

# ***THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES***

## **Secondary School Principals' Use of Quality Assurance and Standards Assessment Feedback in Supervision in Nairobi Kenya: A Critical Analysis**

**Esther Akinyi Ochino-Onyango**

Student, The Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Nairobi, Kenya

**Dr. Jacinta Mary Adhiambo**

Senior Lecturer, The Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Nairobi, Kenya

**Dr. Pascal Wambiya**

Senior Lecturer, Mwenge Catholic University, Moshi, Tanzania

### **Abstract:**

*Feedback from quality assurance assessment informs secondary principals on the status of their institutions and advises on improvement needed. Availability and acceptance of assessment feedback by principals leads to implementation of recommendations contained in the assessment reports. This aids in providing quality education that meets set standards, relevance and continuous maintenance. This is why this study looked at the use of feedback from quality assurance and standards assessment by principals in their supervision of secondary schools in Nairobi, Kenya. Literature reviewed highlighted grey areas for research. Thus, the study delved to answer the question: what is the influence of quality assurance and standards assessment feedback on principals' supervision of secondary schools in Nairobi? Embedded mixed research design of quantitative and qualitative strand was used in data collection, analysis and interpretation. Questionnaires, interview and document analysis guides were used to collect data. Target population included 9 Quality Assurance and Standards Officers and 83 principals from a sample of 9 Quality Assurance and Standards Officers and 30 principals was derived. Stratified and purposive sampling techniques were employed. The study used mean, correlation and regression to analyze data. The major findings were that quality assurance and standards assessments were infrequent and feedback rare but are important in secondary schools' supervision. There was a positive significant relationship between effective supervision and quality assurance standards assessment ( $\rho = 0.594$ ,  $p$  value  $< 0.05$ ). Principals desired timely feedback from quality assurance and standards assessments. They also required discussions on the same, with the stakeholders and particularly follow-up assessments. The study recommends that the Ministry of Education employ and train more officers and avail sufficient resources for timely feedback after assessments.*

**Keywords:** *Quality assurance and standards assessment, feedback and dimensions*

### **1. Introduction**

Quality education is often a topic of discussion in education forum in Kenya. As such reference usually made to quality assurance as one of the strategies to enhance quality students to meet the demands of the international employment market. According to Republic of Kenya/UNESCO, (2012). There is an increase on the demand for quality education world over, for economic development and international competitiveness. The United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2010) maintains that quality assurance is the systematic review of education programs to ensure that acceptable standards of education, scholarship and infrastructure are being maintained. This implies reviews or evaluation.

For reviews to be done successfully there is need for adequate feedback from assessments. With regards to measurability, organizations cannot evaluate project success accurately unless they assess results formed by feedback against defined expectations. Therefore, the quality of products and processes should be assessed against standards, metrics and expectations (FFIEC IT Examination Handbook INFOBASE, undated). In Kenya, Quality assurance and standards officers are expected to give advisory services to schools on how best to improve on pedagogical skills (Republic of Kenya, 2005). The officers can advise principals in schools so as to enhance students' performance only if feedback is availed after assessment. Competencies in using feedback to improve performance are also vital to ensure that assessment procedures are effective. This is because assessments are only effective if feedbacks are availed. Lack of meaningful feedback from assessments to schools on supervision, are among challenges associated with external quality assessments.

Quality assessment is a strategy for ensuring quality in the school system. They are measures taken regularly to ensure that prescribed threshold of quality in education are met (Vlasceanu, Grunberg and Parlea, 2007). The regular reviews and regular measures are made possible through availability of feedback on the performance of different dimension areas in schools. Consequently, as posited by Bruggen (2010), proper planning is requisite for effective assessment to be realized in a school. The schools and data have to be accessed and a standardized national framework defining the educational quality put in place. This implies that there ought to be a clear and concise assessment feedback reports to be addressed and followed up by effective actions as Bruggen further explains.

Similarities have been observed in Kenya, New Zealand, Singapore and Hong Kong, in the process of self and external evaluation which emphasises on feedback (Whitby, 2010). Feedback has recommendations and ought to be discussed by the staff members and the stakeholders of a school. In Ireland, a draft inspection report is made and a post-inspection meeting held with the principal, staff and members of Board of Management (Perry, 2012). If the feedback plays such an important role in the improvement in the school, what would be the case where the assessments are done, yet quality is wanting? This study therefore sought to find out whether or not feedback from assessments are availed to principals in secondary schools in Nairobi. Further, it also gauged if quality assurance reports are addressed and followed up by effective actions to improve secondary school supervision.

There are different assessment types for different task forces by countries in the world (Bruggen (2010). The nine main types of educational institution assessments conducted in Kenya include; Panel, Subject based, Advisory, Block, Assessment for registration, Assessment for introduction of new subjects, Investigative Assessment, and Follow-up Assessment (Republic of Kenya, 2000). Follow-up Assessments are dependent on feedback from the other assessment types. Information on the frequency of this type of assessment in secondary schools is also limited.

