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The study sought to find out the extent to which secondary school head teachers in Siaya district carry out what is expected of efficient and effective instructional supervision in their schools. Role activities under the following five essential supervisory functions were covered by the study: obtaining and distributing instructional resources, providing assistance and support services to teaching and learning, relating the school to the community, maintaining and controlling the learning process and improving the school system.

The study target population comprised of 53 public secondary schools in the district out of which a sample of 12 secondary schools was randomly selected. The study subjects were 12 head teachers, 24 heads of departments and 36 teachers from the selected schools. The main research tools used in this study were Head teachers Questionnaire, Heads of Departments Questionnaire and Teachers Questionnaire. The questionnaires sought to obtain information on the current status of instructional supervision in the secondary schools with regard to the five instructional supervisory functions.

The study found out among other things that majority of secondary school head teachers in the study sample were professionally trained university graduates with the B.Ed graduates forming the bulk. More than half of the head teachers had served as head teachers for more than 5 years and all the head teachers in the study were experienced teachers before appointment in administrative post. Most of the secondary schools in the research sample were either one-streamed with student enrolment of about 160 or two-streamed schools with enrolment of about 320 students. Majority of the teaching staff in the schools studied were professionally trained university graduates and teachers with diploma in education
and untrained teachers formed a small proportion of the staff. The most frequently performed supervisory activities by the head teachers were found to be those concerned with providing resources and setting environment for teaching and learning, implementation of the timetable, maintaining good relationship between the school and the school stakeholders and keeping records of instructional activities. The least frequently performed supervisory activities were found to be those that require more personal guidance by the head teacher like assisting teachers in preparation of schemes of work, observing teachers lesson plans, visiting teachers in classroom to observe instruction, helping teachers identify problem areas in the curriculum and assisting the teachers to come up with strategies for solving the problems and appraisal of teachers instructional performance. Teachers rating of head teachers performance of instructional supervision and heads of departments’ views indicated that there are inadequacies in instructional practices. It is therefore important that head teachers are given formal training in supervision to improve their performance in school administration since supervision is a phase of administration.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Problem

Supervision is a basic component of administration. Every administration needs an inbuilt supervision system to provide the cohesion and direction necessary to achieve the purpose of the organization. Supervision concerns the tactic of efficient and proper management of personnel and those aspects of administration that are aimed at maintaining efforts of personnel in line with the goals of administration, Olembo et al, (1992).

In educational organizations, supervision is considered as that dimension or phase of administration that is concerned with improving instructional effectiveness, (Okumbe, 1998). In this respect, supervision involves guiding and influencing teachers and students to strive towards desirable teaching and learning behaviour in order to achieve educational goals.

Through history, the concept of supervision and its practice in education has evolved from the more judicious nature of inspection to the more executive nature that focuses on assisting the teachers to improve their instructional effectiveness. Eye et al, (1971) highlights the supervisory trends from the earlier American education system of 1640’s to the present. Olembo et al, (1998) explains that supervision in educational administration can be understood in two functional ways: “overseeing” and “helping”. The overseeing function of supervision involves directing, controlling, reporting, commanding and other such activities that emphasize the task at hand and assess the extent to which particular objectives have been accomplished within the bounds set by those in authority for their subordinates. These activities are generally referred to as inspection. In Kenya the “overseeing” function has been delegated to the inspectorate, which is the professional
arm of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. The helping aspect of supervision involves facilitating, supporting, guiding and assisting teachers and pupils to enhance effectiveness in classroom. This constitutes supervision.

Supervision in Education is divided into two; general supervision and instructional supervision. General supervision subsumes supervisory activities that take place principally outside the classroom (Okumbe, 1998). It is a subset of supervision that is concerned with students learning activities in the classroom.

Headteachers of secondary schools have an important role in instructional supervision. The manual for Heads of Secondary Schools in Kenya (1987:1) has stressed this role of headteachers by stating that:

The organization and control of staff, both teaching and non-teaching, are all part of the head’s duty as the immediate inspector of the school. In particular, he must check the teaching standards by reference to schemes, lesson notes, record of work done and pupils exercise books, also by actual visit to the classroom to see the individual teachers. He must see that he is immediately informed of all staff absences.

This means effective and efficient running of schools depends on the headteacher’s role performance as supervisors. As supervisors, they are to make things happen and get things done through work team. They must schedule and assign work, coordinate and oversee performance and make sure work is done well, on time and economically. Olembo et al, (1992:59) observe that,
a well-planned programme of education can be said to be successful only if effective and efficient supervision exists at all levels. Without this the whole of education can be seriously handicapped.

This observation is recognition of the crucial role of headteachers in education as the immediate supervisors of schools. No matter how impressive the school curriculum is, no matter how well a school is equipped, no matter how well qualified the teaching personnel is, no matter how beautiful the school compound looks; without proper instructional supervision, the educational aims and objectives might never be fully realized. It is on this background that the study sought to investigate the role performance of secondary school headteachers in instructional supervision in Siaya district. The role performance of the headteachers was viewed against five essential instructional supervisory functions as summarized by Igram and Mc Intosh (1976) and highlighted by Okumbe (1998). These essential instructional supervisory functions include:

- Obtaining and distributing resources,
- Providing assistance and support services to teaching and learning,
- Relating the school to the community,
- Maintaining and controlling teaching and learning process,
- Improving the school system.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The head teacher of a secondary school occupies a position of great responsibility. Head teachers are the people charged with the attainment of goals and objectives of education. As instructional leaders of school programmes, they are expected to possess superior
knowledge about the curriculum and instruction so that they will help with many and varied educational and personal problems with which they may be confronted.

Review of teaching and learning state in Kenya reveals that despite the many programmes intended to improve teaching and learning, there are replete complaints from education stakeholders that general performance in education is still wanting, (Maranga, 1993). The Education Chapter of the National Development Plan (2002-2008) agrees with this view when it states that, “Despite major strides listed in education and training, a number of challenges still persist.” Among the challenges made in this document is the problem of relevance and quality where concern continues to be raised on failure to satisfactorily inculcate a modern scientific culture and to imbue learners with desirable social skills and values. Generally there are complaints among other things of lack of facilities in school to facilitate effective teaching, crowded curriculum, lack of incentives to teachers, poor supervision, presence of incompetent teachers in schools, inadequate content coverage, lack of adequate lesson preparation and high rate of absenteeism by teachers.

Given that the aim of supervision in education is to establish, maintain and improve educational standards, the wanting state of general performance in education is a matter of concern. The poor state of teaching in Kenya points to problems in performance of instructional supervision in schools in particular. The head teacher being the immediate educational supervisor has his role performance in question.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to find out the extent to which secondary school headteachers in Siaya district carry out what is expected of efficient and effective instructional supervision in their schools.
1.4 Objectives of the study

The study had the following three objectives:

- To determine how secondary school headteachers in Siaya district are currently performing instructional supervisory role.
- To establish whether a gap exists between the expected and what is happening in instructional supervision.
- To give recommendations on how to close the gap between the expected and what is happening in instructional supervision.

1.5 Research Questions

To achieve its objectives, the study used the following research questions:

- What do secondary school headteachers in Siaya district do in performing their role of instructional supervision?
- How do the headteachers carry out role activities under each instructional supervisory function?
- To what extent does the practice of instructional supervision by secondary school headteachers in Siaya district reflect what is expected of efficient and effective instructional supervision?
- In what ways can the supervisory activities of headteachers be improved?

1.6 Significance of the Study

Considering the prevailing practice in Kenya's education management where experienced classroom teachers transform automatically into management role without requiring any training in the new field, a study was necessary to evaluate the performance of such management. Such studies were particularly important given the widely acknowledged
erosion of education quality in many countries and in particular Kenya. Also as the focus of many educational studies is currently directed to finding ways and means of improving teaching and learning situation and the quality of education, it was important to be particular on instructional supervision especially the role of headteachers in instructional supervision. The researcher hoped that this survey study of the role performance of secondary school headteachers in instructional supervision would yield information that would be useful from more than one point of view. First, the findings may provide useful information for improving teaching and learning through effective supervision so as to benefit those who attend schools. Secondly, the findings of this study may provide necessary information on which institutions that train teachers and other educational personnel could work to give the personnel the required skills, knowledge and attitude for effective performance of their roles. Lastly, the findings of study may give a clear picture of instructional supervision in Siaya district secondary schools to the Ministry of Education on the basis of which it could work to provide efficient and effective educational supervision.

1.7 Basic Assumptions

This study was conducted on the following basic assumptions:

- Secondary school headteachers in Siaya district carry out supervisory instructional role in their schools.
- The headteachers work with heads of department in their schools when carrying out instructional supervision.
- Head teachers and heads of department in the research schools would give information about their knowledge and practice of instructional supervision.
1.8 Scope and Limitation of the study

In our education system, like in other systems, guiding, advising and helping secondary school teachers in their instructional functions is done by a number of people who include headteachers, deputy headteachers, heads of departments, and subject heads. These are always referred to as school based supervisors. But office based supervisors are appointed by the Ministry of Education and operate as officers of the inspectorate. This study focused on instructional supervision as carried out in school by the headteachers or through his or her delegation of responsibilities. It examined the kind of help teachers get from the headteacher or the deputy headteacher. Due to the limited time and resources available for the study, the study was confined to 12 of the 53 public secondary schools in Siaya district. Of the 12 secondary school considered for the study, 4 were drawn from the provincial schools category and 8 from the district schools to give an equitable representation of 18 provincial and 35 district schools in Siaya district. While the study sample would provide for safe generalization of study findings to all the secondary schools in Siaya district, the delimitation of the study to secondary school headteachers in Siaya district may not allow safe generalization of its findings to all secondary schools of the province or the entire country.

The findings did not reflect instructional role performance of headteachers in primary schools or principals in tertiary institutions. This is because work stations may vary from one district to another and also because different personnel are involved at different levels of schooling.

1.9 Operational Definitions

- **Supervisor:** refers to the person whose central concern is to guide and help teachers in the classroom instruction in every aspect.
• **Inspector:** refers to the person who critically assesses the aspect of any school with view to establishing whether it is being run according to the laid down guidelines.

• **Instruction:** refers to classroom teaching

• **Headteacher:** refers to the teacher appointed by the Teachers Service Commission to be in charge of management of education in a school.

• **Teacher:** refers to a person employed by the Teacher Service Commission and posted to a school or employed by the Board of Governors of the school to teach specified subjects and carry out other duties which promote education as assigned by the headteacher.

• **Instructional supervision:** refers to the performance of activities involved in the supervisory functions of obtaining and distributing resources, providing assistance and support services to teaching and learning, relating the school to the community, maintaining and controlling teaching and learning process and improving the school system.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Various definitions of supervision indicate that it is an integral part of educational administration. A Handbook of Inspection of Educational Institutions (October, 2000) also points to this view when it gives the mission of inspectorate as to establish, maintain and improve educational standards. This implies that the main concern of supervision is improvement of teaching and learning. Given that the main purpose of school administration is to facilitate teaching and learning, it is clear that supervision is an integral part of school administration. Eye et al. (1971:30) emphasize the role of school administrators in supervision when they say that:

It must primarily be instruction-focused service within the total responsibilities of administration. Furthermore supervision should not be considered a specialized type of service that can be rendered better by an agency unrelated fiscally or legally to the local school organization.

This chapter in a review of literature clarifies instructional supervision by first examining the latest concept in instructional supervision. It then gives a conceptual framework of instructional supervision by looking at teaching practice as the most ideal application of instructional supervision as discussed by Okumbe, (1998). This is followed by a general discussion of activities believed by many educational scholars and writers to comprise instructional supervision before giving a summary of essential instructional supervisory functions as given Igram and Mc Intosh (1976). Basic skills required for instructional
supervision are considered later in the chapter. The skills include conceptual skill, human relation skills and technical skills. The review ends by looking at the secondary school headteacher and his instructional supervisory roles.

2.2 Instructional Supervision

The most recent concept in instructional supervision is called clinical supervision. Cogan, (1973:9) defines clinical supervision as:

the rationale and practice designed to improve the teacher’s classroom performance. It takes its principal data from events of the classroom.

The analysis of this data and the relationship between the teacher and the supervisor form the basis of the programme, procedures and strategies designed to improve the students learning by improving the teachers learning behaviour.

Goldhammer et al, (1980:19-20) have defined clinical supervision as:

the phase of instructional supervision that draws its data from first hand observation of actual teaching events, and involves face to face (and other associated instructions) interaction between the supervisor and the teacher in the analysis of teaching behaviours and activities of instructional improvements.

The most ideal application of instructional supervision is during teaching practice. Teaching practice is a very important activity that is undertaken by all teacher trainees in the
course of their training. It affords the teacher trainee an opportunity to apply their learned professional and academic skill in a practical learning and teaching environment. Being the most ideal application of instructional supervision, the instructional supervision during teaching practice should provide a conceptual framework for instructional supervision.

