International Journal of Education Administration and Policy Studies Vol. 4(5), pp. 133-140, 5 April, 2012
Available online at http://www.academicjournals.org/IJEAPS
DOI: 10.5897/IJEAPS11.073
ISSN 2141 - 6656 ©2012 Academic Journals

Full Length Research Paper

The learning needs of secondary school principals: An investigation in Nakuru district, Kenya

Gladys N. Asuga* and Scott Eacott

School of Education, the University of Newcastle, Australia, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia.

Accepted 27 February, 2012

School leaders have long been recognised as crucial to the quality of schooling. As a result, the preparation and development of school leaders has attracted substantial attention from practitioners, systemic authorities, academics and policy makers. While this discourse has a long history in the US and to a lesser extent other parts of the world such as Britain and Australia, in recent times there has been an emerging voice from Africa. This paper contributes to this emerging literature by reporting on a project conducted in the Nakuru district of Kenya. We argue that for the meaningful construction of school leadership preparation and development programs, there is a need for greater acknowledgement and engagement with the learning needs of practitioners.

Key words: School leadership preparation, professional development, Kenya, secondary schools, Africa.

INTRODUCTION

The preparation and development of school leaders is a contemporarily popular leverage point for governments in their quest to improve schools. However, throughout Africa there is no formal requirement for either aspirants or current principals to have any formal school leadership preparation and or development (Bush and Oduro, 2006). As a result, school leaders begin their careers as teacher and progress through a series of middle management posts such as head of department and deputy principal without any specific preparation and/or development for the nature of administrative, managerial or leadership roles (Bush and Oduro, 2006; Herriot et al., 2002). Embedded within this model of career progression is the assumption that good teachers can become good leaders without specific preparation and/or development. There are however many (Kitavi and Van der Westhuizen, 1997; Oduro and MacBeath, 2003) who contend that such an assumption is fundamentally flawed as the role of the school leadership is qualitatively different to that of a classroom teacher.

In the Kenyan context, although there are some courses and programs offered by universities, systemic authorities, professional associations, and consultants, school leadership preparation and development remains ad hoc, haphazard, and not responsive to the needs of current and aspiring principals (Onderi and Croll, 2008; Wanzare and Ward, 2000). What remains under-researched is the learning needs of practising school leaders and this is where this paper, and the larger project, fits in the discourse of the field. This paper reports on the first phase of a larger research program investigating school leadership preparation and development in Kenya. The purpose of this study is to engage the learning needs of secondary school principals in a single district, Nakuru, in Kenya. Although recognising the need for a Kenyan developed model or framework for school leadership preparation and development, as this project is the first in an extended research program for the first author, this paper draws on Geoff (2003) Learning Principals work with the New South Wales Department of Education and Training in Australia. This selection is purposive for the project.

The primary reason is that it is naive to assume that it is possible to construct a model or framework without at least some underlying assumptions which demonstrates the researcher's ontological/epistemological and

*Corresponding author. E-mail: gladys.asuga@uon.edu.au.

theoretical position. Scott's work explicitly focuses on the learning of school principals – the same as the purpose of this study – making it an appropriate choice. This enables the project to operate at two levels: one, testing the utility of Scott's framework for understanding the learning needs of principals; and two, empirical evidence on the learning needs of principals in Kenya that are comparable with those in New South Wales, Australia. Based on the assumption that Scott's research instrument has utility, this project centres on two key research questions:

1. What is the perceived importance of the domains of leadership capability for the principal ship as applied by Scott in NSW public schools?; and
2. To what extent do existing school leadership preparation and development programs address these domains?

