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ABSTRACT

In Kenya, secondary school boards of management (BOMs) have an oversight governance mandate on implementation of safety standards policy. However, persistent recurrence of safety threats in schools calls for questioning the capacity of managements to discharge this function effectively. The purpose of this study was to investigate the Board of Managements’ (BOMs’) governance practices influencing implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County, Kenya. Four objectives guided the study; to determine the extent to which BOMs’ operationalization of safety standards policy; execution of school budget; maintenance of institutional infrastructure; and enforcement of school rules and regulations, influenced implementation of safety standards policy. The study was guided by Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs theory (1943). The study adopted descriptive survey research design. The study targeted BOM members, teachers, and students in 23 public secondary schools, as well as Sub-County Director of Education (SCDE) and Sub-County Quality Assurance and Standards Officer (SCQASO). The sample size was 370 comprising of 1 SCDE, 1 SCQASO, 184 BOM members, 69 teachers and 115 students. Data collection tools were questionnaires and interview schedule. Instrument validity was assured through seeking expert opinion of university supervisors. Instrument reliability was determined through test-retest method. Descriptive statistics was used for analysis of quantitative and qualitative data and results presented in frequencies and percentages. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0 was used for data analysis. Key findings of the study were; BOMs’ operationalization of safety standards policy was determined by availability of legal and policy documents, formation of safety committees and training on safety; BOMs’ execution of budget depended on availability of adequate funds and adherence to guidelines on financial transactions; BOMs’ infrastructure maintenance was influenced by scheduled repairs and cleanliness; and BOMs’ enforcement of school rules and regulations was dependent on issuance of school rules and and provision of guidance and counseling to students. Key conclusions of the study were; operationalization of safety standards policy; execution of budget; maintenance of physical infrastructure and enforcement of rules and regulations had a significant influence on implementation of safety standards policy in Homa-Bay Sub-county secondary schools. Key recommendations were; BOMs avail safety legal and policy documents, form safety committees, mount trainings on safety; source for adequate funds, enforce guidelines on financial transactions; issue school rules and regulations; and facilitate guidance and counseling, in order to implement safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Secondary education is significant owing to the role it plays in the socio-economic advancement of nations and to the individual students. It gives the student chances of acquiring competencies, and aptitudes, for self advancement; establishes a base for furthering education and training; prepares a dependable, self-directed and socially balanced individual; creates the capacity for being inquisitive, creative and fair in making judgment; among other goals outlined in the policy framework for secondary education in Kenya (Republic of Kenya, 2012).

For a very long time in the history of education, schools have been perceived as safe havens, sanctuaries of the society, microcosms of democratic utopia; learning centers for the democratic ideal, creativity, and all of the best initiatives the society had to offer. In schools, students were out of harm’s way and as such, the parents were less bothered as the safety of their children was assured (Bushaw& Lopez, 2011).

However, this is no longer the case as schools today have become one of the unsafe places. For instance in 2013, 230 girls were taken hostage by Boko Haram in Nigeria. In the USA in 2012, there was mass shooting incident, which led to the death of 30 students and 6 adults. In fact, terrorism and radicalization of the school going youth is on the increase worldwide (Kemunto, et al, 2015).
The increase of unsafe environments in schools has prompted governments and international organizations to formulate various policies, declarations and agreements seeking to ensure school safety. The United Nations International Strategy on Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) in 2006-2007 carried out a global campaign whose theme was “Disaster reduction begins at school”. The point of emphasis was on the need for preparedness in the education sector by advocating for the preservation of the right to life with dignity, protection against threats and availability of basic needs in case of disasters (Republic of Kenya, 2015).

In the United States of America and Canada, Zero-Tolerance policies which promote prevention of violence and drug abuse have been adopted in schools where high school students found to have violated the policies were expelled. Other security measures include installation of closed circuit cameras, installation of metal detectors, deployment of security guards and requiring students, staff and visitors to wear identification badges (Janel, 2017). In China, the siting of school compounds and buildings requires approval by education and government authorities to assess the vulnerability of the locations to destructions caused by strong winds, earthquakes, landslides and floods (HFA, 2015).
In South Africa, the Safe Schools Project was launched in 2000 to create safe and disciplined learning environments, which involved promoting safety at school through; surveillance on violence and injury; developing discipline and behavior codes for learners; and after school safety training activities (Chepkirui, 2017). In Rwanda, the Ministry of Education developed a policy document that outlines infrastructure standards expected to be met by all schools which include; construction of spacious classrooms with adequate ventilation and lighting; and also free of dampness; besides availability of adequate latrines and hand washing facilities (Hirano, 2009).

