Attitude of Head Teachers Towards Guidance and Counseling In Primary Schools In Kisumu West Sub County
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ABSTRACT : This study examined the attitude of head teachers towards G&C in primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County. The research objective was to find out the attitude of head teachers towards G&C. The behavioural theory of B.F. Skinner was adopted. Ex post facto research design was used for this study. The study population comprised 504 prefects, 126 head teachers, 126 G&C teachers from all the 126 primary schools in the Sub County. Saturated sampling was used to obtain 126 head teachers and 504 prefects; purposive sampling was used to obtain 126 Guidance and counselling teachers. Descriptive statistics in frequencies and percentages were used to analyze data generated by questionnaires and focus group discussions using summary tables, data from interviews were transcribed and organized into themes, categories and sub-categories as they emerged in the study. The validity and reliability of the questionnaires were enhanced through pilot study done in 14 schools which were not used in the study. Validity of the instruments was done by Supervisors in the Department of Psychology/Educational Foundation. The findings showed that: head teachers had positive attitude towards guidance and counselling in primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County: Most respondents (71%) agreed that head teachers implement G&C policy, (22%) disagreed, (7%) neutral; (68%) agreed they like using G&C in management, (24%) disagreed, (8%) neutral. Based on these findings, it was recommended that: head teachers should enhance supervision of G&C, head teachers should be trained in G&C, and the Government should fund G&C. The results of the study could assist stakeholders in the status of G&C in primary schools for planning.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Hui (2002) states that in Hong Kong, there is a well defined policy on School G&C Services as an important factor and that all head teachers implement the policy in schools. In America, School administrators spell out policy of School Guidance and Counseling services as a value and an equal partner in the Education system and provide reasons why students need to acquire competencies (Gysbers& Henderson, 2001). Baker (2007) supported (Gysbers& Henderson, 2001) when he reported that in America Schools, head teachers were always positive towards G&C. Ndanlovu, Ngandu and Phiri, (2009) in Zambia found out that the head teachers supported school guidance and counseling teachers in schools. Were, (2003) reports that guidance and counseling was introduced in Kenyan education system in 1967 and the program was coordinated by the Ministry of Education headquarters by the inspectorate. Were, (2003) noted that its main objective was to recommend how guidance and counseling could support all learning activities of the students. Later on, in 1997, the department of inspectorate was charged with the responsibility to organize in-service courses, seminars, conferences and workshops for both teachers and head teachers of school. Using this period, the Ministry of education inspectorate team visited schools to supervise and advice teachers on how to conduct guidance and counselling in all schools. Research materials were also produced for effective implementation, for example, handbook for guidance and counselling was available. Guidance and counselling (G&C) was highly regarded as an integrated part of teaching and learning in school curriculum. In 1976, the Gachathi report recommended expansion of guidance and counselling and head teachers were instructed to appoint a member of staff to be responsible for guidance and counseling in each school. It recommended that each school was to build and use cumulative records of students’ academic performance, home background, aptitudes and interests and special problems to facilitate guidance and counselling (MOEST, 2004). In addition, the Kamunge report re-emphasized that all schools should establish guidance and counselling services and advised that a senior teacher be responsible for the services (MOEST, 2004). The Kamunge report which is still in force stressed that the head of the school was to be responsible to ensure that guidance and counselling services was offered to the children and that each school was to establish guidance and counselling committee headed by a teacher appointed by the head teacher (Were, 2003).
Moreover, the presidential committee on students’ unrest and indiscipline in Kenya secondary schools observed that the Kamunge report was not being implemented in most schools (ibid, 2003). The report also noted that the Ministry of Education in Kenya did not have a strong guidance and counselling division to coordinate all activities of guidance and counselling in the country. As a result, there was laxity in enforcing guidance and counselling in schools yet teachers were also expected to take their work seriously by talking to the children about their physical changes as well as their emotional, moral and spiritual well being (Odera, 1989). This was to include relationship with the opposite sex, delinquent tendencies and how to avoid them. Parents entrust their children to the teacher to look after on their behalf while they are at school so it is the duty of the teacher to have positive attitude to help the pupils to develop fully all aspects of their life and implement the Ministry of Education policy on Guidance and Counselling in schools. According to Odera (1989) guidance and counselling involves providing pupils with leadership, getting to know them and their problems and establishing trusting and friendly relations with them to avoid indiscipline in the school. In another study, Nyaema (2004) in Kenya stated that the head teacher is invested with the weighty responsibility of running and controlling school, success of any school program and their attitude towards such program rests with them. Gitonga (2013) in Kenya noted that there was no significant difference between head teachers’ attitude towards G&C against sex, age, teaching experience and that head teachers’ personal qualities had no relationship on their attitude. The head teacher and the staff formulate and implement guidance and counselling policy in the school in line with the Ministry of Education policy, have school rules and regulations, and code of ethics in Kenyan schools (Wango & Elijah, 2007).

