



Perception on Head Teachers' Delegation of Duties in Secondary Schools of Nandi Central District, Kenya

Dr. Grace Cherutoh Kiptok*, Dr. Fanta Hotamo Hollamo and Prof. Yona Balyage
Department of Curriculum and Teaching
University of Eastern Africa Baraton, Kenya

*Corresponding author: cheru2013christ@gmail.com

Received: June 26, 2018; Revised October 26, 2018; Accepted November 27, 2018

Abstract: *This study sought to determine the perceptions on head teachers' delegation of duties to deputy head teachers and heads of departments in secondary schools in Nandi Central district of Kenya. Descriptive comparative research design was used with a target population of forty seven head teachers, forty seven deputy head teachers and two hundred and thirty five heads of departments. One hundred and seventy five filled questionnaires were returned. A pilot study was conducted in Nandi South District. Percentages, means, standard deviation and ANOVA were used to analyze data. The study revealed that eighty percent of head teachers, deputy head teachers and heads of department held a Bachelor of Education degree and above qualification. The perception of head teachers, deputy head teachers, and heads of departments on delegation of duties was rated as average. The evaluation rating on the head teachers' practice of delegation based on: head teachers' self-evaluation, deputy head teachers' evaluation, and heads department evaluation was rated as average. The highly delegated tasks by head teachers were receiving of visitors, preparation of examination time-tables, checking schemes of work, preparation of duty roster and signing of exit sheets. There is no significant difference between the perceptions on delegation and evaluation rating of head teachers' delegation practices of the respondents grouped according to responsibility. The study recommends that head teachers should take administrative risks by delegating their assistants with meaningful tasks, which require responsibility and accountability and TSC should encourage more teachers to enhance their training through refresher courses.*

Key words: Delegation, Tasks, head teacher, Deputy Head Teachers, Heads of Department

1. Introduction

Schools are established for the purpose of providing conditions and services which would enable children to learn. The school, by its nature, is a complex organization such that delegation of duties is unavoidable. Head teachers, deputy head teachers heads of departments at whatever level, primary, secondary or tertiary, need to understand delegation of duties and its importance to their day to day running of the institution.

According to Mullins (1993), delegation is defined as the authorization to undertake activities that would otherwise be carried out by someone in a more senior position. Cole, (1996) describes it as a process whereby a manager or a senior officer cedes or entrusts some of his/her authority to subordinates or teammates to perform certain tasks or duties on his/her behalf. Delegation of duties is an older practice that has evolved into the modern delegation, which is structured and organized through definition of

tasks and setting timelines for the performance of duties delegated.

According to Hallinger and Snidvongs (2008), the school head plays a key role in bringing about school improvement and effectiveness in the complex operations of schools in the 21st century. Increased interest in leadership preparation and development is based on the fact that school leaders can make a difference in both the effectiveness and efficiency of schooling. It has been observed that effective delegation in schools depends on preparation and development of school heads. It is therefore presumed that there can never be effective delegation without an efficient and effective preparation and development of school heads.

In Great Britain, for instance, preparation and development of school heads is well structured and systematic in the sense that aspiring school heads are prepared for school leadership before appointment and then continuously developed after appointment to enhance

performance of their duties, including delegation of duties. Preparation and development therefore becomes mandatory and is a requirement for all wishing to be school heads.

According to Fink (2005), The National College of School Leadership (NCSL) in England is an example of an institution where aspiring school heads are prepared through the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) Program and are inducted through Early Headship Program (EHP) on ascension to headship and those in service are continuously developed through Head for the future (HftF) Program (Brundett & De Quevas, 2007).

According to Wong & CHUNG – CHI, (2004), Asia, Hong Kong and Singapore have been in the fore front of developing institutions and programs for preparation and development of school heads. Most of their programs are based on institutions and programs in the developed countries. For example, in Hong Kong the conceptual foundations for Leadership education for school heads were established by Hong Kong Education Department in 1999 after study visits to similar programs in England, Scotland, Austria and Singapore.

In Africa, preparation and development of school heads is not as pronounced and systematic as it is in the developed world. In fact, in most cases it is either lacking or not formal (Bush & Odero, 2006).

According to, Harbey & Dadey, (1993), though most studies have been done on the problems facing principals in the performance of their duties there are efforts being made by some countries in coming up with programs for preparation and development of school heads. In South Africa, the Department of Education has developed Advanced Certificate in Education (ACE) in collaboration with 14 universities and other Education stakeholders. In Seychelles, the University of Lincoln (UK), in partnership with Ministry of Education, provides training for the school heads.