The Kenyan government has put in place measures for enhancement of safe learning environments and this was first articulated through the formulation of safety standards policy for schools in 2008. The Constitution of Kenya, 2010 further recognizes the right of the child to protection from an environment that is likely to be harmful to the child in terms of physical, mental, spiritual, moral and social development. Children Act (2001) entitles the child to the right of protection from physical, psychological abuse and neglect (IFAC, 2013).

The Constitution of Kenya, 2010 in the fourth schedule, article 185(2), 186(1) and 187(2) outlines the distribution of the functions between the national and the county governments. Policy formulation is a function of the national government. The cabinet secretary Ministry of Education is mandated by the Basic Education Act, 2013, to ensure that policies and guidelines are developed for the education sector.
The County Education Boards (CEBs), BOMs and semi-autonomous government agencies (SAGAs) in the education sector, as corporate entities, are instrumental in customizing and implementing government policies at the institutional levels, in tandem with national education objectives; policies and legal frameworks (Republic of Kenya, 2016).

BOMs are therefore expected to cascade and entrench MOE policies, including safety standards policy, in secondary schools and ensure that the policies form the basis of decision making as they deliberate on the affairs of schools (Republic of Kenya, 2015). In relation to this study, safety standards implementation could be achieved through the influence of BOMs’ governance practices, which entails; operationalization of safety standards policy, execution of school budget, maintenance of physical infrastructure, and enforcing of school rules and regulations in schools.

According to Moche (2013) policy operationalization calls for entrenchment and adherence to laws and regulations of a corporate entity in order to foster transparency and accountability. School budget execution is the process by which, financial resources made available to the institution, are directed and controlled towards the achievement of purposes for which the budget was approved (www.treasury.go.ke).
Further, BOMs should ensure that classrooms, dormitories, offices, kitchen, toilets and other physical structures are accessible, clean, well maintained, friendly and appropriately situated and utilized. The school compound should be demarcated and fenced with a secure gate (Kemunto, *et al*, 2015). Sensitization of students on the school rules and regulations becomes equally paramount for creation of an orderly school environment (Maingi, 2015).

While the BOMs have their well cut out mandate in the governance of the schools and specifically with regard to safety standards policy implementation, there are persistent recurrence of safety crisis in public secondary schools, which demand urgent strategies for solution, if similar cases or more sophisticated ones are to be avoided in future. The absence of safety mechanisms in schools cause disruption of learning, destruction of property and learning resources and worst of all, lives are lost, hence placing the management, teachers and students on the spotlight (Kirui, Mbugua & Sang, 2011).

**1.2 Statement of the Problem**

The upsurge of incidents of learning disruption, student indiscipline; injuries caused by defects in school infrastructure or destruction of school buildings by winds and fires; mismanagement of school resources; and non-adherence to educational policies in secondary schools continue to be highlighted in the Quality Assurance and Standards assessment reports in Kenya and Homa-Bay sub-county in particular (Executive Summary: Homa-Bay Sub-county Standards Assessment Report, 2018).
The Basic Education Act 2013, provides for the establishment of school BOMs as decentralized corporate entities mandated to oversight implementation of safety standards policy, in order to ensure that school environments are free of safety threats. Despite the existence of functional BOMs, there is unrelenting recurrence of safety threats in schools. Cases of student molestation, bullying and assault, and rape which were reported at Maseno, Alliance Boys, and Moi Girls secondary schools, respectively, added to the statistics of worrying trends of insecurity in secondary schools (Achuka, 2018). In Homa-Bay sub-county, a dormitory fire disaster at Homa-Bay Boys High School (Onyango, 2014) and student protest at Lala Secondary School in January 2018 were reported (SCDE,Homa-Bay,2018)

Several studies have been done in Kenya with regard to safety standards policy implementation and the roles of the BOMs in secondary schools (for instance Ndeto, 2015; Kemunto et al., 2015; Kitheka, 2016; Chepkurui, 2017). However, there is scanty information with regard to BOMs’ governance practices influencing implementation of the safety standards policy, hence a knowledge gap. It is therefore this gap that the researcher sought to fill.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of BOMs’ governance practices on the implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County, Kenya.
1.4 Objectives of the Study

The following were the objectives of the study:

i) To establish the influence of BOMs’ operationalization of the safety standards policy on its implementation in secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County.

ii) To determine the influence of BOMs’ execution of school budget on the implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County.

iii) To examine the influence the BOMs’ maintenance of institutional infrastructure on the implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County.

iv) To establish the influence of BOMs’ enforcement of school rules and regulations on the implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County.

