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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the challenges deputy headteachers encounter in their administrative roles in public secondary schools in Bungoma North Sub-County, Kenya. This was based on the fact that the position of deputy headteachers in public secondary school presents the office holders with numerous challenges. The study objectives were to establish the extent to which role ambiguity, inadequate authority, increased workload, high indiscipline cases and interpersonal relationships are challenges facing deputy headteachers. The study is significant as the findings may contribute towards the improvement of existing knowledge on education administration. The study was guided by the social systems theory, Guba and Getzels model (Lunenburg, 2007) and adopted a descriptive survey design. The target population was 30 headteachers and 30 deputy headteachers in public secondary schools in Bungoma North Sub-County. A questionnaire and oral interview schedule were used to collect data. Qualitative data were analysed using content analysis and presented in narrative form while quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics and presented in tables, graphs and pie charts. The study established that deputy principals were facing challenges of having to carry out ambiguous tasks as a result of lack of clear delegation, tasks not being clearly spelt out, conflicting tasks and differences in expectations between them and headteachers. The study also established that another challenge facing deputy principals was lack of adequate authority when discharging their duties especially in decision-making. It was further established that another challenge facing deputy headteachers was increased workload as the position came with additional responsibilities due to many delegated duties and many discipline cases deputy headteachers have to attend to. Lastly, the study also revealed that the position of being deputy headteachers occasionally leads to a challenge of strained relationship with the headteachers, teachers, students, parents and neighbours of the school. This is because deputy principals are very much involved in the day to day running of schools and therefore are more likely to encounter conflicts with other members of the school community. Based on the findings the study recommends that a manual for deputy principals should be provided which will provide guidelines, duties and responsibilities of deputy headteachers to avoid challenges of dealing with ambiguous tasks. Headteachers should allow their deputies to have a free hand in making decisions and should also avoid overruling or overturning decisions of their deputies in order to empower them when performing their duties. The administration should empower school committees and departments in undertaking various duties and responsibilities in order to minimise the amount of workload on the shoulders of deputy headteachers. Schools should facilitate deputy headteachers to go for capacity building and benchmarking on ways of building healthy interpersonal relationships with members of the school community. This study targeted headteachers and deputy teachers leaving out other members of the school community. A similar study should be conducted to incorporate the views of students, parents and school neighbours.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Proper management of schools is critical in ensuring that the benefits of public and private investment in education are realised. The manner in which schools are managed determines the effectiveness of the implementation of school programmes and in the end students’ academic achievement (Hallinger and Heck, 2008). Studies carried out globally have shown that school managers who discharge their administrative duties efficiently have a great influence on the effectiveness of schools and successful curriculum implementation (Leithwood, 2009). It is further argued that as much as the quality of curriculum instruction is a major incentive to students’ willing to learn and persist throughout the educational cycle, the quality of school management and overall leadership is equally a strong determinant of the quality of teaching and learning in schools (Fullan, 2011 and Sergiovanni, 2009).

Studies by Mortimore, Sammons, Stoll, Lewis and Ecob, (2008) which examined internal efficiency in schools established that deputy headteachers play a major role in school programmes and contribute immensely towards educational outcomes. It was found that in most schools, deputy headteachers are the most available school managers and as a result shoulder much of the responsibility and therefore have more influence on the attainment of educational objectives. It was however found that the role of deputy headteachers has not been given much attention by researchers with their role being viewed more as subordinate to those of headteachers (Mortimore, Sammons, Stoll, Lewis and Ecob, 2008). This is why this
study was therefore very necessary as it critically examined challenges facing deputy headteachers while discharging their duties.

The position of deputy headteacher has been in existence in many countries for many centuries (Ribbins, 2007). Burnham (1968) notes that that position was referred to as an ‘usher’ in the 15th century and was viewed as a substitute position for the headmaster, acting as a stand in when the head was absent. In different countries, the position has also been assigned different names or titles which are attributed to the fact that the roles of the position are numerous and in most cases not clearly spelt out. In the United Kingdom for example, the position is referred to as assistant headteacher in secondary schools and associate headteachers in primary schools (Harris et al, 2003; Webb and Vulliamy, 1995; Jayne, 1996). In the United States of America the position is referred to as the assistant principal (Adrian, 2009); in Australia, the position is referred to as ‘Deputy Principal’ or ‘Deputy Head’ while in New Zealand, the position is referred to as ‘Deputy Principal’, ‘assistant principal’ or ‘associate principal’ (Harvey, 1994). In Kenya, the position is referred to as ‘deputy headteacher’ or ‘deputy principal.’

In recent times, the position of deputy headteacher’s is still viewed as being a stand in for or deputizing the headteacher in his or her absence from school and therefore the roles and responsibilities of a deputy headteacher are seen as identical to those of the headteacher but more as delegated duties. As a result of this Harvey (1994) argues that the position of a deputy headteacher has continued to receive little recognition or attention in many educational systems with Hartzell (1993) cited in Mertz (2000) referring to it as a neglected actor of the school management set up and where the position has been mentioned, it has mostly been through the accounts
of headteachers despite the fact that the deputy and assistant headteacher’s role has secured a much stronger institutional presence (Rasik and Swanson, 2001; Owens, 2001; Morrison, 2002; Harvey and Sheridan 1995 and Ribbins 1997).

In Nigeria, Ajayi (2002a) and Omoregie (2005), describes the functions of a school principal as school management, presiding over curriculum delivery i.e. teaching and learning, mentorship to both learners and staff, enforcement of policies to enhance discipline, supervision of curriculum assessment/evaluation and administration of examinations, presiding over resource mobilisation and budgeting, implementation of staff performance appraisal, establishment and maintaining relationships between the school, the community and other stakeholders and conflict resolution within and without the schools, presiding over meeting and so on (Ojo, 1999). All these functions are shared between the school principal and his/her deputy and therefore it means that the deputy principal is also a planner, director, controller, coordinator, organiser, adviser and a problem-solver (Maduabum, 2002 & Uyang, 2007).

In Kenya, the responsibility of providing and managing education lies with the Ministry of Education although at certain levels, this responsibility is also shared with other stakeholders such as parents, religious organizations, non-government organizations (NGO’s) and private donors (Republic of Kenya, 1999). Management of primary schools is done by school committees while secondary schools are managed by boards of management who are appointees of the Ministry of Education. Primary schools are administered by headteachers assisted by deputy headteachers while secondary schools are administered by principals with the help of deputy principals. The deputy headteacher/principal is therefore second in
command in the administrative structure of schools (Republic of Kenya, 1997, 1999). Since many issues and questions are always raised by the public about education management, it is imperative that the position of deputy headteacher is examined which forms the basis for the current study.

The position of deputy headteachers comes with a number of challenges. Conley & Wooseley, 2000:194 and Cooper (2001:40) identify role ambiguity as a major challenge facing deputy headteachers. This is experienced when duties and responsibilities as well as work objectives of deputy headteachers lack clarity. Another challenge identified is lack of adequate authority. A study by Robbins (2001) revealed that a large number of deputy headteachers found their work experience very frustrating or disappointing as a result of the lack of adequate authority to influence decision-making as well as implementation of policies and resolutions within schools. The heavy and demanding workload is also viewed by deputy headteachers as a source of work-related stress. As a result of additional tasks by virtue of their position, they do not have adequate time to teach to their level of satisfaction (Conley & Wooseley, 2000:194; Cooper, Dewe & O'Driscoll, 2001:31; Harris & Hartman, 2002:403).

Campbell and Neill (1994) reported that in US the increasing administrative workload of headteachers, resulting from the local management of schools, has led to a resultant increase in the delegation of more functions to assistant and deputy headteachers. A survey of 50 primary schools found that deputy heads felt that their work load had significantly increased due to the expansion of their role (Campbell and Neill, 1994). Devis (2002) adds that the workload of deputy headteachers continued to increase and had become even more complex, especially as a result of
dealing with students from diverse socio-economic backgrounds who are at the peak of their adolescence stage.

Steyn (2002) notes that deputy headteachers find themselves isolated from teachers and the rest of school community as they are usually housed in enclosed offices which affects their ability to establish and maintain interpersonal relations. Steyn (2002) adds that poor interpersonal relations with teachers contribute to lack of cooperation which further makes the work deputy principals more difficult. It was further noted that just like teachers, deputy headteachers also desire for personal and professional growth which can be acquired through close collaboration and unwavering support from teachers.

According to Ibukun (1999), the position of the school deputy principal in Nigeria has progressively become more complex and very stressful as a result of lack of clear policy on the function of a holder of this position. Ajayi (2002a) and Omorogie (2005) observed that secondary education in particular is faced by numerous challenges that have led to crisis after crises which affect teaching and learning leading to poor results in examination. This has placed deputy principals at the centre of conflicts either with the principals, the students and members of the teaching and non-teaching staff. It was noted that deputy principals were in most cases singled out for blame whenever things went wrong which was a very demoralising. Ibukun further noted that teachers, especially female teachers were usually reluctant to take up these positions out fear of being caught up in numerous conflicts associated with this position.
A study by Wathituni (2010) found out that the nature of the work of deputy headteachers tended to put them on a coalition course with teachers who viewed them as out to make life difficult for them. This is a challenge to deputy headteachers and has impacted negatively on the working relations in the schools. The study also showed that most deputy headteachers did not enjoy healthy relationship with their superiors (headteachers). It was further noted that deputy headteachers are the most disliked members of the school community by students. This was attributed to the fact that being in-charge of discipline, deputy headteachers are seen to making students’ life in school uncomfortable through reprimands and punishment.

1.2 **Statement of the Problem**

The most important ingredient to the existence of any organisation or institution is ensuring good working conditions of its workforce. Motivated employees are usually very committed and efficient as their job satisfaction contributes positively towards job performance and reduces turnover. It is agreed that a person’s job is an important part of his or her life and follows therefore that job satisfaction is a part of life satisfaction. Various studies have pointed out that the work of deputy headteachers is very complex and comes with responsibilities that are often uncomfortable for holders of this position. This is attributed to numerous challenges that may emanate from within the schools or from the external environment caused by the nature of this job. The researcher therefore found it prudent to carry out this study so as to establish challenges facing deputy headteachers in their administrative roles in public secondary schools in Bungoma North District of Bungoma County.
which may be affecting the way they discharge their duties. The researcher also did not find a similar study done on challenges facing deputy headteachers.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the challenges facing deputy headteachers in their administrative roles in public secondary schools in Bungoma North District of Bungoma County.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study included:

i. To establish ways in which role ambiguity is a challenge facing deputy headteachers when discharging their duties in public secondary schools in Bungoma North District.

ii. To determine how inadequate authority is a challenge facing deputy headteachers when discharging their duties.

iii. To examine ways in which increased workload is a challenge facing deputy headteachers when discharging their duties.

iv. To analyse how working relationships is a challenge facing deputy headteachers when carrying out their duties in secondary schools in Bungoma North District.

1.5 Research Questions

The research questions for the study included:

i. What are the challenges facing deputy headteachers as a result of role ambiguity in public secondary schools in Bungoma North District?

ii. Which are the challenges facing deputy headteachers as a result of inadequacy of administrative authority?
iii. In which way is workload a challenge facing deputy headteachers of secondary schools in Bungoma North District?

iv. What are the challenges of working relationships facing deputy headteachers of secondary schools in Bungoma North District?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The research findings of the study may contribute towards the improvement of existing knowledge on education administration. The findings of the study may also have practical implications. The MOE and TSC may use the findings of the study to formulate future policies on administration of secondary schools. KEMI may find the results of this study useful while reviewing the contents of the induction course for Deputy Head teachers of secondary schools. The study findings may enable the Head teachers and Deputy Head teachers understand and appreciate the deputy headteachers’ roles for smooth running of their respective schools. Future researchers in the area of Education administration may build on the findings of this study.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

The study was limited by the fact that responses that were provided in this study may have been affected by other issues such as social norms or by providing responses that were felt to be socially acceptable for fear of victimisation. The study was also limited by inadequate literature on the challenges facing deputy headteachers since this is an area that has not been given adequate attention.
1.8 Delimitations of the Study

Delimitation is a process of reducing the study population and areas to be surveyed to a manageable size. The study was confined to public secondary schools in Bungoma North Sub-County due to financial constraints and time factor. This is because it was not possible to cover a large area because it was costly to travel and prepare questionnaires. Moreover, since I am taking a school based course, I did not have enough time to cover a large area. The study also confined itself to deputy principals in public secondary schools because these constitute the bulk of secondary schools in Kenya. The deputy principals included in the study were those currently serving in schools in Bungoma North Sub-County. Those on leave or had been transferred from the district were left out although their input would have been valuable.

