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ABSTRACT
The study investigated the factors influencing principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County. It was guided by the following objectives: to establish the extent to which whether administrative experience, teachers’ workload, teachers’ attitude and school size influences principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools. The study adopted the Path Goal Theory developed by Robert J House in 1971. The study reviewed related literature from books, articles and journals in order to get more insight on the factors identified to influence principals’ instructional supervision practices. The study used descriptive survey research design as it enabled collection of information from respondents without compromising their privacy. The study targeted 26 principals and 115 teachers in public secondary schools. The researcher used census technique as the sampling procedure. Therefore the study sample was 26 principals and 115 teachers. Piloting was carried out in Kitui Central sub-county to enhance reliability and validity of the research instruments. Data was collected using questionnaires. Collected data were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively and presented in frequencies and percentages. Data was presented in relation to the study findings, it was noted that majority of the principals (69.2%) indicated that they carry out instructional supervision practices at least once per month. All the principals agreed to the fact that instructional supervision is hindered by their administrative experience. Most of the principals’ workload highly influences their supervisory practices since majority of the principals have many responsibilities. Further majority of the principals indicated that their relationship with teachers have been strained thus teachers have negative attitude towards instructional supervision. The findings of the study concluded that supervision is a combination of processes, procedures and conditions designed to advance the work effectiveness of teachers. Principals’ administrative experience greatly influences their ability to conduct effective instructional supervision, though high administrative workload hinder principals to find enough time to carry out effective instruction supervision in secondary schools. The study findings came up with recommendations that; teachers should be sensitized on the importance of instructional supervision in their career development, this will guide principals how to carry out duties; and use friendly approaches on their instructional supervision duties. A study should also be carried out on contribution of leadership styles and the effectiveness of instructional supervision.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

One widely held aim of education is to equip students with knowledge, skills and attitudes and competences that enable them to render useful services to themselves and to the society at large. Todaro (1992), for example, notes that the formal education system of a nation is principal institutional mechanism used for developing human skills and knowledge. Education is, therefore viewed as an indispensable catalyst that strongly influences the development and economic fortunes of a nation and the quality of life of its people. Most countries thus have committed to providing quality education for all by the year 2015. The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organizations (UNESCO, 1994) recognized education as one of the basic human rights.

Against this background, many nations around the globe have committed to global education policies such as Education for All (EFA), Universal Secondary Education (USE) and Universal Primary Education (UPE). They consider them key to global security, sustainability and survival. However, according to Buregeya (2011) these policies have brought forth significant challenges to many educational systems worldwide. Supervision is viewed as a cooperative 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).
The concept of supervision and its practices in education can be traced to the early American systems. Supervision evolved from a mere judicious nature of inspection, where inspectors made judgment about a teacher rather than the teaching or learning, to the present nature that focuses on assisting the teacher to improve their instructional effectiveness. Reepen and Barr (2010) say supervision was dominant method of administering schools. Teachers perceived supervision as inspectional rather than a helping function (Glanz 2000). Vast plan of supervision tend to be conducted in a haphazard manner in which the plans are seldom locally developed, rarely well-conceived and practically never reduced to written form (Ginsberg, 2003).

Supervision ensures that all staff reflects appropriate rules, routine, procedures and regulations to achieve set objectives. In a school setting the overall supervisor is the principal. According to Okumbe (1998), the principal is regarded as an urgent of supervision on behalf of the inspectorate in the school level. He or she is involved in the translation of educational policies and objectives into the program and is expected to possess a superior knowledge about curriculum and instruction and to provide expert leadership in all areas of the school program.

In the United States of America (USA) for example, the main aim of supervision practiced in schools is to improve classroom instruction; this is through observation of classroom teaching, analysis of observed data and face-to-face interaction between observer and teacher. Currently National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) is committed to
continuous improvement of schools and the quality of teaching. In Canada, school principals must constantly adapt to the reality of continuous reform within their institution. The department of education of New Brunswick (NBDE) emphasized not only the administrative role of principal, but also the role of pedagogical guide for their teachers. In Turkey, inspection and supervision is organized by the Ministry of National Education Inspectorate. This body is directly under the supervision of the minister and it supervises schools on behalf of the minister (Tyak, 2003).

In South East Asian 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). They are key to shaping and strengthening the traditions and ethos of their schools. They should lead and inspire teachers, and work with parents and community to provide the students with opportunities to pursue their passions and discover their strengths. In China, supervision is considered as primary key task of principals in their daily routine. It is considered as the best way to manage what occurs in the classroom to ensure quality of teaching.

A key issue is the teaching load carried by school principals, some of them teach as many as five subjects (Republic of South Africa 1998). In a study carried out in South Africa, most principals indicated that they did not have the requisite support staff to handle day-to-day administrative issues. Too much work compromises quality time for the core function of monitoring
teaching and learning. In Zimbabwe and Tanzania, educational officers or inspectors as they are called are expected to perform both inspection and advice tasks (De Grauwe, 2007). In Ghana, improving the quality of education partly through the improvement of supervision, has been the priority of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports in collaboration with the Ghana Education Service (GES). The Ghana Education Service is responsible for service delivery including deployment of teachers, allocation of textbooks, and supervision of schools and teachers (Baffour-Awuah, 2011). In Nigeria, the principal should assist teachers in determining the right methods, teaching facilities, physical setting, motivating teachers, provide adequate time-table for teaching, routine check of lesson notes and subject dairies, observation of classroom instruction, continuously monitor student progress and provide feedback on student performance (Afolabi & Loto, 2008).

In Kenya, The Report of The Presidential Working Party on Education and Manpower Training for The next Decade and Beyond referred to as Kamunge Report of 1988 advocated provision of government policy guidelines on supervision for improving quality education through optimal use of existing human, physical and fiscal resources as Kenya enters the 21st century (Wawira 2012). The report underscored the importance of the inspectorate and recommended training of headteachers as first supervisors of their schools. According to the Republic Of Kenya, (2000) the principal is responsible for all matters pertaining to the smooth running of the schools. The principal’s role as a supervisor include; monitoring teachers’ work, lesson notes, records of work done and students’ exercise books, actual visits to classrooms to see the
work of individual teachers, selecting subjects appearing in the school curriculum so as to ensure a well-balanced education, teaching a reasonable teaching load as a way of being in touch with the actual teaching-learning situation in the school and maintaining a visible presence in the school (Ministry of Education 1987, Olembo et al., 1988).

The principals’ work experience is a critical factor in supervision of instruction as it improves employee performance (Kirui, 2012). According to Mwiria (1995), limited teaching and administrative experience contribute to management deficiencies in those with less than five years of administrative experience. Academic qualifications and long term working experience provide people with knowledge and skills to be able to perform satisfactorily in establishment. The weight of school principals’ workloads militate against them discharging their core instructional leadership responsibilities.

Teachers’ perception towards instructional supervision is another factor influencing principals’ instructional supervision practices. Blumberg (1980) described the negative relationship between supervisors and teachers, describing the resentment teachers felt towards supervisors and this resentment continues to be a major barrier in achieving benefit from the practice of supervision. Teachers’ perceptions of supervisors are negative and they see supervision as a fault-finding exercise aimed at catching teachers on the wrong. Global education policies aiming at enhancing equity, access and improved transitions (UNESCO, 2005) have consequently led to massive students’ enrolment figures and high student-teacher ratios throughout the
globe, resulting in bigger classes, hence bigger school size. This makes the practice of supervision difficult to principals.

In Kitui county, just like the other areas mentioned above, the immediate supervisor in the schools is the principal. Poor Supervision has been identified as a major cause of low education standards in the county. Most principals have little administrative experience whereas many teachers do not embrace the practice of instructional supervision. Increase in student enrolment has created challenges of heavy workload among principals. The study therefore sought to investigate school factors influencing instructional supervision in Kitui County.

