate on when conducting instructional supervision.

Suffice is to say that; as much as QASOs concentrate on checking teachers professional records and consequently improved them towards proper keeping and up-dating professional records in respect to instructional materials. This is shown with the same weight when it comes to enhanced utilization of instructional materials while teaching (see data in figure 4.14)

These findings on the utilization of instructional materials and keeping of teachers’ professional records contradicts Sule et al. (2015) who had found that there was a
significant positive relationship between instructional supervisory practice of checking of teachers’ lesson notes and teachers’ role effectiveness in utilization of instructional materials. This would imply that to ensure that QASOs influence teachers towards usage of instructional materials while teaching, they should not only concentrate on checking the professional records of teachers with an aim to improve them but should also pay keen attention to whether or not the teachers actually use instructional materials while teaching. This is essentially because of the fact that there could be some dissonance between what could be reflected in well kept and updated professional records and what is happening in the classroom.

4.5.3 Improvement in Assessment and Evaluation of Students

This study also sought to determine whether the instructional supervision activities of QASOs had resulted to improved assessment and evaluation of students in schools. In this regard therefore, the researcher asked the school principals, HOD teachers and QASOs whether there was an improvement in students’ internal assessments as a result instructional supervision of teachers by QASOs. The Principal teachers and HOD teachers responses were categorized as: 1 being strongly agree, 2 being agree, 3 being neutral, 4 being disagree, and 5 being strongly disagree. This is shown in table 4.18.
Table 4.18: Improvement in Conducting Internal Assessment and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>HOD teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>QASOs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>289</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.18, it is noted that most 16(94.1%), 133(46%), and 17(47.7%) of the QASOs, heads of department teachers and school principal teachers respectively, strongly agreed or agreed with the fact that there was an improvement in students’ internal assessments as a result of instructional supervision of teachers by QASOs. This means that schools’ instructional supervision activities by QASOs have improved internal assessments in schools.

This is consistent with Mwaura (2014) and Ikegbusi & Eziamaka (2016) who established that external instructional supervision activities in schools had improved the internal assessments of such schools. The rationale of this is that; implications of any positive influence or improvement in teachers’ pedagogic skills and utilization of available instructional materials is reflected in the improvement in students’ internal assessments. This ultimately contributes towards provision of quality education.
4.6 Utilization of Instructional Supervisory Recommendations and Reports

This study also intended to find out whether instructional supervisory recommendations and reports were ultimately utilized to improve the quality of education offered in public secondary schools. In this regard the study was concerned with utilization of instructional supervisory recommendations and reports in four areas;

(i) Formulation of Action Plans in Schools.
(ii) Advisory to Schools by Educational Administrative Personnel
(iii) Follow-up Supervision in Schools by QASOs Personnel
(iv) Formulation of Policies and Plans on Quality Education Provision in the Ministry of Education Science and Technology

But before the researcher could focus in each of the above domains of utilization of Instructional supervision recommendations and reports, he sought to establish from the QASOs whether; they had sufficient time to compile their recommendations/reports after visiting a school for instructional supervision and if they were able to give prompt final feedback to schools. Their responses were in form of “Agree” or “Disagree” and are captured by table 4.19
Table 4.19: Time to Compile Instructional Supervision Reports and Provide Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reports with supportive evidences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback in one month.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is manifest from table 4.19 that a vast majority, 14(84.6%) of the QASOs agreed that they usually had sufficient time to write well-argued reports where supportive evidences were collated. Also, majority 11(64.7%) of QASOs were of the opinion that they provided written instructional supervision feedback to schools within a period of one month. This implies that generally QASOs don’t face constrain of time while writing instructional supervision recommendations and reports.

These findings agree with Baker et al, (2010) who found that data emanating from professional supervision of teachers is thoroughly and objectively analyzed so that it can be used at various levels and ultimately narrowed down in making a classroom teacher better in curriculum implementation. Ministry of Education (2000), recommends that the institution visited by QASOs should receive a copy of the QASOs’ summary report of instructional supervision within 28days.

Further, the researcher wished to establish whether Principal teachers and HOD teachers received QASOs reports every time QASOs conducted instructional supervision in their schools. The responses are as reported in Figure 4.16
Figure 4.16: Provision of QASOs’ Recommendations and Reports to Schools

Figure 4.16 indicates that slightly over a half 56(51.4%) of the school principal teachers and 154(53.7%) of HOD teachers reported that in all the times that QASOs visited their schools they were provided with the final report and recommendations from their visit. However, it is noted that a significant portion of the schools as represented by 53(48.6%) of school principal teachers did not receive final report and recommendations. This implies that not all schools receive QASOs recommendations and reports of instructional supervision and that could explain the variance in performance in schools when summative evaluation is conducted by KNEC. The responses by principal teachers and HOD teachers on whether they are provided with final reports and recommendations of instructional supervision by QASOs could be true given that 6(35.3%) of the QASOs as reported in table 4.19 had indicated that they are not able to provide written instructional supervision feedback to schools within a period of one month.
These findings to the effect that not all schools receive QASOs final reports and recommendations after an instructional supervision are supported by the works of Mwaura (2014) who found out that only 60% of the schools received QASOs reports and recommendations after supervision. When schools don’t receive final reports and recommendations of instructional supervision, they lack the basic reference document on which to refer to on instructional issues that could have been raised by the QASOs. This essentially means that the implementation of the proposed recommendations might not be very effective and consequently the ultimate value of the instructional exercises is substantially weakened.

Maybe the reasons as why a substantial number QASOs are not able to provide instructional feedback reports to schools can be explained by the sentiments of one County QASO who indicated that there is poor financial facilitation of QASOs in respect to issues of instructional supervision and QASOs’ personnel are few given the many schools they are supposed to serve. Indeed, Akinwumi (2002), Romano (2014), and Manoti (2004) established that QASOs mainly face the challenges of understaffing and facilitation could affect their performance.

4.6.1 Formulation of Action Plans in Schools

This study wished to establish whether QASOs’ recommendations and reports provided blue-prints for public secondary schools to use when formulating their action plans related to provision of quality education in their schools. In this respect therefore, the researcher asked Principal teachers and HOD teachers a number of queries related to QASOs’ recommendations and reports of instructional
supervision. The Principal and HOD teachers’ responses were either reported by “Yes” or “No” and they are as summarized in table 4.20.

Table 4.20: Utilization of QASOs Recommendations and Reports in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilization</th>
<th>School Principal</th>
<th>Heads of Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes n %</td>
<td>No n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulate guidelines on quality education provision</td>
<td>2 25.7 81 74.3</td>
<td>79 27.6 207 72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All recommendations by the QASOs are implemented</td>
<td>19 17.6 89 82.4</td>
<td>96 33.6 190 66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved teachers’ teaching skills</td>
<td>44 40.7 64 59.3</td>
<td>144 51.8 134 48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved teachers’ ability in usage of instructional materials</td>
<td>43 39.8 65 60.2</td>
<td>126 44.1 160 55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved teachers' ability in assessing and evaluating pupils</td>
<td>56 51.9 52 48.1</td>
<td>157 55.1 128 44.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.20, it is clear that a vast majority, 81(74.3%) of school principal teachers and 207(72.4%) of heads of department teachers said that they did not use recommendations of QASOs to formulate guidelines relating to issues of quality education provision in their school. This indicates that there is minimal utilization of QASOs’ recommendations in informing formulation of guidelines that are envisaged to improve the quality of education in schools.

This is in agreement with the Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (IPAR 2008) findings, which shown that; there was no evidence that reports of school supervisions are used in facilitating formulation of policy guidelines that can go a long way in enhancing quality assurance in curriculum delivery in schools. To this end, a lot of focus needs to be channeled by the QASOs in informing the schools
how they can use the instructional supervision reports to generate individual school-based guidelines aimed at improved quality education provision.

On whether all the recommendations captured by the final QASOs instructional supervision reports are implemented in schools, table 4.20 indicates that 89(82.4%) of the school principal teachers and 190(66.4%) of the heads of department teachers said that they were not. This means that hardly are all recommendations of QASOs on instructional supervision in schools implemented.

