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ABSTRACT

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of headteachers’ instructional supervision practices on the performance of pupils’ in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitokitok Sub-County. The study was guided by the following specific objectives: to determine the extent to which headteachers’ frequency of checking teachers’ professional records; holding model teaching session for; undertaking of classrooms observation; and target setting influence pupils’ performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitokitok Sub-County. This study is hoped to provide information that may help management trainers such as the Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) formulate teachers’ education management programme that will be translated in improved pupil’s performance. The study was based on and guided by Symbolic Interactionism theory coined by Blumer (1969). The target population of the study included a total of 118 headteachers and a total of 1600 teachers in public primary school from the three zones within Loitokitok Sub-County. Simple random sampling technique was used to select a sample of 10 schools. Purposive sampling technique was then used to select one headteacher and eleven teachers in each of the sampled schools. A sample size of 30 headteachers and 320 teachers was used. Questionnaires tools were used as the main data gathering instruments. Collected data was analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The key findings from the study revealed that majority of the primary school head teachers (95%) do check teachers’ professional records termly, which is not frequent to help improve pupils’ academic performance. Majority of the headteachers (69%) do not hold model teaching to inspire their teachers’ instructional process development, though most of them (33%) undertake classroom observation this supervisory practice is done in passive mode to avoid conflict with teachers who have a negative attitude on the same. However an overwhelming majority (91%) set targets for their teachers to ensure improved academic performance. The study concluded that regular monitoring of professional documents was the most critical area that headteachers should lay emphasis on, especially on schemes of work, lesson plans, lesson notes and class registers since the documents reflect the plan for syllabus coverage and also assist in monitoring the progress on syllabus coverage. The study recommended that the Ministry of Education through Directorates of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (DQASOs) emphasizes on the regular monitoring of professional documents by the headteachers and that the Ministry of Education ensures availability of adequate teaching and learning resources including physical resources to ensure that pupils are adequately prepared by their teachers for the national examinations. The study suggested further research on whether teachers’ attitude towards headteachers’ role in instructional supervision would be the reasons behind the persistent poor performance of schools in KCPE in the Sub-County since this study ruled out the headteachers’ supervisory skills as the possible cause of the poor performance.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Global educational policies and programs alike have brought forth significant challenges to many education systems around the globe though educational policy in the twenty-first century is the key to global security, sustainability and survival (Olssen, Godd, & O’neill, 2006). Responding to this scenario, Armstrong (2003) suggests that this survival can basically be ensured through adequate work supervision as one of strategic survival approaches. As a manager in any organization, contends Hunsaker & Hunsaker (2009), one must ensure that objectives are met and also that employees learn how to enhance their performance through regular appraisals and supervision.

Instructional supervision therefore has its origin in the earlier American education system in which schooling was in the hands of local authorities. Supervision was handled by laymen who included the clergy, school wardens, trustees, selectmen and citizen committees. The supervisory practices were concerned with management of schools and the fulfillment of the prescribed curricular needs rather than the improvement of teaching and learning process. It was referred to as inspection due to its autocratic nature. Autocratic relationships between supervisors and teachers began to wane giving way to
the period of co-operative group effort between 1937 and 1959. Teacher shortage experienced due to growth of towns and upsurge in population necessitated the employment of more teachers some of whom were untrained. Instructional supervision was therefore required (Okumbe, 1998).

Inspection in Africa is as old as Western Education in Africa. In Uganda for example, according to Ssekemwa (1997) and Mubarak (2000), the recommendations of the Phelp stokes commission of 1924 established the department of Education in 1925. This Department had the responsibility of developing the syllabi and supervised how it was being implemented in schools.

In Uganda for example, the recommendations of the Phelps-Stokes Commission of 1924 established the department of Education in 1925. This Department had the responsibility of developing the syllabus and supervised how it was being implemented in schools. The Uganda Education Act of 1970 gave the inspectors legitimate powers to visit a school at any time. The school head would be informed of the inspectors intended visit and its purpose. In Nigeria, instructional supervision began as a process of external inspection Supervisors was inexperienced in the act of supervision. They had little or no formal training of the ethics, concept and practice of supervision. Until the control of schools by government in 1967, school supervision was left in the hands of missionaries (Alimi, Olatunji, Akifolarin & Ayandonja, 2012).
In Kenya educational supervision can be traced back to the colonial period following passing of the education Ordinance in 1924 which required all schools to be registered and open to inspection by the Education Director (Sifuna, 1990). The modern inspectorate in independent Kenya was initiated through recommendations by Kenya Education Council of 1964. It has however gone through a series of changes to what it is today. The Ministry of Education recently put up the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards and the School inspectors are now referred to as Quality Assurance and Standards Officers, (QASO). The directorate’s mission is to establish, maintain and improve education standards in a bid to provide quality assurance feedback to all education stake holders. The directorate ensures effective monitoring of curriculum delivery in schools to ensure effectiveness. Sub-County Quality Assurance and Standards (DQAS) was also expected to provide advisory services to schools on how best to improve the quality of learning. With the new policy DQAS is expected to be a team player and not a policing service as it had been perceived in the past, Kenya Education Sector Supports Programs (KESSP, 2005).

Supervision is, however, considered as that dimension or phase in educational administration which is concerned with improving educational effectiveness. This management practice evolved after it was realized that there was little that could be achieved by grouping employees together without a leader (Okumbe, 1999). In a school set up, supervision draws its foundation and data from the
events that take place inside and outside the classroom. The analysis of events in the school and the relationship between the teacher and the headteacher form the basis of the programmes, procedures and strategies designed to improve the teaching and learning process (Mbiti, 1974).

Eshiwani (1993) holds the following role of the headteacher as a supervisor in school: It is through supervision that the headteacher gets a clear framework of activities and responsibilities of each member of staff in school. The management practice enables headteachers to evaluate the extent to which policies, objectives, activities and events laid down in the long and short term plans are successfully carried out. Supervision, therefore, as a basic requirement in school administration, brings on board tactics of efficient and proper personnel management with an aim of steering their efforts towards the desired educational goals of a community. As an aspect of administration, it assists in checking of punctuality, discipline, as well facilitating change from old ways to modern ways of doing things at the work place (school). The above implies that it is a process of overseeing people at their places of work in order to ensure compliance with established plans and procedures (Saleemi & Bogonko, 1997).

Instructional supervision in the areas of class visitation, teacher observation greatly influences pupils’ performance (Glans and Sawman 1985). Gachoya (2008) observed that the supervisors who made classroom visits were able to
have an insight into the actual state of instruction and this reinforces performance. This implies that if class visits are intensified, students would keep alert and study and this would influence their performance. According to Ayot and Briggs (2000), ineffective instructional supervision leads to poor performance among learners. Ngunjiri (2012), also agrees with this argument that effective instructional supervision results in students getting high grades in examinations while fewer instances of supervision or lack of it lead to laxity of teachers hence poor performance.

According to Zepeda (2003), model teaching sessions may be formal or informal, clinical or some of the modifications of the original clinical supervisory model. Researchers have theorized that lesson demonstration can improve teachers’ instructional practices (Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006). Supervisors (headteachers) use demonstration lessons to assist teachers individually and in groups. This practice is not only used to guide new and inexperienced headteachers, but pupils as well. Headteachers as supervisors may learn strategies from teachers during their classroom observations, and transfer such learned activity to other teachers to try them out in their classrooms.

