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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions held by headteachers of their role in the management of school-based change. Specifically the study sought to establish headteachers perception of their role in the management of school-based change, the nature of school-based changes initiated by the headteachers, the kind of resistance faced while implementing school-based change and the strategies undertaken to minimize resistance to change. Guided by available literature on headteachers’ management tasks, seven core management task areas were identified. The seven are: general school administration, management of school physical resources, school community relations, staff personnel, finance and income generating activities, student personnel services and finally curriculum and instruction. The study gravitated around these seven management task areas in examining headteachers’ perceptions on change management. The research was anchored on a conceptual framework that views the process of educational change as a replica of interactions in a social system. Using the Ex Post Facto Research design and a School-based Change Management Questionnaire (SBCMQ) data were collected from sixty four headteachers of public secondary schools in Western Province of Kenya. Respondents were chosen by multi stage sampling incorporating stratification and purposive sampling. The collected data were analyzed by descriptive statistics and content analysis. Data analysis revealed that headteachers perceived themselves positively on the accounts of teambuilding, personal motivation and initiative, leadership management and effective communication in the initiation and implementation of school-based educational change. The study found that specific school-based changes introduced by headteachers varied from one school to another and from one management task area to another. It was also established that the main sources of resistance to the school-based changes initiated by headteachers emanated from the communities surrounding the schools, the school staff and students. The key task areas that elicited the most serious forms of resistance to changes were, Management of finances, general administration, staff personnel and student services. The study further established that a large proportion of headteachers were unable to diagnose resistance to change. On the basis of the findings the researcher recommends firstly, for a paradigm shift in the management of secondary schools from a centralized command within the Ministry of Education headquarters to mainstreaming of a guided school-based management as a basis of policy making and execution. Secondly, the study calls for institutions charged with the responsibility of pre-service training and in-servicing of headteachers to consider the inclusion of management of change as a core subject in teacher training/in-service programmes, in view of the finding this should be a priority concern. Thirdly, the study recommends for a similar research on the perceptions’ of other stakeholders on the role played by secondary school headteachers in management of change within their schools. This could be carried out for a comparative analysis of what headteachers contend to be doing and what they are seen to be doing. Fourthly, a replica study on headteachers of private secondary schools could also be carried out to profile their management roles.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Problem

Globally, the school systems of today are not exact replicas of their counterparts of a century or even a half a century ago. Knezivich (1984:102) persuasively argues that “they [schools] neither look, act, nor feel like their historical counterparts.” The last three and half decades have witnessed even more phenomenal challenges to management of educational change. Decades ahead are even poised to witness more intense challenges in the field of educational management due to changing social, political, economic and technological circumstances. Illuminating the worldwide trend, Senge P, Kleiner A, Ross R, Roth G and Smith B (1999:1) rhetorically ask, “look ahead twenty or thirty years. Does anyone expect the next twenty years to be less tumultuous than the past twenty years? Given the changes expected in technology, biology, medicine, social values, demography, the environment and international relations, what kind of world might humanity face? No one can say for sure, but one thing is reasonably certain: continuing challenges will tax our collective abilities to deal with them.” The challenges are bound to tax the abilities of education managers than people at any other levels. In the words of Knezevich (1984:102):

   Educational administrators of prior years had to deal with some change; but it was not of rapid pace, scope or range evident in more recent years that promise to continue for at least the rest of this century.

According to Devos and Verhoeven (2003:403), schools are increasingly faced with permanent social and organizational challenges that there is need for them to become
self-renewing organizations. Morrish (1976:10) might not have been far from the truth when he opined that change seems permanent and there are no longer any stable baselines from which to work.

The task of finding the right educational change strategy is hence a quest pursued by nearly all nations and individual schools within such nations. The ultimate goal is to improve school management as postulated by Shaeffer (1990:1) that ‘Improving the quality of education is a major goal of most nations in the developed and developing worlds.’

In Kenya, the development of an effective education and training programme has been a standing objective of the government since independence in 1963. This quest is founded on the much acclaimed premise in Kenya that education is an investment that opens new horizons, empowers men and women to improve their lot and that it provides knowledgeable and skilled manpower for national development. In a similar perspective, Mungazi (1991:22) argues that:

...educational innovation is often intended to improve the quality of the people; it enables students to set individual goals and objectives consistent with political and socio-economic principles; it promotes development of a nation by developing the individual potential; it seeks to promote and manifest individual endeavors and helps initiate the formation of a new national character so critical to national development.

A number of commissions, committees and task forces have been set up in Kenya since 1963 to look into ways of improving education in the country. These commissions have been harbingers of educational change. It suffices then to consider briefly how
educational commissions in Kenya have potentiated change at national policy level and at the school level.

At independence in 1963, the newly formed government of Kenya found the colonial education system wanting in terms of access, equity, relevance and quality. It therefore, set up an education commission to survey the existing educational system and resources and to advise on the formulation and implementation of National Policies for Education and Training. The Kenya Education Commission (1964) also referred to as “The Ominde Commission” recommended wide ranging changes that reflected the aspirations of a people ready to chart their own destiny. The recommendations of the commission included:

a) Emphasis on education as an instrument of promoting national unity.

b) Stress on the role of education in manpower development.

c) Abolition of racial segregation and establishing a national system of education.

d) The revision of syllabuses especially for secondary schools education.

e) Restructuring of the education system to seven years of primary education; six years of secondary education, four at ‘ordinary level’ and two at ‘advanced level’, and three years of university education.

The Kenya Education Commission became the cornerstone upon which subsequent educational changes emanated.
Another policy document, which made a wide range of recommendations for change in the education sector is Sessional Paper No. 10 of 1965, on African Socialism. This paper stresses that education is a means of producing manpower for economic growth and development. It points out the fact that education is the bridge of reaching a racially integrated society and closing the racial gaps between the whites and Africans in employment opportunities as inherited from the colonial government. This Sessional Paper formally endorsed the Ominde Report as the basis for post-independence educational development and also made other broad sector recommendations. According to GoK (1999: 354) Sessional Paper No: 10 of 1965 provided for “the control of education (whether general or vocational) and educational institutions (whether community or individual owned) to be vigorously enforced in order to ensure uniform standards and to relate educational development to the needs and resources of the country”. Its averred that, Sessional Paper No: 10 of 1965 is the most “definitive statement of national philosophy and the development blue print for all sectors of socio-economic and political life” in Kenya (GoK 1999)

The Ndegwa Commission of 1970 – 1971 recommended for the establishment of education boards to be responsible for the administration of primary education, an overhaul of the inspectoral system for primary education, decentralization of the purchase and distribution of primary school equipment, diversification of the secondary school syllabus to include technical and vocational subjects and planned expansion of primary teacher training colleges.
The Bassey Report of 1971, which is also referred to as “The Kenya Curriculum Mission” was basically a study of curriculum development in Kenya. It emphasized on change of attitude in recognizing the importance of primary education and thus called for concentration of effort in the provision of primary education. Other recommendations of the Bassey Report include:

a) Training of teachers.

b) Re-organizing the Kenya Institute of Education (K. I. E) along universities’ structure.

c) Changes in examination content and structure to widen examination scope.

d) Establishment of staffing policies at all levels.

e) Widening the role of the inspectorate.

Most of the recommendations made by the Bassey Report were not implemented. For instance on secondary schools, the Bassey Report had recommended for the rationalization of upper secondary school growth for gifted children to receive adequate education through available teaching resources. This is yet to happen.

In 1971, an International Labor Organization Mission with the aim of establishing a strategy for increasing productive employment in Kenya also recommended for changes in the education sector. It recommended a cycle of basic, universal and free education of eight to nine years of primary education and lower secondary. It called for gradual increase of vocational subjects and elimination of Certificate of Primary Education (CPE) in favour of a revised testing procedure at the end of lower secondary tier.
Although the Certificate of Primary Education was later faced out, its demise was in no way related to the ILO recommendations of 1971 than to later educational developments. National testing procedures at the end of lower secondary tier were not institutionalized beyond the nineteen eighties and there are blurred memories of such procedures.

Still in pursuance for change in education, the Government of Kenya in December 1975 appointed the National Committee on Education Objectives and Policies (Gachathi Committee) to redefine Kenya’s educational objectives and recommend policies to achieve the objectives. The Gachathi Report (GoK, 1976), recommended for an education cycle with nine years of primary education, three of lower secondary, two of upper secondary and three of university education. It also proposed selection examinations at the end of lower secondary after which students could either proceed to upper secondary or technical schools. Gachathi Report could have ushered radical changes in the educational sector but they were at most academic.

The 1981 Presidential Working Party on the Establishment of a Second University in Kenya (Mackay Report) recommended the establishment of a second university to be technologically oriented. It also recommended the change of the education system from seven years of primary education, six years of secondary and three years of university to eight years of primary, four of secondary and four of university education. Major recommendations of this report have been implemented. The present Moi University was
established following the recommendations of the Mackay Report. The introduction of the 8 – 4 – 4 education system was also an aftermath of the Mackay Report.

In 1988, a Presidential Working Party on Education and Manpower Development for this Decade and Beyond (Kamunge Report) recommended among other things:

a) Teaching of environmental studies at all levels of the education system.
b) Cost sharing in education management and financing at primary, secondary and tertiary levels.
c) Expansion of adult literacy.
d) Coordination and harmonization of curriculum, examinations and certificates at all levels.
e) Establishment of centers of excellence in training, research, technology and the arts.
f) Expansion of university education.
g) Emphasis on vocational and technical education.
h) Expansion of teacher training for all levels – pre-primary and post-primary.
i) Headteachers to be trained as the first line inspectors in the school.

The Kamunge Report (1988) emphatically pointed out that heads of educational institutions have a central role to play in the management of educational institutions. The recommendations of the Kamunge Report (1988) were accepted by the government vide Sessional Paper No: 6 on Education and Training for the Next Decade and Beyond.
One recommendation of Kamunge Report that has challenged the innovativeness of secondary school headteachers in the area of finance and income generation has to do with cost sharing policy. Under this policy, government subsidy to school was drastically reduced. This study points out later in chapter four the various school-based changes that headteachers have introduced to cope with dwindling funding from the government.

The Commission of Inquiry into the Education System of Kenya, (Koech Commission) of 1999 recommended the overhaul of the 8-4-4 system of education. In its place, it called for a flexible system of seven years of primary, four at lower secondary and two options for grammar or technical education then three years of college education. This whole structure as recommended by the Koech Report was to be known as Totally Integrated Quality Education and Training (TIQET). In calling for the change of the 8-4-4 education system, the Koech Commission (1999), pointed out that the objectives of the 8 – 4 – 4 system of education were laudable but the implementation process was haphazard and lacking in several crucial ways, especially the initial lack of consultation with crucial stakeholders and poor monitoring to ensure the readiness of educational personnel and institutions for its successful implementation. At the school level, school headteachers were not inducted for change over to the 8 – 4 – 4 system and the kind of changes they initiated at the school level were mere headteacher personal initiatives.
Accordingly a number of scholars have called for the overhaul of the 8 – 4 – 4 education system. For instance, Sifuna (2003:68) argues that there is an urgent need to overhaul the education system because the current structures are not adoptable to twenty first century that is characterized by massive technological expansion and development. The emergent point is that the envisioned 8 – 4 – 4 change was riddled with numerous problems that can be linked to lack of informed principles on the management of change.

The enumeration of the various policy documents, which have been harbingers for education change in Kenya, is not conclusive. What is clear however, is that the history of managing education change in Kenya is a doleful one. Often at the national level, anticipated changes have faltered and faded. According to MoEST (1998:29), recommendations of four major public commissions namely Ominde (1964), Gachathi (1976), Mackay (1981) and Kamunge (1988) on education and training have yet to be satisfactorily resolved.

The top-down approach to initiation of change that is in vogue in Kenya is a subject of criticism by commentators in educational circles. According to Brown and Eisenhardt (1998) as quoted by Devos and Verhoeven (2003:404), successful change is developed from bottom up. More concisely, Weiss and Bucavals (1980) contend that research derived from top-down projects does not have the effect envisaged at the periphery nor is the process adequately represented by the often proposed linear sequence of change. Kogan and Atkin (1991:251) state that educational commissions are less in favour now as
precursors of change than in the previous decades. Basing his argument on the Kenyan example, Amutabi (2003:141) points out that many of the educational commissions in Kenya appear to be appointed as a response to certain pressures and crises to wade off public concern. At most commission reports are usually put aside after the crises or pressure is over.

Despite the divergent views on the approaches of initiating educational change, the truism of the change process as stated by Fullan (1993a: vii) still holds that:

> Change is ubiquitous and relentless, forcing itself on us at every turn…. The secret of growth and development is learning how to contend with the forces of change… turning positive forces to our advantage, while blunting negative ones.

Shaeffer (1992:I7) argues that individual schools are often loosely coupled to the larger education system making it problematic for standardized central reforms to succeed at the school level. This brings into focus school-based innovations as a kaleidoscope of a nation’s management of education change. Such an approach has been commented on by scholars such as Orlosky et al., (1984:324) who posit that “an understanding of the dynamics of institutional renewal and revitalization is obviously of strategic concern to education”.

Verspoor (1989:1 61), also argues that “while the broad objectives of change and reform programmes will be set by national policy-makers, the design of the implementation and management systems will be undertaken from the bottom-up”. At the school level,
innovations are therefore, basically within the national educational framework but individual schools take the lead in the implementation process. In the same vein, Robson (1996:437) reports that there is evidence of a developing rhetoric favouring local participation and control, a swing towards the view that the identification and development of innovation should lie with the persons taking part in the local concrete situation. Local personnel therefore, should identify their own needs and set solutions to them. The rationale is that those closer to the problem and the process are in the best position to come up with solutions and implement them.

In Kenya, secondary schools can be distinguished as high performing, well-managed or low performing and mismanaged schools not on the basis of the central curriculum that they offer but on the basis of how they are managed at the school level. In the whole process of school-based management, headteachers are lead players in setting distinction marks between one school and the other. HMSO (1990:3) points out that high performing schools are characterized with among other things good leadership that offers breadth of vision and ability to motivate others and the capacity to manage change, solve problems and develop organically. The least successful schools according to Fullan (1993:126) have a leadership that is engaged in ‘shallow coping’- doing nothing, procrastinating, doing things the usual way, or merely increasing pressure. On the other hand, successful schools go a step further by probing underlying factors in a view of providing substantial interventions.
Research on the management of educational change overwhelmingly highlights the crucial role played by the headteacher in effecting school-based change. Campbell et al., (1983:215) say that the involvement of the administrator [head teacher] in education change can help shape anew situation, assist the community to avoid crisis and can ensure that schools really respond to today’s rather than yesterday’s challenges. GoK (2000:225) elucidates that “heads of institutions are central to the successful management of educational institutions and implementation of the total curriculum”. Other eminent scholars among them Caldwell (2001), Fullan (1993), Shaeffer (1992) and Adams and Chen (1981) uphold the crucial role played by the school headteacher in the management of innovations

Amplifying the importance of the Headteacher, the US Congress (as quoted in Onyango 2001:2) states that:

In many ways the school principal is the most important and influential individual in any school. He /she is the person responsible for all activities that occur in and around the school building. It is the principal’s leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism and morale of teachers, and the degree of concern for what the students may or may not become. The principal is the main link between the school and the community and the way he or she performs in that capacity largely determines the attitudes of students and parents about the school. If a school is vibrant, innovative, child-centred place, if it has a reputation for excellence in teaching, if students are performing to the best of their ability, one can almost point to the principal’s leadership as the key to the success.
In pursuit of his/her job, the headteacher is often bemused and mystified due to the enormity of change occasioned by greater call for school accountability from the public, and increasing technological and social developments. Role uncertainty or even confusion, together with raised and changing expectations, further heightens the challenges faced by headteachers. Crow (2007:54) terms the experiences of headteachers as a ‘traumatic experience’. Amidst this ambiguity, education researches are yet to focus on the daunting role of the headteacher in management of institutional school-based change.

Deploring the inadequacy of research in the field of educational change, Baldridge and Deal (1975:1) emphatically point out that:

… at least three things are needed to understand change process in educational organizations: a comprehensive organizational perspective, that is, an understanding of the crucial organizational sub- systems and process involved in innovation, familiarity with strategies that can be used to cause and support educational changes such as leadership dynamics, the role of change agents, the dynamics of organizational politics and use of program evaluation processes and practical experience with the dynamics of educational change, either by actually administering a changing institution or from gaining various experience through case study of actual attempts to change educational organizations.

The “Role of change agents and practical experience with the dynamics of educational change” at the institutional level, can be understood by examining how the headteacher manages school-based changes.
In a study that examined the differences between the perceptions of headmasters and perceptions of teachers towards the role of secondary school teachers in Nairobi and Thika districts of Kenya, Karagu (1982:209) recommends that “the conceptions of the role behaviour of the secondary school headmaster need to be examined for consistency, clarification and for better understanding”. Yet as Eshiwani (1988) points out, there is little evidence in Kenya that education research has taken the task of sharing with stakeholders the role perception of the headteacher and the nature of the tasks headteachers are involved in while managing school-based changes.

Accounts on educational change would be of great importance in planning and conducting educational programmes with precision and little wastage. Legget (1969) as quoted by Orlosky (1984:324) asserts that, “an understanding of the dynamics of institutional renewal and revitalization is obviously of strategic concern to education”. This study was a case towards that understanding.

Stressing the need for a study on educational change in Kenya and East Africa, Ogot and Weidman (2004:8) state that “greater attention needs to be paid to the study of implementation of reform and innovation” and that “results from such evaluations should be used both to monitor the progress of reform and to make modifications necessary for effective implementation of initiatives”.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

The management of education change has been a latent concern of the government and educational institutions in Kenya. The ultimate target of effective and efficient delivery of education services to the satisfaction of parents, students and other stakeholders has remained elusive. The realization of changes espoused by education commissions and other policy documents at national level in Kenya has often been a doleful expectation. As amplified by Amutabi (2003:141) and IPAR (2008:3) recommendations of such commissions whose findings have national implications have not been utilized as expected, they have been ignored totally or implemented only in part. At the secondary school level, headteachers’ initiatives in addressing the inadequacies of a centre-periphery approach to management of education as espoused in government policies have to a large extent been guided by some amalgam of personal experience and undefined individual ideological considerations. Differences that have emerged between public secondary schools of similar catchment areas in key management task areas namely; management of school curriculum and instruction, student personnel services, staff personnel services, school physical facilities, general school administration, finance and income - generating activities, school community relations and the overall school culture are a pointer to the varied individual approaches to the management of school-based changes. Yet knowledge from educational research literature that could have informed practice by specifically bringing to the fore the experience of headteachers of public secondary schools in Kenya is glaringly missing, Eshiwani (1988) and Ogot and Weidman (2004). This study sought to fill this gap: to shed light on headteachers’
perception of their role in the management of school-based change. Specifically, the study investigated how headteachers perceived their role in initiating and sustaining school-based changes in seven identified management task areas.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to explore the headteachers’ perceptions of their role in the initiation and management of school-based change, the kind of resistance they faced and coping strategies they have adapted to minimize resistance and sustain change.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

Objectives of this study were:

i. To find out how headteachers perceive their own role in the management of school-based change.

ii. To establish school-based changes initiated by headteachers in their management task areas.

iii. To determine the kind of resistance or compliance encountered in implementing school-based changes.

iv. To identify strategies used by headteachers in instituting school-based changes.
1.5 **Research Questions**

To realize the objectives of the study, the following research questions were formulated:

i. How do headteachers perceive their role in the management of school-based change?

ii. What changes, if any, have headteachers initiated in their schools?

iii. What is the nature of resistance to school-based changes in secondary schools?

iv. What strategies have been used by headteachers to minimize resistance to school-based changes?

v. What is the implication of headteachers’ perception of their role in management of school-based changes to Kenya’s national education policy?

