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ABSTRACT.

The study was to find out factors influencing delegation in schools in Ekerenyo Division, Nyamira District.

Despite the critical importance of delegation of authority it tended to receive relatively little attention in management literature and training. Managers spend too much time on their historical specialism instead of delegating to reduce workload, motivate Juniors and push authority to the point of action, as Rees (1991) argues.

Recently delegation of authority is gaining recognition in Kenya and the world over, but still there is reluctance from Kenyan managers to delegate effectively. The philosophy behind delegation of authority is that it is a means whereby a manager can, having decided his or her priorities, concentrate on the work of greatest importance to be done by others according to Haldoryd (1970).

The study was based in schools in Ekerenyo Division, Nyamira District which had 21 schools of which all were purposively selected for the study and within each school, teachers were randomly selected for the study.

The study was guided by three specific objectives. It sought to identify factors influencing delegation of authority through four research questions covering issues like the steps taken to practice delegation, views of teachers on delegation and the impact on teacher performance.
The study made use of both primary and secondary data, which highlighted the gap to be filled. Two different types of questionnaires were used to guide the research's data collection. Data from head teachers, HODs and Assistant teachers was obtained and analyzed, so as to get full information on how authority is delegated within schools.

Use of a cross sectional analytical study and both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods were used. Descriptive statistics was to analyze quantitative data with the help of statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) Computer Software Package.

The results were presented by use of percentages and tables from which conclusions were drawn on factors influencing delegation and their impact on performance of teachers.

This research though academic provided linkages of academic knowledge and the practical management problems at the grassroots, which are more often overlooked by schools thus creating gaps in the country’s provision of services to the citizens due to ineffective delegation of authority.
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CHAPTER ONE.

1.0 INTRODUCTION.

1.1 Background of the study.

The term delegation of authority has recently drawn the attention of many organizations. It means an organizational process that permits the transfer of authority from supervisor to subordinates David Rees (1991).

The process has been taken seriously by both the private sector as well as the public sector all over the world. Those organizations who have practiced delegation of authority have given varying answers as to whether it is an effective way of improving performance within organizations.

Delegation of authority stems from the fact that authority should not be centralized at the apex of the organization. Due to the problems experienced by organisations especially those related to economy, political and technology, organizations have devised ways of surviving in the world of competition.

In the recent years centralization and decentralization have occupied most debates among top managers. Some prefer decentralization of the activities of an organization so as to take advantage of the economies of scales. That is why in decentralization of activities it means creation of more departments, employing more people and availing the necessary equipments or facilities for work to continue and achieve organizational goals. This also affects the way how those departments will work because authority
must be delegated among those involved in running those departments so as to work effectively.

The worlds over there are cases where delegation of authority has worked in big organisations. The organisation of the Roman Catholic Church can probably be regarded as the most successful in the history of Western Civilization. In most cases bishops report directly to the pope and Parish Pastors to bishops. Delegation in the Church is very possible because the bishops possess a high degree of authority and training.

On the other hand if every plan, instruction, order or direction has to be communicated by personal contact from only one central place the person at the top will obviously be burdened. To be a good manager, a person must learn to delegate authority and more so effectively.

When asked to discuss the major problems incurred when doing business with the Soviets, FMC chairman Robert Malott replied that it was particularly the problem of delegation of authority and responsibility. He said that in most instances the local decision makers did not have the authority to deliver things like financial guarantees in a place like Moldavia as David Cudabeck (1990) reports. This translates to the view that management must delegate sufficient authority to allow the subordinate to perform the job.
At one stage in Britain it was the practice for government ministers to accept responsibility and resign if there was a serious enough error by one of their subordinates regardless of whether the minister was personally to blame or not. There was the case of Crichel Down in 1954 concerning government land for military use which was later used for agricultural purposes and then sold to a private buyer in David Rees (1991) book.

During the government crisis in Britain in 1982 when the Falkland Islands were occupied by the Argentinian army both the British Foreign Secretary and the defence Secretary offered their resignations. So delegation of authority must be followed by responsibility and accountability.

In Africa the Structural Adjustment Programmes given by the developed Nations through IMF and World Bank have made African governments to embark on programmes that can bring efficiency in the delivery of services among their citizens. They liberalised their economy, retrenched their labour force and introduced new structures based on accountability. They have created regions for easy running of their government and with that decentralized some of the services to those regions.

In Kenya, the government has also undergone several changes since independence. There has been creation and recreation of new ministries, departments and decentralization of services to the grassroots levels. A good example is the
disbursement of CDF funds to the constituency level. Personnel have been trained to undertake those changes. The hard times of the economy has forced the government to introduce hard measures like bills passed in parliament to make civil servants to work towards better results. The introduction of work related ethics, performance contracts and corruption bills are meant to improve performance of individual servants.

Towards the end of the year 2005 some ministers resigned on the account of corruption allegations which they attributed to their junior officers. Administratively the country is divided into provinces, districts, divisions, locations, sub-locations and into villages. At each level authority has been delegated to the people in charge so that each section of the governments keeps on running.

The private sector in Kenya has also shown remarkable performance because of the process of delegation of authority within their departments. A good example is the Kenya Breweries Limited and the Coke Cola Company. They have various departments each with their own managers and they have the authority from the head offices to carry out any activity related to the production and distribution of their drinks including marketing provided it meets the objectives and goals of the company even if in foreign branches.
A survey across the above overview touching national, regional and global discussion of the problem of delegation. In the research there were cases where clear delegation was seen working while in others it was not there. For example in most government schools there were disparities in terms of performance. Some Head teachers delegate authority, while others don’t even think of delegating that authority.

Failure to master delegation is probably the single most frequently encountered reason why top officials fail according to Heinz Weihrich (2001). Almost invariably plans fails in an organization when they are developed by higher level managers for a lower level operations. Study after study and experience after experience have proven that teachers are more highly motivated to realize goals when they have played a predominant part in drawing up the original plans’ of delegation.

Head teachers and HODs spend too much time on the phone outlining the situation and defending his/her recommendations than delegating to be helped by teachers. This brings about a misunderstanding between the Office and teachers in the belief that there is one who knows more than the other.