The teacher, tutor or lecturer who is charged with the responsibility of supervising a teacher trainee during teaching practice is called an instructional supervisor. The instructional supervisor from the educational management point of view must be conversant with the basic techniques of instructional supervisory leadership. He or she must have prior exposure to various supervisory activities. The instructional supervisor must also have been provided with an opportunity to acquire and practice the important skills required in supervision. It is expected that the instructional supervisor is a professionally qualified teacher, with the pedagogical skills at his or her finger tips.

The instructional supervision process is a well planned and progressive one that starts outside the classroom before the actual classroom teaching and ends outside the classroom after the observation of an actual classroom teaching. Instructional supervision process during teaching practice can be understood in three main phases as given by Okumbe, (1998:186)

- Pre-observation conference,
- The observation conference, and the
- Post observation conference.
Pre-observation conference refers to the period that precedes the actual classroom teaching observation. It is the period during which the instructional supervisor strives to develop a rapport between himself and the teacher trainee. The way the instructional supervisor eases the teacher trainee to provide an enabling environment for both himself and the teacher trainee is the foremost task in instructional supervisory leadership. The instructional supervisor then obtains from the teacher trainee the requisite documents which include the lesson plan, scheme of work, record of work and class file. The foremost function of this phase is to provide a conducive environment within which the instructional supervisory leadership takes place in order to release maximum potentials from both the teacher trainee and the instructional supervisor.

The observation conference begins when the teacher trainee and the instructional supervisor enters the classroom. The instructional supervisor sits at the back of the classroom, having been introduced by the teacher trainee, and he takes anecdotal notes of how both the teaching and learning go on during the period. The supervisor must follow the lesson in detail from the beginning to the end and record the teacher trainee’s instructional performance with care to ensure minimum interference on the entire classroom behaviour. The effort should be to create an “intimidation free” teaching-learning-supervision environment for the teacher trainee, the student and instructional supervisor.
Post observation conference is the final phase of the instructional supervision programme. In this phase, the instructional supervisor and the teacher trainee privately discuss the progress of observed lesson freely and fairly. As the discussion progresses, the instructional supervisor informs the teacher trainee of his or her strengths as were detected during the lesson before the weakness can be exposed.

The instructional supervision process is a great learning opportunity not only for the teacher trainee but also for the instructional supervisor. An effective post observation conference recognizes the limitations of the teaching and learning environment. Under such circumstances the teacher trainee may be able to convince the instructional supervisor why he or she thinks the application of a given teaching method during the lesson was more appropriate than the other. Together the instructional supervisor and the teacher trainee will recognize and emphasize alternative approaches to teaching that are more effective in a class situation. An effective instructional supervisor is one who recognizes the fact that learning is a two way process and that supervisory leadership meets its purpose and objective if an enabling environment is provided for the maximum release of the potentials of the teachers.

2.2.1 Instructional Supervisory Functions

From the definitions of supervision, it is clear that the supervisor's role encompasses administrative, curricular and instructional components. Instructional supervision is therefore a sub-set of supervisory activities in general. However, the activities for instructional supervision form the core of supervision in general given that the mission of
the Inspectorate in Kenya is to establish, maintain and improve education standards. The activities for instructional supervision are widely understood by education scholars and practitioners to include those highlighted in this chapter.

Supervisors should be expert educational programme leaders. Because of this expectation, their work should reflect a high value for curriculum, instructional and staff enhancement. Supervisors help individual teachers or groups to develop educational goals and then provide guidance for successful accomplishment of those goals. It is their duty to provide information about the rationale of teaching job and influence members to solve educational problems both critically and creatively. They work with the teachers to develop syllabi, curriculum guide and schemes or work.

Instructional supervisors in schools are concerned with provision of instructional resources and procuring funds for instructional purposes. Supervisory leadership helps to select and evaluate the relevant textbooks for instruction. The supervisors should help teachers in evaluating community resources of instructional significance to curriculum and encourage teachers to prepare materials not otherwise available. Supervisory behaviour is mainly concerned with improving the setting for teaching and learning. The supervisor should also help in selecting and assigning teachers for enhancement of learning and teaching.

Instructional supervisors are concerned with the development and accomplishment of educational goals by working through teachers. The supervisors initiate action for the achievement of individual or group goals and encourage the organization members also to
be initiators of action. Supervisory leaders work diligently as facilitators of instruction, encourage and motivate teachers to be more resourceful in instruction. The supervisors encourage creativity and promote a spirit of cooperation among members in order to enhance the possibility of successful results.

The supervisor is expected to help in appraising teacher effectiveness and follows up improvement of classroom instruction. He or she is expected to observe classes and hold conferences with teachers about possible ways they may strengthen their teaching. Supervisory leadership should encourage innovation among teachers and enlarge their repertoire of teaching strategies and techniques. The supervisor should not only teach demonstration lessons when they may be helpful but should provide for demonstration of the uses of the audio-visual equipment.

Supervision helps the teachers to gain an understanding of the latest trends and developments in education and teaching. New teachers are given orientation and induction programme to assimilate through supervision. A superior should plan and develop in-service programmes for teachers and also provide the teachers with an opportunity to visit classes and attend conferences within and outside their schools. Ingram and McIntosh (1976) gave a summary of essential supervisory functions of school system and corresponding activities of each function as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Supervisory Functions</th>
<th>Corresponding Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>STAFFING</strong>&lt;br&gt;Obtaining and distributing of resources</td>
<td>• Recruiting, selecting and deploying qualified teachers, pupils and other personnel.&lt;br&gt;• Obtaining financial, physical and instructional resources.&lt;br&gt;• Assessing resource needs and adapting resources to such needs&lt;br&gt;• Planning, organizing and decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>MOTIVATION AND STIMULATION</strong>&lt;br&gt;Providing assistance and support services to teaching and learning.</td>
<td>• Assisting teachers and pupils with instructional problems.&lt;br&gt;• Identifying factors which interfere with teaching and learning.&lt;br&gt;• Guidance and counselling&lt;br&gt;• Maintaining good working relationship with and among staff and pupils.&lt;br&gt;• Providing for effective communication, influencing staff and pupils towards better performance of teaching-learning activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 | CONSULTATION | • Discerning and interpreting the expectation of parents.  
• Providing opportunities for community influence.  
• Presenting information on what the school ought to be doing.  
• Communicating improvements in teaching methodologies, facilities and resources. |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT | • Coordinating various teaching and learning activities.  
• Monitoring the effective use of funds and other facilities and resources.  
• Conducting appropriate learning experiences.  
• Diagnosing learning needs and developing appropriate strategies.  
• Encouraging staff and student development through creativity, in-service training, national awareness and participating in activities outside the formal school curriculum. |
In considerable agreement with Ingram and McIntosh, Okumbe, (1998) presents the supervisory roles under instructional dimension to include the following:

- Helping in formulation and implementation of schemes of work,
- Evaluating instructional programmes and overseeing modifications,
- Helping in conducting and coordinating staff in-servicing,
- Advising and assisting teachers involved in instructional programmes,
- Procuring funds required for instructional purposes,
- Receiving community feedback about the study programmes.

Ingram and McIntosh (1976) considered all those instructional supervisory roles under five function areas: staffing, motivation and stimulation, consultation, Programme development and Evaluation. They highlighted the supervisory functions under each area and gave the corresponding activities for each function. Generally, educational scholars...
give five functions highlighted by Ingram and McIntosh to be the major functions of supervision.

2.2.2 Basic Skills required in instructional supervision

In order to provide efficient and effective supervisory leadership, instructional supervisors must acquire certain basic skills. These basic skills include; Conceptual, Human relations and technical skills.

a) Conceptual Skills

Conceptual skills involve the ability to acquire, analyze and interpret information in a logical manner. Instructional supervisors are expected to have a superior knowledge about the curriculum and instruction so that they will help with the many and varied educational and personal problems with which they may be confronted. Supervisors must understand both the internal and external environments in which they operate. It is important that the supervisors should enhance their supervisory effectiveness by acquiring new and emerging concepts and technologies in supervision. Through further training and supervisory staff seminars the conceptual concept of supervisors can be expanded.

b) Human relations skills

Human relations skills refer to the ability to understand the teachers and interact effectively with them. Human relation skills enable the supervisors to act both officially and humanly. These skills will help minimize the threat phenomenon in supervision. They will help reverse the threat phenomenon effects of frustration, anxiety, harmful self
concept and general ineffectiveness among he supervised. The skills will enable the role of instructional supervisor be appreciated by teachers and students in its helping aspects of facilitating, supporting and assisting teachers and students to grow professionally. A supervisor should be able to efficiently link both organization and individual goals so that teacher’s personal potentials can be used to the maximum. Human relation skills can be acquired through training and experience.

c) Technical skills

Technical skills include understanding and being able to perform efficiently the specific processes, practices and techniques required of specific jobs in an organization. Although the supervisors may not be expected to have all the technical answers, they need an overall knowledge of the functions they supervise and sources of specific information. They need to have enough technical knowledge in order to make sound judgement.

2.2.3 Instructional supervisory role of a secondary school head teacher

The head teacher of a secondary school is placed in a position of great responsibility. He or she is the instructional leader of the school programme. The head teacher is the administrative official to whom all teachers are directly responsible. He or she is held responsible for improving instructional programmes in the school. The manual for the Heads of Secondary Schools in Kenya (1987) confirms this when it states that:

the organization and control of staff both teaching and non-teaching are all part of the head’s duties as the immediate inspector of the school. In
particular, he must check the teaching standard by reference to schemes, lesson notes, records of work done and pupils’ exercise books, also by actual visits to the classroom to see the individual teachers. He must see that he is immediately informed of all staff absences.

Efficient and effective running of schools greatly depends on the head teacher’s role performance as instructional supervisors. As supervisors, they are to make things happen by working through the staff and students and other stakeholders in the school to achieve the desired product. They must schedule and assign work, coordinate and oversee performance making sure work is done well and on time. Basically, the role functions of secondary school head teachers are those essential supervisory functions highlighted by Ingram and McIntosh, (1976), and Okumbe, (1978). They include:

- Obtaining and distributing instructional resources,
- Providing assistance and support services to teaching and learning,
- Relating the school to the community,
- Maintaining and controlling the learning process,
- Improving the school system
The five functions of instructional supervision will contribute to the setting of appropriate performance goals, acquisition of up to date instructional resources, provision of qualified staff and students, better performance on the job and overall instructional improvement.

2.3 Summary

From the review of literature, the following summary can be made; supervision is an integral part of education administration. The main purpose of supervision is improvement of teaching and learning. In educational administration there is general supervision and instructional supervision.

General supervision subsumes supervisory activities that take place principally outside the classroom. In Kenya, general supervision had been delegated to the Inspectorate that is the professional arm of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology.

Instructional supervision on the other hand is concerned with the student learning in the classroom. It involves guiding and influencing teachers and students to strive towards desirable teaching and learning behaviour in order to achieve educational goals. This takes into consideration analysis of data obtained from first hand observation of events of the classroom and the relationship between the teacher and the supervisor to form the basis of the programme, procedures designed to improve the students learning. Essential instructional supervisory functions are:

- Obtaining and distributing resources,
- Providing assistance and support services to teaching and learning,
• Relating the school to the community,

• Maintaining and controlling teaching and learning process,

• Improving the school system.

Headteachers as the immediate personnel charged with improving instructional programmes in a school have crucial role to play in instructional supervision.

To carry out instructional supervisory functions efficiently and effectively the supervisors require certain basic skills namely: conceptual skills, human relation skills and technical skills.

A well planned programme of education can be said to be successful only if effective and efficient supervision exists at all levels. Without this the whole programme of education can be seriously handicapped.

It is on this understanding that the researcher sought to find out whether or not the Secondary schools headteachers in Siaya district carry out what is expected for efficient and effective instructional supervision.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to find out the extent to which secondary school headteachers in Siaya district carry out what is expected of efficient and effective instructional supervision in their schools.

This chapter explains how the research was conducted. It explains the methodology of the study in reference to research design, site for the study, target population and sampling procedures. It also explains the research instruments used in the study, piloting of the instruments, data collection process and method used to analyze the collected data.

3.2 Research Design

To accomplish its purpose, this study adopted a descriptive survey as its design. This was a suitable design as the study was interested in what is going on in school in terms of instructional supervision. It was a useful approach for systematically collecting information about the headteachers knowledge and practice in instructional supervision in real life situation of their schools. As the study sought to give a clear picture of instructional supervision in the research schools, It was necessary to systematically to collect information using suitable tools, describe and interpret what goes on in the schools. Descriptive survey method becomes a suitable design in such a case.
3.3 Site for study

The study was conducted in Siaya district of Nyanza province (Kenya). This was because the district had had a history of good performance in education but has over the years shown a great decline in academic performance especially in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE). The study sought to investigate one of the possible causes of the decline in academic performance.

