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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to investigate the role headteachers play in instructional supervision in order to improve on students’ academic achievement in Kitui District secondary school as it is perceived by their teachers. The objectives of the study included; to determine the role played by headteachers in instructional supervision as perceived by teachers, to explore strategies that headteachers can employ to improve on their instructional supervision, to investigate the challenges faced by headteachers in instructional supervision as perceived by teachers and to examine strategies of coping with challenges faced by headteachers in their endeavour to improve instructional supervision as perceived by teachers. Descriptive design was used to carry out the study. The target population were all the schools in the larger Kitui District. The sample consisted of 120 respondents consisting of 60 Heads of Departments and 60 class teachers who were randomly selected from 6 high performing school and 6 low performing schools. The data was collected using a questionnaire with similar items for both the HODs and teachers. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages were used to present the findings. This was done by use of SPSS package. The following were the findings of the study, the role played by headteacher in instructional supervision in secondary schools in Kitui district. About 62.6% of the teachers agreed that headteachers communicated confidently and provided necessary resources for learning. One of the strategies the headteachers employed as perceived by 69.7% teachers was eradicated cheating in examination among the students to a very high extent. About 97.0% of the teachers said there was failure of syllabus coverage. About 58.6% of the teachers felt that to some extent the headteacher encouraged new ideas, planned and executed new in-service courses for teacher professional growth. Another 60.6% of the teachers indicated riots as a challenge that affected the principals in improving instructional supervision. One the suggestion given by teachers (24.2%) on solutions was the government through TSC should employ more teachers. The following conclusions were drawn from the findings; the headteacher provided teaching and learning materials necessary resources for learning in the school. The headteachers eradicated cheating in examination among the students. The headteachers encourages teachers to attend workshops, bringing in new ideas and supports creativity, innovation and practice of new skills. Some of the suggestions given by the teachers were plans and executing new in-service courses for professional growth. The following recommendations were drawn from the findings; the headteachers maintained good standards of works to help to meet the set goals for their schools and were able to achieve the institutional set goals. The strategies put in place by the headteachers, is to employ the right strategies in to order assist in the improvement of instructional supervision. There is need for headteachers to support the teachers in their professional growth. Suggestions given by teachers in perceiving their headteachers to be strong instructional leaders were communicated through school goals and interacting with them during classroom performance. Hence allowing them to try new instructional strategies and clearly communicating a vision for the school.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

This is the introduction chapter of this investigation into headteachers instructional leadership as perceived by teachers. It contains the following sub topics; background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, the research questions, significance of the study, assumptions of the study, scope of the study as well as the limitations of the study.

1.1 Background of the study

Educational leadership is ideally constructed by Anglo-American scholars as embedded with moral, interpersonal, instructional and administrative dimensions (Sergiovanni, 1991; Law & Glover, 2000) Current literature on instructional leadership falls into four broad areas. First, prescriptive models describe instructional leadership as the integration of the tasks of direct assistance to teachers, group development, staff development, curriculum development, and action research (Glickman, 1985). However, professional norms which call for principals to engage more actively in leading the school's instructional programme and in focusing staff attention on student outcomes are prevalent (Hallinger, 1992; Southworth, 2002).

Currently, there are experiences of rapid change in environment with various shifts in every domain of human activity. Technological, scientific and economic advancements, globalization and immigration movements are just a few of the areas giving rise to complexity and uncertainty in the modern world. These societal changes have inevitably transformed the school environment into a more dynamic and complex one than in the past (Crow, 2006). In this novel school environment, where various pressures and external challenges are identified, there is an increasing recognition of the importance of
school leadership in supporting change and providing for educational quality. In fact, school leadership has been identified by a number of researchers as a key element in the effectiveness of school organizations, for instance, (Brauckmann and Pashiardis, 2009; Marzano, Waters and McNulty, 2005; Kythreotis and Pashiardis, 2006; Kythreotis, Pashiardis and Kyriakides, 2010). Hence, principals in western countries are urged to deal with educational change, to anticipate and respond to new initiatives, challenges and opportunities and to adapt to the market-like environment of education (Bredson, 1995; Hall & Southworth, 1997; Oplatka, Foskett & Hemsley-Brown, 2002).

According to Glickman (1990) the school administrator functions as a "glue" in the sense that he or she successfully moulds the myriad elements of instructional effectiveness into successful school action where successfully school action is ultimately manifested as high quality instruction resulting in strong levels of student achievement. Klausmeier (1985) agrees with Glickman that instructional effectiveness is directly related to student achievement such that the higher the effectiveness levels, the higher are the student achievement levels. Moreover, Bloom (1980) reports that instructional effectiveness is apt to be higher when principals take strong instructional roles. The question that can be asked here is how the principal/administrator best attains the objectives of high quality instruction and high levels of student achievement? (Glickman, 1990).

As a result, the various stakeholders have widened their expectations from schools principals demanding higher academic results and performance standards (Weindling and Dimmock, 2006). In this context, it is important to reorient the role of the school leader and identify which forms or sets of leadership perceptions, behaviours and practices influence the main purpose of a school’s mission, which is enhancing student learning.
It is worth noting that the literature on educational leadership and principalship is particularly related to the social and organizational structure of educational systems in the western world. However, the structure of educational systems differs widely across countries, and education systems are structured in very different ways (Dimmock & Walker, 1998; Lassibille & Gomez, 2000). The dissimilarities stem, at least in part, from cultural, national and sociological contexts underpinning education in any nation. In that sense, cultural contexts impact on principals' sets of attitudes, values and norms for behaviour which may be very different from those used by school leaders in other contexts (Heck, 1996; Dimmock & Walker, 1998).

While principals in western countries were observed as engaging in some aspects of instructional leadership (Murphy, 1990; Southworth, 2002), they also spend a considerable amount of time on instructional tasks when compared to principals in developing countries, presumably because of the different environment in which their schools operate (e.g. scarce human and physical resources. In South East Asian countries, but to a much lesser extent than in other developing countries, principals, like their counterparts in the west, were found to attach great value to instructional leadership. In Singapore principals are expected to provide instructional leadership to staff (Bolman & Deal, 1992; Zhang, 1994). Chinese principals perceived excellent instruction as a key to student success and school prestige (Ligget et al., 1997). Hallinger et al. (1994) tells us that Thai principals perceive themselves as exercising more active instructional leadership than is perceived by their teachers, and principals in Hong Kong assume relatively low levels of direct involvement in instructional leadership and higher levels of indirect involvement (Chi-Kin Lee & Dimmock, 1999).
Ghana seems to be the exception among African countries, for its principals perceived their role as including efforts in helping teachers to use new instructional techniques and implementing the new curricula (Chapman & Burchfield, 1994). Nevertheless, instructional leadership functions are relatively rare in schools in developing countries, and principals are likely to adopt a stance in favour of management and administration. Instructional effectiveness is directly related to student achievement such that the higher the effectiveness levels, the higher are the student achievement levels (Klausmeier, 1985).

In Kuwait, for instance, the view is that the curriculum is not directly related to the job of the principal (Al-Jaber, 1996), and survey studies in Thailand and Papua New Guinea show that principals in these countries are ranked lower in items consisting of instructional leadership inventories than their western counterparts (Hallinger et al., 1994; Lahui-Ako, 2001). In some African countries (e.g. Nigeria, Ghana, Botswana), principals are not even appointed on criteria of quality regarding their own performance in teaching. Many of them have never been in a classroom, since political connections may be a dominant factor in their appointment (Uwazurike, 1991; Chapman & Burchfield, 1994). In this situation, it seems less plausible that principals would help teachers improve their teaching or be able to judge their abilities. No wonder Oplatka (2004) sees them as bursars who deal with administrative rather than instruction-oriented role; conservative people due to lack of change initiation and as king in their own realm. Yet Fullan (1991) found in his research that "schools operated by principals who were perceived by their teachers to be strong instructional leaders exhibited significantly greater gain scores in achievement in reading and mathematics than did schools operated by average and weak instructional leaders".
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Teachers in Kenya, as in other African countries, as Kitavi and van der Westhuizen (1997) have indicated, work under very deplorable conditions, with poor pay and no accommodation or textbooks. African and Arab principals (e.g. Kenya, South Africa, Ghana, Botswana, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates) are faced with poor staff morale and with shortages of trained staff (Harber & Dadey, 1993; Al-Jaber, 1996). A study done by Musungu and Nasongo (2008) found out that in Kenya the headteacher instructional role included checking lesson books, schemes of work, records of work covered, attendance, class attendance records and clock in clock out books. Waweru (2003) noted that roles played by the headteacher included supervision of the approved curriculum, staff personnel, student personnel, supervision and promotion of school community relations and supervision of physical and material resource. According to the Republic of Kenya (2000), the headteacher is responsible for all matters pertaining to the smooth running of the school. Muchiri (2008) noted that instruction supervision include the timetable-organization, timetables should be child-centred to ensure maximum learning opportunities. Timetables should provide a variety of activities with subjects spaced in a way that sustains the interest and motivation of learners. When the timetable is child centred it ensures that teachers will be available throughout when their lessons are scattered across the board. Other factors influencing instructional supervision are availability of textbooks, facilities, teacher qualifications and motivation, school management and leadership, the presence/ absence of the pupils among others. This study hence wished to establish the role of headteachers in instructional supervision as perceived by teachers in secondary schools in Kitui District.

1.2 Statement of the problem.

The priority of all countries, especially the developing ones, is to improve the quality of schools and the achievement of students (De Grauwe, 2001) since learning outcomes
depend largely on the quality of education being offered (Barro, 2006). Barro further notes that higher quality education fosters economic growth and development. But quality education partly depends on how well teachers are trained and supervised since they are one of the key inputs to education delivery (Lockheed & Verspoor, 1991). De Grauwe (2001) posits that national authorities rely strongly on the school supervision system to monitor both the quality of schools and key measures of its success, such as student achievement.

Many researchers believe that supervision of instruction has the potential to improve classroom practices, and contribute to student success through the professional growth and improvement of teachers (Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Musaazi, 1985; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002; and Sullivan & Glanz, 1999). Supervision is viewed as a co-operative venture in which supervisors and teachers engage in dialogue for the purpose of improving instruction which logically should contribute to student improved learning and success (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002; Sullivan & Glanz, 1999). Performance in national examinations (KCSE) in Secondary School in Kitui District is poor. Poor performance has persisted despite the fact that the schools in the District are assumed to be having adequate and well trained teachers. Survey on performance of examinations has shown that a majority of schools which display good results have adequate facilities and human resource (Musungu and Nsongo, 2008). Certainly the same cannot be said of Kitui District. This is because the district has consistently posted poor examination results in the previous years.

The nature and quality of instructional supervision within a school is presumed to have effects on the expertise, practice and job satisfaction of teachers and, by extension
ultimately, on student outcomes such as achievement. But very little is known about supervision of instruction (school-site supervision) in Kenya. This study will contribute to the body of knowledge about the nature and practices of supervision of instruction in Kenyan public secondary schools; ultimately, through better understanding and improved practice, the study is seen as having the potential of improve Kenyan students’ schooling outcomes. These contrasting positions coupled with the poor performance in Kitui caught the researchers’ attention and interest to want to investigate the degree of influence of secondary school leadership on student’s academic performance in the District as it is perceived by teachers.