Instructional supervisor should set targets on both academic performance and syllabus coverage. An instructional supervision for effectiveness should develop or set target and communicate the same clearly to the stakeholders.
Understanding the purpose and goals of the school by stakeholders contribute to a healthy organized culture (Glickman, 1990). The researcher did not, however, understand the extent to which headteachers (school-site supervisors) in primary schools were implementing Ministry of Education (MOE) policies on instructional supervision. It was also not clear about teachers’ and headteachers’ understandings and perceptions about supervision of instruction in those schools. No previous study has been done in Loitokitok Sub-County about supervision. It was through this that the researcher sought to investigate the influence headteachers’ instructional supervision practices on the pupil’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitokitok Sub-County.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Although the Ministry of Education (MOE) is focused on improving the supervision of instruction in schools, much still needs to be done (Oduro, 2008; Opare, 1999) suggest that poor pupil performance in public schools, in part, is the result of ineffective supervision of teachers. Yet, there is no empirical evidence about the nature or quality of supervision of instruction in most public primary schools.

Performance in national examinations in Primary schools in Loitokitok Sub-County was poor. The expected maximum mean score was 262.55. The performance of the Sub-County in national examinations between the years
2009 - 2012 was examined. Table 1.1 gave a comparison of results of Loitokitok Sub-County with other Sub-Countys in the County.

**Table 1.1: Kajiado County Kenya Certificate of Primary Education mean score for the last 4 years.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-County</th>
<th>Mean score for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashuuru</td>
<td>239.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isinya</td>
<td>247.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajiado Central</td>
<td>247.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajiado North</td>
<td>250.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loitokitok</td>
<td>239.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Loitokitok Education Office analysis, 2012*

The descriptive statistics in table 1:1 indicated that poor performance in Loitokitok Sub-County had persisted despite the fact that the schools in the Sub-County were assumed to be having: adequate and well-trained teachers, fairly well qualified pupils from primary schools, as well as trained and qualified headteachers.

Table 1:1 showed that Loitokitok Sub-County had the lowest mean score in the years 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012. Undoubtedly, the reasons for poor performance in the Sub-County cannot be easily discerned without focused
investigation. Surveys on examination performance have shown that a majority of schools which display good results each year have adequate facilities and good human resources. Certainly, the same cannot be said of Loitokitok Sub-County. This was because the Sub-County had consistently posted poor examination results in the previous years. It was through this that the researcher sought to undertake the study.

1.3. Purpose of the study

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of head-teachers’ instructional supervision practices on the performance of pupils’ in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitokitok Sub-County.

1.4. Objectives of the study

The specific objectives of the study were:

i. To determine the extent to which primary school headteachers’ frequency of checking teachers’ professional records influences the academic performance of pupils in Loitokitok Sub-County.

ii. To establish the influence of holding model teaching session for teachers by primary school headteachers’ on performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitokitok Sub-County.

iii. To establish whether headteachers’ undertaking of classrooms observation influence pupils’ performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitokitok Sub-County.
iv. To determine whether target setting influence pupils’ performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitoktok Sub-County.

1.5. Research question for the study

The following were the research question for the study:

i. To what extent does the headteachers’ frequency of the checking teachers’ professional records influence performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education?

ii. To what extent does headteachers’ holding model teaching session for teaching influence pupil’s performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education?

iii. To what extent does headteachers’ classroom observation influence pupil’s performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education?

iv. To what extent does primary school headteachers’ setting of target influence pupil’s performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education?

1.6. Significance of the study

The finding of this study are important in that it had the potential to: Help headteachers to be formulate schools supervisory strategies. Secondly, help management trainers such as the Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) formulate teachers’ education management programme, including in-service and salient training needs for headteachers thus improving teaching and learning, hence improving pupil’s performance. Thirdly, it would assist the
Directorate of Quality Assurance improve instructional supervision in primary school. Besides, the findings would enlighten school headteachers in order to address the problem of how to improve students’ achievement in national examinations.

1.7. Limitation of the study

The study was influenced by the following limitations which were beyond the control of the researcher. Since performance was assumed measure of instructional supervision, the researcher was not in a position to control other variables that had influence. Difficulties in controlling the attitude of respondent as they gave their responses affected the validity the responses.

1.8. Delimitation of the study

This study was restricted to the public primary schools in Loitokitok Sub-County. The data from the study was collected from headteachers and teachers of selected schools only.

The study was delimitated to public primary schools in Loitokitok Sub-County. The research only involved headteachers and teachers to provide information on headteachers’ instructional supervisory practices. The students’ performance was based on KCPE results only.
1.9. Assumption of the study

The study was based on the following assumptions:

i. The respondents would cooperate and give honest and non-influential answers.

ii. Questionnaires would form adequate instruments for collecting the information required for the study.

1.10. Definition of significant terms

**Frequency** refers to regularity of the supervision activity carried out by the headteachers in schools.

**Instructional supervision** refers to as an ongoing periodical formative practice carried out solely inside the classroom with intent to improve teacher’s instructional practices and student performance during normal classroom teaching.

**Management** refers to the process of ensuring proper utilization of resources by the headteachers in schools in order to ensure effective instructional supervision.

**Model teaching sessions** refers to welcoming teachers in class to observe the headteacher as he/she conducts lessons.

**Supervisory skills** refer to communication, conceptual, technical, and human relations skills required for effective supervision of school and classroom instruction.
Supervisor refers to any person such as headteacher, deputy headteacher, experienced teacher, inspector of schools or any other qualified person entrusted with direct supervisory responsibilities to oversee subordinates and help them improve school and classroom instruction.

Supervision practices refer to activities such as class visits, classroom observation, post-observation conference, checking professional records by principal in secondary school.

1.11. Organization of the study

The study was organized in five chapters. The first chapter consisted of the introduction, the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, delimitation of the study, assumption of the study, definition and significant terms and the organization of the study. Chapter two comprised of the literature review and focus on the meaning and purpose of supervision, instructional supervision practices influencing academic performance, frequency of checking teacher’s records of work, checking pupil’s record, holding model teaching sessions, early syllabus coverage, classroom supervision, large setting summary of literature review and conceptual framework work. Chapter three focused on research methodology, that is the research design, target population, sample and sampling procedures, research instruments, validity of instruments, data collection procedure and data analysis techniques. Chapter four focused on the data analysis, presentation of
findings and discussion of the study as regards influence headteachers’ instructional supervision practices. Chapter five dealt with conclusion and recommendations and other research findings which require further investigations.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter presents a synthesis of literature related to the study. The study reviews what other researchers have done, and authors related to the planned study. The meaning and purpose of supervision, instructional supervision practices influencing performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education, frequency of checking teacher’s records of work, checking pupil’s record, holding model teaching sessions, classroom supervision, large setting summary of literature review and conceptual frame work.

2.2. Meaning and purpose of instructional supervision

There are various definitions of supervision as stated by different authors. Though, almost all of them centre on a common aim or objective. The main objective of supervision was to improve teachers’ instructional practices, which could in turn improve student learning. Researchers have offered several purposes of supervision of instruction, but the ultimate goal is to improve instruction and pupils learning supervision was historically viewed as an instrument for controlling teachers. Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) refer to the dictionary definition as to “watch over”, “direct”, “oversee”, and “superintend”. They believe that because the historic role of supervision has been inspection and control, it is not surprising most teachers do not equate supervision with collegiality. Hoy and Forsyth (1986), for their part, noted that
supervision has its roots in the industrial literature of bureaucracy, and the main purpose was to increase production. To them, the industrial notion of supervision was overseeing, directing and controlling workers, and was, therefore, management's tool to manipulate subordinates.

