

Influence Of Head Teachers Observation Of Teachers' Lessons On Pupils' KCPE Performance In Public Primary Schools, Lower Yatta Sub-County, Kitui, Kenya

Evans Mulei Mulatya
Professor Ursulla Okoth
Dr. Mercy Mugambi.

¹*Department of Educational administration and Planning, University of Nairobi, Kenya.*

²*Department of Educational administration and Planning, University of Nairobi, Kenya.*

³*Department of Educational administration and Planning, University of Nairobi, Kenya.*

ABSTRACT

Background: Global educational policies and programs have brought forth significant challenges to many education systems around the globe. This study examined specific head teachers' observation of teachers' lessons that influence pupils' KCPE performance in examinations in Lower Yatta Sub-county, Kenya. The study objective was: To establish the extent to which head teachers' checking of teachers' classroom instruction preparedness influence pupils' KCPE performance in public primary schools in Lower Yatta, Kitui, Kenya.

Materials and methods: Descriptive survey design was used. 61 public primary schools were target population with 61 headteachers. 427 teachers and 1556 standards eight pupils. A sample of 51 schools with 51 head teachers, 194 teachers and 51 pupils' focus group discussions were selected by use of simple random sampling technique. Instruments used were questionnaires, focus group discussion guide and document analysis guide. Questionnaires were validated by pretesting and expert judgement while reliability was determined using test retest method and value $r = 0.8$ obtained for reliability. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics that were frequencies, means, standard deviations and percentages and presented in tables. To test the hypothesis, chi-square test was administered to determine if there was significant relationship (Kothari, 2013).

Results: Findings using chi-square test at alpha value 0.05 level of significance on the observation of teachers' lessons and pupils' KCPE performance shown that; there was significant relationship between observation of lessons (108.48 > 41.34) and KCPE performance.

Conclusion: Being greater than critical value at p -value $< .00001$, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis adopted that, there is significant relationship between headteachers' observation of teachers' lessons and pupils' KCPE performance. This study recommends headteachers and teachers to be equipped with more knowledge and skills on the need and use of lesson observation for improvement of instructional performance. This may be acquired from training institutions (Kenya Management Institute), workshops, seminars, conferences organized by Ministry of Education, Teachers Service Commission and Kenya National Examination Council for capacity building programs to empower practicing headteachers. Future research may focus on a similar study in other sub-counties and findings compared to assist educational planners and managers to further find solutions to cases of poor performance in KCPE examinations in Kenya.

KEYWORDS: Head teachers, Lesson observation, Pupils' KCPE performance, teachers' classroom instruction preparedness.

Date of Submission: 10-06-2021

Date of Acceptance: 25-06-2021

I. INTRODUCTION

Supervision in schools is a worldwide phenomenon with each country having its own policy on how supervision should be conducted. It is taken as a positive democratic action aimed at not only improvement of classroom instruction but also creating a harmonious environment through continued growth of all concerned; the learner, the teacher, the supervisor, the parent and the administration (Nzambonimpa, 2011). Global educational policies and programs have brought forth significant challenges to many education systems around the globe. Some of these policies include Education for All (EFA), Universal Primary Education (UPE) and Universal Secondary Education (USE) (UNESCO, 2007; Nzambonimpa, 2011). Currently all organizations continuously strive for sustainable development and survival that can basically be ensured through adequate work supervision as one of strategic survival approaches (Armstrong, 2003). However, through general

observations, articles and repeated educational research studies indicate that there is an ongoing decline of performance in schools throughout the globe today (Nzambonimpa, 2011). Globally, studies have been carried out on instructional supervision by school heads, for example in Kenya, Musungu and Nasongo (2008) state that to improve students' performance head teachers are required first to improve the management of schools. This can be done by setting a clear vision for the school and communicate this vision to students, support its achievement by giving instructional leadership that involves use of staff meetings for students' performance analysis, preparation of professional documents, lesson observations, resources and teachers' punctuality to institutions, and being visible in every part of the institution that account for students' performance. The head teacher according to Sushila (2004) cited by Musungu et al (2008), is the leader in a school, be it academic or administrative. Supervision is a dimension or phase of educational administration that is concerned with instructional effectiveness. It is an administrative activity whose strategy is to stimulate teachers towards greater pedagogic effectiveness and productivity (Okumbe, 2007).