1.3 Purpose of the study
The purpose of this study was to investigate the roles headteachers play in instructional supervision in order to improve on students’ academic achievement in Kitui District Secondary Schools as it is perceived by their teachers.

1.4 Objectives of the study
i) To determine the roles played by headteachers in instructional supervision as perceived by the teachers in Kitui District.
ii) To explore strategies that headteachers employ to improve on their instructional supervision as perceived by teachers
iii) To investigate the challenges faced by headteachers in instructional supervision as perceived by teachers.
iv) To examine strategies of coping with challenges faced by headteachers in their endeavour to improve instructional supervision as perceived by teachers.
1.5 Study Research question

The research was based on the following questions:-

i. What roles does the headteachers role play in instructional leadership as indicated by the head of departments and the teachers?

ii. What are some of the strategies or approaches the headteachers employ in order to improve instructional supervision in their schools as perceived by the teachers?

iii. What challenges do you think the headteachers face in implementing instructional supervision in their schools?

iv. What are some of the ways in which the headteachers cope with the challenges they face in improving curriculum as seen by teachers?

1.6 Significance of the study

This study provided great insight to the administrations and managers of schools in Kitui District for they may be in a position to identify from this study the factors that the teachers identified as contributing to higher academic performance in schools hence they can apply the same in their schools for the realization of better academic achievements.

It also enlightened the school managers on whether the approaches they use in their attempt to improve instruction are appropriate as well as borrowing strategies from the suggestion which their teachers gave as most appropriate so that the student’s performance can be improved in the national examinations.

Besides the findings would also benefit Kenya Education Staff Institute (KESI) with regard to important training needs on instructional supervision for headteachers that need to be addressed in Kitui District so as to train the headteachers on the same.
1.7 Assumptions of the study

The basic assumptions of the study were:

i) The respondents co-operated and provided honest reliable responses.

ii) The KCSE examination results were a valid and reliable measure of performance.

iii) The leadership provided necessary guidance, clarity of direction, and supervision for effective performance of a school.

1.8 Scope of the study

The study took place in the larger Kitui district which included three constituencies namely Kitui Central, Kitui West and Kitui South before its subdivision early 2011. The study sample composed of the high performing schools and the average performing schools in the district who had similar facilities. The study focused on the role of headteachers in instructional leadership as it is perceived by the teachers. Thus the respondents were teachers from the sampled schools. Academic achievement was limited to summative only, that is K.C.S.E hence formative evaluation was not put in consideration.

1.9 Limitation of the study

There was a possibility of the respondents sharing in the process of answering the questionnaires. It may also be difficult for the researcher to control the attitude of the respondents as they respond to the questionnaires, therefore the researcher assured the respondents of confidentiality before filling in the questionnaires.

1.10 Definition of significant terms

**Headteacher** refers to a person who is a teacher by training and employed by TSC and entrusted by appointment with the overall administration and supervision of a school.
Instructional Supervision  general leadership function that coordinates and manages those school activities concerned with learning.

Leadership  refers to a process whereby the headteacher influences the behaviour of teachers regardless of the reason so that the influenced teachers work without their volition.

Role  key functions that the headteacher play in a school.

1.11 Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by Mc. Gregory’s Theory X and Y leadership model (1961). Supervisors empower teachers by sharing leadership. They encourage teachers to set the course of their own learning. Effective supervisors are confident in their own abilities of the teachers for whom they supervise based in large part on Maslow hierarchy of needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory X</th>
<th>Theory Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fission Leadership</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fusion leadership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shifts the whole into parts by creating boundaries</td>
<td>• Joins part into a whole by eliminating boundaries,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotes isolation</td>
<td>• Promotes togetherness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintains layers of hierarchy</td>
<td>• Promotes a common ground and a sense of community based on what people share vision, norms and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotes competition</td>
<td>• Promotes people ‘joining coming together, creating connection and partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotes authority and control</td>
<td>• Promotes seeing similarities rather than differences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.1: Mc. Gregory Theory X and Y Leadership Model (1961)

Supervision that makes a difference, fosters the internal and external motivation that leads teachers to professional growth. Effective leadership encourages teachers to examine and
reflect on their instructional practices, then take up the challenges of strengthening them. (Wlodkosiki, 1985) states there appears to be at least six major factors that have a substantial impact on learner motivation—attitude, need, stimulation, affect, competence and reinforcement. Supervisors who want to motivate teachers take advantage of these factors.

Effective supervisors create the conditions that support motivated teachers. Motivated teachers have higher degrees of persistence and vigour than unmotivated teachers (Petri, 1996). Effective supervisor recognize the teachers need to develop initiate and direct their own learning opportunities that go beyond the clinical model of supervision.

Effective supervisions seek to individualize learning opportunities. An achievement a veteran teacher might take for granted would bring a sense of real accomplishment for a beginning teacher. However, both can feel the satisfaction of being able to do something better or more efficiently than it has been done before (Mc Clelland & Bumham, 1997).

Effective supervisors provide opportunities in the zone of proximal development, challenging and motivating teachers to new growth. Without challenges teachers maintain the status quo. Effective supervisors have a sense of empathy. They strive to understand how teachers feel about the work they do. Parks (1993), drawing the leadership and motivation connection between assumptions about professionals.
1.12 Conceptual framework

Figure 1.2: A model showing the instructional role of the head-teacher

Figure 1.1 shows the headteachers’ leadership instructional role relatively to students’ performance. Headteachers’ have their own external characteristics and values which influenced the way they behaved in different situations as they performed their duties hence exhibiting different behaviours to their followers which called for different responses from the subordinates. The headteachers’ leadership instructional role had a direct influence on both the teachers and the students while the teachers’ behaviour adversely affected the students’ performance. The interaction between the teacher and the students in the teaching learning process would be influenced by their attitudes hence influencing the performance in KCSE.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter contains literature reviewed from other researchers. The sub topics includes; difference between instructional leadership and supervision, role of headteachers as instructional leaders, factors that influence headteachers quality of instruction, strategies or approaches headteachers employ in order to improve instructional leadership in their schools, challenges faced by the headteachers in implementing instructional leadership in developing countries and lastly is the conceptual framework.

2.2 Instructional leadership and supervision
Instructional leadership is seen to be concerned with teaching and process and with head teacher acting as the teacher in terms of pedagogical and instruction rather than taking hands off and being concerned with administration (Hallinger and Heck, 1998). According to Smith (1991), an instructional leader is an administrator who emphasizes the process of instruction and facilitates the interaction of teacher, student and curriculum. Instructional leadership refers to the specific branch or educational leadership that addresses curriculum and instruction. Mendez (cited in Flath, 1989) indicates that there are three major forces that serve to shape and describe a school - the public, the staff and the students-and that these forces interact through the curriculum. The role of the instructional leader is to manipulate these forces in order to maximize the quality of instruction.

On the other hand Wiles and Bondi (1986) defined instructional supervision as a 'general leadership function that coordinates and manages those school activities concerned with learning. Furthermore, supervision could be seen as an interaction involving some kind of established relationship between and among people, such that people influence people.
Such interactions are greatly influenced by a predetermined programme of instruction. In this regard, and according to Netzer and Kerey (1971), the systematization of the interaction of those responsible for operating within the structure of administration is called supervision. Thus, the supervisor is expected in the course of his duty, to initiate several activities that will lead to a successful merging of these two contexts in order to achieve harmony and satisfaction. In conclusion, supervision may be defined as, “All efforts to monitor teacher performance” (Duke, 1987). From the above definitions it is clear that the difference between leadership and supervision is very thin hence for purposes of this study the two words will be used interchangeably to mean instructional leadership.

2.3 Roles of the headteacher as instructional leader

Dawson (1926) stated the functions of supervision in the following terms; administrative and supportive roles.

**Administrative**

The promotion and maintenance of good standards of work, co-ordination of practice with policies of administration, the assurance of an efficient and smooth-running office; In administrative supervision the primary problem is concerned with the correct, effective and appropriate implementation of agency policies and procedures. The primary goal is to ensure adherence to policy and procedure (Kadushin 1992). The supervisor has been given authority by the agency to oversee the work of the supervisee. This carries the responsibility of both to ensure that agency policy is implemented - which implies a controlling function - and a parallel responsibility to enable supervisees to work to the best of their ability (Brown and Bourne 1995). It also entails a responsibility not to lose touch with the rationale for the agency - 'to provide a first-class service for people who
need it (or in some cases are required to have it, in order that they or others may be protected from harm."

**Educational**

The educational development of each individual worker on the staff in a manner calculated to evoke her fully to realize her possibilities of usefulness; in educational supervision the primary problem for Kadushin (1990) is worker ignorance and/or ineptitude regarding the knowledge, attitude and skills required to do the job. The primary goal is to dispel ignorance and upgrade skill. The classic process involved with this task is to encourage reflection on, and exploration of the work. Supervisees may be helped to: Understand the client better; Become more aware of their own reactions and responses to the client; Understand the dynamics of how they and their client are interacting; Look at how they intervened and the consequences of their interventions; Explore other ways of working with this and other similar client situations (Hawkins and Shohet 1989)

According to Muchiri (2008) curriculum instruction include the timetable-organization, timetables should be child-centred to ensure maximum learning opportunities. Timetables should provide a variety of activities with subjects spaced in a way that sustains the interest and motivation of learners. When the timetable is child centred it ensures that teachers will be available throughout when their lessons are scattered across the board. Other factors influencing curriculum and instructional supervision were availability of textbooks, facilities, teacher qualifications and motivation, school management and leadership, the presence/absence of the pupils among others.

**Supportive**

The maintenance of harmonious working relationships and the cultivation of esprit de corps in supportive supervision is the primary problem for worker morale and job satisfaction. Hence supervisions primary goal is to improve morale and job satisfaction
Workers are seen as facing a variety of job-related stresses which, unless they have help to deal with them, could seriously affect their work and lead to a less than satisfactory service to clients. For the worker there is ultimately the problem of 'burnout'. Kadushin argues that the other two forms of supervision focus on instrumental needs, whereas supportive supervision is concerned with expressive needs.

The supervisor seeks to prevent the development of potentially stressful situations, removes the worker from stress, reduces stress impinging on the worker, and helps her adjust to stress. The supervisor is available and approachable, communicates confidence in the worker, provides perspective, excuses failure when appropriate, sanctions and shares responsibility for different decisions, provides opportunities for independent functioning and for probable success in task achievement (Kadushin 1992). Concerning the role of the principal in instructional supervision, Serem (1985) identifies the following responsibilities:

- Making frequent and formal classroom visitations.
- Making school a safe and secure place to work and centralize instructional leadership.
- Ensuring that classroom atmosphere is conducive to learning for all students and establishing high, but attainable learning standards in all academic areas as an important goal of the school.

Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach (1999), identify two variants: the narrow which restricts its focus to teacher behaviours which enhance pupil learning and the broader type which focuses additionally on other organizational variables such as school culture which the leadership believes influences teacher behaviour. Leithwood and his colleagues also noted that principals alone cannot fulfil all of a school’s needs for instructional
leadership. They conclude that a primary avenue of influence lies in the shaping of the school’s direction through vision, mission and goals, and suggest that the broader approach is more effective because it encompasses the indirect as well as the direct impacts, and is also more likely to encourage others to share the responsibilities of instructional leadership (the narrower approach tends conversely to foster the notion of heroic leadership.

