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Abstract:
Learners’ academic performance is an area of great concern to all stakeholders in education worldwide. Schools in Kathiani Sub-County have recorded dismal performance in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education in the last five years. The study sought to establish the extent to which head teachers’ supervisory role affect students’ performance in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) in public secondary schools in Kathiani Sub-County and propose intervention strategies that can be adopted to improve students’ performance. The hypothesis of the study was stated as follows: There is no significant relationship between the head teacher’s supervisory role and student’s performance at Kenya certificate of secondary education. The study used descriptive research design. The target population of the study was 30 head teachers and 270 Heads of departments in all 30 public secondary schools in Kathiani Sub-County, Machakos County. The study used Simple random, stratified and purposive random sampling techniques in selecting a sample size of 9 head teachers and 81 heads of departments from the target population. Questionnaires were used to collect data from the head teachers and heads of department. Validity of the questionnaires was ascertained using researchers while the reliability of the instruments was determined using the Cronbach alpha. Quantitative data was analyzed using percentages and means while hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of significance using correlation analysis. The study found that even though head teachers often carried out their supervisory roles, vetting of teacher’s lesson notes (mean = 2.63) and appraising of teachers (mean 2.72) were rarely done. The study recommends the need for head teachers to intensify teacher performance appraisal in order to give regular feedbacks to teachers.
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1. Introduction
Education is seen as a pathway to raising political, social awareness as well as upholding the level of manpower (Onyara, 2013). These benefits have led to increased number of pupils in primary and secondary school’s world over (World Bank, 1990). The pivot to sustainable development, peace, and stability within and among countries is the provision of quality education to their citizens (Oguntuase, Awe, & Ajayi, 2013). According to Mwangi and Nyangah (2013), the performance of an individual in the National Examination is a predictor of that person’s future. Due to the concern of the countries around the globe about their citizen’s future, education has become a major Centre of investment. For the betterment and improvement of educational achievement; countries further invest in school facilities for better performance of the students (Yichun, Rodney & Lance, 2012).

Many countries in Africa are paying attention to invest in education from primary, secondary and tertiary levels. However, the main challenge is poor academic performance of students (Miller & Yodar, 2002). In Botswana, for example, the government is offering free basic education to all the children attending school. In addition, the government supports education from primary to secondary level. To achieve this, the Ministry of Education receives a heavy share of the country’s budget (Matambo, 2013). Despite all the efforts by the government on education, the students’ academic performance has been declining lately from 2010 (Luke & Mavis, 2014).

In Tanzania, the government has initiated several policy structural reforms to ensure quality education (United Republic of Tanzania, 2001). Notable among these are the Education Sector Development Programmes, institutional vision to
be focused on vision 2025 aspiration and the National Science and Technology Policy (URT, 2001). Despite these efforts, low academic performance in secondary schools has been recorded. For instance, pass rate for Divisions I to III was as follows; 36.6% in 2007, 31% in 2008, 17.91% in 2009, 11.5% in 2010 and 10.05% in 2011 (URT, 2012).

The government of Kenya has implemented free primary education (FPE) and subsidized secondary education to increase access. The government input through Constituency Development Fund (CDF) in secondary schools has been towards improving teaching/learning resources and infrastructure for better academic performance in national examinations. The establishment of additional national secondary schools has also been aimed at improving the students’ academic performance. Despite all the efforts by the government to improve the academic performance of the students, the academic performance in KCSE is still at stake as reported by the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MOEST, 2010).

Kenya’s system of education provides for 8 years in primary and 4 years in secondary education. After 4 years of secondary education the students are subjected to a Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) examination which varies from School to School and from year to year. Factors that can cause this variation in performance can either be school based factor or external factors. According to Onyara (2013), school-based factors are those within school control that can affect students’ academic performance in public secondary schools and key among them is the head teachers’ supervisory role.

