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ABSTRACT

Aims: The objectives of the study were to look at the influence of KEMI’s capacity building programme on head teachers’ competencies in curriculum supervision  
Study design: The research adopted a descriptive survey approach.  
Place and duration of study: This study was conducted in Uasin Gishu County of the North Rift region. The county lies within latitude: 0° 31’ 0.00” N and longitude: 35° 16’ 59.88” E. The study was carried out between May 2019 to October 2019  
Methodology: The study targeted 5 sub-county education officers and 141 head teachers in public primary schools in the county. Random sampling was employed in choosing selecting the 141 public primary schools proportionately from each of the six sub-counties in the county. Every head teacher of the selected public primary schools took part in this study. Data was also gathered from all the six sub-county directors of education of Moiben, Kesses, Turbo, Kapseret, Ainabkoi and Soy. Data was collected using interviews and questionnaires.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: jogegi8@gmail.com;
**Results:** Findings indicated that there was a strong positive correlation between KEMI capacity-building programmes and head teachers’ competencies in curriculum supervision. Pearson’s Product-Moment Correlation indicated that there was a weak positive correlation between KEMI capacity building programme and head teachers competency in curriculum supervision, \( r (132) = .272, p < .0005 \), with KEMI capacity building programme explaining 7% of the variation in head teacher competency.

**Conclusion:** Head teachers capacity in curriculum supervision had been enhanced through KEMI capacity building program. The curriculum activities that had been enhanced comprise monitoring of timetable, schemes of work, records of work and lessons plans. This has enabled syllabus coverage in time.

**Keywords:** KEMI capacity building programme; head teachers’ competencies; curriculum supervision.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

A curriculum comprises of key and non-compulsory lessons; it is a generally arrangement for classes that puts emphasis on detailed proficiency and information [1]. Literature shows that curriculum can be managed and administered through the various subjects implementation [2]. The school managers have a duty to coordinate the curriculum by ensuring that it is in line with the national goals and specific objectives of the course to be undertaken. All this will lead to an optimal continuity of achieving in the other levels [3].

School principals should supervise the curriculum in order to enhance the quality of instruction in the entire system [4]. The Principals who doubles up as the internal supervisors as far as curriculum is concerned ought to give directions to the school. In order to put this in practice the head teachers will mastermind the planning and preparation of schemes of work and preparation of instructional materials especially teaching aids through capacity building. To this end this research investigates the influence of the capacity building programme by Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) among Head teachers in Uasin Gishu County in Kenya.

The issue of leadership competency and its interlink to the outcomes of management has broadly been discussed in research and educational platform globally. A case to mention is in the United States of America and the United Kingdom which have upped efforts to improve students’ achievements through enhanced head teacher competency training. The United States of America has been at the core of enhancing educators’ managerial skills and strategies that improve effective and efficient leadership [5]. On the other hand, United Kingdom has capitalized on research and extension to develop a blueprint for head teacher that improve the quality of student learning.

Africa has equally put in place measures to ensure there is effective management in schools that results in improved students’ performance [6]. These sentiments are confirmed by Sanyal [7] who asserted that Africa is endowed with policies, processes, practices and mechanisms that have ensured a competence based management therefore the need to enrich and up-scale capacity-building endeavors that are ongoing.

In Kenya for instance a study done by Musera, Achoka and Mugasia [8] among secondary school heads in Kenya are selected by the Ministry of Education (MoE) through the Teachers Service Commission (TSC). The school leaders are the accounting officials at the school level and are directly answerable to a Sub County Director of Education (SCDE), the school’s Board of Governors (BoG) currently referred to as Board of Management (BoM) and the school’s Parents Association (PA) on the management of secondary school assets [9]. The BOM members of secondary schools are appointed by the county education board and are charged with the accountability of managing the general secondary school administration [10].

