

DEVELOPMENT OF A PREPARATION PROGRAMME FOR CHURCH AND CHURCH SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS IN KENYA

By JOSPHAT YEGO

The purpose of this study is to correlate perceived present and future needs of church and church school administrators in Kenya and to develop an appropriate preparation program for pastors and church school administrators based on the results of the analysis of the correlation. A questionnaire developed by the research for purposes of this study was structured so that perceived needs through experience were ranked from the most important to the least important based on the present job. Ten administrative functions and responsibilities were listed on the questionnaire, and the respondents were asked to rank these based on experience and on the future needs of church and church school administrators in Kenya. A suggested preparation programme was developed through the correlational study, concordance analysis of the rankings from pastors, church and church school administrators, as well as teachers in church owned schools.

The ten administrative functions and responsibilities were as follows:

- Managing money
- Planning
- Motivating
- Counseling
- Decision making
- Conducting meetings
- Managing conflicts and human relations
- Managing time
- Organizing
- Working in the organizational structure

Several educators and researchers have indicated that developing countries such as Kenya have tended to emulate or borrow outright from the Western World. However, this may have been an unfortunate practice. For example, Pius Wakatama, Director of Communication in Rhodesia, stated that most of the present conflicts between church and mission boards could have been avoided if the mission boards had asked the churches what they needed. Instead, the missionaries gave the national church what they thought they needed. "The problem with a number of missions is that they think they

Dr. Josphat Yego is the Dean of Daystar International Institute and has formerly taught at Kapsabet Bible Institute and Illinois State University in the United States.

know what the national church needs without even asking it. Sometimes this assumption can bear painful results." Wakatama continued to show how several mission boards have established programs, prepared lesson materials, translated these into the national language, and prepared them for distribution, only to find that the program was inappropriate and unworkable.

A successful program should be based on the perceived needs by those practising in the field. Therefore, the correlation coefficient study was performed based on the identification and ranking of perceived needs. A preparation program was developed based on the coefficient or concordance and correlation coefficient of the needs and the needed preparation of the future administrators in Kenya. In order to accomplish this task a questionnaire was developed and sent. Over 700 questionnaires were sent to respondents in Kenya, the United States of America, and Canada. Three hundred and twenty-three were completed and of these, 288 were usable. The 288 respondents were categorized into three groups of which 151 were pastors, forty nine were administrators and eighty eight were teachers.

The respondents were grouped into four categories based on their background. The respondents were grouped into four categories based on their background. Of the 288 respondents, eighty-five had received in training, 106 were trained were trained abroad.

TABLE 1
RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO POSITION

Position	Number of Respondents	Percent
Pastors	151	52.4
Administrators	49	17.0
Teachers	88	30.6
Total	288	100.0

TABLE 2
RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO BACKGROUND

Background	Number of Respondents	Percent
No training	85	29.5
Trained in Kenya	106	36.8
Trained in Kenya and abroad	44	15.3
Trained abroad	53	18.4
Total	288	100.0

Table 3 indicates the background of each group. More than 60.3 percent of the pastors received their training in Kenya; 63.3 percent of the administrators were trained abroad only. Most responding administrators who received training abroad only were missionaries. More than 47.7 percent of the teachers indicated they had not received any Bible or theological training.

TABLE 3
BACKGROUND OF EACH GROUP OF RESPONDENTS

	Pastors	Administrators	Teachers.
With no training			
Number	37	6	42
Percent	24.5	12.5	47.7
Trained in Kenya			
Number	91	2	13
Percent	60.3	4.1	14.8
Trained in Kenya and Abroad			
Number	18	10	16
Percent	11.9	20.4	18.2
Trained abroad only			
Number	5	31	17
Percent	3.3	63.3	19.3
Total			
Number	151	49	88
Percent	100.1	100.0	100.0

Analysis of the Data by General Rankings

General Rankings by

All the Respondents

Rankings by All Respondents Based on Present Job. Respondents were asked to rank the ten listed administrative functions and responsibilities based on present job. They were asked to number them from the most important to the least important, 1—10. Results of the rankings are indicated in Table 4. The three highest-ranked administrative functions and responsibilities were: (1) planning, (2) motivating, and (3) organizing. The three lowest-ranked administrative functions and responsibilities were: (1) working with the organizational structure, (2) conducting meetings, and (3) managing conflicts and human relations.

