

# Academic Capacity Building for Teachers as a Determinant of Student's Performance in Public Secondary in Kenya

Beth K. Mutunga

Correspondent author:

Master of Education candidate,  
South Eastern Kenya University

Dr. Gideon Kasivu (Ed.D.)

Senior Lecturer, Department of  
Educational Administration and  
Planning, South Eastern Kenya  
University

Dr. Selper Cheloti (PhD)

Senior Lecturer, Department of  
Educational Administration and  
Planning, South Eastern Kenya  
University

**Abstract:-** Education is an important ingredient in the progress and changes of countries the world over. The purpose of the study was to determine the influence of capacity building for teachers on students' academic performance in public secondary schools in Kenya. The article is an extract from a study done in public secondary schools in the Yatta sub-county, Machakos County, Kenya. The study was guided by the instructional leadership model. This study adopted a descriptive research design, survey method. The study was conducted among 247 respondents comprising 19 principals and 228 teachers. The study employed stratified sampling techniques and simple random sampling techniques. Data collection was done using questionnaires for principals and for teachers. Data were analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings revealed a strong positive correlation between the principal's involvement in capacity building for teachers and students' academic performance from the principal's perspective. However, the results of the teacher's questionnaires indicated a weak positive correlation between the principal's involvement in capacity building for teachers and students' academic performance. The study concludes that principals' capacity building for teachers positively influences the student's academic performance. However, capacity building in most schools has not been implemented appropriately. It was; thus, suggested that all principals working in public secondary schools enhance capacity building for teachers to ensure that they are always motivated which will in turn help to improve the student's academic performance. Capacity building should be done in consultation with the teachers for it to be effective. It should be a policy from the ministry of education that capacity building for teachers is improved in all public schools.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Education is an important ingredient in the progress and changes of countries the world over (Galigao & Liena, 2019). Besides providing skills and knowledge, education inculcates accrued values and fosters the right habits and attitudes. Globally, the importance of education is prioritised; hence, the establishment of sustainable development goal number four (SDG 4), which emphasizes the provision of equitable

and inclusive quality education that promotes lifelong learning opportunities for all (United Nations General assembly, 2015). The goals seek to ensure that both girls and boys access quality education despite their backgrounds leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes in terms of academic performance (Boeren, 2019). Many factors influence students' academic performance in schools. This study investigated the influence of principals' administrative practices namely; capacity building, use of learning resources, instructional supervision, and goal setting practices on students' academic performance in Yatta Subcounty, Machakos County, Kenya.

Principals' involvement in planning for capacity building for teachers entails arrangements of how teachers can enhance trust, skills and knowledge, and attitudes to help their institution succeed. It entails organizing how teachers acquire in-depth content knowledge; professional ethics, innovative pedagogical skills, and experience as they network with colleagues and professional experts on practices, theories, techniques, and challenges they face in the implementation of the curriculum (Joshua, 2020). There is thus a need for principals to ensure that there is effective teaching to enhance the student's performance. Studies by Jepketer *et al* (2015; Suleiman, et al., (2015) and. Kilonzo, Mulwa, and Kasivu (2020) indicate a positive relationship between principals' involvement in teachers' development and the academic performance of students. This emphasizes the importance of principals' involvement in planning for capacity building for teachers. Studies have been conducted across the world on the influence of capacity building on students' Academic performance. In Turkey, Celik and Anderson (2021) studied the effect of teachers' capacity building on students' performance in institutions of higher learning in Turkey and established that there is a positive effect between teachers' capacity building and students' performance.

In Kenya, various studies have been done. Jepketer, Kombo, and Kyalo (2015) studied the influence of capacity-building strategies for teachers on students' performance in public secondary schools in Nandi county. The findings revealed that the contribution of teacher's capacity development positively influences student's performance to a great extent. Jepketer et al., (2015) used descriptive statistics

only to analyse the collected data, hence did not conduct a statistical correlation between capacity building for teachers and students' academic performance, which is the focus of the current study. Jepaketer et al., (2015) focused on the relationship between capacity-building strategies for teachers and students' academic performance. The current study seeks to examine the Principals' involvement in capacity-building for teachers and its impact on students' academic performance.

