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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to investigate the determinants of deputy head teachers’ managerial practices in public primary schools in Kisau Division of Mbooni East District, Kenya. Four research objectives that guided the study were formulated. The study employed the descriptive survey design and non probability sampling technique. The sample comprised of 66 deputy head teachers, 66 head teachers, 366 teachers and 3 zonal quality assurance and standards officers. Questionnaires and interview schedules were used to collect data. Data was analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings indicated that decision communication styles, professional characteristics and leadership styles were the key determinants of effective deputy head teachers’ managerial practices. These enhanced a deputy head teacher’s managerial effectiveness in a school leading to improved work relations and academic performance among learners. The study further found out that majority of the deputy head teachers (45%) used the interactive style of communicating decisions while written decision communication style was least used (3.3%). The study findings also concluded that the reasons for the effectiveness of the decision communication styles used by the deputy head teachers was due to their own effectiveness and that the majority of deputy head teachers (38.3%) employed the transactional style of leadership compared to 11.7% who used the laissez faire style. The study after analysis failed to establish any strong links existed between a deputy head teacher’s personal traits and enhanced managerial practices. As a result of the study the recommendations are that a study be done to establish whether personal traits enhance a deputy head teacher’s managerial practices; that a similar study be carried out on secondary schools; and that the study be replicated in other parts of Kenya.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Over the past three to five years radical changes have been witnessed in the academic arena. These changes which are legal and policy in nature, have substantially affected the roles of primary school deputy head teachers in Kenya. This is especially so because the deputy head teacher, according to the Teachers’ Service Commission (T.S.C.) Code of Regulations is the most immediate assistant to the school’s chief executive, the head teacher (Republic of Kenya, 1986). These challenges to the deputy headship have also been attributed to the recent changes arising from the provisions of the Kenyan Constitution (Republic of Kenya, 2010). These two documents stress highly the importance of carrying out effective managerial practices as a strategy for effective implementation of the curriculum and for improved school performance.

However, the crucial role played by deputy head teachers in many schools worldwide cannot be over-emphasized. This is because deputy heads help head teachers to influence both the cognitive and affective lives of the learners within the school by influencing the discipline of the learners in an effort to mould them to become responsible future citizens of any country. But despite all of this, some deputy heads have strongly emerged as good implementers of the managerial functions of deputy head teachers as provided
for by the Ministry of Education thus leading to the need to investigate the determinants of deputy head teachers’ managerial practices (which are the functions and activities to be done by a manager in order to achieve certain stated outcomes) in the management of public primary schools (Annual Report, D.E.O’s office, Mbooni East District, 2012). In the United Kingdom, a study on the role of deputy head teachers in the leading and managing of public primary schools was carried out by Rutherford and Dunne (2000). It revealed that successful school deputies were those who had exemplified a number of characteristics such as enhanced communication skills. Another study conducted by Earley, Evans, Collarbone, Gold and Halpin (2002) investigated the effectiveness of the current state of school leadership in England and found that there was a greater need for the acquisition of further training in communication skills among primary school deputy head teachers than among secondary school deputies. The study also established that the leadership styles of deputy head teachers that were based on openness and participatory involvement led to effective school management. However, the study failed to clearly establish if there is a clear link between specific leadership styles and effective execution of managerial practices.

On the other hand, studies done in developing countries such as Botswana have revealed that deputy head teachers merely play a collegial role in the management of effective schools (Mhozya, 2010). This is because schools are managed through Senior Management Teams (SMTs) to which deputy heads
are only but members. Mhozya noted that the inclination of deputy head teachers to make use of democratic leadership in those teams was evident in the decision making process at the school level. This in turn led to effective school management. Oplatka (2004) also brings to the fore different scenarios from countries such as Botswana and Nigeria. In both countries, a key similarity emerges that the appointment to deputy headship is neither based on any prior professional managerial training nor effectiveness in classroom teaching but rather on the strength of one’s political connectivity and patronage.

Numerous studies have been carried out in Kenya with regard to participation of head teachers in headship positions in public primary and secondary schools; for instance Achacha (2012); Cheruiyot (2012); Mwaniki (2012); Kabuga (2010); Kabage (2010); Kinyua (2010); Njoka (2009) and Lutomia (2004). All these findings confirm that leaders’ communication styles exert a key influence on the school’s management performance especially in national examinations. Kinyua (2010) studied the determinants of head teachers’ effectiveness in human resource management and concluded that the academic and professional qualifications of those first appointed to deputy headship then later to headship is a key determinant of the effective execution of their managerial practices in the management of public schools. Nevertheless, most of these studies relied on head teachers’ managerial
practices leaving the deputy head teachers’ roles in the shadow of the head teacher yet their roles are not necessarily the same.

This study therefore sought to fill this gap since much seemed to have been done on public secondary school deputy headship at the expense of primary school deputy headship. The study investigated whether effective deputy head teachers’ managerial practices are determined by their professional characteristics, personal traits, decision communication styles or leadership styles.

1.2 Statement of the problem
Most studies carried out had targeted principals, heads of departments (H.O.Ds) and ordinary classroom teachers. There was limited evidence of research on deputy head teachers as they were often overshadowed by head teachers. This was despite the fact that deputy heads too have a clear job description.

Deputy head teachers play a key role in the achievement of educational goals and objectives in schools. They to a large extent direct the school management under the guidance of the head teacher. They also carry out other unspecificied duties as may be directed by the head teacher from time to time (The T.S.C. Code of Regulations, 1986). Despite these crucial roles of the deputy head teachers, all teachers are basically trained to engage in classroom management but not as school managers (Njoka, 2009). It is on this basis that the appointment of teachers to deputy headship in Kenya is based on an additional criterion; a sound classroom performance and, or
excellence in co-curricular activities. Yet there seemed to be a disparity in the implementation of deputy head teachers’ managerial functions among primary schools’ deputies of different schools. In the past one year alone, numerous complaints had been recorded among head teachers in Kisau Division over their deputy head teachers’ improper managerial practice execution as follows: 11 out of 24 in Kiteta zone, 9 out of 16 head teachers in Kisau zone and 14 out of 29 head teachers in Waia zone (Annual Report, D.E.O’s office, Mbooni East District, 2012). There was need to establish why this disconnect existed among deputy head teachers of different schools despite having been appointed on the same professional basis. Therefore, there clearly existed the need to carry out this study to establish what determined the execution of managerial practices among deputy head teachers in public primary schools in Kenya.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the determinants of deputy head teachers’ managerial practices in public primary schools in Kisau Division of Mbooni East District, Kenya.

1.4 Objectives of the study

The study focused on the following objectives:

i. To determine the extent to which the professional characteristics of the deputy head teacher influenced their managerial practices in public primary schools.
ii. To determine the extent to which the personal traits of the deputy head teacher influenced their managerial practices in public primary schools in Kisau Division.

iii. To determine the extent to which deputy head teachers communicated decisions effectively hence contributed to enhanced managerial practices.

iv. To determine whether the leadership styles employed by the deputy head teacher contributed to enhance their managerial practices in public primary schools in Kisau Division.

1.5 Research questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

i. How did the deputy head teacher’s professional characteristics influence their managerial practices in public primary schools?

ii. In what ways did the personal traits of deputy head teachers enhance their managerial practices in public primary schools?

iii. How did the deputy head teacher’s decision communication strategies contribute to enhanced managerial practices in public primary schools?

iv. To what extent did the leadership style of the deputy head teacher promote enhanced managerial practices in public primary schools?
1.6 Significance of the study
The study aimed at directly benefiting deputy head teachers’ understanding of the application of the appropriate determinants of managerial practices for improved management of schools. The results from the study could also enhance deputy head teachers’ service delivery leading to improved workplace relations and team spirit. The findings of the study could also form a good basis for further research by other researchers.

1.7 Limitations of the study
While carrying out the study some challenges developed. The geographical area of study is expansive especially Waia Zone with schools being a great distance apart so a lot of travelling took place in order to reach the respondents of the study. The researcher also made use of non-probability quota sampling technique so as to obtain a representative sample that covered the universe population of the area under study (Kombo and Tromp, 2011, and Mugenda and Mugenda, 2012).

1.8 Delimitations of the study
Kisau Division which was the area of study is found in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs) of the Southern part of the Eastern Province, now part of the Makueni County and covers a total land area of approximately 19.5 square kilometers (Republic of Kenya, 2009). The study dealt with deputy head teachers, head teachers, teachers and zonal education officers as they
were the key participants to give the expected reliable information. The study targeted public primary schools because the deputy head teachers of public and private schools are neither on the same job descriptions nor the same terms of employment.