A specific format is required when conducting quality assurance and standards assessment for coverage of all dimension areas. The three broad dimensions of assessment consist of; the teaching learning process, management and output. Feedback from these areas gives principals insight into improvement needed in each supervision area. In Kenya, the dimensions also include; curriculum organization and implementation, assessment, student progression and achievement, student welfare, infrastructure and school facilities management (Quality Index MOEST, 2010). This is in line with what Denter and Kruger (2003) postulate on the 5 basic elements of institutional supervisory roles of principals. In Kenya the assessment process is essential in monitoring progress in secondary schools as it provides feedback for better school performance (MOEST, 2008). According to Whitby (2010) external findings are often communicated back to schools inspected within a few days of inspection. Statistically significant relationship existed between constructive oral feedback and overall satisfaction with the inspection or assessment process among the stakeholders (McCrone, Coghlan et al, 2009).

This study was guided by Deming theory of quality management (Deming, 1986), Collegial model with contributions from; Dalin, (1994), Whitaker, (1995), Macroff, (1993), Rowan, (1993), Sergiovanni, (1991) Bush and West-Burnham (1994). The Developmental model of supervision (Glickman, 1987), (Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon, 2005) was also used. This was due to their implication on principals' supervisory roles in relation to quality assurance and standards assessment. The collegial and developmental supervision models appear to have some parallels with Deming's "partnership for quality." Participative techniques such as; teamwork, quality circles, quality control, and quality assurance are just the beginning of the evolution and transformation to Total Quality Management in organizational life. In line with Deming's theory (1986), this study focuses on the contributions of quality assurance and standards assessments in preventing defects and conforming to requirements in secondary school supervision. Deming's theory advocates for avoidance of wastage. Principals do this in their supervision through leadership that coordinates; curricular, co-curricular programs and general school supervision. This is because Deming asserts that quality issues in organizations arise from poor management.

### *1.2. Statement of the Problem*

Studies have shown that impediments that make principals not to give adequate attention to supervision of instructional activities in secondary schools include but not limited to lack of feedback from quality assurance and standards assessments. This may influence secondary school principals' supervision. According to Ehren and Visscher (2008) in Denmark, Dederling and Muller (2011) in Germany, school stakeholders' discussion of feedback from assessment is important for school improvement. In Kenya, principals are supposed to discuss recommendations and implementation of assessment feedback with the teachers and Board of Management in order to enhance supervision (Gichui 2012). Studies by Whitby (2010), Ehren and Visscher (2008) and Gray and Gardner (2010) contend that studies on the effects of inspection or assessment on schools are limited. This study examines the influence of quality assurance and standards assessment feedback on supervision of secondary school principals in Nairobi

### *1.3. Research Question*

What is the influence of Quality Assurance and Standards Assessment feedback on principals' supervision of Secondary School in Nairobi County?

#### 1.4. Research Hypothesis

- Ho: Quality Assurance and Standards Assessment feedback has no significant influence on secondary school principal's supervision.

## 2. Conceptual Framework

Several interrelated factors that influence principals' supervisory roles in secondary schools were considered. These factors included; frequency and quality of quality assurance and standards assessments, principals' supervisory areas, assessment types and feedback availability that are important for effective quality assurance and standards assessment. The framework was based on the interplay of the variables. Principals' supervisory role was the dependent variable and quality assurance and standards assessment type was an independent variable. The actual process of quality assurance and standards assessment itself was one of the intervening variables. The indicator was the influences it had on the various dimension areas of principals' supervision. Availability of feedback from assessments was also an intervening variable whose indicator was the implementations of the recommendations from the feedback on the specific areas of challenges to the principals. This study identified a major gap in the lack of provision of feedback and Follow-up assessments which were rarely done yet respondents indicated their importance. Thus entrenching the availability of feedback from quality assurance and standards Assessment is the contribution of this study to the knowledge area.

### 2.1. Literature Review

Feedback from Quality assurance and standards assessment illuminates the strengths, weaknesses of a school. The recommendations for improvement of the schools are also given. According to Ayeni (2012), quoting Rouf (2012), feedback is an important aspect in quality assurance and standards and corroborates Deming's cycle of continuous improvement in all aspects of education. This cycle is based on Plan, Do, Check and Act (Deming, 1986). The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in 2009 in a workshop in Mexico, reported that the Inspectorate played the role of stimulating qualities of school leadership and teaching. Another study by Rudd (2009), posited that a statistically significant relationship between constructive oral feedback and overall satisfaction with the inspection process existed. Given the central position of feedback from quality assurance and standards assessment in the effective leadership of a school, this study aspired to find out if principals of public secondary schools in Nairobi got feedback from assessments and if they used the same in their supervision.

In Britain the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) has regular inspection of schools by Independent inspectors. The reporting is public with summary of the report as feedback provided to parents and an account report to the parliament for provision of advice to Ministers. Feedback therefore plays a significant role maintaining the quality of education in Britain. This is because the parents and the parliament depend on it to formulate advises to schools. In Netherlands, there are inspectorate follows-up in each school annually to check on progress and if necessary, interventions to ensure improvement ((Whitby, 2010). Therefore interventions, improvement and follow-up in Netherlands depend on feedback from assessments. an In Germany, Dederig and Muller (2011) report that 85% of principals found verbal feedback at the end of inspection and the report useful and meaningful for school development. They further report that a few months after inspection visits, development activities took place at majority of the schools.