Some researchers such as Glanz (1996), and Bays, (2001) argue that defining supervision has been a recurrent and controversial issue in the field of education. Bays for instance observe that current thoughts in the definition of supervision of instruction do not represent full consensus, but has listed some common themes across different definitions. These include supporting teaching and learning; responding to changing external realities; providing assistance and feedback to teachers; recognizing teaching as the primary vehicle for facilitating school learning; and promoting new, improved and innovative practices. Harris, however, noted that questions of roles, relationships, positions, and even skills and functions remain without full consensus.

Similarly, supervision of instruction is seen as a set of activities designed to improve the teaching and learning process. Gray (1984) notes that supervision is a very important instrument which helps to ensure that facilities are effectively used to enhance teaching and learning. He observed that supervision in schools, as existed in the 1990s was not operating as effective as it should be. The reasons he gave were lack of adequate training, lack of dedication, job
satisfaction for teachers, poor standard of education, and commitment to duty on the part of teachers and administrators.

Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (1998) also define supervision as the school function that improves instruction through direct assistance to teachers, group development, professional development, curriculum development and action research. Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (1997) posit that the long-term goal of developmental supervision is teacher development towards a point at which teachers, facilitated by supervisors, can assume full responsibility for instructional development. The definition provided by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) is similar to that of Glickman et al. above, but the latter emphasize respect, caring and support for teachers. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) note that supervisors and teachers working together can make the learning environment more user friendly, caring and respect for students, and supportive of a community of leaders. They argue that this remains a primary intellectual and moral challenge of supervisory leadership.

According to Okumbe (1999) supervision is an administrative strategy aimed at stimulating teachers towards greater pedagogic effectiveness and productivity. The stimulation function of supervision enhances teachers to play important roles aimed at excellence in examinations, which increases the academic performance of pupils in primary schools. Although the duties and responsibilities of the headteacher are enormous, all are geared towards the attainment of the preset broad aims and specific objectives of the educational
system. The school as an organization cannot escape its responsibility to the community in which it is set. The responsibilities range from effective use of human resources, to continued customer satisfaction and value for their money. Instructional supervision aids headteachers in coordinating, improving and maintaining high teaching and learning standards in schools.

Olembo, Wanga and Karagu (1992), defined supervision as that dimension or phase of educational administration which is concerned with improving effectiveness. Supervision in education is regarded as a service to teachers and learners both as individuals and in groups. It is regarded as a means of offering specialized help in improving instruction.

Ogunsanju (1983), asserts that the ultimate aim of supervision is improvement of instruction for providing better education. Supervision is a way of stimulating, improving, refreshing, encouraging and overseeing certain groups with the aim of seeking their cooperation. Such practices seek to assist supervisors in becoming effective in performing their tasks. Supervision is essentially the practice of monitoring the performance of the school staff, school supervision is then a vital process and combination of activities which is concerned with the teaching and improvement of the teaching in the school Kimeu (2010).

The researcher did not however agree to the various studies carried out by the different authors as mentioned above. The researcher’s view was that
supervision is concerned with both teachers and pupils learning activities that would help maintain and improve effectiveness in the classroom. It was from the above case studies that the researchers sought to investigate the whether the headteachers’ instructional supervision practices had influence on pupil’s performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Examination in Loitokitok Sub-County.

2.3. Checking teacher’s professional records in relation to pupils’ academic achievement

School administration is a way of working with people in an educational institution in order to achieve the stated institutional goals. A headteacher has a task of ensuring that the staff, pupils and community are satisfied with the functions of the school. Sergiovannis (1987) presents a reflective model of supervision in which he proposes that since teachers vary in their motives and learning styles, supervision should be responsible to these differences. Supervisors ought to be goal oriented so that they can help in directing the efforts of the teachers towards the right direction.

Eshiwani (1983) in his research findings in Vihiga Sub-County to investigate factors influencing performance among primary and secondary schools in western province showed that, schools that had shown signs of good performance had sound and efficient leadership who were involved in organizing the learning process and ensuring that teachers’ professional records
are up to date for their schools. Therefore, according to Eshiwani (1983) schools where the headteachers checked lesson notes, schemes of work and registers of class attendance for their teachers performed well than schools where this is not done.

Daresh & Playko (1992), found out that through supervision in areas of checking teachers’ records, a positive, impact was realized in students’ academic performance. This concurs with a study by Gachoya (2008), revealed that 70% of instructional supervisors in Nyeri Sub-County assessed and advised teachers on proper preparations and keeping of professional records and this translated to good performance in the Sub-County.

According to Wangui (2007), effective head teachers are perceived as those who are involved in proper tuition and revision. Supervision of teachers and students work, proper testing policy, syllabus coverage, teacher induction and team building enhances pupils’ performance. Musungu and Nasongo (2008) carried out a study in Vihiga Sub-County in western Kenya investigating instructional role of head teachers in academic achievement in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education. They found out that eight percent of the principals in high performing schools checked lesson plans, scheme of work, class registers and school attendance.

Despite, all these studies and others have carried out by different researchers, this has not brought any effect on the performance of pupils in national
examination in Kenya and more especially in Loitoktok Sub-County. It was through this that, the researcher sought to investigate whether checking teacher’s professional records has a positive impact on the performance of pupils in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitokitok Sub-County.

2.4. Model teaching session in relation to pupils’ performance

Model teaching lesson demonstrations can improve teachers’ instructional supervision practices (Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006). Supervisors (headteachers) use demonstration lessons to assist teachers individually and in groups. This practice is not only used to guide new and inexperienced headteachers, but pupils as well. Headteachers as supervisors may learn strategies from teachers during their classroom observations, and transfer such learned activity to other teachers to try them out in their classrooms.

Research studies have shown that supervisors use lesson demonstrations to help teachers to improve their instructional practices. US pre-school teachers in Rous’ (2004) study reported that their instructional supervisors modelled appropriate techniques, and admitted that such practices were a good source of assistance in dealing with children with special needs.

Planning of in-service commonly referred to staff development within all instructional leadership. Thus it is the key role of the head teachers to influence his/her teachers through model teaching. In-service can either take place as part
time study or full time during the continuous professional life of the teacher. Professional development has been used as a means of improving the 8-4-4 system of education (MOE 1984). Therefore head teachers should be role models to their teaching staff by allowing teachers to attend their teaching process which improve their teaching methods (MoEST, 2008).

The views of all this various researchers have done little to influence the overall academic performance of pupils in Loitokitok. The researcher therefore, sought to investigate whether model teaching session had an effect on the academic performance in Loitokitok Sub-County.

2.5. Classroom observation and its influence on pupils’ academic performance

Instructional supervision should allow teachers to make their own judgment and reach their own conclusion through a descriptive type of observation than through an interruptive one. Lesson observation is an important aspect of instructional supervision since it provides an opportunity for supervisors to assess the instructional strategies of teachers and to better provide the necessary assistance and support which can ultimately improve student outcomes (Acheson & Gall, 1980; Blasé & Blasé, 2004; Cogan, 1973; Glickman, 1990; Goldhammer, 1969).

