**CONTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS TO INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION OF SCHEMES OF WORK IN THE ENHANCEMENT OF STUDENTS’ ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN EMUHAYA AND VIHIGA SUB COUNTIES IN KENYA**

**Abstract:** Studies worldwide have revealed that school administrators are key contributors to students’ academic performance by enhancing instructional supervision within schools. Nevertheless, this assertion in some countries has been found to be low despite this administrators’ contribution. For instance, in Kenya the average performance for the years 2010 to 2014, only 29% candidates scored above a mean score of 6.00 points. In Emuhaya and Vihiga Sub Counties 3535 (26%) and 2104 (15%) candidates respectively scored 6.00 and above points compared to Hamisi and Sabatia Sub-Counties’ with 3913 (28%) and 4375 (31%) candidates respectively between years 2009 and 2013. The objective of the study was to establish the contribution of school administrators to instructional supervision with regard to schemes of work in the enhancement of students’ academic performance. The study was guided by a conceptual framework in which the independent variable was the administrators’ contribution in form of checking prepared schemes of works and the dependent variable, students’ academic performance. The study established that administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision was low (Adjusted R²= 0.011). The study concluded that administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision was not significant and therefore, did not enhance students’ academic performance. The study recommended that administrators should increase their contribution to instructional supervision in order to enhance students’ academic performance. The study findings are of significance to school administrators, policy makers and other stakeholders with regard to enhancement of students’ academic performance by increasing instructional supervision.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Contribution of school administrators to instructional supervision is an important aspect in school management and administration. School administrators are responsible for the day-to-day management of schools on behalf of Schools’ Boards of Management (BOM). Further, they are the implementers of government educational policies at school levels. They are also the accounting and quality assurance and standards officers of schools under their management. This means that they oversee provision of quality education in schools in curriculum implementation. It is therefore imperative that school administrators go out of their ways to ensure that teachers prepare and use schemes of work adequately to enhance students’ academic performance. Nevertheless, there are a few administrators who do not check and approve prepared subjects’ schemes of work appropriately in the belief that it is the responsibility of Heads of Departments (HODS) and that teachers are trained for this work and therefore need no supervision.

Administration according to Homby (2012) as cited in Omeke and Onah (2012) is perceived as an activity done in order to plan, organize and successfully run an institution, a process or act of organizing the way something is done. It involved planning activities which aim at the fulfillment of the goals of a particular organization. Similarly, management is a process of making use of human and non-human resources to achieve organizational goals (Onifade, 2004, as cited in Fasasi, 2004). Management of secondary schools refers to a process of making use of the available resources towards the achievement of an educational goal. According to Numkanisorn (2008), school management is the capacity of a school to maximize functions or the degree to which the school can perform functions when given fixed output. That is why the Commonwealth of Learning and the Southern African Development Community Ministries of Education (2000) agree that the efficient and effective management of fiscal and physical resources can enhance instructional progress. All these are attributed to school administrators for purposes of enhancing academic performance.
In particular, the purpose of instructional supervision is to improve the quality of teaching through bettering skills of teachers which in turn enhance students’ academic achievement (Samoei, 2014).

Contribution of school administrators was in this study measured in terms of the value added beyond performing their functional role of management, which is not an end in itself. Besides their mandated roles, school administrators’ contribution in this study focused on the efforts they put in place to ensure that teachers prepared schemes of work for classroom instruction and indicators were checking and approving them for use. The efforts of the administrators in checking teachers’ prepared schemes of works is one way of contributing to instructional supervision in the enhancement of students’ academic performance. The indicators were signatures, dates, rubber stamps and relevant comments. School administrators’ contribution to education is one determinant of quality education since they are designated as internal quality assurance officers in schools (MOEST, 2004). Owing to the challenges that faced the Directorate of Inspection, principals were designated as Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QASO) in schools being entrusted with the task of instructional supervision for teachers under them. The Government has established Quality Assurance and Standards’ Departments, provides trained teachers and funds Free Secondary Education (FSE) in all schools to attain quality education (Republic of Kenya, ROK, 2008). Despite all these measures in place Emuhaya and Vihiga Sub Counties have not been able to realize quality grades. Parents are not obtaining their returns to investments. Secondary schools need to meet the yearning aspirations of the society which include meeting the countries’ national goals of education such as provision of quality education to its citizenry (Ekundayo, 2010a). Based on this, Townsend (1994) in Ajayi and Ekundayo (2011) posits that the criterion for measuring quality should incorporate more than achievement in written examination. In support, Uline, Miller and Moran (1998) posit that when quality is reduced to a single variable it is generally students’ achievement in average tests score levels (Booker, 2008), realized when principals do proper curriculum supervision such as checking and approving prepared schemes of work.