KIE (2003) states that the head teacher by as the chief counsellor is responsible for all the guidance and counselling programs in the schools. MOEST (2004) agrees with (KIE, 2003) by stating that the head teacher is the overall authority in the school. The role of the head teacher is necessary; for approval and support of guidance and counselling activities, for material support, to be able to identify referral / placement points, for he is the link between the G&C panel and the community, and he is in a key position to facilitate study leave for further training of the personnel (MOEST, 2004:182). Ayieko, (2005) agrees with (KIE, 2003) but adds that the head teacher motivates G&C teachers, pupils and facilitates a day for guidance and counselling seminars for students and ensures closer supervision and monitoring of students with unusual behavior. A study by Ajowi, (2005) in Kenya emphasizes that the school administrators need to employ guidance and counselling services in the management of students’ discipline in order to remove bad influence. However, the attitude of the head teachers towards guidance and counselling has not been covered instead Nyaema (2004) concentrated on the support given by the head teacher but did not show whether or not the head teachers liked G&C, implemented G&C policy.

Moreover, Ajowi, (2005) used a smaller sample of 22 Secondary Schools while this study sampled 126 primary Schools which accommodated more views. In addition, there are no measures in primary schools showing that the head teachers are cooperating in the provision of guidance and counselling to help pupils cope up with the challenges in their life. Therefore, there was need to find out the attitude of head teachers towards guidance and counselling in primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County In China, attitudes have affected the implementation and effectiveness of school guidance and counselling services negatively or positively (Hui, 2002). Myrick, (2003) states that many policy makers in American public schools are less concerned about psychological development among students as a result of school counselling. At the same time, Reynolds and Cheek, (2006) reported that some school administrators had negative attitude towards Guidance and Counselling which affected their services in American Schools. Denga, (2001) stressed that Principals who know little about counselling stifle the counsellors’ work by withholding budgetary allocation for guidance services. However, a report by Baker, (2007) differs with (Denga, 2001) by stating that Secondary head teachers were always positive towards school counselling and that students who had participated in counselling sessions had less in appropriate behaviors in California. Reynold and Cheek, (2002) differ with (Baker, 2007) when they argue that in America , negative attitudes of school administrators,counsellors, and students affect the effectiveness of School Guidance and Counselling services. American Administrators who hold the negative perception of G&C in schools give these services lower priority (Trevisan & Hubert, 2001) and that they are concerned about the vagueness of the outcome of School G&C services (Herr, 2001).

A study by Bulus, (2008) in Nigeria observed that principals misconceived the counselor’s status which often creates conflict between them and further see no reason why there should be full time counselors in the school. Nyaga (2013) in Kenya argues that the implementation of G&C in schools largely depends on the support given by the head teacher. She noted that the head teachers’ support to G&C was in adequate and as a result, imparted negatively as evidenced by many problems experienced by students while in school. There are no measures on the ground indicating that the head teachers are collectively working as a team with their
teachers in guidance and counselling in Kenyan Schools (Affulo, 2010). In addition, problems that require G&C are on the increase, therefore, it was not clear whether or not the head teachers had accepted G&C in their schools. There was need to establish their attitude towards G&C in this study.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Implementation of Guidance and counselling policy in primary schools has not been established adequately in primary schools and yet the Government policy stipulates that all schools must have guidance and counselling. As a result, problems such as: disobedience, drug abuse, stealing, irresponsible sexual behaviour and defilement, child abuse, use of abusive words, coping with adolescence, low self esteem, noise making, truancy, effects of technological advancement and HIV/AIDS, and lack of communication between teachers and pupils are rampant in primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County. It poses a question on whether or not the head teachers in primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County have accepted guidance and counselling. Therefore, it was necessary to find out the attitude of head teachers towards guidance and counselling in primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County.

Purpose of the Study and Research Objectives

The purpose of the study was to establish the attitude of head teachers towards G&C in Primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County

The research objective of this study was to examine the attitude of head teachers towards G&C in primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County.

This study attempted to answer this question; What is the attitude of the head teachers towards G&C in primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County?