Supporting Leithwood et al, Grima (2007) says that vision is central to any school based development. However tensions may arise when a head of school has a clear vision for the school's future which may not in the first instance be shared by the staff members (Lashway, 1997) This is where the Head teacher has to have other skills such as the ability to take the lead and actively push things forward because he/she remains the chief instigator, promoter and guardian of that vision. A shared vision brings people together to discuss and draw up school development plans, to improve upon existing school policies and practices (Grima, 2007). Lashway (1997) highlights an important strategy to be adopted by leaders with a vision, that of facilitating change/improvement. He indicate that, principals must create a climate and a culture for change. They do this by speaking about the vision often and enthusiastically; by encouraging experiments; by celebrating successes and forgiving failures and by remaining steadfast in the face of the inevitable problems and missteps. School improvement, followed by planned changes in school policies and practices, is not possible without a clear vision for the future.

E-lead (2008) indicates that the role of an instructional leader differs from that of traditional school administrator in a number of meaningful ways. Whereas a conventional principal spends the majority of his/her time dealing with strictly administrative duties, a principal who is an instructional leader is charged with redefining his/her role to become
the primary learner in a community striving for excellence in education. The modern style of leadership is that of collaboration and empowerment, and not as it was up to a few years ago, rather hierarchical and based on authority. Lashway's (1995) facilitative Leadership and Strategies of a Leader (1996) both deal with the shift of emphasis from authoritative to facilitative leadership. He quotes Dunlap and Goldman (Lashway 1995) who say that, "In short, facilitative power is power through, not power over". When involved the teachers feel that they own the project. The collaboration of every teacher will be amazing and their enthusiasm infectious. One of the reasons for this is that they themselves will identify themselves with the issues, and will make suggestions for improvement based on their knowledge of the context and of children's needs. (Grima, 2007)

As such, it becomes the principal’s responsibility to work with teachers to define educational objectives and set school-wide or district wide goals, provide the necessary resources for learning, and create new learning opportunities for students and staff. Clickman (1990) observed that schools or school systems must first choose goals according to what is best for their students. For example, should higher achievement scores in reading and mathematics be gained at the expense of studying science, art, and music? Once goals are set, research on effective teaching that is congruent with the goals can then be applied in the most effective manner.

Blake and Mouton (1985) add that as instructional leaders, principals can foster an understanding of the school vision, facilitate implementation of the mission, and establish the school climate while Hallinger and Heck (1997) concurs and identify the impact of leadership, both in terms of category as follows; defining school mission, managing instructional leadership and promoting the school climate
2.4 Factors that influence headteachers’ quality of instructional leadership

The school climate

School climate is a multi-dimensional concept. It helps us to understand how schools differ in their climate, what causes these variations and how these underlying influences affect school effectiveness (Kunnanatt, 2007). A continuous interaction among school community creates a school organizational climate. Hoy and Miskel (2005,) defined school climate as "the set of internal characteristics that distinguish one school from another and influence the behaviours of each school's members. Kunannat (2007) came up with eight dimensions of school climate in teachers and principals behaviour as follows: Disengagement refers to a teacher's tendency to be "not with it". It describes a group which is "going through motions", a group that is "not in gear" with respect to the task at hand ... In short, this focuses on the teacher's behaviour in a task oriented situation. Hindrance refers to the teachers' feeling that the Principal burdens them with routine duties; committee demands and other requirements which they feel are unnecessary work. They feel that the Principal is hindering rather than helping their legitimate work. Espirit refers to "morale" of teachers, a feeling that their social needs are being satisfied and that they are at the same time, enjoying a sense of accomplishment. Intimacy refers to a teacher's enjoyment of friendly social relations with each other. This dimension describes a social need satisfaction which is not necessary associated with task accomplishment (Kunnanatt, 2007).

Characteristics of school such as the physical structure and interactions between members of the organizations are two diverse factors that affect and help to define school organization climate. Factors affecting school climate include number and quality of interactions between members, students and teachers perception of their environment, environmental factors, classrooms, materials used for instruction, academic performance,
sense of security, school size, feelings of trust and respect (Kundu, 2007). Research shows that school climate can affect many areas and people within the school. A positive school climate has been associated with fewer behavioural and emotion problems for members of the school community. Employees with a given motive work at their best when organizational climate is conducive for that motive (Gunbayi, 2007). Most governments see education as an important investment and, therefore spend large sums of the tax payers’ money each year for provision of education at all levels. Thus, there is a serious concern on the part of the government to ensure that the money provided for education is wisely spent. Educational reforms have generally neglected the organizational climate which holds key to the success of reforms (Kundu, 2007).

Kagis and Williams (2000) reported that organizational climate has several important outcomes at individual, group and organizational levels. They also assert that organizational climate impacts leaders’ behaviour and turnover intentions have power to influence job satisfaction, individual job performance and organizational performance. It can be predicted with confidence that organizational performance will be higher when the organizational climate helps in determining organisational success. The knowledge of climate prevailing in an organization as a whole helps in better harnessing of human resources, enabling their effective development and utilisation (Thompson & Luthans, 1990).

According to Pashiardis (2000), a school organizational climate is the collective personality of an organization; the overall atmosphere that one senses on entering the school. A positive organizational climate is one where there is communication and collaboration among participants (principal, teachers and students) in reaching the goals of the school and where the school positively influences the behaviour of students and
staff. To facilitate such a process, a school needs mechanisms to enhance collaboration and harmonize seemingly incompatible interests. It is believed that a positive school climate would be able to increase teachers and students satisfaction. With higher levels of satisfaction they are more likely to be committed to their school work (Pashiards, 2000). Okumbe (2001) observed that one of the functions of educational management by principals is to influence and stimulate the human resource available, by providing an appropriate organizational climate.

A positive school climate can enhance staff performance, promote higher morale, and improve student achievement (Freiberg, 1998). Heck (2000) and Goddard et al. (2000) linked school climate and student achievement. "School climate may be one of the most important ingredients of a successful instructional program. Without a climate that creates a harmonious and well functioning school a high degree of academic achievement is difficult, if not downright impossible to obtain" (Hoyle, English, & Steffy, 1985). Bulach, Malone, and Castleman (1995) found a significant relationship between student achievement and school climate; in addition, Bulach and Malone (1994) concluded that school climate is a significant factor in successful school reform. Urban (1999) stated that unless students experience a positive and supportive climate, some may never achieve the most minimum standards or realize their full potential Hoy, Tarter, and Bliss (1990) found that long-term improvement in academic achievement was related to schools with strong academic emphasis within the context of healthy and open climates. Birdin (1992) and Zigarmi, Edeburn, and Blanchard (1991) found strong positive correlations between effectiveness scores and selected climate variables. Ubben and Hughes (1992) stated that principals could create a school climate that improves the productivity of both staff and students and that the leadership style of the principal can foster or restrict teacher effectiveness.
Harris (1999) agreeing with Hallinger and Heck, observed that of central importance are school improvement alignment towards a shared set of values, through headteachers personal vision and belief system, by direction, word and deed. Through a variety of symbolic gestures and actions he found out that, the headteachers were successful at realigning both the staff and pupils to their particular vision of the school.

**Training**

Southworth (2002) is convinced that “learning schools must facilitate teachers’ pedagogic growth, since the development of their teaching skills and repertoires seems to be the major content area. The curriculum of learning schools should be pedagogy.” He also finds a correlation between instructional leadership and certain organizational conditions associated with ‘learning communities’. Thus the school becomes a ‘teaching and learning’ school, with “the most hospitable environment for the exercise of instructional leadership because professional cultures characterized by openness, trust and security appear to be the ones where teachers feel confident to become learners”.

**Other factors**

Southworth (2002) closes by reflecting that, in a world where more and more enterprises are interested in developing themselves as ‘learning organizations it is time for school leaders to present themselves as leaders of teachers par excellence such as teacher qualifications, expenditures and facilities. Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weinfeld and York (1966) report found that out-of-school factors such as family background, socio-economic status and race explained more of the variation in student performance than in-school variables. Other factors are the philosophy which refers to the Heads' personal beliefs and culture which refer to those underlying behaviours of the
organization. Therefore, the beliefs of the Heads guide their managerial behaviour, while the organizational culture affects the behaviour of everyone within the school (Grima, 2007).

2.5 Strategies or approaches headteachers employ in order to improve instructional leadership in their schools

Principals have an influence on teachers’ instructional practices. Principals use the following leadership strategies to change teachers’ instructional practices: (a) communicating goals (Blase & Roberts, 1994), (b) supervising instruction (Blase & Blase, 1998), (c) promoting professional development (d) providing resources (Appleton & Kindt, 1999), and (e) providing incentives (Sheppard, 1996).

Communicating Goals and Change in Teachers’ Instructional Practices

Principals communicate school goals in many different ways. They often do it through faculty meetings and departmental chair meetings. They communicate them through individual meetings such as follow-up conferences to classroom observations. Teachers perceive their principals to be strong instructional leaders when they communicate school goals through (a) interacting with them on their classroom performance, (b) being accessible to discuss instructional matters, (c) allowing teachers to try new instructional strategies by letting them know that it is okay to take risks, and (d) clearly communicating a vision for the school (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Communicating school goals was found to positively affect the type of instruction teachers delivered (Blase & Roberts, 1994; Sheppard, 1996).

Communication of school goals by the principal has a significant, positive relationship with teacher classroom innovativeness (Sheppard, 1996). Classroom innovativeness is the
teacher’s willingness to try new and various instructional approaches. At the high school level, Sheppard found that communication of school goals by the principal accounted for the largest amount of variance in classroom innovativeness. He discovered that communicating school goals, framing school goals, and promoting professional development together accounted for 57% of the variance in classroom innovativeness. Sheppard reported that framing school goals accounted for the largest amount of variance out of the three, but did not report the specific amount of variance.

Communicating school goals encourages teachers to use more reflection, which may lead to teachers adjusting their instructional techniques to address the different learning needs of students (Blase & Roberts, 1994). The connection between the communication of goals by principals and teachers’ classroom instruction, however, was weak. Blase and Roberts discovered that 33% of the responding teachers felt communicating school goals encouraged them to use more reflection. Any leadership strategy identified by 35% or more of the responding teachers was considered a high impact influence. They did not explain how 35% was set as the minimum for a high impact.

**Supervising Instruction and Change in Teachers’ Instructional Practices**

Supervision of teachers’ performance by principals can affect classroom instruction. Principals can use classroom observations and informal visits to the classroom to see what teaching strategies are being used and assess their effectiveness. They can then use instructional conferences to talk with teachers about classroom objectives and instructional methods (Duke, 1987). Supervision includes principals observing teachers in the classroom, conducting instructional conferences, and using professional development for classroom improvement. Supervision provides a way for principals to monitor instruction (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Principals use classroom visits to make sure
teachers are complying with the instructional goals of the school. Instructional conferences with teachers have an effect on teacher classroom instruction (Blase & Blase, 1998; King, 1991). Blase and Blase found that teachers believe good principals use five strategies during instructional conferences: “(a) making suggestions for instructional improvement, (b) giving feedback on classroom observations, (c) modelling good instruction, (d) using inquiry to discover what teachers think, and (e) soliciting advice and opinions from teachers”. These strategies positively affected teachers by increasing their use of reflectively informed instructional behaviours, which referred to teachers taking more risks in the classroom by using different instructional strategies and placing more emphasis on instructional planning (Blase & Blase, 1998).