1.6 **Significance of the Study**

This study is considered significant in the following ways:

Firstly, the study comes at a time when the government and stakeholders are in discourse on how to decentralize provision of educational services. Decentralization attempts on services such as hiring of secondary school teachers and empowerment of District Education Boards have been a subject of criticism. The Ministry of Education in MoEST (2003:8) has noted that centralization resulted in “major weaknesses in the management and delivery of services particularly at the school level”. According to IPAR (2008:5), centralized management of the education system in Kenya has been ineffective.
The emerging school of thought is to strengthen management at lower levels such as schools to allow for practical policy decisions hence the need for entrenching of school-based change. The thinking on entrenching school-based management is echoed by GoK (1998:78) that in order to improve the status of secondary school education, there is need to “improve management down to the institutional level …empower stakeholders through decentralization of management and financing…” These propositions put the headteacher in a position of enormous responsibility creating a need to hear him out. The findings of this study provide insights on the headteachers’ perspective.

Secondly, literature reviewed shows that most studies on secondary schools management have circumvented the hearing of headteachers about themselves. For instance Achoka (2003), focused on parental involvement in the management of secondary schools; Onyango (2001) pays attention to competencies needed by headteachers; and Orora (1998) illuminates on school culture and the role of the headteacher. This study is therefore seminal in so far as it pioneers and leads the way in bringing into focus policy issues from the headteachers perspective.

Thirdly, the findings of this study could be used by educational policy makers within the Ministry of Education, the Teachers’ Service Commission and their delegated agencies to redefine change initiation, implementation and sustenance in secondary schools.
Fourthly, the social system theory that was developed and adapted by the researcher for this study, provides for an understanding of the roles played by a wide spectrum of educational stakeholders involved in educational management. Other researchers may use the same conceptual framework in doing comparable researches.

Fifthly, this study is expected to contribute to knowledge in the field of educational change management, a field that has been scarcely researched on nationally.

Finally, the current findings can be used by scholars who may want to replicate this study in a different setting.

1.7 Study Assumptions

The findings of this study are based on the following assumptions:

i. That headtechers were sincere and truthful in their responses.

ii. That there are no standardized headteachers management task areas universally.

iii. That headtechers initiated, implemented and worked for the sustenance of school-based changes.

iv. That public secondary schools are a crucible of the Kenyan secondary school sector.

v. That sampled headtechers adequately represented all headtechers of public secondary schools in Western Province of Kenya.
1.8 Scope of the Study

This study endeavored to establish headteachers’ self perception of their role in the management of school-based change. The respondents were drawn from public secondary schools in Western Province of Kenya.

1.9 Study Limitations and Delimitations

In differentiating limitations from delimitations, Clark (2009) argues that limitations refer to those characteristics of design or methodology that set parameters on the application or interpretation of results while delimitations are those characteristics that define the scope or boundaries of the study. The main limitations and delimitations of this study included:

i. There is a dearth of literature on educational change in Kenya and more specifically on school-based changes. The researcher therefore, undertook a global perspective in reviewing literature and also gleaned through available relevant studies.

ii. Self - rating by headteachers on their own performance was prone to inflation in comparison to actual performance undertaken. This was expected and did not affect the gist of the study.

iii. It would have been appropriate for this study to cover the entire country but this was not possible due to financial constraints.

iv. The research questionnaire for this study was developed by the researcher on the basis of reviewed literature. It therefore, may not have been exhaustive.
Though the initiation and implementation of educational changes were school-based, they were affected by a legal framework that is mandated from outside the school. There is likelihood that some headteachers may not have mentioned school-based initiatives considered outside the legal framework.

1.10 Theoretical Framework

A number of approaches to the definition of theory have been put forward. According to Robson (1996:18), a theory is “a general statement that summarizes and organizes knowledge by proposing a general relationship between events”. The events could have taken place or not. Kerlinger (1979:11) in a more elaborate definition says that “theory is a set of interrelated constructs (concepts), definitions, and propositions, that presents a systematic view of phenomena by specifying relations among variables, with the purpose of explaining and predicting phenomena”. This definition provides room for a researcher to utilize more than just one theory in explaining a phenomenon. The ultimate aim of theory according to Hoy and Miskel (1992: 23), is “to provide general explanations for phenomena, guide research by providing conceptual underpinnings for the development of research, provide an integrating framework for the further development of knowledge and finally guide action”. Considering the views of these eminent scholars on the importance of theory in research, this section is devoted to expounding the theory that guided the study. Subsequently, this section also establishes the researcher’s conceptual framework.
This study was anchored on the Social Systems Theory of educational change. The Association for Educational Communication and Technology (AECT 2004:1) defines a system as a collection of parts that interact with each other to function as whole. According to Banathy (2008), a social systems theory can be applied in “any educational setting, including public and private schools, corporate and government human resources centres and higher education”.

Hanson (1991), a proponent of the Social Systems Theory of educational change argues that education organizations are made up of numerous social systems that should be brought into a collaborative effort if change is to be successful. The task of formal leadership in the education system is therefore to co-ordinate and control the various subgroups so that they can forge a common front for directing change. In the same vein, Orlosky et al. (1984:17) states that, “the social system approach to organizational studies goes beyond concern for the formal structure. The social system includes all individuals who interact regularly to influence organizational life. The boundaries of a school social system are not limited to the faculty, support staff and administrators as depicted in organizational charts. The social system includes students, secretaries, custodians, parents, volunteers, central office staff and others”. Viewed in the context of the social systems theory, the school becomes a supra system within which other subsystems interrelate. As the prime mover of change at the school level, the principal has the task of building linkages with several players throughout the system.
After gleaning through several discussions on the applicability of the Social System Theory to educational setups, Hoy and Miskel (1982:56-57) record eight basic assumptions of social system models that perfectly fit educational institutions. The eight are:

i) Social systems comprise of interdependent parts, characteristics, and activities that contribute to and receive from the whole

ii) Social systems are goal oriented, and indeed they may have a multiplicity of goals.

iii) Social systems are peopled. People act in the roles of administrators, teachers, students, custodians, and so forth.

iv) Social systems are structured. Different components are needed to carry out specific functions and allocate resources.

v) Social systems are normative. Each person within them is expected to behave in a particular manner.

vi) Social systems are sanction bearing. The norms for behaviour are enforced with reward and punishment.

vii) Social systems are generally open systems. The environment typically supplies inputs to the system; there are exchanges between the system and its environment.

viii) Social systems are conceptual and relative. The concept of social system is a general one that applies to social organizations regardless of size or purpose.
The relevance and applicability of the social system theory of educational change to this study is further strengthened by AECT (2004:1) stress that it is almost impossible to study educational change process without first examining the institutional sub systems. AECT (Ibid) identifies seven features that mark out schools as social systems to include; relationships between parts and the whole, hierarchical arrangement of systems, synergy among the system components, artificial boundaries between the subsystems, presence of homeostasis, atrophy when energy is not focused and the presence of inputs, process, and outputs in a system.

According to Banathy (2008) educational renewal will only become possible if, “the educational community will develop a systems view of education, if it embraces the systems view and if it applies the systems view in its approach to reform”. Banathy (2008) argues that the applicability of the systems theory to education enables us to understand and describe among the following issues:

i) Relationships, interactions, and mutual interdependency of systems operating at various levels.

ii) System processes including behavior and change of systems and the environments over time.

iii) Dynamics of interactions, relationships and patterns of connectedness among components of a system.

iv) Properties of wholeness and the characteristics that emerge at various system levels as a result of systemic interaction and synthesis.
Paulson (1976:340) buttresses the view that change in schools must take cognizance of the diverse subsystems by stating that:

The only way to effect changes in the education system is for educators to make alliances with community people, students, various ethnic groups, union members…participating in decision-making and become agents of fundamental change in the educational system.

The social system theory gives allowance for the examination of the relationship between the central figure in the organization and the significant others in the initiation and sustenance of institutional changes. Having a healthy respect for individuals and for personal visions is a source of renewal when the future is unknown and the environment is changing in unpredictable ways. According to Fullan (1993b:128), the most productive schools value individualism and collectivism simultaneously. This perspective will give prominence to secondary school headteachers and other stakeholders within the school.

Hoyle and McCormick (1976: 19-20) are more concise in the application of the social system theory to schools. They argue that the “system concept assumes some interdependence between the components of an organization” and go further to point the components in a school setup as “teaching groups, pupils, and non – school components”. Within the social system setup, Hoyle and McCormick (1976: ibid) are clear that the headteacher is the prime determinant of events. The headteacher is the cog around which change thrives or is completely blanked.
Arguing strongly for the relevance, applicability and utilization of the social systems theory in the study of educational change, Banathy (2008) states:

It’s my firm belief that unless our educational communities and our professional organizations embrace systems inquiry, and unless our research agencies learn to pursue systems inquiry, the notions of systemic reform and systemic approaches to educational renewal will remain hollow and meaningless.

The applicability of the social system theory to schools in the Kenyan context has been supported by Karagu (1982: 52) when he succinctly states that “a school may be considered a social system in its own right”. This study therefore, found ample anchorage in reviewed literature for the application of a social systems theory to the study of educational change.

1.11 Study Variables

According to Neuman (2000:127), there are three types of variables: the cause variable (independent variable) that identifies forces that act on something else, secondly the dependent variable, a variable that is the result or outcome of another variable and thirdly the intervening variable; a variable that may come between the independent and dependent. In the implementation of change the intervening variable may also come after the dependent variable. Another authority, DTREG (2007: 1) refers to the independent variable as the ‘Predicator Variable’ and the dependent variable as the ‘Target Variable’. In addition, Wikipedia (2007) mentions another set of variable ‘the control variable’ which determines what has to be altered or kept the same.
This study takes cognizance of the definitions of variables as provided by Neuman (2000) and Wikipedia (2007) and identifies the study’s independent variables to include: The District Education Boards, Boards of Governors, Old students labour unions, teaching staff, non-teaching staff and Parents Teachers Association members.

The dependent variables of this study were the changes that were initiated by school headteachers in each of the identified seven management task areas namely curriculum and instruction, student welfare, school finances, staff welfare, school community relations, physical facilities and general administration.

The school headteacher was considered as a control variable in the study. Accordingly the headteacher role was seen as that of tackling the question ‘what do I change or keep the same?’ The interaction of the study variables is illustrated in Figure 1.

1.12 Conceptualization of the Social System Theory

Bearing in mind the social systems theory, the researcher was able to construct a conceptual framework for practical purposes of this study. The conceptualized framework is illustrated in Figure 1.

As shown in Figure 1, the process of educational change can be seen as a sequence of interactions from the origin or initiation phase to – plan conceptualization - adoption-then to implementation or rejection and finally sustenance of the changes. At all stages there is constant feedback to respective stakeholders. The headteacher as the pivotal
player in the model is the recipient of new ideas being suggested for incorporation in to the school management system. The origin of these ideas could be the District Education Board or Provincial Education Board by way of recommendations or suggestions. Other sources could include the School Board of Governors, Old Students Associations, the Labour Unions particularly Kenya National Union of Teachers (KNUT) and Kenya Union of Domestic, Hotels, Educational and Allied Workers (KUDHEA), the teaching staff, non-teaching staff, students and parents. These sources of change form the input or independent variables of the study.

Once the headteacher generates new ideas or receives suggested changes from within the school or outside the school, he/she has to conceptualize the kind of change that they portent. The conceptualization stage involves envisioning. This is the actual picturing of how the school will function if a given new idea is implemented. The headteacher could at this stage involve a team of staff members in assessing the change ideas. However, the final decision of adopting or rejecting the suggested changes rests with the headteacher hence seen as the control variable in this study. A rejected idea is then reverted to its initiator with reasons as to why it could not work. A workable idea then constitutes change which has to be planned for and implemented. At the planning stage, the headteacher will have to consider the resources available and appropriate timing for the implementation.
An implemented or enacted change will need to be sustained to be of benefit to the school. Constant feedback to stakeholders during the entire change process right from initiation to implementation and sustenance is vital for creating ownership of the change. Feedback will also assist in modeling values of the school community in line with the anticipated change. The identified phases of change as shown in the conceptual framework (Figure 1) overlap and are not exclusively discrete.
Figure 1.1: School-based Change Process: A Conceptual Framework
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1.13 Operational Definition of Terms

Change Agent – Refers to the headteacher or any other member of the school community who initiates new ideas within the school. A change agent may also be an external stakeholder.

Education Policy- A guideline that facilitates decision making on educational activities.

Headteacher- A teacher employed by the Teachers’ Service Commission and duly appointed to head a secondary school. The term is used interchangeably with Principal.

Management –Refers to the process of initiating, implementing and evaluating change.

Management Task Areas – Refers to specialized core responsibilities of the headteacher within the school.

Western Kenya – Refers to the administrative region in Kenya which at the time of study comprised of eight districts namely: Bungoma, Kakamega, Vihiga, Butere-Mumias, Busia, Lugari, Mt.Elgon and Teso

Perceptions- Refers to the headteacher’s understanding, knowledge or judgment about oneself. It also meant what the headteacher had come to realize as his/her contribution in the management of the school. Similarly Achoka’s (2003:30) definition of perception as one’s “informed opinion” with respect to one self is implied in this study.

School-based Change- refers to any new initiatives or undertakings within the school in any of the management task areas.
1.14 Organization of the Study

This study is organized in five chapters. Chapter one contains the background to the problem, the statement of the problem, purpose and objectives, research questions, significance of the study, scope, study assumptions and limitations, theoretical framework, conceptual framework and operational definition of terms.

Chapter two is on literature review and has the following sections; historical perspective of educational change, approaches to the study of educational change, headteachers’ management task areas, related researches and the implications of the literature reviewed on this study. Chapter three outlines research methodology of the study. It covers; research design, description of the study area, sampling procedures and sample size, research instrumentation, piloting, validity and reliability of the research instrument, administration of the questionnaire, and data analysis procedures.

Chapter four focuses on presentation, analysis and discussion of findings. The sub-sections of this chapter include description of the study area, background characteristics of respondents, headteachers’ self perception of their role, school-based changes introduced in respective management task areas, nature of resistance to implementation of change, and headteachers’ coping strategies in minimizing resistance to educational change. Chapter five comprises of the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This section is organized into four parts. The first part is an overview of the historical development of the study of educational change during the last several decades. Understanding history is essential for a better grasp and appreciation of the subject under study. Part two is an attempt to elucidate approaches that have been used in the study of educational change. Part three is a survey of written works on headteachers’ management task areas. The last part of this section is a review of researches related to educational change and the methodological implications they had on this study.

2.2 A Historical Perspective of Educational change

Demands for educational change are as old as the human society. According to Boles and Davenport (1975: 108):

When social problems go unsolved or when there is lack of “community” among geographically close clusters of people, the educational institution often becomes the whipping boy of society. Going back to the Franco-Prussian war, and following every war since, the losing side has invariably said, ‘If only our men had been better educated, we would have won’.

Indeed, the years following the Second World War witnessed rapid advances in technology and frequent changes in social institutions. It was like a new age embroiled in the dilemma of how to avoid catastrophe as that caused by the atomic bomb and at the same time embracing technological advancement. It was during these polemical times
that the two leading super powers; the USA and USSR were attempting to out do each other in scientific advance. Education change featured prominently in the national politics of Western and Eastern countries. Education was the arsenal with which the cold war was fought.

Fullan (1993:116) focusing on the USA concedes that the intensive study of education change essentially occurred in the last half of the twentieth century and goes further to identify four phases of change as briefly discussed below.

a) **Adoption of Reforms Phase (1960s)**

During the 1960s, change was driven by the need for equity, for the socially and ethnically disadvantaged plus the fear that US education was falling behind scientific achievements of Russia. After the launching of Sputnik 1 by Russia, the USA beefed up the school curriculum with more mathematics, more science and more foreign languages. Although the federal government initiated changes throughout this period, there was little evidence that schools were changing. The school as the centre of realizing the espoused changes was not given scrutiny. The assumption that change mandated from outside the school will always work was faulted. A lesson had been learned.

b) **Implementation of Reforms Phase (1970s)**

This phase witnessed a stagnant economy and a surplus of teachers. Efforts were therefore, made towards identifying factors related to successful implementation of change. Schools fared better in their own initiated changes as compared to the state-initiated changes. It was established that schools that reworked and redeveloped federal
innovation according to local needs and contexts succeeded in initiating purposive change.

**c) Multiple Innovation Phase (1980s)**

During this phase, lessons that characterized the previous phases began to be implemented as educators attempted more basic reforms than implementing single innovations. This period also saw the state increase its funding of local schools.

**d) Systemic Reform Phase (1990s)**

Under the above postulation, it was realized that comprehensive reforms call for systematic linking of assessment, curriculum and instruction, staff development, patronized selection and promotion.

The American education scene (1960s – 1990s) is a showcase of the ever impending change that education actors worldwide have to be prepared to handle. Summarizing the need to be ready for managing educational change, Fullan (1993: 131) states that:

> The past fifty years have been the formative ones in establishing the field of educational change…the problems and society have become more complex and intractable. We have learned that understanding even complex change processes is only half the battle. Doing something about it is far much more of a challenge, which should occupy us for time to come.

This study attempted to fill the gap that Fullan (1993:131) says is ‘more of a challenge which should occupy us for time to come’. The study was further accentuated by Orora (1997:107) who has contended that, “one of the most fundamental problem in Kenya today is that people don’t have a coherent sense of educational change, that is what it is, what it is for and how far it should proceed”.

2.3 Approaches to the Study of Change

Literature is replete with various approaches to change. Chin and Benne (1969) identified three approaches to change namely: Empirical-rational, Normative–re-educative and Power-coercive. On the other hand, Havelock (1971) proposed three different models namely; Social Interaction Model, Research, Development and Diffusion (RD&D) Model and Problem Solver Model.