Statement of the Problem

Lower Yatta Sub-county in Kitui County has been showing poor performance in KCPE compared to seven sub-counties from 2012 to 2016, despite government efforts of posting qualified teachers and funding educational resources such as textbooks and relevant facilities that facilitate teaching and learning, quality performance in KCPE is wanting. The head teacher is responsible for overall management, control and maintenance of standards in the school and is accountable for all that happens in a school. He/she is the first supervisor because has to play leadership role in checking and monitoring the teachers' classroom work and overall students' achievement, (Machio, 2013). This prompted for this study on headteachers' observation of teachers' lessons and pupils' KCPE performance.

Table 1: Kitui Sub-Counties KCPE mean scores, results analysis (2012-2016) compared

Year	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016	
	M/score	Rank	M/score	Rank	M/score	Rank	M/score	Rank	M/score	Rank
Lower Yatta	253.63	5	248.05	6	252.13	6	249.92	7	251.47	6
Kitui	266.35	3	269.51	2	274.11	1	274.69	1	272.53	1
Central	268.81	2	271.93	1	272.17	2	271.54	2	269.11	3
Kitui West	269.55	1	266.72	3	270.04	3	263.47	4	269.86	2
Katulani	257.12	4	248.00	7	250.19	7	255.31	5	257.47	5
Nzambani	253.42	6	256.17	4	257.50	5	251.88	6	250.09	7
Kisasi	250.40	7	253.75	5	261.43	4	263.70	3	261.85	4
Mutomo										

Sources: KCED and the KCQASO document analysis (2016) Kitui County

Tables 1 shows that, Lower Yatta Sub-County schools consistently posted low KCPE mean scores compared to other Sub-Counties KCPE results analyses (2012-2016) years respectively. Therefore, this study found it necessary to examine and provide broad information the extent to which observation of teachers' lessons influences academic performance of pupils in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education.

Objective and Hypothesis of the Study

The study was guided by the following objective and Hypothesis:

Objective

To establish the extent to which head teacher's checking of teachers' classroom instruction preparedness influence pupils' KCPE performance in public primary schools in Lower Yatta Sub-County, Kitui, Kenya.

Research Hypothesis

H₀₁. There is no significant relationship between head teachers' checking of teachers' classroom instruction preparedness and pupils' performance at Kenya certificate of primary education in Lower Yatta Sub- County, Kenya.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Checking of Teachers' Classroom Instruction Preparedness and Academic Performance

Classroom observation is a necessary part of determining class behavior. The observations are usually direct observation where an individual watches the class while in the classroom. There are a variety of reasons for observations, such as psychological studies, checking up on new teachers, student teachers or scientific studies (Stecker, 2000). According to Ebmeier (2003), if more classroom observations occur, teachers feel they

have more efficacies. A head teacher should therefore be a facilitator of change and be effective by ensuring alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessment, Ngware et al. (2010) contends that teachers may be qualified and trained but still no effective learning may take place in the classroom. They further advocate for the institutionalization of lesson observation, feedback and professional guidance in schools. Komoski (2007) further contends that supervision is a leadership act whose ultimate purpose is to improve classroom instruction. The study submits that if supervision is seen in this light it would be beneficial to supervisors, teachers, and students. According to Okumbe (2007), the instructional aspect involves helping in the formulation and implementation of lesson plans, notes, and schemes of work, evaluating the instructional programmes and overseeing modification, delivery of instructional resources, helping in conducting and coordinating staff in-service, advising and assisting teachers involved in instructional programmes. Gathoya (2008) observes that through classroom visits, the supervisor can have an insight into quality benchmarks and performance. According to Fischer (2011), supervision of instructions by classroom visits may include: walk through mechanism where the head teacher walks into a class and sees how instruction is going on. It provides a quick look at teacher performance and environmental factors in the classroom, an informal visit is an announced visit lasting ten or more minutes during which the teacher's practices are observed and documented, a formal observation is an announced visit lasting an agreed amount of time. According to Afolabi & Loto, (2008), during such an observation, the head teacher records what the teacher and the pupils say. The formal observation has a pre and post conference session where the supervisor and the teacher hold a discussion on the lesson.