1.5 Research Questions

To achieve the above objectives, the following research questions were formulated:

i) How has the BOMs’ operationalization of the safety standards policy influenced its implementation in secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County?

ii) What is the influence of BOMs’ execution of school budget on the implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-county?
iii) What influence has the BOMs’ maintenance of institutional infrastructure had on the implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-county?

iv) To what extent does the BOMs’ enforcement of school rules and regulations influence the implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The study might benefit the following categories of stakeholders. The BOMs might conceptualize the policy and identify the gaps in governance practices with regard to operationalization of safety standards policy, execution of school budget, maintenance of physical infrastructure and enforcement of school rules and regulations.

The study might also provide useful information to education policy makers on the necessity of modifying the existing policy framework on monitoring and evaluation of the BOMs’ mandate with regard to implementation of safety standards policy. Other research scholars might use the findings as a point of reference for future research. This would result in adding more literature on the BOMs’ governance practices influencing implementation of safety standards policy, which is still not adequate in other sub-counties in Kenya and the global scene. The findings could also be of use to the BOMs and CEBs who may use the findings to develop safety standards appraisal tools for assessment of compliance to safety standards policy in schools.
The parents might be able to comprehend their complimentary role in the provision of funds required for entrenching safety standards policy through execution of budget, maintenance of physical infrastructure and enforcement of students discipline. The teachers might equally benefit from the study, as they would gain understanding of the BOMs governance role in the implementation of safety standards policy and how their roles compliment that of the management.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

Some schools in Homa-Bay were inaccessible due to the poor road network and absence of adequate means of transport. The researcher however sought the services of and assistance of local cyclists who accompanied him while locating the schools.

Most BOM members were not available in schools during the time of the study. However, the researcher asked for the principals for assistance to reach them.

1.8 Delimitation of the Study

The study was confined to Homa-Bay Sub County. This means that the study findings were a reflection of unique conditions prevalent in public secondary schools in Homa-Bay sub County and therefore generalizations and application of the conclusions to other areas other than Homa-Bay Sub County ought to be treated with a lot of caution.
1.9 Assumptions of the Study

The study had the following assumptions:

i) The respondents were familiar with the safety standards policy as outlined in the safety standards manual for schools in Kenya.

ii) The implementation of safety standards policy in secondary school is influenced by the BOMs’ governance practices, all other factors held constant.

1.10 Definition of Significant Terms

Board of Management refers to a body corporate mandated by the Basic Education Act (2013) to govern secondary schools.

Enforcement refers to the act of compelling the observance of or compliance with the school rules and regulations.

Execution of budget refers to the process of implementing, monitoring and reporting on the current year’s budget for the school.

Governance practices refer to the framework principles by which a corporate body guarantees responsibility, fairness, and straightforwardness in its association with the stakeholders - financiers, clients, the executives, workers, government, and the community.

Maintenance of infrastructure refers to process of retaining the value of physical facilities that have been constructed, installed or purchased in the school to continue serving the purpose for which they were made available for the promotion of quality education.

Operationalization refers to the process of cascading, entrenching and making the safety standards policy functional in the school.
**Policy** refers to a set of basic principles formulated and enforced by a body corporate or organization, to direct and constrain its activities in the quest for long term objectives.

**Rules and Regulations** refer to the principles, norms, or laws designed to control or govern the conduct and behavior of students in the school.

**Safety Standards** refer to fundamental requirements designed to ensure the safety of learners and staff in school environment.

**Safety** refers to the relative freedom from danger, risk, or threat of harm, injury, or loss to personnel and/or property, whether caused deliberately or by accident.

**1.11 Organization of the Study**

The study was organized in five chapters: chapter one focused on introduction, which highlighted the detailed background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations, delimitations and assumptions of the study and definition of significant terms. Chapter two reviewed related literature on; the concept of governance practices; the influence of BOM’s operationalization of safety standards policy; execution of the school budget; maintenance of the institutional infrastructure; enforcement of school rules and regulation on the implementation of safety standards policy. The chapter also contained the summary of literature review, theoretical and conceptual frameworks.
The third chapter, dealt with research methodology which comprised of research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, instrument validity and reliability, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques and ethical considerations. The fourth chapter covered of data analysis in relation to the study objectives and research questions, presentation, interpretation and discussion of major findings of the study. Chapter five presented the summary of study findings, conclusions, recommendations and suggestion for further research.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviewed related literature of past researchers and the opinion of different scholars. The sub-topics covered in this section include: the concept of governance practices and implementation of safety standards policy; Operationalization of safety standards policy and its implementation; BOMs’ execution of school budget and implementation of safety standards policy; BOMs’ maintenance of institutional infrastructure and implementation of safety standards policy; and BOMs’ enforcement of school rules and regulations and the implementation of safety standards policy. It also contains the summary on literature review, theoretical and conceptual frameworks.