According to Sullivan & Glanz, (2000), the most recent concept of instructional supervision which draws its data from first hand observation of the actual teaching events and involves face to face hand interactions between
the supervisors (headteachers) and the teacher the analysis of teaching behaviours and activities which are undertaken to help teachers maintain and improve their effectiveness in classroom, characterize instructional supervision. Miller and Miller (1987) also have similar view on supervision practices which aims at improving academic performance.

Glickman (1990) in his model of clinical supervisor presented a cyclical sequence of events which should ideally be implemented at least twice a year. The sequence included teacher pre conferencing to determine the method and duration of the observation. The pre-conferencing is followed by a classroom observation which involves making use of physical indicators, visual indicators and interpersonal or directive analysis. The last stage is clinical supervision which is post conferencing is aimed at discussing results and remedial action and critique by both the supervisor and supervisee.

In a study carried out by Ngunjiri (2012), attributes poor performance of students in public schools to ‘arm chair’ head teachers who do not know what goes on in the classroom. He asserts that ineffective instructional supervision leads to delinquent behavior among some students and their subsequent failure in national examinations. Griffins (1994) concurs with this statement in his argument that head teachers need to observe their teachers formally on a regular basis, and work with a clear commitment to discussing their observations with a teacher promptly in order to provide for in-school professional development. He adds that there is need to monitor the standards
being achieved by students, develop and implement strategies for the systematic monitoring of the work of their schools in order to evaluate standards of achievement, curriculum strengths and weaknesses and the quality of teaching and learning.

Gathoya (2008), observes that through classroom visits, the supervisor can have an insight into quality benchmarks and performance. According to Fischer (2011), supervision of instructions by classroom visits may include: walk through mechanism where the head teacher walks into a class and sees how instruction is going on. It provides a quick look at teacher performance and environmental factors in the classroom, an informal visit is announced visit lasting ten or more minutes during which the teacher’s practices are observed and documented, a formal observation is an announced visit lasting an agreed amount of time. According to Afolabi & Loto (2008), during such an observation, the head teacher records what the teacher and the pupils say. The formal observation has a pre and post conference session where the supervisor and the teacher hold a discussion on the lesson.

Every administration needs an in-built supervisory system to provide the cohesion and direction necessary to improving pupils’ academic performance in national examinations. All this had not applied in most of the primary schools in Loitoktok Sub-County and hence poor performance had tremendously been experienced over the past years. The researcher therefore
sought to investigate whether target setting would improve the academic performance of pupils in the Kenya certificate of Primary Education in the Sub-County.

2.6. Target setting in relation to pupils' academic performance.

Developing a school vision is an essential foundation from what the instructional activities of the school evolve Sergiovanni (1991). Robinson, Hohepa and Lloyd (2009) identified the following concepts in school leadership as important: leaders establishing goals and expectations with a clear emphasis on academic learning goals; goals that are embedded in school routines and leaders ensuring staff systematically monitor student progress. Goal setting affects student outcomes because, when the principal and/or the leadership of a school articulate the vision and goals of the school and share this with the staff and the students, a unity of purpose is developed at the school (Sammons et al., 1995).

This unity of purpose, particularly when combined with a positive attitude to learning directed towards students, is a powerful mechanism for raising student achievement because teachers in schools can work collaboratively towards that explicit common goal. Njuguna (2004) defined aptitude as the degree of readiness to learn and to perform well in particular situation or in a fixed domain. He explains that three faces of the mind play a role in aptitudes, cognitive, effective and conation which refers to goal setting and will. Individual students assemble their motivational resources which energize their
efforts to work and complete task. Therefore, the researcher sought to investigate whether target setting will improve the academic performance of pupils in the Kenya certificate of Primary Education in the Sub-County.

2.7. Summary of literature review

Previous studies have examined the perceptions of teachers, principals (headteachers), department heads and education officers about supervision practices. Whereas some of these studies examined the supervision beliefs of heads (Yimaz, Tadan & Ouz, 2009), others examined how supervisors provide supervision, how supervisors improve supervision and how supervisors promote teaching and learning (Bays, 2001; Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan, 2006; Pansiri, 2008; Tyagi, 2009). Some studies have also examined supervisor behaviour that influence practice (Rous, 2004) and working relationships between supervisors and teachers (Holland, 2004). Another study examined the influence of perceptions of participants about how they perceive instructional supervision in terms of strengths and weaknesses (Ayse Bas, 2002). My study, however, examined the influence of headteachers’ instructional supervision practices on pupils’ performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in Loitokitok Sub-County, Kenya.

2.8. Theoretical framework

The study was based on and guided by Symbolic Interactionism theory coined by Blumer (1969), as a relevant theory fitting to explain how and why teachers’
work performance can be influenced by headteachers’ instructional supervisory practices. Essentially, Blumer believed that symbolic interactionism was a method of constructing meaning from social interactions. Symbolic interactionism emphasizes interactions among people, the use of symbols in communication and interaction, and the reality of self as constructed by others through communication and interaction with one another.

Needless to say, supervision by nature is a process (Pierce and Rowell, 2005) and by so being, it involves social interaction of supervisor (headteacher) and the (supervisee) teacher throughout the process, which is from pre-conference observation, observation and post – conference observation. It is worth noting that Blumer’s (1969) structure of symbolic interactionism rests upon three premises:

i. People act toward things, including human beings, on the basis of the meanings they have for them.

ii. These meanings are derived through social interaction with others.

iii. These meanings are managed and transformed through an interpretive process, and finally the meanings prompt the person to action by making a change.

Participants in the study were expected to share their past supervisory experiences by means of which they attached value and meaning to supervision. As the headteachers and teachers expressed their experiences during supervision process or research study, they were in essence, engaging in
the process of communication, creating meanings, and being prompted to act (Blumer, 1969:5). Emphasizing the role of interaction, Hunsaker and Hunsaker (2009), asserted that communication, in other words interaction, was the process of sending a message to another person with the intent of evoking an outcome or a change in behaviour. To communicate is to influence the actions of people and to change their attitudes (Barasa, 2007). Since perspectives are the central concept of Symbolic Interactionism theory, primary school teachers’ perspectives of supervision was taken into account in the study.

2.9. Conceptual framework

The study conceptualized basing on the variables that was used in the study.

Figure 2.1 Headteacher’s instructional supervision practices and their influence on academic performance.
In this conceptual framework it was conceptualized that pupils’ academic achievement is influenced by a combination of various variables, namely: supervisional skills and participation in academic activities. The focus was on the headteachers’ instructional supervision practices which was the central independent variable determines KCPE performance as the overall outcome.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

The chapter highlighted the research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, instrument validity, instrument reliability, data collection, procedure and data analysis technique.

3.2. Research design

The study design used descriptive survey analysis. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1993) descriptive analysis is the method that involves asking a large group of people questions about a particular issue. Information is obtained from a sample rather than the entire population at one point in time which may range from one day to a few weeks. The study employed descriptive analysis to establish opinions and knowledge about the influence of headteacher’s instructional supervision practices or pupil’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitokitok Sub-County.

3.3. Target population

The study consisted of 118 public primary schools within Loitokitok Sub-County from the three zones that is: Kimana zone, Loitokitok zone, and Rombo zone. The target population of the study included a total of 118 headteachers and a total of 1600 teachers in public primary school from the three zones within Loitokitok Sub-County. The table 3.2 below shows the target population for the three zones in the Sub-County;
Table 3.2: Loitokitok Sub-County target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kimana</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loitokitok</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rombo</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>1600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Loitokitok Sub-County Education Office results 2012*

Kimana zone comprised of 42 headteachers and 550 teachers, Loitokitok zone 38 headteachers and 450 teachers while Rombo zone 38 headteachers and 600 teachers.