Kilonzo, Mulwa, and Kasivu (2020) studied the relationship between principals' involvement in developing teachers and the academic performance of students in public secondary schools in Machakos county in Kenya. The study involved 331 principals and 3,006 students. The results revealed a positive relationship between principals' involvement in teachers' development and the academic performance of students.

## II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The mandate of the school principal as per the basic Education Act 2013 is to be the accounting officer and lead educator. The principal is responsible for the operational management of the schools. The principals are also responsible for the establishment and implementation of education plans, programs, policies, and curriculum activities of the school (GoK, 2013). Therefore, once students are admitted, the principal must plan for all activities that will ensure quality teaching. The ultimate goal is to ensure that learners achieve quality education, perform well in KCSE and attain all attributes that help them cope with life after school. The government has established various policies to ensure that every citizen has access to education and performs in their academics. For Instance, the government, through the Teacher's service commission (TSC) introduced performance contracting which is meant to improve the quality of teaching and learning in public schools by building a performance-oriented culture and ensuring there is accountability in public schools (Jonyo & Jonyo, 2017). The TSC has also established a Teacher Professional Development (TPD) program. The TPD is meant to continuously improve and develop teachers' competencies, skills, and knowledge to facilitate the provision of quality education against the ever-changing learners' needs. All of these are meant to enhance students' performance.

However, data from the Yatta sub-county education (2021) shows that students' Academic performance in Yatta Sub-County was below national mean score in most public secondary schools. Most schools have had a declining trend in their KCSE results over the years while others had registered very low mean grades. The analysis of the academic performance of 58 schools in the Yatta Sub-County between 2016 and 2020 showed that most of the schools had registered a very low mean score for the six years as compared to the national mean score, an indication that public schools in this sub-county have been performing dismally.

This is even after the government has made efforts to provide resources to the schools offering subsidized public secondary schools tuition fees, expansion of infrastructure,

and employment of quality teachers to curb teacher shortage. There was; therefore, the need to carry out this study to provide solutions to the administrative practices affecting students' academic performance in public secondary schools in the Yatta sub-county, Machakos County, Kenya

### ➤ *Study Objectives*

To determine the influence of capacity building for teachers on students' academic performance in public secondary schools in Yatta sub-county, Machakos County, Kenya.

### ➤ *Study Theory*

The study was guided by the instructional leadership model. The proponent of the instructional leadership models is Carrier Back in 2014. The model demonstrates an empirical illustration that deliberates on the way the leader and staff crossing points lead to institutional outcomes. In his model, carrier (2014) makes a disparity between the role of the school principals as instructional leaders and the role of teachers. Carriers' (2014) model holds that the principal is supposed to focus on the value of learning for all students by developing a school community with a common vision by encouraging significant expectations for learning and teaching practices. The principals need to concentrate their efforts on attaining the desired goals in learning and teaching practices as well as be in a position to issue clear instructions so that the school can have the best outcomes. Therefore, the teachers need to be able to match the principal's functions in the classrooms for great outcomes to be achieved. Carrier (2014) emphasizes the principals' personal characteristics. As an instructional leader, he or she should be enthusiastic to play his or her role, be modest, and always ready to assume an important role whose purpose is to enhance leaders' achievement. Besides, the principals need to show strong expert resolve to solve to achieve the role of an instructional leader. The ultimate performance of the students is, however, modelled by the teacher's output.

School principals are perceived to be at the centre of curriculum implementation by choosing the appropriate instructional methods that promote effective learning. As such, the model requires that the principles should reflect all learning aspects of the students. He or she must focus on learning, communicate high expectations for student achievement and instruction; utilise data to inform the school's work, and establish a unified community around one vision and mission more so concerning students' academic performance. Thus, the model summarises the principals' role in ensuring there is clear knowledge of instructional best parties such as responsive instructional leadership pedagogy via communicating high expectations for student's performance so that the learner could realise their full potential in their learning outcomes (Carrier, 2014).