In Kenya, the need for preparation and development of not only Secondary school heads but also their counter parts in primary schools, can be traced back to the training Review Committee, Wamalwa Report (1971) of 1971- 72 as cited by Nandwah, (2011) which discovered that there was no regular systematic program to train administrators and managers and therefore, saw the need to train such professional officers in administrative and managerial aspects of their work. This, then, meant that courses to meet these need were to be run at Kenya Institute of Administration. Moreover; according to Muigai Report of (1978) as cited by Nandwah, (2011) which was established to report on the feasibility of establishing KESI, upon the implementation of these recommendations, KESI was inaugurated in 1981 but given legal status in 1988 through legal Notice 565/1988 to among other functions identifying staff educational

development needs and providing service training to meet those needs and organizing, conducting training for personnel involved in the Administration and management of education. KESI offers these courses mostly in April or August holidays for two weeks, Olembo, Wanga & Karagu, (1992). Njeri, (1996) argues that this duration is so short to satisfy the requirements for the complex functions of school leadership.

2. Review of Related Literature and Studies

Delegation of duties is an older practice that has evolved into the modern delegation which is structured and organized through definition of tasks and setting timelines for the performance of duties delegated. It has been observed that effective delegation in schools depends on preparation and development of school heads. It is therefore presumed that there can never be effective delegation without an efficient and effective preparation and development of school heads. Technical professionals, team and business leaders, managers, and executives all need to develop good delegation skills. There are many rules and techniques that help people to delegate. Good delegation saves money, time, builds people and team skills, grooms successors and motivates people.

According to Mbiti (2007) the concept of delegation does not mean the surrender of power but what the one performing the particular duty does on behalf of and with authority from the head teacher. If anything goes wrong, the final responsibility or accountability lies with the head teacher. According to Nwachukwu (1988), Cole (1996) and Mullins (1993), delegation is essentially a two – way power – sharing process. The person delegating duties passes on his/her responsibility and authority to another, but he/she is still accountable, while the person receiving them by implication undertakes to carry out the tasks. However, sufficient authority should be given to hold him/her accountable. Nwachukwu (1988) argued that in practice, delegation can be found to operate with two ends of a continuum. At one end is a loose control but wide freedom while at the other end is a tight control with little freedom that can fluctuate between the two ends depending on the individuals involved and the situation.

According to Farrant (2006), delegation is also seen as empowering another person, normally a junior, to act for the person delegating duties and responsibilities.

The act of delegation then involves conferring some of one's functions or powers on another so that they act on their behalf. Carol, Cunningham, Danzberger & McCloud, (1986) noted that delegation can be used to refer to an ongoing process by which a leader assigns additional task (i.e. responsibilities and authority) to a subordinate in such a way that there is acceptance of responsibility for the assigned tasks.

As for Beckham (2009) delegation is not the giving out of jobs to be done; normally, a delegated task takes more

than a short time frame to complete. It does not involve telling people what to do, rather it involves the outcomes and results they are expected to work out the “how” and the steps involved. According to Beckham (2009), effective delegation being an important leadership skill is used to balance workloads and provide staff development opportunities. Carol et al (1986) argued that delegation has several benefits on the leaders: - eases work pressure, increases time for primary responsibilities, and increases time for self-development.

2.1 The Process of Delegation

According to Rush (2006), the process of delegation is as critical as the planning, because a poor process can reduce the effectiveness of the delegation in several ways. First, it can lower the worker's motivation to perform the task. A qualified worker who is not motivated to complete the assignment is not likely to produce the desired results. Second, lack of proper communication of standards for the task may lead to less than desirable outcomes. Finally, the delegation process may create some artificial barriers or fail to eliminate barriers to performance. The failure to share information and discuss real or perceived problems can reduce efficiency and may lead to failure.

This study seeks to isolate one key problem in delegation. Perceptions on delegation, first by school head, who is the delegator and also the perceptions of the teachers, deputy head teachers and Senior masters/mistresses in the school management and Administration for instance if the school head perceives him/herself differently from the way teachers see him/her, then there is an imbalance, and that can affect the performance of both parties. To avoid obstacles in delegation, the following should be considered in the delegation process.

2.2 Selection of Employees and Level of Delegation

Selection of employees involves assessing their skills level, motivation and dependability; this is because certain people will be more efficient than others depending on the facet upon which they thrive. Employees therefore need to be given opportunities to broaden their horizons and become valuable to the team. Matching the proper person with the proper task can be difficult but the leader needs to start small and be patient.

According to Karen (2009), time is the most precious commodity. No one can be good at everything; therefore all leaders should delegate some of their tasks and responsibilities to their juniors.

