

Full Length Research Paper

Factors and processes involved in the appointment of head teachers for secondary schools in Kenya: political concerns

Nyongesa Edward, Ndiku J. Mualuko and Shiundu John

Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, P.O Box 190- 50100, Kakamega.

Accepted 01 September, 2010

A descriptive survey design was used to determine the relative influence of stakeholders involved in the appointment of head teachers. The study was conducted in Bungoma East District and respondents included 20 head teachers, 20 Board of Governors (B.O.G) executive members, 6 elected councilors (Community leaders), 4 Education Secretaries of school sponsoring churches and 1 Provincial Staffing Officer, Western Province. Questionnaires and interview schedules were used to collect data. The study revealed a variation in the stakeholder influence in the appointment of head teachers. In the light of the findings, it was concluded that there is lack of regulation of stakeholder influence in the appointment of head teachers. Recommendations were made with respect to the establishment of regulatory policy guidelines to streamline the roles of stakeholders, and clear statement of criteria to consider and methods to be used. B.O.G sub-committees need to be established for each school to work in liaison with the District Education Board in identifying deserving teachers and recommending them for appointment into headship by the Teachers Service Commission.

Key words: Head teacher, policy, appointment

INTRODUCTION

Education is the re-construction or re-organization of experience so as to increase the ability (of the learner) to direct the course of subsequent experiences (Nsubuga, 1977). Seen in this light, educational institutions must be structured to function in a way to facilitate the physical, social and mental interactions among learners that will enhance the attainment of the desired educational goals. This calls for a highly competent and responsive leadership in the form of school heads. How well these administrators are identified and selected to be given the responsibilities has a direct bearing on the effectiveness with which they will run the schools.

Appointment of teachers and promotion criteria is guided by the Graduate and the Non-graduate schemes of service where one serves in grades or job groups: 'J', 'K', 'L', 'M', 'N', 'P' and 'Q' (Republic of Kenya, 2005b). Upon promotion to job group M, teachers may be deployed into professional or administrative positions as appropriate. Deployment means placement into a functional position

on a horizontal, rather than a vertical scale. Job group 'M', according to the TSC regulations, is the minimum deployable grade into headship. A teacher who attains this grade gets to be deployed into the professional positions of Lecturer, Head of Department, Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer or, may be deployed into administrative positions of Head master, Deputy Head master, Head of Department or Dean of Students. The regulations are categorical that all administrative posts are deployment positions (Republic of Kenya, 2005b). Conditions for consideration for promotion to professional grades outlined in the TSC Code of Regulations for Teachers (Republic of Kenya, 2005b) include:

- i. Promotion on merit if a teacher has displayed exceptional ability in performance of his/her duties,
- ii. A teacher should have completed not less than three years recognized teaching service within a given grade,
- iii. A teacher who has had a discipline case and was found guilty shall not be considered until he/she has completed two years teaching service after the resumption of duty.
- iv. A teacher who has been re-employed by the commission must complete three years.

*Corresponding author Email: ndikuyuda@yahoo.com

v. Except under special circumstances determined by the commission, consideration for promotion shall be the teacher's willingness to take up the position immediately and where a vacancy exists. The offer of promotion will lapse if not taken within 30 days.

Though the scheme of service and the TSC regulations stipulate the promotion criteria, they are, however, silent on the procedure of selecting teachers on job group 'M' and above for placement into administrative positions. For instance, the documented government policy guidelines on the appointment of head teachers (Republic of Kenya, 2002a) present it as a function of the Teachers Service Commission (TSC). The TSC works in liaison with other stakeholders such as the District Education Boards (DEB), and the schools' Boards of Governors (BOG). In practice however, the school sponsors, the Provincial Education Office and the local communities through their elected leaders are also known to have a strong hand in the appointment of head teachers (Buke, 2007). The policy guidelines outline the minimum requirements for a teacher seeking to be considered for promotion into administrative grades including headship. The requirements include academic and professional qualifications, special merit on work performance, and performance in National examinations. Also to be considered are special achievement in co-curricular activities and a teacher's professional conduct, moral standing and initiative (Republic of Kenya, 2005b).