Head teacher supervisory role refers to the head teacher’s intervention to ascertain, maintain and improve the quality of education students receive at school (Nyamongo, Sang, Nyaoga & Matoke, 2014). Head teachers’ supervisory role include; vetting of teachers notes, regular visits to observe teachers lesson presentation and giving feedback, observing teachers attendance and punctuality, regular checking of students exercise books to find out teachers output of work and inspecting pupils assessment records among others (Amina, 2015). Onumah (2016) argues that the academic performance of any level of education is dependent on the quality, regular and continuous supervision of head teachers. However, he goes on to say that most public secondary schools have a problem of ineffective internal supervision by the school head teachers leading to poor academic performance and the way forward to this phenomenon formed the basis for this study.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The desire to provide quality education for all children is one of the major objectives of the ministry of education (MOE). As such, the government of Kenya has continuously implemented measures to improve the quality of education in secondary schools. Despite government measures like improving physical facilities and learning resources in schools through the Constituency Development Fund, performance in public secondary schools in Kathiani Sub-county has been persistently low. Statistics at Kathiani Sub County Education Office (SCEO, 2016) show that, most of the secondary schools have recorded a mean score below 4.5 in KCSE between 2012 and 2016 except in 5 schools with a mean score above 4.5. This scenario has compelled the researchers to carry out this study whose main purpose was to establish the influence of head teachers’ supervisory role on performance in KCSE in Kathiani Sub County, Machakos County.

1.2 Hypothesis of the Study

The study was guided by the following hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between head teacher’s supervisory role and students’ performance in KCSE in public secondary schools in Kathiani Sub County.

2. Literature Review

Head Teachers Supervisory Role and Students’ Academic Performance

The success of any level of education is hinged on the quality, regular and continuous supervision of instruction (Onumah, 2016). Onumah (2016) identified management of curriculum and instruction, supervision of classroom instruction, monitoring and evaluation of students’ progress and achievement, promotion and enhancement of learning environment, establishing and supporting continuous staff development and procuring instructional materials for teaching and learning as major supervisory functions of secondary school head teachers.

Ankomah (2002) pointed out that one of the characteristics of successful school is the presence of strong leadership manifested through supervision of teachers’ work. For instance, in most successful schools the head teachers sit in the classroom during instructional time and note down points that they later discuss with the teachers. On a regular basis, the head teacher samples out some of the exercises done by children to find out the extent to which teachers are teaching. The head teacher also inspects the lesson plans of teachers and vets them every week. This exercise can affect the students’ academic performance positively.

A study by Nyannyonjo (2007) on analysis of factors influencing learning achievement in Public Secondary Schools in Uganda showed that school performance is influenced by head teachers’ characteristics such as; qualification, age, experience and tenure of service in the school. The study further showed that good supervision strategy styles were significant factors influencing learning achievements in examinations. The findings of this study concur with those of Sushila (2004) on the role of the head teachers in influencing school performance in Kuria District, Kenya. However, Nyamongo, Sang, Nyaoga and Matoke (2014) reiterated that in carrying out supervisory tasks, the head teacher should have a clear specification of goals and targets. They further pointed out that most head teachers did not have objectives and mission targets to guide their schools. They found that 80% of all the head teachers interviewed had not attended any lesson thus were not aware of what was going on in their classes but only waited for final KCSE results which led to their schools posting poor results.
Secondary Schools require good leadership by the head teachers in order to organize the process of teaching and learning and to ensure that the mission of the school is achieved (Lydiah & Nasongo, 2009). The core role of the head teachers is to ensure the achievement of the established mission through creating a good environment for the learners (Lezotte, 2001). A study by Musungu and Nasongo (2008) on the instructional leadership role of secondary school head teachers found out that head teachers supervised teachers’ work by inspecting records such as schemes of work, lesson books, records of work covered, class attendance records, and clock in/clock out register.