2.3 Delegation of Duties in Kenyan Secondary Schools

Teachers who complete diploma and degree in education are usually registered by the Teachers Service Commission to teach in both public and private secondary schools in Kenya. Teachers can therefore be appointed by the school or the Teachers Service Commission to work as class teachers, dormitory master/mistress, head of department or as academic master/mistress.

According to Nandwah (2011), appointment to school leadership in Kenya has evolved and undergone several developments. Initially school heads, currently referred to as school principals (from the old Headmaster or Headmistress), were appointed with participation of the Boards of Governors (BOGs) and Parents Teachers Associations (PTAs). Later their appointment was based on seniority and currently it is based on merit where they have to be interviewed. After graduation from colleges with Diplomas or Degrees in Education, teachers are posted to various public secondary schools in the country by the TSC. Their promotion to leadership depends on their seniority, and performance.

Nandwah (2011) notes that up to 1987 TSC used to appoint principals who were identified as suitable by the principal, politician, school sponsor or TSC field agents. Additionally, the teacher had to be excellent in teaching with a minimum of three years' experience as well as good moral behavior and integrity. However, Bush and Odero (2006), Harber and Davies (1993) and Njeri (1996) argued that such arrangement could be abused by principals, politicians or sponsors picking on a person of their choice who may be lacking the qualities cited. Studies have also shown that being a good teacher does not necessarily mean one can make an effective school leader.

Bush and Odero (2006) argued that in 1998 after the implementation of the schemes of service for graduate and graduate approved teachers, school heads` (principals`) positions became deployable after promotion to job groups L and M where a teacher becomes a Head of Department (HOD), Deputy principal, principal, senior principal and chief principal. As per Rarieya (2007) headship positions currently are advertised and interested teachers subjected to rigorous interviews before they are appointed by the TSC.

However, Bush and Odero (2006) noted that principals have to be trained before and after appointment to school leadership. They can only become principals if they have a certificate in Education Management from KESI.

According to TSC (2005), on appointment, principals are given a lot of responsibilities. TSC, a body charged with employment of teachers in Kenya, outlines some of the responsibilities of a principal as being the accounting officer of the school, interpreting and implementing policy decisions pertaining to training overall

organization, coordination and supervision of activities in the institution as well as maintaining high training standards.

According to Farrant (2006) principals perform the following duties and responsibilities:-

- teaching and training- class teaching and staff training;
- budgetary matters and accounts;
- filling of forms and correspondence to school authorities;
- correspondence to parents;
- preparation of notices;
- preparation of reports, references etc for teachers, students;
- checking records (administration records, teachers records and students' records) and equipment, etc;
- organization and supervision of school activities;
- teaching time tables;
- non- teaching staff work schedules;
- students management discipline, career advice and counseling and welfare;
- building projects;
- meetings: - with education ministry officials staff, students, B.O.M and P.T.A; and,
- events, anniversaries and attending to visitors.

2.4 The Best Practices in Delegation of Duties

Delegation is a two way process, There is the person taking the duties delegated (the delegated) and the one delegating. The one delegating should be prepared to let go the need of the delegated duty and the one being delegated should be willing to take up the delegated duties and responsibilities.

Rarieya (2007) noted that delegation is indeed a crucial element in school management that should be tailored to achieve its intended purpose. However, delegation in schools has been hampered by so many factors that need to be isolated and ironed out to make delegation effective. In Kenya this is being done by encouraging teachers to go for KESI trainings and delegating duties progressively to aspiring principals

Rierdan (2001) suggested the following three criteria that could be beneficial for employee development in the initial stages of delegation: Delegating assignments that the delegator needs to strengthen his/her weakness; delegating a variety of duties to test the employee's versatility and add interest to his/her job, and delegating duties that could lead directly to promotion. The second most important thing in delegation is coaching or mentorship. Coaches neither run onto the field to take over the job nor leave players to their own devices. They offer expertise, new methods, continual training, support and pep talks. They want everyone to be a winner.

Rierdan (2001) contends that for effective delegation, the aspiring principals can be grouped into three categories. The first group is the new or untried people who should be

closely supervised and encouraged to move on. They should be given room to make mistakes and be guided on the best ways to overcome these mistakes. The second group is those who have some little experience and need to be given room to ask questions and consult. The third group is those who have adequate experience and need to be left to work out things on their own. Duties to be delegated should clearly be defined and the expectations on the would be delegated be made clear (Mullins, 1993). In a school setting, however, Arikewuyo (2009) argued that there are some tasks that ought not be delegated by a school principal including; Finance, admission of new pupils, Final decision –making on policy issues and changes in the school, assigning duties to deputy head and senior teachers; communicating with ministry and the governing boards, recruitment of teachers; Final responsibility on examinations and private/confidential correspondence with teachers, this is because the head teacher is personally accountable for the performance of such sensitive tasks in the school.