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP PREPARATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN KENYA

Unlike countries with more formal system of credentialing (England, Scotland), certifying and/or licensing (US) for aspiring school leaders, Kenya adopts a modified version of the 'apprentice model' of preparation (Su et al., 2003). We say modified because despite appointments primarily coming from serving deputy principals and teachers, unlike countries such as Australia, where the average tenure before becoming a school leader is 15 years (McKenzie et al., 2008), some appointments are made to graduating teachers. Furthermore, after appointment principals are expected to undergo an induction program but due to a range of issues, mostly to do with the geographical isolation of many schools, this induction never takes place. This means that many principals are left with little more than a trial and error approach to improving their performance. Pioneering Australian educational administration scholar Bill Walker (1964) argues against those who believe that personal experience in education and/or leadership is sufficient preparation for school leadership conceding that the school of 'hard knocks' has produced some excellent administrators but insists that: they might well have distinguished themselves much earlier and much more often if they had been able to avoid a long period of trial and error learning.

It is doubtful whether we can any longer afford to be wasteful of our resources in material and personnel as we have been in the past. In addition to the lack of preparation, ongoing development opportunities – which may be the only chance for school leaders to engage with colleagues beyond the school – are only an option for those located in urban or semi-urban areas (Wanzare and Ward, 2000). Therefore, it is possible for a principal to be appointed with no specific school leadership preparation and then be deprived of ongoing development opportunities. Similar issues are present in other African nations, including but not exclusively Botswana (Pheko, 2008), Ghana (Oduro and MacBeath, 2003), and Nigeria (Arikewuyo, 2009). As with a great deal of education development there is frequently a deficit view of taken of the nation/system being reformed. However, Oduro and Macbeath (2003) and Harber and Dadey (1993) warn that programs and theories developed in Europe and America (among others) cannot merely be transferred to and adopted in the African context. Interestingly, Pheko (2008) does however call for Botswana to replicate the English model. It should of course be noted that English consultants were hired to develop school leadership preparation and development models in Botswana (Monyatsi et al., 2008).

The South African model and the role of the Matthew Goniwe School of Governance and Leadership (Mestry and Grobler, 2002), is also very similar to that of England. To address the concerns regarding the lack of preparation and ongoing development of school leaders in Kenya and consistent with the international trend towards systematic approaches, the government established the Kenya Education Staff Institute (KESI). Consistent with the government's vision for 2030 and particularly improving the quality of education, KESI is responsible for providing in-service management training to principals.[1] In parallel, the employing body for teachers, the Teachers' Service Commission (TSC), has set out criteria for the recruitment of principals that includes attendance at a minimum of two in-service courses in institutional management either offered by, or recognised by KESI. There is much that could be made of the legitimising role that KESI and the TSC play in this context similar to that of the NCSL in England (Thrupp, 2005) or in parts of Australia (Eacott, 2011). The TSC (2007) has also recommended that educational administration be embedded in initial teacher education programs. This is a much under-discussed and under-researched topic in the educational administration literature (Eacott, 2012). KESI has not been without critique. It has been argued that KESI lacks the capacity to prepare and develop school leaders and the quality of what is provided is questionable (Onguko et al., 2008).

An 'Education management capacity assessment report' conducted for the Ministry of Education, and funded through USAID, found that despite considerable financial resourcing, most principals felt that they had either not been prepared for their role or lacked key administrative skills even if they had attended courses. Consistently noted in relation to these concerns is that the input of practitioners as to their learning needs is either disregarded or not engaged with (Onderi and Croll, 2008; Wanzare and Ward, 2000). Additionally, principals interviewed as part of the capacity assessment study argued that KESI programs are based on government demands rather than the identified needs of principals.

Given the lack of attention to the learning needs of school leaders and the general dearth of empirical research on school leadership in Kenya, this research is timely, innovative and significant.