1.9 Basic Assumptions of the Study

In the study, the following assumptions were made:

i. All the respondents contacted were presumed cooperative and freely provided reliable responses.

ii. All respondents contacted were serving as deputy headteachers in public secondary schools.

iii. That the sampled schools had positions of deputy headteacher/principal.
1.10 Theoretical Framework

The study was guided by the social systems theory using the Guba and Getzels model. The social systems theory was used because according to the researcher administrative behaviour is best studied using the social systems analysis developed by Jacob Getzels and Elgon Guba (Lunenburg, 2007). Getzels and Guba view a social system as having two classes of phenomena which are independent of each other and at the same time interactive. First, institutions are described as having offices and positions occupied by individuals. These offices and positions represent the nomothetic dimension of the organization. That for each of these positions there are certain roles and expectations which are usually specified in the job description, organization policies, rules and procedures, terms of service and traditions. The word tradition means body of beliefs handed down from generation to generation. Second, are individuals who are incumbent in the offices and positions, and have their own personality structure and needs that constitute the idiographic dimension in the organization (Waweru and Ngugi).

According to this model, behaviour in the social system is a function of the interaction between personal needs and institutional goals which are shaped by challenges which personnel may encounter. Conformity to the institution, its roles and its expectations results in organizational effectiveness, whereas conformity to individuals’ personality and their needs disposition results in individual efficiency (Owens, 1970). The interaction between the idiographic and nomothetic dimensions is illustrated below:
A school is a social system since it involves different persons, departments, courses or classes working more or less independently yet together toward a common goal (Piele, 1970). Castetter (1981) adds that a school is a human organization since it deals with people, administrators, teachers, students and parents.

A school fits into Getzels and Guba model since it has offices and positions, for instance offices of head teacher, deputy head teacher, HOD and subject heads. Each office has a role to play toward the achievement of organizational goals and the offices are occupied by people of different personalities and needs. Each of these individuals has his or her own expectations about their institutional role, hence may mould and shape the offices differently in order to fulfill some of the expectations of their role. The social systems theory will therefore help in this study to understand the role of deputy head teacher from the nomothetic perspective. The idiographic dimension will help in understanding how the deputy head teachers feel about their role.
1.11 Conceptual Framework of the Study

The study has been summarised using a conceptual framework showing independent and dependent variables and how they relate to determine the effectiveness with which deputy headteachers perform their duties.

**Figure 1.2: Conceptual Framework of the Study**

![Diagram showing the conceptual framework with independent variable: ROLE OF DEPUTY HEADTEACHERS, intervening variables: Challenges in relation to working relations, Challenges in relation to workload, Challenges in relation to role ambiguity, Challenges in relation to inadequacy of administrative authority, and dependent variable: DEPUTY HEADTEACHERS’ PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.]

**Source:** Researcher 2015

The study focused on the challenges facing deputy headteachers when performing their duties and responsibilities. The study identified challenges in relation to working relations; workload; role ambiguity and challenges in relation to adequacy of administrative authority as the intervening variables which influence deputy headteachers performance of their duties and responsibilities which are dependent variables.
1.12 Operational Definitions of Terms

**Administrative Roles**: Duties assigned to deputy headteachers in management of public secondary schools.

**Authority**: The decision making power needed by deputy headteachers in execution of their duties in public secondary schools.

**Challenges**: Refers to problems or difficulties encountered by deputy headteachers in the process of carrying out their administrative duties and responsibilities.

**Community**: Individuals living in the neighbourhood served by the school.

**Delegation**: Assigning a junior one’s own work.

**Deputy Headteacher**: Refers to the administrator of a school appointed by the Teachers’ Service Commission and who is second in command in the school administration after the Head teacher.

**District**: An administrative area.

**Head teacher**: This is a teacher in charge of the school.

**Indiscipline**: A situation where students don’t adhere to school rules and regulations.

**Induction**: Used to refer to the preparation one is given before assuming duties of a new office.

**Interpersonal Relationship**: How the deputy headteacher connect/behave with students, teachers, Principal, Parents and other people they encounter in the course of their duties.

**Job satisfaction**: Refers to the totality of one’s perceptions and attitudes to one’s job or used to refer to emotional fulfilment one derives from his or her job.
Management: It refers to a system of working with and through individual personnel and groups for the purpose of achieving the establishment of goals an organization.

Motivation: Used to refer to what makes a worker happy so as to improve on performance.

Public Secondary Schools: Governments-run and sponsored secondary schools.

Role Ambiguity: Lack of clear distinction in job description between principals and their deputies.

Secondary school: ‘Secondary school’ is a term that is used to describe an educational institution where the final stage of schooling, known as secondary education, takes place.

School neighbours: Refers to people or institutions found in the same locality with the schools.

Teacher: Used to refer to a member of teaching staff in a school below the rank of a Deputy Head teacher.

Training: Used to refer to a course an officer attends to acquire knowledge and skills required in any job.

Workload: Amount of work assigned to the deputy head teacher
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents literature reviewed from previous studies on challenges facing deputy headteachers. The literature has been discussed in the following themes: The tasks and responsibilities of deputy headteachers, challenges facing deputy headteachers and summary of the literature review.

2.2 Tasks and Responsibilities of Deputy Headteachers

A study by Reed and Himmler (1985) revealed that in Australia, the role of the secondary school assistant principal was preparation of the school timetable and management of student discipline. Later studies also showed that the responsibilities of the assistant headteachers were supervision of student discipline and school and classroom attendance (Scoggins and Bishop 1993). This study was carried out in Australia which has a different educational system as well as socio-economic conditions and therefore it is expected that assistant headteachers in these countries are facing unique challenges and therefore it was necessary to carry out this study to assess the Kenya context.

In a study by Weller and Weller (2002) which was carried out in the USA, discipline and attendance were still identified as the key responsibilities of the assistant principals given that the main role of the assistant head was ensuring cohesion and smooth running of schools. As such, the role of assistant heads was more to do with maintenance of order in schools and developmental function and in most cases they performed functions in acting capacities, with most roles being delegated to them by
the school head (Weller and Weller, 2002). This lack of ‘real’ leadership has been cited by studies carried out in many countries (Mertz 2000). A study by Koru (1993) established that in most schools, assistant heads were allocated routine administrative tasks which headteachers found to be unpleasant. These tasks included periodical record keeping and duties that required too much paperwork (Koru, 1993). These studies concentrated more of duties that were usually delegated by school heads and did not examine responsibilities given to deputy head through educational laws. The current study will in addition examine challenges emanating from duties and responsibilities bestowed on deputy headteachers by Educational Act.

A survey by DfEE (1998), identified the major role of deputy heads as overseeing the formulation of the aims and objectives of the school and putting in place mechanisms through which these objectives will be achieved. They are also tasked with allocating roles to teachers and students as well supervision of the non-teaching staff (DfEE, 1998). This was however found to vary from one school to another. Deputy heads in some schools have additional roles. Staff appraisal, maintaining communication networks and resource management are cited as being new additional responsibilities (Rutherford, 2002). It was found that in some schools assistant and deputy heads play a central role in discussions and decision-making processes while in other schools headteachers make unilateral decision without consultation with their deputies. It was however noted that with time, headteachers and their deputies have been identified as partners while performing administrative duties (Rutherford, 2002). This study relied on document review and therefore the information provided might have had omissions as a result of editing or may have
been biased. The current study collected primary data and therefore provided objective information.

According to Wathituni (2010) in a study on job satisfaction of deputy headteachers in public secondary schools of the Mathira Division, Nyeri Sub-County in Kenya, revealed that deputy headteachers are second in command in school administrative structure and have distinct duties outlined by the Ministry of Education and other duties delegated to them by headteachers. Their key functions include supervision of teaching and learning activities, perform administrative duties in acting capacity or under the instruction and direction of the headteacher and promoting professional development and appraisal of teachers for example ensuring support and training during the induction of new staff and for trainee teachers. This study targeted deputy headteachers and did not include headteachers. As a result, the researcher did not have the opportunity to verify the information given by deputy headteachers. The current study included headteachers to fill this gap.

2.3 Challenges Faced by Deputy Headteachers

The following is a discussion of selected challenges facing deputy headteachers in public secondary schools.

2.3.1 Challenges in Relation to Role Ambiguity

Studies by Conley & Wooseley, (2000); Cooper et al, (2001); Conley and Wooseley (ibid.) and Kyriacou (2001:29) concluded that role ambiguity was among the challenges facing deputy headteachers. It was found that role ambiguity occurred when deputy headteachers undertook tasks that were not clearly spelt out and where role objectives were not well defined. This led to role conflict which emanated from
differences between what the job demanded and what they encountered in actual performance of their duties. Spector (2003) identified extra-role conflict as a major source of frustration for deputy headteachers and negatively impacted on their levels of job satisfaction. It was found that intra-role conflict was as a result of many and conflicting demands of this position and cited cases where headteachers asked their deputies to carry out conflicting tasks and expected good result in both cases. This left deputy headteachers in a dilemma of how they can successfully execute both tasks. This study obtained data from education seminars and workshops and as a result some information may not have been accurately captured. Informants might have also been influenced by lack of confidentiality hence provided inaccurate information. During these sessions a number of informants may not have had an opportunity to give their input. Use of questionnaires and interviews will help fill this gap.

A survey of over 400 deputy principals in Australia found that the majority of them attributed difficulties in role separation to lack of clarity in their roles from those of principals (Harvey, 1994). A study by Marshall (1992) also established that lack of a ‘real’ leadership role for assistant headteachers had contributed to role ambiguity which further complicated the work of deputy heads. As a result of this, it was noted that when dealing with learners, deputy headteachers could not tell whether they were counselors, social workers, managers, examiners, secretaries or creative teachers concerned with the performance of learners. As a result, it was found that role ambiguity and role conflict were a common challenge facing headteachers (Schulze & Steyn, 2007). These studies were carried out in Australia, which has a different educational system and educational policies on the role of deputy
headteachers. As a result, the challenges facing deputies may not be identical to those faced by deputy headteachers in Kenya. This formed the basis for the current study.

Mathenge (2007) carried out a study on the role expectation of women deputy headteachers in public secondary schools in Thika District. The study investigated how women deputy heads performed their roles and also sought to establish if they experienced contradictory expectations leading to role conflicts in relation to their position and gender. The study adopted a descriptive research design with a target population of all teachers, headteachers and deputy headteachers in 35 public secondary schools where the deputies were women. The data were collected using a questionnaire. The study revealed that deputy headteachers duties and responsibilities were not clear-cut leading to confusion. The study recommended that the roles and functions of a deputy headteacher be clearly spelt out to avoid misunderstanding. This study involved only female deputy headteachers and therefore the current study involved deputy headteachers from the two genders with a view of acquiring adequate information. The study also used only questionnaires while the current study in addition used interviews.