Hord (1987) looking at the works of Chin and Benne (1969) and Havelock (1971) on change management, proposes two main approaches to the study of change. The two main types are; Product-Focused Approach and System-Centred Approach. A brief discussion of the Product-Focused Approach and The System-Centred Approach in the section that follows will shed light on the endeavors to understand educational change.

2.3.1 Product-Focused Approach

According to Hord (1987), the three main approaches under this type of change are Empirical - Rational Approach (ERA), Social Interaction Approach (SIA) and Research, Development and Diffusion Approach (RDD).

a) **Empirical Rational Approach (ERA)**

The primary assumption of the Empirical Rational Approach (ERA) is that people are rational and therefore, they can be appealed to on a rational basis to change. Allied to this idea is the notion that improvement and therefore, progress are in some sense natural
outgrowths of rational behavior. For the change facilitator, this suggests that individuals, and by extension groups, will adopt a given change if it can be rationally justified and shown to be in their own best interests. These ideas are firmly rooted in the enlightenment-based liberal arts tradition that is the cornerstone of the whole educational system in most Western countries, (Hord 1987:30). The very concept of Universal Public Education is a corollary to the belief in fundamental human rationality.

In Kenya, it is targeted that Education for All will be realized by the year 2015. The thrust of such a target is that advancing the frontiers of knowledge will greatly improve human life. Ignorance is considered a major impediment to reason. From this point of view, the process of educational change simply mirrors the inevitable natural advance of overall human progress. The ERA however, has been criticized for ignoring individuals as active players in the change process. Hord (1987:31) posits that: “Little clear reference is made between individuals who in any event are seen as rational but passive receivers of change and larger groups, or specific innovation products and improvement in a general sense”.

b) **Social-Interaction Approach (SIA)**

This approach focuses on the individual and views change as a question of involving other stakeholders in the change process. This study has captured the Social Interaction tenets in the conceptual framework.
According to Hord (1987), the SIA is supported by five basic assumptions. These are:

i. Individuals belong to a network of social relations which influence their behavior.

ii. The rate of acceptance of innovations by individuals may be predicted based on each individual’s place in the network. Informal personal contact is vital to the adoption process.

iii. Group membership and reference group identifications are major predictors of adoption for individuals.

iv. The rate of diffusion in a social system follows a predictable pattern: initially slow, then very rapid, and finally returning to a long, slow period.

Due to its focus on the individual’s interaction within the social network, effective communication is essential in the management of change. In the school situation, the headteacher ought to establish informal contacts with members of staff as a form of team-building. This approach, however, is weak as it fails to lay strategies for practicability in real school life. It assumes that change is a natural process that is catalyzed by the recognition of individual roles. At times change may override the individual and focus on the good of the institution.

c) Research, Development, and Diffusion Approach (RDD)

This approach views change as an extensive process that needs detailed research and development. Research is for the purpose of providing raw material from which a change may be initiated. Development then encompasses the initial conceptualization of the change and the design in which the change is transformed into an appropriate functional
package. Diffusion consists of dissemination aimed at generating widespread awareness of the change and demonstration by potential users to evaluate its utility. The final stage is the adoption of the change. This includes trials, installation and institutionalization. Although the RDD approach is product oriented, the stages involved take a fairly narrow view of change by focusing only on a particular change package or product and adopting it for an institution. However, the RDD approach has been credited for showing the change process in a logical progressive way from discovery to utilization. Its major criticism according to Huberman (1973:14) is that:

…it contains some assumptions which may not be borne out when we look more closely at how change takes place in education. Changes to date have not in fact been the result of careful process of planning, nor has research necessarily preceded innovation. Generally, innovators have tried something out and then revised it. There is also a paternalist premise in such a model: that the best results are achieved by experts who pronounce what is good for the practitioners-planning for and doing something for them rather than collaborating with them.

Perhaps more true is the fact that the RDD approach resembles more the industrial process of development of Western economies than educational accounts of developing countries.

In summarizing the weakness of all approaches under the Product-Focused Approach to change, Hord (1987:36) says:

Perhaps the most glaring omission of these models is the lack of attention to the role of the change facilitator. This vital component in the change process is either not mentioned at all or is superficially glossed over, nowhere do we find a specific elaboration of who this person is…. 
By taking cognizance of the role of the school headteacher, this study attempted to fill the gap noted by Hord (1987).

2.3.2 System - Centered Approaches

Three approaches grouped under the System-Centred Approach are the Normative Re-Educative Approach, Problem Solver Approach and Organizational Development Approach.

a) Normative Re-Educative Approach

This approach holds that an individual’s participation in the change process is guided by the society’s and a specific institution’s norms. Strict rationality is, therefore, not enough. What is needed according to this approach is a total re-education or normative restructuring of each individual participant in the change process. According to this approach, values should therefore, be clarified and reconstructed as a way of improving problem solving capabilities of the system. In a nutshell then, change is visualized as primarily a question of removing obstructions and thereby enabling the assumed positive direction of human potential to be fully realized. It advocates on the reliance of an external change agent in giving impetus to the change.

b) Problem Solver Approach (PSA)

The Problem Solver Approach assumes that the user has a definite need that has to be satisfied by a change. The process of initiating change begins with diagnosing the
problem. Very often an external change agent is used in guiding the potential users of change. Huberman (1973:64) views the Problem - Solver approach as having six stages. The first stage is of translating the need to a problem hence arousing the desire by the user to be assisted. The second stage is diagnosis of the problem. Stage three is search and retrieval of information. Fourth stage is adaptation of the change. Stage five is trial of the change and the sixth, evaluation of trial in terms of need satisfaction. Paul and Lipham (1976:234) and Hord (1987:40) introduce the seventh stage as that of termination of the change agent-client relationship.

In the Problem - Solver Approach, there is considerable reliance on an external change agent. Popkewitz (1984:140) queries the Problem - Solver Approach for educational institutions arguing that:

Identification and development of innovation should lie with the people who are involved in concrete situations...teachers, its believed are closest to the problems and the process and therefore are in the best position to suggest remedies for perceived deficiencies.

By focusing on the role of headteacher in the management of educational change this study hoped to provide answers to the criticisms on external change agents as raised by Popkewitz (1984: Ibid)

b) Organizational Development Approach (ODA)

Organizational Development Approach is one of the best-known strategies for change. It typifies the Problem - Solver Approach. ODA was originally intended for use in business
organizations and was subsequently adapted to the needs of schools. It was conceived as a practical strategy for change and not as a theory or model. The strategy focuses on the group and its dynamics. Individuals are considered primarily as functional units within the system. Schools then are systems of people working interdependently on a variety of tasks and collaborating with different sub-groups as they move from one task to another. The major goal of ODA is to foster more effective functioning of subsystems, that is, conceptual entities consisting of people, supplies, space and information which carry out the various tasks that constitute the school. The ultimate objective of ODA is to promote greater organizational adaptability. To accomplish this, improvement in both interpersonal skills and subsystem effectiveness are stressed.

Schrunk et al., (1977) described seven interdependent capabilities operant on both the interpersonal and subsystem levels that are necessary for subsystem effectiveness. These are: Clarifying communication; establishing goals; uncovering and working with conflict; improving group meeting procedures; problem solving; decision making and assessing change. The successful implementation of organizational change is dependent on two fold conditions. These are: the organization’s genuine readiness to undertake change and secondly a strong management support for the change. It also requires the active participation of trained and skilled consultants especially during the introduction and implementation phases.
The System-Centered Approaches have some notable pitfalls. On these weaknesses, Hord (1987:43) comments that:

Organizational development in particular, and the normative re-education and problem solver models in general, tend to ignore the practical realities of our schools….in addition, both the skills and relationships the models emphasize are for most part, quite foreign to the prevalent school climate in most countries.

In retrospect, this section has examined the product-focused and the system centered approaches to the study of change. Both approaches have contributed useful ideas or perspectives. The approaches however, have envisaged weaknesses. They are too theoretical in outlook, some suffer from excessive vagueness like the product focused approach and its empirical rational model, have a narrow focus, give scant attention to the facilitator of change and the gap between the principal facilitator of change and other parties is significant.

Other authorities still cite other approaches not examined in the preceding section. Shiundu and Omulando (1992) have advanced the Restricted Approach and the Democratic Approach to change management. In the Restricted Approach, decision making is in the hands of a few. Information leaves one source and goes directly to the consumer. Power coercive strategies are employed in the implementation process. The Democratic Approach is characterized by decentralization of sources of information and disruption of the centre to periphery linkage with shifting centres.
After examining the various approaches to the study of change the section that follows reviews the various management task areas that headteachers are involved in. It is within the framework of these management task areas that school-based change is discussed.

2.4 Headteachers’ Management Task Areas

There are different accounts on management task areas that headteachers undertake in schools. However, it is within these management task areas that we can identify, analyze and evaluate educational changes that have taken place in a school. Literature on management task areas is strewn with inconclusive standpoints on the number of management task areas that there are for headteachers. In the initial stages of this section the study, in a historical perspective considered prominent studies that have tried and attempted to discuss headteacher management task areas. The study noted that most of these studies were done outside Kenya.

According to Hemphil et al., (1962), there are four broad categories of tasks for secondary school principals. These are:

i. Improving educational opportunity.

ii. Obtaining and developing personnel.

iii. Maintaining effective relations with community.

iv. Providing and maintaining school funds and facilities.

In another study Muller and Kincheloe (1972) identified eight (8) management tasks for headteachers as: pupil personnel, curriculum and instruction, staffing and staff relations,
school housing, finance, fiscal management, auxiliary services and measurement and evaluation.

Other scholars with different views on the quantity and form of management task areas for school headteachers are Lipham and Hoer (1974) who identified the following five tasks:

i. Instructional programme

ii. Staff personnel

iii. Student personnel

iv. Financial and physical resources and

v. School community relations.

Yet according to Bridgewater (1979), there are five management task areas namely;

i. Administration and school management.

ii. Curriculum and supervision.

iii. Pupil welfare services.

iv. Clerical work.

v. School community relations.

Like Lipham and Hoer (1974) and Bridgewater (1979), Campbell et al., (1983) identified five management task areas but still the focus was different. These are;

i. Finance and business management.

ii. Staff personnel.
iii. Physical resources.
iv. School community relations and
v. Curriculum and Instruction.

On the other hand Cawelt (1983), in a presentation to American Association of Administrators, posits four management task areas namely:
i. Curriculum development.
ii. Clinical supervision.
iii. Staff development and
iv. Teacher evaluation.

Basing heavily on the American experience, Orlosky (1984:60) identifies nine (9) headteachers’ task areas as:
i. Management (routines, calendar, finances and plant).
ii. Personnel (evaluation, advising, recruiting).
iii. Student behaviour (attendance, discipline, and meetings).
iv. Program development (curriculum and instruction).
v. Student activities (planning and government).
vi. District office (meetings, committees and reports).
vii. Community relations (advisory groups, parents and PTA).
viii. Planning (weekly, annual and long range).
ix. Professional development (reading and conferences).
According to Orlosky (1984), the outcomes on each of the various school management tasks and the time allocated to each is at the discretion of the headteacher. The most visible criticism is the overlapping of task areas and the inapplicability of some of them to countries outside the USA.

West (1992:13) on the basis of extensive research programmes with headteachers, their deputies and senior teachers in LEAs in Britain, identified the following interdependent management task areas:

i. Teaching and learning

ii. Staff development.

iii. Resources and finance.

iv. Review, monitoring and evaluation.

v. External relations.

vi. Policies and relevant structures.

vii. Professional development.

On prioritization, West (1992) argues that there is need to maintain a balance among all the seven task areas. A skewed situation is neither effective nor efficient.

Upon examination of all articles on educational leadership published in four major educational journals from 1985 to 1995, Leithwood, K and Duke, D (1999), identified six distinct management tasks of headteachers quite different from other scholars:
i. Instructional (to influence the work of teachers in a way that will improve student achievement).

ii. Transformational (seeking to increase the commitments and capacities of staff).

iii. Moral (influencing others by appealing to notions of right and wrong).

iv. Participative (involving other members of the school community in school management).

v. Managerial (focusing on task performance and behavior of others with emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness).

vi. Contingent (focusing on the response of staff to unique circumstances).

Another shade of opinion on management task areas is provided by a study on the roles of the school leader in the USA, (Lahway 2003) which describes four tasks of the school leader as:

i. Providing focused instructional leadership.

ii. Leading change.

iii. Developing a collaborative leadership structure and

iv. Providing the moral centre.

Divergence in opinion on the numeration and identification of headteacher management task areas is manifested among most scholars who have examined the issue of headship management task on the international academic arena. The next section briefly examines
relevant works within Kenya that have attempted to focus the subject of headteachers’ management task areas.

In a Manual for Secondary School Headteachers the Ministry of Education (1979), provides a description of fourteen (14) routine duties for the headteacher. These include: overall running and control of the school, establishing good relations with the staff, delegation of duties, inspecting teaching, ensure safe use of chemicals, accounting and book keeping, proper filling, selection of teaching subjects, maintenance of buildings and grounds, representing the TSC, minuting proceedings of the BoG, classroom teaching, communication with the provincial education office and finally establishing good relations with parents and community. The afore stated duties appear oversimplified to an extent of dwelling on communication protocols between the headteacher and the head office than the actual deliverables expected from the headteachers.

On a scholarly approach Bennars and Njoroge (1994) elucidate six (6) management task areas for the headteacher as:

i. Responsibility to the employer.

ii. Concern to the pupils.

iii. Relations with members of staff.

iv. Concern to the community.

v. Concern to the parents and

vi. Administrative procedures.
On the other hand, Okumbe (2001), identifies eight (8) headteacher management task areas;

i. Curriculum and instruction.

ii. Student personnel.

iii. Staff personnel.

iv. School plant.

v. Business management.

vi. Staff development.

vii. School community relations and

viii. Evaluation.

A different perspective on headteacher management task areas in the Kenyan context is provided by Onyango (2001) who in a study to establish competencies needed by headteachers and implications for pre-service and in-service education, identifies and builds his case on seven management task areas namely:

i. General school management.

ii. Management of curriculum and instruction.

iii. Management of Finances and Business.

iv. Management of physical and material resources.

v. Management of staff personnel.

vi. Management of students and

vii. Management of school community relations.
Still focused on the Kenyan case Achoka (2003), in a research on parental involvement in the management of secondary schools in Kenya has identified five headteachers’ management task areas. These are:

i. Management of school facility.

ii. Financial Management.

iii. Management of teachers.

iv. Students’ guidance and counseling and

v. School public relations.

It is evident from the preceding review that there is no consensus so far, on how many management task areas a school headteacher should handle. Differences are also seen in the recognition of the exact task areas. In this study, the pertinent concern was management of school-based change which cannot be realistically accomplished without paying due attention to management task areas that headteachers are involved in a day-to-day basis in the school. The salient educational management concerns in secondary schools are well reverberated in the various tasks performed by headteachers.

Although Kenyan oriented studies on educational management such as Shiundu and Omulando (1992), Bennars and Njoroge (1994), Okumbe (2001), Onyango (2001) and Achoka (2003) identify headship management task areas, they deviate on their number and application. The Kenyan studies are devoid of a comprehensive and detailed account on the role of the headteacher in the management of school-based educational change vis
a vis their respective management task areas. Indeed, none of the Kenyan works reviewed had utilized management task areas to study school-based educational change. Onyango (2001), for instance, focused on the competencies needed by headteachers and their implications for training from the springboard of management task areas. Achoka (2003) uses headteachers’ management task areas as a spring board of examining parents’ involvement in the management of secondary schools. This study examined the dimension of school-based change management from the perspective of school principals.

On the basis of reviewed literature and more specifically literature that was Kenyan oriented, seven headteachers’ management task areas were identified to anchor the study. The seven were:

i. Management of curriculum and instruction.

ii. Management of student personnel services.

iii. Management of finances and income generating activities.

iv. Management of staff personnel.

v. Management of school community relations.

vi. Management of Physical resources.

vii. Management of general administrative procedures.
The identified seven management task areas formed the basis of examining headtechers’ perceptions of their own role in the management of school-based change. In the section that follows each of the chosen seven management task areas is considered in details.

2.4.1 Management of Curriculum and Instruction

According to Oluoch (1992: 7), curriculum refers to “all that is planned to enable the student to acquire and develop desired knowledge, skills and attitudes”. This implies that curriculum is an intentional undertaking with set objectives and outcomes. The GoK (1999:25) provides a broader definition of curriculum as “all subjects taught and activities provided by the school and may include time devoted to each activity”. Accordingly, curriculum then extends beyond the classroom. The usage of instruction delimits classroom activities from out of classroom activities. A further clarification is opined by West (1992:106) who distinguishes three forms of curriculum. First is curriculum – in - action which he says is the one actually experienced by pupils. It may or may not be congruent with the policies or descriptions of the outlined or intended curriculum. Secondly, it is the intended curriculum that portrays the vision the school is geared to achieve. The intended curriculum is derived from the country’s educational goals. Third is the offered curriculum, which is a representation of the teacher’s version of the intended curriculum. This is the one that is captured by teachers in their schemes of work and lesson plans.

The term “instruction” on the other hand is used to denote classroom learner centred activities. According to Hatchet (1965:28), instruction is “the education process designed
to primarily assist students gain a mastery of subject matter”. The role of the headteacher, among others, is to provide instructional leadership. Indeed according to Di Paola and Tschannen-Moran (2003:2), effective principals are those who “provide leadership in instruction, coordinate instructional programs and emphasize high academic standards and expectations.”

Sergiovanni and Carver (1980:259), have explicated five sub-task areas in the curriculum and instruction task area. These are:

i. Development of a philosophy of education and objectives consistent with that philosophy.

ii. Construction of programmes to fulfill the objectives consistent with the philosophy of education.

iii. Constant appraisal and instruction.

iv. Engender a climate which displays a readiness for change.

v. Provision of support materials for curriculum and instructional activities.

Of the five curriculum and instruction sub-tasks above, the headteacher at the school level has a pronounced role in engendering a climate that displays readiness for change and provision of support material for the implementation of curriculum and instruction. Mbamba (1992) identifies the strategies that a headteacher needs to adopt in effecting curriculum and instruction as:

i. Classroom visitation.
ii. Conferencing with teachers.

iii. General staff meetings.

iv. Demonstration teaching.

v. Inter-teacher observation.

vi. Clinical supervision.