1.2 Statement of the problem

For quality education to exist there must be adequate techniques of supervision since proper supervision of instruction facilitates the achievement of goals and objectives of education Goddard & Emersion (1997). This is not the case with lower Yatta district. Poor supervision practices have affected curriculum delivery leading to poor performance among secondary schools in lower Yatta sub-county. This is evidenced by the examination reports available at Lower Yatta District Education Office. The reports show that secondary schools in lower Yatta District perform poorer than neighbouring districts as indicated in Table 1.1.
Table 1.1 KCSE analysis Lower Yatta Sub-County, Kitui central and Mwingi Central for the last 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lower Yatta Sub-county</th>
<th>Kitui Central Sub-County</th>
<th>Mwingi Central Sub-County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.623</td>
<td>5.420</td>
<td>5.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.141</td>
<td>5.331</td>
<td>5.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4.427</td>
<td>5.389</td>
<td>4.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.129</td>
<td>6.273</td>
<td>4.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5.090</td>
<td>5.131</td>
<td>5.212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kitui County Education Office (2014)

Table 1.1 shows that performance in KCSE in Lower Yatta District for the last five years has been poor compared to other sub-counties. This made Lower Yatta Sub County a suitable area for this study to establish the school factors that influence headteachers supervision practices.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the factors influencing principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County, Kitui County, Kenya.

1.4 Research objectives

The research was guided by the following objectives:-

i. To determine how administrative experience influences principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County
ii. To establish whether principals’ workload influences principals’ instructional supervision practices in secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County Kitui County.

iii. To determine how teachers’ attitude influences principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County in Kitui County.

iv. To determine whether school size influences principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County in Kitui County.

1.5 Research questions

This study was guided by the following questions:-

i. What is the influence of administrative experience on the principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County, in Kitui County?

ii. How does workload influence the principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County?

iii. What is the influence of the teachers’ attitude on principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County, Kitui County?

iv. How does the size of the school influence principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta sub-county, Kitui County?
1.6 Significance of the study

This study may be of practical value in helping abate the challenges faced by principals in their supervision of instruction in the public secondary schools. It is hoped that the study may help pinpoint the areas and issues of challenge that have not been addressed by the government to arrest the situation. The findings of the study may help the Ministry of education and the government to make efforts to offer in-service training and seminars on instructional supervision to be made available to school principals and adequate staffing so that principals do not teach the same number of lessons teachers have so as to carry out the role of supervising instruction. It hopes that the principals may gain knowledge, facts and strategies that are required for effective and efficient instructional supervision. The results of such findings could be used in workshops and seminars to sensitize principals and senior teachers on how best to undertake instructional supervision.

1.7 Limitations of the study

Attitude of respondents to questions was not controlled by the researcher. This could have affected validity of the findings because socially acceptable answers could be given by the respondents. To mitigate this challenge, the researcher created rapport with the respondents and assured them of confidentiality of information given. Although there are many factors influencing principals’ instructional supervision, this study will focus on administrative experience, principals’ workload, attitude of teachers and school size.
1.8 Delimitations of the study

The study covered public secondary schools in Lower Yatta sub-county. Private schools were excluded because they operate under other factors which may affect the performance of Principals. The study variables were administrative experience, workload, school size and attitude of teachers. The respondents were all the principals and teachers in public secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County because they are the ones who perform instructional supervisory roles in the schools. The study used questionnaires to collect data.

1.9 Basic assumptions of the study

Assumptions are statements of which the researcher believes to be facts but cannot be proved.

i. Principals in public secondary schools in lower Yatta sub-county carry out supervision.

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

iii. The teachers were aware of the principals’ instructional supervision activities.

1.10 Definition of significant terms

The following are the definitions of significant terms;

**Administrative experience** refers to the knowledge and skills a principal gains, by holding an administrative office for a period of time.

**Attitude** refers to a predisposition or a tendency to respond positively or negatively towards a certain idea, object, person or situation.
**Instruction** refers to the act of educating, giving the steps that must be followed or an order.

**Instructional supervision** refers to an internal mechanism adopted by principals for school self-evaluation, geared towards helping teachers and students to improve on their teaching and learning activities for the purpose of achieving educational objective

**Principal** refers to the chief executive who provides instructional leadership by coordinating curricular programmes and is responsible for the general administration of the secondary school.

**School size** refers to the number of students in a school.

**Workload** refers to the amount of roles and duties expected of a principal.

**1.11 Organization of the study**

This study was organized into five chapters. Chapter One was introduction consisting of the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, delimitations of the study, basic assumptions of the study, definition of key terms and organization of the study. Chapter two consisted of literature related to the study, concepts of supervision, effective supervision, administrative experience and principals’ instructional supervision, workload and principals’ supervision, attitude of teachers and principals’ supervision, school size and principals’ instructional supervision, summary of literature review, conceptual framework and theoretical framework. Chapter three
comprised of research methodology, capturing the research design, target population, sample size and sampling techniques, research instruments, data collection procedure, validity of the research instruments, reliability of research instruments and data analysis techniques. Chapter four dealt with data analysis, data interpretation and discussions while chapter five focused on summary, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further studies.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with review of literature related to factors influencing principals’ instructional supervision practices. It focuses on principals’ administrative experience on instructional supervision practices, principals’ workload and instructional supervision practices, attitude of teachers and the influence on principals’ instructional supervision practices and school size and the influence on principals’ instructional practices, conceptual framework, summary of literature review and theoretical framework.

2.2 The concept of instructional supervision

Researchers have designed several definitions and interpretations for supervision, but almost all of them centre on a common aim. The main objective of supervision is to improve teachers’ instructional practices, which may in turn improve student learning. Researchers have offered several purposes of supervision of instruction, but the ultimate goal is to improve instruction and student learning. Beach and Reinhartz (1989) think the focus on instructional supervision is to provide teachers with information about their teaching so as to develop instructional skills to improve performance. Others believe the purpose of supervision is helping teachers to be aware of their teaching and its consequences for their learners (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon; 1997).
Supervision was initially described as inspection, which has the connotation of direct control of teachers by school inspectors. The term supervision has gradually taken over inspection, but both terms are sometimes used together. But Musaazi (1982) posits that school supervision which began as inspection has been replaced by that of supervision. The concept of supervision of instruction has evolved over the years (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2004). Early supervisors in the 19th century set strict requirements for their teachers and visited classrooms to observe how closely the teachers complied with stipulated instructions; departure from these instructions would cause dismissal (Oliva & Pawlas, 1997). Some researchers suggest that supervision was historically viewed as an instrument for controlling teachers.

Hoy and Forsyth (1986) do not contend that the purpose of supervision of instruction is not to judge the competencies of teachers, nor is it to control them but rather to work cooperatively with them. Glanz, Shulman and Sullivan (2006) believe that effective principals provide effective supervision. To them, an effective principal creates a culture of shared belief and sense of cooperation, monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of school practices, is resourceful and communicates and operates from strong ideas and beliefs about schooling. They value dialogue that encourages teachers to critically reflect on their learning and professional practice.

Brennen (2008) notes an effective supervisor who links interpersonal with technical skills will be successful in improving instruction. He suggests that an effective supervisor should be able to build self-acceptance, moral, trust and
rapport between the two parties. Objectivity, devoid of personal biases, should be the hallmark if supervision is to be effective. Oghuvbu (2001) believe that effective supervision involves adherence to bureaucratic processes to control and guide teachers. He identifies common determinants of supervision as: teachers and students working rigidly according to school timetable, following school regulations, neat and decent environment, and proper student management and disciplined students.