2.3.2 Challenges in Relation to inadequacy of Administrative Authority

A study by Robbins (2001) revealed that a large number of deputy headteachers found their work particularly frustrating or disappointing because of the lack of leadership influence they felt they had within the school. In the study some interviewees felt that they had experienced more leadership influence as head of department than as deputy headteacher. This was however not the case with headteachers who indicated that they found their positions satisfying as it gave them
necessary powers to implement school programmes and also that the leadership role was clearly spelt out. From the findings, there was a strong view that deputy principals needed a much stronger leadership role than what they actually possessed and that the role gave them little room to undertake in innovation and influence (Harvey, 1994). These studies relied on educational reports and feedback given during seminars and meetings. This might have yielded inaccurate information as some information may have been outdated and biased. Only a handful of stakeholders were also involved. The current study will be inclusive and will obtain data from primary sources.

A survey by Sutter (1996) in the United States which analysed determinants of job satisfaction among assistant headteachers found that those who felt that they had adequate authority were found to have higher levels of job satisfaction (Sutter, 1996). Another study by Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley and McCleary (1990) also established found that assistant heads who demonstrated stronger instructional leadership role reported higher levels of motivation and self-efficacy an indication of deputies’ desire to assume a stronger instructional leadership role and for there to be clearer demarcation between their leadership role and the leadership role of the headteacher (Pellicer, Anderson, et al, 1990). Evidence would suggest that deputies and assistant heads view their own influence as relatively small compared to that of the headteacher (Leonard and Leonard, 1999). These studies were carried out in the USA, which has a different educational system and educational policies on the role of deputy headteachers. As a result, the challenges facing deputies may not be identical to those faced by deputy headteachers in Kenya. This formed the basis for the current study.
A research by Robbins (2001) found that in most schools, the position of assistant heads was viewed as a ‘stand-in’ for the headteacher. It was revealed that it is only in a few isolated cases was the deputy or assistant headteacher viewed as being second in command and possessed the required capacity to be school heads. It was established that headteachers acted as the sole authority and that is some instances headteachers were against a strong leadership role for the deputy or assistant headteacher (Southworth, 1995; Purvis and Dennison, 1993). Similarly in the United States of America, it was found that the principal had the power to decide the role the assistant principal would play (Scoggins and Bishop, 1993 & Mertz, 2000). It was found that most the deputy’s duties were determined by the principal rather than allocated through a job description (Mertz and McNeely, 1999).

A study by Fresko (1997), showed that the position of deputy headteachers was further weakened by lack of autonomy as deputy headteachers did not have the freedom, independence and discretion to perform their duties in accordance with their job descriptions (Atkinson, 2000:46; Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992:180). This research relied on document review to obtain data where documents which included education reports from government agencies and stakeholder organizations in education were reviewed and analysed. This might have paved way for biases as some reports may have been compiled to fulfill certain objectives and may not have been necessarily accurate. Collecting data from primary sources by the researcher will help fill this gap.

In a study by Wathituni (2010) on investigation into job satisfaction of deputy headteachers in public secondary schools of the Mathira Division, Nyeri district where descriptive research design was used and questionnaires used to collect data
from 27 respondents who were deputy headteachers of public secondary schools in Mathira Division, found out that most deputy headteachers did not have adequate powers to influence decisions in the schools. Most felt that they were more of headteachers’ puppets. This was however not the case for those who were serving under principals who used democratic leadership style and believed in shared responsibilities. This study however was mostly concerned with deputy headteachers’ job satisfaction and did not adequately identify challenges faced by deputy headteachers. The study also only targeted only deputy headteachers while the current study also involved principals and in addition use interviews.

2.3.3 Challenges in Relation to Workload

A survey by Campbell and Neill (1994) carried out in US showed that there had been a significant increase in the workload of headteachers which had led to an increase in the delegation of more responsibilities to assistant and deputy headteachers. It was revealed that deputy heads felt that their role had expanded greatly which had negatively affected the quality of their own teaching and found it hard to keep up with administrative. This was most notable where headteachers were away from school for a prolonged period of time. Deputies also complained that as a result of increased workload, they were not able to take up professional development opportunities in order to acquire management skills that they would need in case they applied for school headship positions. Similarly, in Australia a study by Harvey and Sheridan (1995) found that the increasing responsibilities for assistant principals had resulted in less time being available for professional development. These studies were carried out in the USA, which has a different educational systems and educational policies on the role of deputy headteachers. As a result, the challenges
facing deputies may not be identical to those faced by deputy headteachers in Kenya. This formed the basis for the current study.

In South Africa, it was found that the workload for deputy headteachers had significantly increased from the year 1997, when deputy headteachers were allocated additional responsibilities which included burdensome recording and recordkeeping in voluminous portfolios (Mngoma, 2010:2; Potterton, 2010:11). This led to a slump in levels of motivation and job satisfaction of deputy headteachers who saw the additional duties as an unnecessary additional burden that had little value on the quality curriculum delivery (Balt, 2005:11; Ma & MacMillan, 1999:40). However, through the Action Plan 2014: Towards the realisation of schooling 2025 (Rice, 2010:10), deputy headteachers’ workload has reduced to manageable levels. This survey relied on government reports for data and therefore the information would have been subjected to biases and omissions. The current study will use primary data to fill this gap.

Another study by Jayne (1996) which targeted primary school deputies reported that their roles had expanded to include monitoring and evaluation, maintenance of external relations in addition to more traditional administrative roles. This placed an additional workload on deputy headteachers which resulted in a tension between the teaching and management roles of the deputy (Vulliamy and Webb, 1995). This study relied on interviews to collect data and as a result only a few respondents could be interviewed making the study less representative. The presence of the researcher during interviews might have had undue influence on the respondents resulting to giving of information that would ‘please’ the researcher thus leading to subjective findings. The current study also used questionnaires thus filling this gap.
Mathenge (2007) in the study on the role expectation of women deputy headteachers in public secondary schools in Thika District which adopted a descriptive research design and targeted all teachers, headteachers and female deputy headteachers in 35 public secondary schools where the deputies were women and used a questionnaire as a data collection instrument revealed that deputy headteachers are faced with heavy workload. This was attributed to additional duties and responsibilities of this position in addition to their role as classroom teachers. The situation was worse in understaffed schools and upcoming schools where deputy headteachers taught more than 30 lessons per week. This study involved only female deputy headteachers and therefore the current study involved deputy headteachers from the two genders with a view of acquiring adequate information. The study also used only questionnaires while the current study in addition used interviews.

2.3.4 Challenges in Relation to Indiscipline Cases in Schools

A study by Davis (2002) established that the work of the public secondary school deputy principal had increasingly become more challenging, especially when dealing with students from different socio-economic. It was revealed that as a result of this, deputies were confronted with a wide range of disciplinary concerns making them devote extra hours in addressing discipline cases. It was found that the advent of the social media had exposed students to a lot of literature leading to emergence of cases such as cyber crimes, homosexuality and many other cases. This had forced deputy heads to come up with new intervention measures to deal with these cases. These studies relied on secondary sources of data and as a result some information would have been inaccurate or distorted as a result of editing of publications. The
information might have also been outdated and not applicable to the current situation. The current study will collect data from primary sources to fill this gap.

Wang’ombe (2007) carried out a study on adolescence behavioural problems faced by school administrators in public boys’ boarding secondary schools in Kirinyaga District, Kenya. The study employed a descriptive survey and the sample consisted of 7 deputy headteachers and 96 teachers. The study used validated questionnaires from deputy headteachers and teachers. The findings revealed that schools encountered increased adolescence behavioural problems which included boy/girl relationship, drug abuse, and time management problems, recurrent problems in completing assignments, domestic problems, pornographic literature, excessive worry and frequent nervousness. The adolescence behavioural problems encountered were rated as alarming by the teachers. It was also revealed that the major causes of these problems were peer influence, large students' population, lack of enough parental involvement in the students' affairs in school, family background, and the students' stage of adolescence, parents siding with their children even when they were on the wrong, lack of sufficient training among the school administrators and some teachers not cooperating with the school administrators in handling behavioural problems. This phenomenon put more pressure on deputy headteachers who are responsible for maintaining discipline in schools. This study did not however reveal the extent to which these indiscipline cases were a challenge to deputy principals which was addressed by the current study. The current study also in addition used interviews which helped provide additional information.
2.3.5 Challenges in Relation to Working Relationships

The position of a school deputy headteacher puts the holder in a position where he/she plays a supervisory role of teachers and students in addition to having to serve under the school headteachers. It is therefore inevitable that deputy headteachers will encounter interpersonal relationship challenges in schools.

2.3.5.1 Working Relationships with Teachers

A survey by Steyn (2002) established that in most schools, deputy headteacher’s carried out their duties from secluded offices as a result isolated them from the rest of the school community including teachers. It was therefore difficult for them to form and maintain strong interpersonal relations with the school community. It was found the teachers and students tended to shun visiting deputy headteachers in the offices while those who did were viewed suspiciously by the rest of the school. This led to job dissatisfaction and hampered deputy headteachers’ ability to receive regular feedback thus making it hard for them to discharge their duties effectively.

These studies relied on secondary sources of data and as a result some information would have been inaccurate or distorted as a result of editing of publications. The information might have also been outdated and not applicable to the current situation. The current study will collect data from primary sources to fill this gap.

Similar studies by Singh and Manser (2002) and Wright and Custer (1998:62) which examined which were based on the human relations and behavioural science, and social influence theories of job satisfaction noted that deputy head teachers by virtue of their position received minimal support from the rest of the teaching staff as a result of poor relationship with teachers. It was found that deputy heads often missed out on collegial opportunities such team teaching, sharing teaching techniques,
working on projects together, conducting workshops, experiencing stimulating and challenging work, and creating school improvement plans. Singh, Manser and Mestry (2007) maintained that collegiality created conditions for deputy headteachers to have a sense of belonging and identified them with the rest of the school which led to enhanced cooperation and understanding thus enhancing their job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

In a study by Wathituni (2010) on investigation into job satisfaction of deputy headteachers in public secondary schools of the Mathira Division, Nyeri District where descriptive research design was used and questionnaires used to collect data from deputy headteachers of public secondary schools in Mathira Division, found out that the nature of the work of deputy headteachers tended to put them on a collision course with teachers who view them as out to make life difficult for them. This is a challenge to deputy headteachers as it has impacted negatively on the working relations in the schools. This study relied on questionnaires as data collection instrument and as a result, the researcher did not have the opportunity to probe for clarifications and additional information. The current study in addition used interviews to fill this gap.

2.3.5.2 Working Relationships with Headteachers

A study by Jaye (2002:31) established that lack of harmonious relationship between the headteachers and their deputies was greatly hindering the ability of the later to carry out their duties. It was found that as a result of poor relationship, there was mistrust between the two senior most managers of schools and constant conflict. This placed deputy headteachers at a disadvantage as given that the heads had a final say in school management and could constantly overturn the decisions made by
deputies. This study relied on secondary sources of data and as a result some information would have been inaccurate or distorted as a result of editing of publications. The information might have also been outdated and not applicable to the current situation. The current study will collect data from primary sources to fill this gap.

A study by Dehaloo (2008) revealed that the manner in which school heads conducted supervision was a major source of conflict with deputy headteachers. It was found that in most schools, headteachers lacked objectivity when supervising their deputies and in most cases supervision was reduced to fault finding exercises. This led to constant conflict with deputy headteachers and was found to be a major source of job dissatisfaction (Dehaloo, 2008:45). A study by Andrews (2008) noted that when supervising deputy heads, headteachers were often unsympathetic and not considerate and did not treat their deputies with dignity and respect thus leading to poor working relationship. This study was carried out across a number of states each with unique educational policies. As a result the findings were extensively generalized and therefore could not provide specific information on the impact of resource mobilization strategies on the quality of education. The current study on the other hand concentrated on Bungoma North Sub-county in Kenya and therefore yielding specific information.