Ranking by All Respondents Based on Future Needs of Administrators. Respondents were asked to rank the ten listed administrative functions and

responsibilities based on future needs of administrators. They were asked to number them from the most important to the least important, 1–10. Results of the rankings are indicated in Table 5. The three highest-ranked administrative functions were: (1) planning, (2) motivating, and (3) organizing. The three lowest-ranked administrative functions and responsibilities were: (1) working with the organizational structure, (2) conducting meetings, and (3) managing conflicts and human relations.

General Rankings by Position Group

Rankings by Pastors Based on Present Job. Pastors were asked to rank the ten listed administrative functions and responsibilities based on present job. They were asked to number them from the most important to the least important, 1–10. Results of the rankings are indicated in Table 6. The three highest-ranked administrative functions and responsibilities were: (1) planning, (2) motivating, and (3) organizing. The three lowest-ranked administrative functions and responsibilities were: (1) working with the organizational structure, (2) managing conflicts and human relations, and (3) managing money.

Rankings by Pastors Based on Future Needs of Administrators Pastors were asked to rank the ten listed administrative functions and responsibilities based on future needs of administrators. They were asked to number them from the most important to the least important, 1–10. Results of the rankings are indicated in Table 7. The three highest-ranked administrative functions and responsibilities were: (1) planning, (2) motivating, and (3) counseling. The three lowest-ranked administrative functions and responsibilities were: (1) working with the organizational structure, (2) managing conflicts and human relations, and (3) conducting meetings.

Analysis of the Data by Kendall's W Coefficient of Concordance Kendall's W coefficient of concordance measures the amount of agreement of a rank order. It indicates the extent to which members of a set distinctly rank ordering of items. The mean rank indicates the amount of agreement in rank orders. The Kendall's W ranges from 0 to 1, with 0 indicating a total lack of agreement and 1 indicating a perfect agreement.

Kendall's W Measure of All Respondents

The Kendall's W coefficient of concordance was used to measure the amount of agreement for all respondents with respect to their rankings of each administrative function, as well as the mean ranks for the most important to the least important administrative functions for the total group.

Rankings by All Respondents Based on Present Job. The respondents were asked to rank the ten listed administrative functions and responsibilities from the most important to the least important based on present job. The Kendall's W, as well as the mean ranks based on the present job, are presented in Table IV.

Rankings by All Respondents Based on Future Needs of Administrators. Respondents were asked to rank the ten listed administrative functions and responsibilities based on future needs of administrators. The Kendall's W, as well as the mean ranks based on the future needs of administrators, is presented in Table V. The W for this analysis.

TABLE IV
KENDALL'S W COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE OF ALL
RESPONDENTS BASED ON PRESENT JOB

Administrative Functions and Responsibilities	Mean Rank
Managing money	6.19
Planning	3.13
Motivating	4.58
Counseling	5.70
Decision making	5.27
Conducting meetings	6.47
Managing conflicts and human relations	6.32
Managing time	5.71
Organizing	5.09
Working with the Organizational structure	6.54

TABLE V
KENDALL'S COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE OF ALL
RESPONDENTS BASED ON FUTURE NEEDS OF ADMINISTRATORS

Administrative Functions and Responsibilities	Mean Rank
Managing money	5.74
Planning	3.21
Motivating	4.66
Counseling	5.76
Decision making	5.35
Conducting meetings	6.59
Managing conflict and human relations	6.05
Managing time	5.59
Organizing	5.20
Working with the organizational structure	6.86

Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient Based on Position and Training

There were two categories: Position and training. Position included pastors, administrators, and teachers. The training category included no training, trained in Kenya, trained in Kenya and abroad, and trained abroad only. The Spearman rank order correlation coefficient data are presented in Tables VI through XI

Rankings between Pastors and Administrators. Table VI presents the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient for the rankings between pastors and administrators. There was significant correlation between the rankings of pastors and administrators on future needs of administrators, $\rho = .679$, $p = .05$. There was no significant correlation between the rankings of pastors and administrators based on present job, $\rho = .540$.

Rankings between Pastors and Teachers. Table VII presents the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient between pastors and teachers. There was a significant correlation between pastors and teachers in both rankings based on present job and future needs of administrators. The rank order correlation coefficient based on present job was $\rho = .661$, $p = .05$. The rank order correlation coefficient based on future needs of administrators was $\rho = .819$, $p = .01$.