Instructional conferences with principals influenced teachers to implement higher-order thinking skills in their lessons for high school social studies students (King, 1991). In follow-up discussions with teachers in which they both analyzed a lesson, principals encouraged teachers to use more pedagogy that focused on higher-order thinking skills. Consequently, teachers moved away from more traditional types of pedagogy such as direct instruction. These supervisory behaviours created a climate at the school in which teachers openly discussed and critically thought about instructional issues related to higher-order thinking skills.

Visiting classrooms is a supervision strategy that positively affects teachers (Blase & Blase, 1998; Blase & Roberts, 1994). In this strategy, principals use informal visits to classrooms to learn what teachers are doing, to assess whether sound instruction is being delivered, and to interact with teachers (Blase & Roberts; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Blase and Roberts noted that visibility was related to using new teaching strategies, considering different teaching techniques to address the needs of students, and increasing
levels of instructional time on task. They believed that visibility had these effects on teachers because of increased interaction, feelings of trust, feelings of respect, and more opportunities for teachers to express themselves. Blasé and Blase (1998) added to the findings of Blase and Roberts (1994). They found that visibility in the school by walking around and informally visiting classrooms was related to increased use of reflectively informed behaviours and good teacher behaviour. The similarity in findings with almost identical populations supports their validity.

Some behaviours of principals were found to have a negative effect on teachers (Blase & Blase, 2004). These behaviours included discounting teachers’ needs, isolating teachers, withholding resources from teachers, spying on teachers, overloading teachers, criticizing teachers, threatening teachers, giving teachers unfair evaluations, and preventing teacher advancement. Blase and Blase found that teachers felt their creativity was limited by these behaviours. Teachers stated that they could not be instructional risk takers and relied on traditional teaching methods because of a lack of support from their principal (Blase and Blase, 2004).

**Promoting Professional Development and Change in Teachers’ Instructional Practices**

Promoting professional development is the most common principal leadership behaviour found by the researcher to have a positive effect on teacher classroom instruction (Blase & Blase, 1998; Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, & Birman 2002; Johnsen, Haensly, Ryser, & Ford 2002; Sheppard, 1996). Professional development is thought to be a key to improving teacher instruction (Elmore & Burney, 1999). Administrators at the district and school levels are responsible for providing teachers with quality professional development (Desimone, Smith, & Ueno, 2006). Principals accomplish this through alerting teachers to professional development opportunities and organizing in-service
activities at their schools that focus on specific instructional goals (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Principals promote professional development by using supervisors and colleagues to train teachers on instructional strategies, giving teachers’ time for independent studies, and using external sources such as college courses, district-level workshops, and consultants who are experts in a particular area (Duke, 1987). The promotion of professional development by principals increases teachers’ use of higher-order instructional strategies when they receive professional development on a particular strategy (Desimone et al., 2002). Higher-order instructional strategies involved teaching in non-traditional ways and were found to increase the learning capacity of students (Desimone et al. 2002). Principals were perceived by teachers to improve writing instruction by providing staff development on teaching the writing process (McGhee & Lew, 2007).

The promotion of professional development by principals increases teachers’ use of reflectively informed behaviours, including innovative ideas and instructional risk-taking (Blase & Blase, 1998). Blase and Blase provided a list of strategies principals used to promote professional development that increased teachers’ use of reflectively informed behaviours: (a) emphasizing the study of teaching and learning, (b) supporting collaboration among educators, (c) developing coaching relationships among educators, and (d) applying principles of adult learning to staff development. King (1991) found that the participation of principals in curriculum work with teachers was a key to the implementation of higher-order thinking skills by these teachers.

Providing Resources and Change in Teachers’ Instructional Practices

Principals influence classroom instruction by supplying teachers with necessary resources. Providing resources includes more than just monetary resources and materials.
According to Duke (1987), providing resources includes “(a) scheduling, (b) developing the school calendar, (c) hiring and correctly placing teachers, (d) adopting textbooks, and (e) purchasing necessary materials to support instruction.” Principals influence student achievement through helping teachers acquire necessary resources to support instruction (Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990). The lack of resources may be a barrier to the use of some instructional strategies by teachers. The lack of science equipment and reference materials was found by Appleton and Kindt (1999) to dictate how teachers taught their students. Schools did not have the necessary resources to support certain instructional strategies and activities. Providing resources is viewed by teachers as effective leadership by principals (McGhee & Lew, 2007). Teachers perceived that principals improved their writing instruction by providing resources such as technology (McGhee & Lew).

Smith and Andrews (1989) discovered that a majority of strong instructional leaders were given positive ratings as resource providers when they were seen as “(a) promoting staff development activities for teachers, (b) possessing knowledge of instructional resources, (c) mobilizing resources and district support to achieve academic goals, and (d) the most important instructional resource in the school”. Teachers perceived the most important strategies principals engaged in as resource providers were promoting professional development and providing teachers with support through instructional resources.

**Providing Incentives and Change in Teachers’ Instructional Practices**

Organizations use incentives such as praise, good working conditions, material rewards, pride in work completed, and emotional attachment to the organization, and positive working relationships with colleagues to motivate employees (Barnard, 1938). Providing incentives for teachers is a strategy principals can use to motivate teachers to change their instructional practices. Principals provide incentives by giving formal awards and using
public or individual praise for teachers (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Praising teachers in front of their peers can be effective because it encourages improvement by all teachers. Most teachers do not receive sufficient monetary compensation for what they do in the classroom (Hallinger & Murphy). Recognizing teachers for their classroom performance provides an incentive for improvement and continued growth. Providing incentives for teachers influences teacher innovativeness in the classroom (Blase & Roberts, 1994; Sheppard, 1996. Principals motivate teachers to try instructional strategies through rewards such as praise and material rewards (Blase & Roberts, 1994)). Rewards were found by Blase and Roberts to positively affect 38% percent of responding teachers by increasing their use of innovative ideas within the classroom. A similar percentage of teachers (37%) noted that the use of rewards increased levels of time on task. Blase and Roberts believed these percentages are large enough to be considered important effects on teachers.

**Other approaches used by headteachers in instructional leadership.**

**Technical approaches**

A variety of other approaches to improving the quality of teaching and learning have been encountered in literature but three technical approaches stood out.

**Modelling/mentoring/Walking the talk**

Among them is modelling, with heads using their own teaching, and even assemblies, as an example, and working alongside staff in classrooms. Harris (1999) calls it “walking the talk” through the consistency and integrity of their actions, they modelled behaviour that they considered desirable to achieve education. According to Southworth (2002) school leaders giving thought to develop ‘learning schools’ may wish to reflect on what he calls Learning by doing. He focuses on the view prevalent among school leaders that
they learn most by ‘doing the job’. One implication of this is that headteacher appointments should be on the basis of confidence that the candidate is committed to continuous, reflective learning: that their work is a ‘course of study’ so they need to be good students. Brown, and Bourne (1995) refers to it as mentoring. The supervisor is asked to become more of a practice teacher or mentor. Their task is not just to enable the supervisee to reflect on practice and to develop new understandings and ways of working, but also to teach in a more formal sense. Mentors and practice teachers may well need to instruct a student-worker on how to proceed in a particular situation; or to provide theoretical insights. Mentors are skilled performers - they can be observed, consulted and their actions copied. Southworth (2002) advises that more thought needs to be given to the development of deputy heads, whose opportunities to learn from ‘doing the job’ of head in their current school may be restricted. An additional criterion for instructional leaders, often mentioned in research, is that the principal should also be a practicing teacher. Weindling (1990) states that head teachers in the United Kingdom indicated that the most important thing contributing to instructional leadership was the fact that all continued to teach for an average of about 20 percent of the week. Harden's (1988) research outlines why this is important; To have credibility, principals need to work closely with students, developing teaching techniques and methods as a means for understanding teacher perspectives and for establishing a base on which to make curricular decisions. Also, a teaching principal strengthens the belief that "the sole purpose of the school is to serve the educational needs of students.

**Professional dialogue**

Southworth (2002) argues that new heads are likely to benefit more from opportunities to discuss and learn from their own work than from courses with ‘new’ content. Taking all opportunities in staff meetings, developing curricular, policies, reviewing pupil data, to
probe teachers’ assumptions and to promote ideas. Gensante (1994) says that while expertise in instructional supervision is not required, understanding the change process and organizational dynamics are important. Rather than requiring teachers to submit written lesson plans one week in advance, the superintendent might convene a discussion group of teachers to explore ways to work together on instructional improvement issues. Bernd (1992) indicates that increased teacher involvement in school decisions are effective tools for focusing the staff on students’ outcomes. Hallinger (1989) speaks of leadership teams at the secondary level to help carry out the critical functions of curriculum and instructional coordination and supervision. Cooper (1989) states that schools need to create models of shared leadership which incorporate the talents and energy of principals, teachers, students, and parents.

**Monitoring/Observation**

This approach deals with heads looking at teachers’ weekly plans and pupils’ work, and reviewing test data (Southworth, 2002). Teachers are the active participants in organizational change. The principal can facilitate change through class observation by providing legitimate, descriptive feedback for the teacher to consider and reflect upon. Keeping in mind that it is better to allow teachers to make their own judgments and reach their own conclusions through a descriptive type of observation than through an interpretive one (Chell, 1995). The conditions which leaders might benefit from monitoring are identified as:

- a teacher-culture of collaboration, in which formal and informal professional dialogue is the norm, including challenge and debate
- enquiry into pupils’ perspectives on their own learning
- provision of multiple opportunities for teacher mentoring, coaching and school professional development
explicit efforts to manage professional knowledge in the school through audits of teacher strengths, skills and needs (Southworth, 2002).

Interpersonal approaches

Dawursk (2011) and Clickman (1990) classify three distinct interpersonal approaches to instructional supervision: directive, collaborative, and non-directive. A good supervisory program will favor differentiated supervision: basically, different approaches for different people and situations. While they generally prefer collaborative supervision, they indicate that there are times one may need to use the other two.

Directive approach

In the directive approach, the principal accentuates a task for the individual teacher or staff. The principal makes standards clear and shows teachers how they will achieve them. The directive principal uses plenty of data to back-up this systemic approach. This type of supervision implies that the principal is more knowledgeable when it comes to instruction and his/her decisions weigh more than the teacher’s do. As a principal, one should use this approach in decisions where they are confident, have expertise, and have been successful as teachers. This approach is effective when a decision does not have time for extensive collaboration or discussion. In this approach, the headteacher comes with a limited number of choices and allow the faculty to choose from them. The decisions naturally lean toward logic, rational and factual information rather than impulse, emotion and hypothesis; therefore, this approach would allow the staff to choose from a few logical choices rather than meandering through a plethora of options. Directive approach principal is source of wisdom, he uses behaviours such as giving of information, goal articulation, suggested practices, solicit teacher input and can be used when expertise of confidence and credibility of principal clearly outweigh teachers while its Purpose is to direct teacher(s) to choose from given alternatives (Clickman, 1990).
**Collaborative approach**

In the collaborative approach, the principal seeks to indenture the teacher via a mutual agreement. Decisions are arrived at jointly by clarifying, listening, reflecting, presenting, problem solving, negotiating and standardizing. This approach should be used when teachers and principals have similar levels of expertise, involvement and concern with problem. Its purpose is to provide for cooperative, equal decision-making (Clickman, 1990) Dawursk (2011) agree that the approach allows the teacher and principal to negotiate a plan of action where neither side’s viewpoint is excluded. The end product is often a contract and both the principal and teacher share responsibility in its completion. This approach is a more preferred method of supervision as it allows the headteacher to express their opinion and participate in the problem solving but does not mandate their way as the only way. It allows the teacher and principal to share the ownership of the plan and proposed solution. This is especially helpful in areas were the headteachers is not an expert or have little or no experience. Through collaboration, the most informed individual expresses their knowledge but everyone participates in the decision making process.