III. METHODOLOGY

To enhance reliability of the instruments, piloting was conducted in 14 primary schools (10% of the population) and was not used in the study sample (Frankel & Wallen, 1996). The validity of the instruments was tested by presenting copies of the same to the Supervisors/ experts from Department of Psychology/Educational foundation who critically studied them and determined their validity and viability for research (Orodho, 2008). Content validity was adopted for this study. The study population consisted of 126 head teachers, 126 G&C teachers and 504 pupils in 126 primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County (DEO, Kisumu West, 2012). Out of 126 primary schools, there were two girls’ boarding schools and one mixed day and boarding primary. Saturated sampling was used to sample 126 schools in public primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996). The sampling technique gave a fair representation between the single sex and mixed schools. Saturated sampling was convenient because these schools were few and all of them had equal opportunity to participate (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996). Other sampling techniques that were used were as follows:

All the head teachers of 126 sampled schools were sampled using saturated sampling because the head teachers were few and that was the rationale behind the suitability of saturated sampling (Ary et al., 1996). Saturated sampling was used to obtain 504 prefects; each of the 126 schools had a group of 4 prefects. All the 126 G&C teachers were sampled using purposive sampling because they were in charge of G&C services in their schools and they were likely to provide more information. Mugenda and Mugenda, (2003) state that purposive sampling is a technique that allows a researcher to use cases that have the required information with respect to the objectives of his or her study. They were put into male and female stratum.

Table 1 shows sample framework for population and sample for this study:

Table 1: Sample framework on population and sample study in Kisumu West Sub County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Participants</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;C Teachers</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DEO’s Office, Kisumu West

3.9 Data Analysis and Presentation

Data for the study was obtained from questionnaires, focus group discussions and interviews. Data collected using questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics are measures of central tendency, graphs and tables (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Responses from questionnaires and focus group discussions were tallied and converted to percentages. Likert scale was used in this study as follows; 1: Strongly Agree (SA); 2: Agree (A); 3: Undecided (U); 4: Disagree (D); 5: Strongly Disagree (SD) to code the
G&C teachers’, head teachers’ views on the attitude of teachers towards G&C in primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The researcher started by sorting, editing, coding, and classifying according to various categories. Thereafter, tallied, and changed them into percentages which were analyzed according to the degree of responses There were tabulation and computation of frequencies and percentages of quantitative data from close ended questions. Qualitative data from interview schedule was videotaped, reviewed, transcribed, and written in verbatim according to various themes, categories and sub categories as they emerged during the study (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The following table shows G& C Teacher distribution by Age Group and Gender The age and gender of respondents were important in order to find out how they responded to G&C in their schools.

Table 2: Guidance and Counselling Teacher distribution by Age Group and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group (years)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 40 Years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50 Years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 Years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=92
The results in Table 1 reveals that among the 92 teachers, many of them 62 (67.4%) were male while 30 (32.6%) were female. The majority of the teachers 38(41.30%) were aged between 30 to 40 years, while 31 (33.7%) were aged between 41 to 50 years while those above 50 years were 12 (13.0%). About 11 (12.0%) were aged below 30 years.

The results in Table 2 show Head teachers’ distribution by experience. Head teachers’ experience was vital for this study because they were likely to have varied and a lot of information depending on how long they had stayed in leadership.

Table 3: Head Teachers’ Distribution by Experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Teachers’ Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 Yrs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Yrs</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 Yrs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 Yrs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=82
Table 4 reveals that majority of 34 (41.46%) head teachers had experience of 5 to 10 years, followed by 21 (25.61%) who had experience for between 0 to 5 years, 13 (15.85%) for between 10 to 15 years, 9(10.98%) had experience of 15 to 20 years while 5(6.10%) had over 20 years of experience.

Table 3 shows Guidance and counselling teachers’ distribution by experience as required in the questionnaires.

Table 4: Guidance and Counselling Teacher Distribution by Experience G&C teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ Experience in guidance and counselling</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 1 Year</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 Years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6 Years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 6 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=92
Attitude of Head teachers towards Guidance and Counselling

The first objective of the study was to examine the attitude of head teachers towards G&C in primary schools in their schools. The attitude of head teachers towards G&C was considered an important issue in the effective administration, implementation of G&C practices in schools. By virtue of their position, they are the chief counsellors in their schools (MOEST, 2004). Data concerning their attitude was collected from 82 head teachers, 92 G&C Teachers through questionnaires and interviews from 82 head teachers. The question about attitude was asked to find out whether or not the head teachers had positive or negative attitude towards G&C.