Rankings between Administrators and Teachers. Table VIII presents the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient between administrators and teachers. There was significant correlation between administrators and teachers in both rankings based on present and future needs of administrators. The rank order correlation coefficient based on present job was $\rho = .879$, $p = .01$. The Spearman rank order correlation coefficient based on future needs of administrators was $\rho = .819$, $p = .01$.

Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient Based on Background

The Spearman rank order correlation coefficient was used to measure the correlation between all four training groups. There were four alternatives: (1) no training, (2) trained in Kenya, (3) trained in Kenya and abroad, and (4) trained abroad only.

Rankings between Respondents with No Training and the Other Three Training Groups. Table IX presents the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient between the respondents with no training and the other three training groups based on present job. There was a significant Kenya and abroad and those trained abroad only.

TABLE VI
SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
BETWEEN PASTORS' AND ADMINISTRATORS' RANKINGS

Administrative Functions and Responsibilities	Based on Present Job				Based on Future Needs			
	1	2	d	d ²	1	2	d	d ²
Managing money	8	9	-1	1	7	7	0	0
Planning	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Motivating	2	3	-1	1	2	3	-1	1
Counseling	5	8	-3	9	3	8	-5	25
Decision making	6	4	2	4	5	4	-1	1
Conducting meetings	4	10	-6	36	8	10	-2	4
Managing conflicts and human relations	9	7	2	4	9	5	4	16
Managing time	7	5	2	4	6	5	1	1
Organizing	3	2	1	1	4	2	2	4
Working with the organizational structure	10	6	4	16	10	9	1	1

TABLE VII
SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN
PASTORS' AND TEACHERS' RANKINGS

Administrative Functions and Responsibilities	Based on Present job				Based on Future Needs			
	1	†3	d	d ²	1	3	d	d ²
Managing money	8	9	-1	1	7	5	2	4
Planning	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Motivating	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	0
Counseling	5	5	0	0	3	7	-4	16
Decision making	6	3	-3	9	5	3	2	4
Conducting meetings	4	10	-6	36	8	10	-2	4
Managing conflicts and human relations	9	7	2	4	9	8	1	1
Managing time	7	6	1	1	6	6	0	0
Working with the	10	8	2	4	10	9	1	1

TABLE VIII
SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN
ADMINISTRATORS' AND TEACHERS' RANKINGS

Administrative Functions and Responsibilities	Based on Present Job				Based on Future Needs ^C			
	2	3	d	d ²	2	3	d	d ²
Managing money	9	9	0	0	7	5	2	4
Planning	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Motivating	3	2	0	0	2	2	0	0
Counseling	8	5	0	0	3	7	-4	16
Decision making	4	3	1	1	5	3	2	4
Conducting meetings	10	10	0	0	8	10	-2	4
Managing conflicts and human relations	7	7	0	0	9	8	1	1
Managing time	5	6	1	1	6	6	0	0
Organizing	2	4	2	4	4	4	0	0
Working with the organizational structure	6	8	2	4	10	9	1	1

Analysis of the Data by t-test

The t-test was employed to measure the relationship of each function with respect to "yes" and "no" responses with the corresponding rankings based on present job and future needs of administrators. Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they had been prepared in their training for the ten listed administrative functions and responsibilities. The responses of all the respondents are presented in Table IX. Training in counseling, conducting meetings, organizing, and planning were indicated most frequently. Areas reflecting the least frequency were: working with the organizations structure, managing money, managing conflicts and human relations, and decision making.

t-test Based on Present Job

Table X presents the administrative functions and responsibilities which had a significant relationship at the .05 level between "yes" and "no" responses when ranked based on present job. These were managing money and motivating. In both cases, respondents with training ranked higher than respondents with no training.

t-test Based on Future Needs of Administrators

Table X1 presents the administrative function and responsibility that had a significant relationship between "yes" and "no" response when ranked based on future needs of administrators. Managing time had a significant relationship between "yes" and "no" responses at the .05 level. The respondents who had received training in managing time ranked it as more important than those who had not received any training.