**Non-directive**

Dawursk (2011) indicates that the last approach is non-directive supervision. In this approach, the teacher creates their own plan. The premise is simple: the teacher has the capability to self-analyze, self-critique, and implement viable solutions on their own. This form of self-direction hinges upon the teacher’s intrinsic desire for improvement and positive change and necessitates that the teacher sees the need for change. This approach should be considered for use with veteran teachers who understand regulate themselves within the common instructional goals. The standard clinical approach to supervision
could be supplemented with a reflective analysis whereas the teacher analyzes and interprets what the principal has observed. If a clinical approach is used, it is the teacher who determines the plan and solutions. Clickman (1990) adds that in Non-Directive approach teachers are able to determine their own plans with some assistance by use of behaviours such as listening, reflecting, clarifying, encouraging, and problem-solving. He says that it should be used when individual or group posses’ greater expertise, commitment and responsibility for a decision than the principals do. The Purpose of this Approach is to provide an active sounding board for reflective teachers.

2.6 Challenges faced by headteachers in implementing instructional leadership in developing countries

Lack of resources is a dilemma faced by school heads in Africa. Teachers work under deplorable conditions, are overworked, underpaid and as in some countries not paid at all for months (Otunga, Serem and Kindiki, 2008) Lack of resources is a dilemma faced by school heads in Africa. Teachers work under deplorable conditions, are overworked, underpaid and as in some countries not paid at all for months (Otunga et al 2008). There is also lack of enough teachers (Otunga et al, 2008) to handle the various subjects. For instance, In Kenya the implementation of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAP) policies of early 1990s by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank forced the government to cut down expenditure on education and other services leading to employment of teachers being freezed. The SAPS led to shortage of teachers to teach the various subjects which has persisted up to date. This obviously affects the rating of the school principal. Added to that is the fact that in developing countries, teachers work in overcrowded and under furnished classrooms coupled with poor means of communication (Kitavi et al, 1997).
The other challenge faced by headteachers is the ICT resources. In a dynamic and increasing technological world teachers need to move with the world (Evtmer, 1999). The challenge came in the form of lack of ICT policies on ICT use hence headteachers are left without guidelines on how to implement it in their schools. Headteachers in developing countries face the problem of parents’ inaccessibility (Kitavi et al, 1997). Due to poverty, most parents in Africa are busy most of the time either working for the next meal of the day or next terms school fees. Bomett (2011) indicates that the principals may be faced with lack of support from parents who have no respect for teachers and the education system. Kitavi (1997) talks of ignorance of the importance of parental involvement in their children’s education. This implies that school head will at times be confronted with the dilemma of making sure decision on certain students may not create conflict with the inaccessible parent.

Students riots which causes destruction to property, increased costs on parents and guardians lead to poor examination results is another challenge (Bomett, 2011). Examination performance and curriculum supervision will be low unless a systematic and consultative way of solving student’s problem is practiced. Otunga et al (2008), say that violence disrupts the smooth running of schools in Africa and this also has an impact on the effectiveness of schools head.

Teachers’ lack of commitment and uncooperative attitudes, coupled with lateness and alcoholism which affects the output negatively is a challenge for headteachers today (Kusi, 2008) Students’ absenteeism is another challenge caused by the factors such as sexual maturity of especially the girl-child. A study on needs assessment done by Girl Child Network (2010) on gender equity and equality, established that a girl is absent from
school due to menses for 4 days in 28 days. Majority of girls in Secondary Schools are already menstruating.

Other challenges include overloaded curriculum, such that students could not get through all the syllabus, comparison and statistical valuing where comparative benchmarking is used especially for K.C.S.E. results (UNESCO, 2004). The participants’ key concern was that Kenya education was driven by the performance in national examinations at the expense of the knowledge skills and attitudes. This has negative effects as many of the teachers ignore important curriculum elements and teach only what they expect the examiners to set. Due to introduction of free secondary education in 2008, class sizes have grown big. For instance, in some schools, between 60 - 75. The MOE has to find a way of contenting with issues of large classroom against few teachers (Odhiambo, 2003) coupled with high rate of teachers attrition rates (Ingersol, 2001). Frequent and compulsory transfer of teachers including headteachers themselves is also a challenge because the headteacher has no control (Herber 1989)

2.7 Summary of the literature reviewed

Literature reviewed can be summarized as follows:-that instructional supervision has been defined as the general leadership function that coordinates and manages those school activities concerned with learning. Among the role that are played by the headteacher as an instructional supervisor included administrative, educational, and supportive. He also shapes the schools direction by leading in the formulation of the school’s mission and vision, adhering to policy, creating an enabling environment for teaching and learning to take place as well as frequently visiting the classroom and providing feedback on the class visits. Coupled with that the headteacher encourage dialogue, teamwork, models by teaching his subjects, allows teachers to be innovative while checking on the relevant
documents. He has develops his employee by ensuring that they are trained, provides learning resource while communicating goals and change to members of his/her staff.

However there are challenges that the headteachers face in their attempt to improve on instructional supervision. They work under deplorable situations, teachers being overworked, underpayment of teachers, delayed pay or in some countries the teacher snot being paid for some months or not paid at all. Overcrowded classroom are very common with under furnished classroom. AIDS epidemic, technological resources, students’ riots, teachers lack of commitment, alcoholism as well as lack of policy on the same has also been a big challenge to the headteachers. This study thus intents to investigate whether the situation on the role of the headteacher in Kitui District is similar to that which has been indicated by the literature reviewed.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter contains sub topics such as the research design, study population, sample and sampling procedures, instruments for data collection, development of the questionnaires, validity and reliability of the instrument and methods of data collection.

3.2 Research Design

The study design used is descriptive analysis. Ng’ang’a, Kosgey and Gathuthi (2009) describe descriptive analysis as a method that involves measuring a variable or a set of variable as they exist naturally. It is suited for this study because it is not concerned with the relationship between variables but rather a description of individual variables. The aim is to describe a single variable or obtain a separate description for each variable when several are involved. The respondents were asked questions about a particular issue. The study employed descriptive analysis to establish opinions and knowledge about the role of the head-teacher in instructional leadership as perceived by teachers. Any research undertaking involves lots of cost implications hence this design was deliberately selected for the study because it allows for quick data collection at a comparatively cheap cost (Grinnell, 1993).

3.3 Target population

The research study was carried out in the larger Kitui District of Kitui County. It is one of the districts in the former Eastern Province. The study used Provincial schools in the District which are broadly considered to have similar basic facilities and resources. There are 28 provincial schools in the district. Hence the target population included 28 headteachers, 140 teachers and 140 heads of departments.
Labelled on the basis of mean in 2010 National Examination results (the last four years) the researcher picked successful (high performing) and less successful (average performing) schools to participate in the study. The poor performing schools were not used because according to a document obtained from the District Education Office, Kitui, on K.C.S.E Exam Analysis (2010) they did not have similar basic facilities and resources as the top performing schools. Majority of them were relatively new hence District Schools.

3.4 Sampling Design

The secondary schools in Kitui were stratified into high performing with a mean of 7.5 and above and average performance with a mean of between 4.5 and 6.00 in K.C.S.E results 2010. The study focused on twelve schools in total selected purposively. All these schools are boarding schools. All the six high performing schools in Kitui District participated while only six out of the 28 schools with a mean of 4.5 and 6.00 were chosen randomly for this study.

Each school provided five heads of department and five class teachers who were selected randomly. The sample for this study thus consisted of 60 head of departments and 60 class teachers from the selected schools. The total number of the respondents to taking part in this study was thus one hundred and twenty (120) respondents (teachers) and 12 headteachers.
Table 3.1: High Performing Schools in Kitui District in KCSE-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean (2009)</th>
<th>Number of HODS to Participate</th>
<th>No. of Teachers to Participate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.076</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.841</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.054</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.954</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.791</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.616</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Average Performing Schools in Kitui District in KCSE-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean (2009)</th>
<th>Number of HODS to Participate</th>
<th>No. of Teachers to Participate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.658</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.803</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Instrumentation

The data was collected using one questionnaire, one for the heads of departments (Appendix B) and for the class teachers. However the questionnaire for each group was well labelled for purposes of comparing the responses given by each group. Document analysis was also used. The questionnaire was preferred for its suitability to this study. It is suitable as a method of data collection because it allowed the researcher to reach a larger sample within limited time. It also ensured confidentiality and thus gathered more candid and objective replies. The questionnaires were prepared both for head-teachers and class teachers.
3.5.1 Development of the questionnaire

Two techniques were used; multiple choice and open ended technique. The items to be contained in the questionnaire were based on the role of the principal in instructional leadership, the strategies used to achieve instructional leadership as well as the challenges faced by the headteachers in implementing instructional leadership.

- Closed ended items were developed for they allow easier and accurate analysis of the data. They also made numerical comparison relatively easy while allowing a high degree of respondents’ objectivity. They also reduced the problem of falsification.

- Open ended questions are considered feasible in order to give the respondents a chance to deliver rich information and not to feel the constraints imposed by a fixed choice question.

3.6 Data collection procedures

After approval of the research by the University supervisor, a research permit which authorizes the researcher to carry out the study was obtained from the National Council of Science and Research at Utalii House, Nairobi. The researcher then paid a courtesy call to the District Education Officer Kitui, to inform him of the study. The instruments were administered, after authorization from the management of each school, to the HODs and the class teachers. The questionnaires were dropped and picked type, so the respondents were given one week to fill. After one week the questionnaires’ were collected. Due to the vastness of the study area sampled and the large number of the questionnaires involved the researcher was assisted by research assistants whose duty was mainly to follow up the questionnaires.
**Questionnaire return rate**

The study targeted students in public secondary schools teachers and headteachers within Kitui district. The sample consisted of 120 teachers and 12 headteachers. The questionnaire return rate was 82.5% for the teachers and 100% for the headteachers.

**Table 3.3: Questionnaire Return Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Responded</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.1, 82.5% of the teachers returned their questionnaires and all the headteachers 100 percent returned their questionnaires as targeted. Mulusa (1990) stated that 50 percent return rate was adequate, 60 percent good and 70 percent very good. The return rate was hence considered good to provide required information for the purpose of data analysis.