According to Umoh [11], the quality of principals’ position is a pertinent gauge of the excellence of a school, and consequently emphasizes the significance of head teachers in school administration. The administration of elementary schools known as primary schools in each nation of the globe calls for school head teachers to be
well educated and qualified to realize school responsibilities [12]. According to Armstrong [13], preparation improves employee’s skills, knowledge, attitude and competence and in the end worker performance and efficiency in institutions. Due to the massive resources and attempt which have been used during training, managers are under pressure to show the effectiveness of training [14]. One likely way of representing the training that managers have undergone is effectively displaying the skills obtained in the instruction to the workplace and utilized by staff on their job [15].

Although so much is spent on training, research that has been conducted across the world indicates that only a small percentage of what is learned is actually transferred to the workplace [16]. Statistically, only 15-20% of what is learned gets transferred to the workplace [17]. A World Bank survey on training efficacy carried out in different countries concluded that while most project-based trainings resulted in learning, training only resulted in substantial work place performance outcomes about half of the time [18]. This information raises concerns on whether capacity building is giving the anticipated returns in schools. However, evidence indicates that training provides capabilities that can lead to strengthening the organization’s competitiveness and management if it is complemented with organizational planning and a sense of belonging [19].

According to the Republic of Kenya [20] children ought to have an effective service delivery through educational assets that should be administered in a well-organized and efficient manner. This is elaborated by Kiayiapi (2011) cited in Republic of Kenya [20], stated that education administrators have to direct and plan all activities related to proper headship and high-quality authority of public learning institutions. To achieve this purpose Asiago and Gathii [21], avers that Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI) was established by the Ministry of Education to regularly advance the institution’s proficiency through acquaintance, expertise and approach of education administrators. It is in relation to capacity building that KEMI developed the one year Diploma programme in Education management with the maintenance of United Agency for International Development (USAID) Nzeli, [22].

Studies have established that the quality of education relies principally on how education institutions are supervised rather than on the outcomes of those institutions. Research by Stronge [23], established that there exists a strong association between the effectiveness of the management provided by the head of an institution and the capability of a school to progress teaching and learning. However, in Kenya, the head teachers are usually trained on how they should teach in the classroom and not how they should be managers and administrators. It is important to note here that the divide between management and teaching is big as far as training is concerned. One cannot take the place of the other. This compound Government of Kenya [24], basic education act of 2013 which requires head teachers to be internal supervisors in addition to the role of teaching. It, therefore, becomes important for KEMI to enhance these educational managers with management courses to help them manage their schools better especially in the prudent management of school finances. According to David [25], capacity building assists the schools’ head teachers to execute management strategies, actions and improvements in the education segment and make use of current management tools in schools.

It is against this backdrop that the study intended to assess the influence of the capacity building programme by KEMI on Head teacher’s competencies with a focus of public primary schools in Uasin Gishu County.

This study was guided by the following objectives:

i. To establish how KEMI’s capacity building programmes influence head teachers’ competencies in curriculum supervision in public primary schools in Uasin Gishu County.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study adopted the pragmatic worldview which is a mixed method strategy where it incorporated quantitative and qualitative approaches were used to test diverse techniques of investigation for efficiency in attaining the proposed objective.

This research employed a simultaneous triangulation procedure where both quantitative and qualitative figures were gathered simultaneously and making use of the same respondents. It mixed both quantitative and
qualitative research instruments for purposes of triangulation.

The study adopted the concurrent triangulation design where both quantitative and qualitative approaches were employed to collect information and do the analysis at the same time. The survey design was used for the rationale of studying a huge population of public primary schools in Uasin Gishu County and therefore identifies the individual characteristic components in the population. The study observed how head teachers manage aspects of the schools such as curriculum implementation, infrastructure, and financial management. Finally, the survey resulted in the formulation of significant philosophies of knowledge and answers to important issues relating to school management.