In those schools where delegation decisions are professionally done, dissatisfaction has gone down to normal levels, head teachers have their individuality and interests restored and school performance has been improved. Unfortunately other head teachers revel in working long and hard hours and endeavor to do too much,
including many things that should be delegated to others. Consequently the system of making decisions concerning delegation and their impact on the performance of teachers in schools is open to bias and abuse, is demotivating making it difficult to compare teacher performance across schools and has led to poor results out of a trained teacher.

The limitations of the system discussed above were a good cause for linking the factors considered in delegating and teacher performance in this study.

1.2 Statement of the problem.

This study was concerned with factors influencing delegation decisions and their effect on the performance of Secondary School teachers. There are delays in making decisions and implementing them in most schools everything has to wait for the headteacher to give an okay even in small things like issuing certificates and addressing students to parade.

The delegation systems used by head teachers are ineffective and non-participatory. The present delegation systems are strictly varied from one headteacher to another in different schools. There is no climate of openness in the delegation process and the delegate has no chance of giving a recommendation on any another alternative.

Actual job performance and ability to achieve goals in the delegation process has been given little emphasis as can be deduced from the wave of strikes in western
province of Kenya in second term 2006. Investigations carried out from the Ministry of Education reveals that there was high handedness from the head teacher making teacher feel that they are not part of the school who could have helped in diffusing most problems raised from students (Elimu Newsletter Vol.15 2006 pg.14).

Delegation of authority in most schools in Ekerenyo Division in Nyamira District is begged on who toes the line hence done selectively. An analysis of most schools results reveals that they perform poor in National Examinations. For example in 2005 KCSE results the highest mss in Ekerenyo was 6.331 and the lowest was 1.020, which was very discouraging.

In an Education day attended by District Education Officer in Kebabe Girls Secondary School the DEO commented that the poor results in the Division was due to the attitudes of teachers towards students which come as a result of the head teacher’s style of management in such schools who work on their own.

Consequently it was appropriate for this study to focus on the relationship between the factors influencing delegation of authority and their impact on teacher performance in Ekerenyo Division in Nyamira District.

1.3 Study Objectives.

The overall objective of the study was to establish and analyse factors influencing delegation decisions and their impact on the performance of teachers in Ekerenyo Division in Nyamira District.
The study was guided by the following specific objectives:

- To establish the process of delegation of authority.
- To identify factors influencing delegation of authority.
- To find out the effects of factors influencing delegation on the performance of teachers.

1.4 Research Questions.

- What role does information, training, supervision and resources play in carrying out decisions concerning delegation of authority?
- What kind of steps can make delegation of authority effective?
- What is the view of head teachers and teachers on delegation of authority?
- Is delegation of authority carried out in schools?

1.5 Justification of the study.

Delegation of authority has not been tackled widely in management literature and where it has been used, especially in schools there were variations in terms of performance of duties by teachers and the schools in general. Therefore the reason for carrying out this study was to compare the various schools and look into how the process of delegation of authority was carried out. And at the same time point out what leads to poor performance in those schools after delegation of authority.
The research at the end brought out effective delegation of authority, which is beneficial to government departments like Teachers Service Commission and schools across the country.

1.6 **Significance of the study.**

It was intended that the findings of this study will stimulate the interest of future researches to undertake further investigation of delegation of authority. It also forms a basis for the provision of guidance and counseling services to the various schools on the topic of delegation. The study still offers knowledge, which will guide in planning, organizing and implementing effective delegation of authority in Non-Governmental and Government organizations.

1.7 **The scope of the study/study area.**

It was designed to take place in Ekereny Division of Nyamira District. This area was chosen because it had all the categories of secondary schools in the district which gave a broad perspective of the target of population desirable for the study. There were twenty one (21) schools in the Division.

1.8 **Limitations.**

- Due to limited resources the study was done within the Division.
- Because of limited time not all head teachers and teachers were studied.

1.9 **Assumptions.**

It was assumed that:
• Correct information was given by the Headteacher and their teachers.

• All the subjects were teachers.

• All schools at least delegated authority.

• There was homogeneity in the organisation of schools in the Division.
CHAPTER TWO.

LITERATURE REVIEW.

2.1 Introduction to Literature Review

In the recent years, a great deal of management attention has been directed towards the development of an effective way of delegating authority and responsibility organizations. The attention is directed towards the workers' empowerment to perform and produce good results which is essential for the survival of any organization.

The chapter is divided into the following sections:-Definition of delegation and its essential aspects like authority, responsibility, power and accountability, the need for delegation, elements of delegation, principles of delegation, types of delegation and theoretical framework.

2.2 Definition of Delegation, Authority and Responsibility.

David Rees (1991) define delegation as person conferring authority on a subordinate to act on his behalf. To him delegation should not be confused with the issuing of orders or giving of instructions to subordinate.

Henry Sisk (1969) defines delegation of authority as an organisational process that permits the transfer of authority from supervisor to subordinate. He argues that there is a general agreement that the process of delegation is made up of three steps although there is considerable variation in terminology used to describe each step.
Louis Allen (1958) defines delegation as having three essential aspects, that is, entrustment of work or responsibility to another for performance, the entrustment of powers and rights or authority to be exercised and the creation of an obligation or accountability, on the part of the person accepting the delegation to perform in terms of the standards established.

Delegation therefore has a precise meaning one who delegates to another person empowers that person to act for that person. Holdoryd (1970) argues that delegation means to entrust authority to a subordinate in certain defined areas and to make him responsible for the results. To them, delegation has some features like; that it never means abdication of responsibility, no reduction in the status of a manager, never delegating all authority and a manager cannot delegate authority unless the person possesses the authority.

Authority on its own has been variously defined. Henry Sisk (1969) defines authority as the right to act or to direct others to act. Therefore authority empowers the delegatees to act. He also defines responsibility as either the work that is being assigned or to the obligation created by the assignment of such work.

Leslie Rue et al (1992) says that authority represents the legitimate exercise of power. Thus authority is one source of power for a manager. Responsibility to them is the accountability for the attainment of objectives, the use of resources, and the
adherence to organisational policy. They continue to argue that once the responsibility is accepted, it becomes an obligation to perform assigned work. Leslie and Lloyd (1993) say that authority is the right to issue directives and expend resources.

2.3 Need for delegation.

As organizations grow also the work of a manager grows beyond capacity and hence the need to delegate authority to other people in order to assist the manager. Delegation must be practiced if management is to progress and to be assisted in their role. Too often whether or not to delegate is considered a personal choice on the part of each individual manager, but as the environment is changing very fast there is no choice and a true manager must delegate.

