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ABSTRACT

Principals of Secondary schools fully manage all learning processes and their accompanying logistics in the institutions yet they rarely receive appropriate preparation for their challenging roles and some of them lack basic management skills. This study sought to explore influence of Preparation and Development of Principals on Management of Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District. The study was guided by four objectives: To determine the extent to which pre-service training influence management of public secondary schools; To establish the extent to which induction training influence management of public secondary schools; To evaluate how the understudy training influence management of public secondary schools; To assess the extent to which in-service training influence management of public secondary schools. The research was anchored on Peter’s Principle and the contingency theory of leadership which proposes the adoption of training programs that prepare leaders to function effectively in specific organizational situations. 23 out of 38 Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District were sampled. The study utilized descriptive survey design and employed simple random, stratified, and purposive sampling techniques to seek the views of all the Principals, Deputy Principals and 3 Heads of Departments from each of the selected schools, giving a total sample size of 115 respondents. A self-administered questionnaire was used in the study for data collection. The collected quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics based on frequency distributions and percentage counts while qualitative data was organized into various emerging themes of the study and reported narratively. Microsoft Excel and Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) were used as tools of data analysis. The major finding of the study was that the existing preparation and Developmental system of Principals was basically weak. As a result Principals in the study schools were experiencing problems which cut across all areas of school management. Nevertheless, The study revealed that 21.05% of the present Principals of secondary schools in the district have a degree or Masters, It was also found that Even though there is a pre-service curriculum at University level meant to provide introductory elements in management, it was not sufficient in developing detailed and thorough knowledge and skills required in managing schools. The study further established that Induction programmes were mainly not timely and did not cover all Principals with 62.2% having never received any form of orientation training on appointment. Understudy training was discovered to be largely ineffective and did not sufficiently prepare potential Principals for the responsibilities in management of schools. 67.5% of the respondents noted that relying on understudy method purely to train principals was risky. Finally the study concluded that although an attempt had been made to provide in-service courses, with 60% of the respondents having had an opportunity to attend In-service. The trainings were organized on an adhoc basis, lacked sufficient content and coverage. They also lacked follow-up to monitor and evaluate their impact. The researcher has highlighted the study’s contribution to the body of knowledge and acknowledged key sources of information used in the study. The study has also recommended strategies and mitigation measures that could be deployed to address the expressed concerns on Preparation and Development of Principals for effective Management of Public Secondary Schools. Finally, the study has suggested areas for further research for a deeper understanding of the subject of investigation.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

In most developed countries like America, England, Sweden and Australia, preparation and development of principals is formally institutionalized with colleges offering training for principals before and after appointment to school leadership (Fink, 2005). Preparation and development of principals is also well structured and systematic in the sense that aspiring principals are prepared for school leadership before appointment and then continuously developed after appointment to enhance performance of their duties (Brundrett & de Cuevas, 2007).

In the United Kingdom, former Prime Minister Tony Blair in 1998 announced the setting up of the National College for school leadership (NCSL). Basically, the purpose of the College is to improve the lives and life chances of all children and young people throughout the country by developing world-class school leaders, system leaders and future leaders. The corporate goals of this college are: transform children's achievement and well being through excellent school leadership; develop leadership within and beyond the school; identify and grow tomorrow's leaders and create a fit for purpose National College. Essentially, the NCSL since its establishment has been organizing various courses for potential administrators in the educational sector. (National college for school leadership, 2008). For example, the Associate Head teacher Programme aims at encouraging deputy head teachers to step up into headship in schools in challenging contexts, through a combination of hands-on-experience, national development days and external mentoring support.
In Asia, by March 1991, the government launched a School Management Initiative (SMI) in all Hong Kong schools. The concern was to provide a framework for school-based management and effective schools. This was because it was realized that many Principals were insufficiently experienced and inadequately trained for their task. It was also discovered that because proper management structures and processes are lacking, some Principals are insufficiently accountable for their actions and see their post as an opportunity to become "little emperors with dictatorial powers in the school", (Wong & Ng, 2003).

In the late 1999, the Education Department of Hong Kong further proposed that all Principals and potential Principals must undertake a needs assessment, an attitudinal and paradigm change and attend core modules including learning and teaching; human resources development; financial management; strategic management, and for newly appointed Principals, school administration. After a lot of several objections and modifications, the Education Department restructured the plans. (Wong & Ng, 2003).

Today, in Hong Kong, it is now established that not only newly appointed Principals need training, the serving Principals (after three years of service) are required to attend training courses. Thus, from September 2003 onward, all potential Principals were required to attend training programs in school administration and must obtain a certificate issued by the Education Department before they are appointed as school heads (Wong and Ng, 2003). The implication of this is that Principals are now professionally trained and thus be able to administer their schools efficiently.

In Singapore, between 1965 and 1975, school Principals duties consisted largely of supervising routine tasks that were mainly non-professional and often
clerical in nature. From the mid-seventies, there was greater openness and more public discussion of education policies between schools, the ministry and the public. As the Ministry of Education worked towards school improvement efforts in the eighties, Principals were gradually given more autonomy to decide on internal operations of their schools. They were accountable for ensuring the well being of their students and staff, and improving the annual academic results of their students cohorts (Wee & Chong, 1990).

By the late 1980s, the job demands on Principals had changed drastically. Principals were no longer to function as passive managers but as "Chief Executive Officers" responsible for designing the future of their schools. They were increasingly expected to respond to the growing dynamism and unpredictability of the external school environment and steer their schools forward as innovative leaders. In 1985, the Ministry of Education therefore began to provide for the formal training and preparation of school leaders by requiring potential Principals to attend a leadership-training course, the Diploma in Educational Administration, designed and conducted by the Institute of Education. By that time, the selection of candidates for school leadership became a matter of great importance to the Ministry of Education. This led to a change in the process by which prospective Principals were identified and groomed. (Chew, Stott & Boon, 2003).

Generally, in Singapore, the system of identification and promotion for school headship is complex and influenced by the interplay of several factors besides the educational qualification and job performance of eligible education officers. There are a number of paths that teachers aspiring to become Principals can take to advance their careers beyond the classrooms.
The usual pattern for accession to principal ship is one where education officers begin their careers as classroom teachers. They must demonstrate their effectiveness as teachers first and be identified by their Principals for leadership responsibilities at the school level in committees or as heads of department in their school organization. If they prove themselves to have leadership qualities, this could lead to their appointment as Vice Principals. At this stage of their teaching career, they could expect to be nominated by their Principal to attend a formal training programme designed for prospective Principals and conducted by the National Institute of Education, Singapore. Such a recommendation would have to be endorsed by the Ministry of Education. This ministry applies other selection criteria to determine the suitability of candidates for Principalship (Chew, Stott and Boon, 2003).

From all indications, various countries have been making efforts at giving professional training to teachers who wish to make a career in school headship. Outcomes from the reviewed countries indicate that years of experience and seniority no longer account for all that is needed to appoint people into administrative responsibilities. Unfortunately, experience in many African countries, shows that the mechanisms for recruiting teachers to become principals is unsystematic and have not been based on professional criteria (Mulkeen; Chapman; DeJaeghere & Leu, 2007). The preparation and development of principals is not as pronounced and systematic as it is in the developed world. In fact in most cases it is either lacking or not formal (Bush and Oduro, 2006).

In South Africa, for example Moloi & Bush (2006), argue that apartheid affected both education and social infrastructure. These effects included ineffective leadership and management practices of public schools. New professional
development initiatives for principals and aspiring principals are now covered in the Policy Framework for Leadership Education and Management Development in South Africa. As a result, the Department of Education has developed Advanced Certificate in Education (ACE) in collaboration with 14 universities, unions, and the Professional Association of Principals to train aspirant school principals and develop those in service already. The aim is to create a pool of trained school managers, so that by 2011, this course can be made a requirement for one being short listed for the post of the principal.

In Seychelles, the University of Lincoln (UK) in partnership with Ministry of Education provides training at Master’s level to principals and senior managers while Tanzania’s Agency for the Development of Educational Management (ADEM) offers training for educational managers and administrators as well as serving principals in primary and secondary schools.

Head teacher preparation programs in Kenya and Tanzania are offered by a variety of institutions. In both countries there is a section within the ministry of education and the ministry of education and vocational training, respectively, designated for preparation of educational managers including head teachers of secondary schools. In Tanzania there is the Agency for the Development of Educational Management (ADEM) while Kenya has the Kenya Education Staff Institute (KESI). The two institutions are located in Bagamoyo and Nairobi, respectively Njeri (1996).

In addition to the two institutions cited above, there are other institutions within the private sector in Kenya that provide head teacher preparation programs such as Strathmore University and the Kenya Institute of Management (KIM). As well, the Aga Khan University (AKU), through its Institute for Educational
Development (IED) provides head teacher preparation programs for both Kenyan and Tanzanian schools (Olembo, Wanga & Karagu, 1992). Therefore, there is a need to study preparation of head teachers in East Africa.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In Kenya, the secondary education cycle is recognized as the springboard to tertiary and/or higher education and training. Therefore, it is a significant juncture in the educational development (Achoka, 2007). Any attempts towards enhancing the success of this cycle therefore would be welcome by policy makers as well as those in charge of principal preparation programs.

Research on preparation of school leaders confirms that a high level of preparation for the would be school leaders is necessary for the success of that school regardless of its location. For instance Onguko, B., Abdalla, M., & Webber, C.F. (2012) conducted a study on Headteachers’ preparation and experiences in their first year in Tanzania. In another study, Clarke, S. & Wildy, H. (2010) in their study ‘Preparing for principalship from the crucible of experience’ found that high levels of preparations of principals contribute to effective school performance.

Even though there are a number of studies and researches focusing on Principals and management of schools in Kenya, (Onguko, 2007; Muthini, 2004; Kalai, 2002) none of these studies have directly dealt with how Preparation and development of Principals influence the management of schools. Nyonje (2011) for example looked at the factors influencing access to professional development of secondary school managers of Kenya but did not relate it to management. Unfortunately, much of this research has been conducted in the western world giving rise to theories whose applicability and generability are limited to the western world.

Given the nature of the educational system in Kenya and the unique challenges that confronts most of the Principals and other school leaders in the study area, putting into practice the findings of studies carried out in the western world might be impracticable. Thus there is need to conduct this study in order to bridge a gap in the literature on preparation and development of principals. Further, carrying out this study provides an opportunity for the principals to express their experiences on preparation and development in the study area.

Recent studies and reports show that the systems that prepare educational leaders are in trouble, this is captured in the assertion that headteachers are exposed to many challenges in management as the existing preparation measures and support for headteachers are basically weak and do not sufficiently prepare potential headteachers for responsibilities in financial management Irungu, (2002).

The preparation programs for principals have been merely a collection of courses covering general management principles, school laws, administrative requirements, and procedures, with little emphasis on student learning, effective teaching, professional development, curriculum, and organizational change. (Elmore, 2000) In addition, the principals’ professional development programs have been
criticized as being fragmented, incoherent, not sustained, lacking in rigor, and not aligned with global standards for effective administrative practice (Peterson, 2002). In Kisumu county inefficiency and ineffectiveness of principals have lead to cases of indiscipline among staff and students, cheating and poor academic performance in external examination, mismanagement of school property, poor emotional school climate and others (Mathiu, 2008). In January 2010, shock hit the whole country as eleven secondary school head teachers in Nyanza province, Kenya, were demoted for ineffectiveness (Kamau, 2010). Despite such happenings, research is still unclear about the principals’ experience on the issue of their preparation and development for this region. In addition, no studies have been conducted to highlight the unique contextual challenges that principals and other school leaders face as a result to their training needs in Kenya as a whole and in Kisumu East District in particular. This study therefore, becomes imperative as preparation and development mechanisms for principals forms one of the key ingredients that help schools to run effectively (Gorosave, G.L., Garcia, J.M., & Slater, C.L., 2007).

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to establish the influence of preparation and development of principals on management of Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The study sought to:

1. Determine the extent to which pre-service programs influence management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District.
2. Establish the extent to which induction programs influence management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District.

3. Investigate how the understudy training influence management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District.

4. Assess the extent to which in-service programs influence management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District.

1.5 Research Questions

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent does Pre-service programs influence the management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District?

2. To what extent does induction training influence management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District?

3. Does the understudy training influence management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District?

4. To what extent does in-service training influence management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District?

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study was significant because the findings may be used by educational authorities to review the policy on qualifications necessary for principals of public secondary schools, to review the teacher training curriculum to include administration and management of educational institutions. The educational authorities may also use
the findings to introduce mandatory management training for all individuals due for promotion to deputy principals and principals or to alternatively design a comprehensive standard management training curriculum that must be undertaken by all individuals ascending to the positions of deputy principals and principals.

Such finding will also enable the employer of teachers, that is, the Teachers Service Commission to re-examine their policy on recruitment and appointment of deputy principals and principals with a view to enhancement of the quality of management in public secondary schools and other educational institutions as well as serving as an aid in guiding policy on what stage or level in the mobility ladder, formal management training should be given to aspiring teachers.

The findings of this study may help to provoke policy makers to rethink and reassess their age old trend of relying mainly on understudy training to train principals of public secondary schools. It may be possible to draw from this study, the need for alternative ways through which the multi-professional nature of the job of the principal can be handled. This will allow the principal to concentrate on managing the core functions of his/her teaching profession, which is, the management and supervision of curriculum implementation and relieve him/her from undue pressure, arising from the need to be “a jack of all trades but a master of none.”

1.7 Basic Assumptions of the Study

This study was based on the following assumptions: that all the principals are appointed from among serving deputy principals at the time of their appointment; that all the deputy principals are appointed from qualified Heads of Department and teachers; that all Principals served as Deputy Principals before ascending to the
positions of principal; that both the Principal and the Deputy Principals are recruited and appointed by the same authority; that all the public secondary schools in this study have Principals and Deputy Principals.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

The major limitation of this study was the timing. The institutions in which the respondents are located and work in, vary in size and diversity in terms of their uniqueness, geographical locations and complexity. Thus, reaching out to them and obtaining responses from all the respondents quickly posed a bit of a challenge that necessitated prolonging of the period within which the study was to be completed. The availability of all the financial resources required to facilitate the researcher in conducting the study also got into the way of completing the study according to the planned schedule. Above all, these limitations were taken into account during the undertaking of the study.

1.9 Delimitations of the Study

The study was conducted in all the 38 officially registered public secondary schools in Kisumu East District. The study was delimited to Kisumu East District because it has public secondary schools which are of different nature and categories. The District has a National School, Provincial Schools and District Schools, with some located within the urban setup while others are found in the rural areas of the District. Similarly, the District also has schools with well equipped facilities and those without basic academic facilities. This will give a good representation of all categories of schools.
The study was restricted on the management level of these schools which comprises of Principals, Deputy Principals and Heads of Departments. This was because these are the key personnel in the running of public secondary schools. The Principals were targets for the simple reason that they are the persons that the Education Act Cap 211 has charged them with the responsibility to lead, manage and administer secondary institutions and an enquiry into their preparation and development is being made. The Deputy Principals on the other hand were targeted because they are currently being trained to be principals through the understudy method. The Heads of Departments were also targeted because from them deputy principals are drawn. They too are in management rank and it is the interest of the study to find out whether or not formal management skills are imparted to the would-be principals at this stage.

1.10 Definition of Significant Terms Used in the Study

**Influence:** The power to affect persons or events, in this case the power to determine needs and means of acquiring resources, monitor projects and evaluate budgets.

**Principal:** Refers to the teacher in charge of the administration and management of a school, also known as Head teacher.

**Deputy Principal:** Refers to the teacher assisting and understudying the person in charge of the administration and management of a secondary school.

**Administration:** Refers to the day-to-day management of an institution
Management: Refers to the act of engaging in planning, organizing, staffing, directing, controlling, coordinating, and budgeting in a secondary school.

Manager: The term in the study means any person charged with the responsibility of planning, coordinating and directing people, a department or an organization, in this case a secondary school.

Understudy: Refers to the act of a person who studies another’s role or duties in order to perform the duties and responsibilities of that person in his/her absence or to ascend to the other’s position when the position falls vacant.

1.10 Organization of the Study

The study was organized in five chapters. Chapter one constituted the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, basic assumptions of the study, limitations and delimitations of the study, definition of significant terms used in the study and organization of the study. Chapter two dealt with the literature review on influence of; Pre-service programs, Induction programs, Understudy training and In-service programs on management of Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District. This involved a review of various literary materials and publications of scholars who have carried out some research that in one way or another was relevant to this study and was used to build the case of the researcher. The Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks also formed part of this chapter. Chapter three described the research design, target population, sample size and sample selection, research instruments, data
analysis technique and the ethical considerations. Chapter four dwelled on data analysis and interpretation focusing on questionnaire return rate, data reporting and data analysis. The final chapter, which is chapter five, gave a summary of the study, conclusions of the study, recommendations of the study and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a review of literature related to the study based on the following sub-thematic areas: Influence of Pre-service programs on the management of public secondary schools; Influence of Induction programs on the management of public secondary schools; Influence Understudy training on management of public secondary schools; Influence of In-service programs on the management of public secondary schools: Theoretical framework; Conceptual framework and Summary of literature review.

2.2 The Concept of Preparation and Development of Principals

The field of educational leadership has received significant attention in the past decade due to a growing recognition of the role of effective leadership in improving the schooling experience. Research has established a link between effective leadership and enhanced school performance (Leithwood, Harris & Hopkins 2008), and writers have argued that schools may not be able to achieve a successful turnaround of learner achievement in the absence of ‘talented leadership’ (Leithwood et al. 2008).