In this study, 30% of the 471 schools were selected resulting to 141 selected school. The 141 were then chosen proportionately from each of the six sub-counties (Turbo, Kesses, Kapsaret, Moiben, Soy and Anabkoi). The sample size signifies 30% of the population which is sufficient to make a generalization of the whole populace as observed by [26]. This implies that 141 head teachers were purposively selected from the selected schools. A total of 132 Head teachers were able to fill and return the questionnaire. After identifying the number of public primary schools where the study was carried out, simple random sampling was employed to choose the actual primary schools from the five sub-counties. Simple random sampling is appropriate because it predetermined from where or from whom the information is to be obtained before commencing data collection which will avoid biases [27]. Data were also collected from all the five (5) sub county directors of education from Turbo, Wareng, Moiben, Soy and Ainabkoi Sub Counties. Therefore, a total of 146 respondents took part in this research.

The study instruments for this research were questionnaires and interview schedules. Section A of the questionnaires dealt with a general overview of the academic and professional qualifications of the respondents. Section B solicited data on the competence in curriculum supervision.

The study found it necessary to utilize two instruments for purposes of triangulation in order to gather the most reliable. Brewer and Hunter [28] stated that “the multi-method approach allows investigators to attack a research problem with an arsenal of methods that have no overlapping weaknesses in addition to their complementary strengths”. Triangulation was expected to enhance the researcher’s ability and effort to assess the accuracy of the findings and thus assure the reader that they are reliable. In this study, the questionnaires and interview guide added value to this research, because the researcher was able to measure competencies.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Influence of KEMI’s Training on Head teachers’ Competencies in Curriculum Supervision

The study objective intended to ascertain how KEMI’s capacity building programmes influence school heads competencies in curriculum supervision in public primary schools in Uasin Gishu County. In order to achieve this, the questionnaire items around this parameter solicited views from principals regarding the perceptions they held about the influence of the training in view of curriculum supervision. As demonstrated in Table 1.

The results in Table 1 demonstrate that 14 (10.6%) of the respondents disagreed that KEMI capacity building programme has helped them in the monitoring of teachers’ professional records, 60 (45.5%) agreed while 52 (39.4%) strongly agreed. This result clearly shows that majority of the teachers monitored teachers professional records while a few were not capable of monitoring teachers’ professional records. Competency in monitoring professional reports for instance lesson plans, schemes of work and lesson notes is critical in curriculum management thus the importance of head teachers acquiring the relevant competencies to manage. While it can be argued that most of the school head are capable of monitoring professional records a few of them were not capable. IIEP [29] conducted a research and established that there exists a strong relationship between the quality of the management given by the school head and the competence of a learning institution to advance teaching and learning.
Several researchers have documented the significance of school head in curriculum execution, management and sustainability of academic achievement. Particularly is the effort of Shiundu and Omulando [30] who examined that school head are the habitual administrators who have the accountability to make certain that the teacher put into practice the set curriculum and that education is essentially taking place. The school principal’s task in supporting academic achievement comprises of scrutinizing lesson plans, schemes of work, lesson notes, setting academic achievement targets and making sure that the course outline are completed on time. While the previous research of Bulach [31] and Omulando and Shiundu [30] was concerned with efficiency of school head in curriculum growth, it does not categorically show whether an successful school head should attend Inservice Teacher Training (INSET) in order is efficiently deal with academic performance of the learning institution, therefore the head to undertake this research.

These findings are further supported by data from the SCDE interview. One of the SCDE pointed the following in regards to monitoring of professional records:

During our visits in the schools to carry out normal inspections we do encounter problems in some schools. Such problems are related to poor management by the head teachers. Lack of weekly records, unmarked class registers and absence of lesson plans have been witnessed in some schools. Notwithstanding, is that even those schools with records to show had issues of irregular checks by the head teachers.

This finding shows that head teachers may be lacking competencies to effectively monitor teachers’ professional records. It can therefore be said that Head teachers scrutinize pupil’s academic improvement. They manage the regular testing of students through the departmental heads. They as well verify the spread sheet to check each student’s achievement and talk about them with the appropriate teachers. At the release of the KCPE outcome principals argue with the teachers the examined results and subsequently utilize it as a tool for potential academic enhancement. Head teachers make available instructional learning resources for instance teachers guide books and reference books. This is concurrent with the research findings of Moraa [32] that Head teachers...
teachers participated in instructional supervisory tasks by managing the execution of the set of courses which is concerned with assisting teachers in their instructional practices.