On Dutch Educational School Supervision Act, Ehren and Visscher (2008) reported that the effects of school inspection on school improvement had been investigated only to a limited degree. According to them, there was need for more studies in the area. To this end this study attempted to contribute to the area. Whitby (2010) and McCrone *et al* (2009) attest to the importance of feedback to the stakeholders after inspection. In Malaysia the school inspections review the nature, purpose, structure, functions and operations of school systems and outcomes. This enable constant review of the school system to determine whether there is progress, regression or it is static. This is made possible by feedback from assessment that enables stakeholders and school administrators to capture relevant information to forecast the schools' productivity (ANTRIEP, 2002). Feedback enables constant review of a school system that contributes to continuous improvement of supervision. Is productivity linked with the supervision after the assessment feedback? The foregone review casts light on a European scenario. What would be case of continent of Africa? (South Africa, Nigeria referred to bellow)

The fragmentation in the education segment in South Africa due to apartheid, led to the creation of Institution Development and Support Officials (IDSO) in the districts. Their role was to inspect schools by monitoring school leadership and management and creating supportive environment for provision of quality education. This was based on assessment feedback that school principals eagerly awaited ((Raath, 2012). Feedback from assessment in South Africa therefore played an important role in enabling IDSOs advice principals so as to improve their leadership. Studies showing links between quality assurance and standards assesment and principals'supervision include those done by; Ayeni (2012), Adeniji (2002) and Ekundayo (2010) in Nigeria. A link is demonstrated by Ayeni (2012) when he quotes Demings cycle of improvement that includes feedback, which made the study resonate with Demings' theory of supervision.

In the same vein, Momoh and Osagiobare (2015) in Nigeria, found out that only 48% of approved assessment recommendations were implemented in Edo states, while in Delta state 52%. This according to them meant that assessment standards by Federal Republic of Nigeria for secondary schools were not fully implemented in Edo and Delta states. The challenges may have been caused by lack of adequate feedback from quality assurance and standards assessments to enable

undertaking of the implementations. Similarly, Ogunu (2001) found out that in Nigeria some schools failed to provide needed information to enable assessment to be carried out, while in others recommendations from inspectors in the form of feedback were never implemented. Kolawole (2012) in his study reported that; inspection visits were irregular, feedback from the inspection reports were hardly made available and there were no follow-ups that would ensure that the weaknesses identified had been corrected. The United Republic of Tanzania (2008) in a report on performance audit of school inspection said that assessments did not address the problem of poor performance of students in secondary schools. Further information was that inspection from feedback may not have used in a suitable way. However, Shaheen (2013) reported that teachers perceived advice and feedback given through inspection reports and recommendations useful for making improvement in their own work performance.

In Kenya studies found out that provisions of educational quality assurance and standards was impeded by quality assurance and standards officers' inadequacy in relevant skills and insufficient feedback among others (King'oina, 2014). This was corroborated by Ndiso (2013), who reported that most head teachers indicated that quality assurance and standards officers rarely or never gave feedback after their observations. Feedback therefore, seems to occupy a central position in the success of quality assurance and standards assessments, which dictates the quality of education quality provided. Gichui (2012) posited that in Kenya education reforms often fail to achieve desired outcomes due to ineffective supervision. This could be due to lack of feedback to enable principals address corrective measures. The Teachers Service Commission appoints principals to manage the operations of schools and monitors them through Quality Assurance and Standards Officers. The officers' conduct regular assessments in schools and then provide feedback to the Ministry of Education and Teachers Service Commission (Ndiga *et al*, 2014). In 2012, Education Officials worked with principals in secondary schools to strategize how to improve academic achievement. This called for quality assurance and standards assessments (Ndiga *et al*, 2014). From the feedback, the Ministry of Education recommended to Teachers Service Commission that all underperforming principals and their deputies be transferred or demoted. This move alluded to the concern of education authorities over principals' leadership and the importance of feedback from assessments in decision making.

In summary, this study looked at the role of quality assurance and standards assessment feedback on principals' supervision of secondary schools in Nairobi, Kenya and attempted to fill some of the gaps in studies reviewed. Feedback from assessments was examined for its role in assisting principals improve their supervision (MOE-DQAS, 2010). Feedback from assessment reports in school's inspection were also found to be used by most European education systems as instruments for controlling and promoting schools quality (Ehren, Altrichter, McNamara and O'Hara 2012). Shaheen (2013) reported that teachers perceived feedback from assessments as useful. However, in Tanzania it was reported that quality assurance and standards assessment was not beneficial to schools (The United Republic of Tanzania, 2008). Thus, non-availability of feedback from assessments negatively influenced secondary school supervision. This is because there were no recommendations provided for principals to implement and improve their supervision. Due to lack of feedback, principals were also unaware of the performance level of the different dimension areas under their supervision.

### 3. Research Design

This study used an embedded design of a mixed methods approach, where the phenomenon qualitative technique was embedded in a cross-sectional survey design which is a quantitative strand. The qualitative component was embedded in the quantitative method so as to supplement the data collection and analysis. This was as recommended by Johnson and Christensen (2008) and Tashakkori and Teddie (2010). They advocated for the combination in assisting getting better and deeper understanding of the complex phenomenon, by capitalizing on the strengths of the two techniques, which offsets their weaknesses.