Holdoryd (1970) gives factors that lead to the need for delegation:-

2.3.1 Work load.

Through delegation the executive can transfer routine work to subordinates and thereby concentrate on more important tasks. The manager who chooses to try to do everything with his/her own hands will suffer at least three undesirable results. The manager limits his/her own productivity limits the potential contribution to his/her organizations and any contribution made will be accompanied by frustration and an excessive amount of personal effort.

Subordinate can help make management’s work easier and more productive if one knows how to utilize them and makes an effort to permit them to assist him.
2.3.2 Point of action.

When delegation pushes authority near the point of action, decisions can be taken more quickly and without referring to higher authorities. Even with the dramatic advances in the speed and content of communications, a tremendous potential loss exists when a subordinate is not empowered to act.

2.3.3 Motivation.

It helps improve the morale of subordinates. This goes a long way to satisfy subordinates' needs for recognition and responsibility according to David Rees (1991). An effective manager makes the subordinate act as his own boss. He delegates definite accountability to people and holds them strictly accountable for the final results. If he or she has delegated properly and to the right person, the subordinate will handle the detailed checking and the boss will become involved only during the previously established progress review sessions.

Giving a competent manager this type of delegated accountability, productivity, return to the organization and job satisfaction will overshadow that of a manager to whom delegation has never been made.

2.3.4 Foreign Operations

The greater the number of foreign operations, the greater the need for delegation. In relation to the above geographical distances involved must be taken into account.
2.3.5 Utilization of Assets

The manager who refuses to delegate is like the person who has considerable money but refuses to use it even to earn interest. A wise manager delegates as much as his people can handle, in doing so one maximizes the return on the people investment with which the organization has entrusted him/her.

2.3.6 Development of Subordinates

No other part of the manager’s job is more important than his/her mandate for helping to develop subordinates. One must provide the opportunity and tools for developing the subordinates. Delegation for example to a student pilot provides the instructor with the basis for evaluating the student as a poor, fair or excellent pilot.

2.3.7 Planning.

No manager can plan in detail for all the operations and people in one’s organization. Each sub limit manager must plan for his own group. The manager at the lower level is the expert on his/her limit, he/she is more familiar with operations and people. The special circumstances that exist at any given point in time, the advantages and disadvantages that should be exploited or minimized, technical aspects of operation etc.

Almost invariably plans fail when they are developed by higher level managers for a lower level manager’s operations.
2.3.8 Act to Employee Development

It enables employees to develop their capabilities to undertake new and more challenging jobs. At the same time it promotes job satisfaction and contributes to high employee morale.

2.4 Elements of Delegation.

The delegation process involves three aspects or elements according to Henry Sisk (1969). They are assigned of responsibility, delegation of authority and the creation of accountability. Each depends on the others to support delegation.

2.5 Principles of Delegation of Authority.

2.5.1 Scalar Principle.

Urwick Lyndall (1943) says that this principle is sometimes referred to as chain of command. She goes on to say that this principle states that authority in the organization flows one link at a time, through the chain of managers ranging from the highest to lowest ranks.

Fayol (1949) stated that it is an error to depart needlessly from authority but it is an even greater one to keep to it when it is detrimental to the business. What he is simply saying is that in certain instances, one can and should shortcut the scalar chain if it is not done in a secretive or deceitful manner.

2.5.2 Parity Principle.

Henry Sisk (1969) elaborates this principle and says that for effective delegation, authority granted to a subordinate must be equal to the responsibility assigned to the
person. What it means is that authority and responsibility must coincide. Both authority and responsibility must be accepted by subordinates before the delegation process has been completed.

Many managers have a tendency of delegating only simple, unimportant tasks. According to Robert Townsend (1984) successful delegation involves delegating matters that stimulate subordinates.

2.5.3 Unity of Command Principle.
It states that an employee should have one and only one immediate manager. Jesus during His teachings especially the Sermon on the Mount clearly said that No man can serve two masters according to the Holy Bible, RVS (Matt 6:24). A problem can arise if two managers tell the same subordinate to do different jobs at the same time.

2.6 Types of Delegation of Authority.
Forrest (1971) group the various forms of delegation of authority as:

2.6.1 General or specific Delegation of Authority.
General is where authority is granted to a person to perform the various activities in a department or division. But exercise of authority by each subordinate continues to be subject to an overall regulation and supervision by a superior.

Specific delegation is where different subordinates are given different specific functions to perform. It is functional in character for example the production manager
may be delegated authority for production, sales manager for sales and the personnel officer for recruitment, training and placement of workers.

2.6.2 Written or unwritten Delegation of Authority

Written delegation is made by written orders, instructions etc while unwritten is based on custom, convention or usage.

2.6.3 Formal or informal Delegation of Authority.

Formal delegation of authority is laid down in the organisation structure on an enterprise for example, the sales manager is assigned the responsibility and the accompanying authority to maintain and promote sales. Informal occurs when employees perform certain duties not because these are assigned to them, but because they feel that they can perform their tasks better and in time.

2.6.4 Downward, Upward and Sideward Delegation

Downward delegation occurs where superior assigns duties and delegates authority to his immediate subordinates. Upward delegation is where the subordinate assigns some of his/her tasks to his/her immediate superior although this type is rare. In sideward delegation, a subordinate assigns some tasks and duties to another subordinate of the same rank.

2.7 Why Managers Do Not Delegate.

Leslie and Lloyd (1992) say that a manager’s resistance to delegating authority is natural. To them there are several reasons why they are reluctant such as:-
2.7.1 Feeling of Superiority

Some managers have a feeling that subordinates are not capable enough to do any work without close supervision. That is why most of them concentrate all decision-making in their hands to make sure for them that everything is moving as they wish and feel.

2.7.2 Fear of Exposure

For a manager who is not competent to plan a head and decide which tasks should be delegated to whom, he may avoid delegation of authority; because doing so will expose him/her for what is an incompetent and disorganized person.

2.7.3 Habit Pattern

If as a result of a practice of close supervision, the manager has developed personal contact will all aspects of the work, he may avoid delegation of authority so as to sustain the deep-seated habit pattern.