In the study on assessment of principal’s supervisory roles for quality assurance in Ondo State Nigeria, Ayeni (2011) recommended that principals should collaborate with stakeholders such as old students, development partners, Parents’ Teachers’ Associations (P.T.A) to provide adequate instructional materials and facilities for effective teaching, learning process in secondary schools. He concluded that the attainment of quality grades is determined by effective curriculum management. Unlike this study, Ayeni (2011) linked principals’ provision of adequate instructional materials to effective teaching learning process. The present study attempted to link administrators’ contribution to teaching learning process through instructional supervision and how it enhances students’ academic performance. Principals in Nigeria do not involve subordinates in their daily routine administrative duties and as a result do a lot of things themselves (Ekundayo, 2010a). Secondary school performance in the context of Ajayi and Ekundayo (2011) refers to the ability of a school to achieve its predetermined desired goals (Okumbe, 1999; Sergiovanni, 1987; Obondo, Nandago and Otende, 2005; & Fasasi, 2004). Each term teachers engage in preparation of schemes of work for achieving syllabus coverage. In support, Tondeur, Umuhure, Rwigire and Habaragire (2008) observe that good school management depends on the efforts of a number of agencies that are interlinked: the regional or provincial office, the district office, the local community and the school staff, all play a part in the daily operations of the school. The head teacher is the pivotal link in this network and ultimately plays the most crucial role in ensuring good performance.

While studying the impact of head teachers’ supervision of teachers on students’ academic performance in Buret District, Too, Keter, and Kosgei (2012) concluded that supervision had positive relationship with the school’s overall mean score in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (K.C.S.E). The study recommended that head teachers should improve on teacher supervision if schools were to register improved performance in K.C.S.E. Through supervision the teachers are guided and influenced to strive towards desired educational goals. Whereas the focus of Too, et al., (2012) study was on the impact of the head teachers’ supervision of teacher performance on students’ academic performance, the present study linked the contribution of school administrators to instructional supervision in so far as checking teachers’ schemes of work and whether it enhanced learners academic performance. At present, secondary schools’ principals are absolute Chief Executive Officers (C.E.Os) have to be instructional leaders and manage multi-million dollar budgets (Arne, 2009). Further, he observes that instructional leadership occupies half a principal’s day, including checking schemes of work. Though principals are human capital managers adept at recognizing, developing, rewarding and evaluating teachers, a lot more is needed for their professional development (Colvin, 2009). According to Mulkeen (2010), supervision and monitoring of teachers is a central function of the school head. However, heads are absent from schools more than the teachers, frequently for official duties.

Based on national examinations, performance in Emuhaya and Vihiga Sub Counties has been below the minimum university entry requirement of quality grades. From year 2009 to 2013, out of 43705
candidates who sat for Kenya Certificate Secondary Examination (K.C.S.E), 13847 obtained mean grades C+ and above, with Emuhaya and Vihiga Sub-Counties contributing 3535 (26%) and 2104 (15%) candidates, while Hamisi and Sabatia Sub-Counties contributed 3913(28%) and 4275(31%) candidates respectively (Table 1). This means that the quality of education was low and not good enough. Nationally, the percentages of candidates who scored mean grade C+ and above in K.C.S.E during years 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 were 27%, 29%, 29%, 28% and 31% respectively (ROK, 2015b). Since the inception of 8.4.4 system of education in Kenya, candidates who score between grades A and C+ are normally considered for placement in public universities. The country’s minimum grade for accessing university education remains a C+ (Buhere, 2016). Whereas it is the responsibility of parents and communities to provide for physical facilities, payment of teachers’ salaries and learning materials, the contribution of school administrators to students’ academic performance in so far as checking teachers’ prepared subjects’ schemes of work has not been studied, a gap this study sought to fill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vihiga</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2104</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emuhaya</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3535</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamisi</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3913</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabatia</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4275</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>2142</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2468</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2926</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3077</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3234</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13827</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Vihiga County Director of Education Office (2014)

Research Objective

The research objective was to establish the contribution of School Administrators to instructional supervision with regard to schemes of work in enhancement of students’ academic performance in secondary schools in Emuhaya and Vihiga Sub – counties, Kenya

Synthesis of literature on the Contribution of School Administrators to Instructional Supervision in the Enhancement of Students’ Academic Performance

Supervision was derived from the Latin word ‘supervidee’ meaning oversee (Ofianomagbon, 2004 as cited in Okendu 2012). Overseeing the work of and duties of subordinates connotes the art of guiding, helping, coordinating and directing teachers and other instructional staff so that school programs are improved. Supervision helps a lot in improving academic performance of students since it aims at enhancing teaching and learning through proper guidance and planning and devising ways of improving teachers professionally.