Other strategies that have been successful in the monitoring of curriculum and instruction are given by West (1992:119) as:

i. Mutual observation by pairs of staff who focus on agreed aspect of the teaching and learning policy.

ii. Observation by the headteacher, deputy headteacher and other designated members of staff sharing agreed upon criteria with their colleagues.

iii. Observation by the whole staff during in-service [or teaching sessions].

iv. “Talk throughs” where staff gather in a colleagues classroom to hear his or her account of how the learning environment was managed and how the work on display originated.

v. Systematic sampling of pupils’ work to look for evidence of different approaches to writing and recording.

vi. “Mark-ins” where xeroxed, unattributed copies of students work are assessed in the light of agreed criteria.

vii. Interviews with students to explore their perceptions of teaching and learning sequences.
viii. Experiments with the “wait time” between teachers’ questions and students’ response.

ix. Meetings between individual teachers and the head and the deputy in which the class teacher goes through a cross section of students work in a particular curriculum area commenting on the standard of work and pupils response.

x. Regular meetings between the headteacher and individual teachers.

xi. Focused year group discussions at the conclusion of jointly planned work.

The Commonwealth Secretariat (1997a) identifies the headteacher’s role in managing the curriculum to include:

i. Adaptation and development of the school curriculum.

ii. Timetabling by marshalling teachers, teaching areas, finance and time to provide the greatest educational opportunities and alternatives to students.

iii. Organizing human, financial and material resources to support curriculum.

iv. Establishing a system of selecting and utilization of textbooks to allow for effective utilization of the books by students.

v. Establishing and maintaining libraries, media and low cost teaching aids to support curriculum implementation.

vi. Establishing an examination and testing criteria that allows for the assessment of all round capabilities of students.
Commenting on the role of the headteacher in organizing and managing the curriculum, Kavisi (2002) argues that the headteachers’ duties in this aspect include:

i. Giving directions to the school on how to offer a suitable, approved and diversified curriculum in accordance to circularized guidelines from the Ministry of Education and supporting organizations.

ii. Causing teacher’s preparations of schemes of work and development of appropriate instructional materials especially teaching aids.

iii. Checking appropriately pupils’ exercise books, projects, practical work, assignments and continuous assessment scripts to ensure regular marking.

iv. Teaching lessons on the school timetable to get to know what goes on in the classroom.

v. Visiting, observing, and keeping records of learning sessions in classrooms, laboratories, workshops, etc.

vi. Setting the pace and directing the drawing up of schedules for operations in the school thereby ensuring rationalized use of school time.

vii. Convening and conducting regular staff meetings at least twice per school term.

viii. Participating in school co-curriculum activities.

ix. Holding information meetings with staff and students.

x. Ensuring that students are adequately prepared, registered and presented for internal assessments and national examinations.
On the overall, it suffices to say that the role of the headteacher in the management of change in the curriculum and instruction task area involves articulating the school curriculum, aims and objectives, delegating and coordinating curriculum implementation plus monitoring and evaluation. This summation on curriculum and instruction is buttressed by findings of a study that established that the most pervasive problems and issues related to the role of the headteacher were concerned with curriculum and instruction leadership, Di Paola and Tschennannen-Moran (2003:7). The Di Paola and Tschennannen’s (2003:7) study done in Virginia, USA, further established that within curriculum and instruction specific concerns were: student achievement on standardized tests, effective use of instructional time, classroom practice, faculty and staff development and curriculum alignment. This study in part sought to establish and clarify how management of change in the curriculum and instruction task area is handled by public secondary school principals in Kenya.

2.4.2 Management of Student Personnel Services

The prominence of student personnel services as a management task is due to the realization that effective teaching and learning depends on the understanding of pupil’s interests, aspirations and personal characteristics. According to Hummel and Bonham (1968:21-25), student personnel services are hinged on nine foci;

i. The problem centred focus; to assist students with societal and educational problems.
ii. Selection and placement focus; to assist students in making decisions about tertiary education.

iii. Adjustment focus; to pay attention to students’ norm building and limit maladjustment.

iv. Vocational educational focus; to cater for students vocational and educational choices as a developmental process that is lifelong.

v. Developmental task focus; to orient the student to his age group rather than orienting the student specifically to the vocational education needs of the school and the society.

vi. Service focus; for the purpose of establishing various specialized offices and directing students to them.

vii. Mental hygiene focus; to oriented teachers to perceive children as themselves so that the classroom environment is appropriate for student learning.

viii. Everybody is a student worker focus; to enhance interdependence among teachers and other stakeholders in student welfare services.

ix. Planned co-ordinative focus; to optimize all services rendered to all students.

In general student personnel services supplement general curriculum and the headteacher’s role is to integrate the personnel services into teaching and learning. Services that are provided in a school under student personnel include guidance and counseling, psychological services, school social work, school health, attendance
services, speech and hearing services, child accounting, student appraisal, remedial learning and special education.

2.4.3 Management of Finances and Income Generating Activities

Mbamba (1992:165) has defined management of finances as “the operation whereby an organization ensures that available funds are used for the achievement of its objectives”. The headteacher’s responsibility in financial management has two dimensions: sourcing of funds and utilization of the funds. In the event of short falls, the headteacher analyses alternative courses of action available then picks on the best.

The Commonwealth Secretariat (1997b) asserts that for prudent management of school finances headteachers need sufficient knowledge of the following:

i. Identification of the various sources of funds and mobilizing skills.

ii. School budgeting.

iii. Basic legal framework and mechanism of financial management.

iv. Expending and accounting for school finances.

v. Auditing school account books.

On the other hand, Gole (1999:39) identifies six concerns for headteachers in the management of finances. These are:

i) Preparing budget estimates.

ii) Strategies for fund-raising.
iii) Cost sharing policy.

iv) Managing funds.

v) Developing transparent financial systems.

vi) Personal emoluments for support staff.

In his examination of the financial management task in the Kenyan context, Okumbe (2001:17) identifies four sub-tasks that should be of concern to headteachers. These are:

(i) Understanding the sources of revenue for the school by keeping abreast of funding shifts and revisions in qualifications for funding from the government and the donor community.

(ii) Preparation of the school budget which involves budgetary proposal analysis, modification and ratification.

(iii) Monitoring expenditure in the light of the approved budget, which involves appropriate record keeping, accounting and auditing procedures.

(iv) Management of services of non-certified personnel, which includes travel and transport services, insurance and legal advice.

This study considered the management tasks that headteachers undertake in managing school finances and reports on the kind of changes that headteachers had initiated in this area. Of interest also were the activities that the headteachers had undertaken to augment school revenue shortfall occasioned by fees defaulters.
2.4.4 Management of Staff Personnel

The headteacher takes charge of both the teaching staff and support staff. Commitment of all cadres of staff is crucial to the success of the school. Mantep (1995:192) has identified nine areas of concern to the headteacher under the staff personnel task namely:

i. Selection and recruitment of staff with specific emphasis on the support staff.

ii. Wage and salary structure under which salaries for support staff are considered taking into account the government’s minimum wage guidelines, time and effort required to accomplish the job effectively, the kind of technical or professional knowledge, skills and experience required to perform the job and the need to cope with economic changes.

iii. Promotions.

iv. Health and safety.

v. In-service education and training.

vi. General personnel welfare issues.

vii. Termination of service, dismissal and retirement particularly of support staff.

viii. Discipline.

ix. Fringe benefits.

According to the Commonwealth Secretariat (1997c) there are seven concerns considered vital for headteachers in staff management namely:

i. Staff selection specifically non teaching staff.
ii. Staff development through the identification of training needs, planning and implementing in house training programmes, and evaluating the outcomes of such trainings.

iii. Staff motivation through the identification and appropriate use of factors that enhance or weaken levels of motivation.

iv. Carrying out appraisals and making follow ups.

v. Implementing effective techniques of staff supervision and discipline.

vi. Keeping of staff records.

vii. Managing of meetings to effectively plan for school activities, solve problems, and build team work.

A further exposition on the expected roles of headteachers for effective management of staff is provided by Kavisi (2002:6) as:

i. Delegation of responsibilities to the deputy headteacher, heads of departments, senior teachers and teachers.

ii. Welcoming and inducting new teachers and non teaching staff.

iii. Supervising, appraising and preparing staff appraisal reports.

iv. Ensuring that self discipline is cultivated, nurtured and maintained among staff and students in the school.

v. Creating an environment for staff training and development through induction, orientation, attachment and transfer of responsibilities.

vi. Motivating staff.
vii. Encourage staff participation in professional organizations.

Apart from issues raised in Section 2.4.3 connection to management of change in the staff personnel task area, this study also focused on how headteacher dealt with issues such as shortage of teachers, shortage of staff houses, staff motivation and staff appraisal.

2.4.5 Management of School Community Relations

This task area has the dual purpose of obtaining and maintaining community support for school programmes and of ensuring that the community is fully involved in the activities of the school. According to SEDL (2004:3), if schools are to be successful in providing success for all students, especially those at risk, parents and other members of the community must be involved in the school improvement efforts.

Achola (1994) has identified three types of relations between the school and the community. First is what he refers to as “isolationist” relations in which both the school and community have very little interaction. Second is what he calls “uneasy mutual accommodation” in which the school and the community interact in circumstances that neither of them can avoid for instance fees payment or disciplinary cases. This kind of relationship ranges from hostility to lukewarm acceptance. The third type of relationship is “cooperation and exchange”, under which the community see the school as theirs and has a keen interest in whatever goes in there. On the other hand, the school staff appreciates the community. Headteachers thus strive to nurture cooperation and exchange between the school and the community.
Enhancing mutual school community relations can be done through five sub-tasks as established by Okumbe (2001:18). These sub-tasks are;

i. Assisting the community to contrast its current sense of what schools do and ought to do with other conceptions of education.

ii. Interpreting the educational programme to the community.

iii. Working closely with the representatives of the community.

iv. Working with other non-governmental organizations involved with the health of the community and the youth.

v. Enabling the staff to understand and appreciate the community.

Ouso (2000) observes that mutual existence between the school and the community can be perpetuated through guided use of school facilities by the community, school participation in communal activities such as soil conservation and the involvement of the community in school planning and management. Working on the premise that the school is part of the community of its location, the study identified the kind of changes that headteachers had initiated in their respective schools in order to co-exist with the community.

2.4.6 Management of School Physical Resources

Schools need adequate physical resources without which teaching and learning would be difficult. Mantep (1995:210-211) classifies physical resources into four types namely:
i. Land; this is the ground owned as property by the school. Availability of land
would enable the school to expand, plan for new facilities, and even improve the
school environment. Fencing or planting of trees should demarcate school land.
Title deeds should be secured and safely kept.

ii. Buildings are those that have been constructed for the purposes of enhancing
teaching and learning. They include classrooms, libraries, laboratories,
workshops, teachers’ houses, stores, toilets and kitchen. Buildings require repairs
and periodic renovations.

iii. Machinery and equipment referring to those items that are used to produce teaching
and learning materials, transportation of students and staff, cleaning the school
compound, and carrying out economic activities such as farming. Machinery and
equipment should be used carefully to avoid damage. Proper repair and
maintenance should be undertaken to ensure longevity.

iv. Furniture and teaching materials, these are indispensable in facilitating teaching
and learning. Teaching materials include books, science kits, chalkboard and
charts. Quick repair and immediate replacement for lost items should be
undertaken.

Okumbe (2001:16) highlights the responsibility of the headteacher in the management of
physical facilities as:

i. Diligent site of the school plant and facilities.

ii. Maintenance and repair of school plant and facilities.
iii. Enhancing cleanliness in classrooms, dormitories, halls, eating areas and within surrounding environment.


v. Enhancing health and safety concerns through appropriate school plant design, maintenance and repair.

The headteacher’s manipulation of physical resources should be regulated by legal instruments such as building regulations as stated in the Building Code, the Education Standard Buildings Regulations (MoW), 1974 and minimum health standards as provided by the Public Health Act, (Cap. 242). Proper record keeping showing total physical resources in the school should also be ensured by the headteacher.

2.4.7 Management of General Administrative Procedures

General administrative procedures refer to what MEC and CIDA (1990:55) term as the process of taking “… total control of teachers and learners through which material resources like equipment are made available and used effectively by both teachers and pupils in order to accomplish school objectives as regards teaching and learning”.

Included in the general administrative tasks are undertakings such as;

i. Keeping of administrative records in the log book, and attendance register.

ii. Management of meetings for example staff meetings, BoG meetings, PTA, co-curriculum, departmental, professional, and disciplinary and school assessment meetings.
iii. Human relations with emphasis on the intra school community.

Campbell and Neil (1994) identify administrative tasks of school headteachers as being inclusive of report writing, discipline and guidance activities and parent consultation. In handling general administrative procedures, the headteacher should therefore be able to demonstrate knowledge of theory and practice of the factors that enhance good teaching and learning practices.

2.5 Related Researches

The Rand study of 1975 undertaken in USA is considered as one of the earliest systematic studies of educational change (McLaughlin, 1990). The study looked at federal funded educational projects and described the role of the federal policy and local responses as well as actual improvements that took place in school practices. The findings of the Rand study dispelled the assumption that policy set at the federal level improved local school strategies and outputs. Fifteen years later, McLaughlin (ibid) revisited the Rand study and noted that some findings of the original study still endured. The findings are: firstly, that policy cannot mandate what matters, local capacity and local will are what matter most for achieving educational outcomes. Secondly in the management of educational change, local variability is the rule; uniformity is the exception. The setting of the Randy study was not Kenyan but the underlying assumption prior to the study that educational change has to be centrally mandated is strongly held in
the Kenyan psyche. This study examined the Kenyan case of educational change management by focusing on changes that would take place at the school level.

Leithwood and Duke (1999) concentrated on views and articles on educational leadership published in four major administration journals between 1985 and 1995. From their findings, they recommended that school leadership dimensions should be viewed from a perspective that focuses on the connections among leaders, followers and organizations outside the environment. Leithwood and Duke’s (Ibid) recommendations thus gave credence to this study whose focus is on the school headteacher and the way he/she interacts with other stakeholders to initiate educational change. At the same time the relevance of the social systems theory that was adopted by this study to examine all school sub sectors in change management was fortified.

Research findings on the theme of respondents’ perceptions similar to the current have enriched the academia and informed educational policy and practice from different stand points. For instance, Maritim’s (1983) research on the dependence of ‘O’ level and ‘A’ Level results on the sex of the examinees in Kenya emphasized the importance of perception in examining learning and academic performance. Mulambula (2000) examined teachers and students’ perception of educational evaluation and academic performance in secondary schools and made valuable recommendations on relationships between perception of evaluation and academic performance. Goldberg and Mark (2001) synthesized forty three interviews with educational leaders of all types including
principals and teachers then concluded that ‘leaders have bedrock beliefs that inspire and guide their words and actions. The beliefs differed from leader to leader spanning from ideological spectrum but there was always a conviction that their ideas mattered and could make a difference.

Von Brock’s (1962) study on the role of perceptions of superintends and principals in the state of Illinois found that role perceptions of superintendents and high school principals did not agree always on the role of each other. This implied that there was need to hear each of the parties on how they perceived their roles. The headteacher as implied by Berk (2005) in a survey of twelve strategies to measure teachers effectives should be heard from his/her own perspective. Berk (2005:52) argues that that:

Self - evaluation is an important source of evidence to consider in formative and summative decisions; faculty input on their teaching completes the triangulation of the three direct observation sources of teaching performance: the students, peers and the self

In a study done in Kenya, Karagu (1982:209), established that secondary school headteachers and teachers differed significantly in their perceptions of the role of the secondary school headteacher and in a forthright recommendation he states;

The conceptions of the role behaviour of the school headteacher needs to be examined for consistency, clarification and for better understanding.

This study was premised on the proposition that headteachers’ perceptions matter in the management of school-based change and the findings are an attempt to fill the gaps alluded to by scholars reviewed before.
Kemp and Kemp’s (1992) manual on managing change and development on the basis of projects carried out in the United Kingdom, Hong Kong and Thailand influenced the construction of the research instrument of this study. Kemp and Kemp (ibid) generated one hundred and thirty seven items covering seven major themes for school-based review and development. These items have been corroborated and amended in line with other studies on the management task areas of secondary school headteachers. As a result, twenty items were adopted and incorporated in research questionnaire.

2.6 Implications of the Literature Review

It was apparent in the literature reviewed that school-based educational change is irretrievably intertwined with headteachers’ management task areas. Several theoretical approaches to the study of educational change were examined and their relevance to the study pointed out. The literature reviewed established that there is no convergence of thought on identification and application of headteachers’ management task areas in Kenya and globally. Notwithstanding the diversion of thought, seven key headteachers’ management task areas namely general administrative procedures, management of school physical resources, school community relations, staff personnel, finance and income generating activities, student personnel services and curriculum and instruction were then adapted for the study. The review of literature lucidly pointed out gaps in studies so far done on school-based management and more cogently it revealed that research on the role perception of headteachers in the management of school-based change is glaringly missing. The findings of this study are, therefore, a purposed attempt to bring to fore
thoughts of headteachers on their role in management of school-based change. The results are also a bridge to the evident dearth of knowledge on management of school-based change in Kenya.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter covers the following sub-topics: research design, study population, sampling procedures, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

This study was conducted using a descriptive survey design. The use of descriptive surveys has been supported by scholars of educational related researches including Verm and Beard (1981), Robson (1993), Cohen and Lawrence (1995) and Mugenda and Mugenda (2003).

According to Verm and Beard (1981:59), a descriptive survey study has the following advantages:

a) It is an effective way of collecting data from large sources relatively cheaply and in a short time and
b) It produces valid and reliable generalizations.

Commenting on the advantages of a descriptive survey Robson (1993:128-129) says:

a) It provides for a relatively simple and straightforward approach to the study of values, attitudes, beliefs and motives.
b) It may be adopted for the collection of generalizable information from almost any human population.
c) It is the only, or the easiest, way of retrieving information about the past history of a large set of people.

d) It allows anonymity, which can encourage frankness when sensitive areas are involved.

Asserting the suitability of descriptive surveys in a research, Cohen and Lawrence (1995) argue that descriptive surveys gather data at a particular point in time with the intention of describing the nature of the existing conditions, or identifying standards against which existing conditions can be compared. In the same vein, Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) point out that a survey is an attempt to collect data from members of a population in order to determine the current status of that population with respect to one or more variables. Elaborating further on descriptive surveys, Good (1964: 244) notes that the goals of a descriptive survey include:

a) To secure evidence concerning all existing situations or current conditions.

b) To identify standards or norms with which to compare present conditions in order to plan the next step.

c) To determine how to take the next step having determined where we are and where we wish to go.

According to Kitainge and Ng’ang’a (2007), the main purpose of a descriptive survey is to provide quantitative and numeric descriptions of some part of the population that can be generalized. The foregoing reasons suited very well with the purpose of this study as
earlier stated in section 1.3 and hence the usage of a descriptive survey design to fulfill set research objectives.