2.7.4 Feeling of Indispensability

A manager who has an inflated sense of his/her own worth, and wants others to realize his importance, he/she may not delegate authority such that everyone around is dependent on the boss for decision-making.

2.7.5 Risk Avoidance

Feeling of insecurity may make one to reluctantly delegate authority. Even if one delegates one will continue to be accountable for the actions of the subordinates and this might defer him from running the risk of leaving decision-making to the care of subordinates.
2.7.6 Loss of Importance

A boss may have a lurking fear that if any subordinate proves to be more competent, the position of that boss in the department might be threatened.

2.8 Why subordinates do not accept delegation of authority.

Holdoryd (1970) give reasons why subordinates are reluctant to accept delegated authority. They are:-

2.8.1 Insecurity

Some subordinates are afraid of accepting risk and responsibility and they become content with the superior making all the decisions. For them it is safer to carry out the decisions handed down to them by superiors.

2.8.2 Fear of Criticism

They may have a fear that even the slightest mistake on their part may lead to their dismissal from service.

2.8.3 Inadequate information and Resources

Some fear that delegation will only mean assignment of tasks to them without matching authority over the relevant information to facilitate decision-making, or the necessary human and physical resources to carry out the decision.

2.8.4 Lack of Self-confidence

Sometimes subordinates lack confidence in their capability to discharge new responsibilities.
2.8.5 Inadequate Incentives

If delegation of authority is not accompanied by suitable incentives, subordinates may not be motivated to accept it willingly.

2.9 Practical suggestions for successful Delegation.

Allen A. (1958) suggests the following for successful delegation and offers them as a means of putting into practice the principles of delegation. They are:-

2.9.1 Determination of Specific Goals

The objectives should be clearly defined and where possible, stated in quantitative terms. Ill defined or uncertain objectives may defer subordinates from accepting delegation of authority.

2.9.2 Accountability

Individuals or groups should be assigned specific tasks for the accomplishment of those tasks, ability and information to carry out tasks is very essential.

2.9.3 Authority and Responsibility

People will be able to carry out their tasks efficiently only if they are delegated sufficient authority for the purpose. For example, a sales manager will not be able to achieve results if he lacks authority to assign territories to his/her sales staff, reward them for competent performance, or punish them for incompetence.

Acceptance of responsibility implies willingness to accept credit or blame for the results. If one is granted authority over others, it is only natural that he/she be made accountable for their performance too.
It is against the above that a clear indication comes out that delegation decisions in schools are not done professionally and no research has been done to link factors influencing delegation decisions in schools and their impact on teacher performance. This proposed study intends to fill the gap.

2.10 Theoretical Framework

2.10.1 Formal Authority Theory.

This is the theory the researcher will use. This theory has the message that authority originates in the formal structure of an organisation. Managers at each level of the organisation derive their authority from the managers at the higher level.

Every organization represents a chain of command consisting of authority – responsibility relationship according to Holdoryd (1970). This is what is called centralization in management cycles. On the other hand decentralization is where a great deal of authority is delegated to lower levels management. The figure below compares centralized versus decentralized authority.

![Diagram of Centralized vs Decentralized Authority]

Figure 1
The arrows in the above diagram show the flow of authority downwards along a

2.10.2 Acceptance Theory.

Here the real source of managerial authority lies in the acceptance by subordinates of
the orders of a superior. Formal authority becomes ineffective if subordinates do not
accept the command of an executive. This theory was popularized by Chester Barnard
(1938) and Mary P. Follet (1949). They viewed disobeying a command from a
manager as a denial of authority by the subordinate.
2.11 Conceptual Framework
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CHAPTER THREE.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.

3.1 Introduction to methodology.
This chapter describes the methods and materials used in this study and how the same was adopted to suit the specific objectives and conditions in the study area which was to establish whether there are factors affecting delegation of authority.

3.2 Research design.
The study adopted a descriptive survey research design which entails making careful description of the phenomena Borg and Gall, (1989). According to Kathuri and Pals (1993) the descriptive survey method is appropriate because it explore the relationship between variables in their natural settings. It involved the systematic collection of data and summaries, which provided a general picture of delegation employed. Questionnaires were then taken to schools for administration.

3.3 Target population.
The target population was from schools in Ekerenyo Division Nyamira District. There were twenty one (21) schools of which were purposively selected. The population was from head teachers who are 21 and assistant teachers who are 210 in the Division (Source District Education Office.

3.4 The sample and sampling procedures.
The researcher used stratified random sampling in order to group the population under study into two strata: Head teachers and Assistant teachers. All the twenty one
schools were purposively selected. This allowed the researcher to include the cases who had the required information with respect to the purpose of study.

The study used Fischer's mode in calculating the sample size whereby

\[ n = P \% \times Q \% \times \frac{Z^2}{e^2} \]

Where \( n \) is the minimum size required

- \( P \% \): Proportion belonging to the specified category
- \( Q \% \): Proportion not belonging to the specified category
- \( Z \): is the Z value corresponding to the level of confidence required—1.96 corresponding to 95%
- \( e \% \): is the margin of error required—5% or 0.05

The adjusted minimum sample size was calculated using the following formula.

\[ n' = \frac{n}{1 + \frac{n}{N}} \]

Where \( n' \) is the adjusted minimum sample size

- \( n \) is the minimum sample size (as calculated above)
- \( N \) is the total population

In a pilot survey carried out 6 out of 20 teachers were delegated; in other words 30% belong to the specified category why 70% do not.

\[
N = 0.30 \times 0.70 \times (1.96)^2 \\
= 0.21 \times 3.8416 \\
= 0.806736 = 322.7
\]

As population was 210 teachers the adjusted minimum size was calculated as:-

\[ n' = 322.7 = 322.7 \]
Minimum sample will be 128 teachers.

3.5 Data collection instruments.

Both primary and secondary data were used in this study. Primary data was collected using questionnaires. The questionnaire included both structured and unstructured questions in order to capture both qualitative and quantitative data.

Secondary data was obtained from all the relevant published and unpublished sources especially from District Education Office. Pre - testing of the questionnaire was carried out before actual data collection. This was done so as to identify any defects in the questionnaire such as ambiguity, length and terminology. Self observation, interviewing and personal contacts was used to countercheck what is on the ground.