The discourse on effective leadership for school improvement brings under the spotlight the significance of leadership preparation and development and whether training programmes equip leaders with the necessary skills they need to address current and emerging school challenges. If school leadership does make a difference
in the outcomes of schooling (Hallinger & Heck 1996; Bush 2008; Leithwood et al. 2008), it follows that researchers should continually be asking critical questions about how school leaders are prepared for the role, what type of leadership development they receive and what impact training has.

Concerns around leadership succession are being addressed through policy-makers’ development of strategies that accelerate leadership development (Churches, Hutchinson & Jones 2009; Jones 2010); specific leadership programmes targeting certain minority groups (Campbell-Stephens 2009; Coleman & Campbell-Stephens 2010) and personalised leadership learning approaches (Crawford & Earley 2011). However, evidence continues to show lack of preparation for school leadership in the developing world (Lumby, Crow & Pashiardis 2008), suggesting that school principals are largely overwhelmed by the role with negative implications for the improvement of schools.

This study explores these issues through a specific focus on preparation and development for school principalship in Kenya. While leadership development is often used as a generic term for both pre-service and in-service leadership training, leadership preparation refers to preparation prior to becoming a school principal, and encompasses entry qualifications and other forms of training. Ribbins (2008) argues that the preparation stage is a lot more complex and does not only happen through formal programmes but through the entire socialisation process that entails interaction with different agencies shaping the potential leader’s personality from childhood (Crow 2006). However, the aim of this paper is to explore the nature of formal preparation and will be limited to formal programmes that qualify a leader to become a school principal.
Leadership development, on the other hand, is used to refer to continuing development of a leader after they have become school principals, which is regarded as careerlong learning (Ribbins 2008). This study contributes to the contemporary debate by providing an overview of both leadership preparation and development in secondary schools in Kenya.

The need for effective school leadership in developing Commonwealth countries is raised in some Commonwealth reports such as Pashiardis & Brauckman (2010). Many other authors have linked the role of effective headship to school improvement (e.g. Leithwood et al., 2008; Day, Sammons, Hopkins, Leithwood & Kington. 2008). These authors have highlighted the significance of effective school leadership in order for the school to enjoy enhanced learning experience and ensure positive learning outcomes.

In particular, Leithwood et al., (2008) underscored the necessity of effective school leadership for successful learning experience and school organisation by stating that effective school leadership is second only to classroom teaching in its impact on learning outcomes. They add that schools are not likely to achieve successful results without ‘talented leadership’, since leadership effectively unleashes the already existing talent within the school (Leithwood et al., 2008). Thus, the notion of leadership making a difference in school improvement appears to be the starting point for the global debates on what type of leadership training programmes should be provided in preparation for school principalship.

To investigate the nature of leadership preparation and development provision, the paper borrows the concepts of ‘blank spots’ and ‘blind spots’ (Heck & Hallinger 1999) of educational leadership development. Heck & Hallinger refer to blank spots
as areas in our knowledge needing further investigation in order to expand our understanding. These areas are explored through important questions that can be answered through narrowly focused and sustainable inquiries. Blind spots simply refer to gaps in our knowledge and understanding of a phenomenon. Through examining the blind spots of educational leadership development, the study seeks to explore the features of the leadership development and preparation programmes of secondary schools in Kenya.

2.3 Influence of Pre-service Programs on Management of Public Secondary Schools.

Throughout Africa, there is no formal requirement for principals to be trained managers. They are often appointed on the basis of a successful record as teachers with an implicit assumption that this provides a sufficient starting point for school leadership. In Kenya, for example, “deputy principals as well as good assistant teachers are appointed to the principalship without any leadership training (Kitavi & van der Westhuizen, 1997). They seems to be working on the assumption that a successful classroom teacher necessarily makes an effective school administrator” (Amezu-Kpeglo, 1990). The appointment of headteachers is largely based on a teacher’s seniority in “rank” and “teaching experience”. Oduro (2003) notes that “commitment to the provision and maintenance of facilities, salaries and others were given priority over headteachers’ professional development.”

This problem is not confined to Africa. Bush and Jackson (2002) observe that “training in many countries is not a requirement for appointment as a principal and there is still an (often unwritten) assumption that good teachers can become effective managers and leaders without specific preparation.” Oplatka (2004) points out that
even teaching experience may not be necessary. “In some African countries (e.g. Nigeria, Botswana), principals are not even appointed on criteria of quality regarding their own performance in teaching. Many of them have never been in a classroom, since political connections may be a dominant factor in their appointment.” Herriot et al., (2002) make a similar point in respect of Kenya. “Many headteachers had been identified as leaders in schools on the basis of dubious qualifications often of a personal nature rather than relevant experience and proven skills in the field of management.”

This is not the case in Ghana where Oduro (2003) notes that teaching experience, or acquisition of a professional qualification in teaching, is a necessary condition for one’s appointment to leadership positions in basic and secondary schools. Even where political pressures influence the appointment of a headteacher, the appointee must necessarily be a trained teacher. Kitavi & van der Westhuizen (1997) make the wider point that: The means by which most principals in developing countries are trained, selected, inducted and in-serviced are ill-suited to the development of effective and efficient school managers. Neither the old nor the new educational system in Kenya gives attention to either formal training or induction of beginning school principals.

This argument also applies in South Africa: In many instances, headteachers come to headship without having been prepared for their new role, as a result, they often have to rely on experience and common sense. However, such are the demands being made upon managers now, including headteachers, that acquiring expertise can no longer be left to common sense and character alone; management development support is needed (Tsukudu & Taylor, 1995). Subsequent research in the Gauteng
province (Bush and Heystek, 2006) shows that 66 per cent of principals “have not progressed beyond their initial degree while almost one third are not graduates”. Similar findings arise from Van der Westhuizen et al.,’s (2004) enquiry in the Mpumalanga province. “Wide-ranging changes in the education system have rendered many serving school principals ineffective in the management of their schools. Many of these serving principals lack basic management training prior to and after their entry into headship”.

Bush et al.,’s (2005) systematic literature review, for the Matthew Goniwe School of Leadership and Governance, concludes that “most school principals have not received adequate specialist preparation for their leadership and management roles.” One significant exception is the Seychelles, where the Ministry of Education has entered into a partnership with the University of Lincoln (UK) to provide training at Master’s level for up to 100 principals and senior managers over a five-year period (2004-2008). This is a significant step for a small education system with only 33 schools and reflects its wider interest in leadership for school improvement (Bush, 2005).

Researchers like Marrion(1983); Anderson(1989) found that newly employed principals were critical of their pre-service training for failing to prepare them for the rapid-fire pace of a principal’s job. In support of this, Schmuck (1988) wrote that: “Universities… have traditionally provided sound academic preparation while offering only minimal attention to transforming theory into practice. Moreover, the academic course work in personnel evaluation, law, business management, clinical supervision, and public relations, although competently presenting technique and
technical knowledge, offers little opportunity to use that knowledge in coping with real people in real schools”.

Bush & Heystek (2006) advocate an expansion of university provision but caution that knowledge-based programmes need to be modified to ensure that they are directly relevant to participants’ schools. The Government’s Task Team on Education Management (Department of Education, 1996) was critical of much university provision. “Management development practices have tended to focus on the collection of qualifications and certificates with little attention being paid to actual ability to transfer this newly acquired knowledge to the institutions in which managers work.” Van der Westhuizen et al. (2004) make a similar point in concluding their evaluation of management training in the Mpumalanga province: The design and content of training programmes should be geared towards developing requisite skills and knowledge to enable trainees to transfer their skills and knowledge to the school situation.

The Koech report (TIQET, 1999) on heads of institutions appointments states that, ‘in most cases, experience, academic and professional qualifications do not count. Yet, heads of institutions are central to the successful management of educational institutions and implementation of the total curriculum. Head teacher appointments ‘are usually made from serving teachers, most of who have no prior training in institutional management.’ Together with the lack of training in this area is lack of training in various areas of management which are equally important in determining the success of the head teacher in maintaining effective management of educational institution and the maintenance of quality and high standards of education
and training. ‘A good head teacher needs to invest years of hard work in order to create a first-rate school,’ (Koech report, 1999)

The Kenya Teachers’ Service Commission in its revised Code of Regulations for Teachers, (2006) has categorically stated that, ‘All administrative posts are deployment posts.’ In paragraph 33(1), the Code states that ‘promotion of teachers from one grade to another is governed by the relevant Schemes of Service. Such teachers may be deployed by the Commission in administrative posts as Principal/Head teacher, Deputy Head teacher, Head of Department, Dean of Students etc.’

The Code of Regulation for Teachers does not specify the specific academic/professional qualifications necessary for a teacher to ascend to the position of head teacher. Advertisements for head teachers/principals by the Teachers’ Service Commission have over the years laid emphasis on an individual having served on the previous job group for a minimum of 3 years as a basic qualification. No mention of the specific academic and professional qualifications is usually made. Despite the fact that headship/principalship is a position in the dictates of leadership, management and administration, no mention of the relevant and befitting formal qualifications for such responsibilities is usually made.

The Revised Scheme of Service for Graduate Teachers, (2002) indicates that it is only from Principal Graduate Teacher 1 at Job Group P onwards that an individual ‘may be deployed as a Head teacher in a school with one or two streams or a Deputy Head teacher in National School or a school with three streams and above.’ At this level, the scheme stipulates that ‘For appointment to the grade of Principal Graduate Teacher I, a principal Graduate Teacher II must; ‘Have served in that grade for at least
three (3) years: Be conversant with national educational policies and objectives as well as national and international curriculum development: Be able to supervise, guide and assess trainee teachers as well as set and moderate national examinations: Be conversant with the provisions of the Education Act, CAP 211, The Teachers’ Service Commission Act, CAP 212, The Kenya National Examinations Council Act, CAP 225A and Related legislations: Be conversant with the Teachers’ Service Commission Code of Regulations for Teachers and any other relevant regulations.

In the next grade of Senior Principal Graduate Teacher, Job Group Q the scheme states that a person in this grade: ‘may be deployed as a Principal of a National School, a large Provincial School, a Technical Training Institute/ Institute Technology; or as a Deputy Principal, in a National School or Post Secondary Institution.’ The requirements for appointment to is position are stated as follows: “A Principal Graduate Teacher I must; Have served in that grade for at least three (3) years: Have demonstrated organizational ability in an educational institution and be an all-round educational leader familiar with the national educational system: Be conversant with the Teachers’ Service Commission Act, Code of Regulation for Teachers and any other relevant regulations: Be conversant with the current trends in education and training: Have proved ability in improving and maintaining high teaching and learning standards in educational institutions: Be able to interpret and evaluate research activities and be conversant with National Education objectives, policies and practices.”

The next and final grade that a teacher can aspire to is that of Chief Principal Graduate Teacher, Job Group R whose requirement for appointment the same scheme stipulates as follow: “For appointment to the grade of Chief Principal Graduate
Teacher, a Senior Principal Graduate Teacher must in addition to those stated earlier for previous grade: Be conversant with national educational policies and objectives as well as national and international curricula development and implementation practices: Be able to supervise, guide and assess trainee teachers as well as setting and moderating national examinations.” A Chief Principal Graduate Teacher may also be deployed as Head of a National Polytechnic, National school, Large Provincial School and Teachers’ Training College, Technical Training Institute and Institute of Technology.” (Scheme of Service for Graduate Teachers, June, 2002).

Thus, in Kenya, qualifications of head teachers vary even among those in similar educational institutions because the emphasis is neither on academic nor professional qualifications but on experience and conversancy in certain duties, processes, procedures and regulations. The management of schools, even by any other name, calls for special skills in management without which effectiveness and efficiency are severely compromised.

2.4 Influence of Induction Programs on Management of Public Secondary Schools.

Sociologists have pointed out that the first year is a crucial period in administrators' socialization, the process by which they internalize the skills, values, and dispositions of the profession (Normore, 2003). While newcomers will enter the job with both informal and formal preparation, they still face the crucial task of "organizational socialization," in which the simple abstractions learned in university classrooms must be adapted to the messy realities of real schools. During this period, beginning principals are strongly motivated to fit in to their new environment, and the norms of the organization are likely to outweigh the norms acquired during
training. This offers a unique opportunity to influence the goals and behaviors of new leaders (Normore, 2003).

There is little evidence of formal induction occurring in almost all African countries. As Kitavi & van der Westhuizen (1997) put it, “too often, and without consideration, principals in developing countries like Kenya are tossed into the job without pre-service training, without guarantee of in-service training, and without support from their employers”. They report that most experienced principals overcame their problems through trial and error. However, “beginning principals in developing countries like Kenya need well-structured induction strategies that will make them effective and efficient educational managers. Without special attention to the entry year problems of beginning principals other attempts at improving the quality of education in developing countries may yield few results”.

Kitavi & van der Westhuizen, (1997) advocate eight induction strategies for new principals: Assign a veteran principal to assist the new appointee; Provide manuals for new principals; Ensure a smooth transition by involving the outgoing principal; Orient the new principal to the school and its community; Encourage networking with other principals; Encourage principals to allow their deputies to “shadow” them to gain experience; Visits to other schools; and Provide courses in educational management.

Induction is a key factor for workers in different occupational fields and professions. Induction programs assist beginning teachers to adapt rapidly in their teaching career. According to Rebore (1991), induction is the process designed to acquaint newly employed individuals with the community, the school, and the colleagues. Through induction programs, there can be improved employee retention
and job performance. An effective induction program must have well-defined objectives that reflect the needs of new employees in specific school systems. The new employees become integrated as soon as possible, functionally and socially into the organization (Okumbe, 1996).

Talbert and co-workers (1992), define induction as the broad process where novices become professionals. In their views, the induction process for beginning teachers includes all of the steps taken to socialize the teacher into the teaching profession. The process begins when the teacher signs the work contract and ends sometime in the future when the teacher becomes established in the profession. The time of induction is a transitional period when the beginning teacher moves from being a student to a worker or being a teacher.

Recent literature on induction process has focused on different aspects of teachers beginning years. During the induction period, there is need for managers to assist the new employees to go through a well-designed induction program. This should assist the new employees to settle down on the job as smoothly as possible (Talbert et al., 1992). An induction program should provide systematic and sustained assistance to the beginning teachers. Induction programs relate to the field of education as planned programs intended to provide some systematic and sustained assistance specifically to beginning Principals. Many People, teachers inclusive leave organizations shortly after joining them due to the treatment they receive from other employees and employers during the initial phase of employment. For professionals in all fields, the public does not expect them to commit any error as they perform their tasks. However, this may not be true with beginning Principals because they have limited experiences at the time of their training.
Research on induction therefore, has shown that the induction process is difficult and lengthy, thus, beginning Principals require assistance for both leadership and management activities (Talbert et al., 1992). Induction programs need to be tailored according to individuals unique needs. Unique needs arise from the fact that the new schools where they are posted have many challenges. These challenges pertain to the pedagogy and management needs. For instance methods of students discipline management have not been clearly stipulated by the Ministry of Education and with the outlawing of corporal punishment which was thought of as the main means of disciplining students. Beginning Principals have to be inducted by the mentors on how to maintain discipline, change of attitude and increase in performance without the use of the cane. (Republic of Kenya, 2007) This means that beginning Principals should be properly inducted to facilitate quality education.

2.5 Influence of Understudy Training on Management of Public Secondary Schools.

Training can be taken through various methods which include the following: Apprentice training, Operative training, Vestibule schools training, On-the-Job training, Special courses, Coaching, Position rotation, Understudy training among other forms. The understudy method of training has been and continues to be heavily relied upon to train and develop principals in Kenya. In this method, “a certain person is specifically designed as the heir apparent” (Flippo E.B, 1984). The understudy is usually the subject of the person she/he hopes to take over from. Training here takes place through the understudy observing keenly what the person he/she is understudying is doing with occasional opportunities to carry out some of the duties and responsibilities of the superior.
It is a method that is widely used. “It has the advantage of strongly motivating the trainee to learn since it is located in the artificial situation of a classroom” (Flippo, 1984). It provides a practical and realistic situation in which the training is conducted. The method has various challenges that can compromise its efficiency among which are: (from the researcher’s own experience) incompatibility of the understudy and the superior, suspicion of undermining the superior, lack of transparency on the part of the superior or fear by the superior of the understudy toppling the superior. The most feared disadvantage of this method is that of the learner having to learn or tow the ways of the superior who also learned and towed the ways of his superior. The unfortunate thing about this scenario is that the method helps to perpetrate both good and bad work habits.

The fact that the success of this method depends entirely upon the immediate supervisor, means that the personnel unit has a major responsibility for making a good, effective manager or administrator out of every supervisor. This means that the making of a good manager or leader by the understudy calls for the application of additional or other professional academic training that will complement the understudy training even as it recognizes the important role the method plays in the training and development of school administrators (Flippo E.B, 1984).

2.6 Influence of In-service Programs on Management of Public Secondary Schools

In-service training has been arguably the most effective mechanism for Teacher Professional Development as it provides foundational knowledge and skills on which the headteacher can build as they operate in their school environment. As Musset (2010) has rightly asserted, “to teach is a complex and demanding intellectual
work, one that cannot be accomplished without the adequate preparation”. It is thus worthwhile for education systems to strengthen initial teacher training for all teachers and even make similar arrangements for practicing headteachers who may not have minimum qualifications.