The instructional leadership model has some strengths. First, it has been created based on different literature studies about instructional leadership and observation of its application in schools. Second, the model implemented study findings on leadership sharing and the ability of teachers to create schools that highlight the academic field and focus on

students' academic performance. In addition, it provides a linear relationship between the variables which is easy to interpret. However, the model's weakness is the lack of empirical tests, and there are no questionnaire tools created for the model (Alig-Mielcarek, 2014).

Carrier's (2014) instructional leadership model will be relevant to the current study. This is because it helps to conceptualize the principal's administrative practices in terms of four distinct but overlying areas; namely, principals' involvement in capacity building for teachers; use of learning resources; principals' instructional supervision; and influence of principals' goal setting.

### III. LITERATURE REVIEW

#### ➤ *Capacity-building for teacher's and student's academic performance*

Empirical studies have been carried out globally and the need for effective teaching to enhance students' academic performance is emphasized. Thus, empirical evidence indicates that nations in the developed world are more concerned with students' performance (Darling-Hammond, 2012). A study conducted in Kazakhstan (a Country in central Asia) by Yakavets, Frost, and Khoroshash (2017) examined the principals' capacity-building approaches. A mixed-method research design was applied and data was collected from 20 schools. The results revealed that capacity-building strategies are crucial in schools to enhance students' performance, but innovations are required to implement the strategies across all schools. This study will differ from the current in that while it used a mixed-method design, the current one will use a descriptive research design. Furthermore, the study was conducted in Kazakhstan while the current one will be done in Kenya.

Çelik and Anderson (2021) studied the effect of teachers' capacity building on students' performance in institutions of higher learning in Turkey. The research methodology adopted was desktop reviews, hence, inferences and findings were based on findings from previous research. The results established that there is a positive effect between teachers' capacity building and students' performance. This study differs from the current study in various ways. First, it was conducted in Turkey using secondary sources of data. Second, the study focused on how capacity building for teachers affects students' performance in higher institutions of learning. This study will establish how the capacity building of teachers influences learner performance in the yatta sub-county of Kenya.

Adebayo and Sagaya (2016) studied the influence of teacher's capacity building on students' academic performance in junior secondary schools in Kwara state in Nigeria. Using a descriptive survey design the authors sought to establish the relationship between the two variables. The findings established that there exists a significant positive relationship between teachers' capacity building and the academic performance of students. A significant relationship was established between teachers, teaching methodology, classroom management, personality, and the academic

performance of students. This study differs from the current study in that, it was carried out in Nigeria while the current study was carried out in Kenya.

Khanyi and Naidoo (2020) studied the role of principals in the capacity building of post-primary school level teachers in South Africa. The researchers used a qualitative research design and purposively selected a sample of 10 participants from two schools. The results indicated that principals' capacity building is very important in advocating and promoting teachers' leadership capacity development which is necessary for performance in their job. While the study addressed the role played by principals in capacity building for teachers, the focus was not on its direct influence on students' academic performance. Besides, it was conducted in South Africa while the current study will focus on the relationship between principals planning for capacity building and students' academic performance. South Africa had embraced capacity building for teachers and had enhanced academic performance. (Jaarsveldt, 2019), which is an indication of the importance of capacity building in schools.

Uwakwe (2017) examined the capacity-building need of principals for the effective management of teachers in the south-eastern states of Nigeria. The study established that there is a need for capacity building by school principals as it enhances effective student management, which further improves their performance. This study was conducted in Nigeria but the current study will be done in Kenya. Besides, the main focus of the study was on the influence of principals' capacity building on the effective management of students and staff. The current study focused on the influence of capacity building by principals on teachers on students' academic performance in Kenya.