3.6 Data collection procedure.

Having sought permission from the District Education Office and the Head teachers of various schools, the researcher personally explained the importance of the research to the respondents and assured them of confidentiality of the information given. Questionnaires were delivered to the respondents directly and time was given to give the responses. Documentary evidence was sourced from the district Education Office in Nyamira District.
‘The drop and pick later’ method was used in departments where the teachers and head teachers were too busy to fill the questionnaire at that particular day and date.

3.7 Data Analysis.

Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics so as to address each research objectives. Qualitative data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Computer Software Package. Descriptive measures were used to summarize data. Which included frequency distributions and percentage tables. They were easier to read and interpret by a variety of readers.

To analyze qualitative data unstructured questions were carefully recorded and transcribed. Responses were grouped around main themes and the data was analyzed, interpreted and conclusions and recommendations made.

3.8 Variable definition.

In this Study, the dependent variable was effective delegation of authority while the independent variables were factors influencing delegation of authority such as school culture, level and difficult of task, set goals, training, motivation, selection of teachers, controls expected and openness

3.9 Limitations of the study

The study was constrained by the following:-

- It was difficult to convince the respondent to fill in the questionnaire completely within a short time possible as they were preparing students for K.C.S.E examinations, others went to invigilate and supervise the examination.
• It was hectic moving from one school to another and even sometimes not finding teachers.

• Some teachers regarded most information as confidential and needed time away from the school compound.

• Some questionnaires were never returned.

Therefore the generalization of the results of this study must be done with caution since some samples may not be representative in Ekerenyo and in Kenya as a whole.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter contains the summaries of data collected and presentation of findings of the study. They are divided into various sections which correspond to data collected from the questionnaires received.

4.2 Overview of survey results
A total of 149 questionnaires were issued to respondents of these 21 went to headteachers and 128 went to the teachers. The sampling frame consisted of headteachers and assistant teachers from secondary schools in Ekerenyo Division of Nyamira District purposively selected.

Only a total of 144 questionnaires were received back in the time to be included in this analysis 124 of the questionnaires received were those served to the teachers representing a response rate of 96.9% for assistant teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response rate for teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

On the other hand 20 questionnaires were received from headteacher with a response rate of 95.2% for head-teachers. The overall response rate was 96.6%.
The research revealed that 36.6% of the teacher had 11 years experience, 33.9% between 0-5 years and 29.8% between 6-10 years experience in the position they are holding in their schools as shown in table 4.2.

### Table 4.2: Summary of number of years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers Number of Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 and Above</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

### 4.3 Respondents Views (Teachers Questionnaires)

#### 4.3.1 Analysis of the various items

Item 1 was intended to determine whether teachers get confused when tasks are delegated with authority.

The results indicate that 75% are not confused while 25% get confused.

### Table 4.3: Summarizes the respondent’s views on confusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether confused with delegated authority</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

From the analysis once authority is defined with responsibility performance improves 75% are not confused while a small percentage of 25% get confused.
Item 2 required that teachers should indicate whether they check with the headteacher when authority delegated is unclear. 82.3% agreed that they check with the headteacher while a small percentage of 17.7% do not bother to check and assume.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether they check with headteacher when</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority is unclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

This indicates that delegation is influenced by the culture of the school and one had to check with the headteacher.

Item 3 This item was intended to indicate whether training and preparing teachers was prelude to delegation. 54% felt that they are not trained and prepared while 46% were prepared and trained. This affected the delegation process and the performance of duties by teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training and preparation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

Item 4 Indicated that 59.7% of the respondents agreed they are not given the right to make decision right. This hampers the performance of duties as a greater percentage depends on those at the top leading to delays of implementing policies.
Therefore defining responsibility is a prelude to delegating in most schools.

Table 4.6 Right to make decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Right to make decision</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

Item 5 was to investigate whether teacher have ever refused or wished to refuse delegated duties. A greater percentage of 64.5% said Yes while 35.5% never refused. This is a factor that most headteachers use when delegating duties.

Table 4.7 Refusal of duties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refusal of duties</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

This indicates that a greater percentage refuses or wished hence affects performance of duties which are delegated.

Item 6 was supposed to bring out the feelings teachers on delegated authority in general 69.4% surprisingly felt that delegated authority is not fun while 30.6% indicated that it was fun. The greater percentage therefore is an indication that there is no pleasure in carrying out delegated authority leading to poor performance of teachers.

Table 4.8 Delegated authority is fun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegated authority is fun</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)
Item 7 required teachers to indicate whether delegated authority helped them acquire new skills and improved performance 50% agreed while the same percentage of 50% did agree.

Table 4.9 Delegation and acquiring skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation and acquiring of new skills performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

This indicates that one can acquire skills and improve performance hence headteachers can delegate with the aim of helping improve the teachers’ performance while the same percentages do not want to help them.

Item 8 was to investigate whether delegated authority is accompanied with rewards. A small percentage of 35.5% agreed that they are rewarded while 64.5% are not rewarded.

Table 4.10 Whether rewarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether rewarded</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

This indicates motivation necessitates delegation of authority.

Item 9 investigated whether there was good delegation in schools’ surprisingly 67.7% of the respondents indicated that delegation was poorly carried and 32.3% said that delegation was good in their schools.
Table 4.11 Delegation is good.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation is good</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

This greater percentage indicates that poor delegation leads to poor performance of duties. The second part of the item indicated that most teachers wished to be trained, goals set and motivation to be included in preparation for delegation of duties.

Section C

The overall objective of this part of the research was to bring out the feelings of teachers on how delegation of duties is done and its impact on their performance.

Table 4.12 Teachers Responses to various activities carried out in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Σw1 / Σf =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>367 / 124 = 2.9596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>237 / 124 = 1.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>333 / 124 = 2.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>214 / 124 = 1.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>224 / 124 = 1.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>188 / 124 = 1.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>375 / 124 = 3.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>339 / 124 = 2.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>229 / 124 = 1.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>256 / 124 = 2.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

The researcher intended in this section to evaluate and analyze what is considered before headteachers delegate authority in schools of Ekerenyo Division. At the same
time researcher from the activities, was find out the impact of the process of
dlegation on teacher performance of duties.