Information in Table 1 further indicated 11 (8.3%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that KEMI capacity building programme had helped them in time tabling, 7 (5.3%) disagreed, 73 (55.3%) agreed while 16 (12.1%) strongly agreed. Findings indicate that the Head teachers manage curriculum schedule to make sure that every the subjects are scheduled and the accurate number of lessons is observed as a requisite by the education strategy. Although most of the Head teachers managed curriculum timetabling to make sure that they were no conflicts in teaching where one teacher is anticipated to be at two different lessons in one time occurred finding indicated that were not able to do so.

These findings are further supported by data from the SCDE interview. One of the SCDE pointed the following in regards to timetabling:

> Many schools that the sub county office has visited at least had master timetable in the head teacher office. A few schools did not have the master timetable implying that the head teachers were not akin of the importance of timetables. Some of the timetables were not effectively constructed in terms of the actual number of lessons required (Sub County Director of Education).

It can be argued that timetabling is a very important component in curriculum management thus the great importance of having it done rightly. This finding are in line with Pfau [33] who points that amongst the features of the curriculum that the head teacher directs comprise of training of school timetable, making sure that guidance counseling services are offered to pupils, starting/design school-based set of courses, including activities pertinent to local conditions, assisting the teacher to expand continuous assessment procedures, organizing and coordinating assessments (Internal & external), organizing co-curricular activities such as drama, scouting and assisting teachers to expand learning objectives for themselves and their pupils.

Literature further indicates that the head teachers employ the timetable to organize funds to make available the most likely educational prospects for pupils in the most cost-effective manner. The timetable ought to be pupil-centered. Stipend has to be created to cover every activity within the school specifically school assemblies, registration, pupil guidance and welfare, staff development (Ministry of Education & Human Resource, 1999). Further information in Table 4.8 indicated that 7 (5.3%) of the respondents disagreed that KEMI had enhanced their competence in exposing teachers to seminars and workshops, 54 (40.9%) agreed while 65 (49.2%) strongly agreed. This finding indicates that most of the head teachers had benefited from KEMI in terms of ensuring head teachers exposes teachers to seminars and workshops.

Information from the interviews indicated that indeed the SCDE did preside in some of the workshops either in person or through other educational officials. This is indicated in the following excerpt;

> I have participated in seminars and workshops at the county, sub county and zonal levels. When preoccupied I do send other officials such as the quality assurance officers to assist. Teachers have in turn been educated well and sensitized on emergent aspects of education. This is a suggestion that the school heads are cognizant of the need to expose their staff so as to be able to implement the curriculum effectively (Sub County Director of Education).

Table 1 further revealed that 9 (6.8%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that KEMI had assisted them to improve in monitoring syllabus coverage, 58 (43.9%) agreed while 31 (23.5%) strongly agreed. Results specify that majority of the school heads were in a position to monitor syllabus coverage which is an important component in managing the curriculum. Literature indicates that the head teacher is accountable for making certain that syllabus coverage is met by establishing and maintaining learning attainment by the agreed performance indicator. These comprise of achievement rates in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) and/or local examinations; and low repetition and dropout rates, among others (MOE & HR, 1999).

Table 1 further indicated that 119 (90.2%) of the respondents agreed that KEMI capacity building program had facilitated them to acknowledge the importance of availing teaching and learning materials while 6 (4.5%) strongly agreed. It is
significant to state that all the head teachers were in support of availing teaching and learning materials. With this compendium of positions that the school heads are believed to play as curriculum administrators, it is meaningful for them to obtain pertinent training in order to discharge their purposes efficiently. Pfau [33] observed that features of managing curriculum such as material development and curricular consideration were important components of the training programmes of head teachers in Uganda. Odubuker [34] looked at the relationship among the head teachers management training programme and curriculum management in primary schools in Uganda and recognized a positive significant association linking preparation in curriculum supervision and the head teachers’ competencies in management.