3.3 Study Locale

3.3.1 Geographical Location

The study was carried out in Western Province of Kenya. Western Province is one of Kenya’s seven administrative provinces outside Nairobi. It borders Uganda to the West, Nyanza Province to south and Rift Valley Province to the North East. Farming is the main economic activity in the province.

Administratively Western Province had a total of seven districts (See Appendix 4) at the time of the study. The seven were Busia, Butere-Mumias, Bungoma, Kakaemega, Lugari, Mt. Elgon, Teso and Vihiga. Busia District was divided in four divisions namely Budalangi, Butula, Funyula, and Matayos. Busia District had twelve educational zones at the time of the study. Butere-Mumias District was divided into five divisions (Butere, Khwisero, Matungu, Mumias, South Wanga) and eight educational zones. Bungoma district had ten divisions (Bumula, Chwele, Kanduyi, Kimilil, Malakisi, Nalondo, Ndivisi, Sirisia, Tongaren, Webuye) and a total of twenty five educational zones. Kakamega district had seven divisions (Ikolomani, Ileho, Kabras, Lurambi, Municipality, Navakholo, and Shinyalu) and twenty two educational zones. Lugari district had three divisions (Lugari, Likuyani, and Matete). Educational zones in Lugari were eight. Mt Elgon district was made up of four divisions (Cheptais, Kapsokwony, Kaptam and
Kopsiro) with twelve educational zones. Teso district had four divisions (Amagoro, Amukura, Angurai, and Chakol) with a total of five educational zones. Vihiga district had a total of seven divisions (Chavakali, Emuhaya, Luanda, Sabatia, Tiriki East, Tiriki West, and Vihiga) with eighteen educational zones. Distribution of public secondary schools in each of the districts at the time of this study was as shown in Figure 3.3.1

Table 3.3.1 Distribution of Public Secondary Schools per District in Western Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of Public Secondary Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bungoma</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kakamega</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vihiga</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Butere - Mumias</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Busia</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lugari</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mt. Elgon</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teso</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>496</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Provincial Education Office, Kakamega (For Number of Public Secondary Schools in Western Province)

### 3.3.2 Reasons for the Choice of Study Location

The researcher decided to conduct the study in Western Province of the Republic of Kenya for four reasons:

1. It was evident from reviewed literature that educational research in western province was scanty compared to other provinces such as Nairobi and Central.
2. Western Province had all categories of secondary schools: Boarding –day, urban –rural, and single sex- mixed secondary schools. The researcher was of the opinion
that a study of Western Province would provide a national outlook and also allow the findings to be generalized to other provinces.

iii. Ochieng (2000) identified Western Province as having the highest dropout rate (70%) due to low income, cultural practices and early pregnancies. Though this revelation mirrored much on the primary education sub-sector it had implications on the secondary school education and on how headteachers mitigated these challenges.

iv. Compared to other provinces in Kenya, Western province has been identified with dismal performance at the primary and secondary school levels in national examinations (Eshiwani, 2000).

v. There has been great concern about the contribution of school headteachers towards education standards in Western Province (Eshiwani, 1984, Cheloti, 1998 and Yator (2002). For instance in 1998 leaders of the province set up a provincial working committee (Kafu Committee) to establish the cause of declining education standards in the province and suggest possible solutions. The committee noted that "regrettably, there has been a drastic drop in the performance of schools in the province in national examinations", Kafu (1998:vi). The committee urged headteachers to seek answers to two basic questions first, on the kind of educational institution they wanted to develop and secondly the type of community they want to create out of their school (Kafu 1998: 1). These two basic questions were meant to prompt headteachers to evaluate their role as agents of change in their respective schools. Since then, there has been no follow up
study to establish views on how headteachers are managing change within their respective schools. It is in this context that Western Province was chosen for the study.

3.4 Sampling Procedures

According to Kothar (1985:187), sampling is important for a researcher for the following reasons:

a) Helps save time and money since it is usually less expensive than a census study and produces results at a relatively faster speed and

b) It enables the estimation of sampling errors thus allowing accurate collection of some characteristics of the population.

In this study, stratified random sampling and purposive sampling were used in identifying respondents. Various scholars have posited that stratified random sampling is acceptable when dealing with large populations that are not uniform (Mason 1978 and Gall et al., 1996). The universe population was stratified into four strata of boarding schools, day schools, single sex and mixed schools in the province. Respondents from within a given strata were picked by purposive sampling.

According to Kerlinger (1983) purposive sampling is necessary and unavoidable in behavioral sciences since it facilitates the provision of valuable data. The use of purposive sampling is given further support by Gall et al., (Ibid) who argue that within a
large geographical population, coupled with minimal research resources, a researcher could rightfully confine the sample to a section of the population.

To arrive at the target population, the researcher obtained a list of all public secondary schools in Western Province from the Provincial Education Office. The schools were then categorized per district and per school type within each district. Upon stratification and purposive sampling, the final number of respondents for the province was obtained from the summation of respondents per district as shown in Table 3.4.1

Table 3.4.1: Study Population and Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Actual valid Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bungoma</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kakamega</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vihiga</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Butere – Mumias</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Busia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lugari</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mt. Elgon</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teso</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>496</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Sample Size

Scholars, who have written on research methods (Kothari, 2000, Saleemi, 1997, Gall et al., 1996, Charles, 1988 and Kerlinger, 1998), have argued that an appropriate sample size depends upon factors relating to the subject under investigation, cost, time, representativeness, reliability, and flexibility. They further agree that a larger study
sample provides findings that are more representative of the study population. However, the ideal finite proportion of the sample to the universe is still contestable. According to Anderson (1988), ten to twenty percent of the population is considered acceptable for survey studies. McNeil (1990) cogently points out that if data were to be statistically analyzed, the study sample should be at least ten percent of the study population. Newman (2000) as quoted by Kitainge and Ng’ang’a (2007) shifts focus from working out sample sizes on percentages of the universe to the purpose of the study. He argues:

We can’t study every case of whatever we are interested in nor should we want to. Every scientific enterprise tries to find out something that will apply to everything of a certain kind by studying a few examples the results of the study being as we say “generalisable”

Having taken cognizance of the various scholarly views on sample size, this study has as rule of thumb pegged the study sample at thirteen percent of the study population as illustrated in Table 3.4.1.

3.6 Research Instrumentation

A School-based Change Management Questionnaire as shown in Appendix 1 was developed to collect data for this study. The questionnaire had three sections. Section A sought background information or biodata of respondents. Section B of the questionnaire sought to establish respondents’ disposition and general knowledge of the change process. In developing section B of the questionnaire the researcher adopted and adapted some items that were used by Kemp and Kemp (1992). Drawing heavily on theories and
ideas on change, Kemp and Kemp (Ibid) designed a handbook with practical guidelines, exercises and resource materials to enable schools and staff to take up the challenge of diagnosing individual and school needs in order to manage the change process in schools. Though the handbook was UK based, the relevant sections were adapted to the Kenyan situation.

Section C of the questionnaire ascertained changes that headteachers had introduced in their respective schools within the seven management task areas. The task areas are: general administration, management of finances and income generating activities, management of physical resources, management of curriculum and instruction, management of staff personnel, management of school community relations and management of student services.

3.7 Pre – testing of the research Instrument

Pre – testing of the research instrument was done prior to the study for purpose of enhancing its validity and reliability. Dane (1990:257) defines validity as “the extent to which a measure actually measures what it is supposed to measure”. Robson (1993:66) adds that; validity is concerned with whether the findings are really about what they appear to be. To ascertain the validity of the questionnaire, the researcher consulted experts in the Faculty of Education, Kenyatta University. Comments on the face validity and content validity were incorporated in the final research instruments.
Reliability has been defined by Mehrens and Lehmann (1984:267) as ‘the degree of consistency between two measures of the same thing’. The researcher focused on establishing the internal consistency of the research instrument by carrying out a pilot study involving a sample of headteachers from Nairobi was used. Questionnaires were presented to twenty headteachers and collected for computation of Pearson Product Moment correlation (r) using the spilt half method. According to Kerlinger (1983: 145) Product Moment Correlation (r) tells the magnitude and usually the direction of the relation.

The respondents’ questionnaires were numbered in an ascending order then divided in two folds of odd and even numbers. Odd numbers were marked X and even numbers marked Y. Analysis of (r) using the two folds of X and Y was done by excel computer package. The Spearman Brown Prophecy formula was applied to obtain a correlation of 0.7 (70%). The Spearman Brown Prophecy Formula is given by Siegle (2009) as:

\[
\text{Reliability of Scores on Total Test} = 2 \times \text{reliability for } \frac{1}{2} \text{ test} \\
1 + \text{reliability for } \frac{1}{2} \text{ test}
\]

The computed (r) of 0.7 was above the moderate value (0.4 – 0.6) as explained by Smith and Glass (1987). Charles (1988:167) argues that a correlation lower than 0.7 cannot be used to make accurate predictions. The questionnaire was hence considered reliable.

Piloting of the questionnaire assisted in phasing out some questions and restructuring others as a way of enhancing validity and reliability of the research questionnaire.
3.8 Administration of the Research Instrument

The process of administering research questionnaires began after getting clearance from my supervisors, the Dean School of Education (Appendix 2) and securing of a research permit from the Ministry of Education (Appendix 3). Two research assistants were recruited and given a one-day induction on data collection. The study questionnaire was then administered by the researcher with the help of the two research assistants.

3.9 Data Analysis

Data collected in relation to the research questions were analyzed by descriptive statistics. This involved the calculation of measures of variability and central tendency. Percentages were also used in data analysis for they are deemed suitable for large data. Peil (1982:187) acknowledges the suitability of using percentages in data analysis at certain levels like the case for this study when he states that, “below 15 to 20 cases, it is best not to report percentages, as they are likely to be more misleading than useful. The larger the sample, the more stable the percentages and the less the sampling error”.

In analyzing qualitative data that were captured by the study, the responses were initially organized in conceptual categories by open coding thus creating themes on the basis of the research questions. According to Neuman (2000:420,422), this approach of creating themes when analyzing quantitative data, “frees a researcher from entanglement in the details of the raw data and encourages higher level thinking” and also “brings (research) themes to the surface from deep inside the data”.
CHAPTER FOUR
PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the major findings of the study as they relate to each of the research questions. Earlier in chapter one, the independent and dependent variables for this study were identified and operationalized. Research questions for the study were also set out. The researcher restates the research questions for the study and then presents findings related to each research question in the subsequent sections of this chapter. The research questions were:

i. How do headteachers perceive their role in the management of school-based change?

ii. What is the nature of school-based educational change in Kenyan secondary schools?

iii. What is the nature of resistance to school-based changes in secondary schools?

iv. What measures have been designed by headteachers to minimize resistance to change?

v. What is the implication of headteachers’ perception of their role in management of school-based change to Kenya’s national education policy?

To allow for systematic presentation and analysis of the study findings as they relate to each of the research questions, this chapter has been organized under four thematic sections namely:
Section 1: Description of the study area and information on respondents.

Section 2: Headteachers disposition towards school-based change.

Section 3: School-based educational changes initiated by headteachers.

Section 4: Nature of resistance encountered by headteachers in implementing school based change and correctives strategies.

SECTION 1

4.2 Profile of Respondents

The data for this study were obtained from headteachers of public secondary schools from Western Province of Kenya. The province was made up of seven (7) districts with a total of four hundred and ninety six (496) public secondary schools. The distribution of schools per district vis a vis the actual respondents for the study is as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Distribution of Public Secondary Schools per District in Western Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Actual Respondents</th>
<th>Valid Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Bungoma</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kakamega</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Vihiga</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Butere - Mumias</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Busia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lugari</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mt. Elgon</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teso</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher targeted thirteen percent of the study population. The rationale for the thirteen percent has been previously justified in chapter three of this thesis. In total, eighty (80) questionnaires were administered by the researcher with the help of two research assistants. Seventy - five (75) questionnaires were returned for analysis. Out of the seventy five questionnaires, sixty four (64) questionnaires were vetted and found duly completed for analysis. This gave a valid completion rate of eighty five (85) percent. Fifteen (15) percent of returned questionnaires were not used in the final analysis because they were judged incomplete.

4.2.1 Respondents

The researcher asked respondents four demographic questions with regard to; teaching qualifications, age group, gender, and administrative experience. For all the questions, frequencies and percentages were calculated and presentations illustrated by frequency and percentage tables. Details on the respondents are presented in Sections 4.2.2 to 4.2.5 that follow.

4.2.2 Teaching Qualifications

As shown in Table 4.2, a vast majority 46(71.9%) of the respondents were headteachers who held a Bachelors of Education (B.Ed) degree. A significant proportion 13(20.3%) of the headteachers in the study were holders of either SI or Diploma in Education. The least proportion 5(7.8%) of headteachers comprised BA or BSc. degrees holders who complemented their degrees with a postgraduate diploma in education (PGDE).
Table 4.2: Teaching Qualifications of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B/Ed</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip/SI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/B.Sc with PGDE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Respondents’ Age

Table 4.3 highlights the age distribution of respondents. A noted revelation on the age of headteachers in the study sample was that majority 24 (37.5%) were aged between 40 and 44 years followed by those aged between 35 and 39 years 20(31.3%). A sizeable proportion 17(26.6%) was aged 45 years and above. Not surprising was the indication that only 3(4.7%) of the respondents were aged between 30 and 34 years. This could partly be attributed to restricted recruitment of fresh graduates in the public secondary schools by the government in nearly a decade.

Table 4.3: Distribution of Respondents by Age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (Years)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 – 44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 yrs and above</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.4 Respondents by Gender and School Type

In terms of gender, the highest proportion, 43 (70.3%) of headteachers in the study were male as shown in Table 4.4. Female headteachers made up 19 (29.9%) of the respondents. This gender revelation in the study sample where males outnumber females in school headship is consistent with other findings such as Onyango, (2001) who has pointed out that the number of females in school leadership positions is lower than that of males.

On the other hand, sixty seven percent of the schools in the study sample were mixed day. The other school types with the second highest presence in the study were girls boarding and mixed day and boarding both at 9.4%.

Table 4.4: Distribution of Respondents by Gender and School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls Boarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.5 Respondents by Administrative Experience

Analysis of data on the basis of administrative experience revealed that more than three quarters 39(60.9%) of the respondents had been headteachers for less than five years as shown in Table 4.5. Twenty three point three percent of the study sample had been in secondary school headship for six to tens years, while a marginal 2(3.3%) and 1(1.7%) were in school headship for between eleven and fifteen years and over twenty years respectively.

Table 4.5: Distribution of Respondents by Years of Administrative Experience as Head Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (Years)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unspecified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 yrs and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from establishing demographic details of headteachers as has been explained in the preceding sections of this chapter, this study was also interested in establishing headteachers’ dispositions towards educational change. The review of literature in
chapter two of this thesis had established that leadership is pre-eminent in the initiation and implementation of school-based educational change.

Findings of this study on how the headteacher perceived his/her role in the management of school-based change are the focus of this chapter. In the sections that follow the first question of the research study is addressed. The question was: *How do headteachers perceive their role in the management of school-based change?*

**SECTION 2**

**4.3 Headteachers Self Perception of their ability to carry out School-based Change**

According to Prosci (2008), the ability of a change agent succeeding in initiating, implementing and sustaining change is determined by how the agent can build, motivate, lead and communicate his ideas with the staff/team.

To determine headteachers’ self perception of their ability to lead school-based change in their respective schools they were asked to respond to twenty-three variables designed on a Likert scale with the anchor words being Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Undecided, Agree, and Agree Strongly. Although the variables were randomly distributed on the research questionnaire during the analysis stage, the variables were clustered into their predetermined subgroups for analysis. The four subgroups namely; team building ability that had eight variables, personal motivation and initiative had six variables, leadership management had five variables and effective communication had
four variables. These variables constituted section two of the administered research questionnaire. Findings on these variables are presented in sections 4.3.1 to 4.3.4 that follow.

4.3.1 Team Building Ability

Table 4.6 summarises findings pertaining to team leadership management practices pursued by headteachers in their respective schools. The results show that a great proportion of headteachers 38(62.3%) encouraged creative conflict that seldom degenerated into interpersonal conflict that could threaten teamwork in their schools. On the contrary, a lesser proportion 19(31.2%) of the headteachers either disagreed or disagreed very strongly that creative conflicts were encouraged in their schools. These results suggest that a significant proportion of schools still remained largely conservative with administrative structures that allow the headteacher to coalesce other staffs towards his/her suggested direction.

In relation to staff participation, an absolute majority of headteachers 60(95.3%) indicated that all staff in their schools were involved at one time or another in sensing needs and potential problems that faced their schools. This finding is a pointer to the fact that a majority of schools in the study practised an all inclusive approach to the general management of their respective institutions.
Table 4.6: Headteachers’ Ratings for Team Building Management Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Creative conflict is encouraged and seldom degenerate to the level of</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal conflict</td>
<td>11.5**</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) All staff are involved at one time or another in sensing needs and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential problems</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Careful and thorough planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Appropriate in-service/training of staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Realistic time scale for preparation and implementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Adequate provision of resources for change/innovation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) I ensure that new ideas of proved worth are fully incorporated into</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the fabric of the school so that they can be absorbed by all</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) There is a concern for value or quality in innovation rather than</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>novelty for its own sake or as status symbol</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Ratings  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD%</th>
<th>D%</th>
<th>U%</th>
<th>A%</th>
<th>AS%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upper values * represent count, Lower values** represent percentage

The involvement of the teaching staff as a precursor to successfully initiation and implementation as established by this research finds support in the argument of Nhundu (2005:22) that:

… for educational reform to reach the ‘Shop floor’ teachers must be involved in all decisions that have implications for teaching and learning,… they cannot play their role effectively as change agents without participating in decisions that affect professional practice.
In regard to planning for educational change, an absolute majority of headteachers 62(98.4%) in the study indicated that their schools conducted careful and thorough planning. This would imply that the concerns and interests of all staff are taken into consideration when planning school activities. Moreover the indication that there is careful planning for change implies that unique needs of stakeholders are catered for.

Closely related to thorough planning for educational change was the finding that staff in schools are in - serviced or trained in anticipation to an impending change within the school. Indeed, a majority of headteachers 58(92.1%) were positive that their schools extended or facilitated access to in - service training of their staff. Another positive team management attribute of headteachers was the revelation that most of them 58(92.0%) allocated realistic time scale for preparation and implementation of programmes that were planned for. This implies that among the schools under study, teachers were not coerced to support change but time was provided for full conceptualization of the entire process and envisaged outcomes.

A dramatic finding of the study was the establishment that most of the headteachers 56(88.9%) provided adequate resources for change and innovation. It was anticipated by the researcher that provision of resources was a major impediment to initiation of change at the school level. Limited intermittent funding schools received from the government had been projected to be inadequate for changes that could be initiated by headteachers. What can be said of this finding could be the fact that most headteachers were able to fix
changes within the abilities of their school budgets and also congregate staff efforts around these initiatives. A minority of only 6(9.5%) of the headteachers were an exception by being unable to provide the kind of resources that their projects needed.