Conceptual resources applied

The empirical work reported in this paper is based on the conceptual framework employed by Geoff Scott as part of a leadership capability and learning study for the New South Wales (Australia) public school system. It in itself is the synthesis of two conceptual frameworks (one on leadership capabilities and the other on productive adult learning). The first is the leadership capability framework developed by Geoff Scott and colleagues at the University of Technology Sydney, Australia. This framework is consistent with an extensive body of research on professional capability and comprises of five interlocking domains. This framework argues that generic or job-specific skills are necessary but not sufficient for effective professional performance. Scott and colleagues argue that there is a need for: a high level of social and personal emotional intelligence; an ability to 'read' what is going on in new situations and 'match' an appropriate course of action; and, a set of diagnostic maps developed from successfully coming to grips with previous problems of practice in the unique work context. The second framework is based on the principles of productive adult learning founded on over 20 years of work (Scott, 2003).

It focuses on the arguments that adults want: learning that is immediately relevant to them personally and professionally; that is delivered in more active than passive learning modes; the integration of theory and practice; effective management of their expectations; presented in digestible chunks; use a valid professional capability profile; opportunities to pursue flexible learning pathways; timely, constructive and detailed feedback on all assessment tasks; the inclusion of both self-managed learning and active coaching; responsive support and administrative services; with access to learning at times, locations that are convenient and productive to the learner (Scott, 2003). In his synthesis of these two frameworks, Scott (2003) employs a questionnaire built upon five scales: three focused on abilities (personal, interpersonal, and intellectual); one focused on specific skills and knowledge; and a final scale attending to relevance of professional development programs relevant. This questionnaire was selected for the current study for two reasons: first, it is research validated; and secondly, it would enable comparison with Scott's NSW data set, enhancing the contribution of this study to the global discourse.

RESEARCH METHODS

This paper reports on the first phase of a larger research program. Specifically, this paper is based on a static/cross-sectional questionnaire study. The instrument employed is adapted in the sense that NSW department titles were replaced with Kenyan version of Scott's (2003) questionnaire for principals. It consists of 52 items across five scales, a series of demographic items and some scope for open-ended responses (the analysis of which will be reported elsewhere). The questionnaire asks principals to rate the importance of a range of items relating to the principal ship and the extent to which previous preparation and development programs have focused on those capabilities. Using a convenience sampling strategy, this study was undertaken in Nakuru District of Kenya. The data was generated between September and October, 2010. All secondary school principals (n=100) were of interest and therefore invited to participate. Nakuru district was chosen because as an urban area it has the necessary infrastructure to enable the researcher to access all principals via email. While we are aware of the limitations of a single district study and the over representation of urban areas in African school leadership research, as this is only the very first stage of a larger and long term project, we see value in sharing the findings. A total of 41 useable questionnaires were returned representing a 41% response rate.

This is above the 32% average response rate reported by Cycyota and Harrison (2006) from their meta-analysis of self-report surveys of executives. Of the 41 principals represented in the sample 40 responded to the item relating to gender. There was a relatively even spread of males (n=22, 53.7%) and female (n=18, 43.9%). This finding is contrary to Oduro and MacBeath's (2003) argument that schools in developing countries especially in Africa have a paucity of female leadership. It is also indicative of the success of the Kenyan government's policy of at least 30% female representation in leadership/decision-making positions as part of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Within the sample, 48.78% (n=20) had been at their current school for three years or less. A further 21.95% (n=9) had worked for between 4 to 5 years and 5 to 10 years, respectively while only one principal having been in their school for more than 10 years.[2] Before further statistical analysis of data could be undertaken, it was important to ascertain whether the instrument demonstrated a sufficient level of cross-cultural validity.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of data for this project takes place on three levels. First, given the replication nature of the project, there is need to develop an argument for the cross-cultural validity of the research and particularly the research instrument. Secondly, there is analysis of the Nakuru sample and the patterns within that data. Finally, and consistent with the research questions, there is analysis of the Nakuru and Scott's (2003) data.

Cross-cultural validity

Researchers have long been aware of the importance of determining an instruments' suitability for use in different cultural contexts (Robitail et al., 2007) and this issue is of central importance in this paper. The objective of this initial analysis is to examine the structural and cross-cultural validity of the research instrument by analysing its factor structure, the unidimensionality of the data and internal consistency of its individual scales. In each case,

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of importance measures.