In addition, Lunenburg (2010) argued that the delegates should recognize that delegation is more useful to them more than the delegator. Delegation saves times, makes the delegator to achieve much more and increases value. It also increases efficiency, flexibility, makes one achieve balanced workloads, reduces stress, aids in communication and enhances teamwork.

Lunenburg, further argues that the principal should take into account the key elements of organizational structure, including job specialization (the degree to which overall task of the school is broken down and divided into smaller, components), Departmentalization (organizational units, departments or divisions by its function), decentralization (degree to which authority is dispersed and span of control -the number of subordinates who report directly to a given principal).

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

Descriptive-comparative research design was used. According to Quizlet (2013), the main goal of descriptive research design is to describe the data and characteristics about what is being studied. It analyzes and interprets frequencies, means, and standard deviations. While descriptive research design is mainly done when a researcher wants to gain a better understanding of specific constructs and their occurrences, comparative research design compares two or more groups on one or more variables.

3.2 Population and Sampling

The total target population of head teachers, deputy head teachers, and heads of departments in forty seven public secondary schools in Nandi Central District was three hundred and twenty nine. A total of one hundred and seventeen questionnaires were returned with twenty five from head teachers, twenty seven from deputy head

teachers and sixty five from heads of departments. The return rate was thirty six percent. This is because during the study some of the respondents were not available in school while others were not willing to respond to the questionnaires leading to a poor return rate.

3.3 Validity of the Instrument

Validity is the extent to which the instrument accurately measures the concept to which it is assigned (Role, 2007). Validity refers to the extent a research instrument measures what it claims to measure (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). It is the extent to which scores and the conclusions based on these scores can be used for the intended purpose of the data collected by the instrument. In other words, validity is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represent the phenomena under study.

3.4 Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability is the extent of accuracy, consistency, stability or repeatability of a measurement of an instrument. It is the degree to which individuals deviation scores remain relatively consistent over repeated administration of the same test of an instrument (Role, 2007).

To test reliability, a pilot study was conducted in seven public secondary schools in Nandi South District with similar characteristics with targeted population. After the piloted questionnaires had been collected, they were coded and analyzed with the assistance of a statistician at University of Eastern Africa, Baraton. Data from the piloted questionnaires were analyzed and a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was computed which at 0.686 qualified the instrument as reliable. The responses given from the pilot study were used to make adjustments on the questionnaires. This was done after the piloted questionnaires had been scrutinized to remove items that seemed unclear or ambiguous to the respondents. Such items were reviewed and re-worded to improve reliability of the instrument.

3.5 Procedures of Data Collection

This study used self-constructed questionnaires as instruments of collecting data. Questionnaires were designed from the literature review and related studies. They had closed ended items on areas of perceptions since they were more preferable as they could not be easily misinterpreted by the respondents and were easy to analyze as they maintain clarity (Role, 2007).

3.6 Statistical Treatment of Data

The collected data was analyzed using SPSS. Percentages, means, standard deviation and ANOVA were used to analyze data. A coherent summary and analysis of findings was eventually done.

4. Results and Discussion

Research Question 1: What are Demographic Characteristics of Respondents?

4.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

As seen in Table 1, most of the head teachers, deputy head teachers and heads of departments had stayed in their station for between one to five years, while all the schools in the district had TSC teachers with the highest being schools with eight to fourteen TSC teachers. This has enabled them to learn and prepare for school leadership. Majority of the head teachers, deputy head teachers and heads of departments in the schools were degree holders, which is the minimum requirement for one to be employed as a teacher in a secondary school.

Research Question 2. What are the perceptions of head teachers, deputy head teachers, and heads of departments on delegation?

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

		Head Teachers	Deputy Head teachers and Heads of Departments
Length of stay in the station	1-5 Years	18	95
	6-10 Years	7	31
	11-15 years		18
	over 15 years		6
Level of education	Diploma	1	18
	Bachelor Degree	20	121
	Masters and above	4	11
Number of TSC teachers in your school	0-7	10	-
	8-14	12	-
	15 and above	3	-

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics on Head teacher's Perception of themselves

SN	Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Dev.
1.	Delegation of duties is liked by teachers	2.72	1.275
2.	Delegation is part of management	3.68	.627
3.	Delegation prepares teachers for leadership	3.80	.408
4.	Teachers understand the limits of authority and power	2.76	1.091
5.	KESI has helped me understand delegation better	3.40	.866
6.	Attendance of KSSHA has enabled me to understand delegation	3.56	.768
7.	Consultation is with my colleagues has enabled me to understand delegation better	3.52	.714
8.	Attendance of KESI by D/HM and HODS has helped them view delegation positively	3.40	.707
9.	Work delegated is done to my expectation	3.08	.640
10.	Delegation when done well leads to quality performance of duties	3.72	.458
Overall Mean And Std. Deviation		3.36	.378