2.2 The Concept of Governance Practices and Implementation of Safety Standards Policy

According to Njeri (2014) governance practices refer to corporate governance tenets which call for transparency and accountability in management of public institutions. It implies management activities that the BOM engages in order to ensure effective and efficient management of a secondary school. Governance practices also imply adherence to the laws and regulations of a corporate body or organization in order to achieve fairness, responsibility, accountability and transparency in the management of the institutions and organs in order to protect the rights of all stakeholders, Moche (2013).
Secondary school management boards, like other public sector entities, have a responsibility of policy implementation, providing strategic direction and accountability of the entity (IFAC, 2013). Safety standards implementation involves a series of activities undertaken by the government and educational institutions to achieve the goals and objectives articulated in the safety policy statements (Katie, Morris & McGarrigle, 2012). It further entails making available financial and human resources, purchasing equipment and technology, making changes in number of settings and systems and developing the competency of the practitioners (Kemunto et al., 2015).

According to Muthiani (2016), the New Jersey Department of Education in the United States of America, takes proactive measures to protect the safety and security of all students and members of staff in learning institutions. Each school must have a safety and security plan, designed with the help of law enforcement agencies, emergency service providers, public health officials and other key stakeholders. The plans must be reviewed on annual basis to respond to the critical incidents ranging from bomb threats, fires, gas leaks and shootings.

2.3 Operationalization of Safety Standards Policy and its Implementation

The study by Wanyama (2011) on the level of compliance with health and safety standards for emergency response in secondary schools in Sabatia District, Vihiga County, established that majority of the schools were yet to form safety committees with the responsibility of identifying safety needs of the school and mobilizing resources for ensuring a safe; secure and caring environment.
These findings were however different from Mburu (2012) who sought to determine the factors influencing implementation of safety standards in secondary schools in Limuru District, Kiambu County. The study found that schools had safety committees which had not been trained on safety management. This could have hampered operationalization of the safety standards in most schools.

Kirui, Mbugua and Sang (2011) did a study on the challenges facing head teachers in security management in public secondary schools in Kisii County and found that 37 percent of school heads had attended safety and security management training as compared to 21.4 percent of BOM members and 40 percent of security guards.

This implied that the school head teachers and BOM members, who were responsible for making decisions concerning safety and security, were approaching the safety issues ignorantly, thereby endangering the lives and property.

This study however sought to establish the extent to which the BOMs had operationalized the safety standards policy by ensuring availability of legal and policy documents for sensitization, mounting of capacity building programs on safety management and incorporation of Life Skills Education in the curriculum, besides formation of safety committees and training on safety.
2.4 BOMs’ Execution of School Budget and Implementation of Safety Standards Policy

According to Opiyo (2014) study on the influence of budgeting on implementation of development plans in public secondary schools in Uriri District, Migori County, 90 percent of BOM members lacked skills in budgeting, procurement, monitoring and evaluation. They were also poor in project identification, decision-making ability on resource allocation. This study however, sought to determine the influence of the BOMs’ budget execution on implementation of safety standards policy.

Omolo and Simatwa (2010) study of the assessment of the implementation of safety policies in public secondary schools in Kisumu East and West Districts, Kenya revealed that 86.67 percent of head teachers, who are the secretaries to the BOMs, cited inadequate funds, lack of accounting skills and late disbursement of MOE capitation funds, as the causes of their perceived ineffectiveness in safety standards implementation.

Rangongo, Mohlakwana and Beckmann (2016) investigated the underlying causes of financial mismanagement in public schools in the Limpopo Province of South Africa. The findings revealed that lack of knowledge on legislation, and poor budgeting skills, poor monitoring and control of funds, unavailability of financial policies in schools, omission to act against culprits, and lack of honesty, openness and trustworthiness contributed to financial mismanagement.
In this study, the researcher sought to determine the influence of BOMs’ execution of the budget in terms of adequacy of funds, compliance to financial transaction procedures, procurement of quality goods and services, monitoring and evaluation in order to ensure implementation of safety standards policy.

2.5 BOMs’ Maintenance of Institutional Infrastructure and Implementation of Safety Standards Policy.

Picus (2013) researched on the effects of school facilities on internal efficiency in secondary schools in Yaounde centre in Cameroon. The study found that school facilities should be safe, comfortable, accessible, well illuminated and ventilated. The study however did not indicate the oversight roles of school managements on maintenance of physical facilities.

Kitheka (2016) investigated institutional factors influencing implementation of safety standards in public secondary schools in Yatta sub-county, Machakos County, Kenya. The findings of the study revealed that student participation in the maintenance of institutional environment was very poor. The current study however sought to examine the influence of BOMs’ maintenance of institutional infrastructure on the implementation of safety standards policy through inspection, servicing, repair and sanitation.