These findings are in agreement with the works of Manoti (2004), Mwaura (2014) and Ogandoh (2015) who had also found that most schools didn’t implement all the recommendations of instructional supervision by QASOs. This failure to implement the recommendations of QASOs is actively manifest in this study by majority of the school principal teachers and HOD teachers reporting that they never used QASOs’ recommendations to formulate guidelines on how to improve quality of education in their schools. Failure to implement recommendations that are meant to improve quality education provision in a given school would imply that most likely there might be challenges in the implementation or experience would have it that implementation of such recommendations would not make a significant difference on the status quo of quality education provision.

Table 4.20 also indicates that, while most 144(51.8%) of the heads of department teachers said that implementation of the QASOs reports and recommendations in their school had led to improvement in teachers’ teaching skills, most 64(59.3%) of school principal teachers reported that it had not. However, a reasonable
percentage 44 (40.7%) of the school principal teachers were in agreement with HOD teachers that there was pedagogical value addition emanating from implementation of instructional supervision recommendations.

This finding is in agreement with Sergiovanni & Starratt, (2002) who had established that successful implementation of instructional supervision recommendations provided opportunities for teachers to continuously expand their capacity to teach more effectively in classroom.

Table 4.20 above further shows that majority, 65(60.2%) of school principal teachers and 160(55.9%) of the heads of department teachers were in agreement that; implementation of the QASOs report and recommendations in their schools had not led to improvement in teachers ability to use teaching aids. Meaning that implementation of QASOs recommendations and reports had not significantly improved teachers’ abilities in the preparation and use of instructional materials while teaching. These is contrary the works of Sergiovanni & Starratt, (2007) who had found that implementation instructional supervision helps teachers adopt best practices in the process of impacting knowledge to the learners in respect to effective and efficient utilisation of available educational instructional materials.

As earlier reported in the literature review; if QASOs’ recommendations do not help the teachers in selecting and developing instructional materials that can enhance the delivery of content (Tabby, 2005 and Romano, 2014) then such recommendations might not improve the teachers’ ability in the usage of instructional materials.
Finally, table 4.20 shows that 56(51.6%) of the school principal teachers and 157(55.1%) of the heads of department teachers reported that implementation of the QASOs reports and recommendation in their schools had led to improvement in teachers ability in assessing and evaluating pupils. These imply that teacher’ abilities in assessing and evaluating pupils were improved by implementation of QASOs recommendations and reports.

These findings on utilization of final recommendations of instructional supervision as an avenue for improving teachers’ abilities to do effective assessment and evaluation of learners is in agreement with Conley & Dixon, (2000), who observed that when supervision reports are properly integrated into a growth-oriented system, they can be a powerful force that can help promote instructional improvement of teachers in assessing and evaluating pupils. The researcher probed on the reasons that could make schools not implement wholesomely all the recommendations of QASOs. This is captured by table 4.21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>HOD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some recommendations are more theoretical than practical</td>
<td>n 61</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/Physical/Human resources Constraints</td>
<td>n 60</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>n 11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some recommendations have zero impact in enhancement of learning teaching</td>
<td>n 10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N 142</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From table 4.21, it is clear that a good number 61(43.0%) of school principal teachers and 147(41.9%) of HOD teachers reported that QASOs recommendations were not implemented because some recommendations were more theoretical than practical from the stand point of their schools, 60(42.3%) of school principal teachers and 109(31.1%) of heads of department teachers said that they were not implemented because it would require more financial, physical or human resources which the school could not afford. This implies that the reasons why all QASOs recommendations and reports are seldomly implemented in schools are justifiable; these reasons could be limited financial, physical and human resources among others.

These findings may agree with Stephanie (2009) who affirms that quality assurance systems are complicated and costly for educational institutions to implement and that the time and money spent on quality assurance would be better be spent directly targeting factors that affect quality in educational institutions such improving school facilities and libraries. This argument may apply especially where financial, physical and human resources are constraining, indeed this could be what principal teachers and HOD teachers meant by reporting that some recommendations are more theoretical than practical. In this respect, there is need for QASOs to customize the indentified instructional defects of schools with the available financial, physical and human resources of that school in the spirit of making the recommendations more practical for ultimate implementation.
4.6.2 Advisory Purposes by Educational Administrative Personnel

The researcher sought to establish through the principals, HOD teachers and QASOs whether the County Education Officers (CEOs) and Sub-County Education Officers (S-CEOs) made reference to QASOs instructional supervision recommendations and reports when they visited their schools. Their responses were reported on a 5 point likert scale (1 being strongly agree, 2 being agree, 3 being neutral, 4 being disagree, and 5 being strongly disagree). This is captured in table 4.22

Table 4.22: Usage of QASOs Reports by CEOs and S-CEOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HOD teachers</th>
<th>QASOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from table 4.22 that many 5(45.5%), 97(33.3%) and 41(48%) of QASOs, HOD teachers and Principal teachers respectively strongly agreed or agreed that CEOs and S-CEOs made reference to QASOs recommendations and reports when they visited their schools. However, table 4.22 indicates that most 27(25.0%), 104(36.9%) and 4(36.4%) of Principals, HOD teachers and QASOs were neutral on whether CEOs and S-CEOs made reference to QASOs recommendations and reports. The general impression from this data is that QASOs, School principal
teachers and HOD teachers are of the opinion that CEOs and S-CEOs made reference to QASOs’ recommendations and reports when they visit schools.

To this effect, it does not only mean that they are given final copies of instructional supervision of schools by QASOs but they read them as envisaged by Ministry of Education (2000). This has the net effect of assisting the schools implement these recommendations and ultimately improve the quality of education offered in schools.

4.6.3 Utilization of QASOs’ Reports in Conducting Follow-up Activities

The study also sought Principals’ and HOD teachers’ opinions on whether QASOs specifically always checked the extent of implementation of previous instructional supervision reports and recommendations when conducting future instructional supervision in respective schools. Their responses were either by “Yes” or “No” as captured in table 4.23.

Table 4.23: Utilization of Previous QASOs Reports in Follow-up Activities in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilized</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HOD teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23 indicates that majority, 73(67.6%) and 189(65.0%) of the school principal teachers and heads of department teachers respectively reported that QASOs did not use the previous supervision reports as reference document while
conducting subsequent instructional supervision in their schools. This means that QASOs hardly used their recommendations and reports to do follow-up in schools. This is attested to by one County QASO who was categorical that;

It is very hard to do follow-up assessments. We do not have personnel, facilitation and the schools are very many … How many would you access or do a follow-up? Follow-up assessments in most cases are not done and this is because of lack of enough personnel.

Another County QASO commenting on the QASOs doing follow-up on the extent of implementation of previous instructional supervision reports and recommendation indicated that;

That is (a) challenge. The instructor on the forwarding letter instructs that the report should be tabled at the BOM so that the areas that touch on them can be addressed and that which touches on teachers is tabled in staff meeting so that everybody knows areas to improve … the next time we go for assessment in that school will be in 2 or so years for your to go back to minutes of a meeting that were held after the report was dispatched in that school to verify will be quite hectic…

The findings of this study on the issue of the utilization of QASOs recommendations and reports in schools on follow-up activities is in agreement with the works of Wanga, (1988) who observed that productive feedback and follow-up initiatives relative to supervision are lacking in the Kenyan supervision system. Indeed, The Task Force on Alignment of the Constitution with Education 2010 established that Quality Assurance Services in Educational Institutions is manifested with uncoordinated decision-making at all levels, hampered by inadequate data and lacks enough sense of urgency on follow-ups on what they might have already done (Republic of Kenya, 2011).
But as Nakpodia (2006) had found; instructional supervision helps in the identification of areas of strengths and weaknesses of teachers and follow-up activities should be directed at the improvement in identified areas of teachers’ weaknesses. In this regards, it’s clear that there has been inadequate follow-up activities of QASOs schools instructional supervision recommendations and reports. Maybe this may explain why implementation of these recommendations and reports was found to be poor in this study.

This study also sought to find out from the school principal teachers and HOD teachers whether QASOs usually used instructional supervision field reports to design seminars and workshops meant to promote teachers professional growths or capacity building. The findings are presented in a 5 point likert scale (1 being strongly agree, 2 being agree, 3 being neutral, 4 being disagree, and 5 being strongly disagree). This is shown in table 4.24.