A study by Njuguna, Waweru and Nyagosia (2013) on factors influencing academic achievement in public secondary schools in Central Kenya by specifically comparing the top 20 performing schools and 20 from the bottom category, established that head teachers’ frequency of internal supervision contributed towards better performance. This involved proper tuition and revision, careful supervision of teachers and pupils’ work, proper testing policy, syllabus coverage, teacher induction courses and team building. In the same context, Ndunda (2004) and Wanyama (2013) remarked that the students’ performance depends on the school head teacher. This is because the head teachers are the focal system of a school through which all important functions rest and is also the controller of all resources that may influence students’ performance in a school. This study is therefore set out to establish the influence of head teachers’ supervisory role on students’ academic performance in KCSE in public secondary schools in Kathiani sub-County.

3. Methodology
The study used descriptive research design. Bryman and Bell (2011) assert that a descriptive design seeks to get information that describes existing phenomena by asking questions relating to individual perceptions and attitudes. Descriptive research design was appropriate for the study because it was conducted in a setting that required direct responses from respondents while investigating existing phenomenon without manipulating the variables.

This study targeted all the 30 public secondary schools, their head teachers and heads of departments (HODs). Records at Kathiani Sub-County office (2017) showed that the Sub-County had 30 public secondary schools (11 mixed day/boarding schools, 14 mixed day schools and 5 single gender schools) that have presented students for KCSE examinations between 2012 and 2016. The head teachers and the HODs were targeted because they are in charge of curriculum implementation and the academic matters in the school and were considered to have knowledge of the factors influencing students’ performance in KCSE.

Due to the population characteristics, the study stratified the population into three strata as follows; mixed day/boarding schools, mixed day schools and single gender schools. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) recommend a representative sample of between 10 and 30% for a descriptive research. Therefore 30% of each stratum yielded 3 mixed/day boarding, 4 mixed day and 2 single gender schools. After stratification of schools, simple random sampling technique was used to select schools from each stratum. Purposive sampling technique was then used to sample the head teachers and HODs. Data was collected by use of questionnaires and document analysis. Data analysis was done using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 21. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages and mean were used for all the quantitative variables and information presented in form of tables. The qualitative data from the open-ended questions was analyzed using content analysis. The null hypothesis was tested using correlation analysis at 0.05 level of significance.

For ethical purposes, the rights and dignity of the respondents such as the right to decline to participate as a respondent to the questionnaire, and freedom to present their views on related areas without fear of repercussion was assured before data collection took place.

4. Results
4.1. Questionnaire Response Rate
This study administered a total of 9 questionnaires for head teachers and 81 to the heads of departments. Of these, all the 9 questionnaires were returned by the head teachers department while 68 questionnaires were returned by the Heads of Departments. This represented questionnaire response rates of 100% and 84% for head teachers and Heads of Departments respectively. These rates were considered acceptable since according to Best and Khan (2006) return rates of more than 60% are considered to be very good.

4.2. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents
Respondents’ characteristics in terms of gender and professional experience are as presented in Tables 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Heads of departments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Gender of Respondents
Table 1 shows that 6 (66.7%) of the head teachers were male while 3 (33.3%) were female. On the other hand, 40 (58.8%) of the heads of department were male while 28 (41.2%) were female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BED</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Head teachers’ Highest Level of Professional Qualification*

Table 3 shows that 8 (88.9%) of the head teachers had a Bachelors of Education (BED) degree level of qualification compared to nearly 1 (11.1%) of them who had post graduate Master of Education (MED) degree level of qualification.

On a similar platform, heads of department level of professional qualification was analyzed and results are as shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Masters)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Heads of departments’ professional qualification*

Table 3 shows that 40 (58.8%) of the Heads of Department had a degree level of professional qualification while 22 (32.4%) of the Heads of Departments (HODs) with a diploma level of professional qualification. It is also worth noting that about 4 (5.9%) of the Heads of Department had attained a master’s level of qualification. However, there was 2.9% of heads of departments in secondary schools with a P1 certificate level of qualification.

4.3. Duration of Service in Current School

With regard to duration of stay in the current school, head teachers gave the following responses that are presented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 4 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Head teachers’ length of service in current school*

Table 4 shows that 5 (55.6%) of the head teachers had stayed in the respective schools for a period of over 4 years while about 2 (22.2%) of them had stayed for a period of 3-4 years. Only 2 (22%) had stayed for less than 2 years in their current station. This indicates that the head teachers had stayed in their current schools long enough to understand the trend in KCSE performance.