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study design: The study used descriptive survey research design. Kothari (2013) pointed out that survey is concerned with describing, recording, analyzing and reporting conditions that exist or have existed. Also using survey design, no variable is manipulated and therefore helps to report the situation as it is. Descriptive survey design is suitable for this study because it enables rapid data collection and ability to understand a population from a part of it. It is also an economical design.

Study Location: The target population for this study was 61 public primary schools, 427 teachers and 1556 standards eight pupils in Lower-Yatta Sub-County (SCDE, 2016; Mugenda & Mugenda, 2009; Maina, 2012).

Sample size: The sample consisted 51 headteachers, 180 teachers and 51 pupils' focus group discussions that were selected by use of simple random sampling technique. Lower -Yatta Sub-County is a new sub-county having been created in 2009 from the old Kitui District - Kitui County. Lower-Yatta Sub-County is situated in a rural setting. The locale was suitable because Lower Yatta Sub-county has been showing declining academic performance results for the last five years, from 2012 to 2016.

Sample calculation: validity of the instruments was improved through expert judgment. To measure the reliability of the instruments test-retest method was used. This involved administering the same instruments twice to the same group of respondents (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2009). There was a time lapse of two weeks between the first and the second test. This was done to check whether the instruments yielded the same results when administered at different times to the same group. The two schools were selected from the sample and were not included in the main study sample. A reliability coefficient was computed to indicate how reliable the instruments are. Thus, Pearson's product moment formula was used to calculate the coefficient of correlation (r) known as coefficient of a reliability or stability. The value of r for this study was 0.8 which was closer to +1 hence the instruments were reliable. The closer the value is to +1 the stronger the reliability (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003; Kathuri & Pals, 1993).

Statistical analysis

Data collected was simplified and presented in the best way possible for easy interpretation and understanding by use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.0. Data collected from the field was in two forms, that is quantitative and qualitative data. To test the hypotheses, chi-square test was computed to determine if there was significant relationship between checking of teachers' professional records preparation (independent variables) and pupils' KCPE performance (dependent variable) at the significance level of 0.05 and degree of freedom of 1.

IV. FINDINGS AND COMMENTS

Table 2 shows head teachers' responses on observation of teachers' lessons

		Table 2: Head teachers' responses on observation of teachers' lessons						
As a head teacher, I:-		5	4	3	2	1	Total	
i.	Inform teachers before visiting their classes	f	8	28	-	2	2	40
		%	20.0	70.0	-	5.0	5.0	100
ii.	Collect schemes of work and lesson plans	f	4	23	-	13	-	40

	on entering the class room	%	10.0	57.5	-	32.5	-	100
iii.	Check lesson plans in relation to the schemes of work and text books in use	f	10	26	-	4	-	40
		%	25.0	65.0	-	10.0	-	100
iv.	Assess the pedagogic approaches of the teacher	f	8	32	-	-	-	40
		%	20.0	80.0	-	-	-	100
v.	Assess mastery of content knowledge of the teacher	f	20	20	-	-	-	40
		%	50.0	50.0	-	-	-	100
vi.	Observe learners' involvement in the lesson	f	20	18	-	2	-	40
		%	50.0	45.0	-	5.0	-	100
vii.	Allow for own reflection and drawing of inferences on the observed lesson	f	30	10	-	-	-	40
		%	75.0	25.0	-	-	-	100
viii.	Share analysis of performance with teachers and give feedback promptly	f	10	20	-	7	3	40
		%	25.0	50.0	-	17.5	7.5	100

Table 2 shows head teachers' responses on how they practice observation of teachers' lessons in public primary schools. All head teachers rated items one to eight. On informing teachers before visiting their classes, majority (70.0%) of the head teachers agreed that they usually inform teachers before visiting their classes. This encourages teachers to evaluate their practices well before going to deliver content to pupils, which initiatives can be implemented to enhance pupils' performance in national examinations. However, 5.0% of the head teachers disagreed on having informed teachers before going to class. Those who disagreed believed that a teacher should always be ready to be supervised without being informed.

Collecting schemes of work and lesson plans on entering the class room, majority (57.5%) of the head teachers accepted for having done so to see whether the teachers are delivering what was schemed and planned so as to enhance pupils' performance in schools. However, (32.5%) disagreed. This implied that some headteachers assume the importance of professional documents that guide and support teacher's content delivery in the classroom.