2.3 Administrative experience and principals’ instructional supervision practices
The free online dictionary defines experience as knowledge and skills acquired through a direct personal participation or observation of an event. According to Olembo, Wanga and Karugo (1992) principals are expected to possess superior knowledge, skills and attitudes acquired through training and experiences to enable them discharge their instructional duties effectively. A research study by the association of Chartered Certified Accountants shows that employers are laying emphasis on international work experience when recruiting accountants since it is an important tool for business growth (Global Work Experience, 2013).

Wawira (2011) observed that principals’ job and teaching experiences influence teachers’ perception towards the principal’s instructional supervision practices. This means that teachers are readily willing to accept instructional guidance from experienced principals. Studies done in Kenya by Nyandiko (2008) and Kirui (2012) found that principals’ experiences have a positive
influence on implementation of curriculum change and instructional supervision practices. In most countries, principals are promoted on the basis of seniority and experience (De Grauwe, 2001). It would be proper for supervisors to possess higher qualifications and longer years of teaching experience than the teachers they supervise.

There are three basic skills of supervision - technical, human and conceptual. Each of these skills domains applies to educational and organizational roles of supervisors as well. Technical skills assume ability to use knowledge, methods to perform specific tasks. Human skills refer to one’s ability and judgment in working with and through people. Conceptual skills refer to the supervisor’s ability to view the schools and the educational program as a whole (Sergiovani, 2009).

Supervision requires Planning, Staffing, Coordination, Observation, Curriculum development and Assessment. Findings revealed that principals’ supervisory competency was found to be significantly influenced by their administrative experiences. This should be so because supervision is an integral part of administration. Heltzman (1981) declared that supervision is synonymous with managing. The researchers are of the view that administrative experience should be considered as one of the major factors in the posting and appointment of secondary school principals.

2.4 Workload and principals’ instructional supervision practices
Global education policies aimed at enhancing equity, access and improved transitions (UNESCO, 2005) have consequently led to massive students’
enrolment figures and high pupil-teacher ratios throughout the globe, resulting in bigger classes and heavy workload among the principals. Principals are professionally trained teachers as well as supervisors in their respective schools which double up their workload to teaching and school administration. According to Wawira (2012), this doubling up of tasks has been a challenge to many principals who have constantly lamented of being overwhelmed. It also brings confusion regarding their job specification as most opt to either concentrate on one of the two tasks: teaching or administration work.

A study by Abdille (2012) revealed that workload affected principals’ instructional supervision. Most of the principals indicated that workload affects their position to a greater extend since their performance in the schools is judged depending on how well they are able to control and coordinate the schools in one direction. Ogunu (2005) cited lack of time as a challenge to school supervision. He asserted that secondary school principals are so weighed down by routine administrative burden that they hardly find time to visit the classrooms and observe how the teachers are teaching.

According to a study by Issa (2012), teaching load of the principal influences the effectiveness of the principals’ instructional supervision. In addition, Buckley et al’ (2004) revealed that teaching load significantly influenced supervision especially on the principals’ ability to observe teachers in class, give feedback after classroom observation and checking the teaching aids.
2.5 Teachers’ attitudes and principals’ instructional supervision practices.

Zepeda (2007), states that teachers may perceive supervision as a worthwhile activity if supervisors give teachers security by backing their judgments even though at times a teacher judgment can be wrong. According to Mbithi (2007), employees of an organization must possess the right attitude and skills to enable them to get the work done effectively. Teachers must feel that the supervisor is there to serve them and to help them become more effective.

A study carried out by Blumberg (1980), described the negative relationship between supervisors and teachers, and this resentment teachers felt towards supervisors and this resentment continues to be a major barrier in achieving benefit from the practice of supervision. Majority of teachers from the Asian countries believe that supervisors only try to find fault in classroom teaching and never tell them their strengths. They claimed to feel insulted when the principal claims to find their shortcomings before students. In a study of supervisory behaviour and teacher satisfaction, Glatthorn (2007) found that improvement of the teaching-learning process was dependent upon teacher attitudes towards supervision. According to Glatthorn (2001), unless teachers view supervision as a process of promoting professional growth and student learning the supervisory exercise would not have desired effect.

2.6 School size and principals’ instructional supervision practices

Throughout the world, students’ enrolments in all levels of education are on a rising trend. In European Union member countries, there are approximately 97.2 million pupils and students enrolled in educational establishment.
Principals focus mainly on Free Secondary Education (FSE) grants compromising instructional supervision practices. In the very past, instructional supervisory role of principals was little because schools were small in size Ezedi (1995). With increased demand for education and consequent large enrolment of students, secondary schools have grown to have many teachers and many classrooms.

A study conducted by Bays (2010) argues that principals of schools whose enrolment is high have a lot of issues to address compared to principals who have lower enrolments. Principals of high enrolment schools are therefore confronted with many competing administrative and managerial responsibilities which reduce the time available to the principal for direct interaction with teachers on instruction matters. A large number of teachers and high student enrolment is associated with emphasis on bureaucratic approach since the high span of control denies the principal enough time for individualized attention upon teachers. A small number of teachers and students mean a narrower span of control giving principals an opportunity to interact regularly with teachers during supervision hence collaboration. The principal of a small secondary school can more easily spend substantial amounts of time in classrooms working on curriculum and instruction unlike the principal of a big school. After the introduction of FPE and FSE policy in Kenya there has been a massive increase in enrolment figures in public schools.
According to Department for International Development (DFID, 2007) increases in enrolment are associated with large class sizes and lower KCSE scores. Wathera (2008) noted that increase in enrolment overwhelmed teachers and not able to give individualized attention to pupils. Teachers could not mark pupils’ assessments whereas headteachers focus mostly on management of FSE grants compromising instructional supervision practices. In a similar study by Kamindo (2008), she concluded that the introduction of FSE policy has made the principals to be managers, accountants, record keepers and supervisors, instead of instructional supervisors. Boardman (1993) argues that in schools enrolling approximately 500 pupils, the principals tend to spend the major part of their time in the duties of their offices. In large schools, they rarely teach, spending most of the time on administration.

2.7 Summary of literature review

This section has reviewed literature on factors influencing principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in Lower-Yatta sub-county. The headteachers as instructional supervisors should possess prerequisite supervisory skills such as conceptual, human relations and technical skills Okumbe (1998). Mwiria (1995) recommended determination of minimum levels of experience of teachers before appointment to leadership position of principals. This is after finding out management deficiencies in less experienced headteachers.

However, Wawira (2012) noted that administrative experiences of principals do not significantly influence instructional supervision practices. This is in
line with Xueming Luo at the University of Texas that an extended term strengthens customer ties only for a time after which the relationship weakens and the company’s performance weakens.

Bays (2010), argues that principals whose enrolment is high have a lot of issues to address compared to principals who have lower enrolment. It should however be noted that reducing the number of students alone does not improve the quality of instructional supervision or lead to improved teaching and learning. Thus, focus should be shifted from concern on school size to investigating what kind of teaching actually makes a difference.

The literature revealed the negative relationship between supervisors and teachers describing the resentment teachers have towards supervisors and that instructional supervision is perceived as a fault-finding exercise aimed at catching teachers on the wrong. However, Zepeda (2007) observes that teachers may perceive supervision as a worthwhile activity if supervisors give teachers security by backing their judgments even though at times a teacher judgment can be wrong.

2.8 Theoretical framework

This study was guided by the Path Goal Theory developed by Robert J House in 1971. House believes that a leader's behavior is contingent to the satisfaction, motivation and performance of his or her subordinates. Path – Goal states that a good leader provides clear direction, sets high goals, gets involved in goal achievement and supports his employees. It is to do with the leader "clearing" the path for the followers to take. It was developed to
describe the way the leaders encourage and support their followers in
achieving the goals they have been set by making path that they should take
clear and easy. In particular, according to this theory leaders should, Clarify
the path so subordinates know which way to go and remove road blocks that
are stopping them going there.