### 3.4. Sample size and sampling procedure

Orodro (2005) defines sample size as a small part of large population which is thought to be a representation of large population. Borg and Gall (1983) suggests that for description study and correlation studies, 30 percent of the cases are the maximum to work with. The researcher therefore, targeted 30 (25 percent) headteachers and 320 (20 percent) teachers since the larger the sample the higher the reliability.
Table 3.3: Loitokitok Sub-County sample population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimana</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rombo</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Loitokitok Sub-County Education office results 2014*

To sample the research subjects to participate in the study, the researcher applied a purposive sampling technique alongside simple random sampling technique. The rationale behind this choice of sampling approaches was that purposive sampling technique was used to select one headteacher and 11 teachers in each of the sampled schools while Simple random sampling technique was used to select a sample of 30 schools.

### 3.5. Research instruments

This study used questionnaires as the main data gathering instruments. According to Kombo and Tromp (2006), a questionnaire is a research instrument that can gather data over a large sample. The rationale for using questionnaires was: the person to administer the questionnaire had an opportunity to build rapport, explain the purpose of the study and explain the
meaning of items that was not being clear. It was also allow for anonymity of respondents and uniformity of questions which will allow comparison.

The researcher used both closed and open ended questions in order to get in depth responses. Two questionnaire sets were developed, one for the teachers and another one for the headteachers. Both sets were divided into two sections. The first section (section A) of each questionnaire was used to collect personal information of respondents, while section B had questions related to instructional supervision based on the research questions.

3.6. Instrument validity

According to Orodho (2004) validity is concerned with establishing whether the right questionnaire content measures what was intended to measure. The content validation was found appropriate in determining the extent to which the set of items provided relevant and representative sample of the domain of tasks under consideration. The researcher ensured that data collected using various instruments represents the content area under study. This included identifying the relevant items for each of the instruments which was used in the study.

Orodho (2004) further observes that to remove possible errors, every instrument was tested before it is formally administered. To ensure reliability of the questionnaires the researcher conducted a pilot study in two primary schools in Loitokitok Sub-County before the actual study. The two schools were not included in the main study. The main purpose of the pilot study was to check on suitability and the clarity of the questions on the designed
instruments, relevance of the information being sought, the language used and the content validity of the instruments from the responses given.

3.7. **Instrument reliability**

According to Orodho (2004), reliability in research concerns the degree to which a particular measuring procedure gives similar results over a number of repeated trials. In order to test the reliability of the instruments the researcher used the test-retest method. This was done by administering the same instruments twice to the same group of subjects not in the sample schools, and by waiting for a period of two weeks before administering the research instruments for the second time. Then the correlation coefficient of the scores from both tests was calculated using a Pearson's product moment formula in order to establish the extent to which the contents of the questionnaire consistently elicited the same responses every time the instrument was administered.

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

Where; \( x \) = First test \( y_1 \) = Second test

\( XY \) = Sum of the gross product of the values of each variable.

A correlation coefficient, which may range from -1.00 to +1.00, shows the size and direction of a relationship between two sets of scores. A coefficient of 0.7 was considered adequate (Best & Kahn, 2006).
3.8. Data collection procedures

The researcher sought a permit from the National Council for Science and Technology and thereafter paid a courtesy call to the Sub – county Commissioner and DEO of Loitokitok Sub-County. The researcher then booked appointments with headteachers of the sampled schools. The selected school was visited and the questionnaires administered to the respondents as the researcher waited. The respondents were assured that strict confidentiality was maintained in dealing with their identities. The completed questionnaires were collected the same day they were administered.

3.9. Data analysis techniques

Data were edited in the completed research instruments, to identify and minimize errors. Coding was done by assigning numerals so that responses can be put into limited number of categories. The study generated both qualitative and quantitative data. The quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics formulae provided by the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. The analyzed results were tabulated appropriately using graphs, charts, frequency distribution and simple percentages to illustrate the responses to the questionnaires. Responses to open ended questions were recorded to determine the frequencies of each response. Qualitative data were analyzed using descriptive narratives.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This Chapter presents the findings from the study and explains the findings of the study as regards influence of headteachers’ instructional supervision practices on academic performance pupils in primary schools in Loitokitok Sub-County, Kajiado County. The first part of the chapter presents findings from the questionnaire. It begins with the demographic data for the respondents while the other sections are based on the research objectives of the study. Data analysis, presentation of study findings and discussion were guided by the following research objectives:-

i. To determine the extent to which primary school headteachers’ frequency of checking teachers’ professional records influence the academic performance of pupils in Loitoktok Sub-County.

ii. To establish the influence of holding model teaching session for teachers by primary school headteachers’ on performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitoktok Sub-County.

iii. To establish whether headteachers’ undertaking of classrooms observation influence pupils’ performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitoktok Sub-County.
iv. To determine whether target setting influence pupils’ performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitoktok Sub-County.

4.2 Response rate

The study sampled 30 headteacher and 320 teachers, hence 350 questionnaires were administered. After data collection 30 questionnaires from the headteachers were returned (100% return rate) and 318 teachers’ questionnaires were returned representing 99.4 percent. This was therefore 99.4 percent response rate which was deemed satisfactory for the purposes of the study.

4.3 Demographic data

The respondents’ demographic data based on selected variables which included sex, age, highest academic qualification and number years of experience in current position as teacher or headteacher respondents’ were sought to identify their characteristics. The respondents’ sex was presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Respondents’ gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Headteacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the study findings, majority of the teacher and headteachers (83.3% and 75.5%) were female and male respectively. This was an indication that though school headship was male dominated, there were more female teachers in schools. The respondents were also to indicate their age bracket and the findings presented in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2 Respondents age bracket**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that more than half of the headteachers were aged over forty one years while majority of the teachers were between thirty one to forty years old. These findings imply that teacher’s age has an influence to leadership position. The researcher sought to find out the respondents academic qualification and presented the respondents’ responses in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3 Respondents academic qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings majority of headteachers and teachers indicated that Degree and certificate were their highest levels of academic qualification respectively. This was an indication that they were trained to carry out their instructional role that is translated in learners’ academic performance.
Table 4.4 Respondents’ years of service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of years</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings majority (60%) of the headteachers indicated that they had been in the teaching profession for more than 10 years while majority (63.5%) of the teachers had taught for less than 5 years. This was an indication that more headteachers had been in the teaching profession for a very long time as compared to many teacher.

4.4. Influence of headteachers’ frequency of checking teachers’ professional records

First the research instruments used with teachers sought for information on how often headteachers check teachers’ professional records including the schemes of work, lesson plans, records of work covered, and class registers. To establish whether this practice influence academic performance the researcher sought to find out how often these documents are checked.
4.4.1. Frequency of checking the schemes of work by headteachers.

Checking of schemes of work would help the head teacher check of teachers’ preparedness for any instructional process. Table 4.5 shows the frequency of headteachers carrying out this instructional supervision practice.