Table 4.24: Utilization of QASOs’ Field Reports to Inform Agenda for Teachers’ Seminars and Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>HOD teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to table 4.24, many 29(26.6%) of school principal teachers and 76(27%) heads of department teachers were neutral on the fact that QASOs usually used their instructional supervision field reports to design seminars and workshops meant to promote teachers professional growth. However, more {45(16%) and 65 (23%)} HOD teachers strongly agree and agree than those who strongly disagree 46(16.3%) and disagree 50(17.7%). This implies that generally, HOD teachers were of the opinion that QASOs usually used their instructional supervision field reports to design seminars and workshops meant to promote teachers professional growth. This is the converse of what school principal teachers reported; there were more 23 (21.1%) strongly disagree and 23(21.1%) disagree than 15(13.8%) strongly agree and 19(17.4%) agree. Maybe the difference in opinion can be explained by the fact that in most cases it is the HOD teachers that attend QASOs seminars and workshops as representatives of their departments and schools.

The above findings agree with Ogamba (2011) and Kiiru (2015) who had similarly found that Quality Assurance and Standards Officers rarely conducted seminars and workshops on curriculum and instruction to refresh teachers on current educational trends and this impacted negatively on quality of education in public schools. Previously, Wanga (1988), Dolton & Van der Klaauw, (1999) and Semiha, Fatma & Nalan (2011) had noted that instructional supervision recommendations and reports are seldomly used to inform in-service training and professional development of teachers in terms of organizing seminars and workshops. This is seemingly is not happening actively with the instructional
supervision system in the study location maybe because of lack of sufficient funding and manpower (QASOs) to organize seminars and workshops.

4.6.4 Utilization of QASOs recommendations in policy formulation

This study wanted to establish whether QASOs’ instructional supervision recommendations and reports are utilized in informing formulation of plans and policies related to provision of quality education in the Ministry of Education Science and Technology. In this regard, the researcher had some items related to this aspect and he required the school principal teachers and HOD teachers to respond to them. Their responses are indicated on a 5 point likert scale (Agree, Neutral, and Disagree). This is shown in Figure 4.17
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>HoDs</th>
<th>ESQAOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refining QASOs’ Activities in MoEST

Informing Policy Formulation on Quality Education Provision
Figure 4.17 indicates that most 44(41.1%) of school principal teachers and majority, 137(47.6%) of heads of department teachers reported that QASOs use their instructional reports to refine their activities in the MoEST. This means that, at the level of the school principal teachers and HOD teachers, there has been refinement of QASOs’ activities and this can be attributed to previous QASOs, instructional supervision activities in schools. On the contrary, most 7(46.7%) of the QASOs reported that their instructional supervision reports are hardly used in refining their activities in the MoEST.

The sentiments of school principal teachers and HOD teachers are in agreement with Baker (2010) who established that there was consensus in United States that overall successful utilization of instructional supervision reports improves the county educational activities. In Kenya, National Development Plan the 2002-2008 had envisaged that; quality education was to be achieved through supervision of educational institutions and reporting to these institutions and MoEST for continuous improvement of activities related to quality education provision (Republic of Kenya, 2002). It is not clear to the researcher, why most QASOs were of the opinion that their reports are hardly utilized in the education sector in refining quality education related activities in the MoEST. This might imply that the QASOs do not have full control of the utilization of the numerous reports and recommendations on instructional supervision that they give to their seniors, schools and other stakeholders so much so that they are unable to gauge whether the same have been used to refine activities of instructional supervision and therefore quality education provision. In this respect one would advise that there is
need for all stakeholders to be having routine open forums for discussing the status of instructional supervision in schools by QASOs.

Figure 4.17 also indicates that while majority 112(39.%) of the HOD teachers felt that QASOs instructional supervision reports were used in informing policy guidelines formulation on issues of quality education provision in public schools, only 36(33%) and 4(28.6%) of the principal teachers and QASOs respectively were of similar opinion. When one County QASO was asked whether QASOs instructional supervision reports are used in formulation of policies, she indicated that; “… I don’t know, because we always give our reports to different stakeholders, so whether they compile them and make a policy I may not be aware”

The sentiments of school principal teachers and QASOs tend to agree with a study by Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (2008) and Mohammed (2015) who found that there was minimal evidence that reports of school supervisions were being used in informing formulation of policies and guidelines that could be used in enhancing quality assurance in curriculum delivery in schools. But as Baker (2010) rightly observes, instructional supervision recommendations and reports should ultimately contribute towards informing country policy formulation in terms of quality education provision. Apparently, findings from this study are not very clear that this has been happening.

Lastly, the researcher wished to establish whether the QASOs are ever consulted by the KICD personnel during the process of syllabus or curriculum review. Their
responses were either by “Yes” or “No”. The QASOs sentiments are captured by the table 4.25.

**Table 4.25: QASOs Involvement in Curriculum and Syllabus Review in KICD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>School Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KICD syllabus review</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of QASOs sentiments with KICD</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.25 reveals that majority, 9(60.0%) and 9(64.3%) of QASOs indicated that they have been involved in the review of syllabus and that their sentiments have always be adequately incorporated by the KICD when reviewing the curriculum respectively. This implies that QASOs are involved in reviewing of syllabuses via KICD incorporating their sentiments during curriculum review. Such involvement can ensure that every time the curriculums and syllabuses are reviewed the input of knowledge and experiences gained by QASOs through instructional supervision of teachers in schools is put on board in attempt to ensuring that the reviewed curriculums and syllabuses are appropriate and implementable given the instructional competencies of teachers in schools.

These findings agree with Mohammed (2015) to the extent that instruction supervision reports and recommendations can be very hardy in the process of reviewing and improving the quality of syllabuses and curriculum in a given countries’ education system. The point here is that instruction supervision reports can indicate the strengths and weakness of the syllabuses and curriculum in
operation in the schools. Consequently, during the reviews weakness can be addressed while at the same time retaining the strengths, all which can culminate to quality education provision. For resistance in Kenya currently, KICD is in the final stages of changing our current 8-4-4 cycle system of education to 2-6-6-3 education cycle, it is highly envisaged that the new education curriculum framework has significant input of QASOs’ instructional supervision accumulated knowledge and experiences in schools.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the findings of the study. In addition, conclusions and recommendations from the findings are presented. Lastly, the chapter presents suggestions for areas where further research can be carried out based on the findings of this study.

5.2 Summary

This study was conducted for the purpose of establishing the effectiveness of the instructional supervision by Quality Assurance and Standards Officers on quality of education in Nairobi and Machakos County public secondary schools with a view to informing educational practices in Kenya on improving quality of education. The study adopted ex post facto survey design, which combines both qualitative and quantitative approaches in data collection and analysis techniques. This study used four hundred and twenty (420) respondents, which included; Education Standards and Quality Assurances Officers (17), school principal teachers (110) and heads of department teachers (293). To achieve the objectives of the study, the researcher collected data using questionnaire from four hundred and eighteen (418) respondents who were; Sub- County QASOs (15), school principal teachers (110) and heads of department teachers (110). The researcher also conducted two interviews to each of the County QASO of Nairobi and Machakos counties. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics. The following is the summary of the main findings of the study per objective.
5.2.1 Perceptions of Teachers towards QASOs Instructional Competences

This study established that majority of school principal and heads of department teachers felt that QASOs’ competency in instructional supervision was partially effective. It also established that majority of school principal and of heads of department teachers held the view that QASOs were very capable of enhancing provision of quality education via instructional supervision. In addition, majority of school principal teachers and of head of departments felt that QASOs were partially effective in their ability to friendly interact with teachers when they visited school for instructional supervision. In terms of QASOs’ respect and faith in teachers; majority of the school principal and of heads of department teachers reported that QASOs had respect for teachers and faith with the school principal and of heads of department teachers.

The study also found that majority of the school principal and of the heads of department teachers perceived QASOs as being partially effective in their ability to engage teachers in technical knowledge related to teaching and learning processes. In regards to conceptual skills of QASOs’ the study revealed that majority of school principal and of heads of department teachers hold the opinion that QASOs were partially effective in conceptual skills.