**3.7 Instrument Validity**

Pre-testing was conducted to assist in determining accuracy, clarity and suitability of the research instrument. According to Borg and Gall (1989), one can carry pilot study on two or three cases. The purpose of the pre-test was to assist the researcher to identity the items which may be inappropriate so as to make necessary corrections, examine responses to determine the level of ambiguity of the questions and determine the percentage of responses.
Pilot study was carried to validate the instruments. Three schools which had a mean ranging between 7.0 and 6.0 in KCSE results 2010 from Kitui district were used because they were not participating in this study. Content validity was used to examine whether the instruments answered the research questions (Borg and Gall, 1996). The responses were also checked to verify whether the questions answer what they are intended to answer in order to ensure instruments validity. Based on the analysis of the pre-test, the researcher was able to make corrections, adjustments and additions to the research instruments.

3.7.1 Pilot study

This involves pre-testing of the instruments. The questionnaires were pre-tested in two selected schools from Mwingi District which neighbours Kitui and have similar challenges. Pre-testing of the research instruments was important since it determines the validity and reliability of the research instruments.

3.8 Instrument reliability

In the study, reliability was assessed through the results of piloting, which was done using test-retest technique. The research instruments were administered to the same group of subjects twice in the pilot study. A two week lapse between the first and the second test was allowed.

The scores from both tests were correlated to get the coefficient of reliability using Pearson’s product moment formulae as follows: Pearson’s coefficient of correlation $r_{xy}$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{[N \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2][N \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2]}}$$
Where

\[ N \quad \text{number of respondents} \]
\[ X \quad \text{scores from the first test} \]
\[ Y \quad \text{scores from the second test} \]

The value of \( r \) lies between \(+1\), the closer the value will be to \(+1\) the stronger the congruence.

3.9 Methods of data analysis and presentation

The data collected from questionnaires was analyzed by the use of descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages). The descriptive analysis is appropriate for this study because it involved the description, analysis and interpretation of circumstances prevailing at the time of study. Descriptive statistical techniques were used to analyze various items of the questionnaire. These included averages, percentages, frequencies and totals. This study used frequencies and percentages because they easily communicate the research findings to majority of readers (Gay, 1992). Frequencies easily show the number of subjects in a given category.

A number of tables and charts were used to present data findings. Coding was done where the response were transferred into summary sheets by tabulating. They were tallied to establish frequencies. The frequencies were determined by converting similar responses into percentages to illustrate related levels of opinion. The questionnaires were analysed separately in four categories; from the high performing schools, the middle performing, those from the heads of department as well as from the teachers for comparison purposes.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the roles played by headteachers in instructional supervision in order to improve on students’ academic achievement in Kitui District Secondary Schools as it is perceived by their teachers.

The study was guided by the following objectives:

• To establish the role headteachers play in instructional supervision as perceived by the teachers in Kitui District

• To explore strategies that headteachers employ to improve on their instructional supervision as perceived by teachers

• To investigate the challenges faced by headteachers in instructional supervision as perceived by teachers

• To examine strategies of coping with challenges faced by headteachers in their endeavour to improve instructional supervision as perceived by teachers

4.2 Demographic characteristics

This section presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents. They include; gender, age in years, highest academic achievement, job group, department of teaching, residence, teaching experience and current teaching experience in the school for both teachers and the headteachers. The rationale behind inclusion of these attributes in the analysis is that they help to shed light of the personal traits of the headteachers as instructional supervisors.
4.2.1 Gender of respondents

The respondents were asked to indicate their gender. Table 4.1 shows teachers’ and headteachers’ gender.

Table 4.1: Distribution of Teachers and Headteachers by their Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that there were more male teachers (57.6%) as compared to their female counterparts, at 42.4%. On the other hand there are more female headteachers (58.3%) than their male counterparts.

4.2.2 Age of Respondents

The respondents were asked to indicate their age. Table 4.2 shows the age of both teachers and their headteachers.
Majority (75.0%) of the headteachers were aged 41-45 years while 25.0% of them were aged between 36-40 years.

Slightly below half (45.5%) of the teachers were aged below 35 years, while 29.3% of them were aged between 36-40 years and 24.2% were aged between 41 years and above. It is assumed that the young teachers who are below age 35 years have just completed their college education and even others had not been employed most of them were BOG teachers.

**4.2.3 Highest academic qualifications**

The teachers were asked to indicate their academic qualifications and the results are as shown in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3 Teachers highest academic qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE Exam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority (68.7%) of the teachers had attained a Bachelors degree in Education while 20.2% of them had a Diploma in Education and 7.1% had a Masters degree and 2.0% who had only completed their KCSE examination.

The headteachers were also asked to indicate their highest academic qualifications. Table 4.4 show headteachers highest academic qualifications.

Table 4.4: Headteachers highest academic qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority (58.3%) of the headteachers had attained a Master degree while 41.7% of them had attained a Bachelors degree.
4.2.4 Job group

The respondents were asked to indicate their current job group. The results are as shown in Table 4.5

Table 4.5: Teachers current job group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total        | 99 | 100.0|

About 23.2% of the teachers were in job group K, L and others were BOG teachers in their respective schools. While 19.2% were in job group M, 4.0% were in job group N and 2.0% of them were in job group J.
Table 4.6: Headteachers current job group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority (66.7%) of the headteachers were in Job group N while 16.7% of them were in job group P which is the highest among job group and 8.3% were in both job group L and M.

4.2.5 Teaching Experience

The teachers and headteachers were requested to indicate the number of years they had served as teachers and the number of years they had worked in a particular school. The results are as shown in Table 4.7, 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10.

Table 4.7: Distribution of Teachers and their Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration in years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years and below</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16years and above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>99</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority (56.6%) of the teachers had taught for 5 years and below while 22.2% had a teaching experience of 6-10 years and 17.2% had a teaching experience of 11 years and above. Hence the results show that most of the teachers had worked for more than five years. This could enable them establish the role played by the headteacher in instructional supervision. The researcher wished to find out the number of years the teachers had worked in the particular school. The results are as shown in table 4.8.

Table 4.8: Distribution of Teachers by current school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration in years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years and below</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years and above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority (65.7%) of the teachers had worked in the particular school for 5 years and below while 21.2% had worked for between 6-10 years. The rest had served for 11 years and above. Teachers experience would enable the teachers to answer questions about the role played by the headteachers in instruction supervision.

The headteachers were requested to indicate their headship experience. The results are as shown in Table 4.9.
### Table 4.9: Headteachers experience in years in headship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years and below</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority (58.3%) of the headteachers had headship experience of 11-15 years while 16.7% of them had 5 years and below and 6-10 years respectively and 8.3% had an experience of 16 years and above. About 66.6% of the headteachers had experience of 10 years and above hence they could be able to handle their roles of supervision of curriculum, staff personnel, students’ personnel, supervision and promotion of school community relations.

This prompted the researcher to ask the headteachers to indicate the number of years they had worked in the current school. The results are as shown in Table 4.10.

### Table 4.10: Experience in years of Headteachers as per the current school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years and below</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority (58.3%) of the headteachers indicated that they had been in the current school for 5 years and below while 41.7% had been in the current station for 6-15 years. This shows that their roles in the current school had been known by the teachers and the rest of the school community who had worked under them. Hence teachers would be able to give a clear judgement on the role played by headteachers in instructional supervision.

4.2.7 Department taught in by teachers
The teachers were asked to indicate the department they taught. The results are as shown in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Distribution of Teachers by their department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>99</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most (34.3%) of the teachers indicated that they taught sciences while 32.3% of them taught languages, with 19.2% of them teaching humanities and 14.1% of them taught technical subjects.

4.3 Role played by headteachers in instructional supervision as perceived by the teachers
The role of headteachers in relation to management is diverse. He/she plays various roles in the organization and management of all activities in the school. The headteacher is, for instance the key person in management, development, implementation and evaluation of
all activities pertaining to the day-to-day running of the school (Waweru, 2003). He observes that a headteacher has the following roles to play; supervision of the approved curriculum, staff personnel, student personnel, supervision and promotion of school community relations and supervision of physical and material resource. According to the Republic of Kenya (2000), the headteacher is responsible for all matters pertaining to the smooth running of the school. This study then wished to find out from the teachers whether the headteacher performed their roles. Table 4.12 shows the roles played by the headteachers in smoothing running of the school.

Table 4.12: Teachers responses on role performed by headteachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles performed by the headteacher</th>
<th>Strongly agree n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Agree N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No opinion n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate confidently</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains good standards of work</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains harmonious working</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes school safe/secure place to work</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved teachers in decision making</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate practice with policy</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunity for independent functioning</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learns from others</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate workers/Improves their morale</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps workers deal with job related stress</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 99

Majority (56.6%) of the teachers strongly agreed and 37.4% agreed that headteachers communicated confidently. Slightly below half (49.5%) of them strong agree and agreed that the headteachers maintained good standards of working respectively and 49.5% of them strongly agreed and 45.5% of them agreed that maintains harmonious working...
relationship. The least rated was 35.4% of the teachers strongly agreeing that the headteachers motivated worker which improved their morale.

On the other hand all the headteachers agreed that they communicate confidently, they maintained good standard of work, they learnt from others, provided opportunity for independent functioning, involved teachers in decision making, helped workers deal with job related stress, maintained harmonious working relationship, made school safe/ secure place to work and coordinate practice with policy and maintained good standards of work.

Table 4.13: Teachers responses on role performed by headteachers in encouraging learning in school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles performed by the headteacher</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides necessary resources for learning</td>
<td>n 62</td>
<td>% 62.6</td>
<td>n 37</td>
<td>% 37.4</td>
<td>n 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrates success.</td>
<td>n 49</td>
<td>% 49.5</td>
<td>n 44</td>
<td>% 44.4</td>
<td>n 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapes school direction</td>
<td>n 36</td>
<td>% 36.4</td>
<td>n 47</td>
<td>% 47.5</td>
<td>n 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates an opportunity and culture for change</td>
<td>n 37</td>
<td>% 37.4</td>
<td>n 53</td>
<td>% 53.5</td>
<td>n 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that classroom is conducive for learning</td>
<td>n 38</td>
<td>% 38.4</td>
<td>n 52</td>
<td>% 52.5</td>
<td>n 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes frequent and formal class visits</td>
<td>n 36</td>
<td>% 36.4</td>
<td>n 47</td>
<td>% 47.5</td>
<td>n 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 99

Majority of the teachers (62.6%) strongly agreed that headteachers provided necessary resources for learning and 37.4% of them agreed that the headteachers provided necessary resources for learning. Slightly below half (49.5%) of them strong agree that the headteachers celebrates success and makes school safe/ secure place to work. The least rated factor was makes frequent and formal class visits at 36.4%.
All headteachers agreed that they provided learning resources, they celebrated success, made school safe and secure place to work and learn, shaped school direction, created an opportunity and culture for change, ensured that classroom was conducive for learning and makes frequent and formal class visits.

The researcher observed that while majority of the teachers and headteachers agreed that the headteachers carried out their roles diligently there were some teachers who felt otherwise and also some headteachers who felt at fault with some roles like motivating the workers, visiting classroom and shaping school direction since they were not frequently done as required. These results agree with Smith (1991), who notes that an instructional leader is an administrator who emphasizes the process of instruction and facilitates the interaction of teacher, student and curriculum. Muchiri (2008) concurs with the results that the factors influencing instructional supervision were availability of textbooks, facilities, teacher qualifications and motivation, school management and leadership; and the presence/ absence of the pupils among others.