1.9 Basic assumptions of the study
The participants who were involved in the study were presumed to be fully knowledgeable and well-versed with the determinants of deputy head teachers’ managerial practices in schools.

1.10 Definition of significant terms
**Deputy head teacher** refers to the second senior most teacher in a school next to the head teacher.

**Leadership style** refers to patterns of behavior by a leader in influencing the members of the group.

**Managerial practices** refer to the core functions of the manager, namely planning, organizing, coordinating, directing and controlling done to achieve the set objectives.

**Personal traits** refer to the particular qualities of a person that make him/her interesting and different from others.
1.11 Organization of the study

The study was organized into five chapters. Chapter one highlighted the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, the objectives and the corresponding research questions, limitations, delimitations, basic assumptions of the study, and the definition of significant terms as they are used in the study. Chapter two focused on the literature review about deputy head teachers’ managerial practices, professional characteristics, personal traits, decision communication styles and leadership styles as well as the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the study.

Chapter three detailed the research methodology which was applied in carrying out the study, the research design, the target population, the sample, the sampling technique to be used, piloting, research instruments, procedures for data collection and data analysis techniques. Chapter four presents data analysis, interpretation and a discussion on the findings. Finally, the fifth chapter consists of the summary, conclusion, recommendations and suggestions for further research based on the findings of the study.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter reviewed related literature on the determinants of deputy head teachers’ managerial practices in schools. It covered deputy head teachers’ professional characteristics, personal traits, the effects of the decision communication style of the deputy head teachers, the deputy teachers’ leadership styles and their influence on enhanced managerial practices. The last section featured the summary of the reviewed literature, the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the study.

2.2 The concept of managerial practice
Managerial practices are all that a manager does with regard to carrying out one’s stipulated job-related duties. In a school situation, these are the various tasks designated to be effected by the deputy head teacher of the school and others by way of having been delegated to attend to them by the school head (Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development, 1999). Such managerial functions are a vital ingredient for improved pupil learning and academic performance, and go a long way towards the creation of child friendly schools (c.f.s.).

Both Okumbe (2007) and Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development, (M.O.E. & H.R.D.) (1999) have argued that deputy head teachers handle discipline matters, mediate between head teachers, other teachers and non-
deputy head teachers. Deputy head teachers manage staff duty schedules and teaching time-tables, teach and execute other unspecified duties as may be directed by the head teacher from time to time (Republic of Kenya, 1986). Additionally, Cole (2008), Nzuve (2010), M.O.E. & H.R.D (1999) agree with Mathenge (2007) that deputy head teachers also supervise curriculum implementation and instruction, but they hardly play any significant financial management role since they are underutilized when it comes to financial matters. Mathenge (2007) observes that this denies the deputy heads of the much highly desired crucial financial management learning opportunities which might be useful for later use when elevated to headship.

2.3 Deputy head teachers’ professional characteristics

Professional characteristics are the qualities that are distinctive to that person’s profession. They include managerial experience (that is, the time spent doing the same type of work), being responsible, ethical, intelligent and committed to duty. Being responsible means a deputy head teacher is honest and accountable for his/her own actions and meets deadlines (M.O.E. & H.R.D., 1999). Commitment means that a deputy head teacher spends more time at work beyond the call of duty (Yukl, 2006). Intellectual characteristics of a deputy head make one acquire current knowledge (Mathenge, 2007). Professional qualifications are the same as
academic or educational level of attainment such as whether someone holds a certificate, a diploma or a degree.

2.4 Deputy head teachers’ personal traits

Personal traits are such as gender (which is the state of either being a male or female), age, that is, the length of time during which a being has existed, marital status (or the state of being married, single, divorced, or widowed). Miyayo (2007) studied the influence of personal characteristics and communication techniques on head teachers’ leadership effectiveness. The study found out that both variables jointly impact positively on a leader’s leadership effectiveness. However, the findings failed to clarify which particular personal characteristics when combined with which communication techniques positively influenced a leader’s leadership effectiveness.

2.5 Decision communication styles

Decision communication style is the mode of passing on decisions to the intended consumers for action. Luthans (2002) contents that both the decision-making process and communication are intertwined in the sense that decisions must eventually be passed to the desired audience. Decisions made can be communicated through verbal or non-verbal methods.
2.6 Deputy head teachers and the use of non-verbal decision communication style

Non-verbal communication uses non-written responses and is sometimes referred to as silent language (Luthans, 2002). This includes all that communication which goes on without the use of words such as symbols, facial expressions, gestures and body language. Deputy head teachers can use non-verbal communication to get feedback.

2.7 Deputy head teachers and the use of interpersonal communication style

Interpersonal communication is used between one person and another (Luthans, 2002). Deputy head teachers commonly use it when dealing with matters of discipline either of a student or a colleague and when debriefing the school head or handling counselees (Okumbe, 2007). Interpersonal communication can be oral or written such as letters, reports, and notices (Okumbe, 2007).

2.8 Deputy head teachers and the use of interactive communication style

Both Okumbe (2007) and Luthans (2002) agree that interactive communication in organizations can be upward (or vertical throughout an organization) or horizontal (that is, among same level work group members). Within a school, a deputy head teacher may communicate directly to heads of departments or subject panels in order to give instructions to teachers and other workers at the lower levels of the hierarchical structure. This form of communication can be written and, or oral. Deputy head teachers use notices, posters, memos and speeches in their management duties.
2.9 Deputy head teachers and the use of grapevine communication style

Grapevine communication style may take the form of gossips and rumors (Okumbe, 2007). There are four main reasons for the use of grapevine communication, namely, to reduce anxiety about an expected communication from the school authorities, to try and make sense of limited information within reach and to organize workers into informal groupings during times of need such as collective-bargaining periods. Deputy head teachers can use the grapevine informal communication method to reduce rumors into meaningful information through explaining the grey areas for meaningful decision communication but only with the express authority of the head teacher.

But, above all, studies by Mathenge (2007) seemed to concur with Okumbe (2007) that communication plays a key role in an organization’s management such as providing for the venting of emotions and the fulfillment of social needs (Blanchard and Hersey, 1988). And finally, it provides opportunities for decision-makers such as deputy heads to access information for decision-making (Mathenge, 2007).

2.10 The concepts of leadership and leadership styles

Cole (2008) sees leadership to be the process within groups in which one person, either by virtue of position or personality or both obtains sufficient commitment of other members in order to facilitate the achievement of group goals. Leadership styles are the manner in which a person exercises leadership, treats other people
and tasks; in this case, the deputy head teacher is the leader (Cole, 2008). Both Okumbe (2007) and Cole (2008) came up with three major categories of leadership styles namely, authoritarian, democratic and laissez faire.

2.11 Deputy head teachers and authoritarian leadership style

Studies by Huka (2003) and Mwalala (2008) concur with Kemp and Nathan (1989) who assert that an authoritarian school leader, a deputy head in this case, is one who does not involve other members in decision-making processes. Such deputy head teachers were grossly directive in leadership tasks. Hence, Huka (2003), Muli (2010) and Mwalala (2008) argued that schools led by such leaders had improved academic performances in national examinations.

2.12 Deputy head teachers and democratic leadership style

Kiogora (2010) noted that the deputy head teacher who applies this leadership style encourages members’ participation in making decisions which usually take place in groups. Democratic deputy head teachers allow open communication between themselves, their subordinates and superiors leading to increased freedom of thought, cohesion, high team spirit and commitment in line with their schools’ mission and objectives. However, Cheruiyot (2012) observed that such leaders have better managed schools, something that this study sought to investigate.
2.13 Deputy head teachers and laissez faire style

A deputy head teacher who subscribes to laissez faire leadership style allows members complete freedom as there is no leadership provided to the members of the group. Studies conducted by Cheruiyot (2012) contend that with time such a leader almost turns over all authority to the subordinate group and does as little leading role as possible. Manguu (2010) argues that such absence of leadership role may result into disharmony. This is perhaps the reason why Kemp and Nathan (1989) term the style as being the exact opposite of authoritarianism and being chiefly relationship oriented in that a deputy head teacher who applies it gets a lot of rapport from the rest of the group members such as the head teacher, other teachers, non-teaching staff and pupils. But the enhancement of the achievement of the school objectives and efficacy at the work place is minimally realized. Moreover, several scholars such as Yukl (2006), Blanchard and Hersey (1988) and Okumbe (2007) have argued that two other leadership styles, namely transactional and contingency leadership styles exist as observed by Kiogora (2010).