Checking lesson plans in relation to the schemes of work and text books in use, majority (65.0%) agreed that they check lesson plans and schemes of work to see if they are related to text books. This concurred with TSC/MoE (2016) that formulated lesson observation schedule with guidelines on what the supervisor should observe. This facilitates teacher's classroom performance improvement, hence improvement of learner performance. But there were a few (10.0%) head teachers who were not doing that which might be among the causes of performance decline in schools.

Assessing the pedagogic approaches of the teacher, majority (80.0%) of the head teachers agreed that they assess teachers' lessons. This encourages high levels of performance expectations in schools. This is in line with Okoth (2018) who stated that quality pedagogical decisions depends heavily on the teachers. Other headteachers (20%) strongly agreed that they do assess teachers' lessons. This is an important practice if done with enthusiasm (Acheson & Gail, 2003) where the exercise should not be autocratic but collaborative and interactive.

Assessing mastery of content knowledge of the teacher, all head teachers accepted to having assessed their teachers in content mastery in the class room. Headteachers (50%) strongly agreed that they assess and the rest (50%) agreed. This implied that the headteachers are concerned with the required content to be delivered to learners. This is because teachers may be qualified and trained but still no effective learning may take place in the classroom (Ngware et al, 2010). They practice this in schools to help teachers learn new teaching techniques for and master them well for the success of pupils.

Observing learners' involvement in the lesson, majority (50.0%) of the headteachers strongly agreed that they observe learners' involvement in the lesson and other headteachers (45%) agreed that they do so. This implied that majority of headteachers are aware of classroom supervisory roles that concurred with the findings of Fritz and Miller (2003) where the teacher should use a variety of instructional strategies to accommodate different ability levels and different learning styles. However, (5.0%) did not practice it in schools. This implies that they did not create room for decision-making towards issues affecting teachers' lessons and make corrections needed to realize performance.

Allowing for own reflection and drawing of inferences on the observed lesson, majority (75.0%) of the head teachers strongly agreed and (25%) agreed that they allow. According to Ngware et al., (2010) a head teacher should be a facilitator of change and be effective by ensuring alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessment who contend that teachers may be qualified and trained but still no effective learning may take place in the classroom. They further advocated for the institutionalization of lesson observation, feedback and professional guidance in schools.

On sharing analysis of performance with teachers and give feedback promptly, (50.0%) of the head teachers agreed and (25%) strongly agreed that they shared performance analysis and give prompt feedback to teachers and pupils to make further decisions on how to improve academic performance in school. This concurred with the findings of Kariuki (2013) that majority of the head teachers do not give feedback after class observation.

Further, head teachers' means and standard deviations summaries on observation of teachers' lessons are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Head teachers' means and standard deviations on observation of lessons

As a head teacher I :-	N	M	SD	AM
Inform teachers before visiting their classes	40	3.95	.95	
Collect schemes of work and lesson plans on entering the class room	40	3.45	.83	
Check lesson plans in relation to the schemes of work and text books in use	40	4.05	.98	
Assess the pedagogic approaches of the teacher	40	4.20	1.0	
Assess mastery of content knowledge of the teacher	40	4.50	1.2	
Ensure there is assessment of school's staff requirements	40	4.40	1.1	
Observe learners' involvement in the lesson	40	4.75	1.3	
Allow for own reflection and drawing of inferences on the observed lesson	40	3.68	.88	4.12

Table 3 shows how head teachers perceived themselves on practicing observation of teachers' lessons in public primary schools. According to these results, the average mean was 4.12 indicating high and strong instructional supervision practice of observation of teachers' lessons by the head teachers. Mostly head teachers indicated that they practice observing teachers' lessons in schools by involving themselves in what teachers are doing with pupils in classroom to enhance good pupils' performance in national examinations. The only challenge was that there were a few head teachers who had distanced themselves from this practice. Further, teachers rated head teachers on how they practice observation of teachers' lessons in schools and their responses are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Teachers' responses on head teachers' observation of teachers' lessons