From the data gathered, mean scores were calculated for every individual respondent concerning seven elements (4 for head teachers, 3 for G&C teachers). From the mean scores of individual respondents, a general mean score for each group of respondents was calculated for each element. To judge whether the attitudes of head teachers and teachers were positive or negative, any mean score above 3 was considered a positive attitude while any mean below 3 was considered as a negative attitude towards a specific element, mean of 3 was neutral attitude and if the element/statement was stated in a negative way then the reverse applied.

Table 5 shows responses from head teachers on attitudinal statements regarding their attitude towards G&C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudinal statements regarding head teacher</th>
<th>SA f(%)</th>
<th>A f(%)</th>
<th>U f(%)</th>
<th>D f(%)</th>
<th>SD f(%)</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S/DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement MOEST policy in schools</td>
<td>54(65.9)</td>
<td>10(12.2)</td>
<td>3(3.7%)</td>
<td>8(9.8)</td>
<td>7(8.3)</td>
<td>4.171</td>
<td>1.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like using G&amp;C in management</td>
<td>30(36.6)</td>
<td>25(30.5)</td>
<td>7(8.5)</td>
<td>15(18.3)</td>
<td>5(6.1)</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel that G&amp;C is a waste of time</td>
<td>4(4.9)</td>
<td>6(7.3)</td>
<td>2(2.4)</td>
<td>45(54.9)</td>
<td>25(30.5)</td>
<td>2.012</td>
<td>1.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel that G&amp;C does not help pupils change their behaviour</td>
<td>6(7.3)</td>
<td>9(11)</td>
<td>9(11)</td>
<td>42(51.2)</td>
<td>16(19.5)</td>
<td>2.354</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=82

Table 4 shows that majority of head teachers (65.9%) strongly agreed they implemented MOEST policy in schools, followed by (12.2%) agreed, (9.8%) disagreed, (8.5%) strongly disagreed, (3.8%) neutral. Similarly majority of head teachers (36.6%) agreed they like agreed using G&C in their management, followed by (35.4%) agreed, (22%) disagreed, (8.5%) neutral, (6.1%) strongly disagreed.. On whether the head teachers feel that G&C was a waste of time, majority (54.9%) disagreed. Majority (51.2%) disagreed with the statement that G&C does not change pupils’ behavior. About 66 head teachers out of 82 interviewed reported that G&C is an important tool for pupils’ discipline in primary schools. They argued that just as there are mature students in secondary schools, mature pupils are also there in primary schools that need G&C. The average mean rating of the head teachers’ response was (4.171). This was interpreted to mean that the head teachers were: positive towards implementing MOEST policy on G&C, the mean rating (4.000) showed that head teachers were positive towards using G&C in their administration. The mean ratings of (2.012) on G&C as a waste of time and (2.354) on G&C does not help pupils change their behavior, showed negative responses meaning that the head teachers did not agree with the two statements. Therefore, the head teachers were positive towards G&C.

Table 6: Attitude of head teachers towards Guidance and Counselling as responded by guidance and counselling teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance and counselling teachers</th>
<th>SA f(%)</th>
<th>A f(%)</th>
<th>U f(%)</th>
<th>D f(%)</th>
<th>SD f(%)</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S/DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ready to implement Moest policy on G&amp;C</td>
<td>19(20.7)</td>
<td>40(43.5)</td>
<td>10(10.9)</td>
<td>15(16.3)</td>
<td>8(8.7)</td>
<td>3.939</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to support teachers to implement G&amp;C policy</td>
<td>24(26.1)</td>
<td>42(45.7)</td>
<td>6(6.5)</td>
<td>11(12)</td>
<td>9(9.8)</td>
<td>4.110</td>
<td>1.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always willing to discuss G&amp;C practices with teachers</td>
<td>21(22.8)</td>
<td>44(47.8)</td>
<td>7(7.6)</td>
<td>13(14.1)</td>
<td>7(7.6)</td>
<td>4.085</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always inform pupils to seek G&amp;C from teachers when in problems</td>
<td>15(16.3)</td>
<td>18(19.6)</td>
<td>4(4.3)</td>
<td>30(32.6)</td>
<td>25(27.1)</td>
<td>2.976</td>
<td>1.207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 shows that majority of G&C teachers (43.5%) agreed head teachers implemented MOEST policy. Followed by (20.7%) strongly agreed, (16.3%) disagreed, (10.9%) undecided, (8.9%) strongly disagreed. Similarly majority of teachers (45.7%) agreed that head teachers were willing to support teachers implement MOEST policy on G&C, followed by (26.1%) strongly agreed, (12%) disagreed, (9.8%) strongly disagreed, (6.5%) undecided. Similarly G&C teachers (47.8%) agreed that the head teachers were willing to discuss G&C with teachers, followed by (22.8%) strongly agreed, (14.1%) disagreed, (7.6%) undecided, (7.6%) strongly disagreed. However, majority of G&C teachers (32.6%) disagreed that the head teachers informed pupils to seek help from teachers whenever they had problems that required G&C, followed by (27.1%) strongly disagreed, (22.1%) agreed, (16.3%) strongly disagreed. The mean rating of (3.939) showed that G&C teachers accepted that head teachers were positive towards MOEST policy implementation in schools. The mean of (4.110) showed that G&C teachers agreed that head teachers were positive towards supporting teachers on G&C in schools. The respondents also accepted that head teachers were always willing to discuss G&C practices with teachers as shown by the mean of (4.085). The mean of (2.976) showed negative indicating that the respondents agreed that the head teachers did not inform pupils to seek G&C from teachers when in problems.