Wanyama (2011) studied the level of compliance with health and safety standards for emergency response in secondary schools in Sabatia District, Vihiga County. The study established that most schools had not installed fire extinguishers, thunderstorm arresters and removed grills on windows.
The study however did not recommend school management interventions necessary for the maintenance of physical infrastructure in order for them to be friendly to the users.

2.6 BOMs’ Enforcement of School Rules and Regulations and Implementation of Safety Standards Policy

Maphosa and Mammen (2011) sought to establish teachers’ insights into the most prevalent forms of learner indiscipline and ascertain how the insights reflect on safety and security in schools and classrooms in South African Schools. The examination found that the types of indiscipline were: noisemaking, truancy, tormenting, compromising different students, burglary, verbal assaults on individual students, ambush on individual students, spray painting on study hall and can dividers, vandalizing school property, verbal assaults on educators, substance misuse, inappropriate behavior, and obscene strikes on female students. In any case, the investigation neglected to recommend the administration activities that could help alleviate these indecencies so as to make learning condition alright for the students. The present examination tried to build up the impact of direction and guiding mediations on the adherence to class guidelines and guidelines.

Kingoina, Ngaruiya and Mobegi (2017) explored the role of boards of management (BoM) as a determinant of pupils’ academic performance in public primary schools in Marani Sub-County, Kenya.

The study established that in majority of schools BoMs did not participate in matters of discipline, promotion of culture of dialogue, democratic governance and guidance and counseling.
The study also found out that inadequate execution of BOM roles negatively influenced pupils’ academic performance. The study was however skewed on the role of BOM on academic performance but not the extent to which assuring issuance of school rules and regulations and facilitation of guidance and counseling would enhance safety standards implementation.

Magadla (2007) cited in Ndeto (2015) studied the effectiveness of school rules in enhancing discipline in public secondary schools in Kangundo Division, Machakos County, Kenya. The findings of the study revealed that students were not adequately involved in the formulation of school rules and regulations though they were highly involved in the implementation of the same. The findings further revealed that students were positive about school rules and regulations. They were willing to embrace them and seemed to recognize their intrinsic value in day-to-day life and discipline enhancement. This study however sought to establish the extent to which BOMs enforcement of discipline, through enforcing issuance of school rules and regulations, would influence implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay sub-county.

Maingi (2015) investigated the school-based factors that influence the discipline of secondary school students in Kitui Central Sub-county in Kitui County. The study findings revealed that many of the students did not take time to read and apply the schools rules and regulations.
The current study sought to examine the extent to which the BOM was involved in sensitization of students in the school by ensuring that they are issued with rules and regulation.

2.7 Summary of the Literature Review

The reviewed literature has looked into the studies on the implementation of safety standards in schools. Wanyama (2011), Mbure (2012), Kirui, Mbugua and Sang (2011)) established that most schools had not set up safety committees and organized for training on safety and security management. This study however sought to establish the extent to which BOMs had operationalized safety standards policy by availing legal and policy documents, and incorporating life skills education, besides formation of safety committees and safety trainings.

The studies by Opiyo (2014), Rangongo, Mohlakwana and Beckmann (2016), and Omolo and Simatwa (2010) found that BOMs lacked skills in budgeting, accounting, procurement and monitoring financial transactions and evaluation. This study however, sought to determine the influence that BOMs’ execution of the budget; through allocation of adequate funds, and adherence to financial transaction procedures, monitoring and evaluation; had on implementation of safety standards policy.

Studies by Wanyama (2011), Picus (2013), Kitheka (2016) found that school buildings had windows with grills, while fire extinguishers and thunderstorm arrestors had not been installed; but the buildings ought to be clean, comfortable, accessible, well ventilated and illuminated. However, student
participation in maintainance of institutional environment was poor. This study however, delved into the influence of BOMs’ maintainance of institutional infrastructure on safety standards implementation through, programmed repair or modifications on physical facilities and cleaning compound to remove dangerous materials.

Maphosa and Mammen (2011), Ndeto (2015), Kingoina, Ngaruiya and Mobegi (2017), Maingi (2015) identified the forms of indiscipline in schools; established that majority of BOMs did not participate in student discipline matters; noted that students were positive about school rules and regulations but majority of students did not apply the school rules and regulations. This study however sought to establish the extent to which BOMs enforce school rules and regulations through issuance of copies of the code of regulations and provision of guidance and counselling services.

2.8 Theoretical Framework
This study is guided by Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs theories (1943). This motivational theory formed an important base for the study because it identifies safety need as an important motivator of human beings.