Globally, it has been shown that one determinant of excellence in public schools is the leadership of the individual school principal (King, 2006). Research on effective schools in the United States of America strongly supports the concept that the principal is a school’s success or failure (Austin, 1997 as cited in King, 2006). Similarly, Ibukin (1997) as cited in both Ekundayo (2010a) and in Ajayi and Ekundayo (2011) remarks that without leadership an organization can be best described as a scene of confusion and chaos. That is why he concludes that when leadership is effective there is progress, but when the leadership is defective the organization declines and decays. According to Tounder, et al., (2008), principals are expected to be effective managers with focus on students’ achievement. The school head is the authority within the institution with the overall responsibility of its smooth running (Bunwaree, 2009). He is accountable to the higher authorities as well as to the community in relation to the use of resources (Onderi & Makori, 2013). School resources when used prudently will enhance learner performance. One role of the teaching staff is to prepare students and ensure their readiness for further studies and for the world of work as well as for life in a society (Bunwaree, 2009). Thus, their duties involve adequate preparation of schemes of work and weekly plans in respect of the subject taught, among other factors (Ayeni, 2012b). It is then expected that administrators check teachers’ prepared schemes of work for relevance to show support for their work.

Fisher (2011) as cited in Alimi and Akinifalarini (2012) defines supervision as efforts of administrators directed to provide leadership to the teachers and other education works in the improvement of instruction. It involves the stimulation of professional growth and development of teachers and other educational objectives, materials of instruction. In Malaysia, supervision is done by the principal, the headmaster or the senior teacher empowered by the authority (Yunis, Yunis & Ishhak, 2011). Administrators carry out supervision through examining teachers’ teaching plans, students’ work books, and observing the process of teaching and learning in the classroom. In a study carried out in Central Perak District of Malaysia by Yunis et al., (2011), on the school principal’s role in teaching and supervision in selected schools, it was found out that most principals were giving more attention to the teaching materials preparation rather than other supervision tasks. The
study used 140 teachers in 4 out of the 11 schools. The number of school used was insufficient to provide adequate data and the respondents not varied as with present study which used sample sizes of 58 Principals, 58 Deputy Principals, 58 DOS and 58 Chairmen of BOMs in 58 secondary schools. Data collection procedure was not indicated implying that instruments may not been validated. Like in this study, data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) such as descriptive statistics, inferential and Pearson correlation. While Yunus, et al., (2011) linked principals’ role in supervision and teaching process, the study did not link their contribution to checking schemes of work in the enhancement of students’ academic performance, a knowledge gap this study hoped to fill.

Ayeni (2011) while studying an assessment of principals’ supervisory roles for quality assurance in secondary schools in Ondo State Nigeria, found out that most principals accorded desired attention to monitoring of teachers’ attendance and adequacies of dairies of work, while tasks such as the providing feedback to teachers and review of activities with stakeholders were least performed by many principals. The study used a population of 60 principals, 540 teachers, from 60 secondary schools. The study did not address the contribution of the school administrators to instructional supervision with regard to checking teachers’ prepared schemes of work, an area to be pursued in this study. In Kenya, K.C.S.E. is a valid measure of academic performance (Masya, 2009, as cited in Thinguri, Korrir, Charo, & Ogochi, 2014). University assignment and admission depend on performance of K.C.S.E. in secondary schools. In the study carried out in Njoro District Kenya, on students’ school attendance and academic performance, Thinguri, et al., (2014) used a population of 169 male and 89 female teachers, 4898 boys and 3306 girls from 30 public secondary schools. Like this study, simple random sampling was used to select 156 teachers and 363 forms 3 and 4 students from 8 sampled schools. The study found out a strong negative correlation between students’ absenteeism and academic performance.

Supervision improves teaching and learning through deliberate emphasis on ways and means of instilling excellence in the quality of instruction. As supported by Too, et al... (2012), supervision offers professional services to teachers for the purpose of interacting and influencing them so as to maintain, change and improve their service delivery to the students in order to enhance performance. Samoei (2014) supports this by indicating that the primary purpose of supervision is to help support teachers to be able to handle instruction in the classroom. Regular and continuous supervision checks breaches and ensures that teachers conform to stipulated standards.

Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework that guided this study is according to Frankeal and Wallen (2001), a mental or visual picture that a researcher develops to show relationships between and among concepts or variables (Figure 1). In the wake of emphasis on schools’ performance in national examinations, a lot of focus has been directed towards the mean grade, leaving other areas of management unattended. Yet aspects of management among other things involve relating resources to the objectives (Paisley, 1993, as cited in Commonwealth of Learning & the Southern African Development Community of Education, 2000). The study attempted to examine how administrators’ checking of schemes of work - independent variable (Hunt & Ellis, 2004) contribute to students’ academic performance. Independent variables are characteristics that probably ‘cause’ or influence or affect outcome (Creswell, 2003), whereas dependent variables are those that depend on the independent, are the outcomes or results of the influence of the independent variable. Students’ academic performance is dependent on school administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision in so far as checking teachers’ schemes of work are concerned. The independent variable was computed against K.C.S.E. mean scores. Rating scales were used to measure the frequency of checking teachers’ schemes of work as signified by presence of signatures and meaningful comments and not just “Checked” or “Approved for use”, as one way of contributing to instructional supervision. Intervening variables according to Cresswell (2003) are those variables that stand in between the independent and dependent variables, mediating the effect of the former on the latter.

Administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision as supported by Too, et al., (2012), Yunis, et al., (2011), Ayeni (2011) and Samoei (2014) among others, enhanced students’ academic performance. This study went further to establish the actual contribution of the administrators through regression analysis as signified by the presence of principals’ comments, signatures, rubber stamps and dates in teachers’ prepared subject schemes of work perused.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research designs that were adopted in this study were descriptive survey and correlation. The study population was 4874 and consisted of 58 Principals, 58 Deputy Principals, 58 Directors of Studies (DOS), 4640 Students, 58 Chairpersons of the Boards of Management (BOMS) and 2 Sub County Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (SCQASO). Fisher’s formula was used to determine sample size of 354 students. Saturated sampling was used to obtain data from Principals, Deputy Principals, Directors of Studies, Chairpersons of BOMS, and Quality Assurance and Standards Officers. Questionnaires, Observation Checklists, Document Analysis Guides and Interview Schedules were used to collect data. Face and content validity of research instruments were determined by experts in Educational Administration. Reliability of questionnaire was determined by piloting in 6 schools and a co-efficient of 0.7 at p-value of 0.05 was set. Quantitative data was analyzed using frequent counts, means, percentages and regression analysis. Quantitative data was analyzed for content in emergent themes and sub themes.

RESULTS
Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic characteristics of school administrators in Emuhaya and Vihiga Sub Counties as reported by principals (n=52) were as follows

---

**Figure 1:** School Administrators’ Contribution to Students’ Academic Performance in secondary schools in Emuhaya and Vihiga Sub –Counties.

*Source:* Researcher, 2014 (Based on Literature Review)
From Table 2 it can be observed that 30 (58%) of school administrators were male whereas 22 (42%) were female, with 28 (53%) being aged above 50 years. This implies that the gender parity had not been realized in secondary school administration, with 28 (53%) retiring in the next 10 years. However, 23 (45%) of the administrators were aged between 41 – 50 years with only 1 (2%) aged below 40 years. Further, 33 (63%) administrators had teaching experience of between 21 – 30 years, implying that they had been in the teaching profession for some time to understand how schools run. Similarly, 10 (20%) administrators had a teaching experience of between 11 – 20 years, while 8 (16%) have a teaching experience of over 30 years meaning that they had matured in the profession. Concerning one’s experience as an administrator, 22 (43%) reported that they had between 5 to 9 years of experience in leadership, while 17 (31%) had between 10 - 15 years. Only 7 (14%) had an experience of between 2 – 4 years in leadership. Job experience is defined as length of experience in a given occupation (MacDaniel, Schmidt & Hunter, 1988). Studies have shown correlation between job experience and job performance to be positive. In the context of Rice (2010), experience matters. The impact of experience is strongest during the first few years of principals’ leadership during which everyone wants to commit more funds on school activities, after that marginal returns diminish. As concerns the number of lessons taught per week, 32 (63%) of the administrators reported that they taught over 12 lessons per week. This is in keeping with Teachers Service Commission (TSC) policy on curriculum instruction that ensures that administrators are in touch with what goes on in the classroom. Further, 15 (28%) of the administrators indicated that they taught between 6 – 12 lessons a week, whereas 5 (10%) taught less than 6 lessons a week. In terms of the highest level of education attained, 38 (73%) of administrators had a bachelor’s degree while 13 (26%) and 1 (2%) had masters’ degree and a diploma.
respectively. In so far as attendance of management courses was concerned, 48 (92%) administrators had attended management courses. This implies that majority of them are endowed with management skills gained from these trainings.

Table 2 is important to this study in that it gives credibility of respondents used. Characteristics such as age show maturity levels of administrators. Contribution rises with age to optimum levels and then starts to decline as age progresses. Gender shows that information was obtained from both male and female. Gender of respondents indicates that leadership in schools is held by both male and females implying that both sexes are contributing to students’ academic performance. Contribution by female administrators is mainly channelled to girls’ schools, whereas contribution made by male administrators is mainly channelled to both mixed and boys’ schools. However, women remain strongly underrepresented in senior school headship (Fuller, 2017). Although there are changes in the number of women holding senior leadership positions in secondary schools, a man teacher has a greater chance of being a head than a woman (Coleman, 2005). Women are favored as heads in all girls’ schools. Becoming a woman head of a co-ed or boys’ schools was comparatively difficulty. With most of the administrators being above 41 years, it is expected that they are mature and credible enough to give trusted responses that can be relied on. Those below 41 years still have expectations to perform better in life. With 68% of the administrators having a teaching experience of over 20 years, they are familiar with the format, context and subject content within schemes of work.