According to Wathituni (2010) on investigation into job satisfaction of deputy headteachers in public secondary schools of the Mathira Division, Nyeri, majority of deputy headteachers (65.0%) indicated that they did not enjoy healthy relationship with their superiors (headteachers). One deputy headteacher stated that the headteacher had a tendency of openly undermining his work like in case where the
headteacher sides openly with students facing punishment. The headteachers were also reported to be undermining chances of their deputies being promoted by writing negative reports. Another respondent observed that the headteacher had on a number of occasions made far-reaching decisions in the school without consulting the deputy headteacher. The current study used interviews in order to solicit additional information and also seek to establish the extent to which headteachers relationship with their deputies affect the performance of a deputy headteacher.

2.3.5.3 Working Relationships with Students

Research by Wright & Custer (1998) noted that motivation and job satisfaction among deputy headteachers are affected positively or negatively by students’ responsiveness, behaviour, attitude to work, achievement and the relationship with their headteachers. The study revealed that most deputy headteachers saw healthy interaction with learners as the most satisfying. It was however found that in South Africa, the unruly learner behaviour had impacted negatively on the relationship between students and deputy headteachers (Samuel, 2007:5; Karp, 2007:5). This unruly behaviour is attributable inter alia to unmotivated learners, learner ill-discipline, language barriers and challenges posed by inclusive education. Unmotivated learners lack enthusiasm, are often absent from class, are evasive and appear unconcerned about perceptions about them of fellow learners and teachers. It was noted that behavioural challenges presented by both unmotivated and ill-disciplined learners’ impact negatively on relationships with deputy headteachers and on their motivation and job satisfaction. These studies relied on secondary sources of data and as a result some information would have been inaccurate or distorted as a result of editing of publications. The information might have also been
outdated and not applicable to the current situation. The current study will collect data from primary sources to fill this gap.

The study by Wathituni (2010) on job satisfaction of deputy headteachers in public secondary schools of the Mathira Division, Nyeri District revealed that deputy headteachers are the most disliked members of the school community by students. This was attributed to the fact that being in-charge of discipline, deputy headteachers are seen to making students’ life in school uncomfortable through reprimands and punishment. This has led to cases where deputy headteachers have been threatened or attacked by students. This study focused more on the determinants of job satisfaction of deputy headteachers and did not critically examine challenges they face while discharging their duties. This was addressed in the current study. The researcher therefore found it necessary to assess if deputy headteachers in Bungoma North District are faced with similar challenges.

2.3.5.4 Working Relationships with the Community and Parents/Guardians

Studies by Robinson, Hohepa and Lloyd (2009) noted that in most districts, community tended to be hostile towards deputy headteachers who were viewed as strict and an impediment the community’s quest to exploit school resources. It was found out that some community expected to be given first priority when it came to employment opportunities or being given tenders to supply materials to schools. When this was not forthcoming, it led to poor relationship with deputy headteachers who in most cases in charge of personnel recruitment as well as tendering in schools. It was further noted that some community members were peddlers of drugs and criminal elements and viewed strict deputies as an impediment to their activities. These studies relied on secondary sources of data and as a result some information
would have been inaccurate or distorted as a result of editing of publications. The information might have also been outdated and not applicable to the current situation. The current study collected data from primary sources to fill this gap.

In South Africa, a study by Botha (2007) revealed that deputy headteachers often felt that they were not receiving the necessary support and appreciation from parents and the community. This was attributed to sheer apathy of parents to deep underlying social problems that negatively affected parental involvement in children’s education. This included family breakdown as a result of many cases of divorce and separation which gave rise to single parenthood. Poverty, unemployment and the ravages of HIV/AIDS were also identified as social factors that minimised parental support for deputy headteachers. These study was carried out in South Africa; a country with a different education system, education curriculum and educational policies in regard to the implementation of the life skills programme. The country also has different socio-economic conditions to those of Kenya and more so Bungoma North Sub-County. Therefore, there is need for the current study as it will explore challenges facing deputy headteachers under the Kenyan education system.

Research by Goldring and Hausman (1997:29) noted that poor relationship with members of the community was as a result of poor leadership style on the part of deputy headteachers. It was found that deputies were not well equipped with skills that could help in facilitating strong partnership with members of the community and parents. It was noted that facilitative leadership required that the deputy principal possess well-developed interpersonal skills, refrain from using formal authority to make unilateral decisions, but instead encourage group decisions, invite
participation and where necessary build capacity among the parent community. Deputy headteachers also lacked leadership skills to act as mediators and motivators given that in order to build strong relationships in view of conflicts which are inevitable in any decision-making process, the deputy principal were required to mediate, motivate and encourage parents. The researcher did not find a study that assesses the extent to which deputy headteachers’ relationship with the school community, parents/guardian is a challenge thus the need for the current study.

2.4 Summary of the Review of Related Literature
The literature review focused upon challenges associated with roles and responsibilities of deputy headteachers. The researcher however found it necessary to carry out this study because a number of studies did not reveal the extent to which indiscipline cases impacted on the work of deputy principals which has been addressed by the current study. Other studies used only questionnaires as data collection instruments while the current study in addition used interviews which helped to provide additional information. Some studies also involved only female deputy headteachers and therefore the current study involved deputy headteachers from the two genders with a view of acquiring adequate information. The study also used only questionnaires while the current study in addition used interviews. Another study was mostly concerned with deputy headteachers’ job satisfaction and did not adequately identify challenges faced by deputy headteachers which was addressed by the current study. Other studies also only targeted deputy headteachers while the current study also involved headteachers thus obtained additional information. Lastly, the researcher did not find a study on the extent to which deputy headteachers’ relationship with the members of the school community and parents/guardian is a challenge thus the need for the current study.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with research design, methodology and procedures that were followed in carrying out the study. The chapter provides a description of the area of study, target population, sampling and sampling procedures, data collection procedures, research instruments and data analysis techniques that were used.

3.2 Research Design

The study adopted a descriptive survey design. This is a research method through which data is collected from members of targeted population by use of questionnaires in order to determine the current status of that population with respect to one or more variables. It is therefore a self-reporting study which brings out quantifiable information from the sample (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999). A descriptive survey design was employed in the study to allow the researcher gather information, summarize, present and interpret for the purpose of certification (Mugenda et al, 2003; Orodho, 2005).

According to Borg and Gall (1989) a descriptive survey design is intended to produce statistical information about aspects of education that interests policy makers and educators. Orodho (2005) goes ahead to suggest that survey research can also deal with the incidence and interrelations of sociological and physiological variables as they occur in educational context. They deal with how people feel or perceive a particular education system; how students behave; or role and group dynamics and interpersonal relationships. Survey design was appropriate in this
study because it allowed the voices of the deputy head teachers to be heard and gave a better understanding of how they experience their roles in the secondary school.

3.3 Study Locale
The study was undertaken in the Bungoma North Sub-County, Bungoma County of the Republic of Kenya. The District has 2 Divisions namely Tongaren and Naitiri. The area is densely populated with farming being the main economic activity. This locale was chosen by the researcher because the researcher’s work station is within the district. The researcher is also more familiar with the area and therefore it was easier to create rapport with the respondents.

3.4 Target Population
The target population for this study comprised of headteachers and deputy headteachers of all the 30 public secondary schools in Bungoma North Sub-County. This means that the study targeted 30 headteachers and 30 deputy headteachers making a total of 60.

3.5 Sampling
Sampling is the process of selecting a section of cases in order to draw conclusions about the entire set. Cohen, Manion and Marrson (2007) and Bryman (2004) appreciate the role of sampling and noted that it’s difficult to interpret data when too much data is collected from the entire population. In this study all the 30 public secondary schools were included in the study since 30 is the extreme lower limit of a sample size (Singleton and Royce, 1975).
3.6 Research Instruments

Questionnaire and interview were used to collect data from the sampled population. Questionnaire as an instrument of research is used because questionnaires are recommended for survey study designs, information can be collected from large samples within a short time, all respondents answer the same questionnaire, and it normally gives the respondents adequate time to provide well thought out responses in the questionnaire items (Orodho, 2005).

Questionnaires that comprised both closed and open-ended items were administered to deputy headteachers while the headteachers were interviewed. The questionnaires were divided into two parts. Part one sought demographic information of deputy head teachers such as sex and length of service etc. Part two of the questionnaire sought information regarding challenges facing deputy headteachers when performing their duties. The challenges were organised under themes according to research objectives. The questionnaire did not require the identity of the respondent so as to enhance honesty on some contentious issues relating to deputy head teachers role. The interview schedule for headteachers comprised of both closed and open-ended items that also sought information regarding challenges facing deputy headteachers while discharging their duties.

3.6.1 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted prior to the actual research. Three schools were involved in the pilot study and were not included in the sample of the study. Through piloting, the researcher was able to determine whether there were any ambiguities in any of the items and ensured that the instruments elicited the type of
data anticipated to answer the research questions. Those items that failed to measure the variables intended were either modified or discarded.

3.6.2 Validity

The validity of an instrument represents the degree to which a test measures what it purports to measure (Borg and Gall, 1983). To enhance the validity, the researcher had the research instruments appraised by the supervisors and the comments made adhered to. To further establish the instruments’ validity a sample of 3 Principals and 3 deputy principals from the 3 randomly selected public secondary schools filled questionnaires for pilot study. These respondents were not included in the main study. This helped to reduce the extraneous influence of the research findings due to prior knowledge of the information required by the instruments.

3.6.3 Reliability

An instrument is said to be reliable when it measures a variable accurately and consistently and obtain the results under same conditions several times (Kerlinger, 1983). Kerlinger (1983) also equates reliability to consistency. In order to test reliability, the researcher carried out a pilot study to establish internal consistency of the items. According to Kerlinger (1983) the reliability of an instrument can be increased by defining closely the objectives of the study and precise identification of the data required plus a repeated review of the instrument. An instrument is reliable when it can measure a variable accurately and consistently and obtain the same results under the same conditions over a time. Scientific researchers such as Nachimias and Nachimias (1976) recommended split half method to measure reliability of a test. This method involved splitting the statements/items into two halves (odd and even items). Scores of each item were computed for the two groups
and then correlated. The correlation coefficient (r) for this study was obtained using the Pearson Product Moment formula which posted +0.752. This tended towards ±1 and therefore the instruments were found to be reliable.

3.7 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher secured permission from the university and permit from the National commission for science, technology and innovation. Authority was also sought from Ministry of interior and Ministry of Education to allow the researcher to carry out research in all the public secondary schools in Bungoma North Sub-County. The researcher personally visited all the schools in the sample and delivered the questionnaires. The purpose of doing this was to avoid losses and other inconveniences. The time frame for filling the questionnaires was agreed upon with the school authorities. The researcher also interviewed the headteachers when he went to collect the filled questionnaires.

3.8 Data Analysis

Data analysis is the process of packaging the collected information in a form that can be understood by the person undertaking the research. Data from the field were coded and presented in tables and graphs. Qualitative data were analysed using content/narrative analysis while quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics have an advantage since they enable the researcher to use one or more numbers to indicate the average score and variability of scores of a sample, (Orodho 2005). A Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used in analyzing the data.
3.9 Logical and Ethical Considerations

Since the researcher appeared to invade a person’s privacy, the researcher did not subject respondents to situations harmful or uncomfortable to them. The participation in research was voluntary and respondents had the right to refuse or divulge certain information about them. The participants were also made aware of the positive and negative aspects or consequences of participation. The informed consent was involved two main factors. First, the consent of the subjects as what is to be disclosed to the researcher, secondly, assurances of confidential use of research data collected on individuals. The researcher further sought permission to conduct the research from the Ministry of Education.