The study was carried out in schools in 9 Sub-counties of Nairobi, Kenya namely; Starehe, Embakasi, Makadara, Westlands, Njiru, Kamukunji, Langata, Dagoretti and Kasarani. The target population comprised 9 Quality assurance and standards officers from the 9 Nairobi Sub-counties of Nairobi and 83 Principals from the 83 public secondary schools in Nairobi County (Teachers' Service Commission, 2012 and Ministry of Education Science and Technology (EMIS 2015). A total of 30 schools were sampled by proportionate stratification of schools in the form of; mixed day secondary school (MD), girls'boarding secondary school (GB), boys'boarding secondary school (BB), girls'day secondary school (GD), boys'day secondary school (BD) and mixed boarding secondary school (MB). The 30 Principals automatically formed part of the study.

To ensure internal validity of instruments in this study, they were given to experts such as QASOs not part of the study, and lecturers at the Catholic University of Eastern Africa in Nairobi, Kenya and fellow researchers for peer evaluation as recommended by Denzin and Lincoln (2011). Pilot testing was done on the research tools in 2 secondary schools and on 4 QASOs who were not part of the study. The interview guides and some parts of section V of the questionnaire were subjected to the credibility test. For dependability testing, the instruments were again presented to colleague researchers and QASOs who were not part of the study. Triangulation in this study also involved the QASOs and principals in member checking of the interview guides as recommended by Creswell (2014). The researchers-built rapport with the participants and at the conclusion of the interviews they were able to get a true reflection of what participants had given. The reliability of the instruments was tested by using odd numbers split in the split half design. The closed ended items provided this data. All the alpha coefficients ranged between 0.60 and 0.80. Therefore, based on the coefficient values, the items tested were deemed

reliable for this study. Effective supervision had a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.658, assessment had 0.733 and quality assurance officer's feedback had 0.698. Therefore, all were accepted.

Data was then analyzed using both the qualitative and quantitative analysis procedures to enable the researcher give a reasoned meaning to the study. All quantitative data from the questionnaires was entered into the SPSS computer program for descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics was analyzed into frequency counts, means and percentages. The inferential statistics and regression analysis of results was done for statistical relationship of variables. The Hypothesis was tested through regression analysis. Qualitatively data was collected by interviews and document analysis and then transcribed, organized thematically, as they emerged in the ongoing process, then analyzed using statistics to indicate percentages. Thematic analysis, categories and patterns were used in interpretation of data. Graphs, charts and tables were used to present descriptive data analysis results. On ethical consideration, the researchers sought authority to conduct the research and informed all the participants the purpose of the study. Consent was sought from the respondents and their confidentiality and anonymity guaranteed as recommended by Cohen and Manion (1994).

#### 4. Results and Discussion

This section presents the findings beginning with the demographic information as a basis of the discussion that follows. The principals' questionnaire return rate was 80% (24). The study interviewed 20% (6) principals and 67% (6) Quality assurance and standards officers.

##### 4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Principals and Quality Assurance and Standards Officers

There were 56% Female principals while 44% were male. This implies that there was an almost fair representation of the gender. The principals holding bachelor's degrees were 54.16%, master's degree holders were 41.66%) and there was 1 PhD holder. Six principals had between 2-5 working experience, 4 had between 6-10 years and similarly to those who had worked for 11-15 years. Three had 16 years of experience and above, while only one (1) principal had one year. The principals who headed boys' boarding schools were 27.8% and girls' boarding schools were also headed by an equal percentage. 16.7% principals came from a mixed and day schools on equal measures with those from day and boarding. Others categories comprised of 11.1%.

Half the QASOs were male and other half were female. Four (4) QASOs had master degrees while two (2) had bachelor degrees. Five (5) of the QASOs had working experience of between 6-10 years, while one (1) had more than 10 years' experience. Between January 2012 and December three (3) QASOs done between 4-6 assessments, followed by two (2) who had done between 10-11 assessments. One (1) QASO had done assessments between 1-3.

#### 5. Principals' Use of Feedback from Quality Assurance and Standards Assessment in Supervision

The study sought to find out the extent of usage of quality assurance and standards assessment feedback by the principals in relation to the research question. The principals' views are summarized in Table 1

	SD		D		UD		A		SA		Mean	$\sigma$
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
Advisory assessments results by QASOs, do not impact positively on improvement of school supervision in curriculum organization and implementation.	5	22.2	11	44.4	5	22.2	3	11.1		0	2.2	0.9
Advisory assessments do not improve the teaching and learning and students' assessment.	4	16.7	13	55.6	7	27.8		0		0	2.1	0.7
Advisory assessments fees back do not assist in challenges faced in management of finances, staff and physical facilities.	3	11.1	8	33.3	11	44.4	1	5.6	1	5.6	2.6	1.0
Discussion of advisory assessment reports with the QASOs does not make the supervision of the teachers any easier for principals.	4	16.7	7	27.8	5	22.2	7	27.8	1	5.6	2.8	1.2
Discussion of advisory assessment reports with the teachers in school has not made their supervision any easier for principals.	4	16.7	9	38.9	11	44.4		0		0	2.3	0.8
Release of follow-up assessment findings by QASOs enables principals address areas of challenges in their schools.	1	5.6	11	44.4	5	22.2	5	22.2	1	5.6	2.8	1.1

Table 1: Principals' Supervision and Use of Feedback from Quality Assurance and Standards Assessments (N=24)