The following key was used to guide the respondents. That is:-

1=Strongly Agree
2=Agree
3=Disagree
4=Strongly Disagree

From the results indicates from table 12. 1 indicates a strong agreement on that
activity while 4 a strong disagreement on those activities while 2 and 3 is an
agreement and disagreement respectively. On the same scale 1.510 indicates that
response is more than 1 hence is on put on 2 scale meaning that the response is an
agreement. The respondents also reacted differently on the scale hence to get the true
feeling which is general for all the weighted frequency is divided by the total
frequency of the respondents.

The following are then the analyzed results from table 4.12.

Item 1 in the table was intended to capture the respondents feeling whether close
supervision is very necessary for the delegated authority. The weighted mean gave a
scale of 2.9596 and on the Likert type of scale in the table this lies on scale 3
approximately. They felt that it is not such necessary once duties are delegated with authority.

Item 2 in the table which was to investigate whether the headteachers delegates when they have other important tasks at hand and result was 1.911 on the scale hence the teachers agreed they are delegated when such important tasks came up.

Item 3 Shows that headteachers do not delegate and let teachers take over as the result indicate 2.685 hence teachers disagree.

Item 4 was intended to bring out whether all know the basic purpose of delegation, which is the accomplishment of stated objectives/goals 1.725 indicates an agreement.

Item 5 had a response of 1.806 indicating that most agreed that every position in School should be assigned specific tasks, as also individuals or groups for accountability purposes.

Item 6 in the table 4.12 indicated 1.516 teachers agreed that individual teachers and groups will be able to carry out their tasks efficiently only if they are delegated sufficiently authority for the purpose.
Item 7 brought out a disagreement that each teacher should be answerable only to the headteachers hence a mean of 3.024.

In item 8, 2.733 indicates also a disagreement that head-teachers rewards in proportion to results.

Item 9 gave the researcher a scale of 1.846 indicating an agreement that important decisions are postponed in most schools when the headteacher is away. The last item in the table was to investigate whether delegated tasks are completed on time and whether the results are always impressive. Surprisingly the results was 2.064 hence an agreement.

From the table when a mean of the 10 items means is calculated it gives a result of 2.122, which on the scale is an agreement to the various items listed in table 4.12.

Questionnaires for headteachers comprised a section with background information. The females percentage was 25 % and that of males was 75 %. The majority where male headteachers. Summary of the gender respondents are in table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.13 Gender</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)
The research also indicated the percentage of the number of years in the position they are holding presently. Between 0-5 years were 35%, 6-10 years 50% and above 11 was 15%.

**TABLE 4.14 Summarizes the number of years in their positions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

Item 1 was to investigate whether teachers resist delegated duties. 45% agreed that there are cases where they resist while 55% carry out the delegated duties.

**Table 4.15: Resistance to delegation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resistance to delegation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

For those who resist reasons given, vary from fear of failing, inexperience or too much interference.

Item 2 indicated that 65% of the respondents agree that delegation of authority is riskier under the care of teacher while 35% have the feeling that it is not riskier. This affects the performance and the need to delegate duties to teachers.
This makes most headteachers not to delegate or delegation according how they take the risk.

Summaries in table 4.16, on whether delegated authority is riskier under the care of teachers.

**Table 4.16. Riskiness of authority.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riskiness of authority among teachers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

**Item 3** was to investigate whether headteachers consider the age and experience of a teacher in delegating authority. Surprisingly 80% of them agreed that age and experience is a must while only a small percentage of 20% do not consider them.

**Table 4.17** Summarizes the results on whether age and experience is considered when delegating authority.

**Table 4.17 Age and Experience in delegation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether age and experience are considered in delegation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

Once teachers realize that they are recognized their performance improves.
Item 4 was to investigate whether headteachers consider the strengths and weaknesses of teacher before delegating authority. 75% said Yes while 25% said no once a teacher has the capacity that teacher can perform wonderful.

Table 4.18 Summary of the responses in table where on whether strengths and weaknesses of teachers are considered.

Table 4.18 Strengths and Weaknesses in Delegation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths/weaknesses considered in delegation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

Item 5 indicated that 50% of the headteachers give freedom to teachers to decide on how to implement delegated authority while the same percentages of 50% do not give that freedom. The headteachers therefore consider the freedom to be exercised. In the delegated duties before delegation.

Summaries of responses in table 4.19 are on whether freedom is given to make decisions.

Table 4.19 Freedom of implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom to decide on how to implement delegated duties</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)
Once freedom is given performance of teachers improves while if not given it declines.

**Item 6** was to investigate whether perfection is expected the first time hence 70% agreed they want perfection once the duties are delegated and 30% said no and wished to wait as time goes by. The large percentage indicates that if performance is not seen first time there are likely to be conflicts as perfection goes with, time. Teachers could wish to be given time to perform.

**TABLE 4.20 Perfection the first time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perfection should be first time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

**Item 7** was intended to investigate whether counseling of teachers should not be delegated. 70% agreed that it should not while 30% said it should.

Summary in table 4.21 on Counseling of teachers.

**TABLE 4.21 Counseling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counseling should not be delegated</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

**Item 8** required the headteachers to indicate who should create a proper work environment to enhance motivation. 55% said it is the headteacher while 45% said it is all. This shows that before delegation, a proper environment should be created by the head-teachers and then teachers before delegation is effective.
Summary of responses table 4.22 on who creates proper environment of delegation.

**TABLE 4.22 Who creates a proper Environment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creation of proper environment is the headteacher</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

**Item 9** investigated whether delays have been reduced in implementation of policies and decisions through delegation. 55% said yes while 45% said no. This implies that delegation improves performance and where there is no delegation performance of duties goes down.

**Table 4.23 Delays reduced due to Delegation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delays reduced due to delegation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data (2006)

**Table 4.24 Head-teachers’ responses to how they feel and what influence delegation process in their Schools.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>[S^2_f]</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[44/20]</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[41/20]</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[37/20]</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[60/20]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[44/20]</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[51/20]</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[45/20]</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[55/20]</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[50/20]</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[32/20]</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[47/20]</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[25.15/11 = 2.286\] \[\approx 2.3\]

Source: Field data (2006)
The Items on table 4.24 on questionnaires for headteachers was to reveal what factors they consider in delegation process and their possible impact on teacher performance of duties.

The Likert scale ranged from 1 to 4 with:-

1=Strongly Agree
2=Agree
3=Disagree
4=Strongly Disagree

1 and 2 generally corresponds to a general agreement while 3 and 4 general disagreement. The findings where as follows.