2.14 Deputy head teachers and transactional leadership style

According to Sagor (1996) transactional leadership is very similar to democratic style but incorporates some components of laissez faire and authoritarian leadership styles, and is very much effective because it caters for workers’ needs and the school goals. The deputy head teacher who uses this style is likely to appreciate the intermediary between McGregor’s Theory X and Y principles.
However, such a leader would be lacking the strengths of the power of cohesion and the democratic levels of respect.

2.15 Deputy head teachers and contingency leadership style

House and Martin asserted that leaders such as deputy head teachers who subscribe to contingency leadership style believe in “a wait-and-see” or “solve-as-the-problem arises” mentality. Moreover, the leader knowingly or unknowingly ends up equipping the teachers and students with problem-solving skills so as to be able to handle issues confidently and with minimum stress resulting into the achievement of better performance by subordinates.

Finally, as some scholars have observed, since there is not any one single leadership style which is appropriate in all situations, most leaders combine other styles with one that features more in their leadership (Okumbe, 2007). The study investigated whether these leadership styles determine the effective managerial practices’ execution by deputy head teachers in schools.

2.16 Summary of literature review

As noted in this review, different studies have being conducted on leadership styles, professional and personal characteristics of head teachers, heads of departments and classroom teachers with regard to their influence on students’ performance in national examinations. These studies include Achacha (2012), Cheruiyot (2012), Mwaniki (2012), Manguu (2010), Kiogora (2010), Mwalala (2008), Miyayo (2007), Kabage (2010), among others.
Other studies have been done on the role of women participation in leadership positions such as studies by Kabuga (2010) and Mathenge (2007), while Lutomia (2004) investigated administrative constraints faced by secondary school head teachers. However, these findings have failed to address the relationship between managerial practices of deputy head teachers, and their professional characteristics and personal traits in school management, especially with regard to primary school deputy head teachers. This is so because studies done on the attributes of head teachers have overshadowed the role of deputy head teachers. This study therefore sought to address this gap.

2.17 Theoretical framework

The study was guided by the Goal-Path Leadership Theory attributed to Robert House and Martin Evans in 1971 but advanced by Ken Blanchard and Paul Hersey (1988) which emphasizes the importance of the leader helping followers towards a certain direction or goal by clarifying expectations from them and removing barriers while supporting them to achieve personal growth. Nyabengi (2012) in his study used the theory to study the effects of secondary school head teachers’ leadership styles on students’ performance in the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education examination in Marani District, Kenya. Nyabengi’s study revealed that not all the leader’s demographic variables have influence on the students’ performance in national examinations. He in particular noted that the head teacher’s gender and age do not influence the performance of the candidates. Path- Goal Theory is applicable in this study because a leader cannot lead an
organization without communicating decisions to other members of the organization. In leading, the leader also uses his/her professional characteristics and personal traits resulting in the realization of the goals of the organization. This theory is relevant for use in this study because the deputy head teacher’s professional qualities and personal traits will be sought if they enhance the determinants of the deputy head teacher’s managerial practices in public school management.

2.18 Conceptual framework

A conceptual framework is a diagrammatic illustration that serves as a model to explain how different variables interact between themselves (Orodho, 2009). Arising from the literature reviewed, and the variables identified for the study, a conceptual framework, presented in Figure 2.1 have been developed.
Figure 2.1. Conceptual framework

Determinants of deputy head teachers’ managerial practices in public primary schools

- Professional characteristics
  - Professional qualifications
  - Managerial experience

- Personal traits
  - Gender
  - Age
  - Marital status
  - Perception -by self by others

- Decision communication style
  - Verbal
  - Non-verbal
  - Interactive
  - Grapevine

- Leadership style
  - Democratic
  - Authoritarian
  - Laissez-faire
  - Transactional
  - Contingency

Deputy head’s managerial practices (i.e. planning, organizing, coordinating, directing, controlling)

Deputy head teacher’s managerial effectiveness rating:
Effective/ineffective execution of managerial practices.

Figure 2.1 shows that professional characteristics and personal traits, decision communication and leadership styles of the deputy head teacher interact in execution of their managerial functions to influence the managerial practice rating of the deputy head teacher in public schools.
The figure further suggests that when deputy head teachers employ the use of various leadership and decision communication styles while carrying out the managerial practices, this determines the effectiveness of the deputy head teacher’s managerial rating in public schools.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter has described the methodology that was used in the study. The chapter highlighted the research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedure, research instruments, validity and reliability of the research instruments. Data collection and data analysis procedures have also been described.

3.2 Research design

The study used a descriptive survey research design. Descriptive survey research design according to Orodho (2009) was one that allowed a researcher to collect information through interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a representative sample drawn from the target population. This design enabled the researcher to gather, summarize, present and interpret information for classification based on the research participants’ attitudes, opinions, habits or social issues that are relevant to the research conducted (Orodho, 2009). Therefore, descriptive survey design was used in this study because the researcher sought to establish evidence of the existing conditions by describing the situation as it was without any variables being manipulated (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). This was done by seeking the views and facts from the participants. All these was done with specific reference to how deputy heads communicated their decisions, used their leadership styles, and how through their personal traits and
professional qualities influenced their effectiveness in schools throughout Kisau Division.

3.3 Target population

The study was carried out in Kisau Division of Mbooni East District. The target population was all the 69 deputy head teachers, 69 head teachers, the 401 teachers serving in the 69 rural public mixed day primary schools in the division and all the three ZQASOs of the three zones (Staffing Data, DEO’s office, Mbooni East District, 2012).

3.4 Sample size and sampling procedures

Best and Kahn (2005) assert that a sample should be large enough to be representative of the population which the researcher wishes to generalize but small enough to be selected economically. In selecting the schools to participate in this study, non-probability sampling technique was used. This was done by making use of the readily available participants as long as they lay within the sampled schools (Best and Kahn, 2005). The quota sampling procedure was used to select the sample size of the deputy head teachers, head teachers and teachers who participated in the study in order to ensure equal representation from the three zones. This was done by categorizing the schools according to zones and was useful for easy inference of results of the study on the entire population so as to be representative enough (Best and Kahn, 2005). However, all the three ZQASOs of the three zones were also included in the sample for the study.
The Krejcie and Morgan’s (1970) sample size (s) determination formula for calculating the sample size of a given finite population (p) was used such that the sample was within plus or minus 0.05 of the population proportion with a confidence level of 3.841 as provided and applied below.

\[ s = \frac{X^2 N p (1-p)}{d^2 (N-1)} + X^2 p (1-p) \]

Where:

- \( s \) = Sample size
- \( X \) = Value of Chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level (3.841).
- \( N \) = Population size, which in this case was 69 deputy head teachers, 69 head teachers and 401 teachers.
- \( p \) = Population (assumed to be 0.50 since this would provide the maximum sample size).
- \( d \) = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (.05).
Table 3.1: Sampling Frame Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Deputy head teachers</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>ZQASOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisau</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiteta</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=Target population  s= Sample Size  ZQASOs =Zonal Quality Assurance and Standards Officers

The 69 schools of study were divided into three strata according to their geographical location; hence each region formed a quota (Orodho, 2009). Therefore, a total sample size of 66 deputy head teachers out of 69, 66 head teachers out of 69, and 366 teachers out of 401 in Kisau Division was sampled for the study. On the other hand, four (4) schools for the pilot study were selected based on the various geographical locations of schools. Such schools were then excluded from the main study. The selection of the participants was done by use of the simple random sampling technique. This was by putting small pieces of paper containing all the names of the schools from each of the three zones in a container then (with eyes closed) drawing one name at a time up to a maximum of
one (1) school per zone making a total of three (3), then one more was drawn randomly up to four (4) schools for the pilot study (Best and Kahn, 2005).

3.5 Research instruments

The study employed a questionnaire and an interview schedule for data collection. The questionnaire was used to gather data from deputy head teachers, head teachers and teachers while face-to-face interview schedules were conducted to obtain data from the ZQASOs. All the three questionnaires were divided into four parts. Part 1 solicited personal information about the participants. Part 2 sought information on the professional characteristics of the participants, the decision communication styles and leadership styles of deputy head teachers. Part 3 found out the challenges faced by deputy head teachers. Part 4 sought for suggestions to improve the effectiveness of the deputy head teachers’ managerial practice performance. Interview schedules for ZQASOs constituted only one whole section which aimed at gathering information about the deputy head teacher’s decision communication methods, leadership styles, challenges faced and suggestions on how the deputy head teacher’s general execution of managerial practices could be improved. The research instruments were developed by the researcher.