Cochran-Smith (2001), Mulkeen et al., (2007) and Conway et al., (2009) offer some insightful suggestions on which Kenya’s secondary education system could build to make headway into improved Teacher Professional Development in general, and Continuous Professional Development in particular for managers of secondary schools. The suggestions include designing teacher education as a continuum, starting with initial pre-service education and continuing with a strong ongoing in-service professional development program for secondary teachers that would support them throughout their teaching careers. Principals need both support and supervision throughout their careers. Mulkeen et al (2007) caution that it would be naïve to assume that teachers can go through a pre-service program and then perform well for the remainder of their careers without further professional development.

One of the potentially valuable initiatives in ongoing teacher development is the involvement of experienced teachers in the design and delivery of courses at the school (or cluster of schools) level. This has the double benefit of ensuring that the courses are relevant and practical, while also providing development opportunities for the experienced teachers (Gaynor 1998; Condy 1998; Monk 1999). But this can only succeed if there is a strategic programme for retooling the leadership at school level to provide support and an environment for such professional development programmes. Therefore, there is a need to develop strong supportive supervision structures. The
most cost-effective way may be to develop the role of the school principal in this area (Mulkeen et al 2007, DeJaeghere et al., 2009).

There needs to be a system to help teachers and Principals develop good practice and to ensure that school leaders are in place and are doing the required responsibilities. However, in many African countries such inspection systems focus on fault-finding rather than support. In some cases, supervisors or inspectors lack the resources to travel to schools (VSO 2002). Retraining or Continuous Professional Development manifests itself in various ways. For example, Conway et al., (2009) have argued that CPD can be developed to help and support teachers extend and deepen subject matter knowledge for teaching; extend and refine repertoire in curriculum, instruction and assessment; strengthen skills and dispositions to study and improve teaching; expand responsibilities and develop leadership skills; and develop a professional identity. Such a framework does not only help guide the spectrum of CPD but can also be used as a criteria for evaluating any CPD initiatives as a means of ascertaining their impact on teaching.

The Education Sector Strategic Plan highlights the importance of establishing continuous in-service training to enhance the quality of education (MOEST, 2005). Tackling continuing professional development of secondary school teachers is even more urgent at this point in time. The Strengthening of Mathematics and Science Education (SMASE) project jointly funded by Kenya’s Ministry of Education Science and Technology and the Japanese Government has been going on since 2004 (MOEST, 2007). Clearly there have been and are still ad hoc programmes in place intended to continuously up-skill secondary school teachers and their leaders in various ways in Kenya. Some teachers interviewed by Mulkeen et al., (2007) in five
African countries in a study revealed that they had participated in an in-service teacher education program, but felt that the in-service professional development they received prepared them to a lesser degree than their initial training.

In-service programs served three different purposes: Upgrading untrained teachers’ qualifications; Providing master’s degree-level programs for qualified teachers; and Offering short-term training related to subject and pedagogy areas. Some Headteachers interviewed by Mulkeen et al., (2007) stated that short-term professional development is usually conducted by Head teacher’s Associations—such as the Kenya Secondary Schools Headteachers Association (KSSHA), and is generally supported by the government and donor projects.

The teachers who attended in-service programs did so in specific subject areas, such as science, math, computers, and, in a few cases, English. The Principals on the other hand participated in in-service professional development that was focused on more general issues of pedagogy or management. Though some of the teachers did not regard the in-service professional development to be as helpful as their initial training, they felt that it provided them with more confidence in teaching as well as a venue in which to share ideas and solve problems. A number of teachers and headteachers stated that the in-service professional development served as a mechanism for retaining them in the profession.

One other option of in-service delivery that has potential—on the basis of cost savings and reaching geographically separated beneficiaries—is distance education. Distance learning may be a less expensive option than study leave, and it permits teachers to continue to teach instead of taking them out of the classroom (Ware 1992, Aguti 2003). To be effective, however, distance learning requires considerable
follow-through and support (in school-based workshops, seminars, and other means of sharing experiential knowledge and mutual support). However, it is important to explore the most effective way of delivering distance education programmes. For example, it would be useless to plan to deliver it via internet or radio when most schools are not equipped with networked computers and teachers hardly listen to radio programmes. It might be more effective to use printed material via mail even though it may sound a less efficient approach in this modern era of technology.

The past two decades, from 1980, have witnessed considerable efforts by the Ministry of Education in Kenya in providing in-service management training for heads of schools. It has been recognized that changes within the society and within the educational system itself requires continuous in-servicing of staff to enable them to acquire knowledge, skills and attitudes for new roles (Lodiaga & Olembo, 1991). In 1988, the government of Kenya established the Kenya Education Staff Institute (KESI) to offer in-service training for heads of educational institutions including school principals (Kamunge, 1988). Kamunge on behalf of the government recommended that the role of KESI be expanded and diversified to develop both the serving and potential heads. Thus, while KESI has been in existence for more than two decades, recent information indicates that it still provides in-service training largely to practicing heads and very little to beginning or future heads (Kitavi, 1995). This is despite the fact that these educational managers are expected to participate meaningfully in the planning, implementation and evaluation of educational programs and projects as soon as they become heads. Thus, the first problem these new educational leaders face is lack of training.
2.7 Theoretical Framework

A theory is a series of concepts organized into assumptions and generalizations that tend to hypothesize about a phenomenon (Glatthorn, 1999). This study was based on Peter’s Principle that presents a theory, which explains the effect on an employee's effort, of a promotion to a new and different job, which has a new set of demands. Peter and Hull (1969) argued that since past performance is continually used to predict future performance, eventually, people are promoted to a job where they would not be effective. Peter and Hull declare that in a hierarchy, every employee tends to rise to his level of incompetence.

The Peter Principle is the concept that in bureaucratic organizations, new employees typically start in the lower ranks, but when they prove to be competent in the task to which they are assigned; they get promoted to a higher rank, which in some cases are managerial. The process of climbing up the hierarchical ladder can go on indefinitely, until the employee reaches a position where he/she is no longer competent.

The result is that most of the management levels of a bureaucracy will be filled by incompetent people, who got there because they were quite good at doing different and usually but not always easier work than they are currently expected to perform. In other words, workers, managers and administrators tend to be promoted to the level of their incompetence. Many workers and managers do so well and are rated so highly in earlier jobs that they are promoted to higher positions, which often requires skills that they do not possess, until they reach a level where their performance is poor and where they are no longer effective (Obilade, 1986).
Though many scholars have criticized the Peter Principle for being "rather pessimistic", they still agree that this principle represents more truth than fiction (Koontz, O'Donnel & Weihrich, 1980; Mitchel, 1982). They agree that there is a real danger of promoting an individual beyond his or her level of competence. This principle underscores the need to scrutinize the process of staff recruitment and promotion. It also calls for attention to the problems that can arise when past performance is used to predict future performance on a job that is substantially different from the one the individual is leaving.

In Kenya, The Teachers Service Commission relies mostly on years of experience and promotion to elevate people from one cadre to the other, especially from the classroom to the managerial level. The danger here is in promoting an individual from a position of competence to a position of incompetence. There had been cases of individuals who performed well enough in lower positions, but who later occupied positions too difficult for their competencies.

Obilade (1986) further reported that individuals who have been competent teachers or heads of departments often get promoted to the post of the Deputy/Vice Principal. In this position, they relate well with teachers, students and parents and were intellectually competent. Sometimes, they gained further promotions to the rank of school Principal. Usually, these people had never had to deal with officials of State School Board or Ministry of Education; nor had to handle so many students by themselves. Several of them are soon regarded as incompetent Principals since it was apparent that they lacked the required skills to work with such high officials and deal with the student body as well as the resulting administrative problems.
Since it has been observed that experience alone cannot provide the necessary yardstick for the appointment of Principals, it is therefore necessary to search for a more corrective theory. Therefore, the contingency theory of leadership appears to be quite relevant in the search for effectiveness in organizations. The theory proposes the adoption of training programs that prepare leaders to function effectively in specific organizational situations. This approach throws more light on how administrators in the Kenyan school system could be trained to perform effectively. The premise of the contingency idea is that performance is contingent upon a proper match between the individual's competencies, skills and talents and the job (Mitchell, 1982).
2.8 Conceptual Framework

The study was guided by the perceived conceptual framework in figure 2.1
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*Figure 2.1: Perceived conceptual framework showing relationship between the variables*

A conceptual framework is a diagrammatic explanation of the research problem hence an explanation of the relationship among several factors that have been identified as important in the study problem (Ngechu, 2006). The conceptual...
framework in this study was on the idea that effective or poor performance of principals as managers of public secondary schools depends on their level preparation and development.

Based on the results of the initial literature review, a conceptual framework for this study, as illustrated in Figure 2.1, was developed. The independent variable in this proposed study is the preparation and development of principals and its components are; pre-service programs, induction programs, understudy training and in-service programs. On the other hand, the dependent variable is the management of public secondary schools. Government policies, stakeholders politics, leadership skills and financial resources acts as the intervening variables.

From the conceptual framework, the research therefore examined the preparation and development of principals in relation to several factors such as: The Pre-service training, Induction training, Understudy training and In-service training, which may enhance the performance of the principal who receives such indicators. These forms the issues or aspects of the independent variable to be investigated to determine their overal influence on the dependent variable and will form the objectives of the study. When the Principal are given proper management training opportunities through induction, in-service or understudy training they are likely to perform highly as managers of schools. While lack of any form of management training may make the principal to become incompetent, demotivated and this will affect their delivery, hence poor performance as managers of schools.

The performance of principals as managers of secondary schools was measured in terms of improvement or reduction in; academic performance, school discipline, staff morale, local support, resource use among others. These translates
into efficiency in the management of public secondary schools in Kenya and vice versa.

2.9 Summary of Literature Review

Literature review looked at general and empirical literature in order to capture all relevant information concerning the influence of Preparation and Development of Principals on Management of Public Secondary Schools and determine the existing gaps. General literature attempted to look at how the performance of principals as managers of public secondary schools can be influenced by their Pre-service programs, Induction programs, Understudy training and In-service programs. Review revealed that the level of a principal’s preparation and development contribute immensely to the overall management of Public Secondary Schools worldwide. However, in developed countries, the level of principals’ preparation and development is higher as compared to that of developing countries such as South Africa, Nigeria, Botswana, Sub-saharan Africa and Kenya.

From the literature review, it is clear that there is a growing concern over the general ineptitude of both the practicing and forthcoming principals of secondary schools to adequately handle the complex leadership and management duties and responsibilities that their job calls for. This scenario puts at stake, the quality and standards of education which in the long-run may have negative impact on the very important resource in a country’s economic growth and development.

It can be concluded that educational management tasks calls for skills in leadership, management and administration which more than ever before have necessitated the provision of formal training in addition to any understudy training
that the person may have undergone. It is quite clear, therefore, that training in leadership, management and administration for principals of educational institutions is paramount if the management of these institutions is to be of high professional standards. The literature review has confirmed the complexity of the competencies necessary for leading, managing and administering an educational institution. It has also, to some extent portrayed the school principal as an individual possibly being ambushed and overwhelmed by additional professional work for which little or no training has been received and which slowly but surely pushes him/her into the ‘mismanagement web’ without his/her wish. This study therefore investigated and established the magnitude of this ambush and overwhelming of the principals of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District by professional management work that they may or may not have been trained and/or oriented in.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a description of research methodology that will be employed when conducting this study. It encompasses research design, target population, sample and sampling techniques, research instruments, piloting of instruments, validity of instruments, reliability of instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research Design

This study was conducted through a descriptive survey design. According to Gay (1993) descriptive survey is a research design which seeks to ascertain respondent’s perspectives or experiences on a specified subject in a predetermined structured manner. It investigates populations by selecting samples to analyze and discover occurrences. This research design was used because it considered issues such as economy of the design, rapid data collection and ability to understand a population from apart of it and it is suitable for extensive research (Oso & Onen, 2009). The researcher collected both primary and secondary data. Primary data was obtained using questionnaires while secondary data was obtained from the internet, journals, theses and dissertations, Government documents and books.

3.3 Target Population

According to Kombo & Tromp (2006), a population is a group of individuals, objects or items from which samples are taken for measurement. This study targeted
all public secondary schools within Kisumu East District. The target population for this study consisted of all the Principals, Deputy Principals, Heads of Departments and The District Education Officer.

3.4 Sample size and Sample Selection

This section discusses the sample size and the sampling technique. Best & Kaln (1998) defines a sample as a small proportion of a population selected for observation and analysis.

3.4.1 Sample Size

The size of a sample should be neither too large nor too small (Kothari, 2007). This study sampled 23 Schools out of a total of 38 Public Secondary Schools found in Kisumu East District. This constitutes 61%, which is more than the 30% proportion recommended by Mugenda & Mugenda (2003).

3.4.2 Sampling Technique

Sampling means selecting a given number of subjects from a defined population as representative of that population. (Orodho, 2002). According to Ng’echu (2004) sampling is significant in research since it is not possible to study every element of the whole population. The study employed simple random, stratified, and purposive sampling techniques to obtain respondents for the interview. Stratified random sampling is a modification of random sampling in which the population is divided into two or more relevant and significant strata or groups based on one or more attributes (Saunders; Lewis & Thorn hill, 2007).

In the study, schools were categorized into three strata according to sex, that is Boys schools, Girls schools and Mixed schools. 23 schools were thereafter selected
for the study as follows: 4 Boys schools, 4 Girls’ schools and 15 Mixed schools. all
the Principals and Deputy Principals from the selected schools were sampled for the
study through purposive sampling technique. Purposive sampling allows the
researcher to arrive at cases that have the required information with respect to
objectives of the study. (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999). Three (3) Heads of
Department were also randomly selected from each of the sampled schools making a
total of 69 Heads of Department that were included in the study.

3.5 Research Instruments

The data for this study was gathered through questionnaires and document
analysis. The primary data was collected using questionnaire and was administered to
Principals, Deputy Principals and Heads of Department. Gay (1992) maintains that
questionnaires give respondents freedom to express their views or opinion and also to
make suggestions. It is also anonymous. Anonymity helps to produce more candid
answers than is possible in an interview. The questionnaires were semi-structured and
targeted the Principals, Deputy Principals and Heads of Departments. The
questionnaires were organized into two sections. Section one captured demographic
information of the respondents while the second section captured information based
on the themes of the objectives. The questionnaires comprised a list of possible
alternatives from which the respondents selected answers that best suited them. The
open questions helped to capture the respondents’ opinion and attitude without
rigidity.

Document Analysis involved critical examination of public or private recorded
information related to the issue under investigation for purposes of obtaining
unobstructive information at the pleasure of the researcher. The following documents
were studied for purposes of inference, comparative study as well as for gaining more insight into the fundamental causes, omissions, discrepancies and/or attributes to the scenarios that finally emerged as the outcome of the study: Financial and Accounting Instructions for Secondary Schools, The Heads Manual for Secondary schools, Educational Management Training Curricula from Kenya Education Staff Institute (KESI).

3.5.1 Pilot Testing

Mugenda & Mugenda (1999) notes that pilot testing is a very important step in any study. It helps in fine-tuning research instruments so that they can capture the intended information. The instruments were pre-tested using a small sample of 2 Principals, 2 Deputy Principals and 6 Heads of department randomly selected. This pre-test was excluded during the final administration of the instruments. According to Mugenda & Mugenda (2003), deficiencies in the instrument such as unclear direction, insufficient space to write the response, wrong numbering are revealed.

3.5.2 Validity of the Instruments

This is a quality control measure that sought to apply techniques that helped to establish whether the test produced information that was relevant and free from systematic errors for purposes of obtaining accuracy, meaningfulness and soundness of the research (Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999). Thus the questions on the questionnaire as well as those for the interview were structured in such a way that they evoked similar reactions to the questions but with personalized responses to them. Validity of the instruments was ensured through pre-testing (pilot study), the pilot study helped to improve face validity of the instruments. Pre-testing aided in assessing the clarity of the items so that those which were found to be inadequate in measuring the variables
were modified. Content validity was determined by consulting the research supervisors for their judgement, corrections and verifications of the instruments. According to Borg & Gall (1989) content validity of an instrument is improved through expert judgment. As such, the researcher sought assistance of his supervisors, who, as experts in research, helped improve content validity of the instrument.

3.5.3 Reliability of the Instruments

Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) define reliability as a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. Reliability was used to detect errors which as a result of inaccurate coding and inaccurate framing of questions. The pilot study helped the researcher to assess the clarity of the questionnaire items so that those items found to be inadequate or vague were modified to improve the quality of the research instrument thus increasing its reliability.

The study applied the Split-Half technique of reliability testing, whereby the pilot questionnaires was divided into two equivalent halves (questionnaires was used for one part while interviews was used for the other half) and then a correlation coefficient for the two halves was computed using the Spearman Brown Prophesy formula. The coefficient indicated the degree to which the two halves of the test provide the same results and hence described the internal consistency of the test. According to Kiess & Bloomquist (1985) a minimum correlation coefficient of 0.65 is recommended as indicating that an instrument is reliable.

3.6 Data Collection Procedure

The research proposal was presented for approval to the university pannel. The researcher thereafter applied for a research permit from the National Council for
Science and Technology. Upon receiving the permit and introductory letter, the researcher requested for permission to carry the study from the the District Education Officer for Kisumu East District and the District Commissioner.