Ndupuechi (2021), studied the relationship between the principal's capacity-building skills and teachers' job performance in senior secondary schools in Nigeria's plateau state. The study aimed to establish the nature of capacity-building skills by principals concerning job performance by teachers. The researcher adopted a correlational research design and the study was done among 174 principals and 487 teachers. The findings revealed that principals who capacity build their teachers, enhanced teachers' performance, which in turn led to improved student's performance. This could be interpreted to mean that the capacity building of teachers enhances their teaching skills. This study will differ from the proposed study in that it was done in Nigeria and the focus was on principal's capacity-building skills and its influence on teachers' performance at their job while the current study focused on the direct relationship between principals' capacity-building for teachers on student's academic performance in Kenya.

Jepketer, Kombo, and Kyalo (2015) studied the influence of capacity-building strategies for teachers on students' performance in public secondary schools in Nandi county. Stratified and simple random sampling techniques were used to establish a representative sample size that comprised 30 principals, 85 teachers, and 136 students from

30 public secondary schools. The findings show that the contribution of teacher's capacity development positively influences student's performance to a greater extent. Jepaketer et al (2015) used descriptive statistics only to analyse the collected data. Thus, their findings may not be used to conclude that there is a statistical correlation between capacity building for teachers and students' academic performance. Besides, the study focused on the relationship between capacity-building strategies for teachers and students' academic performance. The current study seeks to examine the Principal's involvement in the capacity-building of teachers and its impact on students' academic performance.

Kilonzo, Mulwa, and Kasivu (2020) studied the relationship between principals' involvement in developing teachers and the academic performance of students in public secondary schools in Machakos county in Kenya. The researchers adopted a descriptive survey research design and the study was carried out among 600 participants drawn from 100 schools. The findings of the study indicated that there is a positive statistical relationship between principals' involvement in the capacity building of teachers and the academic performance of students.

#### IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a descriptive research design, survey method. This described the variables of the study and the relationships that occur naturally between and among them

(Sousa et al.,2007). The research design was appropriate since the study sought to investigate the relationship between principals' involvement in capacity building for teachers and students' academic performance. The target population of the study was 838 people comprising 58 principals and 750 teachers from 58 public secondary schools in the yatta sub-county. Stratified sampling technique and Simple random sampling were used to sample 19 principals plus 228 teachers making 247 respondents. The data for this study was collected using questionnaires for principals and teachers. Data was analyzed using SPSS version 23 and presented in Tables, Figures, and narratives.

#### V. FINDINGS

##### ❖ Descriptive Statistics

##### ➤ Capacity-building for teachers and students' academic performance.

The first objective of the study was to determine the influence of capacity building for teachers on students' academic performance in public secondary schools in the Yatta sub-county, Machakos County, Kenya. Therefore, the researcher sought to assess the principal's involvement in the capacity for teachers' and students' academic performance. This was assessed from the perspective of principals and teachers. The descriptive statistics are presented in Table 4.1 and Table 4.1 respectively.

Table 4.1: Results of Principals' involvement in capacity building and student's academic performance as reported by principals

Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean	Standard Deviation
As the school principal, I am involved in building teacher's skills and knowledge	84.2	15.8	0	0	3.84	0.38
As the school principal, I collaborate with the stakeholders to organize teacher workshops, seminars, and conferences	63.2	36.8	0	0	3.63	0.50
As the school principal, I play my role of mentoring and coaching the teachers to enhance their performance	89.5	10.5	0	0	3.89	0.32
As the school principal, I support the professional development of teaching staff by providing the required resources	84.2	15.8	0	0	3.84	0.38
As the school principal, I am involved in capacity-building programs with teachers to help improve my relationship with them.	78.9	15.8	5.3	0	3.74	0.56
<b>Aggregate</b>					3.79	0.43

The findings in Table 4.8, the aggregate mean of the principal's responses is 3.79 and the aggregate standard deviation is 0.43. The high mean of 3.79 shows that most of the participants strongly agreed with the statement since it is skewed towards 4 on the Likert scale. On the other hand, a low variation of 0.43 implies that there was a low variation in responses. Specifically, 84.2% of the principals strongly agreed and the rest 15.8% agreed that as the school principal, they are involved in building teachers' skills and knowledge. The majority of participants at 63.2% strongly agreed and 36.8% agreed that as the school principal, they collaborate with the stakeholders to organize teacher workshops, seminars, and conferences.