3.4 Target Population

In the study, the target population was 53 secondary school head teachers, 106 heads of departments and 150 teachers. The study was intended to focus on instructional supervision as carried out in Siaya district Secondary Schools by the head teachers or through their delegation of responsibilities. It was to examine the kind of help teachers get from head teachers or heads of departments and subject heads as directed by the head teacher. The head teacher is the instructional leader of the school programme and the immediate educational supervisor. It was therefore imperative to have head teachers as the subjects of this study. The choice of heads of departments as additional source of data for this study was not only to help verify information given by head teachers, heads of departments were also to give information that would explain how head teachers extend instructional help to teachers through the heads of departments. Teachers are the recipients of instructional supervisory services. They could give a judgement of supervisory help they obtain from head teachers.
3.5 Sampling procedures

Samples of 12 head teachers and 24 heads of departments were selected from population of 53 head teachers and 106 heads of languages and science departments in Siaya district public secondary schools. This represented 22.6% of each of the two populations. 36 teachers were selected from a population of 150 teachers in the sampled schools representing 24% of the teachers. To achieve this sampling, a proportional stratified sampling method was used to select 12 sample schools. The head teacher and 2 heads of departments (languages and sciences) from each sample school automatically became part of the sample for the study. 3 teachers were randomly selected from each of the selected schools to complete the sample. The heads of languages and science departments were chosen for the purpose of this study because the departments provide a good representation of core subjects in secondary school curriculum.

The 53 secondary schools in Siaya district were first divided into two groups based on school categories, giving the 18 provincial and 35 district public secondary schools in Siaya district. For each of the two categories of schools, a list was prepared bearing name of the schools. Provincial schools list had names ranging from numbers 1 – 18 while district schools had names ranging from 1 – 35. Simple random sampling using lottery method was then applied to select 4 provincial school and 8 district schools. The sampling was done separately for the two categories one after another. The head teacher and 2 heads of department from each of the selected schools of both categories were taken into the study sample. To get a sample of 36 teachers for the study, 3 teachers in the selected school of each category were randomly chosen. Simple random sampling using lottery
method was applied to get the required number of teachers per school from list of teachers in each of the selected schools. Headteachers and heads of languages and science departments were not included in the list of teachers because they were already subjects of the study.

3.6 Research Instruments

The main research instruments used in this study were Headteachers Questionnaire, Heads of Departments Questionnaire and Teachers Questionnaire. The researcher considered these instruments adequate because the survey intended to obtain qualitative data on existing situations in schools regarding instructional supervision. The 3 types of questionnaires were prepared to cater for the 3 categories of study subjects who were headteachers, heads of departments and teachers. The questions were close ended to elicit certain responses which were sought.

3.6.1 Headteachers Questionnaire

The headteachers questionnaire was composed of three sections A, B and C. Each section requested for specific information. Section A sought information on bio-data and personal data. The information was to assist the researcher to determine the personal and academic qualification of the respondent and also their experience in the profession. It was believed that these variables have a profound effect on the teachers perception of the supervisory roles of their headteachers and hence could not be ignored. Section B sought information regarding supervisory activities related to the five essential instructional supervisory functions namely: staffing, motivation and stimulation, consultation, programme
development and evaluation. The respondents were required to indicate regularity of some of the activities in terms of how often or rarely the activities are carried out. The options were therefore; never, rarely, sometimes, often and always or daily, weekly, fortnightly, monthly and termly. The questions were structured in such a way as to elicit certain responses from the respondents and hence minimize the possibility of a wide variety of answers that would make analysis difficult. They were grouped into the five essential supervisory functions. The responses to the statements were to enable the researcher to evaluate the headteachers' performance of the supervisory activities and the importance they attach to the supervisory activities. Section C contained questions that required the respondents to make a general assessment of education preparation they may have received, if any and suggest areas in their work which need special attention in their training programme. They were required to confirm by answering YES or NO and give details as required.

3.6.2 Heads of Departments Questionnaire

Heads of Departments questionnaire comprised of two sections A and B. Section A sought information on the personal data to enable the researcher to determine their professional and academic background as well as their experience in teaching. It was believed that these variables have a profound effect on the teachers' perception of the role of their headteachers supervisory roles. Section B of the Heads of Departments Questionnaire corresponded with section B of the Headteachers Questionnaire, only that the heads of departments were required to confirm whether the headteacher undertake the supervisory
activities and give details of the performance in specified areas. They were therefore required to answer YES or NO and give details as required.

3.6.3 Teachers Questionnaire

Like the Heads of Departments Questionnaire, Teachers Questionnaire had two section A and B. Section A required information on personal data to determine the professional and academic background of the teachers. Section B had questions that corresponded to questions in Section B of the headteachers questionnaire and the teachers were required to rate headteachers' performance in instructional supervisory role using a 5-point rating scale. They were required to use the rating scale to award points against each of performance standards stated in the questionnaire.

3.7 Piloting of Research Instruments

To ensure that the research instruments were efficient and clear, the researcher carried out a pilot study in two secondary school not included in the research sample. The selection of the pilot school was done using purposive sampling procedure requiring one provincial school and one district school. The questionnaires were personally administered to the headteacher, two heads of departments (languages and sciences) and three teachers in each of the pilot schools by the researcher.

The completed questionnaires were collected by the researcher after two days. On analyzing the data given in the completed questionnaires, the information showed lack of understanding of some questions in the questionnaire especially by heads of departments who left blank spaces or gave irrelevant information in some areas that sought their
explanation of how some supervisory activities are conducted in their schools. It was also realized that some of the items in the Headteachers Questionnaires could be better answered using the alternative option rather than the one indicated to the headteachers. The teachers however did not have problems in filling their questionnaires. On following up with some of the heads of departments and teachers, they also expressed concern about the sensitivity of the exercise which required them to give information about their headteachers and wondered if their honest information would lead to victimization of when the headteacher finds out.

The information obtained by the pilot study was very useful to the researcher. It helped to improve the tools and to determine the best method of administration. Where clarity of questions was required the questions were refined. The need to use effective method that would ensure confidentiality required that the tools be administered personally on the study subjects by the researcher. This would also give the researcher opportunity to explain the need for honesty when answering questions.

3.8 Data collection

After pilot study and refining of the research tools, enough copies of the questionnaires were produced to cover the 12 headteachers, 24 heads of departments and 36 teachers in the study. The questionnaires were then personally administered on the subjects by the researcher, ensuring that each subject understood what they were required to do. The respondents were not required to consult each other. But to give their own personal opinion of what they felt was required in the questionnaire. They were given two weeks to fill the questionnaires and keep them ready for collection by the researcher. To ensure
confidentiality, the respondents were requested to ensure that the completed questionnaire were put in an envelope and sealed. The researcher provided the envelopes which was also to make collection easier because even if the subjects were not to be around, they would make sure they left the questionnaire with somebody in the school awaiting collection. All the respondents including the headteacher were assured of their confidentiality.

3.9 Data Analysis

This study being a descriptive survey study, used simple descriptive statistics in the analysis of its data. The data extracted from the questionnaires were analyzed using frequency table and percentages. As Gay (1976) observes, one of the most commonly used methods in reporting descriptive surveys is the use of frequency distributions, calculating percentages in whole numbers and then tabulating them appropriately. The findings were highlighted after each table and their meaning explained. The information in the table represented the variables being studied. Data analysis followed the order in which the items appeared in the questionnaire.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This study sought to find out the extent to which secondary school head teachers in Siaya district carry out what is expected of efficient and effective instructional supervision in their schools.

This chapter presents the results of the study focusing on the following:

- Profile of respondents,
- Profile of the research schools,
- What secondary school head teachers in Siaya district do in performing their role of instructional supervision,
- How the head teachers carry out role activities in instructional supervisory functions
- The practice of instructional supervision by secondary school head teachers in the district viewed against what is expected of efficient and effective instructional supervision and
- General assessment of the head teachers' educational preparation.

4.2 Profile of respondents

Three categories of respondents participated in this study, namely head teachers, heads of department and teachers.
4.2.1 Profile of head teachers

a) Sex of head teachers

Table 1 shows that 10(83.3%) head teachers were males and 2(16.7) head teachers were females.

Table 1: Sex of head teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of secondary school head teachers who participated in the study were males. Given that the sample was representative of head teachers' population in the district, this finding indicated that majority of secondary school head teachers in the district were males.

b) Head teachers years of experience in school management

The data presented in table 2 show that 5(42%) head teachers had served as head teachers for less than 5 years, 2(17%) head teachers had served for 5-10 years, 2(17%) head teachers had served for 11-15 years, 2(17%) head teachers had served for 16-20 years and only 1(8%) head teacher had served as a head teacher for more than 20 years.
Table 2: Head teachers years of experience in school management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that 41.7% of the head teachers in the study had served as head teachers for less than 5 years. Fifty eight point three percent of the head teachers had served for more than 5 years as head teachers. This indicated that a majority of secondary school head teachers in Siaya district (58.3%) were fairly experienced.

c) Head teachers years of experience as teachers before appointment in administrative post

Table 3 shows that none of the head teachers had worked as a teacher for less than 5 years before appointment in administrative post. Four (33.3%) head teachers had served as teachers for 5-10 years, 2(16.7%) head teachers had worked as teachers for 11-15 years and 1(8.3%) head teachers had worked as a teacher for more that 20 years before appointment in administrative post. One head teacher did not indicate his experience as a teacher.
The data show that none of the head teachers in this study had an experience as a teacher of less than 5 years before appointment in administrative post.

The finding indicated that secondary school head teachers in Siaya district were experienced teachers before they became school administrators. This finding is in agreement with the prevailing practice in Kenya’s education management where experienced classroom teachers are appointed into school administrative roles.

d) Academic qualifications of the head teachers

Table 4 shows that 1(8.3%) head teacher had M.Ed degree, 9(75%) head teachers had B.Ed degrees, 1(8.3%) head teacher was an ATS teacher and 1 (8.3%) had diploma in education.
This analysis shows that a majority (83.3%) of secondary school head teachers in this study were professionally trained University graduates. Only 16.6% were not university graduates. It indicated that most of the secondary school head teachers in the district were professionally trained university graduates.

4.2.2 Profile of heads of departments

a) Sex of heads of department

Table 5 shows that 17(81.0%) heads of departments in the study were males and 2(19.0%) heads of department were females.
Table 5: Sex of heads of departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority (81.0%) of the heads of departments in the study were males. This implied that a majority of heads of Languages and Science departments in secondary schools in the district were males.

b) Heads of department years of experience as teachers

Table 6 shows that 7(33.3%) heads of departments had experience as teachers of less than 5 years, 8(38.1%) heads of departments had experience as teachers of 5-10 years, 2(9.5%) heads of department had experience of 11-15 years and 3(14.3%) heads of department had experience as teachers of 16-20-years. Only 1(4.8%) head of department had experience as a teacher of more than 20 years.
Table 6: Heads of departments years of experience as teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in Years.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in the table show that only 33.3% of the heads of department had experience as teachers of less than 5 years. The rest (66.7%) had experience as teachers ranging from 5 to 20 years and only 1 (8.3%) had an experience of more than 20 years. This was an indication that a majority of the heads of departments in the district were experienced teachers.

c) Academic qualifications of heads of department

Table 7 shows that none of the 21 heads of department in the study had M.Ed degree, 15 (71.4%) heads of department had B.Ed degrees, 2 heads of departments were P.G.D.E holders, 1 head of department was an ATS teacher, 1 head of department had Diploma in education and 1 was an untrained teacher. One head of department did not indicate his academic qualification.
Table 7: Academic qualifications of heads of departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.G.D.E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip. Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis shows that a great majority (80.9%) of the heads of departments were university graduates with B.Ed holders (71.4%) forming the bulk. While many schools in the district seemed to prefer university graduates being heads of departments, some schools still had ATS teachers, diploma teachers and even untrained teachers as heads of departments.

4.2.3 Profile of teachers

a) Sex of teachers

The collected data showed that 28(90.3%) teachers who participated in the study were males and 2(6.5%) teachers were females. One (3.2%) teacher did not indicate sex. This finding shows that majority of secondary school teachers in the district were males.

b) Subjects taught by the teachers

Table 8 shows that 3(9.7%) teachers who participated in this study were teaching languages, 16(51%) teachers were teachers of mathematics and science subjects, 7(22.6%)
teachers were of Art subjects teachers and 5(16.1%) teachers were teachers of technical subjects.