The researcher avoided deception in case of limited finance or volatile situations which might lead to inadequate collection of data. The researcher at all costs avoided plagiarism, which is tantamount to stealing other people’s works, which erodes the integrity of the researcher and leads to serious professional repercussions. The researcher also avoided fraud, in terms of the researcher faking the data or copy other peoples work by "Doctoring".
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents data analysis and interpretation of findings based on the objectives of the study. The chapter is divided into the following sub-sections: headteachers and deputy headteachers demographic information, challenges in relation to role ambiguity, inadequate authority, workload and interpersonal relationship facing deputy headteachers of secondary schools in Bungoma North District. The sample of 30 schools was selected for this study and out of these, the researcher was able to interview 25 headteachers and received fully completed questionnaires from 25 deputy headteachers. This is 83.3% return rate which the researcher found to be an adequate representation of the target population.

4.2 Respondents’ Demographic Information

This section presents the demographic information of respondents aimed at establishing their characteristics and professional capacity that will be significant in enabling them provide accurate or reliable information on the challenges facing deputy headteachers in public secondary schools.

4.2.1 Respondents’ Gender

The study sought to establish headteachers’ and deputy headteachers gender. This was through interviews with headteachers while deputy headteachers provided this information in the questionnaire. The results are as shown in Figure 4.1.
The results on Figure 4.1 show that 18 (75.0%) headteachers were male while 6 (25.0%) were female. The study also established that 15 (60.0%) deputy headteachers were male while 10 (40.0%) were female. The findings reveal that majority of school heads and their deputies are male which is an indication that school headship is dominated by male teachers.

**4.2.2 Headteachers’ and Deputy Headteachers’ Experience**

The researcher asked Headteachers and deputy headteachers to state how long they have served in their respective capacities in public secondary schools. The results are as presented on Figure 4.2.
The findings show that 12 (50.0%) headteachers and 12 (48.0%) deputy headteachers had served in their capacities for between 3 to 5 years. The study also shows that 7 (28.0%) headteachers had served for between 6 to 8 years while 5 (20.0%) of them had served for below 2 years. Only 1 headteacher had served for between 11 to 12 years. The findings on the other hand show that 8 (32.0%) deputy headteachers had served for below 2 years. The findings are an indication that majority of headteachers and deputy headteachers had served in their capacities for more than 3 years and were therefore in a position to provide reliable information on the challenges facing deputy principals when discharging their duties and responsibilities out of their own experiences.

**4.2.3 Other Positions held by Deputies**

In order to establish whether deputy headteachers had risen to their current position as a result of experience accumulated while servicing in other administrative positions, the researcher asked them to state whether they held other positions in the
senior management of schools before their current position. Their responses are as highlighted on Figure 4.3.
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**Figure 4.3: Other Positions Held by Deputies**

The results show that 22 (88.0%) deputy headteachers stated that they have held other positions in senior school management positions. Only 3 (12.0%) said they have not. This is an indication that most deputy headteachers have held management positions in schools and therefore have accumulated knowledge and experience in school management that formed the basis for their promotion to the current position. This also means that the information they gave on challenges facing deputy headteachers in public secondary schools was accurate.

### 4.2.4 Positions Held before being Promoted to Deputy Headship

In order to establish other administrative positions held prior to being promoted to the current positions, the researcher asked them to state the positions they held before becoming deputy headteachers. The findings are as presented on Table 4.1.
Table 4.1: Positions Held before being Promoted to Deputy Headship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of department</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the school disciplinary committee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding teacher</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 25

The findings show that 12 (48.0%) deputy headteachers held positions of heads of department followed by 10 (40.0%) who were members of the school disciplinary committees, 9 (36.0%) who were games teachers and 8 (32.0%) who were senior teachers. The findings are an indication that most deputy principals had served as heads of department and as members of the disciplinary committees. It can therefore be concluded that experience gathered when serving as heads of department as well as serving in disciplinary committee is a major determinant for appointment as deputy headteachers.

4.3 Challenges in Relation to Role Ambiguities

The first objective of the study was to establish challenges deputy headteachers face when as a result of the nature of their roles and responsibilities. In order to obtain this information, the researcher interviewed headteachers and administered questionnaires on deputy headteachers. The findings were analysed and presented in the successive sub-sections.
4.3.1 Key Duties as a Deputy Headteacher

It was necessary to establish the nature of duties and responsibilities undertaken by deputy headteachers. The researcher therefore asked them to list their duties and responsibilities in school in the questionnaire. The results are as shown on Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Key Duties as a Deputy Headteacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In charge of student discipline</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In charge of time tabling</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair tender committee</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise prefects</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of curriculum implementation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary during staff meetings</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring cleanliness of the school</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-coordinating HoDs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle fees payment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending BoM meetings upon delegation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of school workers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair the academic committee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of ceremony during school functions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 25

The results show that all deputy headteachers (100.0%) are in charge of student discipline. The study also show that 23 (92.0%) of them chair the tendering committee and are also in charge of timetabling. The findings further show that 22 (88.0%) deputy headteachers have the responsibility to supervise prefects while 20
(80.0%) supervise curriculum implementation in schools. During the interviews, headteachers noted that the main duties assigned to deputy headteachers include being in charge of student discipline in school, assisting the headteachers in administering the school, supervising the teaching staff and serving as a link between the teaching and non-teaching staff and the headteachers. Headteachers also noted that the deputy headteachers are also in charge of supervision of the non-teaching staff as well as school prefects, chair the school disciplinary committee, chairs the school tender committee and are in charge of school routine and timetabling. Some headteachers further mentioned facilitating examinations in the school, in charge of stores requisitions and maintenance of proper inventory. The findings are an indication that the main duties and responsibilities of deputy headteachers are students’ discipline, procurement and supervising curriculum implementation. The findings concur with a study by Reed and Himmler (1985) which revealed that in Australia, the secondary school assistant’s principal role was one largely preoccupied with timetabling and the management of student behaviour. Later studies point towards the fact that assistant heads were most often given responsibility to look after discipline and attendance issues in the school.

### 4.3.2 Additional Duties and Responsibilities

The researcher asked headteachers and deputy headteachers to state whether other than the duties and responsibilities prescribed in the Headteachers Manual and TSC code of regulations for teachers, there were additional duties and responsibilities they undertake. Their responses are as presented on Table 4.3.
### Table 4.3: Additional Duties and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other responsibilities</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-charge of fees collection</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing minutes in BoM meetings</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of school workers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In charge of BoM welfare</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairing academic meetings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising for needy students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of ceremony during AGMs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 25

Findings revealed that 16 (64.0%) deputy headteachers noted that the additional responsibilities included being in charge of fees collection. The study also indicated that 14 (56.0%) of them cited writing minutes in BoM meetings, supervision of school workers and in charge of BoM welfare. The results are an indication deputy headteachers have been assigned extra duties other than those prescribed in the Education Act. During the interviews, headteachers noted that deputy headteachers other than their official responsibilities deputised headteachers in their absence and as a result performed most of headteachers’ duties and responsibilities. They however consulted headteachers in responsibilities that carried heavy financial implications. The findings agree with Wathituni (2010) in a study on job satisfaction of deputy headteachers in public secondary schools of the Mathira Division, Nyeri District in Kenya which revealed that deputy headteachers are at the second structural level in the school hierarchical structure and have distinct duties outlined by the Ministry of Education such as monitoring teaching and learning activities,
some administrative duties where they act under the instruction and direction of the headteacher. They however had additional duties which included promoting professional development among personnel for example ensuring support and training during the induction of new staff and for trainee teachers. They were also required to deputise headteachers in all capabilities with regular consultations.

4.3.3 Reasons why Deputy Headteachers Carry out Extra Duties

In order to establish whether deputy headteachers were compelled to carry out additional duties and responsibilities, they were asked to state reasons why they carry out extra duties. Their responses are as presented on Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As delegated by the headteacher</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By own choice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of personnel to do them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 25

The findings show that 17 (68.0%) deputy headteachers stated that the extra duties were delegated to them by the headteachers. The findings also show that 5 (20.0%) deputy headteachers carried out these duties out of own choice while 2 (8.0%) carried out extra duties due to lack of personnel. This shows that most of the extra duties were delegated by headteachers. Similar sentiments were shared by headteachers during their interviews where majority of them revealed that most of the duties undertaken by deputy headteachers were delegated duties while others were as a result of the absence of headteachers. The findings concur with a study by
Reed and Himmler (1985) which revealed that in Australia, the secondary school assistant’s principal role was one largely preoccupied with timetabling, management of student behaviour and responsibility to look after discipline and attendance issues in the school. Most of these responsibilities were in most cases delegated by the principals.

4.3.4 Undertaking Conflicting Tasks

The study found it necessary to establish whether deputy headteachers were facing challenges as a result of having to undertake conflicting tasks. Their responses are as presented on Figure 4.4.

\[ N = 25 \]

**Figure 4.4: Undertaking Conflicting Tasks**

The findings on Figure 4.4 show that 18 (72.0%) deputy headteachers said that they have had to carry out conflicting tasks while 7 (28.0%) said they have not. The findings are an indication that deputy headteachers undertake conflicting tasks which is a challenge to them when discharging their duties. When asked what
precipitated these conflicting situations deputy headteachers noted that it was due to lack of trust, conflict of interest, lack of finances, priority of the school, the headteacher would compromise in the discipline issues, defiance of teachers, lack of enough personnel, poor communication between the headteacher and the deputy headteacher, inadequate information, being over-strict on discipline, headteacher personal interest in the community, the deputy not willing to take new ideas, fear of being overshadowed and weak school policy. This was in most cases solved by being able to compromise, letting the principal have his/her way, constant consultation with the headteacher and giving directives through writing. The findings are in line with Mathenge (2007) in a study on the role expectation of women deputy headteachers in public secondary schools in Thika District which investigated how women deputy heads performed their roles and also sought to establish if they experienced contradictory expectations leading to role conflicts in relation to their position and gender. The study revealed that deputy headteachers duties and responsibilities were not clear-cut leading to confusion. The study recommended that the roles and functions of a deputy headteacher be clearly spelt out to avoid misunderstanding.

4.3.5 Challenges as a Result of Different Expectations

Deputy Headteachers were asked to indicate whether they have ever experienced situations where their expectations over certain tasks in schools were not in line with those of their headteachers. The findings are as presented on Figure 4.5.
The result show that 18 (72.0%) deputy headteachers noted that they have had incidences when their expectations were different from those of the headteachers while 7 (28.0%) said they have never had such incidents. The findings are an indication that differences in expectations between the principals and deputies are major challenges facing deputy headteachers which make some roles ambiguous. When asked to cite such incidences, deputy headteachers noted that they included when dealing with issues of boy girl relationships, when dealing with professionalism of teachers, when acting as a headteacher but with no authority, when supervising curriculum implementation without provision of resources, when going against staff resolutions such as policy on repetition, manner of handling disciplinary cases of some students where the principal had interest, when the headteacher appeared to favour some teachers who were not teaching, on meeting at odd hours, when ensuring no interference with school routine, during admission of new students, on entry marks of form ones, on promotion of students from one class to the next and when tendering of goods.
The eventual outcomes in most of those situations is that the headteachers have their way, agreements are reached after consultations, increase in students indiscipline and strained relationships between the principal, teachers, parents and students. It was also noted that sometimes cases were not handled procedurally which brought dissatisfaction in the school. Other possible outcomes included drop in performance among students and that some activities could not take place. The findings are an indication that deputy principals are facing challenges as a result of having to undertake tasks that are not clearly spelt out. The study established that most of the roles assigned to deputy headteachers were ambiguous and undertaking them led to conflict as a result of differing expectations between the headteachers and their deputies. The findings concur with a survey of over 400 deputy principals in Australia found that the majority of this group perceived a lack of clarity in their role which led to difficulties of role demarcation with the principal (Harvey, 1994). Marshall (1992) similarly points to the lack of a ‘real’ leadership role for many assistant headteachers. The National Education Policy Act of 1996 identifies seven roles and competencies that are expected from deputy headteachers. The roles are those of learning mediator; interpreter and designer of learning programmes and materials; leader, administrator and manager; scholar, researcher and life-long learner; assessor; learning area and subject specialist and also a community citizen and pastor (Republic of South Africa, 2000). Accordingly, in their dealings with children, deputy headteachers often feel that they are counselors, social workers, managers, examiners, secretaries, and creative teachers who are concerned with the performance of learners. As a consequence, both role ambiguity and role conflict are inevitable (Schulze & Steyn, 2007). The findings also agree with Mathenge (2007) who carried out a study on the role expectation of women deputy headteachers in
public secondary schools in Thika District which revealed that deputy headteachers duties and responsibilities were not clear-cut leading to confusion.