Scale	*N*	$\bar{x}$	σ
Personal abilities	39	4.282	0.586
Impersonal abilities	40	4.396	0.599
Intellectual abilities	40	4.308	0.591
Specific skills and knowledge	40	4.270	0.551
Relevance of professional development	40	4.217	0.611
Overall	41	4.292	0.508

statistics are reported for both the importance and extent measures. Of course, all of this analysis is prefaced on two important assumptions, the conceptual equivalence of 'principal preparation and development' and the successful operationalisation of that concept into measurement. A construct is said to have cross-cultural conceptual equivalence if it can be meaningfully discussed in different contexts (Hui and Triandis, 1985). We argue that despite claims regarding the uniqueness of each and every school that there is a great deal of predictability in schooling and by virtue, school leadership. Therefore we contend that, while acknowledging the idiosyncratic nature of individual nations, states and regions, principal preparation and development has universal acceptance as a concept and as the literature shows (Lumby et al., 2008) can be discussed meaningfully on an international scale.

Building from this, and consistent with the research questions of this project, we argue that the operationalisational of this concept for the purpose of measuring participants perceived importance of specific items and the degree to which prior preparation and development courses/programs have focused on them is appropriate. In addition, the same instrument was applied in both contexts. Moving into statistical analysis of the data, our next move is to examine the structural and cross-cultural validity of the questionnaire by analysing its factor structure, the unidimensionality and the internal consistency of its individual scales. Each scale was subjected to confirmatory factor analysis. Statistically, the factor structure of the questionnaire does maintain integrity in the Kenyan context. It is to be noted that Scott (2003) did not report factor analysis, or scale level statistics for that matter, making it impossible to compare the factor structure directly.[3] The Eigenvalues range from 5.862 to 7.273 for importance and 6.072 to 8.501 for extent with the percentage of variance explained (R^2) 60.162 to 73.274 and 56.644 to 75.989, respectively. To examine the unidimensionality of the data we calculated the skewness and kurtosis of the data set. In all bar one case (personal – importance), the measures are within 1.500 which Kline (1998) argues indicates univariate normality of data.

To assess the internal consistency of the scales, Cronbach's alpha (α) was used. The α for the scales for importance are 0.756 (personal abilities), 0.897 (interpersonal abilities), 0.902 (intellectual abilities), 0.908 (specific skills and knowledge), and 0.869 (keeping principal development programs relevant). The extent measures have α of 0. 959 (personal abilities), 0.929 (interpersonal abilities), 0.956 (intellectual abilities), 0.924 (specific skills and knowledge), and 0.945 (keeping principal development programs relevant). All of which are higher than 0.700 which has been suggested as the lower end of acceptable in the social sciences (Kaplan, 1987). It is to be noted that although many of the α scores are very high (>.900), which DeVellis (2003) suggest may warrant shortening the scale, however, due to the limited scale of this study and the previous use of the questionnaire it was decided to remain with the original structure. Following analysis relating to the cross-cultural validity of the research instrument, a variety of statistical analysis was conducted. While primarily drawing on descriptive statistics, due to the purpose of the study, there is some comparison of means within the Nakuru sample and between the Nakuru and Scott's sample. In such cases, acknowledging recent calls for statistical reform in educational administration (Byrd, 2007; Byrd and Eddy, 2009), and the need to report more than just significance (*p*) values, effect sizes are included. Recognising that Cohen's (1988) *d* is arguably the most recognised and frequently used effect size measure; it has been reported in all comparisons.

What is the perceived importance of the principal leadership capabilities?