The majority of the principals, that is, 89.5% strongly agreed while the rest 10.5% agreed that as the school principal, they play the role of mentoring and coaching the teachers to enhance their performance. Further the majority of the participants, that is, 84.2% strongly agreed while the rest 15.8% agreed that as the school principal, they support the professional development of teaching staff by providing the required resources. Finally, 78.9% strongly agreed and 15.8% agreed that as the school principal, they are involved in capacity-building programs with teachers to help improve my relationship with them. However, 5.3 % of the principals, disagreed that they are involved in capacity-building programs with teachers to help improve their relationship with them.

*Table 4.2: Results of Principals' involvement in capacity building and student's academic performance as reported by teachers*

Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean	Standard Deviation
Our school principal is involved in building our skills and knowledge	17.8	34.2	42.8	5.3	2.64	0.83
Our school principal collaborates with the stakeholders to organize teacher workshops, seminars, and conferences	11.2	38.8	44.1	5.9	2.55	0.77
Our school principal plays his/her role of mentoring and coaching the teachers to enhance their performance	3.9	37.5	56.6	2.0	2.43	0.61
Our school principal support the professional development of teaching staff by providing the required resources	3.9	38.8	55.9	1.3	2.45	0.60
Our school principal is involved in capacity-building programs with teachers to help improve our relationship.	4.6	38.8	53.9	2.6	2.45	0.63
<b>Aggregate</b>					<b>2.50</b>	<b>0.69</b>

*Source: (Survey data, 2022)*

As shown in Table 4.9, the aggregate means for the teacher's responses was 2.50 while the aggregate standard deviation was 0.69. An aggregate mean of 2.50 shows that the majority of the respondents disagreed with the statements since its skewed towards disagree on the Likert scale. On the other hand, a high aggregate standard deviation of 0.75 shows that there were high variations in responses.

Specifically, 42.8% disagreed and 5.3% strongly disagreed that their school principals are involved in building their skills and knowledge. However, 34.2% agreed and 17.8% strongly disagreed that their school principals are involved in building their skills and knowledge. Further, the majority (44.1%) of the teachers disagreed and 5.9% strongly disagreed that their school principal collaborates with the stakeholders to organize teacher workshops, seminars, and conferences. However, 38.8% agreed and 11.2% strongly agreed that their school principal collaborates with the stakeholders to organize teacher workshops, seminars, and conferences.

The majority of the respondents disagreed that their school principal plays the role of mentoring and coaching the teachers to enhance their performance as indicated by 56.6% who disagreed and 2% who strongly disagreed. However, 37.5% agreed and 3.9% strongly agreed that their school principal plays the role of mentoring and coaching the teachers to enhance their performance.

Most of the participants disagreed that their school principal supported the professional development of teaching staff by providing the required resources as demonstrated by 55.9% who disagreed and 1.3% who agreed. However, 38.8 % agreed and 3.9 % strongly agreed that their school principal support the professional development of teaching staff by providing the required resources. Finally, most participants disagreed that their school principals are involved in capacity-building programs with teachers to help improve our relationships as demonstrated by 53.9% who disagreed and 2.6% who strongly disagreed. However, 38.8% agreed and 4.6% strongly agreed that their school principals are involved in capacity-building programs with teachers to help improve our relationship.

➤ *To what extent do you think principals' involvement in capacity building for teachers influences students' academic performance?*

The study further sought to establish from the principals and teachers the extent to which the principal's involvement in capacity building for teachers influences students' academic performance. The results are presented in Table 4.13 and Table 4.14.