Table 8: Subjects taught by the teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Taught</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths and Science</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Subjects</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Subjects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table it can be seen that teachers of various subjects taught in secondary schools were respondent in the study.

c) Teachers years of experience in teaching

Table 9 show that 12(38.7%) teachers who participated in this study had teaching experience of less than 5 years, 10(32.3%) teachers had teaching experience of between 5 - 10 years, 6(19.4%) teachers had experience of 11 – 15 years, none of the teachers had teaching experience of 16 –20 years and 1(3.2%) teacher had an experience of more than twenty years. Two (6.5%) teachers did not indicate their teaching experience.
Table 9: Teachers years of experience in teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table it is clear that majority (75.9%) of the teachers had teaching experience of 10 years and below. A small percentage (3.5%) had experience of more than 20 years in teaching. The information indicated that the district had an energetic teaching force at secondary level which could produce good results.

d) Academic qualifications of teachers

Table 10 show that none of the teachers who took part in this study had M.Ed degree, 17(54%) teachers had B.Ed. One (3.2%) teacher had PGDE, 4(12.9%) teachers had diploma in education, 5(16.1%) teachers were ATS teachers and 4(12.9%) teachers were untrained teachers.
From the table it can be noticed that majority (58%) of teachers who participated in this study were professionally trained university graduates, with B.Ed graduates forming the bulk. A small proportion (12.9%) of the teachers was diploma teachers and untrained teachers formed the least proportion (12.9%). This implied that teachers of the various professional qualifications in secondary schools could have their views on instructional supervision expressed according to their number in the schools.

4.3 Profile of schools

4.3.1 School size

Table 11 shows that 8 (66.7%) schools were one-streamed, 3 schools were two-streamed, there was no three-streamed school in the study sample and 1 (8.3%) school was a four-streamed school.
Table 11: School sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One stream</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two streams</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three streams</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four streams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority (91.7%) of schools in the study were either one-streamed with student enrolment of about 160 or two-streamed with enrolment of about 320 students.

The result meant that a majority of secondary schools in the district are either one-streamed with student enrolment of about 160 or two-streamed with about 320 students.

4.3.2 Schools performance in KCSE as rated by head teachers

The data presented in table 13 show that 2(16.7%) head teachers rated their school performance in KCSE as excellent, 1(8.3%) head teacher rated his/her schools' performance as good and 9(75.0%) head teachers rated their school performance as fair.
The table shows that performance in KCSE for majority of the schools studied could be rated as only fair. It is an indication that performance in KCSE for most of secondary schools in the district could be rated as only fair. This performance may be a reflection of the state of instruction in the district.

4.4 What secondary school head teachers in Siaya district do in performing their role of instructional supervision

Table 13 shows that seven (58.3%) head teachers indicated they always created conducive class environment, 3(25.0%) head teachers indicated they did this often, and 1(8.3%) head teacher did this sometimes. No head teacher indicated that they carried out this activity rarely or never. One (8.3%) head teacher did not indicate how frequently he/she carried out the activity. All 12(100%) head teachers indicated they always ensured that there were qualified teachers for all the subjects taught in the schools.
Of the 12 head teachers in the research schools, 10 (83.3%) head teachers indicated they always made available approved syllabuses for the subjects taught, 1 (8.3%) head teacher did this often and another 1 (8.3%) performed this activity sometimes. All the 12 (100%) head teachers indicated they always ensured that master timetable is in place at the beginning of the term. Three (25.0%) head teachers indicated they always met heads of department to determine needed instructional resources, 8 (66.7%) head teachers indicated they did this often and 1 (8.3%) head teacher never met heads of departments to determine needed instructional resources.

Six (50%) head teacher indicated they always inducted and oriented new teachers into the school operations, 3 (25.0%) head teachers indicated they did this often, 2 (16.7%) head teachers did it sometimes and 1 (8.3%) head teacher rarely carried out this activity. None of the 12 head teachers always assisted teachers in preparation of schemes of work, 6 (50.0%) head teachers indicated they often assisted teachers, 4 head teachers indicated they did this sometimes and 2 (16.7%) head teacher did this rarely.

No head teacher always observed teachers’ lesson plans, 4 (33.3%) head teachers indicated they often observed teachers’ lesson plans, 2 (16.7%) head teachers did this sometimes, 3 (25.0%) head teachers rarely carried out this supervisory activity and 2 (16.7%) head teachers never did this. Two (16.7%) head teachers did not indicate how often they carried out this supervisory activity.

Five (41.7%) head teachers indicated they never visited teachers in classrooms to observe lessons, 2 (16.7%) head teachers visited teachers in classrooms rarely, 4 (33.3%) head teachers indicated they did this sometimes, and 1 (8.3%) head teacher carried out this activity often. Among the head teachers who visited teachers in classrooms to observed
lessons, 1(8.3%) head teachers, rarely held discussion with the teachers after the visit, 2(16.7%) head teachers indicated they did this sometimes, 1(8.3%) head teacher indicated he did this often and 3(25.0%) head teachers indicated they always held discussions with teachers after classroom visits.

Nine (75.0%) head teachers indicated they always encouraged teamwork among teachers, 2(16.7%) head teachers indicated they did this often and 1(8.3%) head teacher did this rarely. Seven (58.3%) head teachers indicated they always recognized teachers who exhibit good instructional performance, 3(25.0%) head teachers indicated they did this often, one (8.3%) head teacher did this sometimes and another 1 (8.3%) did this rarely.

Five (41.7%) head teachers indicated they always discussed instructional expectations of school stakeholders with the teachers, 3(25.0%) head teachers indicated they did this often, 3(25.0%) others did this sometimes and 1(8.3%) head teacher never discussed instructional expectations of school stakeholders with teachers. Six (50%) head teachers indicated they explained curriculum policies to teachers always, 5(41.7%) head teachers indicated they did this often and 1(8.3%) head teacher carried out this activity sometimes. Six (50%) head teachers indicated they communicated improvements in instruction and instructional resources to school stakeholders always, and 5(41.7%) head teachers indicated they carried out this activity often. One (8.3%) head teacher did not answer this question.

Of the 12 head teachers, 2(16.7%) head teachers indicated they always helped teachers identify problem areas in the curriculum, 3(25.0%) head teachers indicated they did this often and 7(58.3%) head teachers indicated they performed this activity sometimes. Of these head teachers 4 (33.3%) indicated they always helped teachers to come up with strategies for solving problems in the curriculum, 3(25.0%) head teachers indicated they
did this often, 4(33.3%) head teachers did this sometimes and 1(8.3%) head teacher did this rarely.

Nine (75.0%) head teachers indicated they always encouraged teachers to attend in-service courses, seminars and workshops, 3(25.0%) head teachers indicated they did this often. Seven (58.3%) head teachers indicated that they carried out formal appraisal of teachers' instructional performance always, 3(25%) head teachers indicated that they did this often while 2(16.7%) head teacher indicated they did it sometimes. Of the 12 head teachers, 9(75%) head teachers indicated they evaluated examination results together with teachers always and 3(25.0%) head teachers indicated they did this often.

Apart from the supervisory activities presented in the table, other supervisory activities performed by the head teachers were; checking students' class attendance, teachers punctuality to class, teachers' schemes of work, students' written work, teachers' records of work and students' progress record.

Four (33.3%) head teachers indicated that they checked students class attendance daily, 4(33.3%) head teachers indicated that they checked students class attendance weekly, 1(8.3%) head teacher did this fortnightly, and another 1 (8.3%) did this termly. Two (16.2%) head teachers did not indicate how frequently they checked students' class attendance. Out of the 12 head teachers, 11(91.7%) head teachers indicated they checked teachers' punctuality to class daily and 1(8.3%) head teacher carried out this activity weekly. Three (25.0%) head teachers indicated they checked teachers' schemes of work weekly, 1(8.3%) head teacher carried out this fortnightly and 8(66.7%) head teachers did it termly. Four(33.3%) head teachers indicated they checked students written work termly, 3(25.0%) head teachers indicated they carried out this activity monthly, 3(25.0%) head
teachers did this fortnightly and 2 (16.7%) head teachers indicated they did it weekly. Four out of the 12 (33.3%) head teachers indicated they checked teachers' record of work weekly, 3 (25.0%) head teachers indicated they carried out this activity fortnightly and 4 (33.3%) head teachers indicated they did this monthly. Four (33.3%) head teachers indicated they checked students' progress termly, 5 (41.7%) head teachers did this monthly and 1 (8.3%) head teacher carried out this activity weekly. Two (16.7%) head teachers did not indicate how frequently they perform this supervisory activity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities performed</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating conducive classroom environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that there are qualified teachers for all subjects taught in school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making available approved syllabuses for the subjects taught</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that master timetable is in place at the beginning of the term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting heads of departments to determine needed instructional resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inducting and orienting new teachers into the school’s operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting teachers in preparation of schemes of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing teachers lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting teachers in classrooms to observe lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding discussions with the teachers after classroom visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging teamwork among teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing teachers who exhibit good instructional performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing instructional expectations of students, parents and community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
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<td></td>
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</tbody>
</table>

49
with teachers
Explaining curriculum policies to teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communicating improvements in teaching, resources and performance to school stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helping teachers to identify problem areas in the curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helping teachers to come up with strategies for solving problems in the curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Encouraging teachers to attend in-service courses, seminars and workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carrying out formal appraisal of teachers’ instructional performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluating examination results together with teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

A = Always
O = Often
S = Sometimes
R = Rarely
N = Never
The findings show that all the supervisory activities listed in the table were carried out by head teachers who participated in this study. The activities performed by the head teachers include: checking students class attendance, creating conducive classroom environment, ensuring that there were qualified teachers for the subjects taught in school, making available approved syllabuses for the subjects taught, ensuring that master timetable was in place at the beginning of each term, meeting heads of department to determine needed instructional resources, inducting and orienting new teachers into the school operations, visiting teachers in classrooms to observe lessons, holding post classroom observation discussions with the teachers, encouraging teamwork among teachers, recognizing teachers who exhibited good instructional performance, discussing instructional expectations of students and other school stakeholders with teachers, explaining curriculum policies to teachers, communicating progress made in school to the schools' stakeholders, checking teachers punctuality to class, checking teachers schemes of work, checking students written work, checking teachers record of work, checking students progress records, helping teachers to identify problem areas in curriculum and helping them come up with strategies for solving the problems, encouraging teachers to attend in service training programmes, appraising teachers instructional performance and evaluating examination results together with teachers. However, the frequencies in which these supervisory activities were carried out by the head teachers in schools varied.
4.5 How the head teachers carry out role activities in instructional supervisory functions

Table 14 shows that 17(81%) heads of department indicated that head teachers regularly checked students’ class attendance in their schools and 4(19%) heads of department indicated that head teachers did not carry out this activity regularly in their schools. On the creation of conducive classroom environment, the heads of department indicated head teachers’ performance as follows: 19(90.5%) heads of department indicated that head teachers ensured adequate spacing in classrooms, 2(9.5%) heads of departments indicated that head teachers did not do this in their schools; 19((90.5%) heads of department indicated that head teachers in their schools ensured that there was good lighting within the classrooms, 2(9.5%) head teachers indicated that head teachers in their schools did not do this; 16(76.2%) heads of department indicated that their head teachers ensured good maintenance of chalk boards, 5(23.3%) heads of department indicated that this was not done in their schools; 18(85.7%) heads of department indicated that head teachers made available chalk and dusters in classroom s and 3(14.3%) heads of department indicated that head teachers did not do this in their schools.

Eighteen (35.7%) heads of department indicated that head teachers ensured that there were qualified teachers for the subjects taught in their schools, 3(14.3%) heads of department indicated that head teachers did not do this in their schools; 20(95.2%) heads of department indicated that head teachers made available approved syllabuses in their schools 1(4.3%) head of department indicated that a head teacher did not. All the 20(100%) heads of department indicated that head teachers ensured that master time table
was in place at the beginning of each from. Ten (47.6%) heads of department indicated that head teachers assisted teachers in preparation of schemes of work while 11(52.4%) heads of department indicated that head teachers did not carry out this activity in their schools.

Thirteen (61.9%) heads of departments indicated that head teachers met heads of department in their schools to determine needed instructional resources, 8(38.1%) heads of department indicated that head teachers did not do this in their schools. Nineteen (90.5%) heads of department indicated that head teachers regularly checked teachers punctuality to class, 2(9.5%) heads of departments indicated that head teachers did not carry out this activity in their schools. Twelve (57.1%) heads of department indicated that head teachers inducted and oriented new teachers to settle down and 9(42.9%) heads of department indicated head teachers in their schools did not do this.

Out of the 21 heads of departments, 4(19.0%) heads of departments indicated that head teachers observed teachers lesson plans while 17(81.0%) heads of department indicated that head teachers did not observe teachers lesson plans. 2(9.5%) heads of departments indicated that head teachers in their schools visited teachers in classrooms to observe instruction, 19(9.5%) heads of department indicated that head teachers did not carry out this supervisory activity. Seventeen (81%) heads of department indicated that head teachers encouraged teamwork among teachers and 1(4.8%) head of department indicated that a head teacher does not do this in the school. Three (14.3%) heads of department did not indicate whether this activity was carried out in their schools.
Fifteen (71.4%) heads of department indicated that head teachers discussed instructional expectations of school stakeholders with teachers, 6(28.6%) heads of department indicated that head teachers did not do this in their schools; 10(47.6%) heads of department indicated that head teachers helped teacher identify problem areas in the curriculum while 11(52.4%) heads of department indicated that head teachers in their school did not carry out this activity. Thirteen (61.9%) heads of department indicated that head teachers in their schools encouraged teachers to attend in-service courses, seminars and workshops while 8(38.1%) heads of department indicated that their head teachers did not do this.