In relation to importation of new ideas to their schools, a big percentage 62(98.4%) of headteachers in the study, indicated that only new ideas of proved worth were fully incorporated into the fabric of their schools so that they could be absorbed by all. The findings of this also revealed that an overwhelming majority 57(90.4%) of headteachers, were concerned with the value or quality derived from an innovation rather than novelty for its own sake or as status symbol in their schools. This finding indicates that there were deliberate attempts by most schools to employ careful adoption of innovations in so far as they added quality to the outcomes of different management practices within the various task areas.

To sum up on headteachers self perception of their team building management practices in relation to the initiation of school-based educational change, a majority of them 57(88.1%) reported having implemented different team building practices supportive of change. Section 4.3.2 that follows examines headteachers self perceptions as they relate to personal initiative and motivation to initiate school-based changes.
4.3.2 Personal Motivation and Initiative

According to the findings of this study (Table 4.7), virtually all headteachers in the study reported being open-minded to new ideas and practices. Most of the headteachers 51(83.6%) were willing to challenge assumptions which underpinned existing structures and practices rather than perpetuate systems that were no longer useful or relevant to their schools. They could take initiative and guide others.

Table 4.7: Headteachers’ Ratings for Personal Motivation and Initiative Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Am open minded about new ideas and practices</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Staff in the school are willing to challenge assumptions which underpin existing structures and practices rather than perpetuate systems that are no longer useful or relevant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I deliberately seek and try out new ways of doing things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) There is a willingness on the part of staff to evaluate our purposes as well as processes and results</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Am able to admit my mistakes in a miscarried change effort</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Am able to learn from my mistakes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Ratings: 1.6% 5.7% 4.8% 46.9% 46.9%

Upper values * represent count, Lower values ** represent percentage

A majority 57(90.5%) as shown in Table 4.7 of the headteachers also acknowledged that they are able to acknowledge their mistakes in cases where intended change does not materialise. Thus, headteachers in this study showed a strong personal motivation and
initiative in spearheading change within their schools. This finding reflects the assertion by Peterson (1995) that ‘school leaders shape the school culture through their actions, words and deeds.’

It could be due to the acknowledgement of the cardinal role of the school headteacher in leading school-based change that 5(8.2%) respondents said that their staff simply conformed to the existing structures and practices. This could imply that teachers didn’t question school headship as regards to change initiatives and as such headteachers were called upon to make suitable decisions for their schools.

An overwhelming majority of headteachers 60(96.7%) reported that they deliberately sought and tried new ways of doing things. This is a pointer to widespread innovative and entrepreneurial approach to management by headteachers. Although a few headteachers 4(6.5%) could not determine if their staff were able to evaluate the schools’ purposes as well as processes and results of change initiatives, in a majority of the schools 58(93.5%) staff had the will to carry out such evaluations. While a majority of respondents 57(90.5%) indicated that they were able to admit their failed attempts at change, an even higher proportion of respondents 62(98.4%) reported that they were able to learn from their mistakes. These findings imply that most school heads were capable of adjusting interventions to meet the emerging needs of their respective schools. On the overall most headteachers (93.8%) were in agreement that either themselves or their staff employed personal motivation or initiative in daily running of the schools.
4.3.3 Leadership Ability

As shown in Table 4.8, a vast majority of headteachers 62(98.4%) kept in touch with ways in which colleagues in other schools were trying out new ideas. Similarly, a majority 58(92.1%) of headteachers had established monitoring systems to provide feedback on what was happening during the process of change implementation. One of the headteachers noted that, “I keep track of the changes to ensure that I get results”. This indicates that most of the headteachers acted as stewards of the changes that they had initiated. A minority of headteachers 2(3.2%) had not established monitoring systems of tracking progress on initiated changes.

Table 4.8: Headteachers’ Ratings for Leadership Management Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) I keep in touch with ways in which colleagues in other schools are trying out new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Monitoring systems which provide feedback on what is happening during the process of change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I try out experimental or pilot projects to assess their worth or feasibility before implementation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Succession planning is well managed. I ensure HODs have prepared subject teachers and other staff so that they can be active partners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Value and quality underpins the justification for systems or practices which remain unchanged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Ratings: 2.4% 5.6% 7.7% 56.2% 30.7%

Upper values * represent count, Lower values** represent percentage
On piloting of projects prior to implementation, the study established that most headteachers 40(63.5%) tried out experimental or pilot projects to assess their worth or feasibility before eventually implementing them. Succession planning was well-managed with 57(90.5%) reporting that they ensured that heads of departments prepared subject teachers and other staff so that they could be actively involved in managing change initiatives. The findings of this study ties up with other findings like that of Louis and Miles (1990) as quoted by Peterson (1995) who have argued that planning for change is vital to the success of any programme. “Substantial change programs” they argue, cannot run themselves, “they need active orchestration and coordination”.

Besides planning for change, a majority of school headteachers in the study 55(90.2%) indicated that value and quality underpinned the justification for systems or practices which remained unchanged in their schools. Therefore, an institutional culture that promoted success remained unchanged even if headteachers were transferred. This could explain why some secondary schools have been excelling in academics, sports and discipline over the years.

In general, findings of this study on self perception of headteachers in leading school-based change are congruent to other scholars such as Zimbalist (2001) who have advocated for the incumbency of strong leadership in successful change management.
4.3.4 Effective Communication Abilities

As illustrated in Table 4.9, study findings on how headteachers perceived themselves as effective communicators of change indicated that a majority 60(94.2%) of them had established an effective and efficient communication network in their schools. There was communication between those assigned to carryout change and the school management in virtually all the schools in the study. Similarly almost all the school heads 62(98.4%) reported that staff was aware of what was happening in different parts of the system through effective communication channels, both formal and informal.

Table 4.9: Headteachers’ Rating of Communication Practices Initiated in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) There is an effective and efficient communication (network) and co-coordinating structures to help action needs or problems when identified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Consulting with those assigned to carry out the change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Staff are aware of what is happening in different parts of the system through effective communication channels, both formal and informal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Leaders in the school inform and protect staff facing rapid and turbulent change by communicating a coherent view of coming changes which help put them in perspective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Ratings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upper values * represent count, Lower values** represent percentage
On the overall, most headteachers 59(96.9%) had implemented different but effective communication practices within their schools. This is a pointer that most schools in the study viewed effective communication as vital to the management of school-based change.

4.3.5 Summary on Headteachers Self Perception of Their Abilities

This section considered headteachers’ perceptions of their role in the management of school-based change. The findings were discussed under four clusters considered critical to the management of school-based change. The four are: team-building, personal motivation and initiative, leadership management and effective communication. The results reflect a positive self perception of headteachers as agents of change at the school level. This ought to be welcome findings for all educational stakeholders who have entrusted headteachers with the taunting task of moulding youngsters.

SECTION THREE

4.4. School-based Changes Introduced by Headteachers

As discussed in chapter two of this thesis, headteachers’ core functions revolve around seven management task areas. The seven are; general administration, management of finances and income generating activities, management of physical resources, curriculum and instruction, staff personnel, school community relations and management of student services. The subsequent sections of this thesis report on the findings from each of the seven task areas with regard to the research question: What is the nature of school-based educational change in Kenyan public secondary schools?
4.4.1 Changes in General Administration

The area of general administration touches on activities within the school that allow for smooth operation of day to day activities of the school. Findings from the study indicated that some of the key changes that were implemented by school heads within their schools in this area included:

i) Democratization of administrative processes.

ii) Delegation of duty and authority.

iii) Staff supervision.

iv) Termly activity plans.

v) Staff orientation.

vi) Controlled off-school breaks.

As shown in Table 4.10, the most common type of change in general administration was delegation of duty or authority by headteachers. This was implemented by 21(33.3%) of all the school heads. Another 13(20.6%) of school heads effected control over off school breaks by either excluding them from the school calendar or reducing their duration. Examples of changes in this area included elimination of weekend off-school walks and reduction of the half term duration.
Table 4.10: Outstanding Changes in General Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiated Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratization of administrative processes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of duty/authority</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff supervision</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termly activity plans</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation of new staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over off school breaks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey data

On the other hand, 10(15.9%) of school heads effected new changes in termly activity plans by reducing number of lessons per day from twelve to nine thus adjusting the school time table to give room for extracurricular and other related activities. The least change initiative under general administration was orientation of new teachers with only 1(1.6%) of headteachers reporting to have initiated it. It can be deduced from this finding that headteachers have not given much attention to orientation of new members of staff. This is an indicator that newly posted teachers often grapple with the school environment until they find their own level. This finding is similar to Crow’s (2007:54) revelation that teachers go through “traumatic first year experiences which involve management issues”.
Background Need for Changes in General Administration

Apart from establishing headteachers’ change initiatives in general administration, the study also sought to establish reasons advanced by headteachers for the changes they had initiated. As shown in Table 4.11, the most compelling background need for changes implemented by head teachers was that of teacher inefficiency 25(39.1%) followed by low student achievement 13(20.3%).

Table 4.11: Background need for changes in General Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher inefficiency/Work discipline</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low student achievement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of proper student-staff interaction</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive management at the top</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High costs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Survey Data**

Other less commonly cited background needs that necessitated changes in general administration included lack of proper student - staff interaction 7(10.9%) and exclusive management practices at the top 6(9.4%). Headteachers anticipated that the changes introduced under general administration would lead to improved time management, greater efficiency in teaching, motivation and improved performance by students in national examinations.
4.4.2 Changes in Management of Finance and Income Generating Activities

The leading three most common changes that were effected in the management of finance and income-generating activities by headteachers were proper financial record keeping 23(38.3%), starting of Income Generating Activities (IGAs) 15(25%) and enhancing collection of fees 10(16.7%). As shown in Table 4.12, other less common changes in management of finances included cost cutting measures 6(10%), tendering for service provision 3(5%). The revelation that just one in ten schools reported having employed cost cutting measures presents two possibilities; first that most schools were probably still profligate and spent resources on non-essentials. Secondly another possible scenario would be that a majority of the schools were running on tight budgets and barely able to afford basics and therefore no further cost cutting measures could be implemented (i.e. further downward scaling on expenditure would compromise quality of education). In view of the observed profile of schools that took part in the study, the latter scenario would be the more plausible in explaining the financial position of most of the sampled schools.
Table 4.12: Outstanding Changes in Management of Finances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiated Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proper financial record Keeping</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting of IGAs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced fee collection</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost cutting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendering/other transparent processes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Background Need for Change in Management of Finances

As shown in Table 4.13, the leading background needs that elicited the kind of changes that school headteachers implemented in the management of finances include: wastage/embezzlement of fund/high debt burden 25(41.7%) by their predecessors, the urge to avoid effects of market price fluctuations 10(16.7%) by bulk buying, past bad debts owed to schools 8(13.3%). Changes implemented by the 25(41.7%) of school headteachers were probably in reaction to loss of funds owing to poor record keeping and possible unprioritized budgeting that led to schools acquiring overwhelming debts due to low fees collection. The 10(16.7%) headteachers who implemented changes to avoid market price fluctuations were mostly of boarding schools. They purchased food supplies and other seasonal school utilities whose prices were bound to fluctuate with time in the course of
the year; the strategy was to purchase adequate stocks of consumables like cereals when their prices were low – an approach that in itself would be cost-cutting.

Table 4.13: **Background need for changes in Management of Finance and Income Generation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wastage /embezzlement of funds/High debt burden</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding effects of market price fluctuation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad debts in the past</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stalled projects/lack facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate funds</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specified</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Survey Data**

The 8(13.3%) headteachers who initiated financial management changes due to bad debts represented a majority of public secondary schools that were faced with chronic fee payment-default rates capable of crippling key school functions. The issue of fees defaulting seems to be endemic in most secondary schools as pointed out by other findings such as Kafu 1999 and Onyango 2001. The schools, therefore reported that there is need to tighten fee collection processes.
Purpose of Changes in the Management of Finance and Income Generation

While the need to minimize cost appeared to be an overriding concern for one in every three of the headteachers as illustrated in Table 4.14, to other headteachers 14(23%) acting and being seen to be transparent was the driving force behind their chosen changes in the management of finances and IGAs. This lot of schools represents those that: opened bank accounts whose particulars were known to all stakeholders, formed tendering committees to ensure that tenders were awarded transparently and fairly, a move that would help in improving school-community relations. For the headteachers 18(29.5%) who undertook change in order to improve the schools’ financial base/reduce fund losses, their main concerns stemmed from the overall rising cost of running schools coupled with high fee payment default rates, inefficient resource management systems in schools that have led to misappropriation or loss of funds and poor budgetary systems.

Table 4.14: Distribution of Respondents by Purpose of Changes in Management of Finance and Income Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimizing costs /Cut on indebtedness</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving of school's financial base / Reduce fund losses</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency and accountability</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operation cost related benefits</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3 Changes in Management of Physical Resources

Provision of physical facilities for schools has been considered as the basis for technological development of any society (Kafu, 1999). Facilities identified as critical include classrooms, libraries, science laboratories, playfields, industrial workshops and computer laboratories. The current study sought to establish the kind of changes that headteachers had established in the management of physical resources. The analysis of headteachers’ responses as summarized in Table 4.15 shows that changes initiated by a significant proportion of headteachers vis a vis their predecessors included: maintenance and repair of facilities, inventory /record keeping, enhanced security systems and construction of learning facilities.

Table 4.15: Outstanding Change in Management of Physical Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiated Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and repair of facilities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory records</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced security systems</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Learning facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specified</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unspecified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data
Four out of ten headteachers in the study sample reported that changes in the management of physical resources were necessitated by high costs incurred owing to breakages/losses. Twenty six point six percent (26.6%) of the headteachers as shown in Table 4.16 reported that the prevailing inadequate facilities within their schools led to establishing of new ones.

Table 4.16: Background Need for Changes in the Management of Physical Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High costs due to breakages/losses</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of/inadequate facilities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degenerated facilities/Environment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor performance in sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: survey data**

Degenerated facilities and poor performance in science subjects were also the basis for changes in physical resources. Schools that probably had lacked science laboratories attributed their poor performance in science subjects to this fact. Thus, the construction of these facilities was a priority to them.
The most common purpose for which changes in the management of physical resources were effected was to minimize losses from breakages, wear/tear, and theft/pilferage of school property. To some headteachers 17(26.6%), there was an urgent urge to increase and improve the capacity of school facilities in response to an influx of students. For those headteachers that enhanced the outlook/appeal of their schools, the change targeted substandard or derelict structures through paintings and renovations to enhance the overall appeal of the school environment. This observation is a pointer to the possibility that students and parents are attracted to aesthetic being of schools.

4.4.4 Changes in Management of Curriculum and Instruction

Quality of curriculum and instruction offered in a school ought to be a top most priority for a school to attain excellence in academics. This study revealed (Table 4.17) that the most outstanding change in management of curriculum and instruction undertaken by headteachers was enhanced teacher supervision followed by purchase of teaching and learning materials, regular student assessment/evaluation and proper timetabling.
Table 4.17: Outstanding Change in Management of Curriculum and Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiated Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved teacher Supervision</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of T-L materials</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular student assessment / Evaluation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper timetabling</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisory services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Tuition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of qualified BOG teaching staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unspecified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Other changes in the management of curriculum and Instruction affairs that were regarded as outstanding by a marginal proportion of schools included: introduction of academic advisory services, remedial tuition to students and recruitment of qualified BoG teaching staff.

Purpose of Changes in Curriculum and Instruction.

When asked the purpose of undertaking changes in curriculum and instruction task area, an overwhelming majority 44(68.8%) of headteachers reported that they had instituted changes in order to cover the wide syllabus. This finding is a pointer that at least seven in ten schools had problems in completing the syllabus. It may further imply that schools
could be understaffed and the few teachers were overwhelmed by work. The later
observation may be corroborated with the selective and periodic recruitment policy by the
Teachers Service Commission. Among the respondents to the study, 9(14.1%) of them as
shown in Table 4.18 initiated changes so as to motivate staff and student. Another
5(7.8%) of headteachers organized remedial classes for slow and average learners.

Table 4.18: Purpose of Changes in Curriculum and Instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enable full coverage of syllabus/improve teacher effectiveness</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To motivate staff and students</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To take care of slow and average students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reduce staff loading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey data

According to 2(3.1%) of the headteachers changes in curriculum and instruction were
intended to reduce staff overloads. Such headteachers hired BoG teachers in response to
understaffing in their respective schools. Understaffing had led to disproportionately high
workload for the few staff.
Background Need for Changes in Curriculum and Instruction.

The leading background concern for which changes in curriculum and instruction were undertaken by headteachers was low syllabus coverage /inefficient staff as shown in Table 4.19. These schools were either understaffed, had poor timetabling approaches or simply lacked teacher efficiency monitoring culture to ensure productivity.

Table 4.19: Background Need for Change in Curriculum and Instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low syllabus coverage/inefficient staff</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor performance</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate T-L materials/resources</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

A total of 16(25%) of headteachers cited poor performance as a background need for initiating changes in curriculum and instruction. Such headteachers had initiated remedial classes, academic advisory services and regular student evaluation to help improve performance. Other reasons for initiating changes included inadequate teaching learning resources and inadequate staff.
4.4.5 Changes in Management of Staff Personnel

According to Orora (1998:62), there is need to always reflect on the reasons why men and women we have in our schools work. Finding the right answers as to why we have personnel in schools is a precursor to successful school management. This study sought to identify ways in which headteachers are managing their personnel.

The most outstanding change in the management of staff personnel that was implemented by most headteachers 18(28.1%) was delegation of authority as illustrated in Table 4.20. Other changes cited by headteachers included: motivation of staff, close supervision and participatory management.

Table 4.20: Changes in Management of Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiated Change</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegation /chain of command</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of staff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Staff supervision</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unspecified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data
Background Need for Change in Staff Personnel

Most headteachers 25(39.1%) cited inefficiency as the reason for initiating changes in personnel management. Other factors as shown in Table 4.21 that elicited change included; laxity among staff, low drive for work and poor performance. The headteachers reported that the need for effectiveness in service delivery was a priority concern for them.