After permission was granted, the researcher visited the selected schools in person to book an appointment for an interview and for introduction and to develop a rapport with the Principals, Deputy Principals and Heads of Departments. This was necessary for the fruitful relationship during the study. The researcher together with the research assistants thereafter visited the respondents on agreed dates and collected data by administering the questionnaire to the Principals, Deputy Principals and Heads of Department of the selected schools, and also conducted interviews with the District Education Officer. The respondents were given one week to fill in the questionnaires after which the filled-in questionnaires were collected.

3.7 Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis is the process of systematically searching and arranging field findings for presentation (Bogan & Biklen, 1992). Upon completing data collection exercise, all completed instruments were edited to ensure that only that which was relevant to the research objectives were retained. Coding of data was then done to classify the responses into categories and match them to their relevant research questions and objectives for analysis and the coded data was analyzed using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS).

As observed by Gray (2004) qualitative data provides rich descriptions and explanations that demonstrate the chronological flow of events as well as often leading to serendipitous (chance) findings. Qualitative data was analysed qualitatively using content analysis based on analysis of meanings and implications emanating
Qualitative data were transcribed, organized into various themes of the study and reported in a narrative form. On the other hand, quantitative data was analysed using various statistics including measures of central tendency and dispersion. Simple descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages and means were both used to describe data. The analyzed data was presented in form of tables where applicable.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

The most ethical factor that was highly considered was the privacy of the respondents’ information. All the responses were treated with confidentiality and great assurance accorded to them. After permission was granted the researcher made preliminary visits to the sampled schools to explain the purpose of the study verbally and assured the respondents of total confidentiality and that the information provided was to be used for the purpose of research only. The researcher also sought for the respondents’ permission to participate in the study and assured them that their participation was be voluntary.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents findings of the study, which have been discussed under thematic areas in line with the study objectives. The thematic areas include: Questionnaire return rate, Demographic characteristics of respondents, Influence of Pre-service training on management of public secondary schools; Influence of Induction training on management of public secondary schools; Influence Understudy training on management of public secondary schools and Influence of In-service training on management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District.

4.2 Questionnaire Return Rate

Out of the 115 respondents sought by the study, 100 responded to the instruments, giving a questionnaire return rate of 86.96%. The study managed to get this response rate due to proper organization of the field work and the efficiency of the field assistants after conducting a successful pilot survey. This return rate was still acceptable because it was above the 60% return rate recommended by Amin (2005). Table 4.1 presents the findings of the study.
Table 4.1: Questionnaire Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaires Administered</th>
<th>Questionnaires Returned</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Departments</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>88.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.96</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings presented in table 4.1, out of 23 Principals sampled for the study, 19(82.61%) responded, 20(86.96%) of the Deputy Principals responded while 61(88.41%) of the Heads of Departments responded. Out of 115 questionnaires administered to respondents, 100 questionnaires were returned, giving a questionnaire return rate of 86.96%. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), a response rate of 70% and above is very good.

4.3 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

This section presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents who were involved in the study. The demographic characteristics that were explored were; age, gender, academic qualifications, area of specialization, management experience, and their Job groups. These information are presented in tables and frequency since they are mainly descriptive. This was significant because these characteristics were used to analyze data so that the relationship between the dependent and independent variables was established beyond doubt. In essence, it is aimed at removing any spuriousness in the relationship between the two variables. These results are presented in the following sub sections.
4.3.1 Distribution of Respondents by Gender

The researcher was interested in establishing whether there was any linkages between gender and management of secondary schools. The respondents were asked to state their gender. Table 4.2 presents the summary of the study findings.

Table 4.2: Distribution of Respondents by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>D/Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>H.O.Ds</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.42%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63.93%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.07%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that out of the 100 respondents who participated in the study, 13(68.42%) were male Principals, 6(31.58%) were female principals, 8(40.0%) were male Deputy Principals, 12(60.0%) were female Deputy Principals, 39(63.93%) were male Heads of Departments and 22(36.07%) were female Heads of Departments.

Table 4.2 does reveal gender inequalities in the management of secondary schools in the district with males (60%) having an upper hand than females (40%). However, this disparity has its implications in the overall management which generally require a reasonable representation of either gender for balanced and reasonable decisions. This disparity may to some extend be a contributing factor on the type of leadership and achievement in the schools in the district.

4.3.2 Distribution of Respondents by Age

The study also sought to establish the distribution of respondents by age. This was to enable the researcher to establish whether the age of the respondents had an influence on the management of public secondary schools. In view of this, the
respondents were asked to state their ages. The findings of this study were presented in Table 4.3.

**Table 4.3: Distribution of the Respondents by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>D/Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>H.O.Ds</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39.34</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.3, Out of the 100 respondents who participated in the study, 4% fell in the category of 20-30 years and these were mainly the Heads of Departments. 31% of the respondents were in the 31-40 age bracket which comprised of Principals (5.26%), Deputy Principals (15%) and Heads of Departments (44.26%).

The table indicates that (26.32%) of Principals, 10% of the Deputy Principals and 9.84% of the Heads of Departments of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District are above 50 years of age and are due for retirement in a few years to come. This could have impacted negatively on the management of these schools since most of them may not be able to keep up with new technological skills required in the management of modern schools. It is also an indication that the people to take over from them should have already been identified and rigorous training administered to them.

**4.3.4 Distribution of Respondents by Areas of Specialization**

The study explored the areas of specialization of the respondents as presented in Table 4.4.
This data shows that those in the management positions in public secondary schools are mainly drawn from those with a background in Mathematics and Sciences which stands at 32% followed by Humanities at 25%. Only 13% of the respondents have a backgroung in management with the Principals standing at 21%, Deputy Principals at 25% and the Heads of Departments at 13%. This is an interesting revelation since it is expected that managers of public institutions should be persons who are themselves trained in management areas.

### 4.3.5 Distribution of Respondents by Experience

The study explored the years of experience of the respondents and how it influenced the management of Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District. The respondents were asked to state their period of stay in the management positions they currently occupy. The findings of the study were presented in Table 4.5.
Table 4.5: Distribution of Respondents by Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>D/ Principals</th>
<th>H.O.Ds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of table 4.5 indicates that 5.26% of Principals, 10% of Deputy Principals and 11.48% of Heads of Departments had served in their current positions for Less than 1 year, this constitute 10% of the respondents. On the other hand, majority of the respondents had served for a period between 1-5 years. This constituted 31.58% of the Principals, 70% of the Deputy Principals and 63.93% of the Heads of Departments. Similarly, 36.847% of the Principals, 15% of Deputy Principals and 21.31% of Heads of Departments have an experience of between 6-10 years. 6% of the respondents have an experience of between 11-15 years and this consists of 15% of the Principals, 5% of the Deputy Principals and 3.28% of the Heads of Department. 10.53% of the Principals have an experience of over 15 years, this comprises of 2% of the respondents.

From these findings, it can be concluded that majority of the respondents (59%) had an experience of between 1-5 years, they are therefore still not adequately experienced in school management and therefore needed in-service courses for capacity building in order to cope with current management of schools.
4.4 Influence of Pre-Service programs on Management of Schools

This section sought to explore the influence of Pre-service training on management of Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District. The Principal, Deputy Principal and Heads of Departments are managers of public secondary schools and hence the pivot around which many aspects of the school revolve. The nature of the Pre-service training these people had therefore, has a great influence on the management of their schools. This basically depends on the academic qualifications and Past professional experience.

4.4.1 Academic Training and Management of Schools

The level of education of an individual is an important indicator in explaining the person’s ability to understand conceptual aspects and is related to good management (Lantos, 2000). The study therefore sought to establish the distribution of respondents by academic qualifications and whether it had any influence on management of public secondary schools. The findings are presented in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Distribution of Respondents by Academic Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Qualification</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.G.D.E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters’ degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.6, 15% of the respondents were holders of Diploma in Education and these comprised of 10.53% of the Principals, 10% of Deputy Principals and...
18.03% of the Heads of Departments. Majority of the respondents (63%) were holders of Bachelor’s degree in Education, which consisted of 43.37% of the Principals, 55% of the Deputy Principals and 71.38% of Heads of Departments. 15.79% of the Principals, 5% of Deputy Principals and 4.92% of Heads of Departments had non-educational degrees but with Postgraduate qualifications in education, this category constituted 7% of the respondents. A further 21.05% of Principals, 30% of Deputy Principals and 6.56% of Heads of Departments had Masters. 5.26% of the Principals had a Phd, which was only 1% of the respondents.

These findings goes contrary to the views of Bush and Heystek (2006) that 66 per cent of principals “have not progressed beyond their initial degree while almost one third are not graduates”. Therefore, from these findings, it can be deduced that the Principals, Deputy Principals and HODs were qualified and capable of delivering their jobs well. This in turn could have impacted positively on the management of these schools, and therefore mismanagement could not be attributed to low qualification of the Principal, Deputy Principals and the Heads of Departments of Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District.

When asked whether they had received management training before being appointed, the respondents responded as indicated in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Management Training before appointment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>D/Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>H.O.Ds</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75.41</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.59</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4.7 shows that only 36% of the respondents had been lucky enough to undergo management training prior to their appointments, while majority of them (64%) had not. In particular, only 42.11% of the Principals, 35% of the Deputy Principals and 24.59% of the Heads of Departments had received some management training before they were appointed while 57.89% of the Principals, 65% of the Deputy Principals and 75.41% of the Heads of Departments had no training. The findings of this study therefore, confirms the findings of Kitavi and van der Westhuizen (1997) that deputy principals as well as good assistant teachers are appointed to the principalship without any leadership training.

When asked to state the extent the management training received during Pre-service has facilitated the performance of their duties and responsibilities as managers of schools. The respondents gave diverse responses as portrayed in Table 4.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>D/Principals</th>
<th>H.O.Ds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diverse responses of the respondents as indicated in Table 4.8, is an indication that school managers have not wholesomely benefitted from the training received at the universities and colleges since what is taught at this level is not elaborate enough to equip a teacher with all the necessary management skills for a management position such as that of a school. This observation is in line with those of researchers like Marrion (1983); Anderson (1989) found that newly employed
principals were critical of their pre-service training for failing to prepare them for the rapid-fire pace of a principal’s job. In support of this, Schmuck (1988) wrote that: “Universities… have traditionally provided sound academic preparation while offering only minimal attention to transforming theory into practice. Moreover, the academic course work in personnel evaluation, law, business management, clinical supervision, and public relations, although competently presenting technique and technical knowledge, offers little opportunity to use that knowledge in coping with real people in real schools”.

4.4.2 Teaching Experience and Management of Schools

The teaching experience of the respondents was determined through their Job Groups. The Job Group of the respondents was also important in explaining the criteria of selecting and appointing managers of Public Secondary Schools. Table 4.9 shows the Job Groups of the respondents.

Table 4.9: Distribution of Respondents by their Job Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ Job Groups</th>
<th>Principals f</th>
<th>Principals %</th>
<th>D/Principals f</th>
<th>D/Principals %</th>
<th>H.O.Ds f</th>
<th>H.O.Ds %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 shows that majority (63.16%) of the Principals in this region are in Job Group N. The Principal in the lowest Job Group is in Job Group M (10.53%), while the highest is in Job Group Q (10.53%). Similarly, Most of the Deputy
Principals are in Job Group ‘M’, this accounts for 55% of all the Deputy Principals and only 5% of them are in Job Group ‘P’. On the other hand, Majority (55.74%) of the Heads of Departments are in Job Group ‘M’ followed by those in Job Group ‘L’ that stands at 29.51%, while those in Job Group ‘K’ and ‘N’ each stands at 6.56% and 8.20% respectively.

The findings of this study therefore, confirms those of Oduro (2003), who found out that in Kenya, the appointment of headteachers is largely based on a teacher’s seniority in “rank” and “teaching experience”. That they are often appointed on the basis of a successful record as teachers with an implicit assumption that this provides a sufficient starting point for school leadership.

These findings confirms Koech report (1999) assertion that a good head teacher needs to invest years of hard work in order to create a first-rate school.

The Scheme of Service stipulates that those in Job Group ‘M’ onwards are the ones to be appointed as managers of schools, however, the findings reveal that 22% of the respondents do not meet this standards hence, a good number of Heads of Departments are not qualified to hold those positions. A good head teacher needs to invest years of hard work in order to create a first-rate school,’ (Koech report, 1999)

4.5 Influence of Induction Programs on Management of Schools

This section sought to present the influence of Induction training on management of public secondary schools. The Principal, Deputy Principal and Heads of Departments are the ones who translate broad general goals into specific objectives and finally oversee the learning experience in a school set up.
4.5.1 Provision of Manuals on Job Specification and Management of schools

Data on the duties and responsibilities of the principal was gathered and their corresponding management skills also gathered. The aim was to find out whether the Principals were aware of their duties and responsibilities that have been spelt out in their Scheme of Service. The respondents were asked whether they were provided with Job descriptions on assumption of their present positions or whether they had been inducted on their duties on being appointed. 63.16% of the principals, 70% of the Deputy Principals and 70.49% of the Heads of Departments responded negatively while 36.84% of the Principals, 30% of the Deputy Principals and 29.51% of the Heads of Departments responded in the affirmative. This implies that only 31% of the respondents had been inducted on assumption of their positions, while majority (69%) were not inducted into their duties and responsibilities. Tables 4.10 shows the results of the responses:

Table 4.10: Induction through provision of Job Specification Manuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>D/Principals</th>
<th>H.O.Ds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 indicates that majority of Principals of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District ascended to the positions of Principalship without knowing exactly what their duties and responsibilities entailed. This supports the arguments of Kitavi and van der Westhuizen (1997) that “too often, and without consideration, principals in developing countries like Kenya are tossed into the job without pre-
service training, without guarantee of an induction training and without an in-service training.

When the Principals were asked whether the prescribed duties and responsibilities were all that they had to do. The study revealed that 62.5% of Principals have more duties and responsibilities than those prescribed for them in their Scheme of Service, while 25% of them have exactly the same duties and responsibilities as those prescribed. 12.5% did not respond.

Their claims that they do more than what is in the Scheme of Service, could have arisen from the fact that no job specification nor induction were given from which the broadly categorized and broadly stated duties and responsibilities of the Principal could be expounded. It is possible that what they see as additional duties could very well be in their portfolio. The Principals’ observation on this contention appears to support that of Hartle (2008) who reported that a survey for the National Association of Headteachers had revealed that the head teachers’ job embraces a wide range of management tasks including monitoring and controlling objectives and goals, evaluating performance and providing leadership.

On being asked whether they performed each of the following management tasks the Principals responded as given in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Management Tasks Performed by Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Task of a Principal</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing Board of Governors meetings.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing other meetings.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking minutes.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resource mobilization.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Procurement.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Letter writing.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Report writing.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Boarding and Lodging Management.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Minutes writing.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tender writing.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Legal advisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Crisis Management.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Financial Management.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Local Purchase Order Processing.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Security.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Public Relations and Information Management</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Supervision.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Legal advisor on the ground.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Human Resource Management.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Community Leader.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Human Relations.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Arbitrator.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Driver.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Property Manager.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Inventory Manager.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Property Developer.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Teaching.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Agent.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Guardian to students and teachers.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Debt Collector.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Planning and Budgeting.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Project Management.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Marketing.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 shows that Principals handle many tasks that have not been spelt out in the prescribed duties and responsibilities list. They may have been implied but given that no orientation is given on appointment to the position of Principal, many of the tasks remain unattended to thereby affecting the overall management of schools. The facts given here further support the argument that Principals are not prepared well on taking up their duties. It shows that Principals handle many tasks that have not been spelled out in the prescribed duties and responsibilities list. They may have been
implied but given that no orientation is given on appointment to the position of Principalship, many of the tasks may remain unattended to thereby affecting the overall management of the schools.

4.5.2 Orientation on Duties and Responsibilities and Management of Schools

On whether or not orientation was conducted for them before they began working on their jobs as managers of schools, the Principals responded as shown in table 4.12

Table 4.12: Orientation of the respondents on appointment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>D/Principals</th>
<th>H.O.Ds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 4.12 further support the argument that Principals and other school leaders are not adequately prepared before taking up their duties and responsibilities. Indeed, this confirms the description by Beeson and Mathews (1992) of novice principals, world as ‘one filled with considerable anxiety, frustration and professional isolation.’ Daresh and Playko (1994) further asserts that new principals are usually faced with “role clarification problems about understanding that they were principals...’ and that they equally faced problems of having “limited technical expertise about how to do the things they are supposed to do.” With no Job description or induction given to the principals on their appointment, they most likely go through the problems that have just been cited above.
The responses of the Principals on whether they were aware of all the duties and responsibilities prescribed for them in their Scheme of Service are given in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13: Principals awareness of their Prescribed Duties and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties and Responsibilities of a Principal</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th></th>
<th>NO</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Overall Head of Institution under the direction of the Board of Governors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Serving as Accounting Officer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Responsible for preparation of estimates for current and development expenditure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Interpreting and implementing policy decisions pertaining to educational training</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Serving as Secretary to the Board of Governors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Overall Organizer, Co-ordinator and Supervisor of all activities in the institution</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Responsible for planning, acquisition, development and maintenance of physical facilities at the institution.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Responsible for improving and maintaining high training and learning standards.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Promoting positive linkages between the institution and neighbouring communities and/or other nearby organizations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Co-ordinating specific training and learning activities in the institution</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Promoting liaison between the institution and other private sector organizations.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Promoting the welfare of all staff and students within the institution.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Promoting good industrial relations.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from table 4.13 indicates that despite the fact that the Principals were not given any job descriptions or even inducted, they acknowledged that they were aware of the duties and responsibilities that have been spelt out for them in their Scheme of Service.
4.5.3 Induction through Mentorship and Management of Schools

On whether or not the beginning Principals and other school leaders were inducted into the system through mentors, the respondents responded as shown in table 4.14.