This research question is explored at two different levels: first, at a descriptive level using the sample from this project, and secondly comparing the Nakuru sample with Scott's research in NSW public schools although it is to be noted that this comparison is based on the data reported by Scott not the actual data set. Analysis takes place at the item, scale and questionnaire level, however, recognizing the limitations of comparing individual items, only scale and questionnaire level results are reported in this paper. Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics of number (*n*), mean ($\bar{x}$), and standard deviation (δ) at the scale level, with the questionnaire level results being *N*=41; $\bar{x}$=4.29; δ=.51. Having operationalized a five-point Likert scale, means ranging from 4.217 through to 4.396

Table 2. Scott's data for perceived importance.

Scale	*N*	$\bar{x}$	σ
Personal abilities	322	4.678	0.107
Impersonal abilities	322	4.567	0.218
Intellectual abilities	322	4.558	0.132
Specific skills and knowledge	322	4.461	0.214
Relevance of professional development	322	4.248	0.613
Overall	322	4.496	0.345

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of questionnaire (extent).

Scale	*N*	$\bar{x}$	σ
Personal abilities	40	3.528	1.068
Interpersonal abilities	40	3.896	0.861
Intellectual abilities	40	3.706	1.070
Specific skills and knowledge	38	3.880	0.744
Relevance of professional development	39	3.641	0.973
Overall	41	3.733	0.842

indicate a positive level of agreement. It is important to read these findings in context. Table 2 displays a comparison of means for perceived importance from Scott's NSW sample. As Scott only reported his data at the individual item level (despite displaying the data as separate categories within the questionnaire), this data was calculated by adding the means for each item within a scale and dividing by the number of items. Given the manner in which the Scott data was calculated (working from item level means as opposed to the raw data), it is not surprising that the standard deviations are smaller. Overall, across both the Nakuru and NSW data sets, there is general agreement in the importance of the domains.

This is a significant development in relation to the study. Building from the cross-cultural validity data presented previously, this data can be used to argue that despite the apparent disparity between contexts, there is a general agreement by school principals as to the importance of the five domains of school leadership (although it is to be noted that the Nakuru sample did not rate as high as the NSW sample did). This is despite noting previously that it is not easy, and/or even possible, to merely borrow a model from developed nations and apply them in an African context. Before moving on to examine the extent of current school leadership preparation and development programs a series of analysis was conducted using the demographic variables supplied by respondents, notably, gender, time as a principal, tenure in current school and the school-based demographic of school size (measured by student enrolment).

In relation to gender (it is noted that conventional thinking is that gender is an organizing structure in society as opposed to a binary measure of a person's makeup), although males rated each domain higher, there was no statistically significant difference with effect sizes ranging up to medium using Cohen's *d*.[4] Similar results are present in relation to time as a principal, the tenure of principals and school size. Not disregarding the potential moderating effect of these variables for principals, and arguably as a result of the sample size, in the context of this study, demographic variables cannot be attributed to variance in perceived importance. On the basis of the data collected from the Nakuru sample, and in the context of Scott's data, we argue that there is a high level of perceived importance in the domains of school leadership capabilities as articulated by Geoff Scott in the NSW context.

The extent of prior programs focusing on these capabilities

Building on from the previous section, this question focuses on the extent to which existing school leadership preparation and development addresses the leadership capabilities as articulated by Scott. As with the previous section, the descriptive statistics are presented in Table 3. The overall questionnaire level results are: N=41; $\bar{x}$=3.73; δ=0.84. Each of the five scales rates lower in the extent of focus than it did for the level of importance. This is however is not surprising given the published literature on the limitations of school leadership preparation and development in Africa and specifically Kenya (Onderi and Croll, 2008; Onguko et al., 2008; Wanzare and Ward, 2000). To provide some context to this difference, Table 4 displays the data from Scott's (2003). As with the Nakuru sample, each scale is rated lower for the extent of focus than it is for importance. In each case though, the

Table 4. Scott's (2003) data for extent.