5.2.2 Instructional Supervisory Practices Exercised by QASOs in Schools

The study found that most of school principal teachers (schools) didn’t receive letters from QASOs notifying them in advance of their intentions to visit them for instructional supervision. Majority of QASOs were in agreement with majority of
Principal and of HoD teachers that there was optimal cooperation between QASOs and the teachers during the whole exercise of instructional supervision. In respect to utilization of previous instructional supervision to inform the preparation for instruction supervision of schools by the QASOs, the study established that most of school principal and of heads of department teachers felt that previous supervision reports were hardly used to inform the preparation for instruction supervision of schools by the QASOs.

The study established that while majority of QASOs felt that they used collegial approach when handling Principal and HOD teachers during instructional supervision, majority of principal and of heads of department teachers reported that QASOs use democratic approach. On whether, QASOs should concentrate on advisory or evaluative services, the study revealed that, most of school principal and Heads of department teachers preferred QASOs to concentrate on both advisory and evaluative service when they visit schools; majority of QASOs reported that they would prefer them to concentrate on advisory. Further, the study established that majority of principal and HOD teachers were in agreement that: QASOs are organized and Lead Assessor clearly explains issues to be assessed during the initial meeting; QASOs spend most of the time checking schemes of work, lesson plan, record of work, pupils’ progress records and departmental records. Indeed, according to this study, majority of the school principal and heads of department teachers ranked checking records like schemes of work, lesson, plans, registers and lesson notes as the most important area that QASOs mostly
concentrate on during instructional supervision and this made supervision more theoretical than practical.

This study also established that most of the HOD teachers were in agreement with most of the principals that: QASO conduct observational conference professionally without humiliating the teachers; conduct post observational conference in a professional manner, appropriately addressing areas of improvement; and finally during meeting between teachers and QASOs, there is always a healthy discussion where the main findings of instructional supervision are highlighted. However, the study found that majority of the principal teachers were in agreement with majority of the HOD teachers that; teachers who are supposed to be observed in classroom teaching (observational conference) are hardly engaged in pre-observational conference to establish how the classroom assessment will be conducted. This meant that most of the teachers being observed are hardly informed of the variables (type of interaction between the teacher and pupils, involvement of all pupils, teaching from known to unknown, use of instructional materials, masterly of subject etc) that the QASOs focus on while observing the manner in which they conduct their classes.

In regards to the final meeting between QASOs and teachers, the study established that majority of school principal and heads of department teachers felt that during the final plenary meeting between the QASOs and the teachers, there was always a healthy discussion based on the main findings of instructional supervision highlighting areas that needed improvement. However, the study found that
majority of the school principal and heads of the department teachers were of the opinion that there was usually no sufficient time for delivering feedback and engaging teachers in such meetings. This limited the effectiveness of consensus building in the identification of instructional deficiencies and development of appropriate strategies to fill them in future.

5.2.3 Influences of QASOs’ Instructional Supervisory Practices on the Instructional Competences of Teachers

This study revealed that while the majority of school principal teachers did not find QASOs instructional supervision sessions with teachers in schools of much help in improving teachers’ pedagogic skills, most heads of department teachers reported that QASOs instructional supervision in schools has improved the teachers’ pedagogic skills. The study established that most school principal and HOD teachers were in consensus that they gained some knowledge on curriculum interpretation and implementation during instructional supervision, and that the post observational conference feedback session impacted essential instructional skills. However, majority of school principal and heads of department teachers reported that they hardly benefited much from QASOs visits in terms of improved instructional skills that would help to improve their schools’ academic performance. This meant that impact that instructional supervision had on improvement of teachers’ instructional competences was not significant to be attributed to schools’ academic performance.
The study revealed that all QASOs, majority of the school principal sand heads of department teacher were in consensus that instructional supervision of teachers by QASOs had enhanced teachers’ abilities in conducting effective pupils’ internal assessments and evaluations in schools. However, a majority of school principal and heads of department teachers felt that QASOs instructional supervision sessions of teachers in schools hardly improved teachers’ ability on the usage of instructional materials while teaching. This could be attributed to the limited attention that was given by QASOs on the utilization of instructional materials by teachers while teaching.

5.2.4 Utilization of Instructional Supervisory Recommendations and Reports

In respect to the final instructional supervision recommendations and reports; this study established that majority of QASOs had sufficient time to write well-argued reports with supportive evidences. However, it was also revealed that a significant portion of the schools as represented by school principal teachers hardly received final recommendations and reports of their instructional supervision. On whether the schools implement all the recommendations captured by the final QASOs instructional supervision reports, it was established that majority of schools seldomly implemented all the recommendations of QASOs. According to principal and HOD teachers, a significant number of schools hardly implemented all recommendations of QASOs because; most of them were more theoretical than practical and required more financial, physical or human resources which the school could not afford. In addition, implementation of the QASOs reports and
recommendations was not considered as an avenue that could lead to improvement of teaching skills by teachers.

The study established that a significant proportion of school principal teachers considered key educational administrative personnel like Sub-County and County Educational Officers as being conversant with QASOs report and recommendations about their schools but they were neutral (undecided) on whether or not these educational administrative personnel made references to QASOs reports when they visited schools. The study further revealed that most of the school principal teachers found QASOs not keen in following the previous supervision reports as reference document while conducting subsequent instructional supervision in their schools.

Similarly, the study established that; while heads of department teachers were of the opinion that QASOs usually used their instructional supervision field reports to design seminars and workshops meant to promote teachers professional growth, most school principal teachers were of the contrary opinion. Further, while most school principal and heads of department teachers were in consensus that QASOs field reports were used in redefining QASOs activities in the MoEST, QASOs were not of the similar opinion. Also while most HOD teachers were of the opinion that QASOs’ field reports are used as basis of informing formulation of policy guidelines on quality education provision in public schools, most principal teachers and QASOs were of the contrary opinion on the same.
Finally this study found that majority of QASOs are usually involved in the review of syllabus and their sentiments on curriculum are sought by the KICD in reviewing syllabuses and curriculums.

5.3 Conclusions

Based on the objectives and the findings this study, the following conclusions were made;

(i) The teachers were found to hold the opinion that instructional supervisory competences of QASOs were partially effective in respect to technical and conceptual skills. However, teachers were of the opinion that QASOs exhibit favorable human relations competences.

(ii) The study established that although the instructional supervisory practices exercised by QASOs in the schools appear well organized, there are certain inadequacies; the QASOs don’t do sufficient preparations before conducting instructional supervision in schools, QASOs hardly engaged principal and heads of department teachers in pre-observational conference, QASOs spend most of the time checking teachers’ professional records, and there was usually no sufficient time for delivering feedback and engaging teachers in the plenary meetings.

(iii) The QASOs’ instructional supervisory practices were found to have positive influences on the instructional competences of teachers insofar as improving teachers’ competences in assessment and evaluation of students. Hardly had Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ instructional
supervisory practices improved teachers’ pedagogic skills, their ability in preparation and utilization teaching aids while teaching.

(iv) The extent of the utilization of the QASOs’ instructional reports and recommendations in schools was found to be inadequate. School principal and heads of department teachers did not fully implement or utilize the QASOs’ recommendations because it required more financial, physical or human resources which the school could not afford. QASOs hardly used the previous supervision reports as reference document while conducting subsequent instructional supervision in schools and lastly, there is no optimal use of QASOs instructional field reports in refining the activities of QASOs’ and in informing decisions related to formulation of policies and plans on quality education provision in the MoEST.

5.4 Recommendations

In the light of the research findings and conclusions, the study wishes to make the following recommendations to each of the various stalk holders.

5.4.1 Policy Recommendations

a) Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards

(i) On the issue of perceptions of teachers towards instructional supervisory competences of QASOs and instructional supervisory practices exercised by QASOs in schools this study recommends that the DQAS should design and roll out an intensive capacity building trainings programme for all QASOs in
technical and conceptual competences so as to equip them with requisite competences for conducting instructional supervision.