Similarly, analysis of heads of department’s length of stay in the current school is as presented in table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 4 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5: Heads of Departments Length of stay in current school*

Table 5 shows that 37 (54.4%) of the heads of department said that they had stayed in the current school for a period of over 4 years while about 17 (25%) of them had less than two-year stay. Another 14 (20.6%) of the departmental heads had stayed in the school for a period of between 3 and 4 years.

4.4. Study Objective

The main objective which sought to examine the extent to which head teachers’ supervisory roles affects students’ performance in KCSE in public secondary schools in Kathiani Sub-County, was investigated and both the views of Head teachers and HODs were analyzed and results presented in Table 6 and Table 7 respectively.
Table 6: Head teachers view on supervisory practices

Table 6 shows the self-rating by head teachers themselves regarding how they conducted the various supervisory roles. As shown on the table, the head teachers often did check on the scheme of work with 33.3% doing that very often while 66.7% said they do it often. Similarly, 22.2% of the head teachers said they rarely check lesson plans while about 55.6% of them said they do it often and 22.2% of them did that very often. Another 55.6% of the head teachers were of the view that they rarely vet teachers lesson notes while about 44.4% of them reported that they do it often; while 77.8% of the head teachers often carried regular visits to classroom to observe teachers lesson only 11.1% rarely observed teachers’ lesson and 11.1% of them did that very often.

The results from Table 6 also show that 66.7% of the head teachers often presented and issued confidential reports about their teachers while 33.3% of them rarely issued confidential feedbacks. 66.7% of the head teachers said that they often observed teacher's attendance and punctuality while 33.3% of them were of the view that they did that very often. 55.6% of the head teachers often found out about the output of teachers by regularly checking students exercise books while 22.2% of them rarely did so and 22.2% did that very often. 55.6% of the head teachers reported that they often checked teachers’ records of work while 44.4% of them did that very often.

On class attendance records, Table 6 shows that 66.7% of the head teachers reported that they very often check, while 33.3% of them did that often. About 55.6% of the head teachers however said that very often they monitored clock in and out system; 33.3% of them did that often while 11 percent of them rarely checked teacher’s times for clocking in and out. Finally, 66.7% of the head teachers reported that they often checked students’ notes as part of their supervisory roles while 22.2% of them did so very often; and 11.1% of them rarely did so. Regarding other mechanism of supervision in order to check on class attendance, head teachers said they apply the following: using lesson attendance register marked by the school management, teachers are taught on self-discipline and responsibility and others use class secretary to mark teachers’ attendance register.

Heads of department were also asked to provide their views on the head teachers various supervisory practices and how often they conducted such activities as shown in Table 7.

Table 7: HODs views on Head Teachers’ Supervisory Role

As indicated in Table 7, HODs were asked to rate the frequency at which their respective head teachers conducted their supervisory roles in ensuring teaching and learning takes place in their respective schools. The results from table 7
shows that 50% of the heads of department said that, head teachers checked schemes of work very often while 42.6% of them said that the head teachers often did so and only 5.9% of them said they rarely perform this activity. Similarly, 48.5% of the HODs said that the head teachers checked lesson plans often, 23.5% of them said that the head teachers performed this very often and 26.5% of them rarely perform this activity. Regarding vetting of teachers’ lesson notes, 39.7% of the HODs reported that most head teachers often vetted lesson teachers notes, 39.7 said that they rarely did so and 14.7% of them said that they very often perform this activity. It was also revealed by 41.2% of the HODs that head teachers often visit to classrooms to observe teacher lessons, 17.1% of them said that they very often did so and 35.3% of them said that they rarely carried out this activity.