4.4 Strategies that headteachers employ to improve on their instructional supervision as perceived by teachers

Instructional leadership is seen to be concerned with teaching process and with headteacher acting as the teacher in terms of pedagogical and instruction rather than taking hands off and being concerned with administration (Hallinger and Heck, 1998). This research wished therefore to find out to what extent the headteacher promoted classroom instruction. The results are as shown in Table 4.14.
Table 4.14: The extents to which headteachers’ promote classroom instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Instruction</th>
<th>Very High extent n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>High extent n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Low extent n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Very low extent n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eradicates cheating in examinations among the students</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors students discipline</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has demonstrated knowledge of curriculum issues in various subjects</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks to teachers as colleagues and discusses classroom affairs with them.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains school climate that is conducive for teaching and learning</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is supportive of the classroom concerns of the teachers.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that all departments have teachers</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models good instructions by teaching his/her subjects</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assists classroom teacher in the implementation of curriculum</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly evaluates the teachers’ instructional methods and makes his contribution without obviously being judgemental.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks the teachers lesson notes and offers correction/advise where necessary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 99

Majority (69.7%) of the teachers felt that the headteacher’s eradicated cheating in examination among the students to a very high extent and 25.3% of them to a high extent. About 65.7% of the teachers to high extent demonstrated knowledge of curriculum issues in various subjects and 32.3% of them said to a very high extent. About 60.6% of the
teachers indicated that headteachers monitored students discipline to a very high extent and 35.4% of them to a high extent. Slightly above half (51.5%) of the teachers noted that the headteachers to a low extent checked the teachers’ lesson notes and offered correction/advice were necessary. All the headteachers indicated that they maintained school climate that is conducive for teaching and learning; monitored students discipline and models good instructions by teaching his/her subjects to a high extent. The least rated to high extent was checking the teachers lessons notes and offers correction/advice where necessary. These findings agree with E-lead (2008) who indicates that the role of an instructional leader differs from that of traditional school administrator in a number of meaningful ways. Whereas a conventional principal spends the majority of his/her time dealing with strictly administrative duties, a principal who is an instructional leader is charged with redefining his/her role to become the primary learner in a community striving for excellence in education. This is also supported by Grima (2007) who noted that the principal’s responsibility to work with teachers to define educational objectives and set school-wide wide goals, provide the necessary resources for learning, and create new learning opportunities for students and staff.

4.5 Factors that influence headteachers in instructional supervision as perceived by teachers

The researcher sought to investigate factors that influence headteachers in instructional supervision as perceived by teachers. There are different factors including school climate and training of teachers that affect instructional supervision as perceived by teachers. The results are as shown in Table 4.15 and 4.16.
Table: 4.15: Challenges faced by headteachers in instructional supervision of curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure of syllabus coverage</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of time management</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure of the principals to allow members of the school community to express their views on instructional resources</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some don’t delegate duties since teachers don’t perform them</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure of the principals to accommodate the interest and goals of members of school community in decision made on instruction resources</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 99

Majority (97.0%) of the teachers indicated that there was failure of syllabus coverage. Eighty four percent (84.0%) of them said there were a problem of time management and the failure of the principals to allow members of the school community to express their views on instructional resources. Eighty three percent (83.0%) of the teachers noted that some headteachers did not delegate duties since teachers don’t perform them. About 78.8% of them indicated that the headteachers failed to accommodate the interest and goals of members of the school community in decision made on instructional resources. The researcher observed that the headteacher was overloaded as the manager; implementer and evaluator of all activities pertaining to the day to day running of the school hence sometimes may fail to check on curriculum delivery effectively.

By virtue of his role and status the headteacher is totally in charge of the curriculum implementation. This responsibility involves curriculum development, the schemes of
work to be followed the allocation of teachers, the teaching methods used and the
 provision of materials. There is no doubt that the headteacher can and does greatly
 influence the nature of the curriculum implementation. Even so, the problems
 headteachers faces in curriculum implementation are enormous. The headteachers today
 live in an age of stiff competition as shown in table 4.15 they have to make sure that
 syllabus is well covered for all subjects which is quite some work. Due to teachers lack of
 commitment and cooperation, important duties cannot be delegated to them. Failure to
 prepare schemes of work which facilitates easy checking of the curriculum
 implementation is also a big problem for the headteacher. The principals not allowing
 members of the school community to express their views on instructional resources may
 result to a challenge in the instructional supervision.

This then means that every effort the headteacher makes in ensuring proper
 implementation of the curriculum is bound to fail. This causes strain on the headteacher
 since he/she gets at loggerheads with the higher offices who require satisfactory reports
 and a good mean score at the end of the day. It may also mean loss of position for the
 headteacher for he/she will be deemed as a non-performer.

This is because the curriculum is the most central in a school. It is therefore expected that
 a headteacher should manage all other areas to suitably affect the teaching and learning in
 the classroom. It is no wonder that in the education circles the mean score is the concern
 of education officers, parents and sponsors. Hence the problem indicated above definitely
 brings down the headteachers morally and puts great pressure on them. According to
 Okumbe (2001) observed that one of the functions of educational management by
principals is to influence and stimulate the human resource available, by providing an appropriate organizational climate.

4.5.1 Promotion of teachers’ professional growth

Promoting professional development is the most common principal leadership behaviour found by the researcher to have a positive effect on teacher classroom instruction (Ryser, & Ford 2002). Professional development is thought to be a key to improving teacher instruction (Elmore & Burney, 1999). Hence the researcher wished to find out to what extent the headteacher promoted teachers professional growth. The results are as shown in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16: Extent to which headteachers promote teachers’ professional growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promoting professional growth</th>
<th>Very extent</th>
<th>High extent</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
<th>Very low extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages new ideas</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans and executes new in-service for teachers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages /facilitates workshop attendance for teachers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports creativity, innovation and practice of new skills</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise, supports and facilitates teachers work</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes definite steps to aid teachers professional growth</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=99

Majority (58.6%) of the teachers noted that to some extent the headteacher encouraged new ideas. About 57.6% of the teachers indicated that to high extent the headteacher plans and executes new in-service for teachers and 20.2% to a very high extent. The
lowest rated factor was to a high extent (47.5%) takes definite steps to aid teachers professional growth and 38.4% of them said to a high extent. From the headteachers questionnaire all the headteachers noted that they promoted teachers professional growth by stepping in to aid teachers professional growth, encouraging new ideas, supporting creativity, innovation and practice of new skills, praises, supports and facilitates teachers work to a high extent. The results on workshops agree with Duke (1987) who noted that the principals promote professional development by using supervisors and colleagues to train teachers on instructional strategies, giving teachers’ time for independent studies, and using external sources such as college courses, district-level workshops, and consultants who are experts in a particular area.

Majority (85.9%) of teachers said that the headteacher took definite steps to aid teachers professional growth to a high extent and 77.8% of the teachers said that the headteachers planned and executed new in-service for teachers to a high extent. The researcher observes that the teachers rated to high extent the support given by headteachers on professional growth. Blase and Blasè (1998) provided a list of strategies principals used to promote professional development that increased teachers’ use of reflectively informed behaviours such as emphasizing the study of teaching and learning, supporting collaboration among educators, developing coaching relationships among educators, and applying principles of adult learning to staff development.

4.6 Challenges faced by headteachers in improving instructional supervision

According to Otunga, Serem and Kindiki, (2008) some of the challenges facing the headteacher such as lack of resources is a dilemma faced by school heads in Africa. Teachers work under deplorable conditions, are overworked, underpaid and as in some
countries not paid at all for months. Lack of resources is a dilemma faced by school heads in Africa. Hence the researcher wished to find out to what extent do challenges faced by headteachers in improving instructional supervision affects them. The results are as shown in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17: Challenges faced by headteachers in improving instructional supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Very High extent</th>
<th>High extent</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
<th>Very low extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of enough teachers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overworked teachers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overloaded curriculum</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ICT policy and resources</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowded and under furnished classrooms</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deplorable working conditions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students absenteeism</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rates of teacher attrition</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccessibility of parents(too busy)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent compulsory transfers of teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents lack of respect for teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher lack of commitment and cooperation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS epidemic.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riots (Disrupting smooth running of the school)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 99
From the findings, 60.6% of the teachers indicated that riots to a very low extent as a challenge that affected the principals. Slightly above half (57.6%) of the teachers noted that to a very low extent was affected by HIV/AIDS epidemic and half of the teachers (50.0%) noted that to a very low extend do parents lack of respect for teachers as a challenge faced by the headteachers. Forty three (43.4%) of the teachers indicated that lack of enough teachers was a challenge faced by headteachers at a very high extent and 34.3% of them to a high extent. Thirty seven percent (37.4%) of them indicated that overworked teachers to a high extent and 36.4% to a very high extent as challenges facing the headteacher. Another challenge facing the headteacher was overloaded curriculum to a high extent at 38.4% and 20.2% to a very high extent.

These findings concur with Otunga, Serem and Kindiki (2008) noted that teachers work under deplorable conditions, are overworked, underpaid and as in some countries not paid at all for months and there was also lack of enough teachers to handle the various subjects. Another challenge as noted by Evtmer, (1999) is the ICT resources. Another challenge as discussed by Bomett (2011) was the principals may be faced with lack of support from parents who have no respect for teachers and the education system. Other challenges facing the headteachers included the teachers’ lack of commitment and uncooperative attitudes, coupled with lateness and alcoholism which affects the output negatively and students’ absenteeism is another challenge caused by the factors such as sexual maturity of especially the girl-child (Kusi, 2008).

4.7 Suggestion given by teachers on solutions that headteachers can use to deal with the challenges

The following are suggestions given by the teachers as shown in Table 4.18.
### Table 4.18: Suggestion on challenges faced by the headteachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested remedies</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The government through TSC to employ more teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers should consult with all stakeholders</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the use of ICT in teaching and learning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The headteachers should motivate both teachers and students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of more classrooms to reduce overcrowding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers should employ more teachers through BOG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers should create a conducive environment for teaching and learning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be effective communication in all departments in the school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers should be sociable and friendly to staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve teachers in decision making</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve learning and teaching resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid students absenteeism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use remedial teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least 24.2% of the teachers said that the government through TSC should employ more teachers, while 22.2% of them indicated that the headteachers should consult with all stakeholders and 12.1% said that the headteachers should encourage the use of ICT in teaching and learning in their schools. Other suggestions included that the headteachers
should motivate both teachers and students, they should construct more classrooms to reduce overcrowding, the headteacher should employ more teachers through BOG, should create a conducive environment for teaching and learning and there should be effective communication in all departments in the school. These findings agree with those of Smith and Andrews (1989) who noted that the teachers perceive their principals to be strong instructional leaders when they communicate school goals through interacting with them on their classroom performance, by being accessible to discuss instructional matters, allowing teachers to try new instructional strategies by letting them know that it is okay to take risks, and clearly communicating a vision for the school.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction

This chapter contains summary, conclusion and recommendations of the study.