Item 1 on table 4.24 asked whether headteachers feel they have the time to delegate authority properly and the result was 2.2 hence agreed that they do not feel they have the time to delegate properly.

On Item 2 the result was 2.1 which is an agreement that headteachers would delegate more authority but the jobs they delegate never seem to get done the way want them to be done.

In Item 3 most headteachers agreed they delegate authority to a task clearly and concisely, explaining exactly how it should be accomplished hence 1.85 was the general result.
In Item 4 headteachers disagreed that they feel they lose control when they delegate authority hence 3.

In Item 5 the result was 2.2 indicating headteachers work long hours than they should. From the table headteachers did not agree hence disagreed that they delegate authority to the whole job give the teacher an opportunity to complete it without any of their involvement and review the end results hence item 6 had arrange of 2.55.

A weighted mean of 2.25 on 7 is an agreement that headteachers get upset when tasks are not done right.

Item 8 in the table showed that headteachers disagreed that they are pretty perfectionist that is a weighted mean 2.75.

In Item 9 headteachers Disagreed that delegation does not save any time hence a weighted mean of 2.5.

From the table on item 10 headteachers agreed that teachers should be given routine tasks but not non-routine tasks hence a weighted mean of 1.6.

The last Item in the table 2.35 indicates an agreement that if headteachers were to delegate authority, their jobs would not be nearby as much fun.
When the weighted means are added together divided by the 11 items the resulting mean of $2.286 \approx 2.3$ indicates that generally headteachers are in agreement with the items listed in table 4.24 above.
CHAPTER FIVE.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

5.1 Summary

The primary role of delegation of duties with authority is to transfer routine work to subordinates and concentrate on more important tasks according to Leslie and Loyd (1993)

Delegation is very important since it reduces workload and nobody can perfectly Do everything and at the same time it pushes authority to the point of action that is to the subordinates who do the routine work.

Different people delegate differently hence have certain factors they have to consider before entrusting authority to the delegated duties. They consider experience, the training necessary, the motivational impact, stated objectives and culture prevailing among the subordinates and their superiors.

The researcher also found out that there are some who do not delegate or partially delegate due to preconceived ideas such as feeling of superiority, fear of exposure, habit pattern and risk avoidance.
At the same time the research highlighted why teachers do not accept delegated duties. They included in their list insecurity, inadequate information, and lack of self-confidence inadequate incentives and fear of criticism.

A look at the performance in there Schools of Ekerenyo Division in Nyamira District is worrying, policies are delayed, the performance of duties is wanting and therefore there is need to install effective delegation to address the poor performance of duties

**5.2 Conclusions**

From the study it can be concluded that there are factors that most headteachers consider at individual levels before they delegate duties with authority. The decision to carry out that exercise is complicated and that is why there is disparity of the performance of duties in most schools.

The findings of this study established that training is very important, as teachers will be exposed to what is expected of them hence improve their performance of duties. But the majority of headteachers do not train their teachers and that confirms the poor performance being experienced in the Division.

Goals are very important when set before duties are delegated. The idea is what goals are to be achieved at the end of the exercise. Goals set the target to be achieved but most headteachers delegate duties because it is a requirement from the Teachers Service Commission. This is the point of departure because if goals are not set then
confusion will come in and this translates to poor performance of duties from the side of teachers and the headteachers themselves.

The findings also found that defining responsibility and motivation should be considered before even deciding on delegation issues. This will put teachers at a position to make urgent decision if the higher authority is not around. But results were that some headteachers define responsibility and motivate teachers while others are not worried about such factors. Some even do not reward and recognize teachers while others do not give responsibility. This means that they use them to coarse and intimidate teachers so as to see them as powerful hence, affecting the performance of duties. Organization culture featured so much in the feeling that the culture of the school and the headteacher determines how to delegate, what to delegate and who to delegate to. This favored a few schools which are exceptionally a poor history of delegation; performance of duties by teachers was curtailed so much.

From the findings proper election of subordinates was also a factor that influenced delegation. The research revealed that those teachers with experience are preferred than young teachers while for the incapable and imposing headteachers they gave duties to younger ones and the weak as not to expose themselves and their weaknesses.
Other factors were also found to be influential in making decisions to delegate. They were the risk involved in the duty, lack of self-confidence, impact on the important on the headteacher, guidance of teachers and information related to the duty.

Generally the results a test that the schools are not performing well and further indicate that immediate action should be taken to help bail out on the willing schools in Ekerenyo. The study has pointed out that non-performing schools should not be kept running by incapable headteachers hence the need to retrain them on the delegation process and how to effectively practice delegation of duties.

The research further brought up the idea of a concerted effort from all stakeholders in education in the process of delegation. It should be seen as an exercise that can benefit all concerned and not an individual.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The government through Teachers Service Commission must act swiftly in a move to help curb the non-performing state of Schools. Policy formulation must focus on creating an environment that encourages delegation of duties effectively.

The policy formulation should be flexible enough to accommodate all types of Schools. Programmes should also be introduced that will increase delegation awareness, in terms of accountability, responsibility and authority.
The following recommendations should be studied for implementation in delegation:

- Objectives should be clearly defined and possibly in quantitative terms. This will make teachers accept delegation of duties.
- Individuals and groups should be assigned specific tasks for accomplishments, ability and information to carry out tasks.
- Sufficient authority should be delegated. This will make teachers be willing to accept credit or blame for the results.
- If one is granted authority over others it is only natural that one is made accountable for their performance too.

5.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.

The study concentrated only on factors influencing delegation in schools and their impact on teacher performance of duties. Further studies could be carried out to investigate why Teachers Service Commission does not train its agents on effective delegation. It would be interesting to adjust the questionnaire appropriately so as to gain knowledge on challenges faced by the Education Boards and the implementation of policies from the Ministry of Education.

Further additional research can be performed on finding ways to overcome the challenges headteachers and teachers face in this study. To illustrate the research may expand the sample size and/or conduct research that deals with the limitations of this study. Moreover future research effort may be carried out using different data analysis techniques for comparison.
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### Appendix II. Work Programme.