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics on Deputy Head teachers' Perceptions

SN	Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Dev.
1.	I like it when duties are delegated to me	3.56	.641
2.	I view delegation of duties as part of management	3.56	.751
3.	Delegation prepares a teacher for leadership	3.67	.734
4.	I understand the limits of authority and power in the performance of tasks	3.48	.753
5.	KESI has helped me understand delegation better	2.93	1.107
6.	Consultation with my colleagues has enabled me to understand delegation better	3.37	1.01
7.	Work delegated by the head teacher is done to her/his expectation	3.30	.775
8.	Delegation when done well leads to quality performance of duties	3.74	.656
Overall Mean and Std. Deviation		3.45	.471

4.2 Head Teachers' perception

Table 2 shows that the head teachers' perception of their delegation highly rated that: delegation prepares teachers for leadership, when done well leads to quality performance of duties, delegation is part of management, attendance of KSSHA has enabled them to understand delegation, and consultation with their colleagues enabled them to understand delegation better, with high mean scores of 3.80, 3.72, 3.68, 3.56, and 3.52 respectively.

The responses of head teachers concur with findings of Keegan (1987) which highlighted that delegation helps to motivate and allow participation of assistants in the decision making process. The findings were eminent in Mbithi, (2007) that the school, by its nature, is a complex organization such that delegation of authority is unavoidable; it is therefore imperative for all school managers and administrators at whatever level, primary, secondary or tertiary, to understand the concept of delegation, its importance and how to use it effectively.

Head teachers rated items: - work delegated is done to his/her expectation, Teachers understand the limits of authority and power, and teachers liked the delegation of with mean scores of 3.40, 3.40, 3.08, 2.76, and 2.72 respectively producing an average rating. The respondents concurred with Muthini, (2004) that

Principal's perception of KESI programs in Nairobi province Kenya, found out that principals appreciated relevance of KESI programs.

4.3 Deputy Head Teachers' Perception

In table 3 the deputy head teachers' perception agreed that: I like it when duties are delegated to me, I view delegation of duties as part of management, Delegation prepares a teacher for leadership, and Delegation when done well leads to quality performance of duties. This means that there was a positive perception of deputy Head teachers towards delegation whose means scores were 3.56, 3.56, 3.67, and 3.74 respectively, producing a high rating. These findings concur with the work of Rierdan (2001), which stressed that there are three criteria that could be beneficial for employee development in the initial stages of delegation: delegating assignments that the delegator needs to strengthen his/her weakness; delegating a variety of duties to test the employee's versatility and add interest to his/her job, and delegating duties that could lead directly to promotion. The second most important thing in delegation is coaching or mentorship. Coaches neither run onto the field to take over the job nor do they leave players to their own devices. They offer expertise,

new methods, continual training, support and pep talks. They want everyone to be a winner.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Department Heads' Perceptions

SN	Item in the Questionnaire	Mean	Std. Dev.
1	I like it when duties are delegated to me	3.60	.617
2	I view delegation of duties as part of management	3.70	.513
3	Delegation prepares a teacher for leadership	3.80	.399
4	I understand the limits of authority and power in the performance of tasks	3.60	.708
5	KESI has helped me understand delegation better	2.96	1.109
6	Consultation with my colleagues has enabled me to understand delegation better	3.40	.766
7	Work delegated by the head teacher is done to her/his expectation	3.22	.767
8	Delegation when done well leads to quality performance of duties	3.71	.588
Overall Mean and Std. Deviation		3.50	.321

Table 5: Descriptives

Item	Category	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error
PERCEPTIONS ON DELEGATION	Head teachers	25	3.36	.378	.076
	Deputy head teacher	27	3.40	.471	.091
	Head of department	117	3.50	.321	.030
DELEGATION PRACTICES	Head teachers	25	3.20	.320	.064
	Deputy head teacher	27	3.01	.512	.099
	Head of department	117	2.30	.463	.043

The same respondent tended to agree with items numbers 4, 5, 6, and 7 that: I understand the limits of authority and power in the performance of tasks, KESI has helped me understand delegation better, consultation with my colleagues has enabled me to understand delegation better, and work delegated by the head teacher is done to her/his expectation. this means that there was a positive perception of deputy Head teachers toward delegation whose means scores were 3.48, 2.93, 3.37, and 3.29 respectively producing an average rating.