Scale	*N*	$\bar{x}$	σ
Personal abilities	322	2.681	0.261
Impersonal abilities	322	2.731	0.300
Intellectual abilities	322	2.554	0.264
Specific skills and knowledge	322	2.884	0.327
Relevance of professional development	322	2.097	0.278
Overall	322	2.597	0.396

Table 5. Comparison of means for import and extent Nakuru sample.

Scale	*N*	$\bar{x}$	σ	*t*	*df*	*p*	*d*
Personal abilities							
Import	39	4.282	0.586	5.325	38	≤.001	0.884
Extent	40	3.514	1.078				
Interpersonal abilities							
Import	40	4.399	0.606	4.021	38	≤.001	0.691
Extent	40	3.889	0.871				
Intellectual abilities							
Import	40	4.309	0.599	3.392	38	0.002	0.694
Extent	40	3.702	1.084				
Specific skills and knowledge							
Import	40	4.285	0.545	3.636	36	0.001	0.607
Extent	38	3.885	0.754				
Relevance of professional development							
Import	40	4.211	0.618	3.632	38	0.001	0.699
Extent	39	3.641	0.973				
Overall							
Import	41	4.292	0.508	4.588	40	≤.001	0.804
Extent	41	3.733	0.842				

NSW sample rated the extent lower. At this level of analysis, it is argued that existing school leadership preparation and development programs are not addressing the leadership capabilities to the same level that principals consider them to be important.

Table 5 presents a comparison, using a paired *t*-test, of the degree of importance and the extent to which existing programs focus on that capability. Unlike previous tables, given that in our data, we are able to present a direct comparison. Particular attention is drawn to the effect size measures. All differences are statistically significant (using the *p* values) with medium to large effect sizes. The difference between importance and extent ranges from 0.400 to 0.768. In contrast, the variance in Scott's data ranges from 1.557 to 2.151. To help provide some further context for this analysis, we decided to investigate, as best as we could, the variance between importance and extent in the two samples. Given the lack of access to Scott's raw data, and the difficulties, if not impossibilities of calculating data for accurate comparison and effect size measures between the two samples, Table 6 displays a comparison between the two samples. It shows a comparison of the raw differences between the sum of all items within each scale. That is, the means for each item in the scale is totalled, with the sum of the extent measure subtracted from the importance measure. What is reported is the raw difference between the two totals and the percentage of difference between the two totals.

The variance in the percentage of difference is

Table 6. Comparison of difference in Scott and Nakuru sample.

Scale	Items	Range	Import	Extent	Diff.	% diff.
Personal abilities						
Nakuru	12	12-72	50.308	40.550	9.974	19.4
Scott			56.140	32.170	23.970	42.7
Interpersonal abilities						
Nakuru	10	10-60	43.300	38.550	4.846	11.0
Scott			45.670	27.310	18.360	40.2
Intellectual abilities						
Nakuru	8	8-48	34.375	29.375	5.051	14.5
Scott			36.560	20.520	16.040	43.9
Specific skills and knowledge						
Nakuru	13	13-78	55.025	49.684	5.649	9.7
Scott			58.130	37.970	20.160	34.7
Relevance of professional development						
Nakuru	9	9-54	37.850	31.256	6.539	17.4
Scott			37.410	19.160	18.250	48.8
Overall						
Nakuru	52	52-312	220.858	189.415	31.443	14.2
Scott			233.910	137.130	96.780	41.4

noteworthy, as Scott's data displays between two and almost four times as much variance as the Nakuru sample. While it is beyond the scope of (temporal and empirical) of this study, there are arguably some underlying cultural principles that require closer interrogation. We interpret both Tables 5 and 6 to argue that while there is a significant difference between the perceived importance and extent measures for the Nakuru sample (not as large as in Scott's NSW data set though), the poor alignment need not be one of deficit. This finding is consistent with the argument that principal programs are poorly aligned to the self-perceived needs of participants. The notion of 'self-perceived' is important here. There is a common sense argument that aspiring school leaders do not necessarily know what it is that they need to know, or they place higher value on learning lesser important information as a result of not being in the role. There is also substantial literature on the accuracy of self-reporting assessments of one's capabilities. What is different about this specific project is that the learning needs are being investigated from practising principals. Unlike aspirants, the participants are working principals on a day-to-day basis and therefore are arguably the most appropriate people to ask in relation to their learning needs. This work is also about the perceived learning needs of practising principals, therefore the self-reporting is less of an issue. Therefore, given the gap between perceived importance and the extent of focus in previous programs, we argue that it is the exclusion of principals from the conversation that is limiting preparation and development programs.