Of the 21 heads of department who participated in this study, 3(14.3%) heads of department indicated that head teachers in their schools carried out formal appraisal of teachers instructional performance while 18(85.7%) heads of departments indicated that head teachers did not do this in their schools; 12(57.1%) heads of department indicated head teachers recognized teachers who exhibited good instructional performance, 8(38.1%) heads of department indicated that head teachers did not do this in their schools.

One (4.8%) head of department did not respond to this question.

On the frequency of head teachers checking of instructional documents, 1(4.8%) head of departments indicated that a head teacher checked schemes of work monthly, 15(71.4%) heads of department indicated that head teachers carried out this activity in their schools termly, 1(4.8%) head of department indicated that a head teacher never did this and 3(14.3%) heads of department indicated that it was done rarely in their schools. One head of department did not respond to this question.

Three (14.3%) heads of department indicated that their head teachers checked students written work weekly, 1(4.8%) head of department indicated a head teacher did this
monthly and 3 heads of department indicated that head teachers carried out this supervisory activity termly in their schools. Five (23.8%) heads of departments specified that head teachers did this rarely while 4(19.0%) heads of departments stated that they had no idea whether head teachers in their schools checked students’ written work. Four (19.0%) heads of department indicated that head teachers in their schools checked teachers record of work covered weekly, 3(14.3%) heads of departments indicated that head teachers did this fortnightly, 2(9.5%) heads of department indicated that head teachers did this monthly and 7(33.3%) heads of department indicated that head teachers carried out this supervisory activity termly in their schools. Three heads of department specified that head teachers in their schools never checked teachers’ record of work, and 2(9.5%) heads of department specified head teachers in their schools carried out this supervisory activity not regularly.

One (4.8%) head of department indicated that a head teacher checked students progress records weekly, 1(4.8%) head of department indicated that a head teacher did this fortnightly, 3(14.3%) heads of department indicated that head teachers in their schools did this monthly and 9(42.9%) heads of department indicated head teachers in their schools checked students progress records termly. Three (14.3%) heads of department specified that head teachers never did this in their schools, 2(9.5%) heads of departments specified that their head teachers did this rarely while 2(9.5%) heads of department stated that they had no idea whether their head teachers checked students progress records.

Of the 21 heads of departments, 10(47.6%) heads of departments indicated that head teachers in their schools evaluated examination results together with teachers termly and 7(33.3%) heads of departments indicated that head teachers in their schools did this yearly.
Three (14.3%) heads of department specified that head teachers in their schools carried out this activity whenever an external examination was done and 1 (4.8%) head of department specified that his head teacher never evaluated examination results together with teachers.

Nine (42.9%) heads of department indicated that instructional supervision was adequately carried out in their schools and 12 (57.1%) heads of department indicated that instructional supervision was not adequately carried out in their schools. Ten (47.6%) heads of department indicated that their head teachers adequately involved them in instructional supervision, while 11 (52.4%) heads of department indicated that their head teachers did not adequately involve them in instructional supervision.

Table 14: Head teachers’ Performance of instructional Supervisory activities as indicated by heads of departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities performed</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the head teacher regularly check students class attendance.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher create conducive classroom environment in the following aspects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Adequate spacing in classroom</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Good lighting within the classroom</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Well maintained chalkboards</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Availability of chalk and dusters</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities performed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher ensure that there are qualified teachers for all subjects taught in their school?</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher make available approved syllabus in the school</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher ensure master timetable is in place at the beginning of each term?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher meet the heads of departments to determine needed instructional resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher regularly check teachers’ punctuality to class?</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher assist new teachers to settle down by inducting them into school operations?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher observe teachers lesson plans?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher visit teachers in classrooms to observe instruction?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities performed</td>
<td>Yes n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher encourage teamwork among teachers?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher discuss instructional expectations of students, parents and the community with teachers?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher help teachers to identify problem areas in the curriculum?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher encourage teachers to attend in-service courses, seminars and workshops?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the headteacher carry out formal appraisal of teachers instructional performance?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the head teacher recognize teachers who exhibit good instructional performance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think instructional supervision is adequately carried out in your school?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the head teacher adequately engage you in instructional supervision as a head of department?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data on headteachers performance of instructional supervisory activities show that most of the head teachers checked students’ class attendance regularly as indicated by 81% of the heads of departments. The heads of department gave ways by which head teachers ensured regular class attendance by students including assigning class teachers who were expected to mark class registers daily as head teachers recall the registers regularly for checking, head teachers making class visits to ascertain attendance and by use of attendance board filled every morning. Head teachers in most of the schools created conducive classroom environment. Over 70% of the heads of department indicated that head teachers in their schools ensured adequate spacing, good lighting within the classrooms, chalk boards were well maintained and availed chalk and dusters in classrooms. Majority of the head teachers ensured that there were qualified teachers for the subjects taught, provide approved syllabuses for subjects taught, and in the entire schools head teachers made sure master timetable is in place at the beginning of each term. Majority of the respondent heads of department explained that their schools had qualified TSC teachers and where TSC teachers lacked head teachers insisted on qualified teachers. The heads of departments also explained that in schools head teachers assigned the responsibility of preparing master timetable to a committee of teachers or deputy head teacher or have the timetable decided in the staff meeting at the beginning of the term or year.  

More than half (61%) of the heads of department indicated that head teachers in their schools met heads of departments to determine needed instructional resources while 39% of the heads of departments indicated that head teachers did not do this in their schools and explained that heads of department only made requisition whenever an item was needed and in some cases heads of department were never involved in obtaining
instructional resources. These supervisory activities as indicated by the heads of
department had been in general well performed by head teachers.

Other instructional supervisory activities indicated to had been well performed by head
teachers were checking of teachers punctuality to class, indicated by 91% of heads of
departments to be taking place in their schools; encouraging teamwork among teachers,
indicated by 81% of the heads of departments; discussing instructional expectations of
school stakeholders with teachers (71%), and encouraging teachers to attend in-service
training, seminars and workshops, indicated by 61.9% of heads of departments to had been
taking place in their schools.

Explanations by the heads of departments as to the ways by which head teachers achieved
some of these supervisory activities were given as monitoring teachers punctuality to class
by walking around the classes, use of class secretary records, use of teacher attendance
register and by checking on the master timetable to identify teachers sitting in staff room
when they were supposed to be in class, encouraging teamwork among teachers by
reminding them to work as a department, to adopt topical teaching in some areas and
through delegation of duties. Head teachers were shown to have been encouraging
teachers to attend in-service training, workshops and seminars mainly by either availing
information concerning the training or by availing information and providing financial
support to teachers.

From the data in the table it was found out that instructional supervisory activities poorly
performed by head teachers include assisting teachers in preparation of schemes of work,
indicated as taking place in school by less than half (47.6%) of heads of department;
observing teachers lesson plans indicated by only 19 heads of departments as taking place in schools, inducting and orienting new teachers into school operations indicated by 37% of heads of department as taking place; visiting teacher in classrooms to observe lessons, indicated as taking place by 9.5%; helping teachers identify problem areas in the curriculum, indicated as taking place in schools by 47.6% of the heads of departments and carrying out formal appraisal of teachers instructional performance, indicated as taking place in the schools by only 14.3% of the heads of department. Information given by the heads of department showed that head teachers asked teachers to prepare schemes of work and hand them in for checking, some left the scheme of work to be done departmentally yet some left it upon teachers to decide whether to prepare schemes of work or not. Head teachers indicated to have been assisting teachers in preparation of schemes of work had their assistance limited to giving information on term dates and term activities and providing materials for preparing the schemes. It was also explained that head teachers use feedback from students’ examination results and TSC confidential reports on teachers’ performance as an appraisal of teachers’ instructional performance. Head teachers did not carry out formal appraisal of teachers’ instructional performance to objectively assess how well their staff was performing.

Concerning the checking of instructional documents it was realized that activities well performed by head teachers were checking students progress records, indicated by more than 50% of the heads of department to be performed in schools as frequently as weekly, fortnightly, monthly and termly, and evaluating examinations results together with teachers indicated by 95% of the heads of department to have been performed in schools either termly, yearly and whenever an external examination was done. The activities
poorly performed are checking teachers record of work covered, indicated by more than 50% of the heads of department to be done in the school termly, not regularly or never done; checking students written work, indicated by 57.1% of the heads of department to have been done in their schools termly, not regularly or never done at all. Checking these instructional documents once a term or irregularly may not be effective in effective in monitoring of syllabus coverage and correcting deviations in time.

On the whole, data in table14 show that the most frequently performed instructional supervisory activities by head teachers were those that involved obtaining and distributing resources, relating the school to the community and maintaining good working relations within the school. Checking of students’ progress records and evaluating examination results together with teachers were also well performed by the head teachers. However the checking of such instructional documents that had more direct focus on the teachers’ performance like schemes of work and students’ written work were infrequently done. Also infrequently performed supervisory activities were those that require more personal guidance by head teachers like inducting and orienting new teaching staff, assisting teachers in preparation of schemes of work, observing teachers lesson plans, visiting teachers in classrooms to observe instructions and holding post classroom observation meeting with teachers, helping teachers to identify problem areas in the curriculum and working out solutions to the problems. Appraisal of teachers’ instructional performance also appeared as the least performed supervisory activity in schools. As explained by the heads of departments many head teachers considered feedback from student examinations results and the filling of TSC confidential reports on teachers as the appraisal of teachers’
They did not conduct formal appraisal to objectively assess how well their teaching staff were performing in instruction. The data show that instructional supervision was not adequately done in school as judged by 57.1% of the heads of department who participated in this study.

### 4.6 The Practice of instructional supervision by secondary school head teachers in Siaya district viewed against what is expected of efficient and effective instructional supervision