4.3.6 Clarity of Extra Duties

In order to establish whether responsibilities bestowed on deputy headteachers were clear or lacked ambiguities, they were asked to state whether the extra duties they undertook were clearly spelt out. The findings are as presented on Figure 4.6.

The findings show that 17 (68.0%) deputy headteachers indicated that the extra duties given to them were not clearly spelt out while 8 (32.0%) said that extra duties were clearly spelt out. The principals who were interviewed on the other hand felt that the job description is clearly spelt out in the appointment letters and headteachers’ manual. They also noted that they frequently updated their deputies on emerging issues. The findings also showed that deputy headteachers noted that they found responsibilities ambiguous especially when they were asked to carry out
duties in which much of the information had been withheld by principals. Such cases also included where deputies had to implement tasks that required finances and yet they cannot access funds at the school bank accounts. This is an indication that some extra duties carried out by deputy headteachers were not clearly spelt and therefore role ambiguity in extra tasks handled by deputy headteachers was a challenge to them. When asked to explain why they felt that the extra duties were not clearly spelt out, deputy headteachers noted that these duties were given verbally and whenever situations arose and therefore there was no reference. They also noted that in some cases the principals failed to brief them adequately as expected and as a result the deputy headteachers did not have enough information on the objectives to be achieved. They also cited lack of clear delegation.

When asked to explain how lack of clarity in extra duties affected them during performance of these responsibilities, deputy headteachers noted that it ended up taking them long to complete them and as a result little attention was given to their own duties or were unable to attend to their duties at all. It was also explained that extra duties led to straining, led to conflict as the expectations of the principal differed from those of deputies, some decisions end up being overruled, sometimes they made mistakes and end up being blamed while some staff members felt deputies were overstepping other teachers’ duties. It was further noted that these extra duties made deputies not able to attend to their lessons and families because work became too heavy. The findings are an indication that deputy headteachers in public secondary schools undertake some duties and responsibilities which are not clearly spelt out and as a result ambiguous. The findings are in line with a survey by Harvey (1994) of over 400 deputy principals in Australia that found that the majority
of this group perceived a lack of clarity in their role which led to difficulties of role demarcation with the principal (Harvey, 1994).

### 4.4 Challenges in Relation to Inadequacy of Authority

The second objective sought to establish whether deputy headteachers are facing challenges as a result of inadequacy of authority when discharging their duties. The researcher therefore asked headteachers and deputy headteachers to provide the information to this end. The findings were analysed and are as presented in successive sub-sections.

#### 4.4.1 Ability to Make Independent Decisions

The researcher asked deputy principals to state whether they sometimes make decisions without being directed by the principals. The findings are as shown on Figure 4.7.
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**Figure 4.7: Ability to Make Independent Decisions**
The findings show that 17 (68.0%) deputy headteachers noted that they sometimes are unable to make decisions without being directed by the principal while 8 (32.0%) said they do. This is an indication that most deputy headteachers do not have a free hand in making certain decisions in regard to their duties and responsibilities and therefore inadequate authority in decision-making is one of the challenges they face. Deputy headteachers who stated that they do not make decisions without being directed by the headteacher noted that they do so to avoid conflicts and being seen as undermining the headteacher. They further noted that being the final authority, the headteacher must be consulted before decisions are made. When asked to list the decisions they make without direction from the principal, they listed them as when dealing with some student discipline cases, when making the timetable, when disciplining workers, when giving teachers leaves of absence and when dealing with emergencies like sickness among students. It was however noted that such decisions were restricted to those with no financial implications.

The findings are in agreement with Fresko (1997) who argues that the position of deputy headteachers is weakened by lack of autonomy. Autonomy refers to the degree to which deputy headteachers are allowed freedom, independence and discretion to perform their duties as they see fit and in accordance with their job descriptions (Atkinson, 2000:46; Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992:180). Owens (1995) concurs, and adds that autonomy is the individual’s need to participate in making decisions that affect them, to exert influence on controlling the work situation, to have a voice in setting job-related goals, to have authority to make decisions, and latitude to work independently. Hoy and Miskel (1996:323) maintain that autonomy is the primary characteristic of work which creates a sense of responsibility.
4.4.2 Adherence to Deputy Principals’ Orders

In order to establish deputy headteachers’ authority over other teachers, the researcher asked to state whether the orders they give are adhered to. The findings are as presented on Table 4.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a very little extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings show that 15 (60.0%) deputy headteachers stated that their orders are adhered to by teachers to very large extent while 10 (40.0%) said that their orders were adhered to, to a large extent. The findings are an indication that failure by teachers to take orders is not a challenge facing deputy headteachers. It was however noted that teachers tended to adhere more to directives that originated from the headteachers. When asked to explain, most deputy principals noted that in most cases orders were respected because the deputy headteachers enjoyed support of the headteachers while in some cases, the orders originated from the headteachers or that orders were consultative and all inclusive making them to be adhered to. It was also noted that orders were respected because they were reached at through consensus in various committees. Deputy headteachers also noted that orders were
followed because they were respected by teachers. Good rapport with teachers was also noted as being essential. The findings concur with findings of a study by Fresko (1997) which revealed that deputy headteachers had to keep mentioning the headteachers as a way of making sure that their orders are adhered to by teachers, students and members of the non-teaching staff.

4.4.3 Amount of Power Wielded by Deputy Headteachers

In order to establish the amount of powers wielded by deputy headteachers, the researcher asked them to state whether being a deputy headteacher gives them enough powers to dictate the day to day running of the school. The results are as highlighted on Figure 4.8.
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The findings show that 9 (36.0%) deputy headteachers feel that the position of deputy headteachers bestows on them enough powers to dictate the day to day running of the school while 16 (64.0%) said it does not. When interviewed, the headteachers noted that the deputy headteacher’s position gives one limited authority as some of their decisions can be overruled or overturned by the
headteachers. The headteachers also noted that in some cases, directions given by deputy headteachers are not followed as deputies are seen more as intermediaries. This is solved by headteachers giving their deputies support on decisions made, facilitating them to attend capacity building courses and benchmarking with deputies in other schools. The headteachers also monitored to ensure that directives given by deputies are adhered to. The headteachers also indicated that they gave their deputies constant advice.

The findings are an indication that the inadequacy of administrative powers is a challenge facing deputy principals. Deputy headteachers who felt that the position gives them limited powers noted that the delegated authority was limited and could easily be withdrawn by the headteacher and that the day to day work running of the school is the work of the headteacher and their work is to supervise what is established. When asked to explain, deputy headteachers who said the position gives the adequate powers noted that "it is as a result of the high levels of confidence teachers and students have in them. It was also because they were the ones who do the timetabling in school and also because they were second in command. This agrees with a study by Robbins (2001) which demonstrated that a large number of deputy headteachers found their experience particularly frustrating or disappointing because of the lack of leadership influence they felt they had within the school. In the study some interviewees felt that they had experienced more leadership influence as head of department than as deputy headteacher. This negative view of time as a deputy often contrasted starkly with their current view of being a headteacher, which was generally much more positive because of their clear leadership role within the school. There was also a view that deputy principals
needed a much stronger leadership role than they actually possessed and that the role was too reactive with little real scope for leading innovation and change (Harvey, 1994).

4.5 Challenges in Relation to Increased Workload

The third objective was to establish challenges facing deputy headteachers as a result of increased workload. Headteachers and deputy headteachers were asked to provide the relevant information. The findings were analysed and are as presented in the following sub-sections.

4.5.1 Workload as a Result of Increased Indiscipline Cases

In order to confirm whether deputy headteachers challenges include increased discipline cases, the researcher asked deputy headteachers to comment on the magnitude of discipline cases in their schools. The findings are as presented in Figure 4.9
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Figure 4.9: Magnitude of Discipline Cases
The findings in Figure 4.9 show that 10 (40.0%) deputy headteachers stated that they have many discipline cases to deal with, 5 (20.0%) deputy headteachers said that they are very many, 6 (24.0%) said they are few and 16.0% very few respectively. Interviews with the headteachers also revealed that discipline cases are quite many in schools further increasing the workload for deputy headteachers. The headteachers further revealed that discipline cases are a major challenge as most of them start from home while others were complex and needed a lot of understanding. The findings are an indication that majority of deputy headteachers have many discipline cases to deal with which significantly increases their workload. It can therefore be concluded that a high number of discipline cases is among the challenges facing deputy headteachers. In order to minimize the burden on deputy headteachers, headteachers revealed that they have formed and empowered the disciplinary committees to deal with some discipline cases. Some cases were also referred to the guidance and counseling departments. Some headteachers noted that they organize student barazas or forums where students are allowed to freely air their views as a way of minimizing discipline cases. The findings further concur with Mathenge (2007) in the study on the role expectation of women deputy headteachers in public secondary schools in Thika District which revealed that deputy headteachers are faced with heavy workload as a result of increased discipline cases in schools and additional duties and responsibilities of this position in addition to their role as classroom teachers. The situation was worse in understaffed schools and upcoming schools where deputy headteachers taught more than 30 lessons per week. The findings concur with Wang'ombe (2007) in a study on adolescence behavioural problems faced by school administrators in public boys' boarding secondary schools in Kirinyagah District, Kenya which revealed that this
phenomenon puts more pressure on deputy headteachers who are responsible for maintaining discipline in schools.

**4.5.2 Workload Related Challenges**

In order to establish whether the position of a deputy headteacher increases workload of the holders, the researcher asked headteachers and deputy headteachers to state the extent to which this position increased their workload. The results are as shown on Table 4.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a very small extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings show that 13 (52.0%) deputy headteachers stated that the position led to increased workload to a very large extent while 12 (48.0%) said it increased the workload to a large extent. The headteachers who were interviewed noted that they found the position of the deputy headteachers demanding because they provide a link between the principal and members of the school community in addition to teaching and supervising teaching and non-teaching staff. One headteacher observed that the deputies walk on a tight rope that requires them to strike a balance and bring all members of the school community on board. The position was also viewed by
headteachers as demanding because deputy principals have to constantly supervise student activities which force them to be close them. They also have to strive to be good classroom teachers to earn respect and assert authority. Headteachers further noted that deputy headteachers’ roles overlap across all departments thus making it very demanding.

This is an indication that being a deputy headteacher comes with additional responsibilities which increased the workload. It can therefore be concluded that increased workload is a challenge facing deputy headteachers due to many delegated duties and increased discipline cases which take much of curricula time. This led to a lot of straining and inability to adequately attend to other duties e.g. teaching. Heavy workload also means that some discipline cases cannot be handled immediately and that they had little time to attend to family issues. In order to lessen the workload on deputy headteachers, headteachers employed additional teachers to take up most of the teaching role. They have also delegated some of their responsibilities to committees for instance the disciplinary committee, boarding committee and guidance and counselling committees. Some responsibilities were also delegated to the senior teachers, class teachers and teachers on duty. The findings agree with Mathenge (2007) in the study on the role expectation of women deputy headteachers in public secondary schools in Thika District which revealed that deputy headteachers are faced with heavy workload. This was attributed to additional duties and responsibilities of this position in addition to their role as classroom teachers. The situation was worse in understaffed schools and upcoming schools where deputy headteachers taught more than 30 lessons per week.
4.6 Challenges in Relation to Interpersonal Relations

The fourth objective was to establish ways in which the position of the deputy headteacher led to interpersonal relationship challenges between the deputy principal and members of the school community. The findings were analysed and are as discussed in the successive sub-sections.