*Table 4.3: To what extent do you think principals' involvement in capacity building for teachers influences students' academic performance?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very great extent	13	68.4	68.4	68.4
	Great extents	6	31.6	31.6	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

As shown in Table 4.13, the principals were of the opinion that their involvement in capacity building for teachers influences the student's academic performance as demonstrated by the majority of (13) 68.42% who indicated the influence is to a very great extent, and the rest (6) 31.58% who indicated that the influence is to great extent. This shows that the principals were confident that their involvement in building capacity amongst teachers has helped ensure that the teachers are productive. However, this was not reflected by the majority of the teachers as shown in Table 4.14.

*Table 4. 4: To what extent do you think principals' involvement in capacity building for teachers influences students' academic performance?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Great extent	26	13.7	13.7	13.7
	Moderate extent	33	17.4	17.4	31.1
	Little Extent	76	40.0	40.0	71.1
	No extent	55	28.9	28.9	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

The findings in Table 4.14 shows that the majority of the teachers at 40% (76) indicated the influence of principals' involvement in capacity building for teachers on student performance is to a little extent while 28.9% (55) indicated no extent. However, some teachers were of contrary opinion as shown by 17.7% (33) who indicated the influence was to a moderate extent and 13.7% (26) who felt that the influence was to a great extent. The results show that most of the teachers had different opinions from the principals concerning their involvement in capacity building for teachers and the way it influences students' academic performance.

*Table 4. 5: Correlation analysis Matrix from the principal's perspective*

		Academic Performance	Capacity Building	Provision of Learning Resources	Instructional Supervision	Goal setting
<b>Academic performance</b>	Pearson Correlation	1	.687**	.225	.236	.271
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001	.354	.330	.263
	N	19	19	19	19	19
<b>Capacity Building</b>	Pearson Correlation	.687**	1	.123	.434	.498*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001		.617	.063	.030
	N	19	19	19	19	19
<b>Provision of learning resources</b>	Pearson Correlation	.225	.123	1	.350	.166
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.354	.617		.141	.498
	N	19	19	19	19	19
<b>Instructional Supervision</b>	Pearson Correlation	.236	.434	.350	1	.759**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.330	.063	.141		.000
	N	19	19	19	19	19
<b>Goal setting</b>	Pearson Correlation	.271	.498*	.166	.759**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.263	.030	.498	.000	
	N	19	19	19	19	19

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

As depicted in the correlation matrix, the principal's involvement in capacity building for teachers has a strong positive correlation with students' academic performance ( $r = 0.687$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ). Besides, the correlation is statistically significant since the P value (0.001) was less than 0.05 (significant level). The results show a weak positive correlation between the principal's provision of learning resources and students' academic performance ( $r = 0.225$ ,  $p = 0.354$ ). The correlation is statistically insignificant since the p-value (0.354) is more than the significant level of 0.05.

The findings further show a weak positive correlation between the principal's instructional supervision and students' academic performance ( $r = 0.236$ ,  $p = 0.330$ ). The correlation is statistically insignificant since the P value (0.330) is more than the level of significance (0.05). Finally, the findings show that there is a weak positive correlation between the principal's goal setting and students' academic performance ( $r = 0.271$ ,  $p = 0.263$ ). The correlation is statistically insignificant since the p-value (0.263) is more than the level of significance (0.05).

Table 4. 6: Correlation analysis Matrix from the Teacher's perspective

		Academic performance	Capacity Building	Provision of learning resources	Instructional Supervision	Goal setting
Academic performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.012	-.154*	-.190**	-.311**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.874	.034	.009	.000
	N	190	190	190	190	190
Capacity Building	Pearson Correlation	.012	1	.405**	.524**	.317**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.874		.000	.000	.000
	N	190	190	190	190	190
Provision of learning resources	Pearson Correlation	-.154*	.405**	1	.639**	.479**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.034	.000		.000	.000
	N	190	190	190	190	190
Instructional Supervision	Pearson Correlation	-.190**	.524**	.639**	1	.634**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.000	.000		.000
	N	190	190	190	190	190
Goal setting	Pearson Correlation	-.311**	.317**	.479**	.634**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	190	190	190	190	190
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).						
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).						