The head teacher:-			4	3	2	1	Total
i.	Informs the teachers before visiting their classes	f	31	117	17	15	180
		%	17.2	65.0	9.4	8.4	100
ii.	Checks lesson plans in relation to the schemes of work and text books in use	f	45	114	12	9	180
		%	25.0	63.3	6.7	5.0	100
iii.	Assesses the pedagogic approaches of the teacher	f	90	72	11	7	180
		%	50.0	40.0	6.1	3.9	100
iv.	Observes learners' involvement in the lesson	f	126	18	27	9	180
		%	70.0	10.0	15.0	5.0	100
v.	Allow for own reflection and drawing of inferences on the observed lesson	f	58	108	9	5	180
		%	32.2	60.0	5.0	2.8	100
vi.	Share analysis of performance with teachers and give feedback promptly	f	54	99	18	9	180
		%	30.0	55.0	10.0	5.0	100

vii.	Conferencing with teachers to plan for lesson observation	f	6	16	55	103	180
		%	3.3	8.9	30.6	57.2	100

Table 4 shows teachers' responses on how head teachers practice observation of teachers' lessons in public primary schools. Teachers rated items one to seven. On informing the teachers before visiting their classes, majority (65.0%) of the teachers stated that sometimes head teachers usually inform them before visiting their classes. Then, (17.2%) of the teachers indicated that their headteachers always inform them. This encourages teachers to evaluate their practices well before going to deliver content to pupils. It also assists teachers to refine the content in light of new understandings to improve academic performance. It shows that head teachers who informed teachers before going to class believed in working with teachers in determining which initiatives can be implemented to enhance pupils' performance in national examinations. However, (9.4%) of the teachers indicated that their head teachers rarely inform them and (8.4%) of teachers stated that headteachers never informed them before going to their classes. Those who strongly disagreed stated that their head teachers believed that a teacher should always be ready to be supervised without being informed which contrary to the findings of Acheson and Gail (2003) who stressed that supervision should not be an autocratic exercise but collaborative and interactive.

Checking lesson plans in relation to the schemes of work and text books in use, majority (63.3%) of the teachers stated that their head teachers sometimes check lesson plans and schemes of work to see if they are related to text books. Also (25.0%) of teachers indicated that their headteachers always check lesson plans, schemes of work and textbooks in use. But there were a few (5.0%) of teachers who stated that their head teachers never did that.

Assessing the pedagogic approaches of the teacher, (50.0%) of the teachers stated that their head teachers always assess teachers' lesson approaches in the class room. This encourages high levels performance expectations in schools. (40.0%) of teachers indicated that their headteachers sometimes assess teachers' pedagogic approaches. The findings concurred with Ogunaju (2006) who highlighted that supervision improves the effectiveness of teachers so that they can contribute maximally to the attainment of the system goals as well as changing some aspects of a person's concept of self, way of behaving and attitude to the school within the school organization.

Observing learners' involvement in the lesson, majority of teachers (70.0%) indicated that head teachers always observe learners' involvement in the lesson. Head teachers did that to help teachers on monitoring learners. However, some teachers (5.0%) indicated that there were head teachers who never bothered on monitoring learners' involvement in class work which lead to performance decline in schools.

Allowing for own reflection and drawing of inferences on the observed lesson, majority (60.0%) of the teachers stated that head teachers sometimes allow for own reflection and drawing of inferences. However, (2.8%) of the teachers indicated that head teachers never did that in schools. This implies that they did not create room for decision-making towards issues affecting teachers' lessons and make corrections needed to realize performance.

Sharing analysis of performance with teachers and give feedback promptly, majority (55.0%) of the teachers indicated that head teachers sometimes shared performance analysis and gave prompt feedback to teachers and pupils to make further decisions on how to improve academic performance in school. However, (5.0%) of teachers stated that headteachers never shared performance analysis and gave feedback promptly.

Conferencing with teachers to plan for lesson observation, (57.2%) of the teachers indicated that head teachers never had any conferencing session with teachers to plan for lesson observation. This an indication that many headteachers distanced themselves from the practice of teachers' lesson observation. This has been noticed by the findings of Kimsop (2002) that most Head teachers do not perform their instructional supervisory roles such as classroom observation, checking students' notes and teaching notes frequently to which Okoth (2018) concurs that some headteachers do not check. However, (3.3%) of the teachers stated that headteachers always conferenced with teachers to plan for lesson observation.