(ii) On utilization of supervisory recommendations and reports, this study recommends that DQAS should ensure that, the QASOs recommendations and reports are based on the specific schools’ financial, physical or human resources and should capture immediate, short, medium and long term recommendations.

b) School Boards of Management

(i) To increase utilization of QASOs’ supervision recommendations and reports in schools, the study recommends that the respective schools’ Board of Managements (BOMs) discuss the QASOs’ recommendations and reports with their respective school principal teachers and staff on how they can be operationalized in the school.

c) Ministry of Education Science and Technology

(i) In respect to influences of QASOs’ instructional supervisory practices on the instructional competences of teachers this study recommends that MoEST should allocate funds to DQAS for QASOs to be taken through capacity building training in pedagogic, conceptual and utilization of instructional materials competences so that when they go for instructional supervision in schools, they are able to cascade the same competences to teachers.

(ii) To enhance the utilization of QASOs’ instructional supervisory recommendations and reports, the study posits that MoEST should annually facilitate QASOs workshops to consolidate and discuss intensely their
instructional supervisory recommendations and reports with an aim to filter out on issues that can be picked up and be used to inform agenda for capacity building teachers in seminars and workshops, and those that can be utilised to inform formulation of new policies and regulations to reinforce the existing ones on quality education provision in the MoEST.

5.4.2 Suggestions for further research

Based on the findings, limitations and delimitations of this study, further research is recommended in the following areas:

(i) This study was conducted in the public secondary schools of Nairobi and Machakos counties. The study can be replicated in other counties in Kenya for comparison purposes. Further, the study can be done in private secondary schools.

(ii) The study was conducted in secondary schools. The study can be replicated in primary schools to find out the status of instructional supervision by QASOs at that level of learning.

(iii) The study focused on the instructional supervision by the QASOs. Other studies can be done focusing on other functions of the QASOs like management of schools infrastructure and finances.

(iv) The study was conducted using the Principals, Heads of Department and QASOs. Other studies can be conducted focusing classroom teachers without administrative roles in schools.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I:

SCHOOL PRINCIPALS’ AND HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS’ TEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction
This study intends to evaluate the effectiveness of the Educational Standards and Quality Assurance Officers (QASOs) in enhancing improvement and the maintenance of high quality education standards in your school. Kindly respond honestly to each of the following questions by either ticking (✓) or filling your preferred response appropriately.

Section A: Background information of the respondents

1. Which administrative position do you hold in this school?
   a) School principal Teacher (  )
   b) Head of Department Teacher (  )

2. How many years have you been in the above administrative position in your teaching profession?
   a) 5 years and below (  )
   b) Between 5-10 years (  )
   c) Above 10 years (  )

3. What is your highest academic qualification?
   a) Diploma in Education (  )
   b) B.Ed. (  )
   c) Post graduate Diploma in Education (  )
   d) M.Ed. (  )
   e) PhD in Education (  )
   f) Any other (Specify) ..........................................................................................................

Section B: Perceptions held by teachers towards QASOs instructional competences

4. (i) Generally, how do you perceive the QASOs in respect to their instructional supervision capabilities?
   a) Very effective (   )  b) Partially effective (   )

   (ii) By ticking (✓) either under the column (VE) for very effective or (PE) for partially effective in the table below, kindly indicate which aspects of QASOs instructional competences tends to make you hold the perception in 4(i) above towards them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Instructional Competence</th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>PE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Human Relations Skills: Their ability to friendly interact with teachers when they visit schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Technical Skills: Their ability to engage teachers in technical knowledge related to teaching and learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Conceptual skills: Their ability to observe and make clear findings which can enhance teaching abilities of teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do you perceive the QASOs as equal to the task of enhancing of quality education through instructional supervision of teachers in public schools?
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )
   c) Partially (   )

6. When the QASOs’ visit your school
   i) Do they have respect for teachers?
      a) Yes (   )
      b) No (   )
      c) Only to some little extent (   )
   
   ii) Do they have faith in teachers?
      a) Yes (   )
      b) No (   )
      c) Only to some little extent (   )
iii) Do they handle teachers in a friendly manner?
   a) Yes ( )
   b) No ( )
   c) Only to some little extent ( )

iv) Do they compliment teachers?
   a) Yes ( )
   b) No ( )
   c) Only to some little extent ( )

7. Using the following scale, please indicate by ticking (✓) how you perceive the QASOs in the domains of; Human, Technical and Conceptual skills:

1 = unsatisfactory, 2 = satisfactory, 3 = good, 4 = very good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Relation</td>
<td>They establish friendly interactions with teachers at all stages of a school assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>QASOs activities in schools motivate teachers towards effective teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QASOs are able to empathize with teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills</td>
<td>QASOs have specialized technical skills that enable them to effectively assist teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QASOs conduct effective evaluation of the teaching-learning processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QASOs effectively help schools streamline issues of teaching and learning processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Skills</td>
<td>QASOs are able to communicate their finding in an objective and clear way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is clear communication between the teachers and QASOs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C: Instructional supervisory practices by QASOs

8. (i) Which is the main approach used by QASOs when handling teachers?
   a) Democratic approach ( )
   b) Collegial approach ( )
   c) Autocratic approach ( )

(ii) Which activities do you think mostly pre-occupy the QASOs throughout the year?
   a) Administrative work in the office ( )
   b) Visiting schools to check and advise teachers on maintenance of quality instruction ( )
   c) In educational seminars ( )

9. Between the evaluative and advisory services, which one would you prefer the QASO to concentrate on when they visit schools?
   a) Evaluative ( )
   b) Advisory ( )
   c) Both ( )

10. State TWO reasons why you would prefer the QASOs to rather concentrate more on the area you have identified in question (9) above.
    a) .................................................................................................................................
    b) .................................................................................................................................

11. For each of the following statements about the main tasks carried out by QASOs before, during and after the assessment of an educational institution. Please tick (✓) the response that indicates your level of agreement.
    (i) They write letters to schools and notify them at least three weeks in advance that they are due to visited them.
        a) Yes ( )
        b) No ( )
c) Not sure ( )

(ii) The QASOs always arrive in the school before 8.30A.M.

a) Yes ( )
b) No ( )
c) Not sure ( )

(iii) The QASOs look organized and lead assessor clearly explains issues to be assessed during the initial team meeting at the institution

a) Yes ( )
b) No ( )
c) Not sure ( )

(iv) They always use the previous QASOs’ supervision report as reference document

a) Yes ( )
b) No ( )
c) Not sure ( )

(v) There is evidence that they peruse essential reports and documents of the school so as to make a beneficial and objective assessment of the school.

a) Yes ( )
b) No ( )
c) Not sure ( )

(vi) The QASOs show optimal cooperation with the teachers during the whole exercise of instructional supervision

a) Yes ( )
b) No ( )
c) Not sure ( )
(vii) They spend most of the time checking schemes of work, lesson plans, records of work, pupils, progress records, and departmental records.
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )
   c) Not sure (   )

(viii) For the teachers that need to be observed in classroom teaching (pre-observation conference), they are engaged in a discussion to establish how the classroom assessment will be conducted.
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )
   c) Not sure (   )

(ix) The classroom observation (observation conference) is professionally conducted and teachers are never humiliated in front of their pupils
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )
   c) Not sure (   )

(x) The post observation conference session (after classroom observation), is professionally conducted and it appropriately addresses areas of improvement
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )
   c) Not sure (   )
(xi) During the final meeting between the QASOs and the teachers, there is always a healthy discussion on the main findings of instructional supervision highlighting areas that need improvement.
   a) Yes ( )
   b) No ( )
   c) Not sure ( )

(xii) There is usually no sufficient time for delivering feedback and engaging teachers in at the end of instructional supervision
   a) Yes ( )
   b) No ( )
   c) Not sure ( )

(xiii) The reports presented by QASOs at final meeting are always well argued where supportive evidences are collated
   a) Yes ( )
   b) No ( )
   c) Not sure ( )
12. By ticking (✔) to your preferred answer, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements? Use the key below:

1-Strongly Agree; 2-Agree; 3-Neutral; 4-Disagree; 5- Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>All QASOs appear conversant and updated on the current teaching and learning process needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>QASOs are able to borrow better instructional strategies from one school and transfer them to other schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>When QASOs visit schools, they take time to understand problems faced in curriculum implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The frequency of school visits by QASOs should be increased to increase their impact in schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>It is possible that QASOs can finish three (3) years without visiting a school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>All the recommendations made by the QASOs to schools they have assessed are always practical and implementable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Majority of the Teachers will not make a request for QASOs to visit their schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>QASOs activities have not been very instrumental in maintaining quality of education in public schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Most of the QASOs school visits are prompted by poor performance in schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>QASOs activities in schools create some pressure and fear among teachers which make them improve in teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: Instructional competences