TABLE IX
PREPARATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS AND
RESPONSIBILITIES

Administrative Functions and Responsibilities	Yes and No Responses by All Respondents						
	Yes	Percent Frequency	No	Percent Frequency	0	Percent Frequency	Total
Managing money	143	49.7	125	43.4	20	6.9	288
Planning	176	61.1	99	34.4	13	4.5	288
Motivating	163	56.6	111	38.5	14	4.9	288
Counseling	189	65.6	86	29.9	13	4.5	288
Decision making	158	54.9	116	40.3	14	4.9	288
Conducting meetings	181	62.8	94	32.6	13	4.5	288
Managing conflicts and human relations	150	52.1	124	43.1	14	4.9	288
Managing time	171	59.4	102	35.4	15	5.2	288
Organizing	178	61.8	96	33.3	14	4.5	288
Working with the organi- zational structure	142	49.3	130	45.1	16	5.6	288

TABLE X
T-TEST FOR MEAN RANK DIFFERENCE BETWEEN YES AND NO
RESPONSES BASED ON PRESENT JOB

Administrative Functions and Responsibilities	Number of cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	2 Tailed Probability
Managing Money				
Yes	137	5.912	3.105	
No	124	6.701	3.052	.040
Motivating				
Yes	157	4.324	2.573	
No	110	4.972	2.649	.046

TABLE XI

**T-TEST FOR MEAN RANK DIFFERENCE BETWEEN YES AND NO
RESPONSES BASED ON FUTURE NEEDS OF ADMINISTRATORS**

Administrative Functions and Responsibilities	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	2 Tailed Probability
Managing time				
Yes	166	5.295	2.643	
No	102	6.000	2.814	04

THE FINDINGS

Planning was ranked as the most important administrative function by all respondents based on present job as well as future needs of administrators. It was also ranked as the most important administrative function and responsibility based on present job as well as future needs of administrators by all pastors, administrators, and teachers as well as by each of the four training groups.

Pastors and teachers ranked motivating and organizing as the second and third most important functions based on present job as well as future need of administrators. Administrators ranked organizing and motivating as the second and third most important functions based on present job and future needs of administrators. Organizing was judged more important by administrators than motivating; motivating was judged more important by pastors and teachers based on present job and future needs of administrators.

When the respondents were divided into the four training groups, there was statistical similarity in rankings between respondents who had no training and respondents who had trained in Kenya. There was a statistical similarity in rankings between respondents who had trained in Kenya and abroad and those who had trained abroad only based on present job and future needs of administrators. Respondents with no training ranked managing conflicts and human relations and working with the organizational structure as the two least important functions based on present job and future needs of administrators. Respondents who trained in Kenya and abroad and respondents trained abroad only ranked conducting meetings as the least important function based on present job as well as future needs of administrators. Working with the organizational structure and managing

money were ranked as the two least important functions by respondents trained in Kenya and abroad and abroad only based on present job and future needs of administrators.

The highest correlation occurred between administrators and teachers in their rankings based on present job, $\rho = .879$ (Table VIII). The lowest correlation was between pastors and teachers based on present job, $\rho = .661$ (Table VIII). There was also a high correlation between pastors and teachers and between administrators and teachers on rankings based on future needs of administrators. One observation was that pastors', administrators', and teacher', rankings based on future needs of administrators correlated significantly at the .05 level (Tables VI through VIII).

When respondents were divided into training groups, there was a higher correlation between respondents with no training and respondents who had trained in Kenya based on future needs of administrators than for the other and church school administration in Kenya.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are based on the analysis of the data in this study.

1. Although planning, motivating, and organizing were ranked by all respondents as the three most important functions; and although working with the organizational structure, conducting meetings, and managing conflicts and human relations were ranked as the three least important functions, all ten administrative functions and responsibilities received high rankings. It can be concluded, therefore, that a training program might appropriately include all ten of the listed administrative functions and responsibilities.
2. Based on the results of this study, it can be further concluded that there is a need for two types of programs. Pre-service programs as well as in-service programs should be developed to meet the needs of both present and future church and church school administrators.
3. Based on the solicited additional comments provided by the respondents it can be concluded that a training program in Kenya should be based on the priorities established by the participants and that Kenya culture and values should be reflected in that program.

Implications for Program development

Based on the analysis of the data, a need exists for two types of training programs: a pre-service program and an in-service program. The pre-service training program would be designed to meet the needs of students preparing for church and church-related vocations who are in training in Bible colleges, Bible institutes, and theological seminaries. The in-service training program would be designed to meet the needs of practicing pastors, administrators and teachers in church and church-related schools.

Pre-service Training Program

The pre-service training program should include instruction on the following administrative functions and responsibilities: planning, motivating, organizing, counseling, managing conflicts and human relations, conducting meetings, and working with the organizational structure.