Table 4.14: Induction through Mentorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>D/Principals</th>
<th>H.O.Ds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 4.14 indicates that majority of the respondents (59%) were inducted into their duties and responsibilities by other persons. 57.89% of the Principals admitted that they learnt from their experienced and successful counterparts through consultation. Matters that were mostly consulted on included finances (72.5%), discipline (63.25%), decision making (58.43%) and academics (78.5%). This could also be enhanced through the networks established amongst principals during their annual conferences or any other fora. These findings further confirms that mentoring programs are generally welcomed by beginners (Ricciardi 2000).

Majority of the Principals admitted to having participated in activities organized by The Kenya Secondary Schools Headteachers Association (KSSHA) and attended the Annual Conferences at the district, provincial and national levels. Table 4.15. shows the responses on attendance of Principals’ Annual Conferences.
Table 4.15: Attendance of Principal’s Annual Conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>D/Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of Table 4.15 indicates that 84.21% Principals of secondary schools in Kisumu East District have attended Annual Conferences organized by The Kenya Secondary Schools Headteachers Association (KSSHA) at the District, Provincial or National Levels. Similarly, 25% of the Deputy Principals have also had an opportunity of attending such Conferences as representatives of their Principals.

This is a good indication since in such meetings, they discuss educational issues affecting their schools and ways in which such issues can be addressed. Some of the Issues addressed in these Conferences include; Financial Management, Guidance and Counseling, Discipline, Parenting, School Management, Policy issues amongst others. This forum plays a very big role in the development of principals in that it enables them to socialize and share and exchange ideas on their experiences on how they run their schools, challenges they face and their efforts in unraveling them. They also learn from case studies presented by their colleagues about their successes from which they can borrow a leaf and apply in their schools to bring about improvement. Some principals built networks with their contemporaries through which they continue sharing, advising and supporting each other after the conferences. Kitavi and Van Dan Westhuizen (1997) assert that networking brings about collegiality which is a desired goal for growth and development.
The study also revealed that 67% of the Principals prefer district conferences because they deal with issues specific to their context. This implies the importance of context in that principals are likely not to have many problems when applying what they have learnt from the conferences because the lessons are embedded within their context. This is strongly supported by Goldring and Vye (2004) when they reiterate that, “learning new knowledge from the perspective of how to put it into practice will enable teachers to develop a connected knowledge base that is adaptive for solving their schools’ problems” (p.21). It is very evident that these principals learn a lot from these conferences that can help them bring about school improvement.

4.6 Influence of Understudy Training on Management of Schools

In this chapter, the study hopes to carry out an enquiry into the Understudy training method for purposes of finding out how this training method contributes to the overall management training of future Principals. The Principals were investigated to find out first, what kind of training they impart to their deputies and secondly, the management training they may have undergone while serving as Deputy Principals. Since the Deputy Principals are currently undergoing this mode of training, the study made them the main focus on this issue.

When asked to state the positions they held before being appointed to their present positions, The responses of the Principals and Deputy Principals were as presented in Table 4.16.
Table 4.16: Previous Positions of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Positions</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Deputy Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>254</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.16 indicates that 47.37% of the current Principals had served as Deputy Principals before being appointed as Principals, while 52.63% did not serve as Deputy Principals prior to their appointments. This is an indication that most Principals are not well prepared for the management duties of a school since “good skills in management combine theory and practice to enhance the speed at which diagnosis of problem is made and decisions on their solutions taken.” (Bush, 2003). Understudy is part and parcel of management training for educational institutions. For individuals therefore to ascend to the position of a Principal without ever having understudied another Principal, even if that Principal was not that good is great injustice to that individual.

On the other hand, Since majority of the Deputy Principals had occupy the position of Senior teacher before they became Deputy Principals, the results could be an indication that the position predisposed him or her to handle all students affairs in the school, thereby enhancing his/her skills to manage many persons and therefore making him/her the best choice for a management position, such as the one of Deputy Principal.
4.6.1 Principals Role in Understudy Training on Management of Schools

This section enquires on whether or not the Principals, who are the trainers, do actually create opportunities for Deputy Principals to train during the Understudy. Table 4.17 presents the responses of both the Principals, which were corroborated by the responses of the Deputy Principals on this subject.

Table 4.17: Creation of Training Opportunities during Understudy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>D/Principals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of Table 4.17 show that majority (84.21%) of Principals create opportunities for their present deputies to train under them. This is ascertained by 65% of the Deputy Principals who acknowledges that they have been accorded opportunities to train by their respective Principals.

The study also enquired whether Principals give full mandate to their deputies to execute all the duties and responsibilities of a Principal when they are away. Similarly, the Deputy Principals were asked whether they are given full mandate to execute all the duties and responsibilities of the Principal during their acting period. Table 4.18 represent their respective responses.

Table 4.18: Mandate to execute duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Principals Giving Mandate</th>
<th>D/Principals Given Mandate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.79</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.18 shows that Most Principals (57.79%) give their deputies full mandate to perform all the duties and responsibilities of the Principals while they are away. On the other hand, 25% of the Deputy Principals stated that they were given full mandate to execute all the duties and responsibilities while the Principal was away. However, majority of the Deputy Principals (75%) state that they were not accorded full mandate to execute the duties of the Principal during their acting. The results in Table 4.17 above confirms that it is not just enough to give an individual to act but how much you allow them to access, in terms of power and authority. The quality and not just the quantity of the Understudy training is what matters most.

The researcher went further to highlight each of the duties and responsibilities of the Principal as contained in the Scheme of Service to ascertain whether or not full mandate was given to the Deputy Principals to execute each of the duties when the Principal was away. The findings once again revealed that full mandate was significantly not given to the Deputy Principals in the critical areas of “Finance” and “Planning,” where 68 and 37% respectively of the Deputy Principals indicated that they were not given full mandate to perform those functions.

When asked whether or not they were accorded opportunity to understudy fully the Principals they worked under as deputies, the Deputy Principals responded as presented in Table 4.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Deputy Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.19: Opportunity for the Respondents to fully Understudy the Trainer*
The results shown in Table 4.19 supports the argument that Principals vary in the way they conduct the understudy training. There are some who will accord trainees under them full opportunity to understudy them and there are others who do not for reasons known to themselves. This of course has the consequence of producing half-baked future Principals. The District Education Officer also conceded that there are certain encumbrances that make the Understudy training not fully effective. Some of the reasons he gave as the root cause of this scenario are; incompetence in management of the Principals as well as incompatibility of the Principals and their deputies.

4.6.2 The Deputy Principals experiences through Understudy on management of schools

The study sought to present the Deputy Principals experiences on the Subject of Understudy training in their respective schools to augment their strength in management skills. The Deputy Principals are currently undergoing through Understudy training as they anticipate to ascend to the position of Principalship.

The study also examined whether or not the Deputy Principals had ever been given the opportunity to act as Principals during the time they were undergoing Understudy Training, 75% of the current Deputy Principals indicated that they had had an opportunity to act as Principals while 25% stated they had not been given opportunity to act as Principals. The findings of the study were presented in Table 4.20
Table 4.20: Opportunity to act as Principal during Understudy Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Deputy Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>f  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>f 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>f 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.20 is a plus for the Understudy training however, the most important aspect is how it is done. If acting means there are several functions that are put on hold the whole period the Principal is away, then that acting is just symbolic rather than functional and it serves very little purpose in terms of developing an individual who is expected to ascend to the position he is understudying for.

The Deputy Principals were further asked to state the longest period they had acted as Principals during the Understudy training and they responded as indicated in Table 4.21.

Table 4.21: Duration of acting as Principal during Understudy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of Acting as Principal</th>
<th>Deputy Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-7 days</td>
<td>f 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 weeks</td>
<td>f 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 weeks</td>
<td>f 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 months</td>
<td>f 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 3 months</td>
<td>f 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>f 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.21 show that half of the Deputy Principals (50%) had one weeks as their longest period of acting while 30% of them had two week as their longest acting period. However, 10% had one month and another 5% had acted for over 3 months. This shows that most Deputy Principals get to feel the Principals’ responsibilities which gives them an opportunity to size themselves up. It would be
interesting to find out the kind of exposure each of those categories were accorded by their respective Principals.

Similarly, the study enquired on the level of involvement of Deputy Principals in certain aspects of school management. Table 4.22 presents the respondents ratings on this.

*Table 4.22 Level of involvement of Deputy Principals in Management*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of School Management</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers disciplinary cases</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.O.G matters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students disciplinary matters</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administrative affairs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding issues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking processes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank withdrawal handling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of stores &amp; supplies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.22 shows that most Principals withhold the power and authority from the Deputy Principal to get involved in duties which involves finances. Areas where the Principals perceive a lower accountability in the responsibility, and those that seem general in nature, the Deputy Principal is immensely involved. On the contrary, training in a particular area or job should not have boundaries and should expose the trainees to all that the job entails. From the results there is no duty or responsibility in which all the Deputy Principals have been trained by their Principals to perform to the extent of 100%. The variations in the extent of the training by the Principals equally indicates the type of pace, mode, quality of Understudy training being imparted to the Deputy Principals. This scenario speaks volumes about the
varieties and divergence in terms of quality of Deputy Principals that eventually becomes Principals. This supports the argument that Understudy training alone is inadequate to train Principals of Public Secondary Schools.

The study further investigated whether the Deputy Principals involvement in management of the school involve also the signing of important documents such as the ones listed in Table 4.23 below and their responses were presented as shown below.

Table 4.23: Signing of important Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Maternity Leave Form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Staff Leave Form</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Study Leave Form</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Teachers Clearance Form</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Casualty Return</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 School Cheque</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cash from Bank Form</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cash Surrender Form at the end of the day</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Appointment Return</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Payment Voucher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 4.23 Show that in those responsibilities where a high accountability tag has been placed by the Principal, most Deputy Principals do not gain access to it. It shows that most Deputy Principals get relegated to signing of documents that are of less importance and consequence and which do not involve finances. It is worth mentioning that part of the reason the Principal may not be giving full authority to their deputies to handle issues that touch on finance is that (The Financial Instructions for Educational Institutions, Revised Edition 1991) puts the burden of financial control on the head of the institution. However, most of the respondents attributed this to failure to being among other reasons lack of adequate
skills in delegation on the part of the principals as well as the fact that Principals themselves are not deliberately made aware of their duty and responsibility to train their deputies for the job of Principal.

The study further found out that 55% of the Deputy Principals are confident in performing most of the management tasks of a Principal, while 45% are not confident. When the Deputy Principals were asked to give reasons why they lacked confidence to carry out the management tasks that are part of the Principals job, they gave various reasons and their reactions to this question was presented in Table 4.24.

Table 4.24: Reasons for inconfidence in performing management duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Inconfidence</th>
<th>Deputy Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little exposure</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lack of exposure</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of know how</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 4.24 indicates that 45% of Deputy Principals attribute their lack of confidence to perform management tasks to Little exposure, while 25% attribute it to Total lack of exposure. The main reason behind this can be probably attributed to individuals working under Principals who delegate very little or nothing at all. This usually results in having Deputy Principals who know very little or nothing at all about what the Principals does. Later, if these Deputy Principals ascend to the Positions of Principalship, they usually have a rather stormy take-off which if not checked or well managed can easily bring institutions to their knees. It is therefore a clear indication that the Understudy training method can be dogged by several shortfalls that make it not reliable and that is why formal In-service training in
management is necessary to augment it. Where Understudy training did not attain much, formal In-service training will complement it and where it failed completely, formal In-service training will provide the much needed anchor during the entry into new and higher management positions.

When asked to state the extent Understudy training has aided them in performing their duties and responsibilities. The responses of both the Principals and the Deputy Principals were as indicated the Table 4.25.

Table 4.25: Relevance of Understudy training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Relevance</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>D/Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.25 indicate that 10.26% of the respondents did not benefit from the Understudy training. This implies that there could be a chance that the Understudy Training can totally fail to impart the training it is meant to impart to an individual undertaking it. Out of those who benefited, 7.69% of them did so to an extent of between 1-25%, while 15.38% of them between 26-50%, 41.02% stated that they benefitted between 51-75%. These results further supports the argument that the Understudy training on its own should not be relied upon to produce future Principals because the standards as well as its levels of achievements are as many as there are Deputy Principals and Principals.
4.7 Influence of In-service Programs on Management of Public Secondary Schools

This chapter of the study sought to establish how well the Principals are trained in management through In-service training. The following hypothesis was used to deal with this section: The Principals of Public Secondary Schools are well equipped with the necessary management skills for carrying out both the prescribed and the unpreserved management duties and responsibilities.

4.7.1 Availability of In-service Training and Management of Schools

An enquiry as whether the Principals had undergone any In-service training training on management produced the following results.

*Table 4.26: Attendance of In-service training by respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>D/Principals</th>
<th>H.O.Ds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, an enquiry as to whether or not the Principals had received professional In service training to enable them perform the specific duties and responsibilities as spelt out in the Scheme of Service was made and the Principals’ responses presented in Table 4.27.
Table 4.27: In-service training on specific management duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties and Responsibilities of a Principal</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall Head of Institution under the direction of the Board of Governors</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Serving as Accounting Officer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Responsible for preparation of estimates for current and development expenditure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interpreting and implementing policy decisions pertaining to educational training</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Serving as Secretary to the Board of Governors</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Overall Organizer, Co-ordinator and Supervisor of all activities in the institution</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Responsible for planning, acquisition, development and maintenance of physical facilities at the institution.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Responsible for improving and maintaining high training and learning standards</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Promoting positive linkages between the institution and neighbouring communities and/or other nearby organizations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Co-ordinating specific training and learning activities in the institution</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Promoting liaison between the institution and other private sector organizations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Promoting the welfare of all staff and students within the institution</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Promoting good industrial relations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings in Table 4.26 and 4.27 are in line with those of Bush & Jackson (2002), who established that leadership training was mostly provided on an optional basis for both aspiring and practising principals. This does not appear to have changed, as the current study shows that the average of those Principals who have stated that they had received In-service training in the various duties in the prescribed list stands at 72.78%, while those who stated that they had not received any in-service training in the various duties and responsibilities listed above was 21.07%. This therefore, implies that there is no policy stipulating compulsory in-service training on
management for Principals of secondary schools hence a large number of school leaders lack basic management skills and the lack of in-service training on some areas of management makes a number of Principals not to perform such duties where they have little knowledge in.

4.7.2 Time of the In-Service Training and Management of Schools

The respondents were asked whether they had undergone any specialized training before ascending to their current positions, that had assisted them in carrying out their duties and their responses to this was shown in Table 4.28.

Table 4.28: Time of In-service training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Training</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>D/Principals</th>
<th>H.O.Ds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Appointment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Appointment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.28 indicates that 23% of the respondents underwent formal management training before they were appointed to their respective positions while majority of them (77%) only underwent formal management training after appointment. The study further reveals that 68.42% of the Principals ascended to this position without ever attending any In-service training on management. This means that they had to depend on the Understudy training they had undergone (if at all) to get on with their changed duties and responsibilities. Here lies the risk of conditioning the Principal to apply his/her own devices to run the institution.

On the other hand, With 40% of the Deputy Principals having undergone specialized management training before ascending to that position, it therefore means
that a good number of them were not so raw in terms of management skills at the time of their appointment. However, since majority of the Heads of Departments (85.25%) undertook the management training when they were already appointed in their positions, it is obvious that they may have faced some challenges in going about their duties and responsibilities without the necessary management skills.

The researcher also enquired on the time factor during the In-service training in terms of the number of times the respondents underwent formal In-service training in the last 5 years and also on the duration of such. The responses were presented in Table 4.29.

Table 4.29: Number of In-service training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Trainings</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>D/Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>H.O.Ds</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 times</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 times</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &amp; above times</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of Table 4.29 indicates that most respondents (43%) had attended a total number of between 4-6 In-service trainings in the past 5 years, while 26% had attended between 1-3 In-service trainings. Only 12% of the respondents had attended more than 10 training sessions in the last five years. The study also revealed that (67%) majority of the In-service trainings were those which took only One Day and the longest duration of training attended by the respondents was “Three weeks”, and those who attended it accounts for only 12.5% of the respondents. Though this is better than nothing, this duration of training is not sufficient enough to prepare a
future Principal and other school managers in all the management tasks that he/she is expected to handle.

The respondents without exception recommended that continuous In-service training on management of schools be provided to all Principals and other leaders of Public Secondary Schools. The findings therefore emphasizes the importance of formal In-service training on management for the development of good and successful Principals and other school leaders. This means that there is need for management training to be provided to all Principals and other leaders of Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District and perhaps beyond. This need was demanded for by all the respondents in this study.

4.7.3 Sponsors of In-Service Training and Management of Schools

The respondents were asked whether they had attended any In-service training organized by Kenya Educational Management Institute (KEMI), formerly known as KESI. The results of their responses was represented in Table 4.30.