3.6 Validity of research instruments

For instrument validity to be maintained, content validity was tested. The items to be tested were written down and the questions to be posed checked against these
items so as to ensure that all items were adequately represented. A pilot study was conducted prior to the start of the research on four selected schools. These schools were not included in the sample of the study.

After the piloting, some of the ambiguous items were modified while others were discarded all together. This pilot survey served a good purpose to increase the face validity of the research instruments (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2012). Moreover, the research instruments were developed with close scrutiny and approval of the two supervisors whose expertise was helpful in improving the instruments’ content validity.

3.7 Reliability of the research instruments

Reliability is the measure of the degree of consistency and dependability of data collected after repeated trials using a scientific instrument under the same conditions (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2012; Orodho, 2010). The test-retest technique of assessing reliability was used to measure reliability with the purpose of improving on the instruments’ reliability. This as asserted by Orodho (2010), involved administering the same instrument twice to the same group of four selected subjects from four selected schools at two separate times and was repeated on the same subjects after one week’s interval. A correlation coefficient between the two separate scores obtained from the first and the second trials was computed using the row score method that uses five columns (Best and Kahn, 2005) as shown below.
\[ r = \frac{N\sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2} \sqrt{N\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2}} \]

Where:

\( r = \) Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMCC).

\( \sum X = \) Sum of the X scores.

\( \sum Y = \) Sum of the Y scores.

\( \sum X^2 = \) Sum of the squared X scores.

\( \sum Y^2 = \) Sum of the squared Y scores.

\( \sum XY = \) Sum of the product of paired X and Y scores.

\( N = \) Number of paired scores.

A Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMCC) of 0.99 which is approximately 1 was obtained; hence the instrument had a high degree of reliability because a coefficient that is close to plus or minus one indicates a strong relationship (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). This same test re-test formula was also applied to check the reliability of the interview schedules by administering the instrument on one identified respondent and repeating it on the same respondent after an interval of one week. A correlation coefficient of 0.99 which is approximately 1 was obtained using the row score method. Therefore, both instruments were highly reliable.
3.8 Data collection techniques

The researcher obtained authority from the National Council for Science and Technology (NCST) in the form of a research permit. This was presented to the District Commissioner (DC), District Education Officer (DEO), Mbooni East District and the Area Education Officer (AEO), Kisau Division for their permission to collect data. The researcher then made appointments with the head teachers to visit their schools and collect data. On the appointment dates, the researcher administered the instruments of the study to the deputy head teachers, head teachers and teachers from the sampled schools and immediately collected the completely filled-in questionnaires. Interview schedules with the ZQASOs were carried out by the researcher on the agreed dates.

3.9 Data analysis techniques

Data analysis involved the organization and interpretation of all the collected data so as to simplify and present it in the best way possible for easy interpretation and understanding. All data collected from the field was first checked for completeness; it was then categorized and coded to reduce it, and entered into a computer for fast and accurate analysis using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003, and Miles and Huberman, 1994). The data was then analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. In quantitative data analysis, data collected from open-ended questionnaire items and interview schedules where the respondents were required to give their views, feelings, perceptions and attitudes was analyzed by use of narrative descriptions.
Qualitative data analysis was done using descriptive statistical tools such as frequency tables, bar graphs, percentages and correlations (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003) on the determinants of the deputy head teachers’ managerial practices in the management of schools.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the data analysis, interpretation and discussion. The main objective of the study was to investigate determinants of deputy head teachers’ managerial practices in public primary schools in Kisau Division, Mbooni East District, Kenya. The reliability of the data collected for the study was determined through ascertaining the reliability of the questionnaires used in data collection. The target population was 542.

The 69 schools of study were divided into three strata according to their geographical location; hence each region formed a quota (Orodho, 2009). Therefore, a total sample size of 66 deputy head teachers out of 69, 66 head teachers out of 69, and 366 teachers out of 401 in Kisau Division was sampled for the study. On the other hand, four (4) schools for the pilot study were selected based on the various geographical locations of schools. Such schools were then excluded from the main study. The selection of the participants was done by use of the simple random sampling technique. This was by putting small pieces of paper containing all the names of the schools from each of the three zones in a container then (with eyes closed) drawing one name at a time up to a maximum of one (1) school per zone to making a total of three (3), then one more was drawn randomly up to four (4) schools for the pilot study (Best and Kahn, 2005).
4.2 Response rate

From the data collected, out of the 473 questionnaires administered, 397 were filled and returned. This represented an 83.93% response rate, which is considered satisfactory to make conclusions for the study. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) a 50% response rate is adequate, 60% good and above 70% rated very good. This also collaborates Bailey (2000) who asserts that a response rate of 50% is adequate, while a response rate greater than 70% is very good. This implies that based on this assertion; the response rate in this case of 97.78% was very good.

This high response rate can be attributed to the data collection procedures, where the researcher pre-notified the potential participants of the intended survey (organization of members), the questionnaires which were simple were self-administered to the respondents who completed them and these were picked shortly after.

4.3 Demographic information of head teachers

Table 4.2: Head teachers’ gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study found it paramount to determine the respondents’ gender in order to ascertain whether there was gender parity in the positions indicated by the respondents. The findings of the study are displayed in figure 4.1. According to the analysis it was evident that majority of the respondents were male which represented 61.7% while 38.3% were female. It can therefore be deduced that males were the most dominant gender among head teachers in Kisau Division, Mbooni East District, Kenya.

**Table 4.3: Head teachers’ age category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents were required to indicate their age whereby the study findings indicated that majority (46.7%) indicated that their age bracket was between 41 and 50 years. Analysis of findings also indicated that 31.7% of the respondents were between 31 and 40 years of age. The findings further indicated that 15% were below 30 years of age, while 6.7% were aged between 51 and 60 years of age. The finding therefore implies that the respondents were old enough to provide valuable responses that pertain to determinants of deputy head teachers’ managerial practices in public primary schools in Kisau Division, Mbooni East District, Kenya.
Table 4.4: Duration served as a head teacher with current deputy head teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration as a teacher</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 10 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4: Duration served as a head teacher with current deputy head teacher

The respondents were asked to indicate the number of years they have been working as a deputy head teacher and the findings of the study are summarized and displayed in table 4.4 and figure 4.4, respectively. Based on the findings, majority (38.3%) of the respondents had 10 years’ experience while 35% had between 4-6 years. It was also revealed that 13.3% of the respondents had an experience not exceeding 4 years and 11.8% above 10 years. The studies further
revealed that 1.7% of the respondents were less than 1 year. From the findings therefore, majority of the respondents were experienced and hence highly informative on the determinants of deputy head teachers’ managerial practices in public primary schools.

Table 4. 5: Level of education of head teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in education</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. 5: Level of education of head teachers

The study sought to find out the respondents’ level of education. The findings of the study are displayed in table 4.5 and figure 4.5. From the findings, majority (50%) had college diploma in education, while 25% of the respondents indicated
that they are holders of P1 level of education. The study further indicated that 20% of the respondents had BEd and minority (5%) had MEd qualifications.

**Table 4.6: Teachers’ gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought the respondents’ gender in order to ascertain gender parity in the positions indicated by the respondents. According to the analysis it was evident that majority of the respondents were male which represented 54.7% while 45.3% were female. It can therefore be deduced that males were the most dominant gender.
Table 4.7: Teachers’ age category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7: Teachers’ age category

The respondents were required to indicate their age brackets where the study findings indicated that majority (41.4%) were of age bracket between 41 and 50 years. Analysis of findings also indicated that 30.5% of the respondents were between 31 and 40 years of age. The findings further indicated that 11.6% were below 30 years of age while 16.5% were age between 51 and 60 years of age. The finding therefore implied that the respondents were old enough to provide valuable responses that pertain to the determinants of deputy head teachers’
managerial practices in public primary schools in Kisau Division, Mbooni East District, Kenya.

**Table 4.8: Duration served as a teacher with current deputy head teacher**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration as a teacher</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 10 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.8: Duration served as a teacher with current deputy head teacher**

The respondents indicated the number of years they have worked as teachers with current deputy head teachers and the findings of the study are summarized above. Based on the findings, majority (31%) of the respondents had an experience of between 1-3 years while 27% had worked between 4-6 years. It was also revealed
that 24% of the respondents had an experience not exceeding 1 year, 10% had worked for more than 10 years while 8% had worked between 7-10 years. From the findings therefore, majority of the respondents were experienced and hence were highly informative on the determinants of deputy head teachers’ managerial practices in public primary schools.