Apart from the requirements, the policy also stipulates a four stage process of appointing head teachers. At the first stage, each school is required to establish a professional sub-committee of the BOG. The sub committees' major task is to identify, on the basis of outlined merit, suitable teachers for consideration for appointment. Its recommendations are then forwarded to the full board. At the second stage, the full BOG may ratify and forward the recommendations to the DEB for consideration. The BOG is meanwhile mandated to facilitate teachers' professional growth by way of availing to them educational documents on teaching and educational management; offering teachers the opportunity to attend relevant administrative and professional training courses, workshops, seminars and educational tours; and developing resource centres for teachers in their schools.

The third stage is at the DEB level. This handles promotions to administrative and professional grades of up to job group 'M'- principal III. The DEB receives recommendations from the various BOGs in their area of administration. It then short-lists and invites qualified applicants for interviews. This board also conducts the interviews according to the guidelines issued by the TSC and recommends them for deployment in administrative positions by the TSC. Names of deployed teachers are then forwarded to the TSC for ratification. The DEB also mounts courses for newly appointed heads, deputies and

senior teachers in their respective duties and follows up their performance through appraisal reports.

Promotion of teachers to administrative positions in senior positions is handled at the TSC headquarters. At the headquarters a technical sub-committee deals with the promotion of teachers in Job group N- principal II and above. Here the TSC receives identified vacancies from BOGs and DEBs. Having verified established positions within the approved establishment, the TSC then advertises the vacant posts. This is followed by short-listing and interviewing of candidates in Job group N-principal II and above. Successful candidates are then deployed through letters of appointment to head National schools, senior provincial schools and colleges. The TSC is also responsible for the development of the necessary overall legal and policy framework for the promotion of teachers.

The government policy on the appointment of head teachers has a number of issues which are not well clarified. Some of them are outstanding. They include; the mode of advertising the identified vacancies for headship; delays in relaying the information to the potential teachers; the criteria for short listing applicants who are found to be on Job Group M- Principal III and above so as to minimize unfairness. Finally, the other issue is to do with the policy. According to the documented policy, it is observed that the Provincial Education Office does not seem to have a direct role in the process of recruiting and selecting teachers for deployment into headship positions (Republic of Kenya, 2002a).

Statement of the problem

Leadership in secondary schools is critical to the attainment of educational goals. This is especially true regarding the role head teachers play in directing the affairs of their respective schools. For this reason, it is increasingly becoming important to all stakeholders who the holders of these offices are. The TSC has a full mandate to employ and manage the entire teaching fraternity in Kenyan public schools, including promoting them to professional and administrative positions (Republic of Kenya, 2005b). While there exist an effective operational policy for promotion of teachers to professional positions, in the Graduate and the Non-graduate Schemes of Service; the policy on promotion to headship positions in secondary schools has elicited misunderstandings and conflict among stakeholders. The key stakeholders here being the TSC, school BOGs, Sponsors and the Provincial Education Office. These bodies work together in recruiting and selecting head teachers for secondary schools as directed by the TSC.

While all the stakeholders in secondary education management work under guidance from the TSC and the Ministry of Education, they each appear to hold different

views. for instance local community leaders may wish to have one of their own to be appointed to head a school in their locality or a church sponsor my push for a head to be appointed from among those who profess its faith without considering qualifications. Divergent views on a single policy by different stakeholders present potential for conflict. Questions that arise concern whether or not these stakeholders are conversant with the official policy on the appointment of head teachers; what attitudes they hold towards the policy; and whether the practices they carry out in performing their roles are in line with the policy. Amid the conflicting interests, is the question of competence and effectiveness of the head teachers selected to manage the schools.