This theory explains that performance of principals’ instructional supervision
practices depend upon effort. Principals can motivate teachers for academic
performance. According to this theory, leaders who show the way and help
followers along a path are effective in leading them. This approach assumes
that there is one right way of achieving a goal and the leader can see but the
followers cannot.

Path–Goal theory is relevant to this study because the principal of a school is
the leader who should show teachers the way. Principals should set high goals
for academic achievement, high mean grades they expect to be scored by the
students. They should be the first to apply best methods of teaching, teaching
aids, keep up to date records of work done, lesson plans and lesson notes so
that teachers can emulate. This theory casts the leader as the "knowing person"
and the followers as "dependents".

2.9 Conceptual framework
Orodho (2005), defines conceptual framework as a mode of representation
where a researcher represents the relationship between variables in the study
and depicts them diagrammatically.
The study was conceptualized based on the variables used in the study. It was conceptualized that principals’ instructional supervision practices were influenced by various factors. The school factors are independent variables while instructional supervision practices are the dependent variables.

The amount of load a principal has determines the effectiveness in instructional supervision. Education input is influenced positively where principals have a low teaching load and a long administrative experience. In a system where the enrolment is high hence a big school size, the instructional work of head teachers becomes difficult. The way teachers perceive supervision is an important factor that determines the outcomes of instructional supervision.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter outlines the following aspects of research methodology: research design, location of the study, target population, sample size and sampling procedure, validity of research instruments, reliability, research instruments, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research design
The study adopted descriptive survey design. According to Orodho (2003), descriptive survey design is a method of collecting information by interviewing and use of questionnaire to a sample of individuals. It can be used when collecting information about people’s attitudes, opinions, habits and any of the variety of the educational issues, Orodho and Kombo (2002). The researcher adopted this design because it describes the state of affairs as it is, that is the school factors influencing principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in Lower Yatta Sub-County, Kenya.

3.3 Target population
The population was 26 principals and 115 teachers in public secondary schools of Lower Yatta Sub-County, (Lower Yatta DEO, 2014). The total number of respondents were therefore 141.

3.4 Sample size and sampling procedure
According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a sample is a small portion of the target population while sampling is a research technique that is used in
selecting a given number of subjects from the target population, as a representative of that population. Due to the small number of respondents, the researcher adopted census technique as the sampling procedure. The researcher conducted piloting in the neighbouring sub-county that is, Kitui Central sub-county.

3.5 Research instruments

In this research, the researcher used questionnaires to collect data. Questionnaires were used to collect data from principals and teachers. A questionnaire is a research instrument consisting of a series of questions and other prompts for the purpose of gathering information from respondents (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). The questions comprised of two sections: Section A solicited data on background information of the respondents. Section B sought information of Administrative experience, workload, school size and teachers’ attitude. Questionnaires were the choice of the researcher because the responses are gathered in a standardized way. Therefore, questionnaires are more objective compared to other tools of data collection. It was also relatively quick to collect information.

3.6 Validity of the instrument

Kothari (2004), states that validity indicates the degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. It is the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences which are based on the research results. It is the degree to which results obtained from analysis of data actually represents the phenomenon under study. The researcher employed piloting of the instruments
by randomly selecting two schools which were not used in the final study. This method identified vague questions, unclear instructions and insufficient space to write responses. To ensure content validity further, the instrument were subjected to analysis by the supervisors in the area of educational administration who assessed the suitability of the content used in the instruments developed and made changes for the purpose of improvement.

3.7 Reliability of the instrument

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), reliability is the degree to which research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. To ensure reliability of the study the researcher applied the test-retest method. This method involved administering the same instrument twice to the same group of people. The second administration was done after a time lapse of one week. The results from both testing periods were correlated to determine their reliability using Pearson’s Product Moment Correlations Coefficient as shown by the formulae below.

\[
r = r_{xy} = \frac{n \sum x_i y_i - \sum x_i \sum y_i}{\sqrt{n \sum x_i^2 - (\sum x_i)^2} \sqrt{n \sum y_i^2 - (\sum y_i)^2}}.
\]

If the coefficient is close to +1 or -1, the instrument is said to be reliable for data collection. For this study the questionnaire scores a coefficient correlation of 0.8 which was deemed satisfactory for the purpose of the study.
3.8 Data collection procedure
The researcher sought a clearance letter from the Department of education, University of Nairobi; this letter enabled the researcher get a research permit from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation. The researcher then got permission from the District Education Officer Lower Yatta District. The researcher drew a visit schedule and visited the schools personally in order to get consent from the principals to administer the instruments. This enabled the researcher to familiarize with the respondents and establish rapport then administer the questionnaires to the participants.

3.9 Data analysis
This is the process of summarizing the collected data and putting it together so that the researcher can meaningfully organize, categorize and synthesize information from the data collecting tools. Data gathered were coded for analysis. This was done after editing and checking out whether all questions had been filled correctly. Quantitative data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and the results presented using frequency tables, pie charts, bar graphs and percentages to make meaningful conclusions. This was deemed to be easy in interpretation and convenient in giving general overview of the problem under study. Qualitative data were analyzed through content analyses which in turn were analyzed by organizing data into themes, patterns and sub-topics.
3.10 Ethical consideration

The researcher assured the respondents of strict confidentiality and privacy in dealing with the responses. This made the respondents free and confident in responding to the questionnaire. To achieve this, the researcher was able to familiarize with the respondents and establish rapport. The researcher sought permission from the principal and requested the teachers to be free and make a choice of either answering questionnaire without being coerced. The researcher explained to the respondents, the purpose of the questionnaire was purely academic and therefore confidentiality and privacy would be maintained in the whole process in totality.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter deals with data analysis and interpretation of the findings based on the research objectives. This study was to investigate the factors influencing principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County, Kitui County, Kenya. It was guided by the following objectives: to establish the extent to which administrative experience, teachers’ workload, teachers’ attitude and school size influences principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta sub-county in Kitui County. The study targeted principals and teachers in public secondary schools. Collected data was analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. It was then presented in frequency distribution tables.

4.2 Instrument return rate
The study population was 26 principals and 115 teachers in public secondary schools thus, a total of 141 respondents. A total of 141 questionnaires were issued to the respondents. Questionnaires from all 26 principals (100% return rate) and 113 teachers (98.3% return rate) were returned. Therefore the study realized an instrument return rate of 98.6%, which was very satisfactory for the purpose of the study which is in line with Mugenda and Mugenda (2003). This efficient response rate was realized since the researcher personally administered the questionnaires, created rapport with the respondents and collected the instruments immediately after they were completed. According
to Edwards et al (2002) a response rate of less than 60 percent is considered inadequate while that of 60 percent to 80 percent is adequate. In addition if the response rate is over 80 percent, it is considered as excellent for the purpose of a study.

4.3 Demographic information of respondents

This study first sought to find out the gender, age distribution, highest academic qualification and length of service to establish an insight on the study respondents’ characteristics.

To find out respondents characteristics in regard to gender, the study sought to establish principals’ and teachers’ gender distribution. The findings were presented as shown in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information contained in table 4.1 shows that majority of teachers (65.5 percent) are female though majority of the secondary school principals in the study area (84.6 percent) were male. These findings are an implication that, though many females are in the teaching profession majority of the school headship positions are taken by males. This is in line with Kamau (2011) who
shares this observation that, feminist thought in Kenya is still treated with suspicion, not just by men but even some women who have worked with women and with gender movements for many years depriving women leadership post.