4.4 Deputy Head Teachers' perception

The deputy head teachers' responses on perception concurred with Blanchard, (2005) that a good leader sets examples, coaches, provides guidance, encouragement, and directs, but explains the parameters of the decision being made and asks the followers for input and reactions. Coaching is when school managers allow his/ her subordinates to design a plan and procedure to carry out his/her delegated task. When coaching is applied professionally and in good faith, many school disputes and problems could be easily eliminated.

These findings concurred with Ngaroga, (2006) that delegation is a function of educational administration and management. It was also backed up by Rierdan, (2010) that delegating duties could lead directly to promotion. Rarieya,(2007) concurred with the same findings that in

Kenya teachers aspiring to be principals should be encouraged to go for KESI trainings. The deputy head teachers' tended to agree on perception on delegation of duties producing an average rating of 3.44 and standard deviation on 0.4706.

In table 4 heads of departments highly agreed with item numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 that: they like it when duties are delegated to them, they view delegation of duties as part of management, delegation prepares them for leadership, they understand the limits of authority and power in the performance of tasks, and delegation when done well leads to quality performance of duties. This means that there was a positive perception of heads of departments towards delegation whose means scores were 3.70, 3.80, 3.60, and 3.71 respectively producing a high rating.

The findings concurred with Mbiti (2007) findings that the school, by its nature, is a complex organization such that delegation of authority is unavoidable, it is therefore imperative for all school managers and administrators at levels of leadership to understand the concept of delegation, its importance and how to use it effectively. The head teacher plays a vital role in the leadership and management of the school. It is widely recognized and agreed that the quality of leadership always has effect on the school effectiveness.

On the other hand the head of department tended to agree with the following items numbers 5, 6, and 7 that: KESI has helped them to understand delegation better, consultation with colleagues has enabled them to understand delegation better, and work delegated by the head teacher is done to their expectation. This means that there was a positive perception of deputy head teachers towards delegation whose means scores were 2.96, 3.40, and 3.2 respectively producing an average ratings.

The head teachers' ratings whether KESI had helped them understand delegation was high compared to both deputy and the heads of department. Restine,(1997) argued that principals in their preparation for school leadership, admitted that classroom experiences, support, being principals in multi-settings and prior experiences in making difficult solutions prepared and developed them for school leadership. This means that both deputy head teachers and the heads of departments have less experience on management compared to the head teacher.

Table 5 shows information on means of perception on delegation and evaluation rating of delegation practices of

the respondents grouped according to responsibility. The head of departments, deputy head teachers and head teachers tended to agree on perception on delegation with mean ratings of 3.50, 3.40 and 3.36 respectively. Moreover the head teachers and deputy head teachers agreed on the delegation practices with mean ratings of 3.20 and 3.01; however the heads of departments tended to disagree with a rating of 2.30 on the delegation practices.

Mbithi (2007) again concurred that there is need for the head teacher to give each teacher specific instructions on how duty should be performed. Regular advisory meetings with each teacher, holding a particular responsibility are necessary. Such meetings serve as reinforcements in those areas one is doing well and also as training opportunities in those areas of work where one might have gone wrong. A good head teacher should plan for such informal meetings with each of the teachers to whom responsibility has been delegated.

Table 6: Comparison of Tasks Delegated in Regard to Responsibility Held per the Means

Tasks Delegated	Head Teacher	D/Head Teacher	Head of Dpt
1. Receiving visitors/guests	3.00	3.26	2.55
2. Filling in the log book	2.40	2.48	1.77
3. Daily financial expenditure	2.84	2.41	2.07
4. Annual budget preparation	2.16	2.11	1.63
5. Receiving letters from the government ministries	2.28	2.26	1.79
6. Receiving letters from parents/guardians	2.7	2.48	2.15
7. Replying letters to government ministries	1.80	2.00	1.63
8. Writing of letters to parents/guardians	2.76	2.89	2.55
9. Preparation of teachers yearly appraisal reports	2.24	2.37	2.15
10. Checking of schemes of work	3.08	3.37	2.89
11. Preparation of teachers duty roster	3.44	3.48	2.69
12. Preparation of exams timetable	3.72	3.19	3.13
13. Checking of lesson plans	2.84	3.26	2.71
14. Checking of daily lesson attendance	2.92	3.30	2.32
15. Teachers discipline	2.68	2.52	1.89
16. Students discipline	2.68	3.59	2.97
17. Admission of new students	2.52	3.30	2.74
18. Supervision of the school curriculum	2.44	3.26	2.74
19. Preparation of school events eg Academic days etc	2.96	3.56	3.24
20. Signing of teachers exit sheets	2.40	2.93	2.06
21. Signing of students exit sheets	3.56	3.63	3.32
22. Handling of staff welfare	3.40	3.22	2.81
23. Appointments of school prefects	3.44	3.78	3.42