Table 4.5 Responses on the frequency of checking schemes of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a term</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 shows that there was a statistically significant influence of the headteachers’ frequency of checking of teachers’ schemes of work at 80% to the academic performance. A further 94% from teachers’ responses indicated a significant influence of checking professional records on pupils’ performance. This was probably because schemes of work are normally submitted at the beginning of the term and editions could be under very few circumstances within the term. The study finding affirms Eshiwani (1983) argument that
schools where the headteachers checked lesson notes, schemes of work and registers of class attendance for their teachers performed well than schools where this is not done.

The figure 4.1. below shows the relationship between headteachers’ and teachers responses on frequency of checking schemes of work to the pupils’ academic performance.

**Figure 4.1 Responses on frequency of checking schemes of work.**

From fig 4.1 majority of the headteachers check schemes of work once per term. This was an indication that they do not carry out the instructional process regularly enough to ensure that they are at close observation of the teachers’ preparedness for any instructional process.
4.4.2. Frequency of checking the Lesson notes and plans

Checking of lesson notes and plan would help the head teacher check of teachers’ work coverage and content delivery for any instructional process. Table 4.6 shows the frequency of headteachers carrying out this instructional supervision practice.

Table 4.6 Responses on the frequency of the checking of lesson notes and plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a term</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown from Table 4.6, varied practices across the Sub-County were observed with zero percent of headteachers inquiring into the document weekly, 10 percent at once a month and 80 percent requiring it once a term. These finding were confirmed by teachers where they submitted the documents at varied intervals with 9 percent of them submitting once a month, and 91 percent once a term. Better delivery of the teaching is attributed to teachers’
preparation prior to teaching in a classroom. These findings agree with Sergiovanns (1987) who presents a reflective model of supervision in which he proposes that since teachers vary in their motives and learning styles, supervision should be responsible to these differences. Supervisors ought to be goal oriented so that they can help in directing the efforts of the teachers towards the right direction.

The figure 4.2 below shows the relationship between headteachers’ and teachers responses on frequency of checking lesson plans and lesson notes to the pupils’ academic performance.

**Figure 4.2 Responses on the frequency of checking lesson notes and notes**
The responses of the teacher and headteachers were a confirmation of the reluctance in the frequency of checking teachers professional record thus headteacher are not able to closely find out the extensiveness of a teachers content delivery on syllabus coverage.

4.4.3. Frequency of checking of records of work covered

Table 4.7. Responses on the supervision of records of work covered were as shown below;

Table 4.7 Headteachers’ frequency of checking of records of work covered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a term</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results on the table above 20 percent of the headteachers required the document once a month with another 60 percent checking on it once a term while 20 percent never checked teachers’ documents. This was evidenced by 25 percent of teachers agreeing that headteachers check their documents once a month, 69 percent once a term and of 6 percent never inquired into the document. Records of work are critical to evaluation of teachers’ work in
respective classes, but headteachers seem to have ignored this fact for varied reasons; possibly heavy workload on the part of the headteachers.

The figure 4.3. below shows the relationship between headteachers’ and teachers responses on frequency of checking records of work covered to the pupils’ academic performance.

**Figure 4.3 Responses on the frequency of checking records of work covered**

![Bar chart showing responses on the supervision of records of work](chart.png)

From the study finding there is only a slight difference in the response of the teachers and headteacher. This was an indication that information gotten from the respondents was reliable. It was also clear that instructional supervision practices of headteachers has created strong relationship between the headteachers and their teaching staff, which is then translated in the schools’
performance. These findings agree with Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993) who note that supervisors and teachers working together can make the learning environment more user friendly, caring and respect for students, and supportive of a community of leaders therefore, this remains a primary intellectual and moral challenge of supervisory leadership.

4.5. Influence of headteachers’ classroom visits on pupils’ academic performance.

The headteachers and teachers were asked to state how classroom visits influence pupils’ academic performance. The following were the responses given in favour of the above objective in the table below:

Table 4.8 Responses of headteachers and teachers on classroom visitation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis indicated that majority (90%), visited classrooms meaning there is a significant influence of the headteachers’ visitation to class whether there is a teacher undertaking instruction or pupils were studying on their own. This is
further confirmed by 97% of the teachers’ responses that indicated that headteachers visited classrooms to a great extent, 50% visited to some extent and 33% rarely visit. Gachoya (2008) observed that, the supervisors who made classroom visits were able to have an insight into the actual instructional process and provide quality benchmarks for good performance and that if the headteachers does not visit classrooms to find out about learning process cannot know the classroom needs and this will affect academic performance adversely.

**Figure 4.4 Responses of headteachers and teachers on classroom visitation.**

This instructional practice seemed to attract embracement from majority of the headteachers since it was occasionally performed in majority of the schools.
This was an implication that headteachers frequent classrooms to observe the teaching/learning process thus were able to monitor and mentor the learning outcomes in their schools. This was in line with Glickman (1990) in his model of clinical supervisor presented a cyclical sequence of events which should ideally be implemented at least twice a year. The sequence included teacher pre-conferencing to determine the method and duration of the observation. The pre-conferencing is followed by a classroom observation which involves making use of physical indicators, visual indicators and interpersonal or directive analysis. The last stage is clinical supervision which is post-conferencing is aimed at discussing results and remedial action and critique by both the supervisor and supervisee.

4.6. Headteachers’ classroom observation and pupils’ academic performance

Lesson observation is an important aspect of instructional supervision since it provides an opportunity for supervisors to assess the instructional strategies of teachers and to better provide the necessary assistance and support which can ultimately improve student outcomes (Acheson & Gall, 1980). Regarding the classroom observation and its influence on pupils’ academic performance, the following responses were given by both the headteachers and teachers in the table below:
### Table 4.8 Responses of headteachers and teachers on classroom observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a week</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrice a week</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is statistically significant influence of observing teachers by headteachers as they carry out instruction at 100%. A further 44% by teachers indicate that headteachers’ frequency of observing teachers significantly influenced pupils’ academic performance. This finding supports the observation by Kitavi (2005), that the instructional supervisor can only assess teacher’s potential for excellence through watching the teacher present a lesson which he/she has prepared. It also supports Afolabi and Loto (2008), that during the classroom observation, the principal records what the teacher and students say and therefore mitigate the challenges that are likely to affect performance, in good time. The finding also reveals that more than 0% headteachers never carry out observation of teachers’ instructional process.
which was contrary to what the teachers presented that is 56% in favour of headteachers not providing the activity.