This manifests on two levels; first, there is a perceived imposition on principals from systematic authorities as to what they need to know to do their job; and secondly, the perceived relevance, and by virtue, impact, of programs is limited. It is important for us to note at this point, that programs offered by KESI were the highest rating in the data set (n= 30, $\bar{x}$=4.57, δ=.77), higher than the Kenyan Secondary School Heads Association (n=30,$\bar{x}$=3.93, δ=1.172), a master's degree (n=20, $\bar{x}$=4.00, δ=1.257), or any other form of professional learning relating to the preparation and development of school leaders. Using a paired sample t-test, the perceived value of KESI programs is statistically significant against both the Kenyan Secondary Schools Heads Association (n=30, t=2.850, df=29, p=.008, d=.644) and master's degree categories (n=20, t=2.491, df=19, p=.022, d=.856), with medium and large effect sizes. That being said, on a six-point scale, rating of 4.00 or above (we do note that Kenyan Secondary Schools Heads Association is only 3.93) reflect a positive level of agreement. Therefore, as this works progresses, we propose to investigate further what is offered in school leadership preparation and development programs, including but not exclusively, what context is covered, what programs are to be taught, how is it delivered, while also engaging with the lived

experience of those who both teaches into and participate in programs. There is clearly much yet to be interrogated in the preparation and development of Kenyan school leaders.

Conclusion

Clearly there is a need for further research on the learning needs of school principals, and arguably school leadership in general, in Kenya. This study has scratched the surface and contributed to an emerging discourse coming out of Africa in relation to school leadership preparation and development. Importantly, this work has laid for the foundation for further empirical work that explores the expectations of participants, facilitators, and government in both auditing the current provision on a larger scale, and developing a series of empirically informed policy recommendations. This future work will also advance the theoretical understanding of school leadership preparation and development in the specific context of Kenya a much needed body of work given the dearth of context specific scholarship and the apparent seduction of importing programs and structures from elsewhere. As noted previously, this work is ongoing, but a step toward advancing the economic prosperity and social cohesion of Kenya through the transformative power of education.

Notes

[1] It should however be noted that the use of the term 'training' has pedagogical, curriculum and assessment issues. Training is frequently linked to vocations as opposed to the 'education' of professionals. This is particularly relevant in neoliberal policy contexts where governments are frequently accused of de-professionalising education as part of the managerialist project of the state.

[2] Two principals did not respond to the item relating to tenure on the questionnaire.

[3] We did attempt to get access to Scott's data, however as the work was commissioned, and therefore owned by, the state education department (and there has been significant changes since 2003 in its structure), we were not granted access to the original data set.

[4] Cohen (1988) hesitantly defined effect sizes as 'small, d = .20', 'medium, d = 0.50' and 'large, d = .80', but warned of the inherent danger of applying such ideas too strictly.

REFERENCES

Arikewuyo OM (2009). Professional training of secondary school principals in Nigeria: a neglected area in educational system. Florida J. Educ. Admin. Policy, 2(1):73-84.

Bush T, Oduro GKT (2006). New principals in Africa: preparation, induction and practice. J. Educ. Admin., 44(4):359-375.

Byrd JK (2007). A call for statistical reform in EAQ. Ed Admin. Q., 43(3):381-391.