On whether the pupils had been informed about G&C by the head teacher, the responses were as follows;

Table 7: Response from the prefects whether the pupils had been informed about G&C by the head teachers Prefects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefects in Focus Group</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils had been informed about counseling in school</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pupils’ response in Focus Group discussion showed that majority (56.5%) had not been informed about G&C in school, followed by (43.5%) who had been informed. Responses from the head teachers and G&C teachers on attitudinal statements regarding the attitude of head teachers towards G&C: (71%) agreed head teachers implement MOEST policy (22%) disagreed (7%) were neutral, (68%) agreed head teachers liked using G&C in management (24%) disagreed, and (8%) were neutral, (72%) agreed head teachers were supporting teachers to implement G&C policy (16%) disagreed (22%) were neutral, (71%) agreed head teachers were discussing G&C practices with teachers (22%) disagreed (8%) were undecided.

It was clear from the responses on the statements regarding the attitude of head teachers towards G&C that majority (71%) agreed that the head teachers implement MOEST policy (68%) agreed head teachers liked using G&C in management, (72%) agreed head teachers were supporting teachers to implement G&C policy (71%) agreed head teachers were discussing G&C practices with teachers. Therefore, the head teachers had positive attitude towards G&C. This explains their position in the schools as chief counselors where they frequently interact with teachers, parents, pupils and other stakeholders. The teachers and pupils value the head teacher as a role model and a base upon which G&C practices are based. The formulation and implementation of G&C starts with the head teachers. This study differs with Reynolds and Cheek (2006) that school administrators in American schools had negative attitude towards G&C and as a result affected some services. The responses showed that the head teachers were ready to implement MOEST policy on G&C in schools as required by the MOEST (Were, 2004). This was a positive sign as the policy provides Government directive on implementation of G&C in schools. In addition, the head teachers were always willing to support teachers implement the policy. 

The teachers needed finance to facilitate G&C practices in schools. This was in agreement with Ndanlov, Ngandu and Phiri (2009) when they stated that head teachers in Zambia Secondary schools supported school guidance and counselling. The teachers were willing to discuss G&C issues with teachers and parents whenever the need arose like pupils’ discipline/ personal problems. The respondents showed that head teachers liked using G&C in their management. This was particularly important when managing human resource. This is contrary to Ajowi (2005) which reported that Secondary school head teachers in Kisumu District were not using G&C in their management. During the study, it emerged that the head teachers did not inform pupils to seek G&C when they were in problems. This created a gap on communication on availability of G&C practices in schools that could benefit the pupils.
Summary of Findings
This study set to establish the attitude of head teachers towards guidance and counselling in primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County. To investigate the above, the study focussed on the following objective; to examine the attitude of head teachers towards G&C in primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County.

Attitude of Head teachers towards Guidance and Counselling
The following were the findings of this objective:
[3] Head teachers were willing to discuss G&C practices with their teachers.
However, the head teachers did not inform pupils to seek for G&C whenever they were in problem situations in schools.

IV. CONCLUSION
The study concluded that:
i) The head teachers were generally positive towards guidance and counselling in primary schools in Kisumu West Sub County.

Recommendations
[2] All head teachers should enhance internal supervision of guidance and counseling in the school and submit returns to their employer monthly.
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