13. Do your teachers look forward to be visited by the QASOs?
   a) No (   )
   b) Yes (   )
14. By ticking (✓) to your preferred answer, gauge the effectiveness of QASOs in their training in each of the following competence based training domains relevant to their work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Highly effective</th>
<th>Partially effective</th>
<th>Need to improve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>General instructional supervision of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Report writing and presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. In your opinion, do you think QASO instructional supervision sessions of teachers in schools have helped in:

i) Improving teachers’ teaching skills?
   a) Yes ( )
   b) No ( )

ii) Improving teachers’ ability to use teaching aids while teaching
   a) Yes ( )
   b) No ( )

iii) Improving teachers’ ability in conducting effective pupils’ assessments and evaluations
    a) Yes ( )
    b) No ( )
16. By ticking (√) to your preferred answer, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements? Use the key below:

| 5 | Strongly Agree |
| 4 | Agree |
| 3 | Neutral |
| 2 | Disagree |
| 1 | Strongly Disagree |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Through instructional supervision by QASOs, teachers have improved their abilities in the use of teaching aids.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>There is an improvement in students’ internal assessments as a result instructional supervision of teachers by QASOs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>During the post-conference feedback session, QASOs ably impact to teachers essential instructional teaching skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>QASOs have influenced teachers towards proper keeping, up-dating and use of teachers’ professional records.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Instructional supervision of teachers by QASOs is a major force in improving teachers’ classroom instructional abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Through instructional supervision by QASOs, teachers gain knowledge on curriculum interpretation and implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. By indicating 1, 2 and 3 below, rank the areas which QASOs concentrate more when they visit schools.

a) Checking records like schemes of work, lesson plans, registers, lesson notes etc ( )

b) Observing teachers in classrooms ( )

c) Holding discussions with Heads of department teachers ( )

18. Please rank 1 (lowest) to 3 (highest) the influence of QASOs visits in schools towards improving teachers in providing quality education.

a) Improvement in teachers’ instructional abilities ( )

b) Fear of being reprimanded by QASOs makes teachers improve ( )

c) Improves teachers ability to interpret and implement the curriculum ( )
19. Have the school visits by QASOs benefited you in your instructional supervisory skills as to improve your school academic performance?
   a) Very much (   )
   b) Not much (   )
   c) Not at all (   )

20. Have the QASOs ever come to your school to specifically, monitor and advice your staff on implementation of a revised curriculum?
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )

21. Do you have teachers amongst your staff who in your opinion you consider more qualified and competent than an average QASO?
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )

22. Do you think that the QASOs promptly and adequately help the teachers to adapt to new KICD syllabuses each time the curriculum is reviewed?
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )

23. Do you have some written policy guidelines from ESQAC that have been provided to you to act as bench mark for streamlining the issues of quality education provision in your school?
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )

Section E: Utilization of QASOs recommendations and reports.
24. In all the times that QASOs’ have visited your school, have they been able to provide you with the final report and recommendations for their visit?
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )
25. (i) Do you implement all the recommendations captured by the final QASOs’ instructional supervision reports?
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )

(ii) If in the question 25(i) above your answer is “No”, by ticking, indicate the reason(s) why you don’t you implement all the recommendations by QASOs.
   a) Some recommendations are more theoretical than practical (   )
   b) Implementation of QASOs’ recommendations would require more financial or physical or human resources which the school cannot afford (   )
   c) Implementation of QASOs’ recommendations is not cost effective (   )
   d) Some of the QASOs’ recommendations have zero impact in enhancement of learning and teaching process (   )
   e) Any other reason(s).................................................................
       ..................................................................................................

26. Is it fair to say that the implementation of the QASOs’ reports and recommendations in your school have led to:
   (i) Improvement in teachers’ teaching skills
       (a) Yes (   )
       (b) No (   )

   (ii) Improvement in teachers’ ability to use teaching aids
       (a) Yes (   )
       (b) No (   )

   (iii) Improvement in teachers’ ability in assessing and evaluating pupils
       (a) Yes (   )
       (b) No (   )
27. Do other key educational administrative personnel like Sub-County and County Educational officers seem conversant with QASOs’ reports and recommendations about your school?
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )

28. By ticking (√) to your preferred answer, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements? Use the key below:
   1-Strongly Agree; 2-Agree; 3-Neutral; 4-Disagree; 5-Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Public schools have benefited from the activities of QASOs in so far improving and maintaining quality of education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Field reports by QASOs are often used as reference in redefining the activities of QASOs by MoEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Most schools use QASOs reports to fine tune their action and strategic plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Most teachers cannot recall what was recommended by QASOs in the plenary meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>The Zonal QASOs and the S-CEOs make reference to QASOs reports when they visit schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>The QASOs usually use field reports to design seminars and workshops meant to promote teachers professional growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>The QASOs field reports inform formulation of policy guidelines on quality education provision in public schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>The activities of QASOs have not been fully recognized as a means of continuously yielding findings which can be used to improve quality of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your co-operation
APPENDIX II:
QUALITY ASSURANCE AND STANDARDS OFFICERS’
QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction
This study intends to assess the effect of the Educational Standards and Quality Assurance Officers (QASOs) in enhancing improvement and the maintenance of high quality education standards in public schools. Kindly respond honestly to each of the following questions by either ticking (✓) or filling your preferred response appropriately.

Section A: Background information of the respondents
1. How long have you been QASO?
   a) 5 years and below ( )
   b) Between 5-10 years ( )
   c) Above 10 years ( )

2. What was your substantive position prior to your appointment as QASO?
   a) A subject teacher in your area of specialization ( )
   b) Head of Subject in your area of specialization ( )
   c) Head of Department in your area of specialization ( )
   d) Deputy head teacher in a secondary school ( )
   e) Principal in a secondary school ( )
   f) Any other (Specify) .................................................................

3. How many years had you actively taught in your area of specialization in secondary school before your appointment as QASO?
   a) 5 years and below ( )
   b) Between 6-10 years ( )
   c) Above 10 years ( )
4. What was your academic qualification at the time when you were appointed as QASO?
   a) Diploma in Education (   )
   b) B.Ed. (   )
   c) Post graduate Diploma in Education (   )
   d) M.Ed. (   )
   e) PhD in Education. (   )
   f) Any other (Specify) .................................................................

5. What is your current academic qualification?
   a) Diploma in Education (   )
   b) B.Ed. (   )
   c) Post Graduate Diploma in Education (   )
   d) M.Ed. (   )
   e) PhD in Education (   )
   f) Any other (Specify) ...........................................................................

Section B: Perceptions held by teachers towards QASOs instructional supervisory competences

6. (i) Kindly, in your opinion do you perceive yourself qualified for the task of maintenance of quality education in public schools?
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )
   c) Partially (   )

(ii) Explain your answer in 6 (i) above ..........................................................
     ............................................................................................................
     ............................................................................................................