It is the policy that the principal must teach a number of lessons. As noted over 90% of administrators teach between 6 – 12 lessons a week. This enables them prepare professional records for proper curriculum implementation and have a ‘feel’ of the conditions within classrooms. Head teachers should have manageable teaching loads so as to deal with paperwork in the offices (Sherrington, 2013). Workloads for principals can have detrimental effects on the quality of teaching, the support they can offer to colleagues, and their health. Overloaded principals would be incapable of effectively carrying out their core work of administration (Ingvarson, Kleinhenz, Beavis, Barwick, Carthy & Wilkison, 2005) such as checking and approving subject schemes of work. Experience is what you gain when you are in the field (Nandwah, 2011). Having been in the school system long enough both as teachers and leaders, administrators are capable of evaluating themselves better in terms of supervising staff under them. This experience enables them advice and support teachers in matters related to schemes of work and ultimately overseeing their use. Work experience is related to job performance (Quinones, Ford & Teachout, 1995). With 73% of the administrators having a Bachelor’s degree, it is expected that they have a deeper understanding of what needs to be acquired in so far as curriculum teaching learning materials are concerned, how to interact with and supervise teachers for the sake of enhancing students’ academic performance. Higher education plays an important lesson in enhancing personal achievement in one’s career. Higher college graduates contribute more than others to social wellbeing in terms of efficiency (Baum & Payer, 2005). A knowledgeable, honest and satisfied teacher will command respect and produce hard working, efficient and honest citizens (Shah, 2007), and in essence inspire confidence when carrying out supervisory tasks.

With knowledge acquired in school management, administrators are expected to engage in meaningful teacher supervision so as to enhance students’ academic performance. Kenya Educational Staff Institute (KESI) was a product of the Mungai Report of 1978. Currently KESI has been transformed into Kenya Educational Management Institute (KEMI) which offers In-service training to principals, deputy principals and heads of departments in schools, but does not prepare teachers aspiring to be principals. Courses are offered in 2 weeks (April, August and December) which seems to be too short (Nandwah, 2011).

### School Data

The study was conducted in 52 secondary schools of which 29 were from Emuhaya Sub – County and 23 from Vihiga Sub – County. Out of these 37 were mixed day schools, 10 girls’ schools and 5 boys’ schools. The students’ population was as shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency (F)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 200</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-700</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 701</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Data, 2016*
From Table 3 it can be seen that 6 (12%) schools had students' population of below 200 students, with another 6 (12%) having between 501 – 600, and another 6 (12%) having a student population of between 601-700. Only 12 (13%) schools had a student population ranging between 201–300, and another 10 (19%) schools had a population ranging between 301 – 400 students. Further, it can be noted that 9 (17%) schools had a population of between 401-500 students, while 3(5%) schools had a student population of above 700.

School population cuts across board where school administrators are making contribution right from schools with low population to schools with large population. Therefore, the study gives realistic data on administrators’ contribution at various levels regardless of school population, thus making it a true representation of contribution of principals in both Emuhaya and Vihiga Sub – Counties’ secondary schools.

Students’ academic performance in this study was measured by the mean scores obtained by the students in the 52 secondary schools’ in K.C.S.E in the year 2016. In order to establish the contribution of Administrators to students’ academic performance, empirical KCSE 2016 results were computed. The results were as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Students’ academic performance in K.C.S.E 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School’s Performance Index</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 – 2.00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01 – 3.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01 – 4.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01 – 5.00</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01 – 6.00</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01 – 7.00</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.01 – 8.00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.01 – 9.00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Emuhaya and Vihiga Sub County Offices, 2017

From Table 4 it can be observed that only 4 (7.7%) schools obtained mean score of above 6.01(C Plain) implying that 48 schools had below average mean score. This raises concern given that School administrators are the custodians of school resources bestowed upon them to utilize in the enhancement of students’ academic performance. The outcome of stakeholders’ investment in education is evidenced in students’ academic performance. Poor results often cast aspersion on the kind of administration in place, hence the need for this study to find out the efforts of administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision with focus on checking schemes of work in enhancing students’ academic performance.

Research Question

What is the contribution of school administrators to instructional supervision with regard to checking schemes of work in the enhancement of students’ academic performance?

School administrators’ contributions to instructional supervision were rated in their schools based on document analysis guides. The indicators were administrators’ meaningful comments, dates, signatures and rubber stamps on schemes of work showing support for instructional supervision. The results are as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: School Administrators’ Contribution to Instructional Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrators’ Contribution Index</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 – 1.44</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45 - 2.44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45 - 3.44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45-4.44</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.45 – 5.00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2017 (Appendix J)

Interpretation of administrators’ contribution
1.00 – 1.44 = Very Low,
1.45 – 2.44 = Low,
2.45 – 3.44 = Moderate,
3.45 – 4.44 = High,
4.45 – 5.00 = Very High
From Table 5 it can be noted that 1(1.92%) school administrator contributed very little in checking prepared schemes of work. Similarly, 22 (42%) administrators contributed little in checking these records, while 20 (38%) administrators’ contribution was moderate in doing the same tasks. Only 8 (15%) administrators’ contribution in checking schemes of work was high, while 1(1.92%) administrator’s contribution was very high.