In table 6 the deputy head teachers' responses agreed that: matters of student's discipline, preparation of school events i.e. AGMS, price giving, academic days and anniversaries; and appointments of school prefects producing a high ratings of 3.59, 3.56, and 3.78 respectively whereas the head teacher and the head of

department tended to agree on the same items producing and average ratings of 2.68, 2.97, 2.96, 3.24, 3.44, and 3.42 respectively are the main tasks they delegated to by the head teachers. the head teachers' and the deputy head teachers' responses agreed on the item number 21 of signing of students exit sheets producing a high ratings of

3.56 and 3.63 whereas the head of the department tended to agree on the same item with an average rating of 3.32. All the respondents tended to agree that: receiving visitors/quests, writing of letters to parents/guardians, checking of schemes of work, preparation of teachers duty roster, preparation of exams timetable, checking of lesson plans, admission of new students, and handling of staff welfare producing an average ratings of 3.00, 3.26, 2.55; 2.76, 2.89, 2.55; 3.08, 3.37, 2.89; 3.44, 3.48, 2.69; 3.72, 3.19, 3.13; 2.84, 3.26, 2.71; 2.52, 3.30, 2.74; and 3.40, 3.22, 2.81 respectively.

The head teachers' and the deputy head teachers' responses tended to agree that: financial expenditure, checking of lesson plans, checking of daily lesson attendance, and teachers discipline producing an average ratings: 2.84, 2.41; 2.84, 3.26, 2.92, 3.30; and 2.68, 2.52 respectively. Whereas the head of department responses tended to disagree on the same items producing low ratings of 2.07, 2.71, 2.32, and 1.89 respectively.

in regard to item number 18 on supervision of the school curriculum, both deputy head teachers' and the head of the department responses tended to agree with an average rating of 3.26, and 2.74 respectively. While the head teachers' responses tended to disagree on the same item producing a low rating of 2.44 in regard to signing of teachers exit sheets, both the head teachers' and the head of departments responses tended to disagree producing a low ratings of 2.40 and 2.06 respectively. Whereas the deputy head teachers' responses tended to agree on the same item producing an average rating of 2.93.

From the above comparisons, it can be concluded that there were some certain task which school heads did not delegate to both deputies and the heads of departments. This concurred with Kimaathi, (2007), that there were certain tasks which school heads do not delegate to any of their teachers. Top on this list include the authority to incur expenditure, followed by admission of students into the school. Although the principals argued that their reluctance to delegate given tasks is motivated by their wish to enhance accountability, the general feeling by the teachers is that there are certain benefits associated with those tasks which school heads would not like to be discovered by any of their teachers.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

1. The study revealed that eighty percent of head teachers, deputy head teachers and heads of department held a qualification of a Bachelor of Education degree and above.
2. The perception of head teachers, deputy head teachers, and heads of departments on delegation of secondary school head teachers was rated as average.

3. The evaluation rating on the Head Teachers' practice of delegation based on: Head teachers' self-evaluation, deputy head teachers' evaluation, and Heads department evaluation was also found to be average.
4. The highly delegated tasks by head teachers were receiving of visitors or guests, preparation of examination time-tables, checking schemes of work, preparation of teachers' duty roster, and signing of students' exit sheets.
5. There is no significant difference between the perceptions on delegation and evaluation rating of head teachers' delegation practices of the respondents grouped according to responsibility. This implies that head teachers do delegate responsibilities to their deputy head teachers and heads of departments but with limited power to decide and act.

5.2 Recommendations

1. The study recommends that TSC should encourage more teachers to enhance their training through refresher courses.
2. The Ministry of education should train head teachers on administration. This will help them to enhance their administrative roles especially delegation of duties.
3. Teachers undertaking administrative roles in schools especially the deputy head teachers and heads of departments should be trained more on administrative roles by the relevant bodies.
4. Head teachers through the TSC and the Ministry of Education should be encouraged to delegate most of responsibilities to their juniors as this will enhance the preparation of successors and also create more time for them to do more of administrative work.
5. Head teachers should take administrative risks by delegating their assistants with meaningful tasks which require responsibility and accountability.

For further research, it can be recommend that studies be carried out on the same issue but at national level since the current study was done in one district in the country which might not give a wholesome picture of the matter. A study may also be carried out on the relevance of college curricula to the administration of schools.