Therefore, teachers' mean and standard deviation summaries on head teachers' observation of teachers' lessons are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Teachers' means and standard deviations on observation of lessons

The head teacher :-	N	M	SD	AM
Informs the teachers before visiting their classes	180	2.91	.79	
Checks lesson plans in relation to the schemes of work and text books in use	180	3.08	.84	
Assesses the pedagogic approaches of the teacher	180	3.36	.94	

Observes learners' involvement in the lesson	180	3.45	.98	
Allow for own reflection and drawing of inferences on the observed lesson	180	3.22	.89	
Share analysis of performance with teachers and give feedback promptly	180	3.10	.85	
Conferencing with teachers to plan for lesson observation	180	1.58	.96	2.96

Table 5 shows how teachers perceived head teachers on observation of teachers' lessons in public primary schools. The average mean was 2.96. This was below 3 on the Likert scale rating indicating low and weak observational practice by the head teacher. Teachers indicated that head teachers carried out instructional supervision by observing teachers' lessons in schools to enhance good pupils' performance in national examinations. The only challenge was that there were some areas in which teachers had a low perception towards head teachers' observation of teachers' lessons. For instance, on items one and seven with 2.91 and 1.58 means respectively.

Further, students rated head teachers on how they practice class room observation as well as teachers' lessons and also how they involve parents in students' academic performance and their responses are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Pupils' Focus Group Discussion Responses on Head teachers' Lesson Observation Practices in School

Item	Pupils' responses	Code/Theme
Lesson observation Does the head teacher come to your class when a teacher is teaching?	Our headteacher is in the office most the time. Our headteacher checks our exercise books. Our headteacher ask whether we are taught properly.	Headteachers rarely go to class.
How often does your head teacher come to class when teaching is going on during one term?	Our headteacher does not come to class when there is a teacher. One time our headteacher came with our CSO to our class. Have never seen our headteacher in class when there is another teacher.	Headteacher rarely go to class.
How often does your head teacher check your exercise books?	Our headteacher checks our exercise books many times. Our headteacher rarely checks our exercise books. Our headteacher does not check our books.	Headteacher checks.
How often do teachers mark your exercise books?	Our mathematics teacher marks our books always. Our teacher reads answers and we mark our books, then checks the marking. Our books are rarely marked.	Teachers mark.
What do you do when teaching is going on?	We write notes. We answer questions. We do given exercise as the teacher mark. Sometimes we ask questions. We read group work answers.	Learners are involved.

Table 6 shows pupils' Focus Group Discussion responses on head teachers' practices in public primary schools. Pupils responded to items one to five. About going to class when a teacher was teaching, pupils stated that it was rarely done. Head teachers should set aside time to observe their teachers in class when teaching. This would encourage teachers to evaluate their practices well before going to deliver content to pupils as well as after finishing a class. It also assists the head teachers to know if teachers refine their content in light of new understandings to improve academic performance. The headteacher should enter the classrooms when lessons are on-going so as to see whether the teachers are delivering what was schemed and planned for.

On the frequency of visiting classes within a term, the pupils noted that it was rarely done also. This might have led to teachers' relaxation towards their work, hence affecting learners' performance. It is the headteacher's role to monitor what goes on in the classroom to ensure learning is as it is stipulated.

Checking of the pupils' exercise books, pupils stated that headteachers check them. This motivates learners leading to high levels of performance expectations in schools. On the marking of pupils' exercise books, the participants stated that teachers do mark them. This shows that the teachers are aware that it is their role to ensure that students' assignments are checked and marked. This enables both learners and teachers to know their progress in particular topics and the subject. Proper decisions would be made for performance improvement. Additionally, on what the pupils were doing when teaching was on-going, it was stated that learners were involved in activities such as writing of notes, asking and answering questions, doing given assignments and observation of the teacher's working on the blackboard. When learners are involved in a lesson properly their brains are alert leading to better understanding of various concepts unlike when they are passive.

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between head teachers' checking of teachers' classroom instruction preparedness and pupils' KCPE performance in public primary schools in Lower Yatta Sub-County, Kitui County.