Information in Table 1 further showed that 7 (5.3%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that KEMI had helped them to enhance benchmarking within other schools, 7 (5.3%) disagreed, 92 (69.7%) agreed while 26 (19.7%) strongly agreed. It is instructive to note that benchmarking is important in terms of borrowing best practices in other schools that can enable head teachers to apply in their school in a bid to ensure that curriculum is managed effectively.

Finally, information in Table 1 showed that 14 (10.6%) of the respondents disagreed that KEMI had helped them to improve their competence in career guidance, 50 (37.9%) agreed while 48 (36.4%) strongly agreed.

These findings are similar to the responses provided by the sub-county directors of education who were interviewed. They all agreed that through KEMI capacity building programmes, the school heads are now competent in providing career guidance and counseling to the students and even provide orientation to the newly employed teachers.

3.3 Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation for Ho1

An attempt was made to establish the relationship between KEMI capacity building programme and head teachers competency in curriculum supervision. The findings indicated in Table 2.

Pearson’s product-moment correlation was conducted to assess the relationship between KEMI capacity building programme and head teachers competency in curriculum supervision among 132 head teachers. Finding in Table 4. 9 indicates that the there was a weak positive correlation between KEMI capacity building programme and head teachers competency and head teachers competency in curriculum supervision, \( r (132) = .272, p < .0005 \), with KEMI capacity building programme explaining 7% of the variation in head teacher competency.

Test of hypothesis on the linear relationship between the two variables was conducted. The null hypothesis was to be rejected at a \( p < 0.05 \) significance level using the Pearson product-moment correlation. The second hypothesis (\( H_{02} \)) stated that there is no statistically significant relationship between KEMI capacity building programme on head teachers competencies and curriculum supervision in public primary schools in Uasin Gishu County. However, findings in Table 2 showed that KEMI capacity building programme on head teachers competencies has a positive and significant influence on teachers supervision (\( r (132) = .272, p < .0005 \)). The level of statistical significance (\( p \)-value) of the

| Table 2. Correlation Analysis between KEMI Capacity Building Programme and Head Teachers Competency in Curriculum Supervision |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-----------------|
| Correlations                                                 | KEMI capacity building | Curriculum supervision |
| KEMI capacity building                                      | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | .272 | .002 | 132 |
| Curriculum management                                       | Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N | .002 | 1 | 132 |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
correlation coefficient in this example is .0001, which means that there is a statistically significant relationship between the two variables. As a result the hypothesis (H$_{02}$) was rejected and this can be enlightened further by stating that there exists a relationship.

3.4 Simple Linear Regression for Ho1

In addition to the Pearson’s product – moment correlation, linear regression model between KEMI capacity building programme on Head teachers competencies on curriculum supervision in public primary schools in Uasin Gishu County was carried out to test the null hypothesis stating that, there is no statistically significant relationship between KEMI capacity building programme on head teachers competencies and curriculum supervision in public primary schools in Uasin Gishu County. The results are presented in Table 3.

As summarized in Table 3 the $r$ value was 0.272. $r$ is a measure of correlation between the observed value and the predicted value of the dependent variable. Hence, 0.272 is the correlation coefficient between the KEMI capacity building on Head teacher’s competence in curriculum supervision as accounted by the participants and the levels as would be predicted by the predictor variable. In the model $r^2 \times 100 = .074 \times 100\% = 7.4\%$ indicating that 7.4% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable in the study. The $r$ - square value shows that this model succeeds in predicting up to 7.4% of the variable on head teachers competence in curriculum supervision. Up to 7.4% of the variation perceives in the area under study is accounted for by KEMI capacity building. Table 4 demonstrates the ANOVA output analysis.

The ANOVA investigation is extremely significant (0.000) representing that the relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable is extremely strong. The Table evaluates the general significance of the model and given that $p < 0.05$; the linear regression model implemented in this study is pertinent for the analysis. The ANOVA results of the Linear Regression Analysis reveals that the regression equation is statistically suitable to look at the relationship ($F = 10.382$; $df = 1$; $p = 0.05$) at 0.05 level of significance. The model summary demonstrates that the model can explicate 7.4% variation in head teachers’ competence in curriculum supervision that was occasioned by any alteration in KEMI capacity building programme. Table 5 provides the model coefficient.