The concern of this study was on the link between the policy as documented and policy as practiced in the field. The interplay of the roles of the various stakeholders involved in the appointment of the head teachers was particularly of interest. This in view of the fact that teacher promotion, if not well handled can be a source of internal inefficiency and politics (Republic of Kenya, 2005a). This study thus focused on the analysis of factors and processes involved in the appointment of head teachers for secondary schools.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

The study was guided by Allison's (1969) political model of organizational functioning (cited in Sergiovanni and Caver 1980). The model was developed as part of his study of the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 in which the USA and Russian military expansionism programs collided.

In Allison's (1969) political model, organizational events are explained by an assumption that events occur as a result of diverse groups, each bargaining to improve its own position. Leaders of organizations are not seen as a monolithic group, but rather each in his or her own right a player in a highly competitive game known as politics. This game of politics is played by bargaining in regularized ways among players in the hierarchy. The political model sees no unitary actor but rather many actors as players who focus not on a single strategic issue but on many diverse problems as well. There is no consistent set of strategic objectives but instead, various conceptions of organizational and personal goals guide decision making, not by rational choice but by pulling and hauling that is politics.

The political model views outcomes as resulting from intra-organizational phenomena such as compromise, coalition, competition and confusion. The process is political in that the activity from which outcomes emerge is bargaining. Many players are involved in this bargaining and power is widely distributed. The following are the key attributes of the model.

- Action emerges neither as the calculated choice of a unified group nor as a formal summary of leaders preferences. Rather, the context of shared power but separate judgments concerning important choices determines that politics is the mechanism of choice.

- The environment in which the game is played is that of inordinate uncertainty about what must be done, the necessity that something be done and crucial consequences of whatever is done.

- The pace of the game, which involves hundreds of issues, numerous games and multiple choices; compels players to fight to get other's attention to make them 'see the facts' to assure that they 'take the time to think seriously about the broader issue'.

- The structure of the game consists of power shared by individuals with separate responsibilities. This validates each player's feeling that "others don't see my problem" and "others must be persuaded to look at the issue from a less parochial perspective."

- Rules of the game include a provision that he who hesitates loses his chance to play at that point, and he who is uncertain about his recommendation is overpowered by others who are sure. Rewards of the game are in the impact on outcomes as a measure of performance and effectiveness in management.

The political model though based on social-military organization, relates to the current study on the analysis of factors and processes involved in the appointment of head teachers for secondary schools. The interrelationship between the various education stakeholders, who influence appointment of head teachers, can be viewed alongside the political model. Each of the stakeholders, namely the Education Office, BOGs, Sponsors and the school community has vested interests in the school. These interests may either be enhanced or frustrated by a head teacher as the chief executive of the school. Because of the shared power in appointing head teachers as spelt out by TSC and Ministry of Education regulations, no one stakeholder can unilaterally appoint a head teacher for a school. This sets the stage for bargaining amongst the stakeholders in the exercise of identifying and selecting teachers into the headship positions.

Objective

To find out the relative influence of stakeholders involved in the appointment of head teachers for secondary schools

Methodology

Research Design

The study adopted a descriptive survey design. Neuman (2000) infers that descriptive research has the capacity to describe the

present status of phenomena, determining the nature of the prevailing conditions, practices and attitudes and seeking accurate descriptions of activities. This study sought to analyse the factors and processes involved in the appointment of secondary school head teachers in Kenya.

Study Area and population

The study was conducted in Bungoma East District of Western Province, Kenya. The district was chosen because such a study has not been undertaken in the area. In addition, there have been cases of conflict in recent times amongst stakeholders arising from the appointments of head teachers for secondary schools in the area (Buke, 2007).

The target population of the study included all head teachers of the public secondary schools, BOG, Executive Members, and Education Secretaries of churches sponsoring schools in the district, Local Councilors and the Staffing Officer, Western Province, Education office.

Sample and Sampling Procedure

The use of different types of schools was adopted so as to provide a representative sample of the school population from Bungoma East District. The schools were categorized as provincial and district, as well as according to sponsors.