Table 4.30: In-service trainings by KEMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>H.O.Ds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of Table 4.30 shows that KEMI trained 36.84% of the Principals, 25% of the Deputy Principals and 20% of the Heads of Departments of Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District, this constitute 20% of the respondents. This shows that despite the fact that KEMI is the organization that trains
educational managers for public institutions which includes Public Secondary Schools, only a minority (20%) of those in Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District have had an opportunity to be trained. The burden of In-service training therefore rests on the school where the respondents worked or on the respondent himself/herself. Since training cost money, this implies that those schools which have funds they have set aside for this purpose will take their staff for training while those without sufficient funds to support training or those which have placed no value on training will not take their staff for training.

4.7.4 Relevance of In-Service Training on Management of Schools

When the respondents were asked to state whether the amount of In-service training so far received was sufficient enough to enable them perform their management duties. The respondents responded as shown in Table 4.31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Principals f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D/Principals f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>H.O.Ds f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.79</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.89</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67.21</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.31 shows that 57.89% of the Principals, 70% of the Deputy Principals and 67% of the Heads of Departments felt that the In-service training so far received was not sufficient. This constitute 66% of the respondents. Only 42.11% of the Principals, 30% of the Deputy Principals and 32.79% of the Heads of Departments felt that the In-service training they have so far received was adequate for them to perform their duties and responsibilities. These findings indicates that management training especially at the level of Deputy Principal, and Heads of Departments was
still wanting. The fact that it is from these positions that Principals are drawn from, urgently calls for this inadequacy in management training at this levels to be addressed because this is the foundation for leadership in management in Public Secondary Schools.

The study further revealed that there are certain areas in the duties and responsibilities of the Principal that appear to be more crucial and where further training is demanded. 75% of the Principals desired to have further training in the area of “Serving as Accounting Officer”, which in essence is management in general. Another area was “Planning, Acquisition, Development and Maintenance of Physical facilities at the institution, where 62.5% indicated their desire for more training. Other areas of need also include; “Interpreting and implementing Policy Decisions pertaining to educational training” (57.2%), and “Promoting good industrial relations” (56.5% ). From the facts given above concerning In-service training of the respondents, it is clear that there are certain areas that the Principals and other schools leaders are not adequately prepared in. Some of these areas are incidentally at the heart of management in any organization and are the core of business management. Therefore, if the Principals and other school leaders feel grossly inadequate in them then it means that their institutions are at risk of not performing favourably.

It is therefore evident from the fore presented facts that the Principals and other schools leaders in Kisumu East District are lacking in management training and desire to access more training than they had before because they still feel inept to effectively perform in some of those technical areas of management.

The Indian Perspective SAPRE (2002) states that “management is a set of activities directed towards efficient utilization of organizational resources in order to
achieve organizational goals.” This is what the Principals and other leaders of Public Secondary Schools seek to do and should be made to do. However, they will not be able to do so without equipping them with the relevant management training through an effective In-service system.

According to the Quebec Plan of Action, management training is imperative for an educational manager because among other benefits it helps to “getting the Principals to appreciate the fact that effectiveness cannot be measured in a vacuum. Knowledge and skills are paramount in empowering the Principals to strengthen education systems and the management of educational institutions” (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Formal management is necessary for all Principals even if they have undergone understudy training. “Theories of Frumee determine what we see and what we do.... Managers need better theories, as well as the ability to implement those theories with skill and grace” (Bolman and Deal, 1997). Bolman and Deal further assert that “management activity is enhanced by an explicit awareness of the theoretical framework underpinning practice in educational institutions.”
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the findings of the study, gives conclusions and further gives recommendations of the research findings. This chapter also gives the contribution of the research to the body of knowledge.

5.2 Summary of research findings

The study investigated the Influence of Preparation and Development of Principals on Management of Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District. The first objective of the study examined the extent to which pre-service programs influence the management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District. Pre-service programs was conceptualized into; academic training and experience of the respondents.

The study revealed that 85% of the respondents had a degree or Diploma certificate and were therefore qualified to hold leadership positions in schools, in particular, 21.05% of the present Principals of secondary schools in the district have a degree or Masters, this has some positive impact on the overall management of secondary schools in Kisumu East District since a majority of them had pursued the line of management at the Masters’ level.

The study further revealed that the kind of training undertaken at the Universities and other colleges did not adequately prepare most of the respondents for all the management duties and responsibilities they are required to handle especially
in those critical and sensitive areas of management such as financial management. This was supported by 67.5% of the respondents while only 23% did not support. The study also revealed that experience had an influence on management of schools. Majority of the Principals (80.5%) were in Job Group M and Q, which suggest that they had a lot of experience in teaching.

The second objective of the study sought to determine the influence of induction programs on management of public secondary schools. The findings showed that there was a positive relationship. Regarding the influence of orientation training on management of public secondary schools, 66.40% of respondents were in agreement that orientation training is an important factor to consider in effective management of schools. 34.20% disagreed.

The study revealed that majority of the principals, 62.2% never received any form of orientation training on appointment, while only 32% were given orientation on appointment. On the provision of Job description manuals on the actual duties and responsibilities of a principal, the study found out that 65% of the respondents considers the manuals on Job descriptions as quite essential as they embark on their duties, while only 10% did not support this fact. However, only 10% of the principals were provided with manuals detailing their duties and responsibilities, while majority, 87% were not provided with such essential manuals at the time of their appointment as principals.

They are instead left to fend for themselves as far as management of their schools is concerned. 85% of the Principals, 67% of the Deputy Principals and a further 60% of the Heads of Departments revealed that they were not aware of their prescribed duties and responsibilities and had to grope in the dark for sometime.
before they found their bearing. It was therefore evident that the majority of the Principals (70%) perform duties over and above those prescribed in their job description given in their Scheme of Service.

The third objective of the study investigated how understudy training influence management of public secondary schools. 80.3% of the respondents acknowledged that there was a direct relationship between the Understudy training and management of public secondary school, only 12% did not support this fact. Understudy training was viewed as necessary by 80% of the Principals who had undergone understudy training while serving as Deputy Principals and 60% of the Deputy Principals, who were still undergoing the Understudy training.

The study found that the Understudy training was viewed necessary and important in management training because of the benefits accrued in combining theory with practice. Majority of the respondents 75.5% supported this fact while a few, 18.2% did not support this fact. 67.5% of the respondents noted that relying on understudy method purely to train principals was risky because the levels and quality of understudy varied between trainer (principal) to trainer (principal) arising due to differences in attitude, styles, method, quantity and quality of the training adopted. However, 17.5% of the respondents held different opinion on the same.

The study further revealed that majority of the Principals tend to retain some duties exclusively for themselves and assigning their deputies duties that are very general in nature and which do not carry very serious accountability tags. This denies their deputies opportunities to train in performing such duties and responsibilities. The strengths and weaknesses of the Understudy method makes its contribution towards management training as assessed by majority of the respondents, to be about 50%. 
This makes it part and parcel of management training and therefore renders incomplete any management training that excludes it.

The fourth objective of the study assessed the extent in-service programs influence management of Public Secondary Schools. 89% of the respondents were in agreement that In-service training is an important factor to consider in effective management of schools. The findings showed that 60% of the respondents had had an opportunity to attend In-service training since their appointment while 36% had not attended any In-service training of any nature. In-service training was mostly available to the Principals with 70% of them having attended either a workshop, seminar or conference, while only 12% of the current principals had never got an opportunity to attend In-service training since ascending in those positions. On the other hand the Deputy Principals and Heads of Departments seem to have been left behind as far as In-service training is concerned as 70% of the Deputy Principals and 68% of the Heads of Department denied ever attending any In-service training since their appointment.

The question on when In-service training should be undertaken evoked mixed reactions with 56% of the respondents advocating for it to be undertaken before one ascends to a leadership position, while 46% advocating for it to be undertaken after one ascends to a leadership position. 70% of the respondents underscored the fact that In-service training on management is important at all stages and/or levels of the management ladder right from Head of Department to the Principal. 70% of the respondents felt that the duration of the In-service training is not sufficient enough to prepare a future Principal in all the management tasks as 80% of the In-service trainings they attended only lasted for one day while just 12% of such trainings took
more than two weeks. On the providers of In-service training for school leaders, the study found out that Teachers Service Commission does not take school leaders for formal management training. The little In-service management training the respondents have received was not from KESI, the designated management training provider for Public Educational Institutions with only 20% of the respondents admitting having attended In-service management training organized by KESI. This results show that the availability, time, sponsors and relevance of any In-service training affects the management of schools.

5.3 Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine the Influence of Preparation and Development of Principals on Management of Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District. Regarding the stated research objectives, the following findings emerged from the study.

The findings of this study have revealed that the management skills required for effective management of public secondary schools require some formal management training which majority of the Principals have had very little of or none at all. The study established that majority of the Principals consider the Pre-service training they had undergone to be insufficient to enable them perform satisfactorily all the duties and responsibilities they are currently shouldering. Similarly, it was established that no formal management training is given to the Principals during their Pre-service training and that management training is not a pre-requisite for appointment to Principalship. Those recruited for this position do not necessarily need to have trained in management.
The study established that although the Understudy training has weaknesses, its contribution towards management training should not be underestimated. It is complementary to the overall formal management training that all management trainees ought to undergo. However, no mechanisms have been put in place by the employer to compel all Principals to deliberately go out of their way to train their deputies nor are there set mechanisms to monitor and evaluate the quantity and quality of the Understudy training undertaken by Deputy Principals. The Understudy training given to Deputy Principals by their Principals is not complete and varies in extent from one Principal to another.

The scenario of having Principals who are untrained in management and then left to devise their own methods of managing schools, does not augur well when such a person is left to be the sole trainers of aspiring Principal. This is because poor management practices and legacies of some Principals are likely to penetrate to those understudying them.

Being managers of institutions of learning, Principals need to be fully equipped with relevant management skills through the provision of appropriate and adequate training in both management theory as well as practice. In a world where standards and quality of performance have become a great concern of both the commodity and its service delivery, a Principal who falls short of any management skills is a Principal unprepared for the task of managing an educational institution.

The overall conclusion is that Principals of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District are not fully prepared for all the management tasks they handle in their institutions. First and foremost, they are not exposed to any meaningful
management training before pre-service as such training is not a compulsory criterion for appointment to the position of Principalship.

Secondly, the Principals have a poor and difficult start on being appointed since neither Job specification nor induction is given to them. The employer of Principals of public secondary schools (The Teachers’ Service Commission) is also not responsible for the training, preparation or upgrading of Principals in management skills before or after their appointments. There is also very little in terms of management training at the ranks below that of a Principal. It should not therefore be assumed that at the time a person is appointed as a Principal, he/she is already fully equipped with all the necessary management skills to enable him/her carry out all his/her duties and responsibilities effectively.

Thirdly, the Understudy training method which the employer has in the past immensely relied upon for training of Principals is inadequate for the needs of the duties and responsibilities handled by Principals. This training is conducted in a haphazard manner and its contents and quality remain unquantified, unqualitiated as well as unverified. Therefore formal management training is very necessary for all Principals as well as all other staff in the organization handling management duties.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions drawn above, the study made the following recommendations:

The first objective determined the extent to which pre-service programs influences management of public secondary schools. The study recommended that there should be a revision of the pre-requisite for appointment to the positions of
Principal and Deputy Principal to include training in management. The study further recommended that Universities and other Tertiary Institutions in Kenya offering Education based courses should revise their pre-service curriculum to make the course covering management more detailed in terms of content, methodology and resources.

In the second objective, the study established the extent to which induction programs influences management of public secondary schools. The study recommended that That the Teachers Service Commission inducts all newly recruited Principals before they take up their duties and the Teachers Service Commission should be compelled to attach a Job description to the letter of appointment for all management positions in public secondary schools.

In the third objective, the study evaluated how the understudy training influence management of public secondary schools. The study therefore recommended that a policy be made by Teachers Service Commission in conjunction with the Ministry of Education to compell the Principals to expose their deputies to a prescribed list of duties and responsibilities, The Ministry of Education should also deploy sufficiently qualified personnel in the Inspectorate section to enhance its capacity to monitor and evaluate the performance of the Deputy Principals as they undergo the Understudy training.

The fourth objective of the study assessed the extent to which in-service programs influence management of public secondary schools. The study recommended that there should be a comprehensive training and development programmes for Principals in the area of management. The Teachers Service Commission should therefore provide continuous short management training to all Principals and other school leaders since management requires sufficient knowledge.
and skills. Therefore, In-service courses should be mandatory, longer in duration, organised in manageable units, and be more frequent and systematic.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Study

The study suggest that in future, a similar research should be carried out in other counties in Kenya on Influence of Preparation and Development of Principals on Management of Public Secondary Schools, so as to compare with the findings of this study.

The study recommends that in future a study should be undertaken to find out the effects of lack of professional management training on the performance of Public Secondary schools.

5.6 Contribution to the Body of Knowledge

Table 5.1 shows the contributions of the study to the body of knowledge. It highlights the gains to be realized from the study which will add knowledge to the present situation.

Table 5.1: Contributions of the Study to the Body of Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Contribution to the Body of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To examine the extent to which pre-service programs influence management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District.</td>
<td>The study revealed that academic qualifications and experience had a positive influence on management of schools. 85% of the respondents had a degree or Diploma certificate and were therefore qualified to hold leadership positions in schools, this has some positive impact on the overall management of secondary schools since a majority of them had pursued the line of management at the Masters’ level. Similarly, majority of the Principals (80.5%) were in Job Group M and Q, which suggest that they had a lot of experience in teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To establish the extent to which induction programs influence</td>
<td>The study found that majority of the principals, 62.2% never received any form of orientation training on appointment. Only 10% of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District. Principals were provided with manuals detailing their duties and responsibilities and they are instead left to fend for themselves as far as management of their schools is concerned. A majority of the Principals were not aware of their prescribed duties and responsibilities and 70% of them perform duties over and above those prescribed in their job description given in their Scheme of Service.

3. To evaluate how the understudy training influence management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District. The study found that Understudy training was viewed as necessary by 80% of the Principals who had undergone understudy training while serving as Deputy Principals and 60% of the Deputy Principals, who were still undergoing the Understudy training. The strengths and weaknesses of the Understudy method makes its contribution towards management training as assessed by majority of the respondents, to be about 50%. 67.5% of the respondents noted that relying on understudy method purely to train principals was risky because the levels and quality of understudy varied between trainer (principal) to trainer (principal) arising due to differences in attitude, styles, method, quantity and quality of the training adopted.

4. To assess the extent to which in-service programs influence management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District. The study found that In-service training is an important factor to consider in effective management of schools. 60% of the respondents had had an opportunity to attend In-service training since their appointment. In-service training was mostly available to the Principals with 70% of them having attended either a workshop, seminar or conference, the Deputy Principals and Heads of Departments seem to have been left behind as 70% of the Deputy Principals and 68% of the Heads of Department denied ever attending any In-service training since their appointment. 70% of the respondents felt that the duration of the In-service training is not sufficient enough to prepare a future Principal in all the management tasks as 80% of the In-service trainings they attended only lasted for one day while just 12% of such trainings took more than two weeks.
REFERENCES


Ngechu, M (2004). *Understanding the Research Project and Methods*; published by University of Nairobi


Ribbins, P. (2008), *A Life and Career Based Framework for the Study of Leaders in Education*, in J. Lumby,


Dear Sir/ Madam,

RE: REQUEST FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN MY RESEARCH PROJECT

I am currently a student at the University of Nairobi, Kisumu Town Campus, undertaking a Master of Arts degree in Project Planning and Management. I am required to submit, as part of my course work assessment, a research project on “The Influence of Preparation and Development of Principals on Management of Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District.”

It is for this reason therefore, that I wish to kindly request for your indulgence to participate in the study by completing the attached questionnaire. Your contribution is crucial in ensuring that the study succeeds. Any information provided will be treated with utmost confidentiality it deserves and will not be used for any other purpose. The information given should be without any biases and should be true as it will be used for academic purposes only.

Participation in the survey is voluntary, and you can choose not to take part. If you have any question please feel free to ask otherwise if you accept to participate please sign below.

Signature: _________________________ Date: _______________

(Your signature means you have understood and accepted to participate in this survey.)

I look forward to your understanding, co-operation and invaluable participation in this very important exercise. Your assistance will be highly appreciated.

Thanks in advance.

Yours sincerely,

Onyango Clifford Ouma
L50/61656/2013
Appendix II: Questionnaire for Principal

PART I: Demographic Information

(Please tick (√) in the box of the answer applicable to you.)

1. Gender:
   i Male [  ]
   ii Female [  ]

2. Age Bracket:
   20-30 [  ]
   31-40 [  ]
   41-50 [  ]
   51-60 [  ]

3. Academic qualification (Highest level attained)
   i Diploma in Education [  ]
   ii B.Ed [  ]
   iii P.G.D.E [  ]
   iv Masters [  ]
   v P.hd [  ]
   vi Others (Please specify) .................................................................

4. Please specify your area(s) of specialization here below.
   ...........................................................................................................

5. What is your current Job group?
   i M [  ]
   ii N [  ]
   iii P [  ]
   iv Q [  ]
   v R [  ]
   vi Others (Specify)...........................................................................