Figure 4.5 Responses of headteachers and teachers on classroom observation

4.7. Frequency of holding model teaching session for teachers by head teachers’ on pupils’ academic performance.

Model teaching lesson demonstrations can improve teachers’ instructional supervision practices (Blasé & Blasé, 2004). The headteachers and teachers were asked to tell the number of times holding model sessions were held. Responses in favour of the above were outlined in the table below:
Table 4.10 Responses of headteachers and teachers on holding model sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The headteachers asked to indicate how often they experienced the provision of professional literature to teachers, half of the respondents said they always or sometimes observed this in their schools as seen in Table 4.6. A majority of participants (teachers) (69%) responded that their headteachers never provided them with model teaching sessions. This was in contrary to what the headteachers gave out 50% in favour of holding model sessions in their schools. These findings concur with Glanz, Shulman & Sullivan (2006) who argued that supervisors (headteachers) should use demonstration lessons to assist teachers individually and in groups. They found out that this practice is not only used to guide new and inexperienced headteachers. Regarding how often they hold model sessions almost nil results were obtained as the both the headteachers and teachers provided the same response.
Figure 4.6 Responses of the headteachers and teachers on the frequency of holding model sessions

4.8 Influence of headteachers’ setting targets on pupils’ performance

Goal setting affects student outcomes because, when the principal and/or the leadership of a school articulate the vision and goals of the school and share this with the staff and the students, a unity of purpose is developed at the school (Sammons, Hillman and Mortimore, 1995). To establish whether headteachers set targets in their school and presented the respondent responses.
Figure 4.6 Responses on head teachers setting targets

The study findings shows that majority of the respondents indicated that targets are set termly in their schools. This was to imply that targets are set for the end of term examination. Further the researcher sought to find out whether the extent to which setting targets influence academic performance. The findings were presented in Table 4.11.
Table 4.11 Responses on the extent setting targets influence academic performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high extent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High extent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study findings revealed that setting targets influence academic performance at a very high extent. These findings are an indication that setting target was directly linked to pupils performance thus they work hand so as to attain the target set. These findings concur with Robinson, Hohepa and Lloyd (2009) who identified school leadership as important in that leaders establishing goals and expectations with a clear emphasis on academic learning goals; goals that are embedded in school routines and leaders ensuring staff systematically monitor student progress.
4.9 Relationship between head teachers’ instructional supervisory practices and pupils’ performance

The study hypothesized that there is a direct relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables. The relationship was cross tabulated in Table 4.12.

**Table 4.12 Cross tabulation of headteachers’ instructional supervisory practices* pupils performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Pupils’ performance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 250 mean score</td>
<td>250 – 300 mean score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional supervisory practices</td>
<td>Checking teachers’ professional records</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holding model teaching sessions</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom observation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting class target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9 revealed that head teacher’s instructional supervisory practices are a determinant factor on pupils’ performance. Moreover, from the study findings only 19.4 percent of the checking teachers professional records, 18.4 holding model teaching, 29.3 percent classroom observation overall 32.5 percent of the target setting impact on pupil’s performance. This was an indication that headteachers in primary schools are reluctant in carrying out their instruction supervisory practices which can be translated in the dismal performance in their schools KCPE performance.

Target setting was the instructional supervision practice than scored highest in the cross tabulation of the practices against KCPE mean scores for the year 2013 in the sampled schools. This was to imply that majority of the primary school head teachers apply this instructional supervision process which was deemed to be effective thus the high scores. However more headteachers undertake classroom observation than checking teachers records of work and model teaching. The cross tabulation shows that majority of the teachers who indicated their headteachers scored a mean score of over 350 while those who did not carry out the practice scored lower thus showing the direct relationship between the supervisory practice and pupils performance. Frequency of checking teachers’ professional records was noted to be done regularly by schools that registered higher mean scores in their KCPE performance. This
was a indication that those headteachers that check their teachers’ professional records were able to monitor closely the instructional process thus improving on the academic performance. Majority of the respondents were differed with the carrying out of this instructional supervision practice. Thus it scored lowest in the cross tabulation with academic performance, though the few who indicated they carried out the practice even as frequently as rarely showed that the practice has an impact on pupils performance. These findings are in line with Sergiovanns (1987) who states that since teachers vary in their motives and learning styles, supervision should be responsible to these differences reflective model of supervision is an effective way of improving teachers’ teaching practice and not commonly used. Supervisors ought to be goal oriented so that they can help in directing the efforts of the teachers towards the right direction.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction

This chapter deals with a summary of the findings, conclusion and recommendations drawn from the findings in connection with research objectives. The purpose of the study was to examine the influence of headteachers’ instructional supervision practices on pupils’ performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitoktok Sub-County, Kenya.

5.2 Summary of the research findings

The study was to investigate the influence of headteachers’ instructional supervision practices on the performance of pupils’ in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitokitok Sub-County. The study was guided by the following specific objectives: to determine the extent to which headteachers’ frequency of checking teachers’ professional records; holding model teaching session for; undertaking of classrooms observation; and target setting influence pupils’ performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Loitoktok Sub-County. This study is hoped to provide information that may help management trainers such as the Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) formulate teachers’ education management programme that will be translated in improved pupil’s performance. The study was based on and guided by Symbolic Interactionism theory coined by Blumer (1969). The target population of the study included a total of 118 headteachers and a total of 1600
teachers in public primary school from the three zones within Loitokitok Sub-County. Simple random sampling technique was used to select a sample of 10 schools. Purposive sampling technique was then used to select one headteacher and eleven teachers in each of the sampled schools. A sample size of 30 headteachers and 320 teachers was used. Questionnaires tools were used as the main data gathering instruments. Collected data was analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Classroom visitation, teacher observation, model teaching sessions and checking of teachers’ records significantly influence academic achievement. Four research objectives were formulated to guide the study. The study used descriptive survey design. Respondents included headteachers and teachers. All the 30 headteachers from the 30 public primary schools that had presented candidates for national examination since 2009 up to 2012 and a sample of 320 teachers, 3 from each school participated in the study hence 350 questionnaires were administered and all were collected back. Quantitative data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to process frequencies, percentages, charts and tables.

The theoretical framework that guided the study was Symbolic Interactionism theory, which focuses on the way individuals interact with others and the meanings the individuals draw from these interactions (Blumer, 1969). Because the perspectives are the central concept of Symbolic
Interactionism theory, this was appropriate to gain insights about the meanings and value the participants assigned to their past supervisory experiences.

The first objective was sought to determine the extent to which checking of teachers professional records by headteachers’ influence pupils’ academic performance. There was statistically significant influence of the headteachers’ frequency of checking teachers’ professional records at 91 percent supporting the research finding by Sergiovanns (1987), and Eshiwani (1983) that instructional supervision strongly impacted on performance.

The second objective explored the influence of headteachers’ model teaching sessions on pupils’ academic performance. The percentages revealed that model sessions are necessary. This significantly supported Blasé & Blasé, (2004) research findings that model teaching lesson demonstrations can improve teachers’ instructional supervision practices.

The third objective of the study sought to determine the extent to which headteachers’ classroom visitation influenced pupils’ academic performance. The percentages analyzed established that headteachers’ class visitation significantly influenced pupils’ academic performance. This finding was in agreement with Gachoya (2008), who observed that supervisors (headteachers) who made these visits were able to have an insight into the actual learning atmosphere in the school, thus enhancing a good reading culture among pupils leading to better performance.
Findings on influence of teacher observation indicated that headteachers’ frequency of observing teachers significantly influenced KCPE performance. The finding is in line with Miller and Miller (1987) interactions between the supervisors (headteachers) and the teacher the analysis of teaching behaviours and activities which are undertaken to help teachers maintain and improve their effectiveness in classroom thus improving pupils’ academic performance.

The fourth objective of the study sought to find determine the extent to which target setting influence pupils’ academic performance. The findings have revealed that target setting is a powerful mechanism for raising student achievement because teachers in schools can work collaboratively towards that explicit common goal. This is in agreement with Hohepa and Lloyd (2009) that goal setting affects student outcomes.

5.3. Conclusions

From the percentages, tables and charts, the study concluded that the frequency of headteachers’ classroom visitation significantly influenced pupils’ performance in KCPE, concurring with Gachoya (2008) that when the headteacher makes classroom visits, he/she is able to have insights into the actual learning atmosphere hence influence performance.