It is based on the premise that human needs are classified into five categories arranged in a hierarchy of importance. The physiological needs that are basic survival are: air, water, food, clothing and shelter.
He argued that when people are hungry, lack shelter and clothing to provide warmth they are motivated to fulfill these needs. When the physiological needs are significantly satisfied the individual will be motivated to seek the satisfaction of Safety Needs in the next level of the hierarchy. Examples of safety needs include: protection from injury, accidents and violence, freedom from fear and psychological torture, health and economic security.

The third category is social needs of love affection, care, belongingness and friendship. The fourth level in the ladder comprise of self-esteem needs, which include self-respect confidence competence and recognition. The apex of the hierarchy of needs is occupied by self-actualization needs characterized by the urge to be capable of becoming what you have the potential to become. It includes the need for growth and self-contentment.

In relation to this study, the BOM should ensure that students are provided with adequate food, water, school uniforms, ventilated dormitories and classrooms that are conducive for habitation. When this is done, the students will struggle to satisfy the safety need which can be assured when the management provide a learning environment that is securely fenced, hygienic and free of factors that may undermine physical, health, emotional and financial well-being of the learners, teachers and workers.
According Kendra (2018) students who feel safe both physically and mentally can concentrate on a theoretical mathematical concept. For example, if one is worried that a bomb is going to explode or will be bullied on the playground during recess then he/she will not be able to concentrate in learning activities but will focus on how to avoid the likely threatening situation. When students feel safe in a school set up they are likely to stay in schools, participate in school programs and eventually perform well in examination thereby exploit their full potential towards self-actualization Muthiani (2016).

This theory however, has its share of criticism. Some critics have noted vagueness in what is considered “deficiency”, since what is a deficiency for one may not necessarily be a deficiency for another. For instance, some people often risk their own safety to rescue others from danger and feel great when this is accomplished Kendra (2018).

2.9 Conceptual Framework
The conceptual framework in Figure 2.1 shows the relationship between independent variables and depended variables. Punch (2001) defines conceptual framework as the representation, either graphically or in narrative form of the main concepts or variable and their presumed relationships with each other.
Figure 2.1: The relationship between variables on BOMs’ governance practices and implementation of safety standards policy.
Figure 2.1 shows that for the implementation of safety standards to take place it requires operationalizing of the policy at school level, execution of school budget, maintenance of institutional infrastructure and enforcement of school rules and regulations. The four variables go through the management process strategies and the result will be the implementation of the policy. The indicators of implementation of the policy will be increased awareness on safety, enhanced capacity to cope with safety risks, effective and efficient use of funds, increased safety status of school infrastructure and compliance with school rules and regulations.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter deals with the research methodology employed in the study. It highlights the research design, the target population, the sample size and sampling techniques, research instruments, validity and reliability of research instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques that were used in the study and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research Design
The researcher adopted descriptive survey research design. It was appropriate for the study because it enabled the researcher to obtain precise information on the status of the phenomena, as it exists and interpreting it without manipulation Jwan (2010).

The design also had the advantage of exploring the differences in opinions, attitudes and experiences from respondents in large sample sizes. The results generated from the samples would represent the conditions that exist in the entire population Orodho (2009). The design was suitable to the researcher since it would reveal the true perceptions of the respondents with the regard to the study independent variables on governance practices, the relationships between them and their influence on the dependent variable- implementation of safety standards policy, in secondary schools in Homa bay Sub-County.
3.3 Target Population

Target population refers to a large group of people, events or things of interest to the researcher and from which the sample is obtained Orodho (2004). The study targeted BOM members, teachers and students in all the public secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County. The study also targeted the Sub-County Director of Education and Sub-County Quality Assurance and Standards Officer. The records in the Sub-County Education Office (2019) indicated that there were 23 public secondary schools in the sub-county. According to the Basic Education Act No. 14 of 2013 the BOM of Basic Education Institutions comprise of 17 members and in this respect, the targeted BOM members were 391. Records from the Sub-County TSC office revealed that 253 teachers had been posted by TSC to teach in the 23 Public Schools. Enrollment statistics available in the SCDE’s office indicated that 9100 students were enrolled in the 23 secondary schools, out of which the researcher targeted about 460 student leaders. The target population in the opinion of the researcher comprised of key stakeholders directly involved in governance, teaching and learning respectively in an environment that ought to be compliant to safety standards requirements.