The groupings had seven provincial schools and 29 district schools, making a total of 36 public schools in the district. Out of the total, 28 were sponsored by the Friends Church, 5 by the Catholic Church, 2 by the Anglican Church of Kenya (A.C.K) and 1 by the Salvation Army (SA).

On the basis of the categorization, stratified sampling was used to select schools that participated in the study. All the seven provincial schools were purposively selected because they were the only schools in the study area and also because of the unique characteristics in their management, out of which 6 were Friends Church sponsored, and 1 sponsored by the Catholic Church. In the district stratum, the remaining 4 Catholic schools and the 1 SA and 2 ACK schools were also purposively selected to represent the district schools. From among the remaining schools, a sample of 6 was selected randomly. This was done to ensure uniform representation of schools. A total of 20 schools were thus selected for the study. Their distribution was as shown in the Table 1 below.

A total of 51 respondents were selected as shown above. For instance 20 head teachers and 20 BOG executive members of the selected schools were included in the study as respondents. Purposive sampling was also used to select the Provincial Staffing Officer and the 4 Education Secretaries of the school sponsors. Simple random sampling technique was used to select 6 elected Councilors.

Instruments of data collection

The researchers used questionnaires and interview schedules to collect the data. Two sets of questionnaires were used to collect information from head teachers and BOG executive members respectively. The questionnaires included both structured and unstructured items. A few dichotomous (fixed choice, Yes / No) questions were included for easy tabulation, analysis and interpretation. However, the fixed choice items, may have involved "putting words" in the respondents' mouth, especially when acceptable answers were provided. In this case, there was a temptation to avoid serious thinking on the part of the respondent.

The respondent may have ended up choosing the easiest reasons. It was thus necessary to combine this format of items with the open-ended response items. Interview schedules were used to capture the views of the Educational Administrative Officers at the Provincial Staffing Office.

Validity and Reliability of Research Instruments

The content validity of the instruments was determined in two ways. First the researchers discussed the items in the instruments with the lecturers from the department of Educational planning and Management. These people were asked to indicate by tick or cross for every item in the questionnaires, and in the interview guides to show if it measured what it was supposed to measure or not. A coefficient of those that measured was computed. A coefficient of above 0.5 implied that the instrument was valid for the research. The advice obtained included suggestions, clarifications and other inputs in order. These suggestions were used in making necessary changes. Secondly, content validity of the instruments was determined through piloting, where the responses of the participants were checked against the research objectives. This also gave reason as to why particular content was to be used. For a research instrument to be considered valid, the content selected and included in the questionnaire must be relevant to the variable being investigated (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999).

To establish the reliability of the questionnaire, pre-testing through piloting was done in the schools within the district that did not form part of the sample. Head teachers and BOG executive members of these schools filled the questionnaires, while the education secretaries of the sponsors and a district education officer were interviewed.

The reliability of the items was based on estimates of the variability of heads, BOG executive members, sponsors and the Education Officer responding to the items. The reliability coefficient was determined by test-retest technique. The instruments were administered to the same participants after an interval period of two weeks. This technique was used because it determines the suitability of the research instrument. From the test-retest scores, Pearson's product moment's Correlation (r) was used to determine the reliability coefficient. A coefficient of (0.86) was obtained and was considered high enough according to Mugenda and Mugenda, (1999). The instruments were thus deemed reliable.

Data Analysis Techniques

The data collected were analyzed by use of the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) Computer package. Other data were subjected to descriptive methods of analysis, where frequencies and proportions were used in interpreting the respondents' perception of issues raised in the questionnaires and interviews, so as to answer the research questions. Qualitative data obtained through the interviews were transcribed and interpreted and reported. Descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution, percentages, means and standard deviations were calculated and data presented in the form of tables.

Limitations of the study

Views of students and the teachers' labour unions, the Kenya National Union of Teachers (KNUT) and the Kenya Union of Post Primary Teachers (KUPPET) on the head teacher appointment process were not included in the study.