Table 4.21: Background Need for Changes in Management of Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inefficiency</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laxity/low drive at work</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Purpose for Changes in Personnel Management

As shown in Table 4.22, a majority of the headteachers 30(46.9%) in the study purposed changes in the management of staff personnel to help increase staff efficiency and effectiveness. On the other hand, about one in every four schools 14(21.9%) targeted changes in this area in order to improve school performance. Similarly, 9(14.1%) of the headteachers in the study purposed in their changes, to enhance and improve the capacity of teachers in their respective schools.
Table 4.22: Purpose of Change in Management of Staff Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase staff efficiency/Effectiveness</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve school performance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

4.4.6. Changes in Management of School Community Relations

A good school headteacher should foster cooperation with the school community. When this does not happen, unnecessary conflicts between the school and the community will directly impact on the performance of the school. Most respondents 20(40.6%) in this study cited increased social responsibility of the school to the community as the most outstanding change that had been implemented to improve school community relations. Involvement of community members in school welfare matters was cited by about one in every three school headteachers. For some headteachers 9(14.1%) as shown in Table 4.23, joint social activities with the community was reported as an outstanding form of change that had been initiated. Such activities included environmental cleaning and sports.
Table 4.23: Outstanding Changes in School Community Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased social responsibility of the school to community</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving community members in school welfare matters</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint social activities with community</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Background Need for Change in School Community Relations

For headteachers that reported having implemented changes in the management of school-community relations, there were two leading background needs: lack of community support to the headteachers cited by 23(35.9%) and prevailing hostile/poor relations with the community 22(34.4%) as shown in Table 4.24. Six point three percent (6.3%) of the headteachers in the study cited insecurity as a background need for the changes they effected in school community relations. Such headteachers represent the proportion of schools that were faced with encroachment on their compounds by school community members. As a result of poor relations with, school community members did not find it their responsibility to protect school property.
Table 4.24: Background Need for Change in School Community Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of community support</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor relations with community</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Headteachers expected improved school-community relations, enhanced security and support for school activities by the local community to arise from the changes they had initiated.

4.4.7 Changes in Management of Student Services

Four outstanding changes in the management of student services that headteachers said they had introduced were: Improved student welfare 14(21.9%), democratization of student affairs 12(18.8%), open forums 10(15.6%) and student guidance/advisory services 7(10.9%). Student service management changes that were cited as outstanding by a minority of schools included: Introduction of extra curricular activities 5(7.8%) and disciplinary structures 3(4.7%). The changes introduced in student management are shown in Table 4.25.
Table 4.25: Outstanding Change in Management of Student Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved student welfare</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratization of student affairs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open forums</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of Student guidance counselling/advisory service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of Extra curricula activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary structures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Background Need for Change in Management of Student Services

When asked to state the reasons for initiating changes in student welfare, the headteachers identified: Indiscipline/irresponsibility among students 20(31.3%), unmotivated students/lack of interest 14(21.9%), poor time management 8(12.5%) and poor performance 6(9.4%). These four were the leading causes for the introduction of changes in the management of student services. Other causes for change included: Poor learning environment 5(7.8%) and low enrolment 3(4.7%), as shown in Table 4.26.
### Table 4.26: Background Need for Change in Student Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiscipline/lack of responsibility</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmotivated students/Lack of interest</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor time management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor learning environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low school enrolment/poor attendance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey data

**Purpose of Changes in Management of Student Services**

The leading outcomes that schools had purposed to achieve in introducing change in the management of student welfare included: Enhanced discipline/responsibility 16(25%), Freedom of choice expression 13(20.3%) and Motivation of students 12(18.8%) as shown in Table 4.27
Table 4.27: Purpose of Changes in the Management of Students' Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Change</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance discipline/responsibility</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow freedom of choice/expression</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve performance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain students in school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unspecified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Both the improvement of performance and retention of students were cited by equal proportions of headteachers 7(10.9%) as the purposes for which their changes in the management of student services were targeted. Commenting on the introduction of more freedom of expression in the school one of the headteachers said: “I have allowed students to participate in the choosing of school prefects and to contribute freely in the running of the school”

4.4.8 Conclusion on Changes Introduced in the Seven Management Task Areas.

In conclusion, section three has examined the various changes introduced by headteachers in the seven identified management task areas. In each case, the outstanding changes as cited by respondents were pointed out as well as the background need for the changes made. The next section examines the nature of resistance faced in the
implementation of school-based changes and the strategies that headteachers used to minimize the resistance.

SECTION FOUR

4.5 Nature of Resistance to Changes Implemented in Schools and Headteachers

Coping Strategies

4.5.1 Nature of Resistance to Changes Implemented in the Schools

Drawing from the findings on changes introduced by headteachers in the various management task areas in the preceding section, what follows in this section are the study findings on the kind of resistance that headteachers encountered in their attempts to implement school-based changes. While examining respondents’ answers on the forms of resistance encountered, this section addresses itself to the second research question: What is the nature of resistance faced by headteachers in the implementation of school-based change? An attempt is also made to elicit views on the strategies employed by headteachers in order to minimise resistance to change. Presentations on the twin issues of resistance and coping strategies is made in line with the seven management task areas identified in the previous sections.

a) Nature of Resistance to Change in General Management and Headteachers’ Coping Strategies

The study established that changes introduced by headteachers under general management of the school revolved around: Democratization of the administrative
process, delegation of authority, closer supervision of staff, setting termly activity plans, induction of new members of staff, and control of school breaks. More than a half of the headteachers 33(51.6%) reported that they faced resistance from unwilling staff and to a small extent 5(7.8%), from unwilling parents. In order to minimize resistance, headteachers reported that they initiated dialogue and endeavoured to make the change process inclusive of all stakeholders. As shown in Table 4.28, other strategies of minimising resistance to change included disciplinary action such as recommendation for transfer of staff that adamantly refused to embrace change.

**Table 4.28: Resistance Faced in Implementing Change in General Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Resistance</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling staff</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling parents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other challenges external to the school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Survey data**

b) **Resistance Faced in Implementing Changes in the Management of Finance**

In regard to changes in the management of finances, headteachers cited resistance by parents and guardians as being enhanced by factors beyond the school. The government policy on fees payment and treatment of defaulters was one such external factor. Whereas
headteachers undertook to tighten fees collection from guardians and sponsors, they were bound by government policy not to lock out defaulting students from attending school. The government stance encouraged high fees defaulting rates in schools. As illustrated in Table 4.29, headteachers also faced internal resistance from staff. Headteachers cited lack of support for their IGA activities on suspicion that they were using them as ploys to steal school funds.

Table 4.29: Resistance Faced in Implementing Changes in the Management of Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Resistance</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unwilling staff</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges external to the school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Challenges within the school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling parents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

c) Resistance faced in implementing change in Management of Physical Resources

In the management of physical resources, headteachers reported that neighbouring communities were an obstacle to changes in the management of physical resources (Table
4.30). One headteacher reported that: “fencing of the school compound was resisted because it had for a long time been used as a common grazing area by the community”. Headteachers indulged the community in dialogue through the provincial administration as a way of minimising resistance. Through the DEO’s office, the headteachers were able to handle ambivalent communities.

Table 4.30: Resistance faced in implementing change in Management of Physical Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Resistance</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students/staff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/ neighbours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling parents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.O.G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

**d) Resistance Faced in Implementing Change in Management of Curriculum and Instruction**

As reported in Table 4.31, resistance to curriculum and instruction changes came from the members of staff. This was not unexpected since the changes initiated in this area namely; improved teacher supervision, regular student evaluation, time tabling, formation of academic advisory committees and remedial tuition would be considered as inevitable
for improved student performance. These changes however, called for a reorientation of individual staff working schedules and hence the resistance.

Table 4.31  **Resistance Faced in Implementing Change in Management of Curriculum and Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Resistance</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoEST Bureaucracy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey data

e) **Resistance to Change in Management of Personnel**

One in three school headteachers in the study reported that they had not encountered any resistance to changes in the management of personnel in their schools; this is a possible indicator that a significant number of headteachers had implemented changes that were mutually agreed upon. It also affirms the earlier finding in section 4.3.1 that headteachers strove to build consensus through team work.

The headteachers however, stated that three foremost and widely experienced forms of resistance to changes they initiated in the management of personnel included; slow response 15(23.4%), criticism by conservative staff 12(18.8%) and dishonesty/outright indiscipline among staff 3(4.7%), (Table 4.32).
Table 4.32: Resistance Faced in Implementing Change in Management of Staff Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Resistance</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow/lukewarm response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiscipline/dishonesty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism by conservative staff</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unspecified</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

Analysis of reported forms of resistance to changes in the management of staff personnel revealed that criticism by conservative staff, dishonest and unenthusiastic staff hindered the pace of change.

f) Resistance to Change in Management of School Community Relations

On resistance to changes in school community relations, the study established that to some extent 21(32.8%) suspicion and peddling of falsehoods by community members derailed new initiatives. As shown in Table 4.33 to a small extent, 5(7.8%) respondents also indicated that there was outright lack of community support and enthusiasm for their initiatives.
Table 4.33: Resistance Faced in Implementation of Change in Management of School Community Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Resistance</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From community</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From within the school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of community support/enthusiasm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unspecified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey data

g) Resistance Faced in Implementation of Changes in Management of Student Services

In the implementation of changes in student services, a slight majority of headteachers 20(31.3%) reported that students were the main source of resistance. However, 10(15.6%) of headteachers (Table 4.34) reported that they had resistance from the teaching staff. This was rather unexpected. This could validate assertions put forward by The Committee on Student Unrest (MoEST 2001) that there are cases in schools where teachers incite students against their headteachers.
Table 4.34: Resistance Faced in Implementation of Change in Management of Student Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Resistance</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other interest groups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other challenges</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data

4.5.2 Coping Strategies Used to Minimize Resistance to Change

This sub-section presents what the study established on the coping strategies employed by headteachers in their efforts to minimize, stem or forestall resistance to the various forms of school-based change within the seven key management task areas that the study focused on, namely; general administration, finance and income generation, physical resources, curriculum and instruction, staff personnel, school community relations and student services.

a) Strategies used to Minimize Resistance to Changes in General Administration

As show, in Table 4.35, 4(6.3%) of the headteachers reported that they had not employed any strategies to cope with the resistance they might have met in trying to implement changes in general administration. This proportion represents the minority of school headteachers that either had effected no changes in the area of general administration, or
had not formulated any strategic approaches to minimize the resistance they were encountering. However, the foremost strategy used by the biggest proportion of school heads 25(39.1%) was making the change inclusive, followed by cultivation of dialogue 18(28.1%). Some of the headteachers 10(15.6%) employed coercion or threats by taking disciplinary measures against those opposed to change. Considering that more than three quarters of the headteachers tried to make change all inclusive, motivate staff or dialogue with the parties involved in the change process it can be argued as earlier established in section 4.3.4 that this was made possible on basis effective communication network established in schools.

**Table 4.35: Strategies of minimizing resistance to changes in General Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategy</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making change process inclusive of all holders</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary action</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to staff and students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Survey data**

Though applied by a minority of the headteachers 4(6.3%), motivation of staff and students was one of the strategies headteachers were using to minimize resistance; this
represents the proportion of school heads who used gifts and other rewards to motivate those who either embraced the changes enthusiastically or facilitated the required transformations, an approach that would be effective towards the attainment of high adoption levels by the rest of the stakeholders targeted by the change.

b) Strategies used to Minimize Resistance to Changes in Management of Finances

A significant proportion of headteachers 18(28.1%) indicated they had not used any coping strategies to minimize resistance to changes they had implemented in the management of finances (Table 4.36). This high proportion is in part attributable to the fact that most changes in the management of school finances are of an executive nature involving the school board of governors or ministerial directives and therefore, not much resistance could be anticipated from the other stakeholders in the school. Again, this relatively high proportion of those who seem not to take any action when confronted with resistance to changes on financial operations in the school could be attributed to the fact that a significantly high proportion of school heads lacked managerial skills in financial management, as established by Onyango (2001) and Achoka (2003).
Table 4.36: Strategy used to minimize resistance to changes in management of
Finances and Income Generating Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategy</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to staff and students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making change process inclusive of all holders</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specified</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unspecified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey data

As way of minimising change resistance the 13(20.3%) of headteachers who reported making the change process inclusive of all stakeholders indicated that they incorporated PTA and BoG members in planning for new projects, discussed financial status of their schools with parents, employed qualified Accounts Clerks and even opened bank accounts for different school projects.

c) Strategies used to minimize resistance to changes in management of Physical Resources

As table (4.37) illustrates, the two foremost strategies used by headteachers in minimizing resistance to changes in the management of physical resources were dialogue with the stakeholders 10(15.6%) and making the changes all inclusive 10(15.6%).
One headteacher explained that “disputes between the school and the community over school grazing space were settled jointly between the school administration and the community members”.

**Table 4.37: Strategies used to minimize resistance to changes in management of Physical Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategy</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue with stakeholders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made change an all inclusive process</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought and backing from authorities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradual introduction of change</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Survey data**

There were 16(25%) of headteachers who indicated that they had not applied any strategy to minimize changes in the management of physical resources. This proportion represents schools in which probably no substantive changes in the management of physical resources had been implemented. This proportion for non-action could only be attributed to the fact that in many instances management of physical resources involves high capital investments that most schools lacked.
d) **Strategies used to Minimize Resistance to Changes in Management of Curriculum and Instruction**

Management of curriculum and instruction components of the school operations is central to the mandate of the school administration. The study revealed that in about one in three schools 23(32.8%), headteachers (as shown in Table 4.38) opted for timely communication with staff and students over any on-going or planned changes on curriculum and instruction matters. The second widely applied strategy at minimizing resistance to changes in curriculum and instruction was motivation to teachers and students 17(20.3%) as a way of enhancing higher rates of change adoption and acceptance.

**Table 4.38: Strategies used to minimize resistance to changes in Management of Curriculum and Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategy</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely communication with stakeholders</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to teachers/students</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradual introduction of change</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data*

About one in five school headteachers 14(21.9%) in the study had not put in place any strategy to minimize the resistance encountered in the curriculum and instruction task area, (Table 4.38). Although this could be a pointer that in a significant proportion of schools there were either no forms of resistance to the changes implemented in Curriculum Instruction or, there was the likelihood that most of these school heads could
not identify resistance to the changes they had implemented in this task area hence inability to develop strategies to counter them.

e) **Strategy used to Minimize Resistance to Changes in Management of Staff Personnel**

As shown in Table 4.39, 17(26.6%) headteachers reported that they did not have any strategy to minimize resistance to changes in the way they managed staff personnel. Given the fact that changes in management of staff personnel is a natural change process with every new manager, it would be safe to infer that the 17(26.6%) of school heads reporting non-implementation of coping strategies mostly represent those schoolheads who either could not identify the existing forms of resistance or were faced with resistance but could not devise suitable strategies to minimize them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategy</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to staff and students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making change process inclusive of all holders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradual introduction of change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted support/ Backing of authority</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Unspecified</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey data
About one in five of the schoolheads in the study, 13(20.3%) resorted to lobbying their staff to support the causes they had chosen to change existing staff personnel management structures. Although it may be an exclusive approach to getting changes implemented, schoolheads resorted to this strategy because it is usually very efficient.

f) Strategies used to Minimize Resistance to Changes in Management of School Community Relations

School community relation is a major component of school operations. The community link is capable of propelling the institution to attain its goals if the relations are good or total failure if the relations are bad. In any real situation, there is bound to be administrative or social frictions between the school and its immediate community. The study revealed that among the coping mechanisms employed by headteachers in the study to minimize resistance to changes in the area of school community relations included:

The incorporation of local opinion leaders in school planning processes 13(20.3%) as the most common strategy as illustrated in Table 4.40. This was a popular strategy for the sole reason that owing to the geo-social location of most of the schools in the study, direct relations with the schools’ immediate communities were inevitable. The establishment of most of these schools was an initiative of the locals and therefore, any slight indication that school headteachers were alienating the ‘owners’ of the schools could lead to serious upheavals.
Table 4.40: Strategy used to Minimize Resistance to Changes in Management of School Community Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategy</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of local opinion leaders in school planning</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating school activities with community ones</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit based employment of locals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepped up security</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Unspecified</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data

The subsequent commonly employed strategies at minimizing school community relations included; integration of school activities with those of the community 11(17.2%) and engaging the community members in dialogue 10(15.6%) to help sort out any emerging friction with the school, respectively (Table 4.40). Whereas the integration of school activities with those of the community was an indicator that school heads believed that joint social events between the school and the community enhanced good relations, dialogue with the members of the school community on the other hand ensured that existing conflicts arising from changes are settled amicably while any future ramifications arising from the changes are pre-empted as soon as they emerge.
Baldridge and Deal (1975) suggested that incorporation of opponents of change in the planning process minimizes the extent of resistance to educational change. This assertion finds support in this study. Headteachers reported that opinion leaders were incorporated in school planning committees. Another notable form of incorporation took the form of employment. Locals were engaged on merit basis as casuals within schools.

g) **Strategies used to Minimize Resistance to Changes in Management of Student Services**

Strategies used by headteachers to minimize resistance from students, included seeking support from the PTA. The PTA is composed of class representatives who are there to articulate the parental involvement on discipline of students. Other strategies as shown in Table 4.41 include students’ involvement in decision making, and firm disciplinary action that include the use of the cane.

**Table 4.41: Strategy used to Minimize Resistance to Changes in Management of Student Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategy</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying of stake holders</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradual introduction of change</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy/Making change process inclusive of all holders</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking firm disciplinary action</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unspecified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey data
4.5.3 Summary on Resistance to Change and Coping Strategies

The study identified the various forms of resistance that headteachers faced while initiating changes in the seven management task areas focused on by the study. It also emerged that changes varied from one management task area to another and so did the strategies used by headteachers to minimise resistance. The section that follows gives a summary of the chapter on presentation and analysis of findings.

4.5.4 Summary on Data Analysis, Results and Discussion

All usable data obtained from the field were presented, analysed and discussed in narrative form in this chapter. The four sections of this chapter delved in depth at demographic characteristics of respondents, headteachers perceived role in management of school-based change, nature of educational change in the seven management task areas, nature of resistance faced by headteachers in the implementation of school-based and strategies put in place by headteachers to minimize resistance to change.

The chapter also provided specific findings for research questions of the study. The presentation and analysis of findings in this chapter provided the basis for developing the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study that follow in chapter five.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of Major Findings

The purpose of this study was to find out headteachers’ perception of their role in the management of school-based change, the nature of school-based educational change in Kenyan secondary schools, the kind of resistance faced in introducing school-based changes in secondary schools and measures that have been designed by headteachers to minimize resistance to change.