The study further sought to find out respondents age bracket and presented the findings as shown in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2 Respondents’ age distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 30 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.2, majority of the principals (53.8\%) were over 50 years old while (73.5\%) of the teachers were between 31 to 40 years old. This was an indication that more elder teachers were in school leadership since none of the principals indicated that he/she was below 41 years old. These findings are an implication that a teacher’s age influences their progression into school leadership and effectiveness in handling educational management issues. These findings are in agreement with De Grauwe (2001) who stated that principals are promoted on the basis of seniority and experience.
Table 4.3 Respondents’ highest academic qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional qualification</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 reveals that, majority of the principals (73.1%) and teachers (80.5%) had attained Bachelor degree as their highest academic qualification. Moreover more principals than teachers had attained post graduate degree. This shows that all the teachers and principals were in the capacity to carry out their role in school since they were all trained to do so though more principals had attained higher academic qualifications than teachers. The findings concur with De Grauwe (2001) argument that it would be proper for supervisors to possess higher qualifications and longer years of teaching experience than the teachers they supervise.

Then the study sought to find the duration principals had being in their current station and presented the findings in Table 4.4.
Information presented in Table 4.4 shows that most of the principals had been in their current station for more than 5 years. This was an implication that the study sample was familiar with the schools’ culture and practices thus they were in a position to give relevant information in regards to instructional supervision in their current station. This concurs with Mwiria’s (1995), statement that limited teaching and administrative experience contribute to management deficiencies in those with less than five years of administrative experience. Academic qualifications and long term working experience provide people with knowledge and skills to be able to perform satisfactorily in establishment.

The study also sought to find the duration teachers had being teaching profession and presented the findings in Table 4.5.
Table 4.5 Teachers length of service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study findings revealed that majority of the teachers (59.4%) had been in the teaching profession for over 10 years. This was an implication that majority of secondary school teachers had been in the teaching profession for long enough and were in a good position to give valid information on instructional supervision practices in their schools.

4.4 Administrative experience and principals’ instructional supervision practices (Objective One)

To establish the extent to which administrative experience influence principals’ instructional supervision, the researcher sought to find out whether principals carry out instructional supervision in secondary schools. The study findings revealed that principals’ instructional supervision is conducted in all schools. The study sought to find out how often instruction supervision is conducted in schools and the findings presented as shown in Table 4.6.
Table 4.6 Principals’ responses on how often they carry out instructional supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings contained in Table 4.6, majority of the principals (69.2%) indicated that they carry out instructional supervision practices once per month. These findings show that principals’ frequency of carrying out instructional supervision due to their experience. This is in line with Olembo, Wanga and Karugo (1992) principals are expected to possess superior knowledge, skills and attitudes acquired through training and experiences to enable them discharge their instructional duties effectively. Further the study sought to find out what principals check when carrying out instructional supervision and presented the findings in Table 4.7.
Table 4.7 Principals responses on what they check during instructional supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schemes of work</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records of work covered</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils lesson notes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class attendance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 26

Data presented in Table 4.7 shows that principals conduct various instructional supervision practices with all principals indicating that they check for teachers schemes of work and pupils lesson notes. This was an indication that principals were able to monitor teachers’ lesson preparation and content delivery. These findings concur with a report by Republic of Kenya, (2000) that stated that the principal is responsible for all matters pertaining to the smooth running of the schools. The principal’s role as a supervisor include; monitoring teachers’ work, lesson notes, records of work done and students’ exercise books, actual visits to classrooms to see the work of individual teachers, selecting subjects appearing in the school curriculum so as to ensure a well-balanced education, teaching a reasonable teaching load as a way of being in touch with the actual teaching-learning situation in the school and maintaining a visible presence in the school.
The study requested the principals to indicate whether instructional supervision is important for good teachers’ professional performance. Their responses were as shown in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8 Instructional supervision is important for teacher professional performance as perceived by principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of instructional supervision</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data contained in Table 4.8 shows that all the principals agreed to the fact that instructional supervision is important for good teacher professional performance. This was an implication that with effective instructional supervision practices teachers are able to deliver effectively in their role during instructional process. This is in agreement with Okumbe (1998) who state that the principal is regarded as an urgent of supervision on behalf of the inspectorate in the school level. He or she is involved in the translation of educational policies and objectives into the program and is expected to possess a superior knowledge about curriculum and instruction and to provide expert leadership in all areas of the school program.
Teachers were presented with statement to show how effective principals administrative role are in regards to instructional supervision. Their responses are presented as shown in Table 4.9.

**Table 4.9 Effectiveness of principals’ as school supervisors as perceived by teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Effective Frequency</th>
<th>Effective Percent</th>
<th>Ineffective Frequency</th>
<th>Ineffective Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Setting goals and ways to achieve them.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Determining subjects offered in the school.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Giving instructional guidance to teachers on school curriculum.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Organizing to support curriculum implementation.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Advising teachers on school curriculum.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Observing teachers in class</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Checking lesson plan</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Checking teachers record of work</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Checking schemes of work at the beginning of the term</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Giving feedback to teachers after lesson observation</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 reveals that majority of the teachers indicated that most principals’ instructional supervision practices in their schools were effectively performed. However majority of the teachers (74.3%) indicated that principals in their schools were ineffective in determining subjects offered in school. These findings were an indication that majority of principals in Lower Yatta Sub-
County were effective in their administrative experience thus they were able to carry out instructional supervision in schools. These findings were confirmed by teachers since all of them indicated that principals’ instructional supervision personally benefited them. These findings agree with UNESCO (2005) that indicated that principals are professionally trained teachers as well as supervisors in their respective schools which double up their workload to teaching and school administration.

Teachers were requested to indicate how they benefit from principals instructional supervision practices and their responses presented as shown in Figure 4.1.

![Figure 4.1](image_url)  
**Figure 4.1 Benefits of principals’ instructional supervision as perceived by teachers**

Figure 4.1 shows that majority of the teachers indicated that principals’ instructional supervision help them improve their instructional process,
followed by professional development. This was an indication that teachers are helped to improve teaching methods when principals effectively carry out their roles in instructional supervision. These findings differ with Glanz (2000) who stated that teachers perceived supervision as inspectional rather than a helping function.

4.6 Workload and principals’ instructional supervision practices
(Objective Two)

To establish the extent to which workload influence principals’ instructional supervision, the researcher sought to find out how principals workload influence their instruction supervision practices and presented teachers responses on Table 4.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information contained in Table 4.11 reveals that most of the principals’ workload highly influences their supervisory practices. This was an indication that many principals have high responsibilities that hinder them from carrying out supervisory practices. This agrees with Abdille (2012) who revealed that
workload affected principals’ instructional supervision. Most of the principals indicated that workload affects their position to a greater extent since their performance in the schools is judged depending on how well they are able to control and coordinate the schools in one direction.

The study then sought teachers rating on the extent to which principals’ workload influence instruction supervisory practices. Their responses were as shown in Table 4.12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the teachers (54%) principals’ workload influence their instructional supervision practices at a very large extent. This was an implication that principals’ workload is greatly related to how effective they carry out instructional supervision practices. This is in agreement with Buckley et al’ (2004) who revealed that teaching load significantly influenced supervision especially on the principals’ ability to observe teachers in class, give feedback after classroom observation and checking the teaching aids.
To establish the kinds of principals’ workload the study sought to find out whether principals teach students in class. Principals’ responses were as presented in Table 4.13.

**Table 4.13 Principals’ responses on whether they teach students in lessons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching students lessons</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not teach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the principals (88.5%) indicated that they teach students in classes. This implies that other than their administrative principals also teach students showing that they have heavy workload. These findings agree with a study by Issa (2012) that teaching load of the principal influences the effectiveness of the principals’ instructional supervision. Further the study sought to find out the number of hours principals who teach students conduct instructional process in a week. Table 4.14 presents principals responses.