Key: SD- Strongly Disagree, D-Disagree, UD- Undecided, A- Agree, SA- Strongly Agree,  $\Sigma$  – Std. Deviation

The study sought to find out from principals whether advisory assessment feedback from QASOs had not helped them improve the supervision of curriculum organization and implementation in school. A total of 66.6% of the principals opposed this statement, while only 11.1% agreed to the fact that no improvement had been realized after advisory assessment feedback. Overall this statement had a mean of 2.2 and standard deviation of 0.9 implying majority of the respondents disagreed with this statement. Therefore, many respondents agreed that feedback assisted in the improvement of supervision in their schools. However, from the interviews principals reported that they desired frequent assessments and provision of feedback. Principal D (19<sup>th</sup> Nov, 2015) said, "We would like more frequent and effective quality assurance and standards assessments, with meaningful reports written and follow-ups done to hold schools accountable". Quality assurance and standards officers on their part reported that, their few numbers and lack of facilitation impeded their performance of duties. An officer said that; "there is need for increase of manpower; that is more QASOs, availing more resources and induction of QASOs time and again. The frequency of assessment should also be increased" QASO AA (5<sup>th</sup> April 2016).

Principals were further asked if feedback from advisory assessment had made no contribution to improvement of teaching and learning and students' assessment, 55.6% of the respondents disagreed, 27.8% were undecided and 16.7% showed a strong disagreement. In this statement no respondent agreed that there was no contribution which was further supported by the mean of 2.6 and standard deviation 1.0. This meant that feedback from advisory assessment results had contributed to teaching and learning significantly.

On whether principals had received any assistance from feedback in time of challenges like in the management of finances, staff and physical facilities, those who ascertained to have received assistance were 44.4%, while 44.4% were indecisive, and a total of 11.2% denied having received any assistance with a mean of 2.6 and standard deviation of 1.0. This seems to be an indicator that principals do not get adequate assistance from assessment feedback in times of challenges as only 44.4% agreed to the construct. In the interview a principal reported that; "There is a problem because very little follow-up is done and no written feedback is given" Principal C (6<sup>th</sup> Nov., 2015). From the Developmental supervision model that this study hinges on, Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2003) posit that it is a requirement that at each stage a teacher knows their level of performance. In South Africa also, Raath's study found out that principals looked forward to knowing their performance levels from the Institutional Development Support Officers. This also underscores the need for feedback from assessments.

Further, on whether discussion of advisory assessment reports with the QASOs had not made the supervision of the teachers any easier, 27.8% of the principals agreed on equal basis 27.8% also disagreed. 22.2% were unsure, 16.7% strongly disagreed and 5.6% strongly agree. A calculated mean of 2.8 and standard deviation of 1.2 implied a great variability therefore a gap. Principal B (5<sup>th</sup> Feb., 2016), further emphasized the need for more assessments by reporting that; "There should be frequent visits, advice and feedback that is, improved feedback and frequency of Quality Assurance and Standards assessment".

The QASOs on their side reported that inadequate staff affected their work, with one saying that, "Assessments should be made regular and follow-ups made, staff should be adequate and vehicles availed. Funding should also be improved and recommendations on reports that are not currently being acted upon should be acted upon as this demoralizes us. Support is also needed from the senior bosses to QASOs" QASO BB (2<sup>nd</sup> Feb., 2016). The QASOs interviews seem to suggest that their few number and lack of resources made their work difficult. Studies by Ehren and Visscher (2008) and by Dederling and Muller (2011) support the importance of feedback discussion with stakeholders. This enables identification and discussion of challenges by the QASOs, principals and teachers in line with collegial model advanced by Bush (2011), which encourages joint ownership. The stakeholders can therefore contribute suggestions and means to improve the quality of education provided in the particular school. This may also assist the principals improve their supervision of the schools.

The principals who were unsure that "discussion of advisory assessment reports with the teachers had not made it easier to be supervised" were 44.4%, while 55.6% disagreed. None of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed with the construct. The mean was 2.3 and standard deviation of 0.8 meaning there was a reduced variability in the responses given. This meant that the principals who reported that advisory assessment reports discussion with the teachers had made it easier for them to supervise the teachers were just slightly more than the principals who were unsure. The percentage of the unsure principals was significant and needed to be addressed.

On the influence of the release of follow-up assessment reports as feedback by QASOs in enabling principals to address areas with challenges in schools, 44.4% of the respondents disagreed, followed by 22.2%, who were undecided and then 22.2% agreed and on equal basis. Those who strongly agreed were 5.6% and another 5.6% also strongly disagreed. Principal E (6<sup>th</sup> Jan., 2016), posited that, "Frequent quality assurance and standards assessments and provision and discussion of reports would assist principals address areas with challenges in their schools" Therefore the principals' responses indicate a gap exists in the release of follow-up assessment reports in quality assurance and standards assessment.