5.2. Summary

The aim of this study was to investigate the role of the headteacher in instructional supervision as perceived by teachers in secondary schools in Kitui District – Kitui County. This research prompted by literature review which indicates that performance of National Examination (KCSE) in Kitui District was below average for the majority of schools despite the Government’s effort to staff the schools with trained teachers as well as providing learning materials through the Free Secondary School Education. The purpose of the study is to investigate the role headteachers play in instructional supervision in order to improve on students’ academic achievement in Kitui District Secondary school as it is perceived by their teachers. The objective of the study includes, to establish the role headteachers play in instructional supervision as perceived by teachers in secondary schools in Kitui District, to explore strategies that headteachers can employ to improve on their instructional supervision, to investigate the challenges faced by headteachers in instructional supervision as perceived by teachers, to examine strategies of coping with challenges faced by headteachers in their endeavour to improve instructional supervision as perceived by teachers. Descriptive design was used to carry out the study. The target population were all the schools in the large Kitui District. The sample consisted of 120 respondents consisting of 60 Heads of Departments and 60 class teachers who were randomly selected from 6 high performing school and 6 low performing schools. The data was collected using a questionnaire with similar items for both the HODs and teachers.
Descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages were used to present the findings. This was done by use of SPSS software packages.

5.2.1 Summary of findings

The role played by headteacher in instructional supervision in secondary schools in Kitui district.

The study revealed that the majority of the teachers (62.6%) strongly agreed that headteachers provided necessary resources for learning and the headteachers communicated confidently. The teachers results agreed with those of all the headteachers that they provided learning resources, they learnt from others, celebrated success, provided opportunity for independent functioning, involved teachers in decision making, communicated confidently, helped workers deal with job related stress, maintained harmonious working relationship, ensured that classroom were conducive for learning, made school safe/ secure place to work, coordinate, practice with policy and maintained good standards of work.

On the exploration of the strategies that headteachers employed to improve on their instructional supervision as perceived by teachers.

The results revealed that majority of the teachers (69.7%) felt that the headteacher’s eradicated cheating in examination among the students to a very high extent. The results revealed that 65.7% of the teachers to high extent demonstrated knowledge of curriculum related issues in various subjects and 60.6% of the teachers indicated that headteachers monitored students discipline to a very high extent. The results of the teachers agreed with those of the headteachers that they maintained school climate that is conducive for teaching and learning; monitored students discipline and models good instructions by teaching his/her subjects to a high extent.
On the investigating the factors that influence headteachers in instructional supervision as perceived by teachers

The results revealed that the majority 97.0% of the teachers indicated that there was failure of syllabus coverage. The study revealed that 83.8% of them said there were problem of time management and the failure of the principals to allow members of the school community to express their views on instructional resources and 82.8% of the teachers noted that some headteachers did not delegate duties since teachers don’t perform them.

On promotion of teachers’ professional growth

The study revealed that majority of the teachers (58.6%) felt that to some extent the headteacher encouraged new ideas, the headteacher plans and executes new in-service courses for teachers. It also revealed that all the headteachers promoted teachers professional growth by stepping in to aid teachers professional growth, encouraging new ideas, supporting creativity, innovation and practice of new skills, praises, supports and facilitates teachers work to a high extent. The study also revealed that majority (85.9%) of teachers said that the headteacher took definite steps to aid teachers’ professional growth to a high extent and 77.8% of the teachers said that the headteachers planed and executed new in-service course for teachers. The researcher observed that the teachers rated their headteacher to a high extent on the promotion of professional growth.

On the challenges faced by headteachers in improving instructional supervision

From the findings, 60.6% of the teachers indicated that riots to a very low extent as a challenge that affected the principals. 57.6% of the teachers noted that to a very low
extent was affected by HIV/AIDS epidemic and half of the teachers (50.0%) noted that to a very low extend do parents lack of respect for teachers as a challenge faced by the headteachers.

**On the suggestion given by teachers on solutions that headteachers can employ to deal with challenges**

About 24.2% of the teachers said that the government through TSC should employ more teachers, while 22.2% of them indicated that the headteachers should consult with all stakeholders. Other suggestions included that the headteachers should motivate both teachers and students, they should construct more classrooms to reduce overcrowding, the headteacher should employ more teachers through BOG, should create a conducive environment for teaching and learning and there should be effective communication in all departments in the school.

**5.3 Conclusions**

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings.

1. The study revealed that the headteacher provided teaching and learning materials and that there were necessary resources for learning in the school. The study established that headteacher maintained good standards of work by involving teachers in decision making, the communicated confidently, helped the teachers to deal with work related stress, maintained harmonious working condition and ensured conducive teaching and learning environment.

2. On the strategies employed by the headteachers to improve on their instructional supervision as perceived by teachers, the study revealed that the headteachers
eradicated cheating in examination among the students, demonstrated knowledge of curriculum related issues in various subjects and the headteachers maintained a school climate conducive for teaching and learning. This was through monitoring students discipline and modelling good instructions through teaching the subjects allocated to them.

3. The factors that influence headteachers instructional supervision as perceived by teachers is realized when the headteacher encourages teachers to attend workshops, to bring in new ideas and supports creativity, innovation and practice of new skills hence teachers get confidence of their headteachers support for professional growth. This results to teachers working hard to achieve the set goals in their school.

4. Some of the suggestions given by the teachers included that the headteachers assisted in the teachers’ professional growth through encouraging new ideas, plans and executing new in-service courses for teachers.

**5.4 Recommendations**

The following recommendations were drawn from the findings

1. The provision of teaching and learning materials and other necessary resources for learning in schools, the headteachers also maintained good standards of works this is to help to meet the set goals for their schools. Hence, the teachers and headteachers are able to achieve the institutional set goals.

2. The strategies put in place by the headteachers such as eradicating cheating in examination among students, demonstrated knowledge of curriculum related issues, maintaining a school climate conducive for teaching, learning and monitoring of
students discipline. There is need for the headteachers to employ the right strategies in order assist in the improvement of instructional supervision.

3. When the headteacher encourage the teachers to attend workshops, to bring in new ideas and support creativity, innovation and practice new skills helps the teachers to gain confidence hence this enhances teachers professional growth. There is need for headteachers to support the teachers in their professional growth. Hence the researcher notes that these challenges can be overcome if there are clear set goals between the teachers, students, parents and the headteacher in working together for the better of the students.

4. Some of the suggestions given by teachers in perceiving their headteachers to be strong instructional leaders when they communicate school goals through interacting with them on their classroom performance, by being accessible to discuss instructional matters, allowing teachers to try new instructional strategies by letting them know that it is okay to take risks, and clearly communicating a vision for the school.

5.5 Suggestions for further research

1. A research should be carried out concerning the problems encountered by teachers when headteachers do not carry out instructional supervision.

2. A replication of this research should be done later to find out if there will be some change on the present condition in public secondary schools in the Kitui county including the area of study.
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Dear Respondent,

I am currently a post-graduate student at Kenyatta University pursuing a Masters Degree in Education; I am required to conduct a research on the Role of Headteachers in Instructional Supervision as Perceived by Teachers in Secondary Schools in Kitui District-Eastern Province.

You can greatly contribute towards the attainment of the goal by giving your honest responses. Any additional information will be highly appreciated and you may write them behind the questionnaire or use additional paper.

The information so obtained shall be exclusively confidential: you do not have to write your name anywhere in this questionnaire.

Please answer all questions by putting a tick in the brackets and/or giving explanations where necessary.

Yours faithfully,

Penninah Nzile.

Post graduate student.
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HODS AND CLASS TEACHERS

Section A: Demographics of the HODs and teachers

1. What is your gender?
   - Male ( )
   - Female ( )

2. Kindly indicate your age bracket?
   - Below 35 yrs ( )
   - 36 – 40 yrs ( )
   - 41 – 45 yrs ( )
   - 46 – 50 yrs ( )
   - 51 and Above yrs ( )

3. What is your highest academic qualification?
   - Diploma ( )
   - Bachelors Degree ( )
   - Masters Degree ( )
   - Other (specify) ………………………………….

4. What is your current job group?
   - K ( )
   - L ( )
   - M ( )
   - N ( )
   - Other (specify) ………………………………………………………………….

5. Which is your department?
   - Languages ( )
   - Sciences ( )
   - Humanities ( )
   - Technicals ( )

6. Where do you reside?
   - Inside the school compound ( )
   - Home (rented) ( )
   - Home (owned) ( )
   - Other (specify) ………………………………………………………

7. How long have you been teaching?
   - 5 years and below ( )
   - 6 – 10 years ( )
   - 11 – 15 years ( )
   - 16 years and above ( )
8. For how long have you taught in your current school?

- 5 years and below ( )
- 6 – 10 years ( )
- 11 – 15 years ( )
- 16 years and above ( )

**Section B:**

i) **Role of Headteachers**

9. Please indicate by ticking the extent to which the headteacher performs the following roles. (Use the scale provided)

- Strongly Disagree - (SD)
- Disagree - (D)
- No Opinion - (NO)
- Agree - (A)
- Strongly Agree - (SA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles performed by the headteacher</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maintains good standards of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coordinate practice with policy (Adhere to policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Makes school safe/secure place to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Makes frequent and formal class visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Shapes school direction. (School vision and mission)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ensure that classroom is conducive for learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Maintains harmonious working relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Motivate workers/Improves their morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Helps workers deal with job related stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Communicate confidently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Involved teachers in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Provide opportunity for independent functioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Creates an opportunity and culture for change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Celebrates success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Learns from others
16. Provides necessary resources for learning

### ii) Headteacher’s promotion of classroom instruction

10 To what extent do the principal assist/encourage their teachers in their classroom instruction? Kindly tick the extent in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Instruction</th>
<th>Very high extent</th>
<th>High extent</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
<th>Very low extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has demonstrated knowledge of curriculum issues in various subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assists classroom teacher in the implementation of curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Checks the teachers lesson notes and offers correction/advise where necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Maintains school climate that is conducive for teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Regularly evaluates the teachers instructional methods and makes his contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Talks to teachers as colleagues and discusses classroom affairs with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is supportive of the classroom concerns of the teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ensure that all departments have teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Eradicates cheating in examinations among the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Monitors students discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Models good instructions by teaching his/her subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iii) **Headteachers promotion of teachers professional growth**

11. To what extent do headteachers promote professional growth of teachers? Kindly tick the extent in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of promoting professional growth by headteachers</th>
<th>Very high extent</th>
<th>High extent</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
<th>Very low extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Takes definite steps to aid teachers professional growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Encourages new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supports creativity, innovation and practice of new skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Plans and executes new in-service for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Praise, supports and facilitates teachers work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Encourages /facilitates workshop attendance for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv). **Challenges faced by headteachers in improving instructional supervision.**

12. To what extent do the headteacher face the following challenges in their attempt to improve instructional supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Very high extent</th>
<th>High extent</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
<th>Very low extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Deplorable working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overworked teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of enough teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Crowded and under furnished classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of ICT policy and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inaccessibility of parents (too busy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Parents lack of respect for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Riots (Disrupting smooth running of the school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Teacher lack of commitment and cooperation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Overloaded curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Students absenteeism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>High rates of teacher attrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Frequent compulsory transfers of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. As a teacher give your suggestions on the solutions that your headteacher can employ in dealing with the challenges mentioned in questions 12.

Thank you for your cooperation
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