**Table 4.14 Number of hours principals teach students per week**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of hours</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 hours</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.14 shows that majority of the principals (92.3%) who indicated that they teach students in class stated that they do so for less than 10 hours per week. This was an indication that principals who teach students in classes conduct instructional process for 15 lessons in a week thus they teach 3 lessons per day. It concur with Buckley et al (2004) revealed that teaching load significantly influenced supervision especially on the principals’ ability to observe teachers in class, give feedback after classroom observation and checking the teaching aids.

The study also sought to find out other duties carried out by principals apart from teaching and presented their responses in Table 4.15.

**Table 4.15 Duties carried out by principals apart from teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending to stakeholders</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Table 4.15 shows that most of the principals indicated that they initiate schools development, accounting and attend stakeholders on top of teaching. This was an implication that principals have other duties to attend to other than teaching. This shows that instructional supervision time is limited by the other duties shouldered on to principals. This was in agreement with Ogunu (2005) who cited lack of time as a challenge to school supervision.
Secondary school principals are so weighed down by routine administrative burden that they hardly find time to visit the classrooms and observe how the teachers are teaching.

The study further sought to establish duties that take up most of the principals’ time. Principals’ responses were as presented in Table 4.16.

**Table 4.16 Duties and responsibilities that takes most of principals time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties and responsibilities</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attending to stakeholders</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative duties</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the principals (46.2%) indicated that administrative duties take up most of their time in secondary schools. This was an indication that administration duties of principals consume most of their time thus weighting their responsibilities.

The principals were also requested to indicate whether workload hinder instructional supervision practices. Their responses were presented in Table 4.17.
Table 4.17 Principals’ responses on whether workload hinder instructional supervision management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings presented in Table 4.17 shows that majority of the principals (69.2%) agreed that workload hinder carrying out of instructional supervisory practices. This shows that principals are overloaded therefore failing to carry out instructional supervision. This agrees with Issa (2012), who states that teaching load of the principal influences the effectiveness of the principals’ instructional supervision.

4.5 Teachers’ attitudes and principals’ instructional supervision practices (Objective Three)

To establish the extent to which teachers’ attitude influence principals’ instructional supervision, the study sought to find out whether teachers view instructional supervision as fault finding mission. Principals’ responses were as presented in Table 4.18.
Table 4.18 Principals’ perception on whether teachers view supervision as fault finding mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the principals and majority of the teachers view instructional supervision as fault finding mission. This is an indication that majority of the teachers do not embrace principals instructional supervision practices. These findings agree with a study carried out by Blumberg (1980) described the negative relationship between supervisors and teachers, and this resentment teachers felt towards supervisors and this resentment continue to be a major barrier in achieving benefit from the practice of supervision. Majority of teachers from the Asian countries believe that supervisors only try to find fault in classroom teaching and never tell them their strengths. The study then sought to find out whether principals and teachers relationship is stained due to instruction supervision.
Table 4.19 Principals’ perception on whether relationship with some teachers have been strained due to instructional supervision practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information contained in Table 4.19 shows that majority of the principals indicated that their relationship with teachers have been strained due to conducting instructional supervision. This implies that majority of the teachers negatively perceive principals instructional supervisory practices. It shows that teachers do not like being supervised. However, all the principals indicated that creating awareness on active participation of teachers in supervisory practices would help build strong relationships between them.

The researcher issued teachers with statements to establish their attitude towards principals’ supervision practices and preceded their agreement or disagreement to the statement as shown in Table 4.20.
Table 4.20 Teachers’ attitude towards instructional supervision as perceived by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Agreement Frequency</th>
<th>Agreement Percent</th>
<th>Disagreement Frequency</th>
<th>Disagreement Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) The head teacher carries out supervision fairly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Personal relations interfere with the head teachers’ instructional supervision</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Supervision mainly looks at the negatives and not good work of teachers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings contained in Table 4.20 majority of the teachers (92.9%) disagreed that principals’ carries out supervision practices fairly, while 59.3 percent of teachers indicated that instructional supervision interfere with their personal relations with the head teachers. These findings imply that teachers feel undermined by principals’ instructional supervision practices thus creating conflict/rivalry among them. Therefore it is conclusive to state that instructional supervision is hindered by teachers’ attitude. This agrees with Mbithi (2007), employees of an organization must possess the right attitude and skills to enable them to get the work done effectively. Teachers must feel that the supervisor is there to serve them and to help them become more effective.
The study requested the teachers to state measures they feel could be taken to improve principals’ instructional supervision in secondary school. Table 4.21 presents teachers’ responses.

Table 4.21 Measures to improve principals instructional supervision as perceived by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegate duties to heads of departments</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals to stop teaching</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create positive working environment</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.21 shows that most of the teachers (42.5%) principals should create positive working environment followed by delegating most of their duties to heads of department. This is an indication that teachers perceive that principals conducting instructional supervision interferes with conducive working environment in secondary school thus principals are bound to conduct in-service training and engage senior teacher in supervision practices to change teachers perception towards instructional supervision.
4.7 School size and principals’ instructional supervision practices

To establish the extent to which school size influence principals’ instructional supervision (Objective Four), the researcher requested the principals to indicate students’ enrolment in their schools and presented the findings in Table 4.22.

Table 4.22 School enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of pupils</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 - 350</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351 - 500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the principals in secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County had enrolment of between 351 to 500 students. This was an indication that student enrolment in public secondary schools was high. The study then sought to find out the number of streams there are in schools’ classes and presented the principals’ responses in Table 4.23.
Table 4.23 Number of streams in schools’ classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streams</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Double stream</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single stream</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23 shows that majority of the schools had double stream classes. These findings show that majority of the secondary school in the study area were large sizes. The study further sought to find out class size of secondary school and presented teachers responses as shown in Table 4.24.

Table 4.24 Teachers response on class size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of pupils</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most teachers (47.8%) their schools had more than 50 students per class. These findings reveal that many secondary schools students are clouded in classes, due to high student enrolment. This could then be translated into high principals' workload hindering instructional supervision time. These findings
differ with Ezedi (1995) statement that in the past, instructional supervisory role of principals was little because schools were small in size.

The teachers were requested to indicate whether principals carry out instructional supervision in all classes. Table 4.25 shows teachers responses.

**Table 4.25 Teachers response on whether principals carry out instructional supervision in all classes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carry out instruction supervision</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not carry out instructional supervision</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data contained in Table 4.25 reveals that majority of the principals do not carry out instructional supervision in all classes. This was an indication that school size hinders effective instructional supervision since principals are not able to carry out the practices in all classes. The study asked the teachers to indicate how often principals carry out instructional supervision in all classes. Their responses were as shown in Table 4.26.
Table 4.26 Teachers response on how often principals carry out instructional supervision in all classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of times</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Termly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information contained in Table 4.26 shows that most principals in their schools carry out instructional supervision in all classes at least once per term. This was an indication that the school size in terms of the students’ enrolment and number of classes influence the number of times principals carry out instructional supervision practices in secondary schools. Further the teachers were to give reasons for frequency of principals carrying out instructional supervision. Their findings were presented in Table 4.27.

Table 4.27 Principals’ reasons for not conducting instructional supervision in all classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much work</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority of principals (69.2%) indicated that the amount of work they have in secondary schools is the main hindrance for them to conduct instructional supervision. Thus the findings imply that majority of the secondary school were big hence the principals had a lot of responsibilities and duties making them to abandon instructional supervisory practices. The findings agree with a study conducted by Bays (2010) argues that principals of schools whose enrolment is high have a lot of issues to address compared to principals who have lower enrolments. Principals of high enrolment schools are therefore confronted with many competing administrative and managerial responsibilities which reduce the time available to the principal for direct interaction with teachers on instruction matters.