Byrd JK, Eddy C (2009). Statistical applications in two leading educational administration journals. J. Ed Admin., 47(4):508-520.

Cohen J (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cycyota CS, Harrison DA (2006). What (not) to expect when surveying executives: A meta-analysis of top manager response rates and techniques over time. Organ. Res. Methods, 9(2):133-160.

DeVillis RF (2003). Scale development: theory and applications (2nd ed. Vol. 26). London: SAGE.

Eacott S (2012). Introducing under-graduate students to school leadership concepts. J. Educ. Admin., 50(2):159-172..

Eacott S (2011). Preparing 'educational' leaders in managerialist times: an Australian story. J. Educ. Admin. History, 43(1):43-59.

Harber C, Dadey A (1993). The job of headteacher in Africa: Research and reality. Int. J. Educ. Dev., 13(2):147-160.

Herriot A, Crossley M, Juna M, Waudo J, Mwirotsi M, Kamau A (2002). The development and operation of headteacher support groups in Kenya: A mechanism to create pockets of excellence, improve the provision of quality education and target changes in the community. Int. J. Educ. Dev., 22(5):509-526.

Hui CH, Triandis HC (1985). Measurement in cross-cultural psychology. J. Cross-Cultural Psch., 16(2):131-152.

Kaplan RM (1987). Basic statistics for the behavioral sciences. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kitavi MW, Van der Westhuizen PC (1997). Problems facing beginning principals in developing countries: a study of beginning principals in Kenya. Int. J. Educ. Dev., 17(3):251-263.

Kline RB (1998). Principles and practice of structural equation modelling. New York, NY: Guilford.

Lumby J, Crow GM, Pashiardis P (2008). International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders. New York, NY: Routledge.

McKenzie P, Kos J, Walker M, Hong J (2008). Staff in Australia's schools 2007. Canberra: Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training.

Mestry R, Grobler B (2002). The training and development of principals in the management of educator. Int. Stud. Educ. Admin., 30(3):21-34.

Monyatsi PP, Tsayang G, Bulawa PG, Mhozya C (2008). An evaluation of the impact of the PSMDP on the management performance areas from the perspectives of the SMTs. Int. J. Sci. R in Ed, 1(1):1-12.

Oduro GKT, MacBeath J (2003). Traditions and tensions in leadership: the Ghanaian experience. Cambridge J. Educ., 33(3):441-455.

Onderi H, Croll P (2008). In-service training needs in an African context: a study of headteacher and teacher perspectives in the Gucha district of Kenya. Prof Dev in Ed, 34(3):361-373.

Onguko B, Abdalla M, Webber CF (2008). Mapping principal preparation in Kenya and Tanzania. J. Educ. Admin., 46(6):715-726.

Pheko B (2008). Secondary school leadership practice in Botswana. Educ. Mgmt. Admin. Lead., 36(1):71-84.

Robitail S, Ravens-Sieberer U, Simenoni MC, Rajmil L, Bruil J, Power M, Duer W, Cloetta B, Czemy L, Mazur J, Czimbalmos A, Tountas Y, Hagquist C, Kilroe J, Auquier P, the Kidscreen Group (2007). Testing the structural and cross-cultural validity of the KIDSCREEN-27 quality of life questionnaire. Qual. Life Res., 16(8):1335-1345.

Scott G (2003). Learning principals: leadership capability and learning research in New South Wales Department of Education and Training. Sydney: New South Wales Department of Education and Training.

Su Z, Gamage DT, Minniberg E (2003). Professional preparation and development of school leaders in Australia and the USA. Inter. Educ. J., 4(1):42-59.

Thrupp M (2005). The National College for School Leadership: a critique. Manage. Educ., 19(2):13-19.

Walker WG (1964). Teaching and research in educational administration. J. Educ. Admin., 2(1): 9-22.

Wanzare ZO, Ward K (2000). Rethinking staff development in Kenya. Int. J. Educ. Manage., 14(6):265-275.