With regard to presentation and issuing of confidential feedback, 44.1% of the HODs held the view that head teachers often carried out the activity while 30.9% of them said that head teachers rarely carried out the activity and 17.6% of them said they very often did this activity. 67.6% of the departmental heads were of the view that most head teachers very often observed teacher’s attendance and punctuality while 27.9% of the HODs held that the head teachers often observed the teachers and attendance and punctuality; Table 7also shows that 52.9% of the departmental heads held the view that head teachers often checked students’ notebooks to gauge the output of teachers work output. In addition, 14.7% of them were of the view that they did this very often while 26.5% of the HODS held that the head teacher rarely carried out this activity.

The results from the table 7 in addition show that; 50% of the heads of department also held the view that head teachers very often checked records of work while 44.1% of them held that the head teachers often did so and 5.9% were of the view that the head teachers rarely did so. Table 7 shows 64.7% of the HODs also held the notion that, head teachers very often checked class attendance records while 33.8% of them observed that their head teachers often checked class attendance records. Additionally, 70.6% of the HODs held that the head teachers, very often checked clock in and out records while 26.5% of them held that the head teachers often did so and 2.9% of them said that they rarely did so. All in all, 47.1%of the HODs observed that head teachers often checked students’ notes while 19.1% said that the head teachers very often did so. Only 29.4% of the HODS held that the head teachers rarely checked students’ notes.

An open-ended question was addressed to the HODs on other supervisory mechanisms that head teachers use in ensuring that teachers attend to their lessons without fail. According to the HODs, head teachers employ various mechanisms such as class representatives keeping lesson attendance register, delegating supervision to the deputy principal, use of secret class informers, close supervision, use of threats and consistent check of the block timetable.

In line with achieving the main objective, this study sought to find out the extent in which the head teacher’s supervisory roles influenced academic performance of the school considering the underlying facts about head teacher’s supervisory roles established herein in the preceding sections. In this case, a common question was asked to both the head teachers and heads of departments to rate their views on an ordinal scale with regard to the extent of influence. The measure of extent was ordinal ranked on a continuum and numerical figures were assigned to give an interpretation schema as follows: 5 = very great extent; 4 = great extent; 3 = moderate extent; 2= little extent and 1 = no extent at all. Pursuant to the foregoing, data was analyzed collectively for both head teachers and heads of department and presented in table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers (N= 9)</th>
<th>Heads of Department (N =68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a very great extent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Extent to which head teachers supervisory role influence students’ performance in KCSE.

As noted from table 8, 6 (66.7%) of the head teachers were of the view that head teacher’s supervisory role influences students’ performance to a great extent, while 2(22.2%) of the head teachers concurred that head teacher’s supervisory role influenced performance to a very great extent. However, 1(11.1%) of the head teacher reported that, head teacher’s supervisory roles influenced students’ performance in KCSE to a moderate extent while, none averred that it affected to a little extent. On the other hand, about 28(41.2%) of the heads of departments were of the view that head teacher’s supervisory roles influenced performance to a great extent while 25(36.8%) of them agreed that head teacher’s supervisory role influenced students’ academic performance to a very great extent. However, 14(20.6%) of the heads of departments opined that head teacher’s supervisory roles influenced students’ performance in KCSE to a moderate extent while 1(1.5%) averred that it affected to a little extent.

Overall and in line with the interpretation schema presented at the beginning of this section where 5 represents very great extent and 1 representing no extent at all, it can be seen that the mean value depicting extent of influence by the head teachers was found to be 4.13 while that of the heads of department was 4.11 implying that both categories of respondents were in agreement that head teachers supervisory roles influenced students’ academic performance at the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) to a great extent.
Finally, in order to make inferences concerning the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variable in lieu of objective four, the null hypothesis for this study was formulated and tested at the 0.05 level of significance. The formulated null hypothesis stated that: There is no significant relationship between head teacher’s supervisory role and students’ performance in KCSE in public secondary schools in Kathiani Sub-County. In order to test the validity of this claim, a correlation analysis was performed and results are as presented in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KCSE Average Performance</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>.680**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory roles</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.680**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Correlation between KCSE Performance and Head Teachers Supervisory roles

Results from Table 9 show that there was a significant and positive relationship between head teacher’s supervisory role and academic performance; r (77) = .680; p ≤ .05. This means that head teachers’ supervisory roles and academic performance are dependent of each other in the sense that, when head teachers supervisory role is increased by one-unit, academic performance of the students will also tend to increase by 0.6 of a unit. Consequently, the null hypothesis which stated that there was no significant relationship between head teacher’s supervisory roles and students’ academic performance in KCSE was rejected.