Finally the study sought to rate among the four variables which one of them influences principals’ instructional supervision practices more. Principals’ responses were as presented in Table 4.28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative experience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' attitude</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.28 Factors that affect instructional supervision more as perceived by principals
Most of the principals indicated that workload affect instructional supervision more followed by teachers’ attitude. This is an indication that though all factors under observation in the study influence principals’ instructional supervision, they all affect the practices at different levels. The findings concur with Wathera (2008) who noted that increase in enrolment overwhelmed teachers and not able to give individualized attention to pupils. Teachers could not mark pupils’ assessments whereas headteachers focus mostly on management of FSE grants compromising instructional supervision practices.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations generated from the research findings of the study. The chapter also presents suggestions for further study.

5.2 Summary of the study

The study was to investigate the factors influencing principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County, Kitui County, Kenya. It was guided by the following objectives: to establish the extent to which administrative experience, teachers’ workload, teachers’ attitude and school size influences principals’ instructional supervision practices in public secondary schools in lower Yatta sub-county in Kitui County. The study adopted the Path Goal Theory developed by Robert J House in 1971.

The study adopted descriptive survey research design as it enabled correction of information from respondents without compromising their privacy. The study targeted principals and teachers in public secondary schools. Collected data was analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. It was then presented in frequency distribution tables. Target population comprised of 26 principals and 115 teachers in public secondary schools and due to the small number of respondents, the researcher adopted census technique as the sampling procedure. Therefore the study sample was 26 principals and 115 teachers. The researcher conducted piloting in the neighbouring Kitui Central sub-county to enhance reliability and validity of the research instruments. Data
was corrected using questionnaires, analyzed and presented in frequencies and percentages.

Data was presented in relation to the study findings, first the study demography shows that majority of teachers (65.5 percent) are female though majority of the primary school principals in the study area (84.6 percent) were male. Majority of the principals 53.8 percent were over 50 years old while 73.5 percent of the teachers were between 31 to 40 years old. Moreover majority of the principals (73.1%) and teachers (80.5%) had attained Bachelor degree as their highest academic qualification. Moreover more principals than teachers had attained post graduate degree. Information from the study findings show that majority of the principals had been in their current station for more than 5 years. Majority of the teachers (59.4%) had being in the teaching profession for over 10 years. This was an implication that majority of secondary school teachers had been in the teaching profession for long enough and were in a good position to give valid information on instructional supervision practices in their schools.

In line with objective one that state: to establish the extent to which administrative experience influence principals’ instructional supervision it was noted that majority of the principals (69.2%) indicated that they carry out instructional supervision practices once per month. These findings were shows that principals’ frequency of carrying out instructional supervision was low. However, principals conduct various instructional supervision practices with all principals indicating that they check for teachers schemes of work and pupils lesson notes.
All the principals agreed to the fact that instructional supervision is important for good teacher professional performance. Majority of the teachers indicated that most principals’ instructional supervision practices in their schools were effectively performed. However majority of the teachers (74.3%) indicated that principals in their schools were ineffective in determining subjects offered in school. These findings were an indication that majority of principals in Lower Yatta Sub-County were effective in their administrative experience thus they were able to carry out instructional supervision in schools. These findings were confirmed by teachers since all of them indicated that principals’ instructional supervision personally benefited them.

Majority of the teachers indicated that principals’ instructional supervision help them improve their instructional process, followed by professional development. This was an indication that teachers are helped to improve teaching methods when principals effectively carry out their roles in instructional supervision.

With objective two, to establish the extent to which workload influence principals’ instructional supervision the study reveals that most of the principals’ workload highly influences their supervisory practices. This was an indication that many principals have high responsibilities that hinder them from carrying out supervisory practices. According to majority of the teachers (54%) principals’ workload influence their instructional supervision practices at a very large extent. This was an implication that principals’ workload is greatly related to how effective they carry out instructional supervision practices. Majority of the principals (88.5%) indicated that they teach students
in classes. This implies that other than their administrative principals also teach students showing that they have heavy workload.

According to principals who indicated that they teach students in class stated that they do so for less than 10 hours per week. This was an indication that principals who teach students in classes conduct instructional process for 15 lessons in a week thus they teach 3 lessons per day. All principals indicated that they steer head schools development, accounting and attend stakeholders on top of teaching. According to most of the principals (46.2%) administrative duties take up most of their time in secondary schools. This was an indication that administration duties of principals consume most of their time thus weighting their responsibilities. This shows that principals are overloaded therefore failing to carry out instructional supervision. While majority of the principals (69.2%) agreed that workload hinder carrying out of instructional supervisory practices.

With regard in objective three, to establish the extent to which teachers’ attitude influence principals’ instructional supervision majority of the principals and majority of the teachers view instructional supervision as fault finding mission. Further majority of the principals indicated that their relationship with teachers have been strained due to conducting instructional supervision. Majority of the teachers (92.9%) disagreed that principals’ carries out supervision practices fairly, while 59.3 percent of teachers indicated that instructional supervision interfere with their personal relations with the head teachers.
According to most teachers (42.5%) principals should create positive working environment followed by delegating most of their duties to heads of department. This is an indication that teachers perceive that principals conducting instructional supervision interferes with conducive working environment in secondary school thus principals are bound to conduct in-service training and engage senior teacher in supervision practices to change teachers perception towards instructional supervision.

Objective four, to establish the extent to which school size influence principals’ instructional supervision, according to most of the principals secondary schools in lower Yatta Sub-County had enrolment of between 351 to 500 students. Majority of the schools had double stream classes. According to most teachers (47.8%) their schools had more than 50 students per class. These findings reveal that many secondary schools students are clouded in classes, due to high student enrolment. This could then be translated into high teacher workload hindering instructional supervision time.

The study also reveals that majority of the principals do not carry out instructional supervision in all classes. This was an indication that school size hinders effective instructional supervision since principals are not able to carry out the practices in all classes. According to most teachers principals in their schools carry out instructional supervision in all classes at least once per term. This was an indication that the school size in terms of the students’ enrolment and number of classes influence the number of times principals carry out instructional supervision practices in secondary schools.
Majority of principals (69.2%) the amount of work they have in secondary schools is the main hindrance for them to conduct instructional supervision. Thus the findings imply that majority of the secondary school were big hence the principals had a lot of responsibilities and duties making them to abandon instructional supervisory practices.

Finally the study sought to rate among the four variables which one of them influences principals’ instructional supervision practices more. Principals’ According to most of the principals indicated that workload affect instructional supervision more followed by teachers’ attitude. This is an indication that though all factors under observation in the study influence principals’ instructional supervision, they all affect the practices at different levels.

5.3 Conclusion

The findings of the study, supervision is a combination of process, procedures and conditions designed to advance the work effectiveness of individuals and groups. It was deemed to oversee smooth learning process. Instructional supervision stimulates teachers to improve instruction, revise and maintain instructions and methods of teaching. Moreover principals’ administrative experience greatly influences their ability to conduct effective instructional supervision.

The principals are supposed to carry out instructional supervisory practices like sitting in class as teachers teach to realize the teachers’ weaknesses and strengths. After observation the principals should physically hold a conference to discuss the instructional process. This is supposed to uplift both the teacher
and principal’s relationship when positively enhanced. However due to high administrative workload majority of the secondary school principals do not find time to carry out effective instruction supervision practices. Teachers are aware of the head teachers’ instructional supervision role but have negative attitude towards the process. Majority of them felt that supervision was meant to witch hunt and fault find their teaching, rather than it being a development of their career. The school sizes in secondary school varies in workload thus the study conclude that school size is a determinant for effective instructional supervision.