To confirm administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision, the researcher physically checked teachers’ prepared schemes of work in various subjects in 52 schools. The results are as shown in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Administrators’ Checking and Approval of Schemes of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspect of Contribution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Comments on HODs Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Principal’s Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Principal’s Rubber Stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Principal’s Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Completeness e.g. pg by pg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2017

From Table 6 it can be seen that 52 (100%) schemes of work checked had the principals’ rubber stamps while 50 (96%) had the principals’ signatures. Similarly, 39 (75%) of the checked schemes of work had the HODs signature alongside the principals’ comments on the action taken by the HODs. Only 47 (90%) principals commended on the schemes of work with remarks such as ‘Approved’, ‘Checked’ or ‘Seen and approved for use’. Concerning whether administrators checked and approved schemes of work page by page so as to be aware of finer details, only 22 (42%) of the principals did this, with the rest either approving random cover or center pages.

To establish the contribution of school administrators to instructional supervision in the enhancement of students’ academic performance, contribution of administrators were regressed against students’ performance (Tables 4 & Table 5). The results were as shown in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Regression analysis of administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision in the enhancement of students’ academic performance (n = 52)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant Instructional supervision)

From Table 7 it can be noted that there was a weak, positive and not significant relationship between the administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision and students’ academic performance ($r = .092$, $p > .05$). This means that the administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision in enhancement of students’ academic performance was negligible ($p$ value was $> 0.05$). Similarly, it can also be noted that administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision accounted for 1.1% variation in students’ academic performance as signified by the co-efficient of Adjusted $R^2$ of 0.011. This co-efficient means that administrators’ activities of checking and approving schemes of work reduced students’ academic performance instead of enhancing it. It was little or small and did not have any significant influence on students’ academic performance.

To further confirm whether principals’ instructional supervision was a significant predictor of students’ academic performance, ANOVA was computed. The results were as shown in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: ANOVA of Administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision in the enhancement of students’ academic performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Students’ academic performance in KCSE
b. Predictors: (Constant Instructional Supervision)
From Table 7 it can be observed that principals’ instructional supervision was not a significant predictor of students’ academic performance ($F(1, 50) = 0.425, p > 0.05$). Document analysis guide revealed that principals’ contribution in checking teachers’ prepared schemes of work was moderate with a mean rating of 2.62.

Since the administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision was not a significant predictor of students’ academic performance as signified by p value of .517, there was therefore no need to compute a linear regression to establish the actual influence of administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision in the enhancement of students’ academic performance (Brace, Kemp & Snelgar, 2006). Moreover, it is commonly believed that administrators’ contribution to supervision enhances students’ academic performance. However, their mere presence did not influence performance, since it was evidenced that principals were not helping teachers to improve students’ academic performance through advice.

**DISCUSSION**

Instruction in this study refers to teaching and learning. Supervision is an interaction between principals and teachers for the purpose of improving activities such as making schemes of work. Instructional supervision requires that principals focus mainly on teachers who implement curriculum directly through instruction. The purpose of supervision is to help principals to support teachers to be able to handle instruction in the classroom. Instructional Supervision approaches used in this study included administrators checking and approving prepared schemes of work. Added to this, administrators are expected to do classroom visitations to oversee teacher – student interaction, guide and help teachers in matters of curriculum delivery. Further, supervision entails the administrator checking inventories to understand what needs to be provided. Through checking teachers’ records, problems and weaknesses are identified and addressed (Samoei, 2014). Instructional supervision aids principals in coordinating, improving and maintaining high teaching and learning standards. Continuous instructional supervision ensures that teachers adhere to set norms and standards of behavior with regard to curriculum implementation. Any breaches can be noted easily and amendments made (Macharia, 2012). A scheme of work is a guideline that defines the structure and content of an academic course. It is usually an interpretation of a syllabus and can be used as a guide throughout the course to monitor progress against the original plan. It maps out clearly how resources (time, books and equipment) and class activities (teacher’s talk, group work, and discussion) and assignment strategies such as home-work will be used to ensure that the learning aim and objectives of the course are met successfully.