Table 1. Target Population and Sample Size

POPULATION	Target Population	Sample size	% selected
Head teachers	36	20	56%
BOG executive	186	20	11%
Provincial Staffing Officer	1	1	100%
Sponsors	4	4	100%
Councilors	12	6	50%
Total	239	51	21%

RESULT/FINDINGS

Influence of Stakeholders in the Appointment of Head Teachers

The objective of the study was to find out the relative influence of stakeholders involved in the appointment of the head teachers. To achieve this objective an attempt was made during literature review and the pilot study to identify key stakeholders involved in the appointment of Head teachers in the district. These were isolated as the School's Board of Governors, the District Education Board, the School Sponsors, the Provincial Education Office, and the School Community. Head teachers and BOG executive members were the respondents in the study and data was collected from them by use of a questionnaire.

The stakeholders were listed in a Likert scale of rank of significance with the scale of one to five (one being most significant influence and five least significant). The head teachers and BOG executive members in the study were asked to indicate with a tick the appropriate levels of influence for each stakeholder. The responses were scored and analyzed and the information obtained is presented in Tables 2 to 4 below.

Views of Head Teachers on stakeholder influence

The findings of the investigation are that most head teachers (65%) hold the view that the Provincial Educational Office is the most significant stakeholder in the appointment of head teachers. This was followed by the BOGs at 30%, the school community at 25% and DEB at 5%. By the Provincial Education Office being ranked first, it meant that proposals of teachers for appointment into headship by the Provincial Education Office had more influence than other proposals and they carried the day over proposals by other stakeholders in most of the cases. The DEB was ranked least influential contrary to government regulations contained in the procedure for appointment of head teachers (Republic of Kenya, 2002a). The regulations give the mandate of advertising, selecting and recommending for appointment of head teachers for secondary schools to the DEB.

Views of BOG Executive Members

As presented in Table 3 above, most respondents seem to believe that the BOG was the most influential stakeholder at 56%, closely followed by the provincial education office at 50%. The DEB was still ranked least influential at 28%. Reactions on the influence of the school community appear polarized, with 39%, ranking it least and 33% as most influential. The sponsor was rated most influential by 33% of the BOG members.

The BOG may have received the highest rating because it was a self evaluation. The Provincial Education Office with a 50% rating was particularly significant because it agrees with the high rating obtained from the views of head teacher. The mixed responses on the rating of the school community could have arisen from variation in personality classification. The persons known to be significant opinion leaders in the community may usually be appointed to serve on school Boards. Most respondents could thus have had problems classifying their influence.

Relative Influence of Stakeholders

Table 4 represents the findings of the analysis of the combined responses of the head teachers and B.O.G executive members on the influence of the stakeholders on the appointment of head teachers.

As perceived by the head teachers and BOG Executive members, therefore, the Provincial Education Office was ranked as the most influential stakeholder in the appointment of head teachers with 58% of all the responses. The B.O.G was ranked second with 42%, the school community with 29%, the sponsor at 26% while the DEB was ranked least influential with only 16% of the respondents affirming their influence. Table 5 presents a chi-square (χ^2) test on the findings.

The test revealed a significant difference in the levels of stakeholder influence in the appointment of the head teachers. The calculated χ^2 values for the various stakeholders reveal differences in significance at the 0.05 level. Only the Provincial Education Office, the BOG and the school community appear to have significant influence, with scores of less than 0.05 while the sponsor

Table 2. Head teachers' responses to relative influence of stakeholders in the appointment of head teachers

STAKEHOLDER	N	RANK SIGNIFICANCE OF INFLUENCE				
		1	2	3	4	5
BOG	20	6(30)	4(20)	6(30)	2(10)	2(10)
DEB	20	1(5)	3(15)	5(25)	9(45)	2(10)
School sponsor	20	4(20)	6(30)	4(20)	3(15)	3(15)
Provincial Education Office	20	13(65)	2(10)	1(5)	1(5)	3(15)
School community	20	5(25)	2(10)	2(10)	2(10)	9(45)