3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Procedures

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) a sample is a representative proportion of the target population that possess characteristics that are under investigation.
An ideal sample should be large enough to serve as an adequate representation about which the researcher wishes to generalize and small enough to be selected economically in terms of subject availability and expense in both time and money Best and Kahn (2006). In this study, the sample size was arrived at using the sample size formula given as by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) cited by Matula et al., (2018).

\[
S = \frac{X^2NP(1 - P)}{d^2(N - 1) + X^2P(1 - P)}
\]

Where:

- \( S \) = required sample size.
- \( X^2 \) = the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level (3.841).
- \( N \) = the population size (9746)
- \( P \) = the population proportion (assumed to be 0.5) since this would provide the maximum sample size.
- \( d \) = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (0.05).

\[
S = \frac{3.841 \times 9746 \times 0.5 \times (0.5)}{0.05^2 \times (9746) + 3.841 \times 0.5 \times (0.5)} = 370
\]

This satisfied Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sampling table for population sizes between 9,000 and 10,000. According to the Basic Education Act 2013, Executive Board of Management for each school consists of the BOM chairman, secretary to the board, chairman of Parents Association (PA) and two other board members.
The researcher purposively selected 5 BOM executive members from each of the 23 secondary schools. The BOM executive members were sampled because they regularly consult on key decisions on emerging issues which cannot wait for the approval of the full board which meets at least once every four months.

The researcher purposively and randomly selected three parent representatives appointed to the board but who are not members of the BOM executive. The parent representatives articulate on the interests of parents and students in the board. They also partly provide financial resources that support budget implementation, development and maintenance of physical facilities. In addition, they assist the management in disciplining students.

Purposive sampling was further used to select 3 teachers from every school comprising of boarding master or master on duty in the case of day schools, teacher in-charge of guidance and counseling and the teachers’ representative in the BOM. The boarding master was viewed to possess the clearest picture on the status of safety and discipline of students in the school and regularly consult with the secretary to the BOM on measures that can be applied to improve discipline standards and safety status in the school. The teacher in charge of guidance and counseling addresses personal concerns and welfare of students as well as discipline of students. The representative of the teaching staff in the BOM articulates on curriculum delivery requirements and the welfare of teachers, workers and students in general.
According to Kamau (2017) the proposed student leadership council comprises of about 20 student leaders per school. So, in 23 public secondary schools the researcher targeted 460 student leaders. Purposive and random sampling was used to select 4 student leaders from each school. Finally, the overall student leader per school was purposively selected. The student leaders act as the link between the student body and parents, teachers, administration and management in terms of identifying safety risks and discipline problems in the school.

The Sub County Directors of Education (SCDE) and Sub county Quality Assurance and Standards Officer (SCQASO) were also sampled purposively as key informants. These are individuals who are likely to provide needed information, ideas and insights on a particular subject, Best and Kahn (2006). The researcher viewed them as people who know what was going on in the education sector as experts with fast hand knowledge and understanding on the issues under investigation. The SCDE is mandated to administer, supervise and oversee the implementation of educational programs in collaboration with relevant government agencies and ensure compliance to education sector policies. The SCQASO is mandated to set standards, monitor compliance with standards, evaluate outcomes after compliance and enforce standards where there is non-compliance with policies.
Table 3.1: Sampling frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Respondents</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOM members</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>42.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student leaders</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCQASO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample size of 370 respondents was finally obtained, which was representative for research purposes. This was in agreement with Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) states that a sample size of 10 percent is considered minimum; a sample of 20 percent is required for a smaller population while 30 percent is ideal for statistical analysis.

3.5 Research Instruments

The research instruments used for data collection were questionnaires and interview schedule. The questionnaires, in the opinion of the researcher, were simple to understand and the questions seeking views of respondents were focused and limited to a single idea in each research question at a time. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) questionnaires are administered to bring out the feelings, attitude and perceptions of the respondents on the subject under investigation.
Further, questionnaires collect a large amount of information within a reasonably short time, ensures anonymity, permit use of standardized questions, have uniform procedures and easy to complete Orodho (2009).

In this study, structured questions that were accompanied by possible alternatives from which the respondents would select the answers that best describe the true situation were contained in the questionnaires. The questionnaires were aligned to the objectives of the study in order to elicit responses on each of the independent variable indicators. The questionnaire for BOM members, teacher and students each had five sections. Section A gathered demographic information. Section B, C, D, and E gathered information based on each research objectives.

Interview schedule was used to collect in-depth information from key informants namely SCDE and SCQASO. The researcher purposed to obtain from the two respondents reliable information on specific issues in a systematic and investigative format using questions that were formulated before the interview. According to Matula et al (2018) interview schedules enables the researcher to collect detailed information by probing and prompting the respondents deeper until most of the information is obtained. In addition, interview schedule provided the researcher with a greater flexibility to alter the format of questioning in order to seek clarifications on ambiguities.
3.5.1 Instrument Validity

Validity is the ability of a research tool to obtain the needed data which is credible, transferable, objective and dependable (Mohajan, 2017).

According to Kimberlin and Winterstein (2008) an instrument can only be valid upon attaining the required validity threshold.