Review of literature showed that although many studies have previously been done on the subject of school-based change management, the bulk of the studies have their orientation in developed countries. Reviewed literature from Kenya revealed that so far no study has been done on the management of school-based change. Other issues that were discussed in the course of literature review included: historical aspects of the study of educational change, emerging theoretical approaches to the study of change, headteachers’ management task areas, the role of the headteacher in the management of school-based change, and relevant educational researches that have focused on respondents’ perception to inform educational policy and practice. In general, reviewed literature showed that although the head teacher plays a cardinal role in the management of school-based change not much has been established on his own role perception.
After reviewing the literature, the researcher explained the research design for the study justifying the usage of a descriptive survey design and samplings procedures. A School-based Change Management instrument with three sections was designed to obtain information about headteachers’ perception of their own role in the management of school-based change. The first section of the questionnaire sought to establish the demographic information of respondents such as age, gender, teaching qualifications and their administrative experience in teaching. The second section had sought to establish the respondents’ disposition and general knowledge on the change process. Section three focused on the changes introduced within the seven management task areas by headteachers in their respective schools. The resultant instrument, A School-based Change Management Questionnaire (SBCMQ) is shown in Appendix 1.

Findings of the study were analysed and discussed in relation to each of the research questions. The results pertaining to the first question on headteachers’ self perceptions of their role in management of school-based change were discussed under four clusters considered critical to the management of school-based change. The four are: teambuilding, personal motivation and initiative, leadership ability and effective communication. The results reflected that headteachers perceived themselves positively as agents of change at the school level on the four accounts. Findings related to the second question on the nature of school-based change in Kenyan public secondary school
were tied to the seven identified management task areas. The specific changes are highlighted in subsequent sections.

5.1.2 General administration

The key changes that were implemented by school heads in this area included:
democratization of administrative processes, delegation of duties and authority, staff supervision, termly activity plans, staff orientation, control of school breaks by either excluding weekend offs from the school calendar or reducing half term duration. The least common change initiative under general administration was orientation of new teachers. It can be deduced from this finding that headteachers do not give much attention to orientation of new members of staff. It assumed that new members of staff would find their own bearing within the school.

5.1.3 Changes in Management of Finance and Income Generating Activities

The study established the three most common changes that were effected in the management of finance and income generating activities to be: proper financial record keeping, starting of income generating activities (IGAs) and enhanced collection of fees. Other less common changes in management of finances included: cost cutting measures and tendering for service provision
5.1.4 Changes in Management of Physical Resources

Changes initiated by a significant proportion of headteachers in the management of physical resources included: maintenance and repair of facilities, inventory/record keeping, enhanced security systems and construction of learning facilities.

5.1.5 Changes in Management of Curriculum and Instruction

This study revealed that the most outstanding change in management of curriculum and instruction undertaken by headteachers was enhanced teacher supervision followed by purchase of teaching and learning materials, regular student assessment/evaluation and proper timetabling.

Other changes in the management of curriculum and instruction affairs that were regarded as outstanding by marginal proportions of school headteachers included: introduction of academic advisory services, remedial tuition to students and recruitment of qualified BoG teaching staff.

5.1.6 Changes in Management of Personnel

The most outstanding change in the management of staff personnel that was implemented by most headteachers was delegation of authority. Other changes that headteachers reported to have established included: motivation of staff, close supervision and participatory management.
5.1.6 Changes in Management of School Community Relations

In the task of school community relations, the study found out that social responsibility of the school to community was the most outstanding undertaking by headteachers. This had been implemented to improve school community relations. Other initiatives were involvement of community members in school welfare matters and joint social activities with the community.

5.1.7 Changes in Management of Student Services

Outstanding changes in the management of student services that the study established were: improved student welfare, democratization of student affairs, open forums and student guidance/advisory services. Introduction of extra curricula activities and tight disciplinary structures were also identified as initiated changes in the management of student services.

The third research and fourth research questions were merged to allow for the collation of headteachers’ views on the nature of resistance faced and the strategies they adopted to minimize the resistance. The findings related to these twin questions vis a vis the seven management task areas were as follows:

5.2 Resistance to Change in General Management and Coping Strategies

The study established that resistance to changes introduced by headteachers under general management of the school revolved around unwilling staff within the schools and
non supportive parents. To minimize resistance, the study found out that for parents and school staff, headteachers initiated dialogue and endeavoured to make the change process inclusive of all stakeholders. Other strategies of minimising change included disciplinary action on staff who adamantly refused to embrace change.

5.2.1 Resistance Faced in Implementing Changes in the Management of Finance and Headteachers’ Coping Mechanism

In regard to changes in the management of finances, the study established that headteachers faced resistance from sources external to the school. The government policy on fees payment and treatment of defaulters was one such external factor. Whereas headteachers undertook to tighten fees collection from guardians and sponsors, they were bound by government policy not to lock out defaulting students from attending school. Headteachers also faced internal resistance from staff. Headteachers cited lack of support for their IGA activities by members of staff on suspicion that they were using them as ploys to steal school funds.

The study further established that headteachers found it hard to institute coping mechanisms to resistance in financial management changes due to government policy that forbids exclusion of fee defaulters from school activities and the executive nature of decision making on financial related issues that involves the school board of governors. However, headteachers reported that they attempted to make the change process inclusive of all stakeholders by incorporating PTA and BoG members in planning for new projects,
discussed financial status of their schools with parents, employed qualified accounts clerks to work on school financial reports and even opened bank accounts for controlling and monitoring school expenditures.

5.2.2 Resistance Faced in Implementing change in Management of Physical Resources and Headteachers’ Coping Mechanisms

In the management of physical resources, the study found out that communities neighbouring schools were an obstacle to changes in the management of physical resources. One headteacher reported that: fencing of the school compound was resisted because it was being used as a common grazing field by the community.

In an attempt to minimise resistance, the study revealed that headteachers indulged the community in dialogue through the provincial administration. Through the DEO’s office, headteachers were able to handle ambivalent communities. Direct discussions between the school administration and the community members were also undertaken as an avenue of minimising resistance.

5.2.3 Resistance Faced in Implementing Change in Management of Curriculum and Instruction and Coping Mechanisms

Findings of the study on resistance to curriculum and instruction changes showed that members of staff were the main source of resistance. This was not unexpected since the changes initiated in this area namely: improved teacher supervision, regular student
evaluation, time tabling, formation of academic advisory committees and remedial tuition. These changes called for a reorientation of individual staff working schedules.

The study findings on coping strategies to resistance in the area of curriculum and instruction showed that headteachers opted for timely communication with staff and students over any on-going or planned changes. Secondly, motivation of teachers and students by cash or material were used to enhance change adoption and acceptance.

5.2.4 Resistance to Change in Management of Personnel and Coping Mechanisms

The study revealed that dishonesty/outright indiscipline among staff, slow response to change among the staff were the forms of resistance that headteachers faced in initiating changes in the management of school personnel. Other forms of resistance that were established were criticism by conservative staff, and lack of enthusiasm in the staff.

Identified strategies to minimize resistance to changes in personnel included lobbying for support from teachers. This strategy was noted to be effective. Coercion was also reported as a strategy of minimising resistance to change.
5.2.5 Resistance to Change in Management of School Community Relations and Coping Mechanisms

On resistance to changes in school community relations, the study established that suspicious and peddling of falsehoods by community members derailed their initiatives. Secondly, lack of support and enthusiasm for new initiatives in this task area also lessened the pace of change.

The study revealed that some of the coping mechanisms employed by school headteachers to minimize resistance to changes in the way school community relations were handled included: the incorporation of local opinion leaders in school planning processes, engaging casual labourers from the immediate communities, integration of school activities with those of the community and engaging of the community members in dialogue when sorting out any emerging frictions between the school and the community.

5.2.6 Resistance Faced in the Implementation of Change in Management of Student Services and Coping Mechanisms

Findings of the study on resistance to change in the task area of managing student services showed that resistance emanated from the teaching staff. This was a surprising finding of the study. However, it gives credence to arguments pointed out that teachers do incite students against their headteachers. It was also found out that the students resisted changes in aspects touching on their services.
The study further showed that headteachers’ strategies of minimizing resistance from teachers included dialogue and disciplinary measures whereas for students’, headteachers sought support from the PTA, involved the students in decision making, and also instituted firm disciplinary action against errant students including use of the cane.

5.3 Conclusions

Based on the on the study findings and on the basis of the research questions for the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

- There is a general positive self perception of headteachers as agents of change at the school level in Western Province of Kenya. Between 80% and 90% of public secondary school headteachers agreed or strongly agreed with statements considered by the researcher as pointers of positive self perception.

- Headteachers had initiated unique school-based changes within the identified seven management task areas for their respective schools. The changes were based on realities of their schools and did not necessarily stem from central government policy.

- The main sources of resistance to the changes that school heads had initiated were the communities surrounding the schools, the staff and students in varying degrees in the various management task areas.

- Management of finances, general administration, staff personnel and student services were the key task areas that elicited the most serious forms of resistance
• There was a significant proportion of secondary school head teachers in Western Province that were unable to identify the various forms of resistance to changes introduced and therefore, they were unable to device appropriate coping strategies.

• Constructive engagement process which include; motivation of staff and students, an all inclusive approach to change implementation, dialogue with the stakeholders in school administration were among the strongest coping strategies of minimizing resistance to changes.

5.4 Recommendations

In the light of the foregoing summary and conclusions a number of recommendations can be drawn from this research that can be used by various stakeholders with vested interests in the management of School-based Change. In the sections that follow, a synopsis of the recommendations for the various groups is provided

5.4.1 Recommendations for Education Policy Agents

Considering the variety of initiatives undertaken by headteachers in the seven management task areas, School-based Management can be an effective strategy of improving schools. It can also enhance accountability among headteachers. Consequently, the government should mainstream school-based management as a core component of its policies.
Secondly, the study established that headteachers had a positive perception of themselves as initiators and implementers of school-based change, a large proportion of them lacked the capacity to diagnose and deal with resistance within their schools. The government of Kenya through the concerned ministry should consider mounting in-service courses for headteachers on the theme of change management.

Thirdly, tertiary institutions that offer teacher education programme should consider introducing management of change as a core teaching unit in their pre - service and in-service programmes. This will enhance the capacity of teachers in handling change within their schools.

**5.4.2 Recommendations for Further Research**

It can be ascertained that this study has shed some light on critical issues in the management of school-based change in Kenya. However, inherent in social science research like this one, is the identification of additional opportunities for further research. Some suggestions for further research are anchored on the following:

i. The findings and conclusions of this research were generated from data based on self evaluation by secondary school headteachers on the management of school-based change, a research on the perspective of others stakeholders on the role of the headteachers may generate different results. Therefore, conducting a research using alternative respondents for instance parents may be prudent.
ii. The focus of this study was headteachers of public secondary schools. Much can be learned from a study on their counterparts who head private schools.

iii. As noted earlier, respondents to this study were drawn from Western Province of Kenya, an examination of self-role perception for headteachers in other provinces or throughout the country in the management of school-based change would be an invaluable contribution to the existing body of knowledge on this vital area in educational management.
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Dear Respondent,

This questionnaire has been prepared as a main component of a doctoral study to establish headteachers’ perceptions of their role in the management of school-based change. It is the belief of the researcher that headteachers’ views will lay a firm foundation for future educational changes in Kenya. Upon this thinking, the researcher holds that your opinion will be vital to our policy makers and to the destiny of this country.

I request that you spare a few minutes of your precious time to complete this questionnaire. Your response will be treated with total confidentiality and will be used only for academic purposes. Do not write your name on any of these pages.

Part One: Background information

Please mark with an (x) or fill in appropriately.
1. Gender:
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

2. Age bracket
   - [ ] Up to 29 years
   - [ ] 30 - 34
   - [ ] 35 - 39
   - [ ] 40 - 44
   - [ ] 45 and above
3. Number of years in the teaching profession_________Months_______

4. Administrative experience;
   • As Head of Department-------------------years-----------------months
   • As Deputy headteacher-------------------years-----------------months
   • As headteacher--------------------------years-----------------months

5. Teaching Qualifications:
   □ Dip/ SI
   □ B Ed
   □ BA/B.Sc. ( with PGDE)
   □ Other qualifications (please specify)-------------------

PART TWO

This part is made up of nineteen statements concerning management of school-based changes. You are requested to respond by putting a tick in the response that truly reflects the way you manage your school. I implore you to be honest.

KEY
SD---STRONGLY DISAGREE
D--- DISAGREE
U---- UNDECIDED
A---- AGREE
AS--- AGREE STRONGLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANGE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>AS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I keep in touch with ways in which colleagues in other schools are trying out new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Am open- minded about new ideas and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Staff in the school are willing to challenge assumptions which underpin existing structures and practices rather than perpetuate systems that are no longer useful or relevant.

4 I deliberately seek and try out new ways of doing things.

5 There is a willingness on the part of staff to evaluate our purposes as well as processes and results.

6 Am able to admit my mistakes in a miscarried change effort.

7 Am able to learn from my mistakes.

8 Creative conflict is encouraged and seldom degenerates to the level of interpersonal conflict in the school.

9 All staff are involved at one time or another in sensing needs and potential problems.

10 There is an effective and efficient communication (network) and coordinating structures to help action on needs or problems when identified.

11 The school considers the following stages in managing change:
   a) Careful and thorough planning of change
   b) Consultation with those assigned to carry out the change
   c) Appropriate in-servicing/training of staff
   d) Realistic timescale for preparation and implementation
   e) Monitoring systems which provide feedback and what is happening during the process of change
   f) Adequate provision of resources for the change/innovation

12 I try out experimental or pilot projects to assess their worth or feasibility before implementation.

13 I ensure that new ideas of proved worth are fully incorporated into the fabric of the school so that they can be absorbed by all.

14 Succession planning is well managed. I ensure HoDs have prepared subject teachers and other staff so that they can be active partners.

15 There is a concern for value or quality in innovation rather than novelty for its own sake or as a status symbol.

16 Value and quality underpins the justification for systems or practices which remain unchanged.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Staff are aware of what is happening in different parts of the system through effective communication channels, both formal and informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>When multiple pressures for change come from outside the school we are able to fix priorities and manage changes in a coherent and rational way without betraying our values and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Leaders in the school inform and protect staff facing rapid and turbulent change by communicating a coherent view of coming changes which help people put them in perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART THREE**

This part has seven management task areas considered to be crucial in the management of schools. The questions generally seek to identify the various changes that you have initiated in the school. You are requested to respond to all questions.

**20 General Administration**

a) Mention the changes you have introduced in the general administration of the school.

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

b) Choose any one change under *general administration* you regard to be outstanding and respond to the following questions:

i. Mention the change-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ii. What was the purpose of the change?

...........................................................................................................................................................................
iii. What was the background need for the change?
....................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................
........................................................

iv. What was your estimated time for the change to take root?
....................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................
........................................................

v. How did the change place additional demands on the following:

1) Students?
....................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................

2) Teachers?
....................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................

3) BoG members?
....................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................

4) Non teaching staff
....................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................
5) Other (Specify).
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

  c) What resistance did you face in implementing the change?
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

  d) How did you go about minimizing the resistance?
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

  e) Mention any evidence that improvements within your school resulted from that change?
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

21 Management of Finances and Income - Generating Activities

  a) Mention the changes you have introduced in the management of finances and income generating activities of the school.
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
b) Choose any one change under **finance and income generating activities** you regard to be outstanding and respond to the following questions:

i. Chosen change-------------------------------------------------------------

ii. What was the purpose of the change?

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

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

iii. What was the background need for the change?

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

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

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

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

...........

iv. What was your estimated time for the change to take root?

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

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

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

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

...........

v. How did the change place additional demands on the following:

1) Students

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

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

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

2) Teachers

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

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

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

3) BoG members

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

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

...........................................................
4) Non-teaching staff

5) Other (Specify).

C) What resistance did you face in implementing the change?

D) How did you go about minimizing the resistance?

E) Mention any evidence that improvements within your school resulted from that change?

22. Management of Physical Resources

A) Mention the changes you have introduced in the management of physical resources of the school.
b) Choose any one change under management of physical resources you regard to be outstanding and respond to the following questions:

i. Chosen change

ii. What was the purpose of the change?

iii. What was the background need for the change?

iv. What was your estimated time for the change to take root?

v. How did the change place additional demands on the following:

1) Students

2) Teachers

3) BoG members
4) Non teaching staff

5) Other (Specify).

23. Management of Curriculum and Instruction

a) Mention the changes you have introduced in the management of curriculum and instruction in the school.

b) Choose any one change under curriculum and instruction you regard to be outstanding and respond to the following questions:
i. Chosen change

ii. What was the purpose of the change?

iii. What was the background need for the change?

iv. What was your estimated time for the change to take root?

v. How did the change place additional demands on the following:

1) Students

2) Teachers

3) BoG members

4) Non teaching staff
5) Other (Specify).
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

c) What resistance did you face in implementing the change?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

d) How did you go about minimizing the resistance?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

24. Management of Staff Personnel

a) Mention the changes you have introduced in the management of staff personnel in the school.
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

b) Choose any one change under staff personnel you regard to be outstanding and respond to the following questions:

i. Chosen change-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ii. What was the purpose of the change?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
iii. What was the background need for the change?
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

iv. What was your estimated time for the change to take root?
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

v. How did the change place additional demands on the following:

1) Students
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

2) Teachers
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

3) BoG members
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

4) Non teaching staff
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

5) Other (Specify).
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

C) What resistance did you face in implementing the change?
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
d) How did you go about minimizing the resistance?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

e) Mention any evidence that improvements within your school resulted from that change?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

25. Management of School Community Relations

a) Mention the changes you have introduced in the management of school community relations.

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

b) Choose one change under the management of school community relations you regard to be outstanding and respond to the following questions:

i. Chosen change-------------------------------------------------------------

ii. What was the purpose of the change?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
.........
iii. What was the background need for the change?
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………

iv. What was your estimated time for the change to take root?
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………

v. How did the change place additional demands on the following:

1) Students
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………

2) Teachers
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
………………

3) BoG members
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

4) Non teaching staff
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
………………

5) Other (Specify).
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
………………

c) What resistance did you face in implementing the change?
…………………………………………………………………………………………
d) How did you go about minimizing the resistance?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

e) Mention any evidence that improvements within your school resulted from that change?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

26. Management of Students Services

a) Mention the changes you have introduced in the management of students in the school.

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

b) Choose one change in the management of students’ services you regard to be outstanding and respond to the following questions:

i. Chosen change-----------------------------------------------

ii. What was the purpose of the change?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
……
iii. What was the background need for the change?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........

iv. What was your estimated time for the change to take root?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
...

v. How did the change place additional demands on the following:

1) Students
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

2) Teachers
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

3) BoG members
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

4) Non teaching staff
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
5) Other (Specify).

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

  c) What resistance did you face in implementing the change?
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

  d) How did you go about minimizing the resistance?
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

  e) Mention any evidence that improvements within your school resulted from that change?
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

27 Is there any aspect of your experience in managing change that has not been covered? Please elaborate………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT IN RESPONDING TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE CHECK IF YOU HAVE ACCIDENTALLY FORGOTTEN TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. GOD BLESS YOU.
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