Figures in parentheses are percentages

Table 3. BOG responses on the relative influence of stakeholders in the appointment of head teachers

STAKEHOLDER	N	RANK SIGNIFICANCE OF INFLUENCE				
		1	2	3	4	5
BOG	18	10(56)	5(28)	3(17)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
DEB	18	5(28)	8(44)	2(11)	3(17)	0(0.0)
Sponsor	18	6(33)	4(22)	3(17)	4(22)	1(6)
Provincial Education Office	18	9(50)	2(11)	1(6)	2(11)	4(22)
School community	18	6(33)	3(17)	2(11)	0(0.0)	7(39)

Figures in parentheses are percentages

Table 4. Influence of stakeholders in the appointment head teachers

STAKEHOLDER	N	RANK SIGNIFICANCE OF INFLUENCE				
		1	2	3	4	5
BOG	38	16(42)	9(24)	9(24)	2(5)	2(5)
DEB	38	6(16)	11(29)	7(18)	12(32)	2(5)
Sponsor	38	10(26)	10(26)	7(18)	7 (18)	4(11)
Provincial Education Office	38	22(58)	4(11)	2(5)	3(8)	7(18)
School Community	38	11(29)	5 (13)	4 (11)	2(5)	16(42)

Figures in parentheses are percentages

Table 5. Summary of analyses of Stakeholder Influence on Appointment of Head teachers

STAKEHOLDERS	VALUES	DEGREES OF FREEDOM (DF)	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
BOG	0.001	4	P<0.05 S
DEB	0.073	4	P>0.05 NS
Sponsor	0.067	5	P>0.05 NS
Provincial E.O	0.000	5	P<0.05 S
School community	0.001	5	P<0.05 S

and the DEB were insignificant with scores exceeding the 0.05 level.

Views obtained from the Provincial Staffing Officer through interview affirm that interviews for prospective head teachers are usually held at the Provincial Education Office. The interviews are usually carried out without indicating (to the interviewees) the schools in which headship vacancies exist. It means therefore that

BOG members are never invited to sit on the interview panels. This was well articulated by the Provincial Staffing officer when the researcher elicited information from him through interview though the BOGs may recommend teachers from the various schools to attend the interviews. This implies therefore that the BOG's role is limited to recommending candidates for interviews, while the PDE's Office does the selection. it was also

established through the interviews that local communities on the other hand do not have an official, direct role in the appointments because they are not represented in the interviewing panels.

DISCUSSIONS

From the above analysis it emerged that there is a variation in the stakeholder influence in the appointment of head teachers. Some stakeholders exercise greater influence than others. While all the other stakeholders had significant influence, the DEB and school sponsors had insignificant influence on the appointment exercise.

The findings here seem to agree with the situation envisaged in the theoretical framework that guided this study, namely, the political model of organizational functioning (Allison, 1969). In this model, organizational events are explained by an assumption that events occur as a result of diverse groups, each bargaining to improve its own position. In the case school headship, the interested groups are the Provincial Education Office, the BOG, school sponsors, the DEB, and the local community. As Allison (1969) puts it, the decision on who heads which school becomes an outcome of intra-organizational phenomena such as compromise, coalition, competition, and even at times confusion amongst the stakeholders. It is the stakeholder(s) with the strongest influence that carry the day in ensuring that the head teacher(s) of their choice get appointed.