REFERENCES

- Arikewuyo, M. O., (2009). Professional Training of Secondary School Principals in Nigeria. *Florida Journal of Educational*

- Beckham, J., (2009). *Delegation: Selection and Education of Members*; New times, Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, USA.
- Blanchard K. (2005). *Situational Leadership*. (Retrieved on 30 June 2013)
- Brundrett, M., and De Quevas, R. A., (2007). *Setting an agenda for social Justice Through Leadership Development: Management in Education, 21(4)* , 44-48.
- Bush T. & Odero, G. K.T., (2006). *New principals in Africa: Preparation, Induction and Practice*: Journal of Educational Administration, 44, 359-375.
- Carol, L. N., Cunningham, L; Danzberger, J. & Mccloud, B. A., (1986). *School Boards; Strengthening grass Roots Leadership*. Washington, DC; Institute of Educational Leadership, USA.
- Cole, G. A., (1996). *Management Theory and practice*, London; DP Publication, UK.
- Ceridian Corporation (2006). *Learning to Delegate*, Rice University.
- D'Souza, A. (2008). *Leadership: Trilogy on Leadership and effective Management*. Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa.
- Farrant, J. S., (2006). *Principles and practice of Education*, Longman Publishers Ltd. England.
- Fink, D. (2005). *Developing Leaders for their future not our past*: The international Journal of Educational Management, 16 (4) 196-206.
- Hallinger, P. & Snidvongs, K., (2008). *Educating Leaders: Is there anything to Learn from Business Managements* .*Educational Management and Administration* 36(1), 9-39.
- Harber, C., & Davies L., (1993). *School Management and Effectiveness in Developing Countries*. London: cassel.
- Harbey, C. & Dadey, A., (1993). *The Job of Head teachers in African: research and reality*;
- Harris, S. Ballenger, J., Leonard J., (2004). *Aspiring Principals Perceptions: Are mentor Principals modeling standards-based leadership? Mentoring and Tutoring, 12(2)*, 155-172.
- Karen, S. (2009). *Delegating Responsibility*: retrieved on 8/01/12 from About.comGuide.
- Keegan, *the Mask Command* (New York: Viking, 1987, retrieved on Jan 05, 2012 from mind Tools; http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/new_x_MDR_-98.htm.
- Kimaathi, J. (2007). *The Effectiveness of Delegation in public secondary schools in Nairobi Province*: Masters' Thesis, University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Lunerburg, F. C., (2010). "The Management Function of principals," National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, Vol 27 (A).
- Mbiti, D. M., (2007). *Foundations of school Administration* (Rev. Ed.) Nairobi, Oxford University press, Kenya.Com.guide.
- Mullins, I. J., (1993). *Management and Organizational Behavior*, London: Pitman Publisher UK.
- Mugenda, O., & Mugenda, A., (2003). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, Nairobi .Acts Press. Kenya.
- Muthini, P.W., (2004). *A study of Head teachers' perception towards in-service programmes in Public secondary schools in Nairobi Province*, Unpublished masters of Education Thesis. University of Nairobi. Kenya.
- Nandwah, I., (2011). Preparation and development of public secondary schools Principals in Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 1 No. 9 [Special Issue – July 2011, 291-301*.
- Ngaroga, J.M., (2006). *Education – PTE Revision series for Primary Teacher Education*, East African Education publishers, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Njeri, W.J., (1996). *Preparation of Secondary school Head teachers and Implications on Administrative performance*. A case study of Nairobi province. Unpublished masters' Thesis Kenyatta University.

- Nwachukwu, C.C., (1988). *Management Theory and Practice*. Onitsha. AFRICANA Fed Publishers Ltd. Nigeria.
- Olembo, J.O., Wanga&Karagu, N. M., (1992).*Management in Education*, Nairobi: Educational Research Publication.
- Quizlet, (2013).*Intro to research CED ch8 midterm*. Retrieved on July 24, 2013 from <http://quizlet.com/14473624/intro-to-research-ced-ch-8-midterm-flashcards/>.
- Rarieya, J. F. A., (2007). *School Leadership in Kenya: The Lived realities of women heads of schools*. Unpublished PHD Dissertations, Keele University
- .Restine, L. N., (1997). *Experience, meanings and principals Development*: Journal of Educational Administration, 35(3) 253-267.
- Rierdan, R. C., (2001). “*The Fine Art of Delegation* “, Delegations Journal, 4 (3), 230- 256.
- Role, E. M., (2007).*Handbook of Social and educational research methods*. Notes Presented in class.University of Eastern Africa Baraton.
- Rush, M., (2006). *Management-A Biblical Approach*.World Alive Publishers Teachers Service Commission (2005).Code of regulations for teachers. Government Printers. Nairobi.
- Wong, P. M., (2004). *The Professional Development of school Principals: Insight from evaluating a programme in Hong Kong*; School Leadership and Management, 24 (2), 139-162.