PART II: Influence of Pre-service Programs on Management of Schools

6. For how long have you been a principal?
   i Less than 1 year [  ]
   ii 1-5 years [  ]
   iii 6-10 years [  ]
   iv 11-15 years [  ]
   v Over 15 years [  ]

7. What position did you hold just before you ascended to the position of Principal?
   i Deputy Principal [  ]
   ii Senior teacher [  ]
   iii Dean of Students [  ]
   iv Head of Department [  ]
   v Classroom teacher [  ]
8. Did you undergo any management training while serving at the lower positions?
   i  YES [    ]
   ii NO [    ]

9. Did you receive any management training during your teacher training at college/University?
   i  YES [    ]
   ii NO [    ]

10. At what stage should formal management training be given to a principal?
    i  During teacher training at college/University [    ]
    ii Before taking up duties as Principal [    ]
    iii After taking up duties as Principal [    ]

11. Here below are the duties and responsibilities of the principal as spelled out by the Directorate of Personnel Management in the Revised Scheme of Service for Graduate Teachers (2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties and Responsibilities of a Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Overall Head of Institution under the direction of the Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Serving as Accounting Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Responsible for preparation of estimates for current and development expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Interpreting and implementing policy decisions pertaining to educational training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Serving as Secretary to the Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Overall Organizer, Co-ordinator and Supervisor of all activities in the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Responsible for planning, acquisition, development and maintenance of physical facilities at the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Responsible for improving and maintaining high training and learning standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Promoting positive linkages between the institution and neighbouring communities and/or other nearby organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Co-ordinating specific training and learning activities in the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Promoting liaison between the institution and other private sector organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Promoting the welfare of all staff and students within the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Promoting good industrial relations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Were you aware of these duties and responsibilities before you were appointed as a Principal?
   i  YES [    ]
   ii NO [    ]

12. Does the above prescribed list of duties and responsibilities for the Principal cover all the duties and responsibilities you perform in your job currently?
   i  YES [    ]
   ii NO [    ]
13. To what extent do you feel the pre-service programs has enabled you to perform your duties and responsibilities as a manager of a Secondary School?
   i  0% [ ]
   ii 1-25% [ ]
   iii 26-50% [ ]
   iv 51-75% [ ]
   v 76-100% [ ]

PART III: Influence of Induction Programs on Management of Schools

14. Did you receive any induction training on your appointment as a Principal?
   i YES [ ]
   ii NO [ ] (If No skip to 16)

15. If the answer to question No 14 above is YES, which of the following induction strategies was used to induct you on your appointment as a Principal?
   i Provided with manuals with Job specifications [ ]
   ii Orientation on their duties and responsibilities [ ]
   iii Used other people as mentors [ ]
   iv Used networks and linkages [ ]
   v Others (Please specify) ..............................................

16. On your appointment as a principal to this institution, did your employer supply you with a manual of your Job Specification?
   i YES [ ]
   ii NO [ ]

17. Did anyone else explain the Job Specification to you before embarking on the principals job?
   i YES [ ] (If yes skip to 17)
   ii NO [ ]

18. If the answer to questions No. 8 and 9 above were ‘NO’ which of the following did you apply to help you to set off on the principals job?
   i Trial and error [ ]
   ii Consulted authorities [ ]
   iii Refered to guides [ ]
   iv Refered to literary materials [ ]
   v Simply groped in the dark [ ]
   vi Others (Please specify) ..............................................
19. Please indicate using a tick (√) whether or not you were inducted to perform each of the following prescribed duties and responsibilities of the Principal of a secondary school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF A PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Overall Head of Institution under the direction of the Board of Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Serving as Accounting Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Responsible for preparation of estimates for current and development expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Interpreting and implementing policy decisions pertaining to educational training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Serving as Secretary to the Board of Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Overall Organizer, Co-ordinator and Supervisor of all activities in the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Responsible for planning, acquisition, development and maintenance of physical facilities at the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Responsible for improving and maintaining high training and learning standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Promoting positive linkages between the institution and neighbouring communities and/or other nearby organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Co-ordinating specific training and learning activities in the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Promoting liaison between the institution and other private sector organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Promoting the welfare of all staff and students within the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Promoting good industrial relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Does the above prescribed list of duties and responsibilities for the Principal cover all the duties and responsibilities you perform in your job currently?
   i YES [    ]
   ii NO [    ]

21. In carrying out the prescribed duties and responsibilities, do you perform the following tasks? (tick (√) appropriately)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT TASK OF A PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Planning and Organizing Board of Governors meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Planning and Organizing other meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Taking minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Resource mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Procurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Letter writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. To what extent do you feel the induction programs have enabled you to perform your duties and responsibilities as a manager of a Secondary School?

i. 0% [ ]

ii. 1-25% [ ]

iii. 26-50% [ ]

iv. 51-75% [ ]

v. 76-100% [ ]

PART IV: Influence of Understudy Training on Management of Schools

23. Did you serve as a Deputy Principal before your appointment as a Principal?

i. YES [ ]

ii. NO [ ]

24. For how long did you serve as a Deputy Principal?

i. Less than 1 year [ ]

ii. 1-3 years [ ]
iii 4-6 years  [  ]  
iv 7-9 years  [  ]  
v 10 years and above  [  ]

25. Did the Principal you worked under accord you the opportunity to participate and understudy him in all the duties and responsibilities you saw him perform?
   i  YES  [  ]
   ii  NO  [  ]

26. In your opinion, to what extent did she/he enable you to train in all the duties and responsibilities she/he was performing?
   i  0%  [  ]
   ii 1-25%  [  ]
   iii 26-50%  [  ]
   iv 51-75%  [  ]
   v 76-100%  [  ]

27. As a Principal, to what extent do you feel you have trained your deputy in each of the following duties and responsibilities that you perform? (tick (✓) appropriately)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF A PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Overall Head of Institution under the direction of the Board of Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Serving as Accounting Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Responsible for preparation of estimates for current and development expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Interpreting and implementing policy decisions pertaining to educational training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Serving as Secretary to the Board of Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Overall Organizer, Co-ordinator and Supervisor of all activities in the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Responsible for planning, acquisition, development and maintenance of physical facilities at the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Responsible for improving and maintaining high training and learning standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Promoting positive linkages between the institution and neighbouring communities and/or other organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Co-ordinating specific training and learning activities in the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Promoting liaison between the institution and other private sector organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Promoting the welfare of all staff and students within the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Promoting good industrial relations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. Do you deliberately create opportunities for your Deputy to train in the duties and responsibilities that you perform?
   i  YES [ ]
   ii  NO [ ] (If ‘No’ skip to 31)

29. If the answer to No. 29 above is ‘YES’. How do you create the Understudy training opportunities for your Deputy? Through;
   i  Delegation [ ]
   ii  Assigning the Deputy specific duties to perform [ ]
   iii  Carrying out some duties and responsibilities together [ ]
   iv  Allowing the Deputy to act in full capacity in your absence [ ]
   v  Others (Please specify) .................................................................

30. How would you rate your level of involvement in the following aspects of school management? (Indicate using a tick (√)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of School Management</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Teachers disciplinary cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 B.O.G matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Students disciplinary matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 General administrative affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Boarding issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Banking processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Bank withdrawal handling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Procurement of stores &amp; supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Are you confident today that your deputy can make a good principal with the understudy training (mentorship) you have imparted to him/her?
   i  YES [ ]
   ii  NO [ ]

32. Does the Understudy training undertaken at Deputy Principal level adequate to satisfy the demands of the duties and responsibilities of a principals’ job?
   i  YES [ ]
   ii  NO [ ]

33. Despite undergoing through Understudy training as a Deputy Principal, do you think there is still a need for you to undergo further formal training to enhance performance of certain management duties.
   i  YES [ ]
   ii  NO [ ]
34. To what extent do you feel you are able to carry out your current duties and responsibilities as a manager of a secondary school as a result of the Understudy training you received when you served as a Deputy Principal?
   i  0% [ ]
   ii 1-25% [ ]
   iii 26-50% [ ]
   iv 51-75% [ ]
   v 76-100% [ ]

PART V: Influence of In-Service Programs on Management of Schools Training

35. Have you ever attended any In-service program on management since you became a principal?
   i YES [ ] (If ‘Yes’ skip to 37)
   ii NO [ ]

36. If the answer to No 35 above is NO, Why?
   .............................................................................................................................
   ..................................................................................................................................

37. How many times have you attended an in-service program in the past five years?
   i 1-3 times [ ]
   ii 4-6 times [ ]
   iii 7-9 times [ ]
   iv 10 and above times [ ]

38. Indicate the duration of the in-service training(s) you have attended? (Tick (√) as appropriate)
   i Less than one day [ ]
   ii One day [ ]
   iii Less than one week [ ]
   iv One week [ ]
   v Two weeks [ ]
   vi Three weeks [ ]
   vii One month [ ]
   viii More than one month [ ]

39. Which organization(s) organized and/or facilitated the In-service training(s) you attended?
   i Kenya Educational Management Institute (KEMI) [ ]
   ii Kenya Institute of Management (KIM) [ ]
   iii District Education Office [ ]
   iv Kenya Secondary Schools Heads Association (KSSHA) [ ]
   v Teachers Service Commission (TSC) [ ]
   vi School [ ]
   vii Others (Please specify) .................................................................

40. Is the training you have so far received sufficient enough to enable you perform satisfactorily all the duties and responsibilities that you are currently shouldering?
41. Do you think it is necessary to continue to undertake short management courses even after formal management training has been undertaken?
    i  YES  [  ]
    ii NO  [  ]

42. If you were to be given the opportunity to recommend when formal management training should be given to the school administrators, what would you choose?
    i  Before appointment  [  ]
    ii  After appointment  [  ]
    iii Both Before and after appointment  [  ]
    Others (Please specify) ..........................................................................................................................  

43. To what extent do you feel the in-service programs have enabled you to perform your duties and responsibilities as a manager of a secondary school?
    i  0%  [  ]
    ii  1-25%  [  ]
    iii  26-50%  [  ]
    iv  51-75%  [  ]
    v  76-100%  [  ]

THANK YOU
Appendix III: Questionnaire For Deputy Principal

PART I: Demographic Information
(Please tick (✓) in the box of the answer applicable to you.)

1. Gender:
   i. Male [ ]
   ii. Female [ ]

2. Age Bracket:
   20-30 [ ]
   31-40 [ ]
   41-50 [ ]
   51-60 [ ]

3. Academic qualification (Highest level attained)
   i. Diploma in Education [ ]
   ii. B.Ed [ ]
   iii. P.G.D.E [ ]
   iv. Masters [ ]
   v. P.hd [ ]
   vi. Others (Please specify) ...........................................

4. Please specify your area(s) of specialization here below.
   ........................................................................................................

5. What is your current Job group?
   i. M [ ]
   ii. N [ ]
   iii. P [ ]
   iv. Q [ ]
   v. R [ ]
   vi. Others (Specify) ...........................................................................

PART II: Influence of Pre-service Programs on Management of Schools

6. For how long have you been Deputy principal?
   i. Less than 1 year [ ]
   ii. 1-5 years [ ]
   iii. 6-10 years [ ]
   iv. 11-15 years [ ]
   v. Over 15 years [ ]

7. What position did you hold just before you ascended to the position of Deputy Principal?
   i. Head of Department [ ]
   ii. Classroom teacher [ ]
   iii. Dean of Students [ ]
   iv. None of the above [ ]
   v. Others (Please specify) ......................................................................
8. Did you undergo any management training while serving at the lower positions?
   i  YES [ ]
   ii  NO [ ]

9. Did you receive any management training during your teacher training at college/University?
   i  YES [ ]
   ii  NO [ ]

10. At what stage should formal management training be given to a Deputy principal?
    i  During teacher training at college/University [ ]
    ii  Before taking up duties as Principal [ ]
    iii  After taking up duties as Principal [ ]

11. According to the Scheme of Service for Graduate Teachers by the Teachers Service Commission, your duties and responsibilities as a Deputy Principal are listed here below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties and Responsibilities of a Deputy Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Deputy head of the institution who takes charge of all aspects of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional administration when the Principal is not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Responsible for the Principal for Guidance and Counseling of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trainers and trainees as well as ensuring that proper discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is maintained in the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ensuring that examinations and assessments are carried out and that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper scheduling of instructional programs are done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Responsible to the Principal for the organizational and supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of institution activities and events including maintaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleanliness and general repairs of buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 In charge of stores and requisitions and the maintenance of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper inventory records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Responsible to the Principal for the supervision of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff and other institutional employees in the proper discharge of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutions programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Were you aware of these duties and responsibilities before you were appointed as a Deputy Principal?
   i  YES [ ]
   ii  NO [ ]

12. Does the above prescribed list of duties and responsibilities for the Principal cover all the duties and responsibilities you perform in your job currently?
   i  YES [ ]
   ii  NO [ ]

13. To what extent do you feel the pre-service programs has enabled you to perform your duties and responsibilities as a manager of a Secondary School?
   i  0% [ ]
   ii  1-25% [ ]
   iii  26-50% [ ]
PART III: Influence of Induction Programs on Management of Schools

14. Did you receive any induction training on your appointment as a Deputy Principal?
   i  YES [ ]
   ii NO [ ] (If No skip to 16)

15. If the answer to question No 14 above is YES, which of the following induction strategies was used to induct you on your appointment as a Deputy Principal?
   i  Provided with manuals with Job specifications [ ]
   ii Orientation on their duties and responsibilities [ ]
   iii Used other people as mentors [ ]
   iv Used networks and linkages [ ]
   v Others (Please specify) ..........................................................

16. On your appointment as a Deputy Principal to this institution, did your employer supply you with a manual of your Job Specification?
   i  YES [ ]
   ii NO [ ]

17. Did anyone else explain the Job Specification to you before embarking on the principals job?
   i  YES [ ] (If yes skip to 19)
   ii NO [ ]

18. If the answer to questions No. 16 and 17 above were ‘NO’ which of the following did you apply to help you to set off on the principals job?
   i  Trial and error [ ]
   ii Consulted authorities [ ]
   iii Referred to guides [ ]
   iv Simply groped in the dark [ ]
   v Others (Please specify) ................................................................

19. Please indicate using a tick (√) whether or not you were inducted to perform each of the following prescribed duties and responsibilities of the Deputy Principal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties and Responsibilities of a Deputy Principal</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Deputy head of the institution who takes charge of all aspects of institutional administration when the Principal is not available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Responsible for the Principal for Guidance and Counseling of trainers and trainees as well as ensuring that proper discipline is maintained in the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ensuring that examinations and assessments are carried out and that proper scheduling of instructional programs are done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Responsible to the Principal for the organizational and supervision of institution activities and events including maintaining cleanliness and general repairs of buildings.

5 In charge of stores and requisitions and the maintenance of proper inventory records.

6 Responsible to the Principal for the supervision of teaching staff and other institutional employees in the proper discharge of institution programs.

20. Does the above prescribed list of duties and responsibilities for the Principal cover all the duties and responsibilities you perform in your job currently?
   i  YES [ ]
   ii NO [ ]

21. In carrying out the prescribed duties and responsibilities, do you perform the following tasks? (tick (√) appropriately)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Task of a Principal</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Planning and Organizing Board of Governors meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Planning and Organizing other meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Taking minutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Resource mobilization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Procurement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Letter writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Report writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Boarding and Lodging Management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Minutes writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Tender writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Legal advisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Crisis Management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Financial Management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Local Purchase Order Processing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Security.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Public Relations and Information Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Supervision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Legal advisor on the ground.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Human Resource Management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Community Leader.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Human Relations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Arbitrator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Driver.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Property Manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Inventory Manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Property Developer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. To what extent do you feel the induction programs have enabled you to perform your duties and responsibilities as a manager of a Secondary School?
   i. 0%  [ ]
   ii. 1-25%  [ ]
   iii. 26-50%  [ ]
   iv. 51-75%  [ ]
   v. 76-100%  [ ]

PART IV: Influence of Understudy Training on Management of Schools

23. Has the Principal you work under accord you the opportunity to participate and understudy him in all the duties and responsibilities you see him perform?
   i. YES  [ ]
   ii. NO  [ ]

24. In your opinion, to what extent does she/he enable you to train in all the duties and responsibilities she/he performs?
   i. 0%  [ ]
   ii. 1-25%  [ ]
   iii. 26-50%  [ ]
   iv. 51-75%  [ ]
   v. 76-100%  [ ]

25. To what extent do you feel you have been trained by your Principal in each of the following duties and responsibilities of a Principal? (tick (√) appropriately)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties and Responsibilities of a Principal</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Overall Head of Institution under the direction of the Board of Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Serving as Accounting Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Responsible for preparation of estimates for current and development expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Interpreting and implementing policy decisions pertaining to educational training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Serving as Secretary to the Board of Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Overall Organizer, Co-ordinator and Supervisor of all activities in the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Responsible for planning, acquisition, development and maintenance of physical facilities at the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Responsible for improving and maintaining high training and learning standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Promoting positive linkages between the institution and neighbouring communities and/or other organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Co-ordinating specific training and learning activities in the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Promoting liaison between the institution and other private sector organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Promoting the welfare of all staff and students within the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Promoting good industrial relations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Does your Principal deliberately create opportunities for you to train in the duties and responsibilities that he/she performs?  
   i. YES [ ]  
   ii. NO [ ] *(If ‘No’ skip to 29)*

27. If the answer to No. 27 above is ‘YES’. How does your Principal create the Understudy training opportunities for you? Through;  
   i. Delegation [ ]  
   ii. Assigning me specific duties to perform [ ]  
   iii. Carrying out some duties and responsibilities together [ ]  
   iv. Allowing the me to act in full capacity in his/her absence [ ]  
   v. Others (Please specify) .................................................................