7. (i) From your interactions with teachers during instructional supervision, what perceptions do teachers have towards the QASOs activities in schools in general?
   a) Negative (   )
   b) Positive (   )
   c) Indifferent (   )
(ii) Explain your answer in 7 (i) above: .................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

8. Using the following scale, please indicate by ticking (✓) how you think the Teachers perceive the QASOs in the domains of; Human, Technical and Conceptual skills: 1 = unsatisfactory, 2 = satisfactory, 3 = good, 4 = very good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Relation Skills</td>
<td>(i). QASOs are able to stimulate friendly interactions between themselves and teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii). QASOs activities in schools motivate teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii). QASOs are able to empathize with teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv). Teachers appears intimidated and anxious when ESQASOs visit schools for supervision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills</td>
<td>(v). QASOs have appropriate skills to effectively handle their tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vi). QASOs conduct effective evaluation of the teaching-learning processes during their visit to schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv). QASOs effectively help schools streamline their curriculum implementation processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Skills</td>
<td>(vii). QASOs deliver their finding in an objective, clear and concise manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C: Instructional supervisory practices of QASOs

9. Which is the dominant approach used by QASOs when handling teachers?
   a) Democratic approach ( )
   b) Collegial approach ( )
   c) Autocratic approach ( )
10. Which activities mostly pre-occupy you throughout the year?
   a) Administrative work in the office ( )
   b) Visiting schools to check and advise teachers on maintenance of quality education ( )
   c) In educational seminars and workshops ( )

11. Which activities would you prefer to pre-occupy QASOs throughout the year?
   a) Administrative work in the office ( )
   b) Visiting schools to check and advise teachers on maintenance of quality education ( )
   c) In educational seminars and workshops ( )

12. Between the evaluative and advisory services, which one do you concentrate on when you visit schools?
   a) Evaluative ( )
   b) Advisory ( )

13. State TWO reasons why you would rather concentrate more on the areas you have identified in question (12) above.
   a) ..........................................................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................................................
   b) ..........................................................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................................................

14. For each of the following statements about the main tasks carried out by QASOs before, during and after the assessment of an educational institution. Please tick (✓) the response that indicates your level of agreement.
   (i) There is a written schedule for visiting institutions in my county
      a) Agree ( )
      b) Disagree ( )
(ii) The schools are notified at least three weeks in advance before they are visited by QASOs
   a) Agree (  )
   b) Disagree (  )

(iii) Through the lead assessor, essential reports and documents pertaining to the school to be visited are always perused in advance.
   a) Agree (  )
   b) Disagree (  )

(iv) The lead assessor allocates duty to QASOs in good time to facilitate effective preparation before visiting a school
   a) Agree (  )
   b) Disagree (  )

(v) Before visiting a school previous supervision reports are analyzed to determine on what to focus on
   a) Agree (  )
   b) Disagree (  )

(vi) The arrival to the institution being visited is always by 8.30A.M.
   a) Agree (  )
   b) Disagree (  )

(vii) There is optimal cooperation by the teachers during the whole exercise of instructional supervision
   a) Agree (  )
   b) Disagree (  )

(viii) When the QASOs visit schools most of the time is spent on checking professional records.
   a) Agree (  )
   b) Disagree (  )
(ix) During the final meeting between the QASOs and the teachers, the teachers usually don’t ask questions
   a) Agree (   )
   b) Disagree (   )

(x) There is usually no sufficient time for delivering feedback and engaging teachers in at the end of assessment
   a) Agree (   )
   b) Disagree (   )

(xi) Within a period of one month, QASOs always provide written feedback to schools
   a) Agree (   )
   b) Disagree (   )

(xi) We usually have sufficient time to write well argued reports where supportive evidences are collated
   a) Agree (   )
   b) Disagree (   )
15. By ticking (√) to your preferred answer, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements? Use the key below:
1-Strongly Agree; 2-Agree; 3-Neutral; 4-Disagree; 5- Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>All QASOs are well-trained and updated on the current curriculum implementation needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>QASOs are able to borrow better instructional strategies from one school and transfer them to other schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>When QASOs visit schools, they take time to understand problems faced in curriculum implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The frequency of school visits by QASOs should be increased to improve standards of education in schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>QASOs cannot finish three (3) years without visiting a school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>All the recommendations made by the QASOs to schools they have assessed are always practical and implementable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Teachers will usually not make requests for QASOs to visit their schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>QASO activities have been instrumental in maintaining quality of education in public schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Most of the QASOs school visits are prompted by poor performance in schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Most of the QASOs school visits are based on regular scheduled routine visits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>QASOs activities in educational institutions create some pressure and fear among teachers that make them to improve in teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section D: Instructional competences

16. Kindly indicate the extent of effectiveness in training that you have undergone in each of the following competence based training domains relevant to your work.

(i) General instructional supervision of teachers
   a) Highly effective (   )
   b) Partially effective (   )
   c) Totally ineffective (   )

(ii) Data collection and analysis
   a) Highly effective (   )
   b) Partially effective (   )
   c) Totally ineffective (   )

(iii) Report writing and presentation
   a) Sufficient (   )
   b) Partially sufficient (   )
   c) Totally insufficient (   )
17. By ticking (✓) to your preferred answer, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements? Use the key below:
1-Strongly Agree; 2-Agree; 3-Neutral; 4-Disagree; 5- Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The QASOs have been able to influence teachers to use available teaching aids while teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>QASOs’ activities in schools have improved in students’ internal assessments and evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>During the post-conference feedback session, QASOs impact to teachers essential instructional teaching skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>QASOs have influenced teachers towards proper keeping and use of teachers’ professional records.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Instructional supervision of teachers by QASOs is a major force in improving teachers’ classroom instructional abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Through instructional supervision by QASOs, teachers gain knowledge on curriculum interpretation and implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section E: Utilization of QASOs recommendations and reports.
18. (i) Do you have tangible evidence that your findings and reports of school visits been used in policy and guidelines formulation by the Ministry of Education on issues of quality education provision in secondary schools?
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )

   (ii) If your response in question 19 (i) above is “yes”, please highlight two policy guidelines that have been delivered from QASO findings and reports. ........................................................................................................................................................................
19. By ticking (✓) your preferred answer, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements? Use the key below:
1-Strongly Agree; 2-Agree; 3-Neutral; 4-Disagree; 5- Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Public schools have benefited from the activities of QASOs in improving and maintaining quality of education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Field reports by QASOs are often used as reference in redefining the activities of QASOs by MoEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Most schools use QASOs reports to fine tune their action and strategic plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Most teachers cannot recall what was recommended by QASOs in the plenary meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>The Zonal QASOs and the S-CEOs make reference to QASOs reports when they visit schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>The QASOs usually use field reports to design seminars and workshops meant to promote teachers professional growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>The QASOs field reports inform formulation of policy guidelines on quality education provision in public schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>QASOs activities are not recognized as a means of yielding findings which can be used to improve quality of education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Have the Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD) ever involved you in the review of the syllabus in your subject areas?
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )

21. Do you think the KICD adequately incorporates your sentiments in reviewing the curriculum?
   a) Yes (   )
   b) No (   )

Thank you for your co-operation
APPENDIX III:

COUNTY QUALITY ASSURANCE AND STANDARDS OFFICERS’

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Name of the Interviewer: ........................................................................................................

Name of the interviewee: ........................................................................................................

Time of the interview: ...........................................................................................................

Objective of the interview:

The purpose of this interview is to gather information related to the effectiveness of instructional supervision by Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ (QASOs’) in the Public secondary schools of Nairobi and Machakos Counties. It further seeks to solicit information related to whether the QASOs supervisory activities in schools have had a positive effect on the quality of education offered.