4.6.1 Working Relationship with the Principal

In order to establish whether the position of deputy headteacher had an impact on the working relationship between them and their headteachers, the researcher asked deputies to comment on the relationship between them and headteachers. The results are as shown on Figure 4.10.
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**Figure 4.10: Working Relationship with the Headteacher**

The findings show that 7 (28.0%) deputy headteachers indicated that the working relationship with their headteachers was fair. 6 (24.0%) deputy headteachers said the relationship was good and a similar number of deputies indicated that the
relationship with their headteachers was poor. 4 (16.0%) deputy headteachers said it was very poor while 2 (8.0%) deputy headteachers said it was very good. While interviewing the headteachers, it was established that a substantial number of them have poor relationship with their deputies. These headteachers during interviews accused their deputies of sabotage and not taking their duties and responsibilities seriously. A number of headteachers accused their deputies of being slow in decision-making. The headteachers who said they had good relationships with the deputies attributed it to the respect they had for one another and the willingness of their deputies to take instructions positively. The findings are an indication that the position of being deputy headteachers has led to strained relationship with the headteachers. It can therefore be concluded that poor working relationship between headteachers and their deputies are among the challenges facing most deputy headteachers. When asked to comment on the reasons behind this kind of working relationship, deputy headteachers stated that it is to some extent influenced by existing mistrust between the two offices. This led to difficulty in cultivating teamwork between the headteachers and their deputies. The findings are in line with Mngoma (2010) who argues that the position of a school deputy headteachers puts the holder in a position where they are involved in key decision-making processes. As a result they encounter resistance from principals especially in case of differences in expectations and mistrust between the two administrators.

### 4.6.2 Working Relationship with Teachers

As a way of assessing whether deputy headteachers were facing challenges in their working relationship with teachers, the researcher asked them to comment on how the position has influenced their relationship with teachers. The results are as presented on Figure 4.11.
Figure 4.11: Working Relationship with Teachers

The findings revealed that 8 (32.0%) deputy headteachers noted that the working relationship between them and their teachers was good, 6 (24.0%) said it was fair, while 5 (20.0%) said it was poor and very poor. Only 1 (4.0%) said they had a very good working relationship with teachers. Most headteachers who were interviewed also noted that the relationship between deputy headteachers and teachers was in most cases frosty. This was attributed to the fact that deputy principals are the immediate supervisors of teachers and therefore are most likely to be on collision courses. Headteachers also explained that deputy headteachers avoided interacting with teachers to avoid being compromised. They further observed that teachers with pending tasks tended to dislike deputy headteachers who kept reminding them of these tasks. The findings are an indication that most deputy headteachers have poor working relationship with teachers. It can thus be concluded that poor working relationship with teachers is a challenge facing deputy headteachers. This concurs with Mngoma (2010) who argues that the position of a school deputy headteachers puts the holder in a position where he/she plays a supervisory role of teachers. It is
therefore inevitable that deputy headteachers will encounter interpersonal relationship challenges in schools. In a study by Wathituni (2010) on investigation into job satisfaction of deputy headteachers in public secondary schools of the Mathira Division, Nyeri District where descriptive research design was used and questionnaires used to collect data from 27 respondents who were deputy headteachers of public secondary schools in Mathira Division, found out that the nature of the work of deputy headteachers tended to put them on a coalition course with teachers who view them as out to make life difficult for them.

4.6.3 Working Relationship with Students

To establish the influence of the deputy headteachers’ position on working relationship with students, the researcher asked the deputy principals to comment on their relationship with students. The results are as presented on Figure 4.12.
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**Figure 4.12: Working Relationship with Students**
The findings show that 9 (36.0%) deputy headteachers noted that the relationship between them and students was fair, 7 (28.0%) said it was good while 3 (12.0%) said it was very good, poor and very poor. During the interviews with headteachers it was noted that students tended to dislike deputy headteachers because they were the ones in most cases enforcing school rules and regulations. The fact that deputy headteachers were in charge of discipline among students also further strained relationship with students especially those who are always breaking school rules. The findings are an indication that the relationship between most deputy headteachers and students was fairly good and therefore was not a major challenge. According to the deputy headteachers, this was attributed to impartiality in handling discipline cases where even those found guilty could see the mistake and not vendetta in the punishment. This has attracted support from the students. The findings are in line with Mngoma (2010) who argues that the position of a school deputy headteachers puts the holder in a position where he/she plays a supervisory role of students. It is therefore inevitable that deputy headteachers will encounter interpersonal relationship challenges with students in schools.

4.6.4 Working Relationship with Parents/Guardians

In order to establish whether working relationship between deputy principals and parents/guardian is a challenge to deputy principals, the researcher asked them to provide the required information. The results are as shown on Figure 4.13.
Figure 4.13: Working Relationship with Parents/Guardians

The findings show that 10 (40.0%) deputy headteachers stated that they have a good working relationship with parents/guardian, 6 (24.0%) said the relationship was very good while 5 (20.0%) said that it was fair. Headteachers who were interviewed noted that parents whose children have discipline cases tended to have poor relationship with deputy headteachers especially those who were not supportive when their children are being disciplined. Parents and guardians who were fees defaulters also tended to have poor relationships with deputies who were mostly following up on fees payment. The findings are an indication that most deputy headteachers are enjoying a cordial relationship with parents. This was attributed to the fact that most of them show commitment when serving parents, communicate with parents frequently, are faithful to parents and give parents audience to air their views. The good relationship was also attributed to the fact that they normally agree with parents on the mode of fees payment which is respected by both parties. Those who had poor relationship with parents attributed this to parents’ failure to fulfill the agreement on fees payment and that some parents are illiterate. The findings concur
with a study by Wathituni (2010) which revealed that administrative duties of deputy headteachers such as handling payment of school fees and discipline cases tended to put them on a coalition course with parents and guardians especially in cases where deputy headteachers took perceived unpopular measures.

4.6.5 Working Relationship with Members of the Non-teaching Staff

In order to establish whether working relationship between deputy principals and members of the non-teaching staff is a challenge to deputy principals, the researcher asked them to provide the required information. The results are as shown on Figure 4.14.
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**Figure 4.14: Working Relationship with Members of the Non-teaching staff**

The findings show that 6 (24.0%) deputy headteachers noted that they have a very good, good and fair working relationship with members of the non-teaching staff, 3 (12.0%) stated that the relationship was poor while 4 (16.0%) said it was very poor. Interviews with the headteachers gave mixed feedback where half of them reported that their deputies had good relationship with members of the non-teaching staff.
while another half noted that relationship was poor. Those who said that relationship was poor attributed it to the fact that deputy headteachers are tasked with ensuring that school workers perform their duties as required which may lead to poor relationship. The results show that most deputy headteachers have a good relationship with members of the non-teaching staff while a substantial number have poor working relationship. This concurs with Mngoma (2010) who argues that the position of a school deputy headteachers puts the holder in a position where he/she plays a supervisory role of the teaching and non-teaching staff. It is therefore inevitable that deputy headteachers will encounter interpersonal relationship challenges in schools.

4.6.6 Working Relationship with Neighbours of the School

In order to establish whether working relationship between deputy principals and people and institutions found in the same locality with the school is a challenge to deputy principals, the researcher asked them to provide the required information. The results are as shown on Figure 4.15.

![Figure 4.15: Working Relationship with Neighbours of the School](image-url)
The findings on Figure 4.15 show that 10 (40.0%) deputy headteachers said they have a good relationship with neighbours of the school. 6 (24.0%) deputy headteachers indicated that the relationship is fair. 3 (12.0%) deputy headteachers said the relationship is very good while 3 (12%) deputy headteachers said the relationship is poor. 3 (12%) other deputy headteachers also said their relationship with neighbours of the school was very poor. There was a general feeling among headteachers who were interviewed, that deputy headteachers tended to have warm relationship with neighbours of the school as there were very minimal areas of conflict. This shows that majority of deputy principals are enjoying cordial relationship with school neighbours.

The study findings show that a few deputy headteachers are faced with challenges in relation to working relationship with members of the school community. This is attributed to the nature of the duties and responsibilities bestowed to the position. The findings concur with a study by Reed and Himmler (1985) which revealed that in Australia, the secondary school assistant’s principal role included discipline and attendance issues in the school which resulted to conflicts with the neighbouring communities that were mostly accused to being responsible for deteriorating discipline in schools through peddling of contrabands to students.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the study, a summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations arrived at, as well as suggestions for further studies. The purpose of this study was to investigate the challenges deputy headteachers encounter in their administrative roles in public secondary schools in Bungoma North District, Kenya. This was based on the fact that the position of deputy headteacher in public secondary school presents the office holders with numerous challenges. This was be done by establishing the extent to which role ambiguity, adequacy of administrative authority, workload and working relationships are challenges facing deputy headteachers. The study is significant as the findings may contribute towards the improvement of existing knowledge on educational administration. The study was guided by the social systems theory, Guba and Getzels model (Lunenburg, 2007) and adopted a descriptive survey design. The target population was 30 principals and 30 deputy principals in public secondary schools in Bungoma North District. A questionnaire and oral interview schedule was used to collect data. Qualitative data were analysed using content analysis and presented in narrative form while quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics and presented in table/s, graphs and pie charts.

5.2 Summary of the Findings

The study sought to establish whether role ambiguity was a challenge facing deputy headteachers. The findings confirmed that deputy principals were having challenges of carrying out ambiguous tasks. This was due to the fact that deputy headteachers
were often assigned extra roles which were not clearly spelt out and as a result it took them longer to accomplish these tasks and that there was no clear delegation. It was also established that they occasionally came across conflicting tasks and that in some instances, there were differences in expectations between them and headteachers.

The second objective sought to establish whether deputy headteachers are facing challenges as a result of adequacy of administrative authority when discharging their duties. From the findings, it was revealed that most deputy headteachers did not have a free hand in making certain decisions especially those that had financial implications. It was however noted that teachers respected directives from deputy headteachers especially whenever there was support from headteachers. It was therefore clear that deputy headteachers are facing challenges when carrying out their duties because the position did not accord them adequate administrative powers and thus relied on the headteachers’ support.

The third objective was to establish challenges facing deputy headteachers as a result of increased workload. The study established that the deputy headteacher’s position came with additional responsibilities which increased the workload. This was attributed to many delegated duties which take much of curricula time. It was also said to be due to many discipline cases deputies have to attend to. This led to a lot of straining while deputy headteachers were unable to adequately attend to other duties e.g. teaching. Heavy workload also meant some discipline cases could not be handled immediately and that they had little time to attend to family issues.
The fourth objective was to establish ways in which the position of the deputy headteacher led to working relationship challenges between the deputy headteacher and members of the school community. The findings revealed that the position of deputy headteacher occasionally leads to strained relationship with the headteachers. A number of headteachers who were interviewed accused their deputies of sabotage and not taking their duties and responsibilities seriously. A number of headteachers accused their deputies of being slow in decision-making. The findings also showed that most deputy headteachers had poor working relationship with teachers. This was attributed to the fact that deputy headteachers are the immediate supervisors of teachers and therefore are most likely to be on collision courses.