5. Discussion
Head Teachers’ Supervisory Role and Academic Performance

It is important to note that the success of any level of education is hinged on the quality, regular and continuous supervision of instruction (Onumah, 2016). With regard to this parameter, this study found that in nearly all the aspects of teaching, head teachers exercised their mandate of supervision except in the vetting of teachers’ lesson notes, and to some extent presentation and issuing of confidential feedback and regular checking of students’ exercise books to check on teacher output which was rarely done. This view is in agreement with 39.7% of HODs who reported that the head teachers rarely vetted teachers lesson notes while 30.9% of them said that the head teachers rarely presented and issued a confidential feedback back to the teachers after a lesson presentation. A study by Musungu and Nasongo (2008) on the instructional leadership role of secondary school head teachers found out that head teachers supervised teachers’ work by inspecting records such as schemes of work, lesson books, records of work covered, class attendance records, and clock-in/clock out register. This clearly indicates that most of the head teachers rarely vet lesson notes.

Regarding other mechanisms of supervision in order to check on class attendance, head teachers said they apply the following: using lesson attendance register marked by the school management, teachers are taught on self-discipline and responsibility and others use class secretary to mark teachers’ attendance register. These views were in agreement with those of the HODs. The reason for this may have been occasioned by the fact that HODs also assist in supervision of curriculum implementation and therefore are aware of the mechanisms they apply to ensure 100% class attendance by the teachers.

As to whether supervisory roles influenced performance, majority of the head teachers said that supervisory roles by the head teacher influenced academic performance to a great extent as reported in Table 8. These views also concur with those of the HODS as analyzed in Table 9. Correlation results also analyzed in Table 9 show that there was a significant and positive relationship between head teacher’s supervisory roles and students ‘academic performance at KCSE. This implies that when head teacher’s supervisory practices are regular, KCSE performance would improve and vice versa.

Indeed, as Ankomah (2002) points out, successful schools are noticed by the presence of strong leadership manifested through supervision of teachers’ work. The findings of this study are in line with those of Nyannonjo (2007) on analysis of factors influencing learning achievement in Public Secondary Schools in Uganda, that showed that school performance was influenced by among others head teachers’ supervision strategy. He also noted that the supervision strategy was significant in influencing learning achievements in examinations. The findings of this study also concur with those of Sushila (2004) on the role of the head teachers in influencing school performance in Kuria District, Kenya. However, Nyamongo, Sang, Nyaoga and Matoke (2014) reiterated that in carrying out supervisory tasks, the head teacher should have a clear specification of goals and targets.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

With regard to the findings of the study the researchers can conclude that, head teachers rarely vet teachers’ notes and presentation, and issue a confidential feedback to teachers after a lesson observation session. The study can also conclude that head teacher’s supervisory role greatly influenced the students’ performance in KCSE in Kathiani sub-county. Additionally, it is evident that there is a positive and significant relationship between head teachers’ supervisory roles and
KCSE performance. This implies that when head teachers play their supervision roles quite often, the performance outcomes significantly improve. Therefore, it was concluded that the greater the frequency of supervision by head teachers, the greater the improvement in performance in KCSE in Kathiani Sub County, Machakos County.

Based on the findings that head teachers rarely vet teacher’s lesson notes nor have regular visits to the classroom to observe teacher lesson and that; they rarely give feedback to the teachers; the study recommends the need for head teachers to monitor class attendance on a regular basis and ensure that they vet often the teachers notes. There is also need for quality assurance and standards officers (QASOs) to intensify supervision in secondary schools. Finally, there is need for head teachers to intensify teacher performance appraisal in order to give regular feedback and subsequently improve academic performance.
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