### Table 3. Model summary of KEMI capacity building programme on head teachers’ competencies on curriculum supervision

| Model | $R$  | $R$ Square | Adjusted $R$ Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|------|------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 1     | .272*| .074       | .067                | 4.26884                   |

$a$. Predictors: (Constant), KEMI capacity

### Table 4. Anova Output Analysis for Ho1

| Model | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | $F$  | Sig.   |
|-------|----------------|----|-------------|------|--------|
| 1     | Regression     | 189.193 | 1 | 189.193 | 10.382 | .002*  |
|       | Residual       | 2368.989 | 130 | 18.223 |
| 1     | Total          | 2558.182 | 131 |

$a$. Dependent Variable: curriculum supervision; $b$. Predictors: (Constant), KEMI capacity building

### Table 5. The coefficient for Ho1

| Model          | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | T   | Sig.   |
|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----|--------|
|                | B              | Std. Error | Beta |       |       |
| 1 (Constant)   | 24.360         | 1.109      |      |       |       |
| KEMI capacity building | .944 | .293 | .272 | 21.960 | .000  |

$a$. Dependent Variable: curriculum supervision
The linear regression analysis was done so as to establish the relationship linking KEMI capacity building programme and head teachers competence in curriculum supervision. Table 5 provides the coefficients essential for the linear regression equation. The linear regression equation \( Y=\alpha +\beta X \) as a result become:

\[
Y= 24.360 + 0.944 X
\]

Where \( Y \) is the dependent variable (head teachers competence in curriculum supervision) and \( X \) influence KEMI capacity building programme.

In relation to the linear regression equation ascertained, taking every additional issue into account (KEMI capacity building programme) constant at zero, head teachers competence in teacher supervision will be 24.360 (24.360%). Influence of KEMI capacity building programme will lead to a 24.360 (24.360%) increase in head teachers proficiency in curriculum supervision.

The hypothesis (\( H_0 \)) stated that there is no statistically significant relationship between KEMI capacity building programme on head teachers competencies and curriculum supervision in public primary schools in Uasin Gishu County. However, findings in Table 5 showed that KEMI capacity building programme has a positive and significant influence on head teachers’ competence in curriculum supervision (\( \beta = .272, P < 0.05 \)). Consequently, the hypothesis (\( H_0 \)) was rejected and this can be explained further by assessing the value of the t-test which specified that head teachers competencies and curriculum supervision in public primary schools in Uasin Gishu County would be ascribed to the regression model 3 times more compared to the effect of the standard error associated with the estimated coefficient (\( t = 3.222 \)). Result established from the ANOVA indicated that the sum of squares for the linear regression model was 2558.083, this reveals that the linear regression model accounted for more than 2558.083 times the variation of learners behavior compared to the residuals, F- 10.382, P value = 0.001.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that KEMI capacity building program had enhanced head teachers’ competence in monitoring teacher’s performance in class and outside class, and helped them in cultivating good relationship with the teachers and building motivating climate to enhance teamwork among teachers. Further, the findings also indicates that KEMI capacity building program had helped them in appraising teacher’s performance objectively and helped them in providing teacher’s opportunity for professional growth, proper delegation of duties and it had enhanced the recommendation of teachers for upward mobility. The study concludes that KEMI capacity building program had helped head teachers in monitoring of teacher’s professional records, timetabling as indicated by 67.4% and enhanced their competence in exposing teachers to seminars and workshops as indicated by 90.1% who agreed. Further, it can be concluded that KEMI had helped them to improve in monitoring syllabus coverage. Similarly, the study established that KEMI capacity building program had helped head teachers to acknowledge the importance of availing teaching and learning materials and to enhance bench making within other schools as indicated by 89.4%. KEMI had also helped head teachers to improve their competence in career guidance as indicated by 74.3% who agreed.
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