The study further showed that the relationship between most deputy headteachers and students was fairly good and therefore was not a major challenge. Headteachers noted that students tended to dislike deputy headteachers because they were the ones in most cases enforcing school rules and regulations. The fact that deputy headteachers were in charge of discipline among students also further strained relationship with students especially those who are always breaking school rules. Most deputy headteachers were found to be enjoying a cordial relationship with parents and guardians. This was attributed to the fact that most of them show commitment when serving parents, communicate with parents frequently, are faithful to parents and give parents audience to air their views. The good relationship was also attributed to the fact that they normally agree with parents on the mode of fees payment which is respected by both parties.
5.4 Conclusions of the Study

Firstly, the study established that deputy headteachers were facing challenges of having to carry out ambiguous tasks as a result of lack of clear delegation, tasks not being clearly spelt out, conflicting acts and differences in expectations between them and headteachers. Secondly, the study also established that another challenge facing deputy headteachers was lack of adequate authority when discharging their duties especially in decision-making. Thirdly, it was further established that another challenge facing deputy headteachers was increased workload as the position came with additional responsibilities due to many delegated duties and many discipline cases deputies have to attend to. Fourthly, the study revealed that the position of being deputy headteachers occasionally leads to a challenge of strained relationship with the headteachers, teachers, students and parents of the school. This is because deputy principals are very much involved in the day to day running of schools and therefore are more likely to encounter conflicts with other members of the school community.

5.5 Recommendations of the Study

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made:

i. A manual for deputy headteachers should be developed which will provide guidelines and duties and responsibilities of deputy headteachers to avoid challenges of dealing with ambiguous tasks.

ii. Headteachers should allow deputy principals to have a free hand in making decisions and should avoid overruling or overturning decisions of their deputies in order to empower them when performing their duties.
iii. The administration should empower school committees and departments in undertaking various duties and responsibilities in order to minimise the amount of workload on the shoulders of deputy headteachers.

iv. Schools should facilitate deputy headteachers to go for capacity building and benchmarking on ways of building healthy interpersonal relationships with members of the school community.

5.6 Suggestions for Further Research

The study targeted headteachers and deputy headteachers leaving out other members of the school community. A suggestion is therefore made that a similar study should be conducted to incorporate the views of students, parents and school neighbours.
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APPENDICE

APPENDIX A: HEADTEACHERS’ INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is your gender?
2. How long have you served as a headteacher?
3. What are the roles of your deputy headteacher?
4. Do you think your deputy headteacher’s roles are clearly defined? Explain your answer.
5. Have you witnessed your deputy facing ambiguous tasks?
6. Which tasks were they?
7. Why were the tasks ambiguous or not clear?
8. How did you deal with the situation?
9. Do you find the position of the deputy headteacher adequately powerful? Explain your answer.
10. What do you do when you realize that your deputy lacks the required powers to deal with a situation?
11. Do you find the position of the deputy headteacher demanding? Explain your answer.
12. What have you done to lessen the workload of your deputy?
13. Do you think heavy workload affects the work of the deputy headteacher? Explain your answer.
14. Comment on levels of discipline in your school.
15. Who deals with cases of indiscipline in your school? Explain your answer.
16. What measures have you put in place to deal with cases of indiscipline?
17. Do you think dealing with discipline cases poses a challenge to the deputy headteacher? Explain your answer.
19. Has the relationship between you and your deputy affected the work of the deputy? Explain in which way.
APPENDIX B: DEPUTY HEADTEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. For how long have you served as a Deputy Headteacher in Bungoma North Sub-County?........................................................................................................................................

3. Have you held another position in the senior management team of this school prior to this current position? Yes [ ] No [ ]

   If Yes, which Position? ........................................................................................................................................

   For how long: ........................................................................................................................................

SECTION B: CHALLENGES IN RELATION TO ROLE AMBIGUITIES

4. What are your key duties as a deputy head teacher?........................................................................

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

5. (a) Other than the duties and responsibilities prescribed in the Headteachers manual and TSC code of regulations for teachers, are there additional duties and responsibilities you undertake?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) If yes, list some of these duties and responsibilities..........................................................

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

(c) Please give reasons why you have to carry out these duties.

   As delegated by the headteacher [ ]

   By own choice [ ]

   Lack of personnel to do them [ ]
(d) Are these duties and responsibilities clearly spelt out?

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

(e) If no explain why think they are not clearly spelt out.

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

(f) If the duties and responsibilities are not clearly spelt out, to what extent has this affected your performance of these functions?

To a very large extent [ ]
To a large extent [ ]
To a small extent [ ]
To a very small extent [ ]
Have not affected your performance [ ]

(g) In what ways has lack of clarity of duties and responsibilities affected your performance of these functions?

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

6. (a) Have you ever experienced a situation where you encountered conflicting tasks?

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

(b) If Yes list some of the situations

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

(c) What precipitated these conflicting situations?

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

..........................................................................................................................
7. (a) Have you ever experienced a situation where your expectations over certain tasks in schools are not in line with those of your headteacher?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) If yes can you mention some of those instances?

(c) What was the eventual outcome in most of those situations?

(d) What do you suggest should be done to reduce ambiguity of duties and responsibilities undertaken by deputy headteachers?
SECTION C: CHALLENGES IN RELATION TO INADEQUATE AUTHORITY

8. (a) Are there instances you make decisions without being directed by the headteacher?  
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

(b) If yes list some of the decisions you have made at one time without being directed by the headteacher:
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

(c) If No, explain why you cannot make decisions without being directed by the headteacher:
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

1. 9. (a) To what extent are the orders you give in school adhered to by teachers and students?  
   To a very large extent [ ]  To a large extent [ ]  To a small extent [ ]  To very small extent [ ]
   Never [ ]

(b) Please explain your answer:
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

(c) Does the position of being a deputy headteacher give you enough powers to dictate the day to day running of the school?  
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]
9. In what ways do you think the position of the deputy headteacher can be made more influential in the school?

SECTION D: CHALLENGES IN RELATION TO INCREASED WORKLOAD

10. (a) Do you have lessons in your school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) If yes how many lessons do you have per week? 

(c) If No explain why you don’t have lessons 

11. (a) To what extend does the position of being a deputy headteacher increase your workload?

To a very large extent [ ] To a large extent [ ]

To a small extent [ ] To very small extent [ ]

Never [ ]

(b) In what ways does the position of being the deputy headteacher increase you workload 

.................................................................
(c) In what ways are you able to deal with the increased workload? 

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

(d) In what ways has the workload impacted on your performance of duties and responsibilities of the deputy headteacher? 
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

(e) What do you suggest should be done to ensure that the workload of deputy headteachers is manageable? 
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

SECTION E: CHALLENGES IN RELATION TO INCREASED
INDISCIPLINE CASES

13. (a) Please comment on the levels of discipline in your school.

   Very good [ ]     Good [ ]    Fair [ ]
   Poor [ ]        Very Poor [ ]

(b) Please comment on the amount of time you spent dealing with discipline cases .............................................................................................................................

(c) What time do you attend to discipline cases in your school? ........................................
........................................................................................................................................

(d) How does it affect you attendance of lessons? ..............................................................
........................................................................................................................................
(e) In what ways do you make up for lessons lost when dealing with discipline cases?

(f) Please list some of the problems you have encountered when dealing with these discipline cases.

(g) How were you able to deal with these problems?

SECTION F: CHALLENGES IN RELATION TO INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

14. (a) Please comment on your working relationship with your Principal or headteacher.

Very good [ ]  Good [ ]  Fair [ ]
Poor [ ]  Very Poor [ ]

(b) Can you comment on the reasons behind this kind of working relationship?

(c) How has this relationship affected your work as the deputy headteacher?
(d) What do you suggest should be done to improve the working relationship between headteachers and their deputies? .................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................

15. (a) Please comment on your working relationship with your teachers.

Very good [ ]  Good [ ]  Fair [ ]
Poor [ ]  Very Poor [ ]

(b) Can you comment on the reasons behind this kind of working relationship?
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................

(c) How has this relationship affected your work as the deputy headteacher?...
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................

(d) What do you suggest should be done to improve the working relationship between deputy headteachers and teachers? ........................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................

16. (a) Please comment on your relationship with students in your school.

Very good [ ]  Good [ ]  Fair [ ]
Poor [ ]  Very Poor [ ]

(b) Can you comment on the reasons behind this kind of working relationship?
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
How has this relationship affected your work as the deputy headteacher? ...

What do you suggest should be done to improve the relationship between deputy headteachers and students?

17. (a) Please comment on your relationship with parents/guardians.

Very good [ ] Good [ ] Fair [ ]
Poor [ ] Very Poor [ ]

(b) Can you comment on the reasons behind this kind of working relationship?

(c) How has this relationship affected your work as the deputy headteacher?

(d) What do you suggest should be done to improve the relationship between deputy headteachers and parents/guardians?

18. (a) Please comment on your relationship with members of the non-teaching staff.

Very good [ ] Good [ ] Fair [ ]
Poor [ ] Very Poor [ ]
(b) Can you comment on the reasons behind this kind of working relationship?
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

(c) How has this relationship affected your work as the deputy headteacher?...
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

(d) What do you suggest should be done to improve the relationship between deputy headteachers and members of the non-teaching staff?……………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

19. (a) Please comment on your relationship with neighbours of the school.

Very good [ ] Good [ ] Fair [ ]
Poor [ ] Very Poor [ ]

(b) Can you comment on the reasons behind this kind of working relationship?
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

(c) How has this relationship affected your work as the deputy headteacher?...
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

(d) What do you suggest should be done to improve the relationship between deputy headteachers and neighbours of the school?……………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
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The bearer of this letter, Mr Habil Malika Omoto a student of Kenyatta university, sought an authority to carry out a research on “challenges facing Deputy Head Teachers in the performance of their administrative roles in public secondary schools in the Bungoma North Sub County, Bungoma County, Kenya” for a period ending 30th September 2014.

The authority granted to him by the National Commissioner for Science, technology and innovation is hereby acknowledged and appreciated.

Any assistance accorded to him in that pursuit would be highly appreciated.

M. A. Maalim
COUNTY COMMISSIONER
BUNGOMA COUNTY
APPENDIX F: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION FROM THE
COUNTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

REPUBLIC OF KENYA
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
State Department of Education – Bungoma County

When Replying please quote
e-mail: bungomaedc@gmail.com

County Director of Education
P.O. Box 1620-50200
BUNGOMA

Ref NO: BCE/DE/19/VOL.1/96
Date: 19th/8/ 2014

All Sub – County Directors of Education
BUNGOMA COUNTY.

RE: AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT RESEARCH – HABIL MALIKA OMOTO
NACOSTI/P/14/5514/2710 - ADMISSION NO. E55/CE/11749/07.

The bearer of this letter Mr. Habil Malika Omoto is a Student at Kenyatta University – Nairobi.

He is given authority to carry out research on “Challenges facing Deputy Head teachers in the performance of their administrative roles in public secondary schools in Bungoma North, Bungoma County, Kenya,” for a period ending 30th September, 2014.

Kindly accord him the necessary assistance.

\[Signature\]
CHARLES A. ANYIKA
COUNTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
BUNGOMA COUNTY
APPENDIX G: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION FROM THE
SUB-COUNTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCIENCE
AND TECHNOLOGY
STATE DEPARTMENT-EDUCATION

Telephone Bungoma:
DEO’s House:
When replying please quote
Our REF: BGM/N/2/7/VOL.III249

SUB-COUNTY EDUCATION OFFICE
BUNGOMA NORTH SUB COUNTY,
P.O. BOX 687,
KIMILILI
DATE: 25/08/2014

RE: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH
MR. HABIL MALIKA OMOTO ADM NO.-ESS/CE/11749/07
The above named is a student of Kenyatta University-Nairobi is hereby granted
permission to conduct research in Secondary schools in Bungoma North Sub-County
between 26th August to 30th September 2014.

Topic: Challenges facing Deputy Headteachers in performance of their
administrative roles in Public Secondary schools in Bungoma North, Bungoma
County, Kenya.

Kindly accord him the necessary assistance.

OGANDOH GEORGE
SUB-COUNTY EDUCATION OFFICER
BUNGOMA NORTH SUB-COUNTY