Table 4.9: Level of education of teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in education</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.9: Level of education of teachers

The study sought to find the respondents’ level of education. From the findings, majority (65.3%) had P1 level of education, while 29.8% indicated that they had
college diploma. The study further indicated that 4.9% of the respondents had BEd.

4.4 Demographic information of deputy head teachers
Of the 39 deputy head teachers captured in the survey, 24 were from the male gender forming the majority and accounting for 61.5% as compared to their 15 female counterparts accounting for only 38.5% as indicated in table 4.10 and figure 4.10 respectively below.

Table 4.10: Deputy head teachers’ gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.10: Deputy head teachers’ gender
The majority, 19, of the respondent deputy head teachers fell in the 41-50 age bracket representing 48.7% of the sample population, followed by 12 in the 51-60 age bracket accounting for 30.8% and the remaining 20.5% accounting for 8 respondents of the 31-40 age category. The same was presented in table 4.11 and figure 4.11 respectively below.

**Table 4.11: Deputy head teachers’ age category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.11: Deputy head teachers’ age category**

As asked about the number of years they had served as deputy head teachers, 18 (46.2 %) of the respondents had served for between 4 and 6 years as deputy head
teachers as illustrated below, 8 (20.5%) serving for 7 to 10 years, 6 (15.4%) serving over 10 years and only 3 (7.7%) serving for less than one year, as presented in table 4.12 and figure 4.12 below.

Table 4.12 : Number of years served as deputy head teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years served as deputy head teacher</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.12: Number of years served as deputy head teachers
4.5 Deputy head teachers’ highest level of education

Most of the respondents, 16 (41.0%) were P1 certificate holders as depicted by table 4.13 and figure 4.13 below, followed by 39.5% who were diploma holders in education and 23.1% having a Bachelor’s degree in Education.

Table 4.13: Deputy head teachers’ highest level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.13: Deputy head teachers’ highest level of education
On their marital status, 26 (66.7%) of the deputy head teachers were married, 10 (25.6%) single while 3 (7.7%) were widowed as presented in table 4.14 and figure 4.14 below.

Table 4.14: Deputy head teachers’ marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ marital status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.14: Graphically illustrating the deputy head teachers’ marital status

4.6 Deputy head teachers’ execution of managerial practices

Information by head teachers

The head teachers were asked to respond to a number of questions on the deputy head teachers’ execution of their managerial practices. The findings of the study were discussed as below.
Decision communication style deputy head teachers employ

Table 4.15: Decision communication style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision communication</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grape vine/gossip</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked to indicate the deputy head teachers’ decision communication style they employ most. From the findings, the majority who are 45% of the respondents indicated that the most widely used style of communication was interactive, followed by 35% who indicated that they use verbal, 16.7% use grape vine and 3.3% use written communication.
The study established that most respondents in the study indicated that the communication style was effective who accounted for 48.3% followed by 43.3% who said it was strongly effective, 6.7% said it was very ineffective and 1.7% indicated ineffective. The findings of the study were summarized in table 4.16 and figure 4.16 respectively.
The respondents were asked to indicate what they thought could be attributed to be the cause of effectiveness in decision communication style. Most of the respondents indicated it was due to the deputy head teacher’s own effectiveness who accounted for 38.3%, followed by 31.7% who gave head teacher related causes while 8.3% indicated it was due to deputy head teacher’s own ineffectiveness, and 15% said it was due to influence from outside the school. The
study further revealed that 6.7% of the respondents indicated that it was due to other teacher’s related causes. The findings of the study were summarized in table 4.18 and figure 4.18 respectively.

**Table 4.18: Leadership styles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.18: Leadership styles**

The study sought to find out the leadership style the deputy head teachers employ. According to the analysis of the findings, 38.3% of the respondents indicated that transactional style, 26.7% said democratic style, and 13.3% indicated contingency
style, 10% gave laissez faire, while 11.7% said they employ authoritarian style of leadership. The findings of the study were summarized in table 4.18 and figure 4.18 above.

Table 4.19: Effectiveness of leadership styles employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership styles</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very ineffective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly effective</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. 19: Effectiveness of leadership styles employed

The study found it of paramount importance to find out the respondents’ views on the effectiveness of the leadership styles employed by the deputy head teachers. Based on the study findings, majority (51.7%) of the respondents were of the view that the leadership style is effective for use in managerial practices of public primary schools while 20% of the respondents indicated it as strongly effective,
21.7% said it was ineffective and 6.6% indicated very ineffective. The results of the findings are summarized in table 4.19 and figure 4.19.

Table 4.20: Reasons attributed to the effectiveness of leadership styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons to effectiveness</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other teacher related causes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence from outside the school</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher related causes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teachers own effectiveness</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.20: Reasons attributed to the effectiveness of leadership styles

The respondents were required to indicate the reasons attributable to the effectiveness of the leadership styles of deputy head teachers in public primary schools. The study findings to this effect indicated that majority (36.7%) of the respondents were of the view that it was due to the deputy head teacher’s own effectiveness followed by 30% who said it was due to head teacher related causes,
23.3% said it was due to the influence from outside the school and 10% of the respondents said it was due to other teacher related causes. The study findings to this effect are displayed in table 4.20 and figure 4.20 above

Table 4.21: Perception of deputy head teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not effective</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.21: How the deputy head teachers are perceived

The study sought to find out from respondents on how the deputy head teachers are perceived. Based on the study findings, 66.7% of the respondents indicated that they are perceived to be effective by the majority, followed in a distance by
21.7% who indicated that they are perceived as not effective and 11.7% who said that they were perceived as very effective.

**Table 4.22: Reasons attributed to the perception of deputy head teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher’s marital status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy head teacher’s managerial experience</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective leadership style</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective decision communication style</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.22: Reasons attributed to the perception of deputy head teachers**

The respondents were required to indicate the reasons attributed to the perception of deputy head teacher on managerial practices in public primary schools. The study findings to this effect indicated that majority (51.7%) of the respondents were of the view that it was due to the deputy head teacher’s managerial experience followed by 36.7% who said was due effective decision
communication style while 10% said it was due to effective leadership style and 1.7% indicated it was due to deputy head teacher’s marital status. The study findings to this effect were displayed in table 4.22 and figure 4.22 respectively.

Table 4.23: Rating the key contributor of deputy head teacher’s enhanced managerial practice performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial experience</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception by him/her self</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception by other teachers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were requested to indicate the key contributor of deputy head teacher’s enhanced managerial practice performance on a 3 point rating scale whereby 1= Not at all, 2=Highly, 3=Very highly. So the study sought to find out from respondents the biggest key contributor to deputy head teacher’s enhanced managerial practice rating. Based on the study findings, as it can be shown by the means and standard deviations, most respondents, for example on the perception by other teachers x=2.37, sd=.688, gender x=2.35, sd=.515, age x=1.58, sd=.787, marital status x=1.55, sd.832 and on gender x=1.50, sd=813. The study further revealed that those who indicated Very Highly were represented by the mean=2.60 and standard deviation=.494 and mean 2.52 and standard deviation =.651 respectively. Hence, managerial experience and self
perception were singled out as key contributors of a deputy head teacher’s managerial practice determinant.

Table 4.24: Teacher’s information on managerial practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.23: Decision communication style

The respondents were requested to indicate the deputy head teachers’ decision communication style they employ most. The findings of the study show that majority (58%) of respondents indicated that the most widely used style of communication was interactive, followed by 24% who indicated that they use verbal, 18% use written communication.
The study determined communication style of the respondents where most respondents indicated it was effective and who accounted for 82.5% followed in a distance by 13.7% who said it was strongly effective, 3.9% said it was very ineffective. The findings of the study are summarized in table 4.25 and figure 4.24 respectively.
Table 4.26: Causes attributed to the above situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other teacher related causes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers related causes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Head teacher's own ineffectiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Head teacher's own effectiveness</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.25: Causes attributed to the above situation

The respondents were requested to indicate what they thought was the cause of effectiveness in decision communication style. Most of the respondents indicated that it was due to the deputy head teacher’s own effectiveness who accounted for 78.9%, followed in a distance by 18.7% who gave head teacher related causes, while 1.4% indicated that it was due to other teacher related causes and 1.1% who said that it was due to deputy head teacher’s own effectiveness.
Table 4.27: Leadership style deputy head teachers employ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian style</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez faire style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic style</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional style</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency style</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.26: Leadership style deputy head teachers employ.