The results presented in Table 4.34 shows that there is a weak correlation between the principal's involvement in capacity building for teachers and students' academic performance ( $r = 0.012$ ,  $p = 0.874$ ). The correlation is statistically insignificant since the p-value of 0.874 is greater than the significant level of 0.05. The results show that there is a weak negative correlation between principals' provision of learning resources and students' academic performance ( $r = -0.154$ ,  $p = 0.034$ ). The correlation is statistically significant since the p-value (0.0034) is less than the significant level (0.05).

The findings further show that there is a weak negative correlation between the principal's instructional supervision and students' academic performance ( $r = -0.190$ ,  $p = 0.009$ ). The correlation is statistically significant since the p-value (0.009) is less than the significant level (0.05). Finally, the results show that there is a moderate negative correlation between the principal's goal

setting and students' academic performance ( $r = -0.331$   $p = 0.000$ ). The correlation is statistically significant since the p-value (0.000) is less than the significant level (0.05)

**Table 1: Correlation analysis Matrix from the principal's perspective**

		Academic Performance	Capacity Building
Academic performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.687**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001
	N	19	19
Capacity Building	Pearson Correlation	.687**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	
	N	19	19

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: (Survey data, 2022)

As depicted in the correlation matrix in Table 3, the principal's involvement in capacity building for teachers has a strong positive correlation with students' academic performance ( $r = 0.687$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ). Besides, the correlation is statistically significant since the P value (0.001) was less than 0.05 (significant level).

**Table 2: Correlation analysis Matrix from the Teacher's perspective**

		Student's Academic performance	Capacity Building	Acquisition of Learning Materials	Instructional Supervision	Goal Setting
Student's Academic performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.006	-.071	-.135	-.196*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.940	.383	.098	.016
	N	152	152	152	152	152
Capacity Building	Pearson Correlation	.006	1	.442**	.556**	.407**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.940		.000	.000	.000
	N	152	152	152	152	152

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: (Survey data, 2022)

The results presented in Table 4 show that there is a weak correlation between the principal's involvement in capacity building for teachers and students' academic performance ( $r = 0.006$ ;  $p = 0.940$ ). The correlation is statistically insignificant since the p-value of 0.940 is greater than the significant level of 0.05. The results from the principal's perspective and the teacher's perspective differed significantly. From the principal's point of view, the results revealed a strong correlation between involvement in capacity building for teachers and students' academic performance. This support previous studies by Çelik and Anderson (2021), Adebayo and Sagaya (2016), Kilonzo, Mulwa, and Kasivu (2020), Jepketer, as well as Kombo, and Kyalo (2015) that found that there is a positive and significant correlation between teachers' capacity building and student's academic performance. However, from the teachers' point of view, the relationship was found to be weak. This implies that the capacity building for teachers was not effective in many schools, which the principals indicated that capacity building was implemented, most teachers had a contrary opinion.

The findings revealed that there is a strong positive correlation between the principal's involvement in capacity building for teachers and students' academic performance from the principal's perspective. However, the results of the teacher's questionnaires indicated a weak positive correlation between the principal's involvement in capacity building for teachers and students' academic performance. The study concludes that principals' capacity building for teachers positively influences the student's academic performance. However, capacity building in most schools in had not been implemented appropriately. It was; thus, suggested that all principals working in public secondary schools enhance capacity building for teachers to ensure that they are always motivated which will in turn help to improve the student's academic performance. Capacity building should be done in consultation with the teachers for it to be effective. It should be a policy from the ministry of education that capacity building for teachers is improved in all public schools.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Adebayo, F.A. and Sagaya, A. (2016). Teachers' Capacity Building and Students' Academic Performance among Public Junior Secondary Schools in

## VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS



- Kwara State. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science*, 12(3), 1-10.
- [2]. Alig-Mielcarek, J. (2014). *A model of school success: Instructional leadership, academic press, and student achievement*. Columbus, OH: Diss. The Ohio State University.
- [3]. Boeren, E. (2019). Understanding Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4 on “quality education” from micro, meso, and macro perspectives. *International Review of Education*, 1-18, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-019-09772-7>.
- [4]. Carrier, L. (2014). *Putting the leadership back in instructional leadership: What does an effective model of instructional leadership look like in practice when we place a value on both the work and leadership of principals?* Plymouth: Plymouth University.
- [5]. Çelik, Q. T., and Anderson, S. (2021). Effect of Capacity Building of Teachers on Performance of the Students in Higher Institutions of Learning in Turkey. *Journal of Education*, 4(6), 43-52. <https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5014>.
- [6]. Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). *Creating a Comprehensive System for Evaluating and Supporting Effective Teaching*. Stanford, CA. Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education(online). Stanford, CA. Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.
- [7]. Etor, C. (2018). *Introduction to Educational Planning*. Nigeria: University of Calabar.
- [8]. Galigao, R., and Llena, M. (2019). Principals’ Preferred Approach in Educational Planning: A Systematic Search and Review. *International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology*, 8(7), 60-66.
- [9]. GoK. (2013). *The Basic Education Act, 2013*. Nairobi, Kenya: Government printer.
- [10]. Jaarsveldt, L. (2019). Human capacity building through Public Administration education at Unisa. *Journal of Public Administration*, 44(1), 257-267.
- [11]. Jepketer, A., Kombo, K. and Kyalo, D. (2015). Relationship between Teacher Capacity Building Strategy and Students’ Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Nandi County, Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 37-50.
- [12]. Jonyo, D.O. & Jonyo, B. (2017). Teacher Management: Emerging Issues in Kenya. *European Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(1), 18-41.
- [13]. Joshua, A. (2020). Teachers’ Capacity Building And Productivity in Secondary Schools in Ondo North Senatorial District of Ondo State, Nigeria. *Innovative Studies: International Journal (ISIJ)*, 3(1), 1-9.
- [14]. Khanyi, J.G., and Naidoo, P. (2020). Principals’ role in leadership capacity development of post-level one teachers. *Perspectives in Education*, 38(2), DOI: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v38.i2.11.
- [15]. Kilonzo, J.M., Mulwa, D.M., and Kasivu, G. (2020). Principals’ Transformational Leadership Practices Influencing Students’ Academic Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Machakos County, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 11(23), 44-50.
- [16]. Ndupuechi, T. (2021). Principals’ Capacity Building Skills and Teachers’ Job Performance in Senior. *KIU Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(2), 157-160.
- [17]. Ololube, N. P. (2013). *Educational Management, Planning, and Supervision: Model for Effective Implementation*. Owerri: Springfield Publishers.
- [18]. Patrinos, H., Osorio F.B and Guáqueta, J. (2009). *The Role and Impact of Public-private Partnerships in Education*. Washington, D.C: World Bank Publications.
- [19]. Singh, S.P., Malik, S. and Singh, P. (2016). Research Paper Factors Affecting Academic Performance of Students. *Paripex - Indian Journal Of Research*, 5(4), 176-178.
- [20]. Sousa, V.D., Driessnack, M., and Mendes, I. (2007). An overview of research designs relevant to nursing: Part 1: Quantitative research designs. *Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem*, 15(3), 1-10, <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-11692007000300022>.
- [21]. Suleiman, Y. Hanafi, Z.B., Thanslikan, M., and Abdulrasheed, O. (2015). Impact of Teachers’ Capacity Building on Students’ Academic Performance in Secondary Schools: A Partial Least Square (PLS-SEM) Approach. *6th International Conference on Education, Humanities and Social, Sciences Studies (EHSSS-17)* (pp. 10-16). Malaysia: Eminent Association of Pioneers (EAP).
- [22]. Uwakwe, I. (2017). Capacity building needs of school principals for the effective student personnel services in secondary schools in the southeast, Nigeria. *International Journal of Development Research*, 9(11), 6508-16524.
- [23]. Yakavets, N., Frost, D., and Khoroshash, A. (2017). School leadership and capacity building in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 20(3), 345-370.