Further, the study found out a divided opinion on whether the discussion of advisory assessment reports with both the QASOs and teachers had made it easier for the principal to supervise the schools, as indicated by the varying number of response proportions. Nonetheless, earlier on, Ehren and Visscher (2008) found out that, feedback about weaknesses and discussion with schools regarding improvement activities, made a difference in performance. Further Ehren et al (2012) reported that promoting and controlling schools in Europe is based on feedback, however little research knowledge had been done in this area according to them. In Deming's theory (1986), he advocates for a zero defects day, where employers and

managers monitor staff performance standards by giving feedback. The argument was later supported by Ayeni (2012) who reported that quality assurance in education corroborates with Deming circle of continuous improvement of; Plan, Do, Check and Act which can only be done by principals and QASOs on realization of feedback. Original plans are checked against achievement and further improvement depends on feedback (Deming, 1986). In practice, it would be useless for the assessment to be done only not to be availed to the principals for required action to be taken, thus making the exercise a futile one.

That is why Momoh and Osagiobare (2015) observed that lack of adequate feedback from quality assurance officers affected principals' implementation of the recommendations. In Tanzania, Shaheen (2013) found out that teachers perceived advice and feedback from inspection reports as useful in improvement of their work. This was also a suggestion by Watsulu & Simatwa (2011) that feedback on assessment of schools should be given immediately after the assessment. Bush (2011) posits that the participative nature of the collegial model enables stakeholders with the knowledge of feedback from assessments, to participate in decision making since they have common values and share objectives of the institution. This may address issues raised by Mosigis in a study (2012), where it is acknowledged that the government bureaucrats, the public and politicians have raised concern over the inadequacy of the quality assurance practices in Kenyan schools.

### 5.1. Test of Relationships between Variables

The researchers used inferential statistics to determine the nature of the relationship, direction and significance of the bivariate relationship between variables in the study. Pearson correlation analysis was used to show the strength of the relationship between independent and dependent variables, while multiple regression analysis was used to show the nature of the relationship between variables. As concerns the decision rule, In this study the Significant levels were tested at  $\alpha=5\%$ , therefore, the cut off point for the p-value were at a maximum 0.05. The decision was that if a p value was less than 0.05 then there was enough evidence to warrant rejection of the hypothesis. In contrast, if the p value was greater than 0.05 then there was no significant influence of the particular variable on the dependent variable and the alternative hypothesis would be accepted.

Correlation analysis between the dependent variable (effective supervision) and independent variables; Assessment and, QASO conduct in feedback yielded the results as presented in Table 2.

		Effective Supervision	QASA Assessment	QASO Conduct
Effective supervision	Pearson Correlation	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)			
QASA Assessment	Pearson Correlation	.594**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00		
QASO Conduct/feedback	Pearson Correlation	.447*	-0.049	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.012	0.408	

Table 2: Correlation Analysis

From the results in the Table 2, there is a positive and significant relationship between effective supervision and quality assurance standards assessment ( $\rho = 0.594$ , p value  $< 0.05$ ). This implies that a unit change in assessment increases effective supervision by 59.4%. Secondly, there was a positive and significant relationship between feedback from assessment given by QASOs and effective supervision ( $\rho = .447$ , p value  $< 0.05$ ). This implies that a unit change in QASOs conduct in giving feedback increases effective supervision by 44.7%. The finding is different from that of Momoh and Osagiobare (2015) which indicated that lack of feedback on assessment negatively affected principals' implementation of recommendation and Barrow (2011) which found that QASOs rarely gave feedback after assessment.

The regression analysis model summary in Table 3 shows that 39.9% of the variations in principals effective supervision can be accounted for by QASOs conduct of giving feedback after assessment while the remaining percentage can be accounted for by other factors not included in the model.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.632a	0.399	0.381	.033

Table 3: Regression Model Summary  
a. Predictors: (Constant), QASO Conduct (Feedback), QASA

Results in Table 4 shows that the two independent variables; QASOs conduct of giving feedback and Quality Assurance and Standards Assessment have a joint significant influence on effective supervision.

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	325.959	3	108.653	11.813	.000a
	Residual	2630.554	286	9.198		
	Total	2956.514	289			

*Table 4: Feedback and Quality Assurance and Standards Assessment*  
*a. Predictors: (Constant), QASO Conduct(Feedback), QASA*  
*b. Dependent Variable: Effective Supervision*

The hypothesis of the study stated that there is no significant relationship between assessment feedback represented by QASOs conduct in giving feedback and principals' effective supervision. Results of the study revealed a positive and significant relationship between QASOs conduct in feedback and principals' effective supervision ( $\beta = 0.086$ ,  $t = 2.246$ ,  $p$  value  $< 0.05$ ) and a unit change in QASOs conduct as they give feedback, increases principal supervision effectiveness by 0.086 units.

From the findings of the study majority of the respondents had university degrees and had over 2 years work experience. This indicated that they were familiar with quality assurance and standards assessment. Additionally, a higher proportion of QASOs had conducted between 4-6 assessments. Majority of principals, QASOs and teachers believe that Quality Assurance and Standards Assessment contribute to School supervision. Respondents reported that assessments influenced all dimensions of school supervision. However, it was noted the assessments especially follow-up was not frequently done. Findings also indicated that principals believed that; advisory assessments feedback influenced curriculum organization and implementation, improvement of teaching and learning and areas of challenges. It was desirable to discuss feedback by QASOs, Principals and teachers in relation to school supervision. However, the influence of follow-up assessment feedback by QASOs on principals' areas of challenges was not felt as they were rarely done.

From the results there was a positive and significant relationship between feedback from assessments given by QASO and effective supervision. Findings revealed that feedback from assessments by QASO increases principals' effective supervision of the school.