The study sought to find out the leadership style the deputy head teachers employ. According to the analysis of the findings, 45% of the respondents indicated that it was democratic style, 24% gave transactional style, and 20% indicated contingency style, 10% gave authoritarian style while 1% said it was laissez faire.
The study found it of paramount importance to find out the respondents views on the effectiveness of leadership style employed by the deputy head teachers. Based on the study findings, majority (80%) of the respondents were of the view that the leadership style used is effective while 15% of the respondents indicated strongly effective, 5% said ineffective and 6.6% indicated very ineffective. The results of the findings were summarized in table 4.28 and figure 4.27.
Table 4.29: Reasons attributed to the effectiveness of leadership styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers' related causes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/teacher's related causes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Head teacher's own ineffectiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Head teacher's own effectiveness</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.28: Reasons attributed to the effectiveness of leadership styles

The respondents indicated the reasons attributed to the effectiveness of leadership styles used by deputy head teachers in public primary schools. The study findings to this effect indicated that majority (76%) of the respondents were of the view that it is due to the deputy head teacher’s own effectiveness followed by 20% who said it is due to head teacher related causes, 3% said it is due to other teacher related causes and 1% said is due to the influence from outside the school.
Table 4.30: How deputy head teachers are perceived

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not effective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.29: How deputy head teachers are perceived

The study sought to find out from respondents on how the deputy head teachers are perceived. Based on the study findings, the majority, 84% of the respondents indicated that they are perceived to be effective followed in a distance by 16% who indicated that they were perceived as not effective.
Table 4.31: Reasons attributed to the perception of deputy head teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D/Head teacher’s qualifications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Head teachers' managerial experience</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective leadership style</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective decision communication style</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.30: Reasons attributed to the perception of deputy head teachers

The respondents were required to indicate the reasons attributed to the perception of deputy head teacher’s determinants of managerial practices in public primary schools. The study findings to this effect indicated that majority (42%) of the respondents were of the view that it was due to effective leadership style followed by 34% who said it was due to their effective decision communication style, while 23% said it was due to effective deputy head teacher’s managerial experience.
Table 4.32: Rating the key contributor of deputy head teacher’s enhanced managerial practice performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a key contributor to D/Head's managerial performance; how would you rate experience?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a key contributor to D/Head's managerial performance; how would you rate qualifications?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a key contributor to D/Head's managerial performance; how would you rate gender?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a key contributor to D/Head's managerial performance; how would you rate age?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a key contributor to D/Head's managerial performance; how would you rate marital status?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a key contributor to D/Head's managerial performance; how would you rate self-perception?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a key contributor to D/Head's managerial performance; how would you rate others' perception?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were requested to indicate on the key contributors of deputy head teacher’s enhanced managerial practice rating on a 3 point rating scale whereby 1=Not at all, 2=Highly, 3=Very highly. All the respondents indicated yes indeed it highly enhanced managerial practice performance of deputy head teachers as has been indicated by the means and standard deviations.
When asked about the decision communication style they mostly employed, an overwhelming 26 (66.7%) deputy heads checked ‘Interactive’, 6 (15.4%) employed ‘Written’ and 7 (17.9%) used the ‘Verbal decision communication style’.
Table 4.34: Effectiveness level of the decision communication style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly effective</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.32: Effectiveness level of the decision communication style

On the effectiveness of the decision communication style, 25 (64.1%) claimed their style was effective, while 14 (35.9%) asserted that their style was strongly effective.
Table 4.35: A tabular presentation of the cause of the communication style effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers' related causes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher's related causes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own effectiveness</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.33: Graphical illustration of the causes of the communication style effectiveness

When asked about the cause of the communication style effectiveness, 28 deputy head teachers (71.8%) attributed this to their own effectiveness, 6 (15.4%) to other teachers’ related causes and 5 (12.8%) to the head teacher’s related causes as illustrated in the above table and figure.
Table 4.36: Indicating the leadership styles most employed by deputy head teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic style</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional style</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.34: A graphical illustration of the leadership styles mostly employed by deputy head teachers

4.8 Leadership styles mostly employed
The leadership styles most probably applied by the deputy head teachers were categorized into 5, from which the respondents had to select one they used most, namely: Contingency, Transactional, Democratic, Laissez faire and Authoritarian styles. Conspicuously, as shown below, none of the respondent deputy heads applied either the Laissez faire or Authoritarian styles.
On the contrary, the transactional leadership style was the most popular among the deputies with 20 of the respondents employing it representing 51.3% of the 39 sampled deputy head teacher population followed closely by the democratic style being employed by 16 respondents accounting for 41.0%, while 3 deputy heads applied the contingency style, making up 7.7%.

Table 4.37: Effectiveness level of the leadership styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly effective</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.35: Effectiveness level of the leadership styles

On the level of effectiveness, asked to rank their leadership style as either: ‘Strongly effective’, ‘Effective’, ‘Ineffective’ or ‘Very ineffective’, 66.7% of the respondents confirmed that the leadership style they employed was effective as
provided by 26 of the 39 respondents while 13, making up 33.3% indicated that their leadership styles were highly effective. None selected either ‘Ineffective’ or ‘Very ineffective’.

Table 4.38: Effectiveness of the leadership styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers' related causes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own effectiveness</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.36: Effectiveness of the leadership styles

As reason for effectiveness of their leadership style, 34 (87.2%) stated their own effectiveness while 5 (12.8%) gave other teachers’ related causes as the reason for the effectiveness of their leadership style.
Table 4.39: Reasons for effectiveness of the leadership styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D/Head teacher's managerial experience</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective leadership style</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective decision communication style</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.37: Reasons for effectiveness of the leadership styles

The deputy head teachers’ managerial experience was the cause of the reason for the effectiveness of 16 of the deputy head teachers, who were the majority with 41.0%, while 14 (35.9%) attributed the cause to their effective decision communication style and 9 (23.1%) to their effective leadership style.
Table 4.40: Rating the managerial experience of deputy head teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial experience rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.38: Rating of the managerial experience of deputy head teachers

When asked to rate their managerial experience as a key contributor to the enhancement of their managerial practice execution, 21 (53.8%) rated their experience as ‘Good’, 14 (35.9%) rated it ‘Excellent’, while 3 (7.7%) and 1 (2.6%) their managerial experience contribution as ‘Average’ and ‘Poor’ respectively.
Table 4.41: Deputy head teachers’ qualifications rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.39: Deputy head teachers’ qualifications rating

As a key contributor to the enhancement of their managerial practice execution, 17 (43.6%) respondents rated their qualifications as ‘Good’, 15 (38.5%) as ‘Excellent’, 6 (15.4%) as ‘Average’ while 1 (2.6%) rated it as ‘Below average’.
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Table 4.42: Deputy head teachers’ gender rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.40: Deputy head teachers’ gender rating

As asked to rate gender, 17 (43.6%) pointed out its contribution as ‘Good’, 12 (30.8%) as ‘Excellent’, 5 (12.8%) as ‘Average’, while 4 (10.3) rated it ‘Below average’ and 1 (2.6%) as ‘Poor’.
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Table 4.43: Deputy head teachers’ marital status rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.41: Deputy head teachers’ marital status rating

Rating marital status, most respondents, 18 (46.2%), indicated that its contribution to the enhancement of their managerial practice execution was ‘Good’, 7 (17.9%) rated it ‘Excellent’, an equal number, 5 (12.8%) rated it ‘Average’ and ‘Below average’ and 4 (10.3%) rated their marital status contribution as ‘Poor’.
Table 4.44: Perception by the head teachers’ rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.42: Perception by the head teachers’ rating

When asked to rate the perception by their deputy head teachers as a key contributor, 20 (51.3%) deputy head teachers rated it ‘Good’, 12 (30.8%) rated it ‘Excellent’ while 7 (17.9%) rated its contribution as ‘Average’.
Table 4.45: Perception by other teachers’ rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception by other teachers’ rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.43: Perception by other teachers’ rating

On the perception by other teachers, 21 (53.8%) deputy head teachers rated it as ‘Good’, 11 (28.2%) as ‘Excellent’, an equal number 3 (7.7%) as ‘Average’ and ‘Below average’ and 1 (2.6%) rated its contribution as ‘Poor’. 
Table 4.46: Decision communication styles’ rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.44: Decision communication styles’ rating

Rating their decision communication style, 22 (56.4%) deputy head teachers rated its contribution as ‘Good’, 14 (35.9%) as ‘Excellent’, 2 (5.1%) as ‘Average’ while 1 (2.6%) rated it as ‘Below average’.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND
SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Summary of findings

The purpose of the study was to examine the determinants of deputy head teachers’ managerial practices in public primary schools in Kisau Division, Mbooni East District, Kenya. The study achieved the objectives it sought to find out, which included: A determination of the extent to which the professional characteristics of the deputy head teacher influenced their managerial practices in public primary schools; a determination of the extent to which the personal traits of the deputy head teacher influenced their managerial practices in public primary schools in Kisau Division; a determination of how effective the deputy head teachers communicated decisions hence contributing to enhanced managerial practices, as well as determining whether the leadership styles employed by the deputy head teacher contributed to enhancing their managerial practices in public primary schools in Kisau Division.