28. How would you rate your level of involvement in the following aspects of school management? *(Indicate using a tick (✓))*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of School Management</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Teachers disciplinary cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 B.O.G matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Students disciplinary matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 General administrative affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Boarding issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Banking processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Bank withdrawal handling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Procurement of stores &amp; supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. Are you confident today that you can make a good Principal with the understudy training that has been imparted to you?
   i  YES  [  ]
   ii NO  [  ]

30. Have you ever got opportunity to act as principal?
   i  YES  [  ] (If ‘Yes’ skip to 11)
   ii NO  [  ]

31. If your answer to No 9 above is ‘NO’, why?
   .................................................................................................................................

32. If ‘YES’ what is the longest period you have acted as a principal?
   i  1-7 days  [  ]
   ii 1-2 weeks  [  ]
   iii 3-4weeks  [  ]
   iv 1-3 months  [  ]
   v Over 3 months  [  ]

33. Did you (during your acting) get full mandate to perform all the duties and responsibilities of a principal?
   i  YES  [  ]
   ii NO  [  ]

34. Please indicate using a tick ( √ ) against each of the listed duties and responsibilities of the Principal given below whether or not full mandate to perform them was granted during your acting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties and Responsibilities of a Principal</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Head of Institution under the direction of the Board of Governors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving as Accounting Officer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for preparation of estimates for current and development expenditure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting and implementing policy decisions pertaining to educational training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving as Secretary to the Board of Governors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Organizer, Co-ordinator and Supervisor of all activities in the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for planning, acquisition, development and maintenance of physical facilities at the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for improving and maintaining high training and learning standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting positive linkages between the institution and neighbouring communities and/or other nearby organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinating specific training and learning activities in the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting liaison between the institution and other private sector organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the welfare of all staff and students within the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting good industrial relations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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35. Have you ever signed any of the following documents on behalf of your Principal?

(Indicate using a tick (√))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENTS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Maternity Leave Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Staff Leave Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Study Leave Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Teachers Clearance Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Casualty Return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 School Cheque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cash from Bank Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cash Surrender Form at the end of the day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Appointment Return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Payment Voucher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Does the Understudy training undertaken at the Deputy Principal level adequate to carry out the demands of the duties and responsibilities of a Principals’ job?

i YES [ ]

ii NO [ ]

37. Despite undergoing through Understudy training, do you think there is still a need for you to undergo further formal training to enhance performance of certain management duties.

i YES [ ]

ii NO [ ]

38. To what extent do you feel you are able to carry out your duties and responsibilities as a manager of a secondary school as a result of the Understudy training you have received so far as a Deputy Principal?

i 0% [ ]

ii 1-25% [ ]

iii 26-50% [ ]

iv 51-75% [ ]

v 76-100% [ ]

PART V: Influence of In-Service Programs on Management of Schools

39. Have you ever attended any in-service program on management since you became a Deputy Principal?

i YES [ ] (If ‘Yes’ skip to 37)

ii NO [ ]

40. If the answer to No 35 above is NO, Why?

..........................................................................................................................

41. How many times have you attended an in-service program in the past 5 years as a Deputy Principal?

i 1-3 times [ ]

ii 4-6 times [ ]
iii 7-9 times [ ]
iv 10 and above times [ ]

42. Indicate the duration of the in-service training(s) you have attended? (Tick (✓) as appropriate)
i One day [ ]
ii Less than one week [ ]
iii One week [ ]
iv Two weeks [ ]
v Three weeks [ ]
vi One month [ ]
vii More than one month [ ]

43. Which organization(s) organized and/or facilitated the In-service training(s) you attended?
i Kenya Educational Management Institute (KEMI) [ ]
ii Kenya Institute of Management (KIM) [ ]
iii District Education Office [ ]
iv Kenya Secondary Schools Heads Association (KSSHA) [ ]
v Teachers Service Commission (TSC) [ ]
vi School [ ]
vii Others (Please specify) ........................................................................................................

44. Is the training you have so far received sufficient enough to enable you perform satisfactorily all the duties and responsibilities that you are currently shouldering?
i YES [ ]
ii NO [ ]

45. Do you think it is necessary to continue to undertake short management courses even after formal management training has been undertaken?
i YES [ ]
ii NO [ ]

46. If you were to be given the opportunity to recommend when formal management training should be given to the school administrators, what would you choose?
iv Before appointment [ ]
v After appointment [ ]
vi Both Before and after appointment [ ]
vii Others (Please specify) ........................................................................................................

47. To what extent do you feel the in-service programs have enabled you to perform your duties and responsibilities as a manager of a secondary school?
i 0% [ ]
ii 1-25% [ ]
iii 26-50% [ ]
iv 51-75% [ ]
v 76-100% [ ]

THANK YOU
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Appendix IV: Questionnaire for Heads of Department

PART I: Demographic Information
(Please tick (√ ) in the box of the answer applicable to you.)

1. Gender:
   i  Male       [ ]
   ii Female     [ ]

2. Age Bracket:
   20-30   [ ]
   31-40   [ ]
   41-50   [ ]
   51-60   [ ]

3. Academic qualification (Highest level attained)
   i  Diploma in Education [ ]
   ii B.Ed                [ ]
   iii P.G.D.E            [ ]
   iv Masters             [ ]
   v  P.hd                [ ]
   vi Others (Please specify) .................................................................

4. Please specify your area(s) of specialization here below.
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................

5. Which department do you head?
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................

6. What is your current Job group?
   i  M       [ ]
   ii N       [ ]
   iii P      [ ]
   iv Q       [ ]
   v  R       [ ]
   vi Others (Specify)..................................................................................

PART II: Influence of Pre-service Programs on Management of Schools

7. For how long have you served as Head of Department in this institution?
   i  Less than 1 year       [ ]
   ii 1-5 years              [ ]
   iii 6-10 years            [ ]
   iv 11-15 years            [ ]
   v  Overs 15 years         [ ]

8. What position did you hold before being appointed Head of Department?
   .............................................................................................................
   .............................................................................................................
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9. Did you undergo any management training while serving at the lower positions?
   i  YES [    ]
   ii NO [    ]

10. Did you receive any management training during your teacher training at college/University?
    i  YES [    ]
    ii NO [    ]

11. At what stage should formal management training be given to a Head of Department?
    i  During teacher training at college/University [    ]
    ii Before taking up duties as H.O.D [    ]
    iii After taking up duties as H.O.D [    ]

12. The following are the duties and responsibilities of a Head of Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties and Responsibilities of Head of Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Administering a teaching department in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Allocating duties to staff within the department as well as undertaking research, consultancy and teaching duties in the field of specialization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Co-ordinating teaching and research activities within the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Co-ordinating students admissions, tuitions and examinations within the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Co-ordinating consultancy and research activities undertaken with the department in liaison with other institutions and Government department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Providing leadership in curriculum design, development and review in a particular field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Co-ordinating the development and production of course materials to be used within the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Ensuring the maintenance of high standards of professionalism in setting, supervision and marking of examinations within the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Undertaking general duties relating to students’ welfare and academic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Maintenance of proper inventories of equipment and supplies entrusted to the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ensuring proper care and maintenance of equipment, tools and other facilities within the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Co-ordinating the identification and procurement of appropriate materials and supplies, tools, equipment and other facilities inorder to improve and uphold high teaching standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Stipulating the publication of written materials and other professional endeavours undertaken by staff within the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Co-ordinating staff development activities within the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Co-ordinating income generating activities within the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Co-ordinating students’ field work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Promoting liaison between the institution and the students, employers, sponsors, parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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and the local community in order to cultivate goodwill.

18 Ensuring that schemes of work and Lesson plans are prepared and adhered to in the course of teaching.

19 Advising the Headteacher on the appropriate books, facilities and equipment required to effective teaching and learning in the department.

20 Performing any other duties as may be assigned by the Head of institution.

Were you aware of these duties and responsibilities before you were appointed as a Head of Department?

i  YES [ ]

ii  NO [ ]

13. Does the above prescribed list of duties and responsibilities for the Head of Department cover all the duties and responsibilities you perform in your job currently?

i  YES [ ]

ii  NO [ ]

14. To what extent do you feel the pre-service programs has enabled you to perform your duties and responsibilities as a manager of a Secondary School?

i  0% [ ]

ii  1-25% [ ]

iii  26-50% [ ]

iv  51-75% [ ]

v  76-100% [ ]

PART III: Influence of Induction Programs on Management of Schools

15. Did you receive any induction training on your appointment as a Head of Department?

i  YES [ ]

ii  NO [ ] (If No skip to 16)

16. If the answer to question No 14 above is YES, which of the following induction strategies was used to induct you on your appointment as a Deputy Principal?

i  Provided with manuals with Job specifications [ ]

ii  Orientation on their duties and responsibilities [ ]

iii  Used other people as mentors [ ]

iv  Used networks and linkages [ ]

v  Others (Please specify .................................................................)

17. On your appointment as a Head of Department to this institution, did your employer supply you with a manual of your Job Specification?

i  YES [ ]

ii  NO [ ]

18. Did anyone else explain the Job Specification to you before embarking on the principals job?
i  YES [ ] (If yes skip to 19)
ii NO [ ]

19. If the answer to questions No. 17 & 18 above were ‘NO’ which of the following did you apply to help you to set off on the principals job?
i Trial and error [ ]
ii Consulted authorities [ ]
iii Refered to guides [ ]
iv Simply groped in the dark [ ]
v Others (Please specify) ..........................................................

20. Please indicate using a tick (√) whether or not you were inducted to perform each of the following prescribed duties and responsibilities of the Head of Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties and Responsibilities of Head of Department</th>
<th>YES (√)</th>
<th>NO (X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Administering a teaching department in school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Allocating duties to staff within the department as well as undertaking research, consultancy and teaching duties in the field of specialization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Co-ordinating teaching and research activities within the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Co-ordinating students admissions, tuitions and examinations within the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Co-ordinating consultancy and research activities undertaken with the department in liaison with other institutions and Government department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Providing leadership in curriculum design, development and review in a particular field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Co-ordinating the development and production of course materials to be used within the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Ensuring the maintenance of high standards of professionalism in setting, supervision and marking of examinations within the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Undertaking general duties relating to students’ welfare and academic development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Maintenance of proper inventories of equipment and supplies entrusted to the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ensuring proper care and maintenance of equipment, tools and other facilities within the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Co-ordinating the identification and procurement of appropriate materials and supplies, tools, equipment and other facilities in order to improve and uphold high teaching standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Stipulating the publication of written materials and other professional endeavours undertaken by staff within the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Co-ordinating staff development activities within the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Co-ordinating income generating activities within the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Co-ordinating students’ field work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promoting liaison between the institution and the students, employers, sponsors, parents and the local community in order to cultivate goodwill.

Ensuring that schemes of work and Lesson plans are prepared and adhered to in the course of teaching.

Advising the Headteacher on the appropriate books, facilities and equipment required to effective teaching and learning in the department.

Performing any other duties as may be assigned by the Head of institution.

21. Does the above prescribed list of duties and responsibilities for the Head of Department cover all the duties and responsibilities you perform in your job currently?
   i  YES [  ]
   ii NO [  ]

22. To what extent do you feel the induction programs have enabled you to perform your duties and responsibilities as a manager of a Secondary School?
   i  0% [  ]
   ii 1-25% [  ]
   iii 26-50% [  ]
   iv 51-75% [  ]
   v 76-100% [  ]

PART IV: Influence of In-Service Programs on Management of Schools

23. Have you ever attended any in-service program on management since you became a Head of Department?
   i  YES [  ] (If ‘Yes’ skip to 25)
   ii NO [  ]

24. If the answer to No 23 above is NO, Why?
   ...........................................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................................

25. How many times have you attended an in-service program in the past 5 years as a Head of Department?
   i 1-3 times [  ]
   ii 4-6 times [  ]
   iii 7-9 times [  ]
   iv 10 and above times [  ]

26. Indicate the duration of the in-service training(s) you have attended? (Tick (√) as appropriate)
   i Less than one day [  ]
   ii One day [  ]
   iii Less than one week [  ]
   iv One week [  ]
   v Two weeks [  ]
   vi Three weeks [  ]
vii One month [ ]
viii More than one month [ ]

27. Which organization(s) organized and/or facilitated the In-service training(s) you attended?
i Kenya Educational Management Institute (KEMI) [ ]
ii Kenya Institute of Management (KIM) [ ]
iii District Education Office [ ]
iv Kenya Secondary Schools Heads Association (KSSHA) [ ]
v Teachers Service Commission (TSC) [ ]
vi School [ ]
vii Others (Please specify) ...........................................

28. Is the training you have so far received sufficient enough to enable you perform satisfactorily all the duties and responsibilities that you are currently shouldering?
i YES [ ]
ii NO [ ]

29. Do you think it is necessary to continue to undertake short management courses even after formal management training has been undertaken?
i YES [ ]
ii NO [ ]

30. If you were to be given the opportunity to recommend when formal management training should be given to the school administrators, what would you choose?
i Before appointment [ ]
ii After appointment [ ]
iii Both Before and after appointment [ ]
iv Others (Please specify) ...........................................

31. To what extent do you feel the in-service programs have enabled you to perform your duties and responsibilities as a manager of a secondary school?
i 0% [ ]
ii 1-25% [ ]
iii 26-50% [ ]
iv 51-75% [ ]
v 76-100% [ ]

THANK YOU
Appendix V: List of Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KISUMU GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>GIRLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KISUMU BOYS HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>BOYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KISUMU DAY SECONDARY</td>
<td>BOYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASOGO MIXED SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIONS HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINGO GIRLS SECONDARY</td>
<td>GIRLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. TERESAS GIRLS SECONDARY</td>
<td>GIRLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XAVERIAN SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. IGNATIUS MAGADI SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTIENO OYOO HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>BOYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBWOLO MIXED SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LELA MIXED SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOBURA GIRLS SECONDARY</td>
<td>GIRLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASAGAM SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKOK SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOEL OMINO SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. ALOO GUMBI SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. PETERS NANGA SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORONGO MIXED SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIWANI SECONDARY</td>
<td>BOYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. ALBERTS ANGIRA SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONG’ECHE SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHUR SECONDARY</td>
<td>BOYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISHOP ABIERO SHAURI MOYO SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. ALLOYS MAYENYA SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDURU MIXED SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYALUNYA MIXED SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYAMASARIA SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALENDU MIXED SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. PETERS KINDU SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOYLAND SPECIAL SECONDARY</td>
<td>MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>KANYAGWAL SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>G.P. OWITI SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>AROMBO SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>NYAKAKANA SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>ODIENYA SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>GOT NYABONDO SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>KIBOS SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOEST, KISUMU EAST DISTRICT 2012
Appendix VI: Research Authorization

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Telephone: 254-020-2212471, 2241349, 254-020-2673550;
Mobile: 0713 788 767, 0735 464 245;
Fax: 254-020-2213215;
When replying please quote
secretary@ncst.go.ke

NCST/RCD/14/013/495

Clifford Ouma Onyango
University of Nairobi
P.O.Box 825-40100
KISUMU.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application dated 15th April, 2013 for authority to carry out research on “Influence of preparation and development of principals on management of public secondary schools in Kisumu East District, Kenya” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Nyanza Province for a period ending 30th April 2014.

You are advised to report to the District commissioner and the District Education Officer, Kisumu East District before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

DR. M. K. RUGUFT, PhD, HSC.
DEPUTY COUNCIL SECRETARY

Copy to:
The District commissioner
The District Education Officer
Kisumu East District.
Appendix VII: Research Permit

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT:
Prof./Dr./Mr./Mrs./Miss/Institution
Clifford Ouma Onyango
of (Address) University of Nairobi
P.O.Box 825-40100, Kisumu.
has been permitted to conduct research in

Location
Provinces

Nyanza

on the topic: Influence of preparation and
development of principals on management of
public secondary schools in Kisumu East
District, Kenya.

for a period ending: 30th April, 2014.

CONDITIONS

1. You must report to the District Commissioner and
the District Education Officer of the area before
embarking on your research. Failure to do that
may lead to the cancellation of your permit.
2. Government Officers will not be interviewed
without prior appointment.
3. No questionnaire will be used unless it has been
approved.
4. Excavation, filming and collection of biological
specimens are subject to further permission from
the relevant Government Ministries.
5. You are required to submit at least two(2)/four(4)
bound copies of your final report for Kenyans
and non-Kenyans respectively.
6. The Government of Kenya reserves the right to
modify the conditions of this permit including
its cancellation without notice.
Appendix VIII: Introductory Letter

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Telegram:

DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICE

Telephone: Kisumu (057) 2022828
KISUMU EAST

When replying please quote

P.O. BOX 1914

REF: KSM/E/MISC./29/VOL.III/(169)

KISUMU

3RD JUNE, 2013

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION
CLIFFORD OUMA ANYANGO – ADM.NO.L50/61656/2013

The above named who is a student in Project Planning and Management –
University of Nairobi, Kisumu Town Campus.

This is to certify that, he has been granted authority to undertake research on
"Influence of preparation and development of Principals on management of
public secondary schools in Kisumu East District, Kenya" for a period ending
30th April, 2011.

Kindly accord him the necessary assistance he requires to accomplish the
assignment.

JOSEPH OCHIENG' ONDORO
FOR: DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICER
KISUMU EAST
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