#### Table 4.25.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1(^{st}) - 20(^{th})</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Identification of the problem area and Research Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21(^{st}) - 5(^{th})</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Search and Review of Related Literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6(^{th}) - 13(^{th})</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>First Draft of Proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14(^{th}) - 17(^{th})</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Second Draft of Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18(^{th}) - 19(^{th})</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Final Draft of Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20(^{th}) - 1(^{st})</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Break and Rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(^{nd}) - 9(^{th})</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Presentation of the Proposal to the School of Business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15(^{th}) - 30(^{th})</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Field Work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(^{st}) - 8(^{th})</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Data Analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9(^{th}) - 20(^{th})</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Writing and Typing of the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21(^{st}) - 26(^{th})</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Submission of the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27(^{th}) - 30(^{th})</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Defense of the Project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix III. Questionnaire for Heads Teachers/Head of Departments.

This questionnaire is designed for the purpose of studying the factors influencing delegation in schools and their impact on teacher performance in Ekerenyo Division. The information provided will be treated with confidentiality and is only meant for this research. Please fill in each question as appropriate as possible.

SECTION A

Background Information.

Name of the School __________________ Position in the School ___________

Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ] (✓ Tick where applicable)

No of years worked in the Position: 0 – 5 yrs[ ] 6 – 10 yrs[ ]

Above 11 yrs [ ] (✓ Tick where applicable)

SECTION B

Please answer the following questions by placing a tick [✓] on the boxes or fill in the blank spaces provided.

1. a) Have you ever experienced a situation where teachers resist to be delegated authority?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

b) If yes, what reasons do they give?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
2. Do you agree that delegation of authority is riskier under the care of teachers?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

3. a) Do you consider the age and experience of a teacher when delegating authority?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]
   
   b) If no, what do you consider when delegating authority?

4. Do you know the major strengths and weaknesses of your teachers?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

5. a) Do you give some freedom to your teachers in deciding how to implement the delegated authority?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]
   
   b) If No, Give reasons why you don’t give freedom of making decisions

6. a) Once you have delegated authority do you expect perfection the first time?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]
b) If No, Give reasons why you don’t expect perfection the first time.


7. The head teacher normally should not delegate authority of the counseling of teachers regarding job-related issues

   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

8. a) Creating the proper work environment to enhance teacher motivation is the responsibility of the Head teacher.

   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

   b) If No, who should create the proper environment for motivation?

9. Delegation has reduced delays in the implementations of policies and decisions in school and has improved the performance of teachers in your school.

   Yes [ ]   No [ ]
SECTION C

EVALUATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES INFLUENCE DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY IN YOUR SCHOOL

Key:
1=Strongly Agree  2=Agree  3.Disagree  4.Strongly Disagree

Table 4.26: Questionnaire for Head teachers and HODs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. You do not feel you have the time to delegate authority properly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You would delegate more authority but the jobs you delegate never seem to get done the way you want them to be done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You delegate authority to a task clearly and concisely, explaining exactly how it should be accomplished.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. You feel that when you delegate authority you lose control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You work long hours than you should.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. You delegate authority to the whole job – giving the teacher an opportunity to complete it without any of your involvement. Then you view the end result.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. When you have given clear instructions and authority and the task is not done right, you get upset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. You would delegate more but you are pretty much a perfectionist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. You have not really found that delegation saves any time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. You can give teachers the routine tasks, but you feel you must keep non – routine tasks to yourself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If you were to delegate authority, your job would not be nearly as much fun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking your time to answer the Questions.
Appendix IV. Questionnaires for Teachers

Confidential

This questionnaire is designed for the purpose of analyzing the factors that influence delegation in schools and their impact on teacher performance. The information provided will be treated with confidentiality and is only meant for this research.

SECTION A

Background Information.

Name of School__________________ Position in the School__________

No.of years in the teaching profession  0-5Yrs[ ]  6-10Yrs [ ]
Above 11 yrs[ ] √ tick the appropriate box)

Please answer the following questions by placing a tick [√ ] on the boxes or fill in the blank spaces provided.

1. Do you get confused when tasks are delegated with authority?
   Yes [ ]     No [ ]

2. a) Do you check with the headteacher when authority delegated is unclear?
   Yes [ ]     No [ ]

   b) If No, what do you do?

3. Are you trained and prepared for any delegated authority?
   Yes [ ]     No [ ]

4. a) Are you given the right to make decisions on delegated duties
Yes [ ]  No [ ]

b) If No, what do you do?

5. a) Have you ever refused the delegated duties or felt later that you should have refused the delegated duties?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]
   b) If yes why?

6. Delegated authority is such fun?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

7. a) Does delegation of authority help you acquire new skills which help you improve your performance?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]
   If No, give reasons why it doesn't.

8. a) Is delegated authority usually accompanied with rewards?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]
   b) If yes give the rewards

9. a) There is good delegation of authority in your school
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]
   b) If No give suggestions that can improve delegation of authority in your school.
SECTION C

EVALUATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES INFLUENCE DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY IN YOUR SCHOOL.

Key: 1=Strongly Agree  2=Agree  3.Disagree  4.Strongly Disagree

Table 4.27: Questionnaire for Teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Close supervision is very necessary for the delegated authority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Your head teacher delegates authority when he/she has another important task at hand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Your head teacher delegates authority and let you take over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The basic purpose of delegation of authority is to facilitate accomplishment of the stated objectives/goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Every position in the school should be assigned specific tasks, as also individuals or groups who are to be held accountable for the accomplishment of those tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Individuals teachers and groups will be able to carry out their tasks efficiently only if they are delegated sufficient authority for the purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Each teacher should be answerable only to the head teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The head teacher rewards in proportion to results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Important decisions are postponed when the head teacher is away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Usually delegated tasks are completed on time and the results are always impressive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking your time to answer the questions.
Appendix V.  Secondary Schools in Ekerenyo Division.

1. Ngangoge
2. Kebabe Girls
3. Egentubi
4. Omonayo.
5. Kiabonyoru
6. Nyamiranga
7. Kea
8. Gekendo
9. Kenyoro ELCK
10. Nyagokiani
11. Enkinda.
12. Keng’uso
13. Nyairang’a

(Source: Nyamira District Education Office)
APPENDIX VI:
NYAMIRA DISTRICT MAP

LEGEND
District Boundary
Division Boundary
Location Boundary
Sub Location Boundary

DIVISIONS
1. NYAMIRA 5. NYAMUSI
2. MANGA 6. ROBARIL

Source: District Statistics Office