Literature and empirical studies reviews pointed out the great importance to the study and how it establishes the kind of interaction taking place in public primary schools with regards to managerial practices. The study was conducted in public primary schools in Kisau Division, Mbooni East District, Kenya.
Using descriptive statistics analysis, the study findings indicated that the interactive style was the most preferred means of communicating decisions by the deputy head teachers as attested to by both the teachers and head teachers, and indeed confirmed by the deputy head teachers themselves, with a majority rating it ‘Effective’ with others even rating it ‘Very effective.’

On the reasons attributable to the effectiveness of the communication style mostly employed, it was revealed that the effectiveness of the communication can indeed be attributed to the deputy head teachers’ own effectiveness as pointed out by both the head teachers and teachers which was also confirmed by the deputy head teachers who also in most cases employed the transactional style of leadership with most of the respondents rating it ‘Effective.’

The study also sought to investigate the reasons attributed to the effectiveness of the leadership style. According to the findings of the study, most teachers, head teachers and the deputy head teachers themselves attributed the effectiveness of the latter to the deputy head teacher’s own effectiveness who are also perceived by others to be effective.

The researcher sought to determine the reasons attributed to the perception of the deputy head teachers. According to the findings of the study, majority of the respondents pointed out that the deputy head teacher’s managerial experience was the reason for this. On the rating of the key contributor to enhancing the managerial practice of deputy head teachers, the findings of the study revealed
that all the factors contributed to the enhancement of the managerial practices to a high extent with most respondents rating the deputy head teachers’ managerial experience, qualifications, self perception and perception by the head teachers very highly.

5.2 Conclusions
The study concludes that the deputy head teachers usually adopted the interactive style in communicating their decision and it was indeed effective. The findings also conclude that the reason for the effectiveness of the communication style of was due to the deputy head teacher’s own effectiveness and that they mostly employed the transactional style of leadership.

The researcher sought to determine the reasons attributed to the perception of the deputy head teachers as effective and it was found out that it was due to the deputy head teacher’s own managerial experience. On rating the key contributors of deputy head teachers in enhancing managerial practice, the findings conclude that all the factors contributed to the enhancement of the managerial practices to a high extent.

5.3 Recommendations
As overwhelmingly pointed out in the response when asked to comment on the challenges and recommendations, the key challenges the deputy head teachers faced on a daily basis in the execution of their duties included among others, work overload due to the assignment of lessons coupled with their managerial tasks;
lack of enough staff; uncooperative colleagues; uncooperative parents as well as a clash of roles between the head teachers and the deputy head teachers.

To address this, the study recommends the following: one, enough teaching staff should be acquired so as to relieve the deputy head teachers of their teaching roles or the number of lessons taught by deputy head teachers be reduced so as to provide them ample time so as to effectively execute their managerial functions. This would lead to improved work relations, effective time management, service delivery and improved academic results. Two, fellow teachers and parents are also encouraged to cooperate and support the deputy head teachers to enable them effectively execute their roles. Three, the head teachers and their deputies’ roles need to be distinguished so as to avoid a conflict of the same. Therefore, schools would be rid of the current state of confusion that exists due to role conflict between head teachers and their deputies coupled with the time wastage and misunderstandings. Four, refresher courses especially on public relations also need to be undertaken by school staff for better coexistence and cooperation in the execution of their duties. Deputy head teachers, too, need to specifically be trained in school management in order to improve on their managerial, human relations and technical skills for better handling of their managerial duties. And finally, the study also recommends that more women take part in school leadership, for gender parity, women empowerment and improved participation in managerial roles in schools.
5.4 Suggestions for further research

As a result of the study the recommendations are that a study be done to establish whether personal traits enhance a deputy head teacher’s managerial practices; that a similar study be carried out on secondary schools; and that the study be replicated in other parts of Kenya.
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APPENDIX A: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

University of Nairobi
Department of Educational Administration and Planning
P.O. Box 92
KIKUYU
15/3/2013

To:
The Head teacher

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: REQUEST FOR RESEARCH DATA

I am a Master of Education student at the University of Nairobi, Department of Educational Administration and Planning. I am currently in the process of carrying out a study titled ‘Determinants of Deputy Head teachers’ Managerial Practices in Public Primary Schools in Kisau Division, Mbooni East District.’

I kindly request you to allow me collect data from your school.

This study is purely academic and any information provided by you will be used for the purpose of this study. The participant’s identity will be treated with utmost confidence.

I look forward to your cooperation in this exercise.

Yours faithfully

Paulous Mutwii Mathuva
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DEPUTY HEAD TEACHERS

Respond to all items by putting a tick (√) against your choices or filling in the blank spaces provided.

PART 1: Personal information

1) What is your gender?        Female [ ]        Male [ ]

2) Would you please indicate your age category?
   21-30 [ ]   31-40 [ ]   41-50 [ ]   51-60 [ ]

3) How many years have you served as a deputy head teacher?
   Less than 1 [ ] 1-3 [ ] 4-6 [ ] 7-10 [ ] Over 10 [ ]

4) Would you please indicate your highest level of education?
   P1 [ ] Diploma in Education [ ] BEd. [ ] MEd. [ ]

5) Would you please indicate your marital status?
   Married [ ] Separated [ ] Single [ ] Divorced [ ] Widowed [ ]

PART 2: Deputy head teachers’ execution of managerial practices in schools

6) As the deputy head teacher, which decision communication style do you employ most?
   [ ] 4 = Verbal
   [ ] 3 = Written
   [ ] 2 = Interactive (i.e. Non-formal and consultative).
   [ ] 1 = Grape vine / Gossips.

7) How effective would you rate such decision communication style (used in 6 above)?
   [ ] 4 = strongly effective. [ ] 3 = Effective.
   [ ] 2 = Ineffective.      [ ] 1 = Very ineffective.

8) What would you attribute to be the cause of the above situation?
   [ ] 4 = Own effectiveness.
   [ ] 3 = Head teacher related.
   [ ] 2 = Influence from outside the school.
9) What leadership style do you employ in the execution of managerial practices?

[ ] 5 = Contingency style (i.e. solve-as-the-problem arises).
[ ] 4 = Transactional style (i.e. mixture of all these three below).
[ ] 3 = Democratic style.
[ ] 2 = Laissez faire style.
[ ] 1 = Authoritarian style.

10) How effective would you rate the leadership style you employ above?

[ ] 4 = Strongly effective. [ ] 3 = Effective.
[ ] 2 = Ineffective. [ ] 1 = Very ineffective.

11) What reason would you attribute to the above situation?

[ ] 5 = Own effectiveness. [ ] 4 = Own ineffectiveness.
[ ] 3 = Head teacher related. [ ] 2 = Influence from outside the school.
[ ] 1 = Other teachers’ related causes.

12) What single reason do you attribute to the above (in 11)?

[ ] 7 = Effective decision communication style.
[ ] 6 = Effective leadership style.
[ ] 5 = Deputy head’s perception by self and by others.
[ ] 4 = Deputy head teacher’s age.
[ ] 3 = Deputy head’s gender.
[ ] 2 = Deputy head’s qualifications.
[ ] 1 = Deputy head teacher’s managerial experience.
13) How would you rate the following as a key determinant of your enhanced managerial practice execution using the choices below?

(1) Excellent   (2) Good   (3) Average   (4) Below average   (5) Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deputy head teacher’s:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Managerial experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Qualifications?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Age?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Marital status?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Perception by head teacher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Self perception?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Perception by other teachers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Decision communication style?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j Leadership style?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 3: Challenges deputy head teachers face in the execution of managerial practices

14) What challenges as a deputy head teacher do you face in the execution of your managerial practices?