Chi-square test was computed to show the association between lesson observation and pupils' KCPE performance. Data obtained from head teachers and teachers was computed in contingency tables, analysed and summarised in Chi-square tables to show the strength of the relationship at alpha- value 0.05 level of significance (Orodho, Khatete & Mugiraneza, 2016). Results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Hypothesis testing on head teachers' observation of lessons

	Value	df	Critical value	P-value
Pearson Chi-square	108.48	28	41.34	< .00001
Nominal by nominal Phi (Φ)	0.068			
Cramer's V	0.026			
No. of valid cases	40			

Results from Table 7 indicate that Chi-square (X^2) = 108.48 is greater than $X^2_{[0.05, 28]} = 41.34$. The value lies in the rejection region. The p-value in chi-square output is $p < 0.00001$. Also, the table gives a nominal by nominal Phi value of .068 and Cramer's V as .026. This implies that the relationship between the variables is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis adopted (Orodho, Khatete & Mugiraneza, 2016). This implies, therefore, that there is a significant association between head teachers' observation of teachers' lessons and pupils' KCPE performance in public primary schools in Lower Yatta Sub-County, Kitui County.

H_{A1}: There is significant relationship between head teachers' checking of teachers' classroom instruction preparedness and pupils' KCPE performance in public primary schools in Lower Yatta Sub-County, Kitui County.

To test if head teachers' lesson observation has influence on pupils' KCPE performance in public primary schools, teachers were to provide data and a Chi-square test was computed on their responses at alpha value =0.05 significance level (Orodho, Khatete & Mugiraneza, 2016). Results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Hypothesis testing on teachers' response on lesson observation

	Value	df	Critical value	P-value
Pearson Chi-square	721.00	18	28.87	< .00001
Nominal by nominal Phi (Φ)	0.167			
Cramer's V	0.068			
No. of valid cases	180			

Results from Table 8 indicate that the P-value is <.00001. The result is significant at $P < .05$. Chi-square (X^2) = 721.0 and is greater than $X^2_{[0.05, 18]} = 28.87$. The X^2 value lies in the rejection region. Also, the table gives a nominal by nominal Phi value of .0167 and Cramer's V as .068. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis adopted (Orodho, Khatete & Mugiraneza, 2016). There is a significant association between head teachers' observation of teachers' lessons and pupils' KCPE performance in public primary schools in Lower Yatta Sub-County, Kitui County.

V. DISCUSSIONS

The findings in Table 7 concur with Ogunsaju (2006) and Machio (2013) who stated that the ultimate purpose of supervision of lessons in schools is to improve pupils' learning but its immediate focus is on the teacher and the head teacher who is in charge of the whole educational setting in the school. Supervision of lessons improves the effectiveness of teachers so that they can contribute maximally to the attainment of the system's goals as well as changing some aspects of a person's concept of self, way of behaving and attitude to the subject and learners. It also enables teachers to increase their knowledge, interest, ideals, and powers, and abilities to shape themselves and learners towards good performance.

The findings in Table 8 are in line with those of Kariuki (2013). In his findings, Kariuki (2013) on the frequency of visitation of classes during teaching, data indicated that over two thirds of head teachers never visited teachers, but 26.7% visited them sometimes. The majority (80%) of head teachers do not sit in class when teaching is going on. Again 66.7% of head teachers do not give feedback after class observation. Lesson observation is necessary. According to Stecker (2000), lesson observation is a necessary part of determining class behavior. The observations are usually direct observation where an individual watches the class while in the classroom. However, it is stressed that supervision should not be an autocratic exercise but collaborative and interactive. They argue that in instances where school heads act as autocrats in their supervision, they are bound to face challenges such as resistance from teachers and the whole purpose of supervising for curriculum improvement is defeated. According to their findings, this is probably the reason why 35.7% of the teachers disagreed with the proposition that classroom observation by head teacher's help teachers improve their teaching and pupils learning. Gaziel (2007) contend that teachers' negative views about the supervisor's supervision tasks are normally caused by wrong supervision.

VI. CONCLUSION

According to the findings of this study, observation of teachers' lessons has a positive and significant relationship on pupils' performance in KCPE examinations. Both head teachers and teachers concur that, observing of teachers' lessons has high and strong influence if exercised well would improve results in public primary schools in Lower Yatta Sub-County, Kitui County.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher made the following recommendations:

Ministry of Education, highlight how instructional supervision practices such as lesson observation can be streamlined in schools to enhance good performance in KCPE examinations. MOE and TSC to make sound policies.

QASOs should ensure there are constant visits to public primary schools to oversee and get regular feedback on the progress of headteachers' lesson observation practices.