Table 15 shows that on a 5-point rating scale, 8(25.8%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in the checking of students' class attendance, 11(35.5%) teachers gave their head teachers 4 points, 7(22.6%) teachers gave their head teachers 3 points, 2(6.5%) teachers gave their head teacher 2 points and 3(9.7%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point in the performance of this supervisory activity. 14(45.2%) teachers gave their teachers 5 points in creating conducive classroom environment, 9(29%) teachers gave their head teachers 4 points, 6(19.4%) teachers gave their head teachers 3 points and 2(6.5%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point. Fourteen (45.2%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in ensuring that there were qualified teachers in school for the subjects taught, 11(35.5%) teachers gave their head teachers 4 points, 3(9.7%) teachers gave their head teachers 3 points, 1 (3.2%) teacher gave a head teacher 2 points and 2(6.5%) teachers gave 1 point to their head teachers in the performance of this supervisory activity. Fifteen teachers (48.5%) gave their head teachers 5 points in making available approved syllabuses for the subjects taught, 10 teachers (32.2%) gave 4 points, 1 teacher (3.2%) gave 3 points, 4(12.9%) teachers gave 2 points and 1(3.2%) teachers gave a head teacher 1
point in carrying out this supervisory activity. Fourteen (45.2%) teachers gave their head
teachers 5 points in ensuring that master timetable was in place at the beginning of each
term, 10(32%) teachers gave their head teachers 4 points, 5(16.1%) teachers gave their
head teachers 3 points and 2(6.5%) teachers gave their head teachers 2 points. Five
(16.1%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in meeting heads of department to
determine needed instructional resources, 5(16.1%) head teachers gave their head teachers
4 points, 10(32.3%) teachers gave their head teachers 3 points, 5(16.1%) teachers gave
their head teachers 3 points and 6(19.4%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point in the
performance of this activity. Six (19.4%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in
inducting and orienting new teachers, 7(22.6%) teachers gave their head teachers 4 points,
8(25.8%) teachers gave their head teachers 2 points and 6(19.4%) teachers gave their head
teachers 1 point in performing this supervisory activity. Three (9.7%) teachers gave their
head teachers 5 points in assisting teachers in preparation of schemes of work, 5(16.1%)
teachers gave their head teachers 4 points, 9(29.0%) teachers gave their head teachers 3
points, 5(16.1%) teachers gave their head teacher 2 points and 9(29.0%) teachers gave
their head teachers 1 point in carrying out this activity. Three (9.7%) teachers gave their
head teachers 5 points in observing teachers lesson plans, 8(28.8%) teacher gave their
head teachers 4 points, 8(25.8%) teachers gave their head teachers 3 points, 6(19.4%)
teachers gave their head teachers 2 points and 6(19.4%) teachers gave their head teachers
1 point in observing teachers lesson plans. One (3.2%) teacher gave a head teacher 5
points in visiting teachers in classrooms to observe instruction, 3(9.7%) teachers gave their
head teachers 4 points, 6(19.4%) teachers gave their head teachers 3 points, 7(22.6%)
teachers gave their head teachers 2 points and 14(45.2%) teachers gave their head teachers
1 point in performing this instructional supervisory activity. Two (6.5%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in post classroom observation discussion, 5 (16.1%) teachers gave their head teachers 4 points, 5 (16.1%) teachers gave 3 points, 5 (16.1%) teachers gave 2 points and 14 (45.2%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point. Ten (32.3%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in encouraging teamwork among teachers, 7 (22.6%) teachers gave their head teachers 4 points, 6 (19.4%) teachers gave their head teachers 3 points, 4 (12.9%) teachers gave their head teachers 2 points and 4 (12.9%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point. Six (19.4%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in recognizing teachers who exhibit good instructional performance, 5 teachers (16.1%) gave their head teachers 4 points, 7 (22.6%) teachers gave their head teachers 3 points, 6 (19.4%) teachers gave 2 points and 7 (22.6%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point in performing this activity. Seven (22.6%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in discussing instructional expectations of school stakeholders with teachers, 10 (32.3%) teachers gave their head teachers 4 points, 7 teachers gave their head teachers 3 points, 1 (3.2%) teacher gave 1 point and 6 (19.4%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point. Seven (22.6%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in explaining curriculum policies to teachers, 10 (32.3%) teachers gave 4 points, 10 (32.3%) teachers gave 3 points, 3 (9.7%) teachers gave 2 points and 3 (9.7%) teachers gave 1 point to head teachers in carrying out this supervisory activity. 6 (19.4%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in communicating improvements made in school to school stakeholders, 14 (45.2%) teachers gave 4 points, 5 (16.1%) teachers gave 3 points, 3 (9.7%) teachers gave 2 points and 3 teachers (9.7%) gave their head teachers 1 point in carrying out this activity. Twelve (38.7%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in checking teachers' punctuality to
class, 10(32.2%) teachers gave their head teachers 4 points, 7(22.6%) teachers gave their head teachers 3 points and 2 teachers gave their head teachers 1 point in performing this instructional supervisory activity. Twelve (38.7%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in checking teachers schemes of work, 7(22.6%) teachers gave their head teachers 4 points, 6(19.4%) teachers gave 3 points, 2(6.5%) teachers gave 2 points and 4(12.9%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point in performing of this instructional activity. 12(38.7%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in checking teachers records of work, 7(22.6%) teachers gave 4 points, 6(19.4%) teachers gave 3 points, 2(6.5%) teachers gave 2 points and 4(12.9%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point. Eight (25.8%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in checking students progress records, 12(38.7%) teachers gave 4 points, 2(6.5%) teachers gave 3 points, 2(6.5%) teachers gave 2 points and 7(22.6%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point in performing this instructional supervisory activity. Six (16.5%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in helping teachers identify problem areas in the curriculum, 8(25.8%) teachers gave the head teachers 4 points, 7(22.6%) teachers gave 3 points, 3(9.7%) teachers gave 2 points and 8(25.8%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point in performing this activity. Five (16.1%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in checking students written work, 10(32.3%) teachers gave 4 points, 6(19.4%) teachers gave 3 points, 4 (12.9%) teachers gave 2 points and 6(19.4%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point in carrying out this supervisory activity. Four (12.9%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in helping teachers come up with strategies for solving problems in the school curriculum, 8(25.8%) teachers gave 4 points, 9(29.0%) teachers gave 3 points and 6(19.4%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point in carrying out this instructional supervisory activity. 10(32.3%)
teachers gave 4 points, 7(22.6%) teachers gave 3 points, 1(3.2%) teacher gave 2 points and 4(12.9%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point in performance of this activity. Two (6.5%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in carrying out formal appraisal of teachers instructional performance, 12(33.7%) teachers gave their head teachers 4 points, 7(9.7%) teachers gave 3 points, 3(9.7%) teachers gave 2 points and 7(22.6%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point in the performance of this activity. Thirteen (4.9%) teachers gave their head teachers 5 points in evaluating examination results together with teachers, 5(16.1%) teachers gave their head teachers 4 points, 6(19.4%) teachers gave their head teachers 3 points, 1(3.2%) teacher gave 2 points and 5(16.1%) teachers gave their head teachers 1 point in carrying out this supervisory activity.

None of the 31 teachers who participated in this study gave their head teachers total points of 0 – 26 in their performance of instructional supervisory activities; 5(16.1%) teachers gave their head teachers total of 27-52 points, 7(22.6%) teachers gave their head teachers totals of 53-78 points, 8(25%) teachers gave their head teachers totals of 79-104 and 11(35.5%) teachers gave their head teachers totals of 105-130 points in their performance of instructional supervisory activities.
Table 15: Teachers rating of the head teachers performance of instructional supervisory activities on a 5-point rating scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities performed</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking students class performance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating conducive classroom environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making available approved syllabuses for the subjects taught</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that there are qualified teachers for all subjects taught</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that master timetable is in place at the beginning of each term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting heads of departments to determine needed instructional resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inducting and orienting new teachers into the school operations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting teachers in preparation of schemes of work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing teachers’ lesson plans</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting teachers in classrooms to observe instruction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding discussions with teachers after classroom visits</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging teamwork among teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing teachers who exhibit good instructional performance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities performed</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing instructional expectations of school stakeholders with teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining curriculum policies to teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating improvements in teaching, resources and performance to the school stakeholders</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers punctuality to class</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking schemes of work</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers records of work covered</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking students progress records</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking students written work</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping teachers to identify problem areas in the curriculum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping teachers to come up with strategies for solving problems in the curriculum</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging teachers to attend in-service courses, seminars and workshops</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying out formal appraisal of teachers instructional performance</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating examination results together with teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total points given**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 – 26</th>
<th>27 – 52</th>
<th>53 – 78</th>
<th>79 – 104</th>
<th>105 – 130</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 5 points = Very good; 4 points = Good; 3 points = Fair; 2 points = poor; 1 point = Very poor
Over 50% of the teachers who participated in this study rated their head teachers performance in the following instructional supervisory activities as either good or very good: checking students class attendance; creating conducive classroom environment in terms of adequate spacing, good lighting, well maintained chalkboards and availing chalk and dusters; ensuring that there were qualified teachers for the subjects taught; making available approved syllabuses for the subjects taught, ensuring master time table is in place at the beginning of each term; encouraging team work among teachers; discussing instructional expectations of students, parents and the community with teachers; explaining curriculum policies to teachers and communicating progress made in school to the school stakeholders.

Other supervisory activities in which the head teachers performance was generally rated high were checking teachers punctuality to class; checking teachers record of work covered, encouraging teachers to attend in-service courses, seminars and workshops and evaluating examinations results together with teachers.

On the other hand over 50% of the teachers rated their head teachers performance as fair, poor or very poor in supervisory activities like meeting heads of departments to determine needed instructional resources, inducting and orienting new teachers into school operations, assisting teachers in preparation of schemes of work, observing teachers lesson plans, visiting teachers in classrooms to observe instruction and holding post classroom observation discussions with teachers, appraising teachers instructional performance, recognizing teachers who exhibit good instructional performance checking schemes of
work, helping teachers to identify problem areas in the curriculum and helping them come up with strategies for solving the problems, and checking students written work.

Majority (61.3%) of the teachers in the study rated head teachers performance of instructional supervision in their schools as good or very good, while 48.2% rated their head teachers performance as fair or poor.

The instructional supervisory activities listed in table 13, 14 and 15 represent what is believed by many educators to constitute what is expected of efficient and effective instructional supervision and can be used as bench marks for determining adequacy of instructional supervisory practice.

The explanation given by the heads of department and teachers rating of head teachers’ performance of the supervisory activities revealed the supervisory activities that were well performed by the head teachers in schools and those that were poorly performed. It was clear from the study findings that secondary school head teachers in Siaya district performed well more than half of the expected supervisory activities. However the head teachers performance still does not fully reflect what is expected of efficient and effective instructional supervision as a good number of important supervisory activities were not well performed.

A look at the instructional supervisory activities more frequently performed by the head teachers revealed that they were supervisory activities that take place principally outside the classroom. The most frequently performed supervisory activities by the head teachers in the study were found to be those generally concerned with providing resources, setting
environment for teaching and learning, implementation of the timetable, maintaining good
relations between the school and school stakeholders and keeping records of instructional
activities. The supervisory activities infrequently performed by the head teachers were
found to be those that take place principally within the classroom like visiting teachers in
classroom to observe instruction, observing teachers lesson plans, holding post classroom
observation discussions with the teachers, helping teachers identify problem areas in the
curriculum and helping them come up with strategies for solving them, and appraising
teachers instructional performance. This means that secondary school head teachers in
Siaya district still apply a general approach to instructional supervision and have not yet
adopted the modern approach of clinical supervision. This represents inadequacy in the
head teachers' performance of instructional supervision.

Despite the fact that more than half of the expected supervisory activities were carried out
by the head teachers, the head teachers' performance of instructional supervision in
general still did not fully reflect what is expected of efficient and effective instructional
supervision. This observation was in agreement with the study finding in which more than
half (57.1%) of the heads of departments in the study judged their head teachers
performance of instructional supervision as inadequate. The level of head teachers
performance of instructional supervision in the district seemed to compare well with the
teachers rating of the head teachers performance in which on total point score 61.3% of
the teachers rated their head teachers performance as good or very good and 38.7% rated
their head teachers performance as fair or poor.
4.7 General assessment of head teachers educational preparation

The findings on head teachers' educational preparation showed that a pre-qualification criterion such as interview was required for appointment of 8(66.7%) head teachers. The appointment of 4(33.3%) head teachers did require pre-qualification criteria in form of interview. Among the 8 whose appointment procedure involved pre-qualification criteria, appointment of 4(33.3%) head teachers of the sample had pre-qualification to do with formal in administration. Four (33.3%) did not include pre-qualification criteria to do formal training in administration.

Of the 12 head teachers in the study, 6(50%) head teachers were inducted into the new job through a training programme and 6(50%) head teachers were not. Eleven (91.7%) head teachers were deputy head teachers before appointment to headship, 1(8.3%) head teacher was not a deputy head teacher before appointment to headship. Out of the 12 head teachers, 10(83.3%) head teachers have received training since appointment, 2(16.7%) head teachers have not received any training since appointment to headship. The training offered to the head teachers was short courses organized by Kenya Educational Staff Institute (KESI) as indicated by head teachers (66.7%) and some by the Ministry of Education Science and Technology. Three (25.0%) of the head teachers have had training covering management of curriculum and instruction, financial management, human resource management and management physical resources. Four (33.3%) head teachers had already trained in guidance and counseling in addition to the mentioned areas and 3 head teachers attended courses organized by those institutions in financial management only. Eleven (91.7%) head teachers indicated that they were comfortable with their instructional supervisory duties. One (8.3%) head teachers indicated discomfort with
instructional supervisory duties. The reasons given included difficulty in getting instructional work done in time and little preparation for instructional supervisory duties.

All the 12 head teachers in the study were teaching currently. Six (50%) head teachers were teaching science subjects, 2 (16.7%) head teachers were teaching languages, 2 (16.7%) head teachers were teaching Art subjects and 2 (16.7%) were teaching Mathematics. Six (50%) of the head teachers were teaching lower forms (1 and 2), 3 (25.0%) head teachers were teaching upper forms while 3 head teachers were teaching both lower and upper forms.

Eleven (91.7%) indicated that experience is necessary before appointment to headship. One (8.3%) head teachers did not answer this question.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This research work was aimed at finding out the extent to which Secondary school head teachers in Siaya district carry out in their schools what is expected of effective and efficient instructional supervision. Twelve public secondary schools in the district were selected randomly for the purpose of the study. Four of the secondary schools in the study were selected from the 18 provincial Secondary Schools in the district while 8 were selected from the 35 district public secondary schools. In each school the head teacher, 2 heads of department (languages and science) and 3 teachers were given questionnaires to fill. The head teachers Questionnaires, heads of department Questionnaire and teachers’ Questionnaires were different but related in content. Completed questionnaires were collected and the data analyzed using frequency tables and percentages.

5.2 Summary of research findings

In the random sample of secondary school head teachers in Siaya district a majority (83.3%) of the head teachers were found to be males while 16.7% were found to be females. More than half (58.3%) of the head teachers in the study had served as head teachers for more than 5 years and all the head teachers were experienced teachers before appointment in administrative post, as none was appointed in administrative post with less than 5 years teaching experience. Majority (83.3%) of the secondary school head teachers were found to be professionally trained university graduates. Majority (81%) of the heads of departments in the randomly sampled schools were found to be males. More than half (66.7%) of the heads of departments had experience as
teachers ranging from 5 years to 20 years. The findings showed that 81% of the heads of
departments are professionally trained University graduates with B.Ed. graduates forming
the bulk. Other heads of departments were found to have diploma in education and 1
school had an untrained teacher as a head of department.