## 6. Conclusions

Principals desired feedback from assessment to assist them in the improvement of supervision in their schools and gave them platform on which to implementing recommendations from assessment. The fact that the principals did not receive feedback in time implies there is a gap in the provision feedback after quality assurance and standards assessments. This lacuna does affect the quality of supervision by the principals who should have been backed by reports as evidence.

Feedback from assessments also enable the stakeholders participate in school management. The success of assessment to achieve its intended purposes depends on feedback for the implementation of recommendations. This underscores the importance of feedback from assessment in relation to principals' supervision of secondary schools. As feedback about weaknesses and discussion with schools regarding improvement activities, make a difference in performance. Effective supervision is greatly dependent on the timely feedback and so should be encouraged for quality teaching and learning in the secondary schools.

## 7. Recommendations

Based on the findings, the study recommends that the Ministry of Education should sensitize; all stakeholders on the process of Quality Assurance and Standards Assessment. It should also ensure that follow-up assessments are done after other types of assessments and feedback given. The Quality Assurance and Standards Officers should avail feedback reports with recommendations to the principals soon after the assessments. Provision of feedback after assessment should be mandatory after every assessment.

## 8. References

- i. Adeniji, I.A. (2002). Perception of principals and teachers of external supervisors role in Secondary Schools in Ogun State. Nigerian Journal of Clinical and Counselling Psychology.
- ii. ANTRIEP International Seminar. (2002). External school inspection as a form of school evaluation: School evaluation for quality improvement. Kuala Lumpur.
- iii. Ayeni, J.A. (2012). Assessment of principals' supervisory roles for quality assurance in secondary schools in Ondo State in Nigeria. World Journal of Education. Vol. 2 No. 1 February 2012 : Ondo State Quality Education Assessment Agency.
- iv. Barrow, I. Mohamud (2011). A critical assessment of quality assurance and standards on educational quality in secondary schools in the larger Mombasa district Kenya. URI: <http://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/handle/123456789/525>



- v. Bruggen, V. C. J. (2010). Inspectorates of education in Europe; some comparative remarks about their tasks and work. SICI. Germany.
- vi. Bush, T. (2003). Theories of educational management: Third Edition. London: Sage.
- vii. Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1994). Research methods in Education, fourth edition. London: Routledge.
- viii. Creswell, J.W. & Plano Clark, V.L. (2007). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- ix. Creswell, J. (2014) Research design. International students' edition. Qualitative, quantitative and mixed Methods Approaches. Second Edition, London: Sage Publications
- x. Dederling, K. & Muller, S. (2011). School Improvement through Inspections? First Empirical Insights from Germany. Journal of Educational Change 12 (3), 301-322.
- xi. Deming, W. Edwards. (1986). Out of the crisis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Studies.
- xiii. Denzin N. K & Lincoln Y. S. (2011). The Sage handbook of qualitative research. U.S.A Sage Publication. Available: [http://www.edb.gov.hk/FileManager/EN/Content\\_760/ehandbk\(mar%2007\).pdf](http://www.edb.gov.hk/FileManager/EN/Content_760/ehandbk(mar%2007).pdf) [16 November 2007].
- xiv. Denter, I. and Kruger, A.G. (2003). An educators' guide to school management skills. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- xv. Ehren, M.C.M., Altrichter, H., McNamara G. & O'Hara, J. (submitted). Impact of school inspections and learning: Describing assumptions on causal mechanism in six European countries. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability. Retrieved from authors in January 2012.
- xvi. Ehren, M.C.M. & Visscher, A.J. (2008). The Relationships between School Inspections, School Characteristics and School Improvement. British Journal of Educational Studies, 56 (2), 205-227.
- xvii. European Commission and SICI. (2001). Effective School Self-Evaluation (ESSE) Project School Self-Evaluation in Thirteen European Countries/Regions [online]. Available: [http://www.see-educoop.net/education\\_in/pdf/school-self-eval-in-13-countries.pdf](http://www.see-educoop.net/education_in/pdf/school-self-eval-in-13-countries.pdf) [23 November 2007].
- xviii. FFIEC IT EXAMINATION HANDBOOK INFOBASE. Development and acquisition. (undated)
- xix. Gichuhi, M.S. (2012). Constraints facing Quality Assurance and Standards Officers in supporting curriculum implementation in public secondary schools in Nyandarua district.  
xx. URL: <http://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/handle/123456789/5455>
- xxi. Glickman, C.D. (1981). Developmental supervision. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- xxii. Glickman, C. D. (1981). Developmental supervision: Alternative practices for helping teachers improve instruction. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- xxiii. Glickman, C., Gordon, S. and Ross-Gordon, J. (2003). Supervision and Instructional leadership: Developmental Approach. Boston MA: Allyn & Bacon, P. 6.
- xxv. Johnson, B. & Christensen, L. (2008) Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches. Los Angeles, CA et al: Sage Publications.
- xxvi. King'oina J. G. (2014). Enhancing quality education through devolution of quality assurance functions to schools in Kenya: Expectations and challenges. Maasai Mara University, Kenya.
- xxvii. Kolawole, A. O. (2012). Comparative study of instructional supervision roles of secondary school principals and inspectors of the Ministry of Education in Lagos State, Nigeria. European Journal, December edition, Vol. 8, No. 28- ISSN:1857-7881.
- xxviii. Ministry of Education: Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards, (2010), Quality Index: Guidance for quality assurance and standards of schools in Kenya. Department of International Aid (DFID) & The Kenya National Audit Office.
- xxix. Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MOEST) (2000). A handbook for inspection of educational institutions.
- xxx. Ministry of Education (MOE) (2008). Safety Standards Manual for schools in Kenya. Church World Service. Nairobi, Kenya.
- xxxi. Ministry of Education (2012). Task force report on the Realignment of the Education Sector to the Constitution of Kenya 2010. Government press
- xxxii. Momoh, U., & Osagiobare, E. O. (2015) Implementation of quality assurance standards and principals' administrative effectiveness in public secondary schools in Edo and Delta States. World Journal of Education, 5(3):107-114
- xxxiii. Mosigisi, T. E. (2012). Role of quality assurance and standards officers in performance of Kenya certificate of secondary education in Kasarani District Nairobi county URL: <http://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/handle/123456789/5440>
- xxxiv. Ndiga, B., Mumukha, C., Fedha, F., Ngugi, M., and Mwalwa, S. (2014). Principals Transformational Leadership Skills in Public secondary schools: A case study of Teachers' and Students' Perceptions and Academic Achievement in Nairobi County, Kenya. American Journal of Education Research. 2.9(2014):801-810
- xxxv. Ndiso, E. M. (2013). Influence of quality assurance and standards officers instructional supervision practices on curriculum implementation in public primary schools in Central Division, Machakos district, Kenya. Nairobi University.
- xxxvi. OECD. (2009), Teacher Evaluation: A Conceptual Framework and Examples of Countries Practices. Mexico