The final identification of administrative functions and responsibilities must remain with the specific faculty and curriculum committees of each institution. Only they know best the needs of their denominational churches as well as the groups they serve. As an example, counseling may be taught as a subtopic in a course entitled pastoral theology. Conducting meetings may be studied within the context of the course, homiletics.

Suggested Pre-service Training Program

As shown by this research, there is a need to prepare church and church school personnel in the area of administration. The following suggested program reflects the rankings of all respondents and is based on the analysis of data obtained in regard to future needs of church and church school administrators in Kenya. It is recognized that the suggested program might be modified or adapted to meet individual or institutional needs of church and church-related schools.

Term	Administrative Functions and Responsibilities
(Twelve Weeks)	
One	Planning Motivating Organizing Decision making Managing time Managing conflicts and human relations
Two	Counseling
Three	Conducting meetings Managing money working with the organizational structure Communication Evaluation

Term one would provide instruction in the four areas that were ranked as most important. These functions are technical in nature and provide the basis for those less technical administrative functions and responsibilities that would be taught during the second term. The functions offered in term two should further prepare the student to work with the organization. Functions taught in term three should seek to encourage application of knowledge gained in terms one and two.

It is recommended that this program be offered as an elective option in the third or fourth year, near the conclusion of a student's college or seminary training. Since most of the Bible colleges, Bible institutes, and theological seminaries have elective course, it would be possible to implement this program as an elective option.

A second alternative would be to design a course that utilizes a seminar format. Practising church and church school administrators would be assigned responsibility for discussing important administrative functions and responsibilities. They would discuss their methods of dealing with these issues and their thoughts on improving administration. Both students and seminar leaders could gain from shared experiences. Christian education directors, bishops, hospital administrators, bookstore managers, and others in any other form of administration could be invited to lead these seminars under the direction of one lecturer.

Suggested In-service Training Program

It is recommended that in-service training programs should include instruction on all ten of the listed administrative functions and responsibilities. The order of instruction suggested below reflects the rankings of all respondents and is based on the analysis of data obtained in regard to future needs of church and church school administrators in Kenya.

The specific order and degree to which these functions should be addressed is dependent upon the needs of each particular group of practicing church and church school administrators. Detailed implementation of this suggested training program must remain the prerogative of the specific denomination, faculty, and the sponsoring denomination. The suggested order of instruction is:

1. Planning
2. Motivating
3. Organizing
4. Decision making
5. Managing time
6. Managing money
7. Counseling
8. Managing conflicts and human relations
9. Conducting meetings
10. Working with the organizational structure
11. Communication
12. Evaluation

Based on the importance of these functions, seminars and refresher courses are recommended for those practicing church and church school administrators who are in the field. Seminars and refresher courses should be arranged and offered on days convenient for most prospective participants.

This program should follow the pattern of implementation utilized by the Kenyan Ministry of Education in its in-service courses for teachers in the field.

It is also suggested that an expert or experts be assigned to each administrative function and responsibility and that presentations be scheduled for practising administrators. Following any large group presentation, participants should be permitted to discuss, in small groups, the material presented. Each member should also be given the opportunity to apply the new knowledge to his or her own particular situation.

Written information which presents the identified administrative functions and responsibilities in either Swahili or English should be given to those participants in the in-service program. This combination of expertise, shared information, and application should offer administrators opportunities to increase their knowledge of administrative practices.

It is suggested that a course of this type be offered three times each year; one week in April, one week in August, one week in December. All Kenyan schools are closed for holidays which occur during these months. Thus teachers, school administrators, and church administrators would be likely to have time to participate.

A further suggestion is that those churches which conduct post-refresher courses include these identified administrative functions and responsibilities within the existing framework. It is further suggested that in the first in-service year all, rather than just a few, of the administrative functions and responsibilities be covered broadly. During the second in-service year, several of the most important functions could be presented in greater detail. During the third year, church leaders could decide on the areas of concentration.

EVALUATION

Following the implementation of any training program, an evaluation of that program should be conducted for the purpose of analyzing its strengths and weaknesses. A selected committee of practicing administrators should be formed to evaluate the program. After evaluation, the committee should provide feedback information to those who were responsible for organizing and participating in the in-service program. The committee should also share its evaluation with the principals and curriculum developers of those Bible colleges, Bible institutes, and theological seminaries that participate in the pre-service training program.

Evaluation of this type would provide for the continuous assessment and appropriate modification of programs so as to meet the needs of church and church school administrators in Kenya.