Most of the secondary schools (91.7%) in the sample were found to be one-streamed with
student enrolment of about 160 or two-streamed with enrolment of about 320 students. A
majority (65.4%) of the teaching staff in the secondary schools were found to be
professionally trained university graduates with the B.Ed graduates forming the bulk
(60.7%). The schools were also found to have teachers with diploma in education (29.4%)
and untrained teachers (5.3%). Performance of majority (75.0%) of the secondary schools
in KCSE was rated as only fair by the head teachers.

All the supervisory activities listed in the questionnaires were found to be carried out by
the head teachers in the research schools. The supervisory activities include: checking
students class attendance, creating conducive classroom environment, ensuring that there
are qualified teachers for the subjects taught in school, making available approved
syllabuses for the subjects taught, ensuring that master timetable is in place at the
beginning of each term, meeting heads of departments to determine needed instructional
resources, inducting and orienting new teachers into the school operations, visiting
teachers in classrooms to observe lessons, holding post classroom observation discussions
with the teachers, encouraging teamwork among teachers, recognizing teachers who
exhibit good instructional performance, discussing instructional expectations of students
and other school stakeholders with teachers, explaining curriculum policies to teachers,
communicating progress made in school to the schools’ stakeholders, checking teachers punctuality to class, checking teachers schemes of work, checking students written work, checking teachers record of work, checking students progress records, helping teachers to identify problem areas in curriculum and helping them come up with strategies for solving the problems, encouraging teachers to attend in service training programmes, appraising teachers instructional performance and evaluating examination results together with teachers. However, the frequencies and manner in which these supervisory activities were carried out by the head teachers in schools varied.

Analysis of data obtained from the heads of department and the teachers rating of head teachers performance of the supervisory activities showed that the following supervisory activities were well performed by the head teachers: checking students class attendance; creating conducive classroom environment in terms of adequate spacing, good lighting, well maintained chalkboards, availing chalk and dusters; ensuring that there are qualified teachers for the subjects taught; ensuring that master timetable is in place at the beginning of each term; encouraging teamwork among teachers; discussing instructional expectations of students, parents and the community with teachers; explaining curriculum policies to teachers; communicating improvements in teaching, resources and performance to the school stakeholders; checking teachers punctuality to class; checking teachers work covered; encouraging teachers to attend in service courses, seminars and workshops and evaluating examination results together with teachers.

Head teachers’ performance in inducting and orienting new teachers into school programmes, checking schemes of work and recognizing teachers who exhibit good instructional performance appeared to be only fair.
The poorly performed supervisory activities by the head teachers in schools were found to include: assisting teachers in preparation of schemes of work; observing teachers lesson plans; visiting teachers in classrooms to observe instruction; holding post classroom observation discussions with the teachers concerned; helping teachers to identify problem areas in the curriculum; helping teachers to come up with strategies to solve identified problems in the curriculum; appraisal of teachers instructional performance and checking students written work.

From the findings it could be seen that head teachers performed more frequently those supervisory activities generally concerned with providing resources, setting environment for teaching and learning, implementation of the timetable, maintaining good relationship between the school and school stakeholders and keeping records of instructional activities. But they tend to avoid supervisory activities that require more personal guidance by the head teacher like assisting teachers in preparation of schemes of work, observing teachers lesson plans, visiting teachers in classrooms to observe instruction, helping teachers to identify problem areas in the curriculum, helping teachers to come up with strategies for solving the problems and appraisal of teachers instructional performance. It was also found that head teachers are still applying general approach to instructional supervision rather than the modern approach of clinical supervision. More than half (57.1%) of heads of department from the randomly sampled schools indicated that instructional supervision was not adequately carried out by head teachers in the schools and 52.4 % indicated that their head teachers did not adequately involve them as heads of department in instructional supervision. Majority (61.3%) of teachers in the study rated their head teachers
performance of instructional supervision as good or very good while 48.7% rated their head teachers performance as fair or poor.

Among the head teachers who participated in the study 66.7% were appointed through a process that involved prequalification criteria like interview, the rest were not. Of those whose appointment involved prequalification criteria, only 33.3% required prequalification to do with formal training in administration. However, 91.7% of the head teachers in the study were deputy head teachers before appointment to headship. Majority (83.3%) of the head teachers had undertaken some training in administration since their appointment through short courses organized by Kenya Education Staff Institute (KESI) and some organized by the Ministry of Education Science and Technology.

5.3 Conclusion

In this section the research findings are used for answering research questions and conclusion drawn there from.

5.3.1 What do secondary school head teachers in Siaya district do in performing their role of instructional supervision?

The finding in chapter 4 showed that secondary school head teachers in Siaya district carried out all the supervisory activities listed in the questionnaires. It could be concluded that in performing their role of instructional supervision head teachers in Siaya district carried out instructional supervisory activities involved in obtaining and distributing
resources, providing assistance and support services to teaching, relating the school to the community, maintaining and controlling teaching and learning process and improving the school system. However the frequency and manner in which the head teachers carried out the role activities under each of these supervisory functions varied and affected the adequacy of instructional supervision in the district.

5.3.2 How do the head teachers carry out role activities under each instructional supervisory function?

In all the instructional supervisory functions the most frequently performed supervisory activities by the head teachers in the district were found to be those concerned with providing resources and setting environment for teaching and learning, implementation of timetable, maintaining good relations between the school and the school stakeholders and keeping records of instructional activities. The least frequently performed activities by the head teachers were found to be those that require more personal guidance by the head teachers like assisting teachers in preparation of schemes of work, observing teachers lesson plans, visiting teachers in classrooms to observe instruction and holding post classroom observation meetings with the teachers, helping teachers to identify problem areas in the curriculum and assisting them to come up with strategies for solving the problems and appraisal of teachers instructional performance. Since the supervisory activities most frequently performed by the head teachers were those that take place principally outside the classroom while the least frequently performed were supervisory activities that take place within the classroom, it could be concluded that secondary school
head teachers in the district still applied general supervision as opposed to the modern approach of clinical supervision.

5.3.3 To what extent does the practice of instructional supervision by secondary school head teachers in Siaya district reflect what is expected of efficient and effective instructional supervision?

From the findings it was clear that more than half of the expected supervisory activities were well performed by the head teachers in the district. However a good number of the expected supervisory activities were also shown to be poorly performed. A look at the head teachers handling of records of instructional activities showed that majority of the head teachers did not assist teachers in preparation of schemes of work. Most of the head teachers were found to check schemes of work once a term and check teachers’ lesson plans and students written work rarely. The head teachers pattern of handling instructional records as revealed by the study did not adequately reflect meaningful supervision that involves tracing content from syllabus through schemes of work, lesson plans, students exercise books, records of work and examination records to enable the instructional supervisor make valid judgement of the standard of work reached in order to give guidance for improvement of standards. The findings further showed that the head teachers in the district still apply a general approach to instructional supervision rather than the modern approach of clinical supervision. Considering the deficiencies of these important elements of instructional supervision in the head teachers’ practice of
instructional supervision, it can be concluded that the practice of instructional supervision by the secondary school head teachers in Siaya district did not adequately reflect what is expected of effective and efficient instructional supervision.

5.4.0 Recommendations

From the overall findings of the study the following recommendations were made:

5.4.1 Recommendations on how to improve instructional supervision by head teachers in secondary schools

a) Instructional planning as a cooperative undertaking

There is need for the head teachers to work together with all members of teaching staff in determining performance goal for the school. The head teachers should further work with the subject teachers in determining the necessary instructional resources, appropriate subject schemes, lesson plans and lesson notes. It is believed that this approach will lead to development of a common educational plan that would provide a means for integrating the teachers' efforts towards realization of a shared vision for the school.

As much as the head teachers may want to work with the deputy head teacher and heads of departments given charge over the curriculum and instructional process in the departments, there is also need for direct involvement of the head teacher with the teachers if the head teacher is to secure the necessary cooperation of the teachers and give guidance for the achievement of the school instructional goals.
b) **Instructional supervision within the classroom (clinical supervision)**

The head teachers should visit teachers in classrooms to observe instructional process. This would provide opportunity for the head teachers to determine whether the right environment for implementing the school educational plan prevails and find out the extent to which the teaching approaches identified as necessary for effective teaching are applied. The head teachers should find out instructional techniques and skills lacking in teachers or not accurately applied and the common mistakes made by teachers in lesson delivery. This will enable the head teachers to develop strategies for helping the teachers to build and practice competences necessary for effective teaching and learning. In doing so, the head teachers will also help teachers to translate theory into practice so as to enhance their professional growth.

c) **Sequential review of instructional records**

The head teachers should engage in meaningful review of instructional records. They should regularly review the records tracing content materials from syllabus, through schemes of work, lesson plans, students' exercise books, and record of work and examination records. The process is to enable the head teachers make valid judgements on the standard of work reached in order to assist the teachers improve instructional standards.
d) A good and relaxed working relationship

A good and relaxed working relationship between the head teachers and the teachers is the main to effective and efficient instructional supervision. The head teachers need to cultivate a harmonious working relationship with teachers where both can gain and maintain confidence in working with each other in order to achieve improved results. This would help remove the suspicion and sense of fault finding that often characterize head teacher-teacher relationship in instructional matters. Through such a relationship it should be understood that supervision is a deliberate approach to enhance and improve classroom instruction and promote the teacher's professional growth.

e) Appraisal of teachers' performance in instruction

Head teachers should develop objective system for appraising the performance of teaching staff in their work of instruction. Appraisal of teachers will enable the teachers to know where they are standing and improvements necessary in relation to practicing the competences necessary for effective teaching and learning and efforts made towards achievement of the schools performance goal. Recognition should be given to those who have done well and to teachers who have not, they should be encouraged positively.

5.4.2 Recommendations on educational preparation of head teachers

Since supervision is the backbone of administration, head teachers should be well trained in educational administration. To facilitate effective instructional supervision, head teachers should attend higher courses or degrees in educational administration so as to
learn a lot in supervision and be confident in providing professional and instructional guidance. As the study found out most of the head teachers tend to avoid supervisory activities that require more personal guidance from them and those that focus more directly on the teachers' instructional performance, majority of whom are professionally trained graduates. With strong academic background in administration head teachers will perform supervisory duties more effectively.

The in-service courses for head teachers should be regularized and strengthened to keep head teachers abreast of new supervisory techniques and fade out out-dated supervisory techniques. The in-service programmes should take into account what head teachers have already learnt so that the relevance and effectiveness of the programmes may be maintained over time and limited resources involved spent wisely.

When the head teachers possess sound administrative background, the level of supervision in secondary schools would be highly enhanced. The teachers would be able to understand the purposes of supervision from the head teachers as part of their on-the-job-training.

5.4.3 Suggestions for further research

The following areas are recommended for further research: -

a) Further research into the kind of training newly recruited head teachers should undergo to prepare them for supervisory role in their administrative position is necessary. Such a study should also look into the nature of courses serving head teachers should receive to keep them abreast of the new developments in the area of supervision.
b) Further research should also look into ways for establishing positive attitude among head teachers and teachers for instructional involving head teachers classroom visit to observe instruction process.

c) A research should also be conducted to find out the kind of improvements that supervised teachers make. This could be done by comparing the performance of a group of teachers before and after supervision.
REFERENCES


Maranga, J.S. (1981) *How School Institutions can be Improved* Kenya Teacher No.31, Nairobi; Elezer Services


Storey V.J. and Housego J.A. *Personnel: A Descriptive Framework: The Canadian Administrator* 19 No.6
Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to inform you that I need to collect data for my research study from your school, which has been selected along with others for this purpose through random sampling.

The study is on the Role Performance of Secondary School Headteachers in Instructional Supervision. In this respect I present to you a questionnaire intended to collect information that would help explain the role performance of Siaya District secondary school headteachers in instructional supervision.

The research study is conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of Master of Ed. degree of Kenyatta University. Any information obtained through the questionnaire shall therefore be used only for the purpose of this study and shall be treated with confidentiality.

I greatly value your cooperation and would appreciate if you consider spending sometime to answer all the questions as honestly as possible.

Thank You.

Yours faithfully,

OPIYO J.O
Our Ref. ........................................

Your Ref. ........................................

Date: 26/04/2004

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

RE:  OPI-TO JOSEPH ODOR  E54/0036/2002

This is to certify that the above named is a student undertaking a Master of Education course at Kenyatta University in the Institute for Continuing Education. He/she would like to carry out a research on 

ROLE PERFORMANCE OF SCHOOL HEADTEACHERS IN INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION: A CASE OF GIATH DISTRICT

Any assistance given to him/her will be appreciated.

DR. G. A. ONYANGO
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION
TO ALL PRINCIPALS
SECONDARY SCHOOLS
SIAYA DISTRICT

RE: DR JOSEPH ODUCOR

This is to grant the above named person permission to carry out a research study on Role Performance of Secondary School Headteachers in Instructional Supervision.

Any help accorded to him in this respect will be appreciated.

SANGORO M.B
FOR: DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICER
SIAYA DISTRICT
HEADTEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is intended to collect information that would help explain how secondary school headteachers in Siaya District are currently performing instructional supervision.