Principals understand and know their role to supervise teachers but they seldom have time to do so due to heavy workload. Some principals delegated this supervisory responsibility to senior assistants namely deputy principals and respective HODs. According to Wehmeber (2004) as cited in Too, et al., (2012) supervision is the act of being in charge and making sure that things are done correctly and safely. According to Eshiwani (1993), supervision of teachers’ and students’ academic performance takes the dimension of checking schemes of work. Whereas Eshiwani (1993) insists that the principal has the responsibility of performing this role, this study points out that some are not doing it. If all principals were doing it, the overall performance could increase. Principals’ active supervision as witnessed by participant observation schedule which showed that principals got involved in this role only when the TSC’s Teachers’ Performance Appraisal Development Tool (TPAD) demanded it. It was witnessed that principals delegated the checking of schemes of work to DOS, prepared lesson plans and lesson notes to use for classroom instructions when they were to be appraised. This is in disagreement with Hall (2005) who says that principals’ presence can influence and improve the teaching learning process. Physical presence in the classroom where the action is can motivate performance. Instruction as defined by Okendu (2012) refers to the interaction between persons, materials, ideas, performance and objects of the contrived curricula. As observed by Okendu (2012) in his study on the influence of instructional process and supervision on academic performance of secondary school students in Rivers State University, Nigeria, regular instructional supervision has a significant bearing on students’ academic performance. Despite this, the present study confirmed otherwise.

Where adequate supervision is done it enhances students’ academic performance. However, the outcome from the principals’ questionnaires showed that what is actually being done does not enhance performance as supported by the Adjusted $R^2$ of 0.011. This finding agrees with the preliminary survey indicated in Table 1 where Emuhaya and Vihiga Sub Counties contributed 26% and 15% candidates respectively with quality grades for University intake. While Murithi (2015) study agreed that instructional supervision enhances students’ academic performance, the present study found out that administrators’ contribution to students’ academic performance in so far as checking teachers’ prepared schemes of work was very weak and did not add much value. Were supervision in Emuhaya and Vihiga Sub Counties effective then this could increase students’ academic performance culminating into high University students’ intake. Checking and approval of schemes of works was actually done by the principals but without giving serious attention to strengths and weaknesses encountered. If administrators actually looked at the adequacy of schemes in terms of whether
the content area was capturing the syllabi, correct formatting especially in regard to learning objectives and reference materials, and remarked appropriately it would enhance learner performance. However, schemes of work perused lacked concrete evidence as signified by missing principals’ remarks, signatures, rubber stamps and dates. While some lacked the attention of HODs some were only signed and rubber stamped on the cover and last pages, meaning that the principals did not go through them page by page to ascertain relevance. Whereas administrators approved schemes of work with such comments as “Approved for use” or “checked for use,” this was not enough substantive comment since whatever the principal had diagnosed to make it meaningful was lacking. Some of the schemes had respective HODs signatures implying that before such records are forwarded to the administrators HODs had chances of perusing as a matter of procedure. That is in line with one of the duties of the HODs which state that they are supposed to promote efficiency in the teaching process in the department with regard to syllabus grasp, schemes of work formation, record of work maintenance, and records of tests and examination. However, it must be noted that 25% of the HODs were not keen on checking and signing schemes of work, yet there was no comment coming from the principals, making supervision weak. This means that efforts by the 75% of HODs were being nullified by the 25% who did not check these records. This confirms the r of 0.092 and R Square of 0.011 obtained from this study.

Interviews with DOS found out that most schemes of work were endorsed by HODs and kept with Director of Studies (DOS). It is no wonder that in the schools visited, request for subject schemes of work was to be made to the HODs or DOS who said thus: “Yes we are the custodians of teachers’ subject schemes of work. After all it is us who check, approve and file them.” This explains why 4% of schemes of work did not have the principals’ signatures. In any case principals are also subject teachers and are bound to submit their schemes of work to their respective HODs for endorsement. Interview findings with the deputy principals noted that most schemes of work had been approved and rubber stamped by the deputy principals. “We do this all the time given that principals delegate this role to us especially when they are away attending meetings”, said deputy principals. Lack of administrators’ signatures in some of the schemes of work can be explained by the fact that those administrators whose signatures were missing may have had their rubber stamps used in their absence, as it is routine sometimes. There was therefore no contribution from the administrators directly, thus confirming the r of 0.092 and R^2 of .011 obtained from this study. Checking schemes of work page by page was poorly done (22%), displaying the casual nature of attending to professional duties and further affirms the 1.1% obtained in this study. What this means is that the administrators are merely engaging in arm chair exercises and doing paper work which is purely theoretical without any practical implications, making this supervision ineffective and of little significance.