After a brief introduction by the researcher on the study and its purpose, the interview will start with general overview questions about the status of the instructional supervision by QASOs in the County.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Main Question</th>
<th>Probing Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>To examine the influences of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’</td>
<td>To what extent do the instructional supervisory practices of the Quality</td>
<td>Generally, how would you describe the working relationship between QASOs and teachers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instructional supervisory practices on the instructional competences of</td>
<td>Assurance and Standards Officers’ improve the teachers’ instructional</td>
<td>Do you think teachers look forward towards interacting with QASOs during the Instructional Supervision exercises by QASO?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers.</td>
<td>competences?</td>
<td>In a scale of one to ten how would you rank the instructional supervisory competences of QASOs in your county?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How would you describe QASOs instructional practices in terms of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improving teachers’ pedagogical skills?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improving teachers’ ability to use teaching aids?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improving teachers’ assessment and evaluation skills?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In a scale of one to ten how would you rank the contribution of QASOs instructional supervisory practices towards quality education provision in public secondary schools in your county?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Main Question</td>
<td>Probing Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To assess the utilization of the Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ reports and recommendations in schools.</td>
<td>To what extent are the reports and recommendations of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ utilized in schools to enhance quality of education in public secondary schools?</td>
<td>After QASOs visit a school for instructional supervision, how fast are they able to come up with reports and recommendations in schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How fast do the QASOs instructional supervision reports and recommendations find out the way to the schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Who are the other stakeholders in education do you give copies of QASOs schools instructional supervision reports and recommendations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have you had instances where schools seek clarifications on the implementation of the QASOs instructional supervision recommendations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In one out of ten how would you gauge the implementation of QASOs schools’ instructional supervision recommendations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has the utilization of QASOs instructional supervision reports and recommendations improved the quality of education in schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are there policies or regulations related to quality education provision whose formulation has been informed by the QASOs schools’ instructional supervision?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following is the work plan schedule for this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>April 2010 - November 2011</td>
<td>- Develop and present first comprehensive draft proposal to the University Supervisors</td>
<td>9 Months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.  | November 2011 - March 2013 | - Draft research tools  
- Continue with literature review  
- Receive feedback from the University Supervisors | 4 Months |
| 3.  | April/June 2013        | - Make corrections to the draft proposal  
- Incorporate research tools into the proposal  
- Present second comprehensive proposal to the other Comrades for editing and advise | 2 Months |
| 4.  | June/September 2013    | - Receive feedback from the Comrades.  
- Make corrections on the research instruments and any other modifications.  
- Present final proposal to the University Supervisors. | 2 Months |
- Defense of the proposal at the department and make corrections thereof. | 3 Months |
| 6.  | March/April 2015       | - Preparation and testing of the instruments.  
- Piloting of the research instruments | 1 Months |
| 7.  | June/ August 2015      | - Data collection and data analysis | 2 Months |
| 8.  | October/ December 2015 | - Report writing and submission of first draft Thesis to University Supervisors. | 2 Months |
| 9.  | January/ April 2016    | - Revision and correction of the thesis  
- Submission of corrected thesis | 3 Months |
| 10. | May/June 2016          | - Departmental thesis defense and correction done | 2 Months |
| 11. | July/August 2016       | - Defense at the Graduate School  
- Corrections to be made if any. | 1 Months |
| 12. | September 2016         | - Submission of final thesis to the Graduate school | 1 Months |
| 13. | December 2016          | - Graduation | - |
APPENDIX VI:

INTRODUCTION LETTER

Solomon Gitonga Mwaniki
C/o Department of Educational Management, Policy & Curr. Studies
School of Education, Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI.

To:.................................................................................................................................

Ref: A Questionnaire on Effectiveness of Instructional Supervision by Educational Standards and Quality Assurance Officers on Quality of Education in Secondary Schools in Nairobi and Machakos Counties

I am a post graduate student in Kenyatta University in the Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies. I am carrying out a study on effectiveness of the instructional supervision by Educational Standards and Quality Assurance Officers (QASOs) on quality of education in secondary schools in Nairobi and Machakos Counties.

The purpose of the study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the QASOs in enhancing improvement and the maintenance of high quality education standards in secondary schools. Ultimately, this study aims to inform educational practices in Kenya. Kindly, I am requesting you to share with me your experiences on the above subject by responding to the questions in all the sections of this questionnaire. Do not indicate your name or work station anywhere in this Questionnaire.

Thank You.

Yours Faithfully

Solomon Gitonga Mwaniki (Researcher)
APPENDIX VII:

LETTER OF CONSENT FOR INTERVIEW

Dear……………………………………………………………………………………………………

You are humbly requested to participate in a research study on the effectiveness of instructional supervision by Educational Standards and Quality Assurance Officers’ (QASOs’) in the public secondary schools of Nairobi and Machakos Counties. The interview will take about (30-40) minutes of your valuable time and will be conducted at a place of your preference.

Your participation in this interview is completely voluntary and you are free not to respond to any query or withdraw any time you feel like. Kindly, note that several steps will be taken to protect your anonymity and identity. Although the interview will be recorded, the recording will be deleted once the content is typed. The typed interview will not contain your name and any information revealing your identity will be removed. All information will be kept under key and lock and will be destroyed after five years.

If you have any questions regarding your right as a participant in this research you may contact Kenyatta University Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum studies. Through the researcher mobile 0722 497 405, you can always monitor the progress of this study and ultimately obtain the results of the study.

I have read the above information regarding this research and am making an informed consent to participate in the study;

Name:………………………………………………………………………………………………

Date:………………………………………………………………………………………………

Signature:…………………………………………………………………………………………
APPENDIX VIII:

LETTER OF RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Ref No. NACOSTI/P/16/88859/10219

Solomon Gitonga Mwaniki
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI

Date: 18th April, 2016

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Effectiveness of instructional supervision by quality assurance officers on quality of education in secondary schools in Nairobi and Machakos Counties, Kenya.” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Nairobi and Machakos Counties for the period ending 15th April, 2017.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioners and the County Directors of Education, Nairobi and Machakos Counties before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

DR. STEPHEN K. KIBIRU, PhD.
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:

The County Commissioner
Nairobi County.

The County Director of Education
Nairobi County.
APPENDIX IX:

RESEARCH CLEARANCE PERMIT

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT:

MR. SOLOMON GITONGA MWAOKI
of KENYATTA UNIVERSITY, 0-300
NAIROBI, has been permitted to conduct
research in Machakos, Nairobi

for the period ending:
15th April, 2017

Applicant:

Signature:

National Commission for Science, Technology & Innovation

CONDITIONS:

1. You must report to the County Commissioner and
the County Education Officer of the area before
embarking on your research. Failure to do that
may lead to the cancellation of your permit.

2. Government Officers will not be interviewed
without prior appointment.

3. No questionnaire will be used unless it has been
approved.

4. Excavation, filming and collection of biological
specimens are subject to further permission from
the relevant Government Ministries.

5. You are required to submit at least two (2) hard
copies and one (1) soft copy of your final report.

6. The Government of Kenya reserves the right to
modify the conditions of this permit including
its cancellation without notice.

RESEARCH CLEARANCE PERMIT

Serial No. A 8888

CONDITIONS: see back page.
APPENDIX X:

ETHICS REVIEW COMMITTEE APPROVAL LETTER

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
ETHICS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Email: chairman_kuerc@ku.ac.ke
secretary_kuerc@ku.ac.ke
ecu20006@gmail.com
Website: www.ku.ac.ke

P. O. Box 43844 - 00100 Nairobi
Tel: 8710901/12
Fax: 871242/8711575

Date: 20th July, 2016

Out Ref: KU/R(COMM)/31/784

Mwaniki Solomon Gitonga,
Kenyatta University,
P.O Box 43844,
Nairobi

Dear Mwaniki,

APPLICATION NUMBER PKU/520/1612 – EFFECTIVENESS OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION BY QUALITY ASSURANCE OFFICERS ON QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN NAIROBI AND MACHAKOS COUNTIES, KENYA. – VERSION 2

1. IDENTIFICATION OF PROTOCOL
   The application before the committee is with a research topic, “Effectiveness of instructional supervision by quality assurance officers on quality of education in secondary schools in Nairobi and Machakos Counties, Kenya.” – Version 2.

2. APPLICANT
   Mwaniki Solomon Gitonga, Department of Education Management Policy and Curriculum Studies

3. SITE
   Nairobi and Machakos Counties, Kenya

4. DECISION
   The committee has considered the research protocol in accordance with the Kenyatta University Research Policy (section 7.2.1.3) and the Kenyatta University Ethics Review Committee Guidelines AND APPROVED that the research may proceed for a period of ONE year from 20th July, 2016.

5. ADVICE/CONDITIONS
   i. Progress reports are submitted to the KU-ERC every six months and a full report is submitted at the end of the study.
   ii. Serious and unexpected adverse events related to the conduct of the study are reported to this board immediately they occur.
   iii. Notify the Kenyatta University Ethics Committee of any amendments to the protocol.
   iv. Submit an electronic copy of the protocol to KU-ERC.

When replying, kindly quote the application number above.

If you accept the decision reached and advice and conditions given please sign in the space provided below and return to KU-ERC a copy of the letter.

DR. TITUS KAHIGA
CHAIRMAN ETHICS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Accept the advice given and will fulfill the conditions therein.

Signature: ____________________________ Dated this day of ___________________________ 2016.

cc: Vice-Chancellor
    DVC-Research Innovation and Outreach

[Signature]

[20 JUL 2016]

[Handwritten note: 20-07-2016]