In terms of conducting teaching observation, the study concluded that headteachers who consistently conduct lesson observation and held model teaching sessions with teachers, significantly influenced teacher performance
and hence students’ performance. Lastly, the study concluded that the headteachers’ frequency of checking teachers’ records of work gave the headteachers the opportunity to have a foresight of teachers’ delivery and pupils’ needs for early intervention through in-service or otherwise, thus it significantly influence KCPE performance in public primary schools. Target setting also emerged as one of the areas in which headteachers should focus as this had a positive correlation with the academic performance of the pupils in KCPE.

Based on the findings, several conclusions have been made: First the study revealed that internal supervision of curriculum was not effective since headteachers rarely checked the utilization of professional documents prepared by teachers. It was also noted that, though majority of teachers prepared professional documents, they rarely or never used them in teaching.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this research, the study recommends that:-

i. The Ministry of Education emphasizes on the regular monitoring of professional documents by the headteachers including schemes of work, lesson plans, lesson notes and class registers. It was observed that some of the headteachers were not sure of when to inquire of these documents. The study established a strong correlation between the supervision of professional records and target setting and performance. These documents
assist in monitoring the teachers’ progress thus helping in improving pupils’ academic performance.

ii. Headteachers should proceed with focused instructional supervision by conducting classroom visitation, observation and checking of teachers’ professional records in order to enhance pupils’ academic performance. This process should be well organized and planned to ensure it does not inflict fear or demoralize teachers in carrying out their duties of teaching.

5.5. Suggestions for further research

i. Based on the findings of this research, the study recommends that further research would be necessary to identify whether teachers’ attitude towards headteachers’ role in instructional supervision would be the reasons behind the increasing poor performance of schools in KCPE in the Loitokitok Sub-County since this study ruled out the headteacher supervisory practices as the possible course of the poor performance.

ii. More comprehensive studies should be undertaken to include a larger population in order to ascertain or not whether the problem transcends other Sub-Counties.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Letter of introduction

PETER SANKA

P.O. Box 32-00209

LOITOKITOK

Dear Sir/Madam,

**RE: PERMISSION TO VISIT YOUR SCHOOL FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES**

I am a Master Education (Educational Administration) student registered at University of Nairobi. A requirement of the course is the completion of a research project. I have decided to focus on the influence headteachers’ instructional supervision practices on the academic performance of learners in primary school in Loitoktok Sub-County of Kajiado County. I would like to bring the plight of headteachers in the management and provision of instructional supervision practices to the learning and teaching to improve learners’ academic performance in their schools.

In this regard, I request for your permission and support in carrying out this study in your school. The information given will be kept confidential and only used for the purposes of this study.

Thank you.

Peter Sanka
Appendix B: Headteachers’ questionnaire

The purpose of this study was to collect information on how teachers and headteachers in primary schools perceive supervision of instruction. Please feel free to indicate your opinion because no response will be treated as wrong.

Part I: Demographic information:

(Please tick (√) details the appropriate category for you).

1. Please indicate your gender  Male [ ]  Female [ ]

2. Please indicate the age bracket (in years) that applies to you by use of a tick ( √ ): Up to 29 years [ ] 30-39 years [ ] 40-49 years [ ]
   50-59 years [ ] 60+ years [ ]

3. What is your education qualification?  Certificate [ ]  Diploma [ ]
   Degree [ ]

4. How many years have you served in your current position? _________

Part II: Instructional supervision activities

(Please tick ( √ ) whichever matches your understanding).

5. How often do you check the records? Daily [ ]  Weekly [ ]
   Fortnightly [ ]  Monthly [ ]

6. How many times throughout the term are you evaluated or supervised by your teachers? Daily [ ]  Weekly [ ]  Fortnightly [ ]  Monthly [ ]

7. How often do you carry out supervision of instruction in your school?  Weekly [ ]  Once a month [ ]  Once a term [ ]  Never [ ]

8. Do you carry out model teaching session in your school? Yes [ ]  No[ ]
9. How often do your teachers present their professional records in time for supervision? Always [ ] Occasionally [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]

10. How often do you visit classrooms for observation? Daily [ ] Once a week[ ] Twice a week [ ] Once a month[ ] Sometimes [ ] Never [ ]

11. How many times do you check the professional records from your teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Once a term</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Lesson plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Scheme of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Record of work covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Registers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Do you require your teachers to set targets for their classes / pupils?

   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

13. How frequent do you carry out the following supervision activities?

   Using the likert scale: (1.) Always (2.) often (3.) sometimes (4.) rarely (5.) never
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom visits to observe teachers as they teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of frequent feedback to teachers after classroom observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers’ schemes of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers’ records of work covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving appropriate instructional guidance to teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving right solutions to common instructional problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. In your opinion what are the challenges faced by head teachers in carrying out inspective instructional supervision that affect performance in KCPE.

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

b) Suggest ways for overcoming the challenges in (a) above
................................................................................................................................................

Thank you for your cooperation and participation
Appendix C: Teachers’ questionnaire

The purpose of this study will be to collect information on how headteachers’ instructional supervision on the pupils’ performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Examination (KCPE) in primary schools in Loitoktok Sub-County. Please feel free to indicate your opinion because no response is treated as wrong.

Part 1: Background information:

(Please tick (✓): details the appropriate category for you).

1. Please indicate your gender       Male [ ]       Female [ ]

2. Please indicate the age bracket that applies to you by use of a tick (✓):
   Up to 29 years [ ] 30-39 years [ ] 40-49 years [ ] 50-59 years [ ]
   60+ years [ ]

3. What is your education qualification?     Certificate [ ] Diploma [ ]
   Degree [ ]

4. How many years have you served in your current position? __________

Part II: Instructional supervision practices

(Please tick whichever matches your understanding).

5. How many times throughout the term are you evaluated or supervised by your headteachers? Daily [ ] Weekly [ ] Fortnightly [ ] Monthly [ ]

6. How many times does your headteacher carry out model sessions in your school? Always [ ] Occasionally [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]
7. How many times throughout the year does your headteacher carry out observation of lessons while teaching? Once [ ] Twice [ ] Thrice [ ] None [ ]

8. Does your headteacher require you to set targets for pupils in your respective classes? Yes [ ] No[ ]

9. How many times does your headteacher check your professional records?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Once a term</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Lesson plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Scheme of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Record of work covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Registers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Does your headteacher provide the necessary learning resources for you in order to ensure effective teaching in classrooms? Yes [ ] No [ ]

   If yes, indicate how often. Always [ ] Occasionally [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]

11. How often does your headteacher supervise teaching/learning activities in your class? Always [ ] Occasionally [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]

12. Please list down areas you think the headteacher needs to give more attention when supervising instruction.
13. How frequent do you carry out the following supervision activities?

Using the likert scale: (1.) Always (2.) often (3.) sometimes (4.) rarely (5.) never

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom visits to observe teachers as they teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of frequent feedback to teachers after classroom observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers’ schemes of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers’ records of work covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving appropriate instructional guidance to teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving right solutions to common instructional problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Kindly rate the extent to which setting targets would improve your pupils’ academic performance

   a. Very high extent
   b. High extent
   c. Small extent
15. In your opinion what are the challenges faced by head teachers in carrying out inspective instructional supervision that affect performance in KCPE.

b) Suggest ways for overcoming the challenges in (a) above

Thank you for your cooperation and participation
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