Teachers' training institutions redesign curriculum to equip them with instructional supervision skills during training courses, the proper use of TPAD and Lesson Observation Schedule to enhance classroom instruction performance.

Teachers Service Commission (TSC) should come up with a well-defined criterion for carrying out instructional supervision in schools, especially the proper use of TPAD and Lesson Observation Schedule to enhance classroom instruction performance. Teachers should well informed on the importance of lesson observation as part of professional development.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Afolabi, F.O., & Loto, A. B., (2008). The Head Master and Quality Control in Primary Education through Effective Intra School Supervision, Nigeria: Journal of teachers' perception (Jotep) Vol 2 No 24.
- [2]. Armstrong, M. (2003). Team rewards, London. London chartered institute of personnel and development.
- [3]. Awuah, P.B (2011), Supervision of instruction in public primary schools in Ghana: Teachers' and Headteachers' perspectives, Doctor of Education Dissertation, Ghana, Murdoch University.
- [4]. Bakhda, M., & Sushila, P. (2006). Management and evaluation of Schools, Nairobi; Kenya: Oxford University Press.
- [5]. Donkoh, KE & Dwamena, E.O (2014), Effects of educational supervision on professional development perception of professional development: perception of public basic teachers at Winneba; Ghana. British journal of education Vol. 2 (6).
- [6]. Ebmeier, H. (2003). How supervision influences teacher efficacy and commitment: An investigation of a path model. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, Journal of education 18(2), 110-141.
- [7]. Gachoya, A. W. (2008). Impact of Quality Assurance and Standards on Education quality in Secondary schools in Nyeri south district Kenya, unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Nairobi.

- [8]. Gaziel, H.H (2007), Re-examining the relationship between principal's instructional /educational leadership and student achievement. *Journal of social sciences*.Vol 15(1).
- [9]. Kariuki, P.W (2013), Influence of head teachers' instructional supervision practices on pupils' performance in Kenya certificate of primary examination performance in public primary schools, Siakago division. Kenya. Unpublished masters project report Nairobi. University of Nairobi.
- [10]. Komoski, G. (2007). *Supervision*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- [11]. Kothari, C.R. (2013). *Research Methodology; Methods and technique* (2nd revised ed.) New Delhi: New age international (p) Ltd.
- [12]. LYSCED & LYSCQASO. (2016). Lower Yatta Sub-County public primary schools KCPE Results Analysis (2011-2015). Kitui: Unpublished Report.
- [13]. Mugenda, O.M, & Mugenda, A.G. (2009). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi, Kenya: ATS press.
- [14]. Musungu, L.L., & Nasongo, J.W. (2008). The head teacher's instructional role in academic achievement in secondary schools in Vihiga district, *Academic journal*, Vol. 3 (10).
- [15]. Ngaroga, J. M. (2010). *PTE Revision Series Education for primary teacher education*. Nairobi: East African educational Ltd.
- [16]. Nzambonimpa, B.J. (2011). Influence of head teachers' General and instructional supervisory practices on teachers' work performance in secondary schools in Entebbe Municipality, Educational Management Masters thesis; Kampala. Bugema University.
- [17]. Okumbe, J.A. (2007). *Educational Management: Theory and practice*. Nairobi: Nairobi University Press.
- [18]. Ogusanju, S. (2006). *Management and Supervision*. Ife-Ife: University of Ife press.
- [19]. Oso, W.Y. & Onen, D. (2008). *A general Guide to writing Research proposal and Report*, (2nded.) Kampala. Uganda: Makerere University printer.
- [20]. Sibanda, J. Mutopa, S. Maphosa, C. (2011). Teachers perceptions of lesson observations by school heads in Zimbabwean primary schools. *educational journal, JSOC Sci*, 28(1). 21-28.
- [21]. Sidhu, G.K,& Fook, C.T (2010), Formative supervision of teaching and learning: issues and concerns for the school head. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 39 (4).
- [22]. Zulu, S.D.C (2004). *The instructional leadership role of school principals*, unpublished masters research report, Pretoria; South Africa: The University of Zululand.

Evans Mulei Mulatya, et. al "Influence Of Head Teachers Observation Of Teachers' Lessons On Pupils' KCPE Performance In Public Primary Schools, Lower Yatta Sub-County, Kitui, Kenya." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 26(06), 2021, pp. 47-56.