Nyaberi, (2002) reports cases of competition between local communities led by political leaders and school sponsors in the appointment of head teachers in Kisii District. Naremo (2002) found that politicians and sponsors exercise undue influence on school management in Baringo District. Though in the present study, several head teachers revealed that political influence is not a strong driving force in the appointment of head teachers going by the findings presented in table 2 and 3 above, aspects of politics and support by politicians to have qualified heads appointed to head schools in their areas come in play. Thus, aspects of the respondents presenting the ideal appointing process were evident. The same political forces come into play to protect the same head teachers when they fail to perform and are required to be removed as Nyaberi (2002) argues. Buke (2007) decries the decline in performance of traditionally prominent schools Kenya at the hands of political interference. He argues that, local political leaders, keen on pleasing their supporters coerce officers at the TSC to appoint "their own people" as head teachers without adhering to merit and procedure. This appeared to have been the unsaid by the respondents though it was alluded to in the interviews with the Provincial Staffing Officer.

In the cases cited above, it appears like survival for the fittest for the stakeholders involved in the appointment of

head teachers is the norm. This "law-of-the-jungle" needs to be brought to an end so as to give way to professionalism, merit and fair play in the appointments of head teachers in Kenya.

While the Provincial Education Office was found to be the most influential stakeholder in the appointment of head teachers, influence from the other stakeholders cannot be ignored. The political model in the theoretical framework acknowledges articulation of interests by stakeholders. This is appreciated because local leaders and church sponsors may have influence on who is to be appointed to head a school in their region. Whereas political influence may not carry the day, it may not be ignored. Thus the validity of the arguments by Allison (1969) that in a political game, there is no unitary actor but rather many actors as players who focus not on single strategic issues, but on many divers problems as well.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There was a significant variation in the levels of stakeholder influence in the appointment of head teachers for secondary schools. Whilst the Provincial Education office wielded the strongest influence, the BOG and school community were found to have significant levels of influence. The DEB and school sponsor influence was found to be insignificant. The recruitment and selection of the head teachers was done at the Provincial, rather than the District Education office as per regulation (Republic of Kenya, 2002a). It was therefore concluded that there is a lack of restriction of influence for stakeholders involved in the appointment of head teachers,

On the strength of the findings and conclusions, it was thus recommended that the government guidelines (Republic of Kenya, 2002a) on the appointments should be followed with amendments by all concerned as follows: The BOG through head teachers should: avail relevant educational documents on teaching and educational management to teachers in their establishment; encourage teachers to attend, by sponsoring them for relevant administrative and professional training courses, workshops, seminars and educational tours and forward to the DEB names of suitable teachers for appointment into headship.

The DEB should handle cases of Head teachers appointment for secondary schools within their jurisdiction by: openly advertising through the public media all the positions of headship that fall vacant in their area; inviting applications from all suitably qualified teachers from anywhere within the Republic of Kenya; constituting interview panels for each vacancy comprising of among others the BOG chairman of the school in question and a representative from the Sponsor; determining through competitive interviews the suitable

Head teachers to recommend to the TSC for appointment.

REFERENCES

- Allison GT (1969). Conceptual models and the Cuban Missile crisis. *Am. Pol. Sci. Rev.* 63(3)
- Buke R (2007). Education at Crossroads. *East African Standard*, 29th June. Nairobi: Standard Media Group.
- Mugenda MO, Mugenda GA (1999). *Research Methods: Quantitative Methods, Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi: Act Press
- Naremo SP (2002). Factors Influencing the Choice of the Headship Styles in Baringo Secondary Schools. Unpublished project. Nairobi: Kenyatta University.
- Neuman L (2000). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Nsubuga EHK (1977). *Help Yourself with Educational Ideas*. Kampala: Heinman Education Publishers.
- Nyaberi J (2002). A Study of Administrative Problems Faced by Secondary School Head teachers. Unpublished M Ed. Project. Nairobi: Kenyatta University.
- Republic of Kenya (2000). Bungoma District Development Plan 2002-2008. Nairobi: Government printers.
- Republic of Kenya (2002a). *Operational Manual on Teacher Management*. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.
- Republic of Kenya (2005)(Sessional paper No.1 of 2005 on A Policy Framework for Education, Training and Research. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Sergiovanni TJ, Carver FD (1980). *The New School Executive: Theory of Administration (Second Edition)*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers Inc.