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

PART 4: Recommendations

15) What suggestions would you give for the improved execution of your managerial practices?

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

Thank you.
APPENDIX C: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HEAD TEACHERS

Respond to all items by putting a tick (✓) against your choices or filling in the blank spaces provided.

PART 1: Personal information

1) What is your gender?             Female [   ]   Male [   ].

2) Would you please indicate your age category?

21-30 [   ]   31-40 [   ]  41-50 [   ]    51-60 [   ]

3) How many years have you served as a head teacher of the current deputy head teacher?      Less than 1 [  ]   1---3 [  ]   4---6 [  ]  7---10   [  ]   Over 10 [  ]

4) Would you please indicate your highest level of education?

P1   [   ]   Diploma in Education [   ]    BEd. [   ]  MEd.   [   ]

PART 2: Deputy head teachers’ determinants of the execution of managerial practices in school management

5) As the head teacher, which decision communication style does your deputy head teacher employ most?

[   ] 4 = Verbal

[  ] 3 = Written.

[   ] 2 = Interactive (i.e. non-formal and consultative).
6) How effective would you rate such decision communication style (used in 5 above)?

[ ] 4 = Strongly effective. [ ] 3 = Effective.

[ ] 2 = Ineffective. [ ] 1 = Very ineffective.

7) What source would you attribute to be the cause of the above situation?

[ ] = 5 Deputy head teacher’s own effectiveness.

[ ] = 4 Deputy head teacher’s own ineffectiveness.

[ ] = 3 Head teacher related causes.

[ ] = 2 Influence from outside the school.

[ ] = 1 Other teachers’ related causes.

8) What leadership style does the deputy head teacher mostly employ in the execution of managerial practices as a manager?

[ ] 5 = Contingency style (i.e. solve-as-the-problem arises).

[ ] 4 = Transactional style (i.e. mixture of all these below).

[ ] 3 = Democratic style.

[ ] 2 = Laissez faire style.

[ ] 1 = Authoritarian style.
9) How effective would you rate the leadership style employed by the deputy head teacher (as stated in 8 above)? [ ] 4 = Strongly effective. [ ] 3 = Effective. [ ] 2 = Ineffective. [ ] 1 = Very ineffective.

10) What reason would you attribute to the above situation?

[ ] 5 = Deputy head teacher’s own effectiveness.

[ ] 4 = Deputy head teacher’s own ineffectiveness.

[ ] 3 = Head teacher related causes.

[ ] 2 = Influence from outside the school.

[ ] 1 = Other teachers’ related causes.

11) How do you perceive your deputy head teacher?

[ ] 3 = Very effective. [ ] 2 = Effective. [ ] 1 = Not effective.

12) What single reason do you attribute to the above situation?

[ ] 4 = Effective decision communication style.

[ ] 3 = Effective leadership style.

[ ] 2 = Deputy head’s managerial experience.

[ ] 1 = Deputy head teacher’s marital status.
13) How would you rate the following as a key contributor to deputy head teacher’s enhanced managerial practice performance using the choices below.

   (1) Not at all.  (2) Highly.  (3) Very highly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deputy head teacher’s:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Managerial experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Qualifications?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Age?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Marital status?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Perception by him/her self?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Perception by other teachers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART 3: Challenges faced by deputy head teachers in execution of their managerial practices**

14) What challenges does your deputy head teacher face in the execution of their managerial practices?

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

**PART 4: Recommendations**

15) What suggestions would you give for improved deputy head teacher’s execution of managerial practices?

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

Thank you.
APPENDIX D: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Respond to all items by putting a tick (✓) against your choices or filling in the blank spaces provided.

PART 1: Personal information

1) What is your gender? Female [ ] Male [ ]

2) Would you please indicate your age category?

21.....30 [ ] 31.....40 [ ] 41.....50 [ ] 51.....60 [ ]

3) For how long have you been working with the current deputy head teacher (in years)? Less than 1 [ ] 1..... 3 [ ] 4...... 6 [ ] 7......10 [ ] Over 10 [ ]

4) Would you please indicate your highest level of education?

P1 [ ] Diploma in Education [ ] BEd. [ ] MEd. [ ]

PART 2: Deputy head teachers’ determinants of the execution of their managerial practices in school management

5) As a teacher, which decision communication style does your deputy head teacher employ most?

[ ] 4 = Verbal.

[ ] 3 = Written.

[ ] 2 = Interactive (i.e. non-formal and consultative).
6) How effective would you rate such decision communication style (used in above)?  
[ ] 4 = Strongly effective.  [ ] 3 = Effective.  
[ ] 2 = Ineffective.  [ ] 1 = Very ineffective.

7) What factor would you attribute to be the cause of the above situation?

[ ] 5 = Deputy head teacher’s own effectiveness.  
[ ] 4 = Deputy head teacher’s own ineffectiveness. 
[ ] 3 = Head teacher related causes. 
[ ] 2 = Influence from outside the school. 
[ ] 1 = Other teachers’ related causes.

8) What leadership style does your deputy head teacher employ in the execution of managerial practices as a manager?

[ ] 5 = Contingency style (i.e. solve- as- the- problem arises).  
[ ] 4 = Transactional style (i.e. mixture of all these below).  
[ ] 3 = Democratic style.  
[ ] 2 = Laissez faire style.  
[ ] 1 = Authoritarian style.
9) How effective would you rate the leadership style of your deputy head teacher used above?  
   [ ] 4 = Strongly effective.  [ ] 3 = Effective.  
   [ ] 2 = Ineffective.  [ ] 1 = Very ineffective.  

10) What reason would you attribute to the situation (in 9) above?  
   [ ] 5 = Deputy head teacher’s own effectiveness.  
   [ ] 4 = Deputy head teacher’s own ineffectiveness.  
   [ ] 3 = Head teacher related causes.  
   [ ] 2 = Influence from outside the school.  
   [ ] 1 = Other teachers’ related causes.  

11) How do you perceive your deputy head teacher?  
   [ ] 3 = Very effective.  [ ] 2 = Effective.  [ ] 1 = Not effective.  

12) What single reason do you attribute to be the cause of the above situation?  
   [ ] 6 = Effective decision communication style.  
   [ ] 5 = Effective leadership style.  
   [ ] 4 = Deputy head teacher’s managerial experience.  
   [ ] 3 = Deputy head teacher’s age.  
   [ ] 2 = Deputy head teacher’s gender.
13) How would you rate the following as a key contributor to your deputy head teacher’s enhanced managerial practice performance using the choices below?

   (1) Not at all. (2) Highly. (3) Very highly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deputy head teacher’s:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Managerial experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Qualifications?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Age?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Marital status?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Perception by head teacher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Perception by him/her self?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 3: Challenges deputy head teachers face in the execution of their managerial practices

14) What challenges does your deputy head teacher face in the execution of his/her managerial practices?

PART 4: Recommendations

15) What suggestions would you give for improved deputy head teachers’ execution of managerial practices?

Thank you.
APPENDIX E : INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR ZQASOs

1.) Based on your observations and interactions with deputy head teachers, comment on their effective managerial practices execution in relation to:

(a) Managerial experience and its influence on their managerial practices.

(b) Gender and managerial practices.

(c) Qualifications and managerial practices.

(d) Decision communication style and influence on managerial practices.

2.) How effective do you feel the personal characteristics of a deputy head teacher influence his/ her execution of managerial practices in a school?

3.) How does the deputy head teacher’s decision communication style enhance his/ her effective managerial practices in a school?

4.) How does the deputy head teacher’s leadership style enhance his/ her effective managerial practices in a school?

5.) In your own opinion, what challenges hinder the deputy head teachers from executing their managerial practices effectively in primary schools?

6.) What measures do you recommend to be taken to enable deputy head teachers effectively execute their managerial practices in schools?

Thank you.
## APPENDIX F: RESEARCH PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td>Academic writing conference at Kikuyu Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2012</td>
<td>Topic selection and discussion with supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August- September 2012</td>
<td>Concept paper writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December - 2012</td>
<td>Proposal development and corrections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January – February 2013</td>
<td>Corrections in the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>Defense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2013</td>
<td>Data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>Data analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>Completion of research findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2013</td>
<td>Binding and presentation of the final project report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher operated with the following budget plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERIAL NUMBER</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST (KSH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Typing and printing</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Binding cost</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Photocopying</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Traveling and accommodation</td>
<td>27,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Internet services/Modem credit</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Overheads</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10% Contingency</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>99,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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