Interview findings with SCQASO indicated that principals are the internal QASOs in schools confirming that heads of institutions have the responsibility of ensuring the maintenance of teaching standards and professional records maintained by a teacher including schemes of work (ROK 2013). One SCQASO intoned “When we arrive in a school we expect to find principals to have checked and signed all teachers’ prepared schemes of work. Although this can be done by the HODs since they are the experts in this field, HODs should not rubber stamp them. This can be done by the principals themselves afterwards since it is their duty and stamping makes the records look authentic.” Though this role is anchored in policy, SCQASO’s assessment of the schools is irregular and therefore weak. Their response to school assessment matters is occasional and somehow ‘knee jerk’ coming mostly after unrests or before school registration. In contrast, a study by Murithi (2015) on the role of the principals in promoting students’ academic performance in Tigania West Sub- County, Meru Kenya, reported that on average 70% of the school principals ensured that teachers prepared schemes of works. Murithi’s study did not physically check prepared schemes of work. He relied on the opinions of the head teachers by asking them whether they checked the schemes of work, although he agreed that the practice of checking schemes of work has a positive impact on students’ performance. Perhaps supervision was going on in schools in Tigania West Sub County. However, there is no significant data obtained through regression. The present study physically went through prepared schemes of work to determine the contribution of administrators’ on students’ academic performance, and found out that while administrators indicated that they were doing it, physical checking found otherwise.

In contrast Lydia and Nasongo (2008) found out that 80% of the head teachers in high performing schools in Vihiga County checked schemes of work, as reported by the head teachers. The study did not actually check the schemes to confirm what the head teachers’ were reporting. Apart from asking the administrators whether they checked schemes of work prepared by the teachers, this study went further to check prepared schemes of work in various subjects in 52 schools. The findings confirmed that the administrators did check schemes of work as evidenced by presence of their signatures, rubber stamps, and comments, but this had little influence on students’ academic performance (Adjusted R^2 = 0.011). The administrators simply sat in their offices and went through the schemes of work, randomly stamping and signing pages without looking at strengths and weaknesses of the content therein. Thus, this did not enhance students’ academic
performance. It is done as a matter of routine, a kind of
terminy ritual, done without verifying if teachers actually
use these records to improve their teaching. What was
being done was only theoretical without practical
significance. Administrators’ contribution was ineffectual as signified by some professional records
missing signatures and meaningful comments. This
explains why the administrators’ contribution to
students’ academic performance was not significant.
The administrators had taken further actions such
engaging in classroom visitation to find out if teachers
are actually using prepared schemes of work to teach so
as to assist teachers to improve students’ academic
performance.

Adequate supervision is supposed to result in
good performance. Similarly, the finding of this study
though, that the contribution of the administrators was
weak, did not expressly mean that administrators did
not contribute to students’ academic performance as the
contribution was statistically not significant. School
administrators should go beyond checking and
approving prepared schemes of work and instead step
up classroom visitation to interact with teachers and
learners to understand challenges faced in curriculum
implementation. Efforts should be put in place to ensure
that the prepared schemes of work are used effectively
beyond being just filed. A study by Too, et al., (2012)
on the impact of head teachers’ supervision of teachers
on students’ academic performance, revealed that
supervision had a positive relationship with the school’s
overall mean score in K.C.S.E. Further, they
recommended that head teachers should improve on
teacher supervision for schools to register improved
performance in K.C.S.E. If head teachers performed
this supervisory role there is bound to be remarkable
efficiency in the work carried out by subordinates. On
the contrary this study proved otherwise. Secondary
school administrators in Emuhaya and Vihiga Sub –
Counties are contributing weakly in so far instructional
supervision is concerned as signified by Adjusted R²
of 0.011. Administrators’ activities of demanding for and
approving teachers’ prepared schemes of work is
merely a routine exercise in readiness for arrival of
Quality Assurance and Standards Officers to inspect.
The demand for these records is done beginning each
term or earlier in the year.

Interview findings supported the finding on the
ANOVA as DOS asserted that they were the ones who
checked and endorsed teachers’ prepared schemes of
work, and that principals only rubber stamped and
signed them. Document analysis supported this finding
too as it was noted that most documents did not have
signatures, rubber stamps and meaningful comments,
meaning that principals were not checking these
records. Where they assessed instructional records, their
input was minimal such that teachers did not benefit
much from this quality of supervision at all. Presence of
mere signatures did not imply that the principals
communicated to the teachers and advised them accordingly. This finding somewhat contradicts the
findings of other researchers who found out that
administrators’ contributions to instructional
supervision enhances students’ academic performance.
This is because these researchers did not quantify the
contributions and therefore, their findings were rather
not precise. Similarly, the finding of this study though,
that the contribution of the administrators was weak,
did not expressly mean that administrators did not
contribute to students’ academic performance as the
contribution was statistically not significant. In view of
interview findings and document analysis guide, it was
clear that principals contributed very little to students’
academic performance through instructional supervision
as supported by the 1.1% variation in students’
academic performance.

CONCLUSION
The study concluded that school administrators’ contribution to instructional supervision
in the enhancement of students’ academic performance
was not significant. Therefore, it did enhance students’
academic performance somewhat.

Recommendations
School Administrators should:
1. Actually check teachers’ prepared schemes of work
to ensure that scheming adheres to set norms and
standards so as to enhance students’ academic
performance.
2. Be trained to acquire conceptual, interpersonal and
technical skills in supervision in order to enhance
students’ academic performance
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