5.4 Recommendations of the study

The study findings came up with the following recommendations:

i. The Ministry of Education should organize seminars/workshops for secondary school principals on administrative management to ensure that principals are able to create enough time for their administrative duties and instructional supervision.

ii. School Board of Management and Quality Assurance and Standards Officers should employ expertise in various designated duties that are burdened on the principals to help lighten his workload so that he can have enough time for instructional supervision.

iii. Secondary school principals should use friendly approaches on their instructional supervision duties to ensure that they do not experience conflict with teachers when carrying out instructional supervisory practices.
iv. The teachers should be sensitized on the importance of instructional supervision in their career development, this will guide on teachers how to carry out duties.

v. The Kenya Educational Management Institute should create awareness to training teachers and head teachers on the importance of instructional supervision on their career development.

vi. Educationalists should organize seminars and workshops to create awareness to principals on positive ways of conducting instructional supervision practices.

vii. The Ministry of Education should reinforce the policy on maximum class size to ensure that secondary schools do not over enroll students so as to avoid large class sizes that hinder effective instructional supervision.

5.5 Suggestions for further study

The researcher proposes further research in the following areas:

i. This study needs to be replicated in other sub-counties throughout the country in order to compare the results.

ii. Further study should also be carried out on contribution of leadership styles and the effectiveness of instructional supervision.

iii. A study should be carried out to investigate the influence of instructional supervision on the relationship of teachers and principals.
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APPENDIX I

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

University of Nairobi
College of Education and External Studies
School of Education
Department of Educational Administration & Planning
P. O. Box 30197
Nairobi.

The principal

............................................secondary school

P.o box ____

Kitui.

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: REQUEST TO COLLECT DATA

I am a post graduate student at the University of Nairobi pursuing a Master of Education Degree in the Department of Educational Administration. I am conducting a research on the school factors influencing principals’ instructional supervision practices.

Your school has been selected to participate in this research. All responses will be used for this academic work only and respondents will be treated in confidence. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Kieleko Deborah M.
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS

The objective of this Questionnaire is to collect data on establishing the factors that influence instructional supervision practices among principals in public secondary schools in Lower Yatta sub-county. Kindly read the items carefully and provide a response that best represents your opinion. To provide confidentiality, do not indicate your name on the questionnaire. The questionnaire has several sections. Please answer by putting a tick( √) in the boxes or writing your answer in the space provided.

Section A: Background information

1. What is your gender?
   Male [  ] Female [  ]

2. How old are you? 21 – 30 years [  ] 31 – 40 years [  ] 41 – 50 years [  ] Over 50 years [  ]

3. What is your highest level of education?
   P1 [  ] ATS [  ] College Diploma [  ]
   Bachelors’ Degree [  ] Postgraduate Degree [  ]

4. How long have you served as a principal?
   Less than 1 year [  ] 1-5 years [  ] 6 - 10 years [  ]
   11-20 years [  ] Over 20 years [  ]

Section B: Instructional supervision

5. Do you carry out instructional supervision?
   Yes [  ] No [  ]

6. How often do you carry out supervision?
   Daily [  ] Weekly [  ] Monthly [  ] Others (Specify)..........................
7. What do you check during supervision?
........................................................................................................................................

8. Instructional supervision is important for good teacher professional performance

   Strongly agree [ ] Agree [ ] Neutral [ ] Disagree [ ] Strongly disagree [ ]

Section C: Work load and the influence on principal’s instructional supervision practices.

9. Do you teach students in lessons?

   Yes [ ] No [ ] If yes, how many hours a week?....................

10. What other duties do you carry out apart from teaching?

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

11. Which of your duties and responsibilities takes the most time?

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

12. Sometimes I have too much work that I cannot manage to carry out instructional supervision

    Strongly agree [ ] Agree [ ] Neutral [ ] Disagree [ ] Strongly disagree [ ]

Section D: Teachers’ attitude and the influence on principal’s instructional supervision practices.

13. Some teachers view supervision as a fault finding mission

    Strongly agree [ ] Agree [ ] Neutral [ ] Disagree [ ] Strongly disagree [ ]
14. Relationships with some of my teachers have been strained due to my instructional supervision practices

Strongly agree [ ] Agree [ ] Neutral [ ] Disagree [ ] Strongly disagree [ ]

15. Do you engage in creation of awareness on teachers on how they can actively participate in supervision? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Section E: School size and principals’ instructional supervision

16. Kindly indicate your school enrolment

Below 200 [ ] 201 – 350 [ ] 351 – 500 [ ]
above 500 [ ]

17. How many streams are your school’s classes?

Single stream [ ] Double stream [ ]
Tripple stream [ ] More than four streams [ ]

18. Are you able to carry out instructional supervision in all classes in your school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

a. If yes how often? Termly [ ] Monthly [ ] Weekly [ ]

b. If no why?.................................................................

19. Do your other administrative responsibilities hinder instructional supervision in your school due to high pupil enrolment? Yes [ ] No [ ]

[ ] Explain your answer.................................................................

20. Which of the following factors do you feel affects you most in your instructional supervision role?

Administrative experience [ ] Workload [ ]

Teachers’ attitudes [ ] School size [ ]
APPENDIX III

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

The objective of this questionnaire is to collect data on establishing the school factors that affect instructional supervision practices among principals in public secondary schools in Lower Yatta sub-county. Kindly read the items carefully and provide a response that best represents your opinion. To provide confidentiality, do not indicate your name on the questionnaire. The questionnaire has several sections. Please answer by putting a tick (✓) in the boxes or writing your answer in the provided spaces.

Section A: Background information

1. What is your gender?
   Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. Kindly indicate your age bracket?
   25-35 years [ ] 36 – 40 years [ ] 41 – 45 years [ ]
   46-50 years [ ] 51 – 60 years [ ]

3. What is your highest academic qualification?
   Graduate [ ] B. Ed (Bachelor of Education) [ ]
   M. Ed (Masters in Education) [ ]
   Any other (please specify)..............................................................

4. How long have you served as a teacher?
   .................................................................................................

Section B: Work load

5. How would you rate the teachers work load in your school?
   Very high [ ] High [ ] Average [ ] Low [ ] Very low [ ]
6. To what extent would you rate the influence head teachers workload has on their instructional supervision?

To a large extent [ ] Uncertain [ ] To a small extent [ ]

Section C: Attitude towards supervision.

Kindly indicate with (✓) the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements below.

**KEY:** 1= Strongly Disagree 2= Disagree 3=Uncertain 4= Agree 5= Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>The head teacher carries out supervision fairly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 ii) | Personal relations interfere with the head teachers’ instructional supervision |
 iii) | Supervision mainly looks at the negatives and not good work of teachers |

7. What measures can be taken to improve head teachers instructional supervision?

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

Section D: Supervision practices

8. By means of a tick (✓) indicate effectiveness of the principal as school supervisor to perform the functions listed below. Use the following choices: 5. Very Effective [ ] 4.Effective [ ] 3.Fairly effective [ ] 2. Ineffective [ ] 1. Very ineffective [ ]

2. Ineffective [ ]  1. Very ineffective [ ]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Fairly Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Setting goals and ways to achieve them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Determining subjects offered in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Giving instructional guidance to teachers on school curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organizing to support curriculum implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Advising teachers on school curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Observing teachers in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Checking lesson plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Has supervision by the principal benefited you personally?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   If yes, explain.................................................................

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

Section E: School size and principals’ instructional supervision

21. Kindly indicate your class size

   Below 30 [ ] 31 – 40 [ ] 41 – 50 [ ] above 50 [ ]

22. How many streams are your school’s classes?

   Single stream [ ] Double stream [ ] Triple stream [ ]
   More than four streams [ ]

23. Is your headteacher able to carry out instructional supervision in all classes? Yes [ ] No [ ]

   a. If yes how often? Termly [ ] Monthly [ ] Weekly [ ]
24. Do your headteacher’s other administrative responsibilities hinder instructional supervision in your school due to high pupil enrolment?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Explain your answer

Thank you.
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