The questionnaire is divided into three sections A, B and C.

Section A requests information on general background.

Section B is a checklist on instructional supervisory duties that the headteacher undertakes in school.

Section C requires your opinion on educational preparations for headship.

Please answer all the questions as honestly as possible.
SECTION A: General Background Information (Fill as appropriate)

1. Sex: Male ( ) Female ( )

2. Name of School ...........................................

3. a) Experience as headteacher.............. Yrs.
   b) Experience as a teacher before appointment in administrative post ............... yrs.

4. Professional Qualifications (tick as appropriate)
   I) Masters level ( )
   II) B.Ed ( )
   III) PGDE ( )
   IV) Dip. Ed. ( )
   V) ATS ( )

5. Size of school enrolment (give the figures)
   i) Boys ( )
   ii) Girls ( )

6. No. of teachers in terms of grade and sex (give the figure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Give figure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Female teachers</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Male teachers</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Give figure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) M.ED</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) B.ED</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) PGDE</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Dip. Ed.</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) ATS</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) UT</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How would you rate your school in National examinations performance in comparison with other schools in this district? (Tick as appropriate)

   i) Excellent ( )
   ii) Good ( )
   iii) Fair ( )
SECTION B: Instructional Supervisory Activities
As a headteacher how often do you engage in the following instructional supervisory activities?
(Tick appropriate answer on the un-shaded section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEVER RARELY SOMETIMES OFTEN ALWAYS DAILY WEEKLY FORTNIGHTLY MONTHLY TERMLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>STAFFING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Checking students class attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Creating conducive classroom environment - adequate spacing, good lighting, well maintained chalkboards, availing dusters &amp; chalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Ensuring that there are qualified teachers for all subjects taught in school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Making available approved syllabuses for the subjects taught.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Ensuring that a master time table is in place at the beginning of each term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Meeting H.O.Ds to determine needed instructional resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Inducting and orienting new teachers into the school operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>MOTIVATION AND STIMULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Assisting teachers in preparation of schemes of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>FREQUENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Observing teachers lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Visiting teachers in classrooms to observe instructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Holding discussion with teachers after classroom visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Encouraging teamwork among teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Recognizing teachers who exhibit good instructional performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>CONSULTATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Discussing instructional expectations of students, parents and the community with teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Explaining curriculum policies to teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Communicating improvements in teaching, resources and performance to the school stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Checking teachers punctuality to class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Checking schemes of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Checking students written work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>FREQUENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Checking teachers record of work covered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Checking students’ progress records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Helping teachers identify problem areas in the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Helping teachers to come up with strategies for solving problems in the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Encouraging teachers to attend in service courses, seminars and workshops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Evaluation**

| a)  | Carrying out formal appraisal of teachers’ instructional performance.     |           |
| b)  | Evaluating examination results together with teachers.                   |           |
SECTION C: Educational Preparation For Headteachers

INSTRUCTION: Please make a general assessment of the educational preparation that headteachers are given by ticking the right response or giving details as required.

1. a) Was there a pre-qualification criteria for appointment such as an interview?  
   YES ( )  NO ( )

   b) Did one of the criteria have to do with formal training in administration?  
   YES ( )  NO ( )

   c) Were you inducted into the new job through a training programme?  
   YES ( )  NO ( )

   d) Were you a deputy headteacher before appointment to this post?  
   YES ( )  NO ( )

2. a) Have you received any training in educational administration since appointment  
   YES ( )  NO ( )

   If the answer to 2 (a), is YES  
   b) Which institution offered the training? ________________________________

   c) Which areas were covered by the training programme?  
      i) Management of Curriculum and Instruction ( )
      ii) Financial management ( )
      iii) Human Resource Management ( )
      iv) Management of Physical and Material resources ( )
      v) Any other, Specify ________________________________

3. a) Considering the educational preparation, are you comfortable with your instructional supervisory duties  
   YES ( )  NO ( )

   b) If NO, please state the main difficulties you experience in instructional supervision.  
      i) ________________________________
      ii) ________________________________
iii)  

4. a) Do you currently teach? 
   YES ( )   NO ( )

   b) If YES, Name the subjects you teach.

   Subject | Form
   ------- | -----
   i)      |     
   ii)     |     

5. Is experience necessary before appointment to leadership
   YES ( )   NO ( )

END

Note:
Once again I'm very grateful to you for having spared time out of your busy schedule to answer this questionnaire. Your contribution to the success of this study is very valuable. As you wind up, please confirm that you have attended to all items of the questionnaire before putting it in the envelope provided awaiting collection.
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is intended to collect information that would help explain how secondary school headteachers in Siaya District are currently performing instructional supervision.

The questionnaire is divided into two sections A and B.

Section A requests for general background information.

Section B requires information on duties that go on in the school and more especially those that affect teaching in your department.

Please answer all the questions as honestly as possible.
SECTION A: General Background Information (fill as appropriate)

1. Sex: Male ( ) Female ( )

2. Name of School: 

3. Subjects taught: 
   Subject | Form
   --- | ---
   i) | 
   ii) | 

4. Experience as a teacher: ... years

5. Experience as HOD: ... years.

6. Academic qualifications (tick as appropriate)
   i) M.Ed ( )
   ii) B.Ed ( )
   iii) PDGE ( )
   iv) Dip. Ed ( )
   v) ATS ( )
   vi) UT ( )
SECTION A: General Background Information *(Fill as appropriate)*

1. Sex: Male ( ) Female ( )

2. Name of School ..............................................................

3. i) Experience as headteacher ................................ Yrs.
   
   ii) Experience as a teacher before appointment in administrative post ........................... yrs.

4. Professional Qualifications *(tick as appropriate)*

   i) Masters level ( )

   ii) B.Ed ( )

   iii) PGDE ( )

   iv) Dip. Ed. ( )

   v) ATS ( )

5. Size of school /Enrolment *(give the figures)*

   i) Boys ( )

   ii) Girls ( )

6. No. of teachers in terms of grade and sex *(give the figure)*

   **Sex**  
   i) Female teachers ( )

   ii) Male teachers ( )

   **Grade**  
   i) M.Ed ( )

   ii) B.Ed ( )

   iii) PGDE ( )

   iv) Dip. Ed. ( )

   v) ATS ( )

   vi) UT ( )

7. How would you rate your school in National examinations performance in comparison with other schools in this district? *(Tick as appropriate)*

   i) Excellent ( )

   ii) Good ( )

   iii) Fair ( )
SECTION B: Instructional Supervisory Activities

INSTRUCTIONS: By means of a tick, please indicate whether or not the headteacher performs the functions listed below in your school. Please explain briefly as required.

1. Does the headteacher regularly check students' class attendance?  
   Yes ( )  No ( )
   Please explain

2. Does the headteacher create conducive classroom environment in the following aspects:
   i) Adequate spacing classroom?  
      Yes ( )  No ( )
   ii) Good lighting within the classroom?  
       Yes ( )  No ( )
   iii) Well maintained chalkboards?  
        Yes ( )  No ( )
   iv) Availability of chalk and dusters?  
       Yes ( )  No ( )

3. Does the headteacher ensure that there are qualified teachers for all subjects taught in the school?  
   Yes ( )  No ( )
   Please Explain

4. Does the headteacher make available approved syllabuses in the school?  
   Yes ( )  No ( )
   If NO please explain

5. Does the headteacher ensure a master timetable is in place at the beginning of each term?  
   Yes ( )  No ( )
   Please Explain
6. Does the headteacher assist teachers in preparation of schemes of work? 
   Yes ( )  No ( )
   Please Explain

7. Does the headteacher meet the H.O.Ds to determine needed instructional resources? 
   Yes ( )  No ( )
   If NO please explain.

8. Does the headteacher regularly check teachers’ punctuality to class? 
   Yes ( )  No ( )
   Please Explain.

9. Does the headteacher assist new teachers to settle down by inducting them into school operations? 
   Yes ( )  No ( )

10. Does the headteacher observe teachers’ lesson plans? 
    Yes ( )  No ( )
    If YES does he discuss the lesson plan with the teachers? 
    Yes ( )  No ( )

11. Does the headteacher visit teachers in classrooms to observe instructions? 
    Yes ( )  No ( )
    If yes does the headteacher hold discussions with the teachers after the classroom visits? 
    Yes ( )  No ( )

12. Does the headteacher encourage teamwork among teachers? 
    Yes ( )  No ( )
    Please explain
13. Does the headteacher discuss instructional expectations of students, parents and the community with teachers?  
Yes ( )  No ( )

14. Does the headteacher help teachers to identify problem areas in the curriculum?  
Yes ( )  No ( )

If YES does the headteacher help teachers come up with strategies to solve the problem?  
Yes ( )  No ( )

15. Does the headteacher encourage teachers to attend in-service courses, seminars and workshops?  
Yes ( )  No ( )

If YES please explain ________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

16. How often does the headteacher carry out the following instructional supervisory activities in the school?

i) Checking schemes of work?
   - Weekly ( )
   - Fortnightly ( )
   - Monthly ( )
   - Termly ( )
   - Any other specify ________________________________

ii) Checking Students written work
   - Weekly ( )
   - Fortnightly ( )
   - Monthly ( )
   - Termly ( )
   - Any other specify ________________________________

iii) Checking teachers record of work covered
    - Weekly ( )
    - Fortnightly ( )
    - Monthly ( )
    - Termly ( )
    - Any other specify ________________________________

iv) Checking students progress records
    - Weekly ( )
    - Fortnightly ( )
    - Monthly ( )
17. Does the headteacher carry out formal appraisal of teachers’ instructional performance?

Yes ( ) No ( )

Please explain ________________________________

______________________________

______________________________

18. Does the headteacher recognize teachers who exhibit good instructional performance?

Yes ( ) No ( )

Please explain ________________________________

______________________________

______________________________

19. Do you think instructional supervision is adequately carried out in your school?

Yes ( ) No ( )

20. Does the headteacher adequately engage you in instructional supervision as a head of department

Yes ( ) No ( )

END

NOTE:
Once again I’m very grateful to you for having spared time out of your busy schedule to answer this questionnaire. Your contribution to the success of this study is very valuable. As you wind up, please confirm that you have attended to all items of the questionnaire before putting it in the envelope provided awaiting collection.
TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is intended to collect information that would help explain how secondary school headteachers in Siaya District are currently performing instructional supervision.

This questionnaire is divided into two sections A and B.

Section A requests general background information.

Section B involves rating headteachers performance of instructional supervision on various performance standards using a five point rating scale.

Please answer all the questions as honestly as possible.
SECTION A: General Background Information *(fill as appropriate)*

1. Sex: Male ( ) Female( )

2. Name of School .................................................................

3. Subjects taught: Subject Form
   i) ........................................
   ii) ........................................

4. Experience as a teacher ............................................yrs.

5. Academic qualifications *(tick as appropriate)*
   i) M.Ed ( )
   ii) B.Ed ( )
   iii) PGDE ( )
   iv) Dip. Ed ( )
   v) ATS ( )
   vi) UT ( )
**SECTION B:**
Use the 5-point rating scale given below to answer the questions that follow.

Very good  (5 Points)
Good     (4 Points)
Fair     (3 Points)
Poor    (2 Points)
V. Poor (1 Point)

How do you rate your headteacher’s performance of the following instructional supervisory activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>ROLE PERFORMANCE (give points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. STAFFING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Checking students class attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Creating conducive classroom environment - adequate spacing, good lighting, well maintained chalkboards, availing dusters &amp; chalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Ensuring that there are qualified teachers for all subjects taught in school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Making available approved syllabuses for the subjects taught.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Ensuring that a master time table is in place at the beginning of each term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Meeting H.O.Ds to determine needed instructional resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Inducting and orienting new teachers into the school operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. MOTIVATION AND STIMULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Assisting teachers in preparation of schemes of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Observing teachers lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Visiting teachers in classrooms to observe instructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Holding discussion with teachers after classroom visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Encouraging teamwork among teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Recognizing teachers who exhibit good instructional performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. CONSULTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Discussing instructional expectations of students, parents and the community with teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Explaining curriculum policies to teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Communicating improvements in teaching, resources and performance to the school stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>a) Checking teachers punctuality to class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Checking schemes of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Checking students written work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Checking teachers record of work covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Checking students’ progress records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Helping teachers identify problem areas in the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) Helping teachers to come up with strategies for solving problems in the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h) Encouraging teachers to attend in service courses, seminars and workshops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EVALUATION

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>a) Carrying out formal appraisal of teachers’ instructional performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Evaluating examination results together with teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For official use only (don’t fill)**

**Total Points Score out of 130**

Note:
Once again I’m very grateful to you for having spent time out of your busy schedule to answer this questionnaire. Your contribution to the success of this study is very valuable. As you wind up, please confirm that you have attended to all items of this questionnaire before putting it in the envelope provided awaiting collection.