- xxxvii. OFSTED. (2007). Raising Standards, Improving Lives: the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills Strategic Plan 2007–2010 [online]. Available: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Publications>
- xxxviii. OFSTED. (2007). Review of the impact of inspection. Ref. No. 070042. Retrived from <http://www.ofsted.government.uk/resources>, impact report.2007.
- xxxix. Ogunu, M. (2001). Problems of school inspectors in Nigeria. In current issues in educational management in Nigeria. Nigeria. 270-281
- xl. Perry, C. (2012). School inspection; Research and information service research paper. NIAR 575-12. Northern Ireland Assembly.
- xli. Raath, E. L. S. (2012). Principal experiences and expectation of the role of the Institutional Development Support Officer in Gauteng Province South Africa
- xlii. Raouf, A. (2008). Continous improvement of higher education quality. <http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/default.asp>. And <http://www.abet.org/thebasics.shtml>.
- xliii. Republic of Kenya. Ministry of Education Science and Technology. (2000). A handbook for inspection of educational institutions. Nairobi: Government Press.
- xliv. Republic of Kenya/UNESCO. (2012) . Education for All (EFA). End of Decade Assessment (2001-2010) . Ministry of Education and INICEF, Nairobi, Kenya.
- xlv. Republic of Kenya . (2005). Kenya Education Support Programme 2005-2010. Delivering Quality Education and Training to all Kenyans. Ministry of Education. Nairobi, Kenya.
- xlvi. Republic of Kenya .The Basic Education Act (2013). Nairobi :Government Press.
- xlvii. Rudd, P. (2009). Evaluation of the Impact of the Section 5 Inspection – Strand 3: Final Report for Ofsted. NFER: Slough.
- xlviii. Shaheen, Z. (2013). Role and effectiveness of academic monitoring in development of schools :Journal of academic Research International. 4(5), 57-579.
- xlix. Shaheen, Z. (2013). Role and effectiveness of academic monitoring in development of schools: European Journal of Education and learning. 1(5), 6-65.
- I. Tashakkori, A, & Teddie, C., (2010). Sage Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research. Thousand Oaks, C.A, Sage Publications.
- li. Teachers Service Commission. (2012). Nairobi County teachers statistical database. Teachers Service Commission EMIS, Nairobi, Kenya
- lii. The United Republic of Tanzania, (2008). When school inspection dosen't deliver. Highlights from CAG audit of the secondary schools program in Tanzania.
- liii. UNESCO (2010). Quality assurance and recognition. United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Available from-<http://www.unesco/en/higher-education/quality-assurance-recognition>.
- liv. Vlasceanu, L., Grunberg, L. & Parlea, D. (2007). Quality assurance and accreditation: A glossary of basic terms and definitions. UNESCO CEPES, Bucharest.
- Iv. Watsulu B. J. & Simatwa E. M. W. (2011). Quality of Education in secondary schools: Challenges and oportunities for quality assurance and standards in Kenya: A case study of Kakamega Central District. International Educational Research Journal (ISSN:2141-5161) Vol. 2(7) pp. 1281-1298.
- Ivi. Whitby, K. (2010). Literature review; School Inspection: recent experiences in high performing education systems. CfBT Education Trust. Berkshire, U.K
- Ivii. Zia B, & Qureshi R.H. (2006). Quality Assurance manual for higher education in Pakistan. HEC, Islamabad Pakistan. website:[[http://qa.nust.edu.pk/downloads/Quality\\_Assurance\\_Manual.pdf](http://qa.nust.edu.pk/downloads/Quality_Assurance_Manual.pdf)] Retrieved on: 12-09-2011.