The validity of the instrument was assured by seeking the expert opinion of the assigned University supervisors on the degree to which the questionnaires and interview schedules collected data specific to the domain of indicators of each research question. The experts therefore peer reviewed the items and suggested ways of improving the items so that more accurate and meaningful data could be obtained (Matula et al, 2018)

3.5.2 Instrument Reliability

Reliability is the extent to which a data gathering process gives consistent results under consistent conditions (Kothari, 2008). To test reliability, a pilot study was conducted at Oyugi Ogango Girls Secondary School and Nyarach Mixed Secondary school in the neighbouring Rongo Sub County, Migori County. The two secondary schools were used in the pilot study since they are viewed to possess similar characteristics with the schools in the study area. In order to ensure high degree of reliability the researcher used test re-test technique for the questionnaires. One principal, teacher in charge of guidance and counselling, and the student leader for each school participated in reliability testing.
The questionnaires were administered to them and the responses then scored. After an interval of two weeks the same questionnaires were administered to the same participants and the responses were recorded again. The scores from both tests were then correlated to get the coefficient of reliability using Pearson’s product moment formula as follows:

\[
\frac{N \Sigma xy - \Sigma x (\Sigma y)}{\sqrt{(N \Sigma x^2 - (\Sigma x)^2) (N \Sigma y^2 - (\Sigma y)^2)}}
\]

Where 
- \( r \) = Pearson’s coefficient of reliability
- \( N \) = Number of scores
- \( \Sigma \) = the sum of \( x \) = first set of the scores
- \( y \) = Second set of the scores
- \( \Sigma xy \) = Sum of the product of first and second sets of scores
- \( \Sigma x \) = Sum of the first set of scores
- \( \Sigma y \) = Sum of the second set of scores
- \( \Sigma x^2 \) = Sum of squares of the first set of scores
- \( \Sigma y^2 \) = Sum of squares of the second set of scores

The researcher obtained reliability coefficients of 0.807, 0.791 and 0.82 for the questionnaires for BOM members, teachers and student leaders respectively. According to Orodho (2009), a coefficient reliability above 0.7 is high enough to offer reliable results; hence the instruments used in the study had high reliability.
3.6 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher sought permission to conduct the study from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). After the issuance of the research permit, the researcher then presented authorization letter to the County Commissioner and County Director of Education.

The County Director of Education introduced the researcher to the Sub County Director of Education who in turn notified the principals of the intended research exercise. The researcher made appointment with the Principals of respective secondary schools. The researcher produced introduction letter to the school principals and explained the purpose of the study. The principals then introduced the researcher to their BOMs, teachers and the students. After establishing a rapport, the researcher administered the research instruments in person and collected them immediately they were filled. The researcher finally conducted interviews with SCDE and SCQASO.

3.7 Data Analysis Techniques

According to Matula et al (2018) data analysis involves systematic organization of raw data into some logical format, breaking data into interpretable units, synthesizing data, searching for emerging patterns and finally making conclusions.
Quantitative data from the questionnaire was checked to ensure that the responses were free mistakes, omissions or biases. Coding was then done to translate the responses to the questions into specific categories. The coded categories were then keyed into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software version 20.0 for analysis. Descriptive statistics like frequency distribution and percentages were used analyse the quantitative data which were presented in tables and comparative bar graphs.

Qualitative data collected from interviews in form of field notes was condensed through editing to remove ambiguities. Categories of data organized into themes, patterns, concepts were then created, and each was coded. The coded categories were then analyzed using SPSS and interpreted to formulate narrative generalizations from which conclusions were drawn.

3.8 Ethical Considerations
The study adhered to research ethical procedures. All sources of information were acknowledged. The consent of the respondents was sought and the questionnaires were administered after accepting to participate in the study. The respondents were given assurance that the information that they would provide would be handled with strict confidentiality. They were also informed that the information that they would provide would be used for the purposes of research only. Assurance was also given to the participants that the research findings would be made available to them upon request.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents research findings of the study. The study sought to examine Board of Managements’ Governance Practices influencing implementation of Safety Standards Policy in Secondary Schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County. The chapter contains response rate, demographic data for the BOM members, teachers, and students, data analysis, presentation, and discussion according to research objectives.

The data was collected using questionnaires as the main research instrument and interview schedule for Sub-County Director of Education and Sub-County Quality Assurance and Standards Officer. The questionnaires were administered to sampled members of the Board of Management, teachers, and student leaders in all the schools. For the interview schedule, the researcher sought audience and interviewed Sub-County Director of Education and Sub-County Quality Assurance and Standards Officer. The data was analysed using descriptive statistics such as percentages and frequency distribution and then presented in tables and bar graphs. Discussion was done in prose form. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) Questionnaire return rate illustrates the number of respondents who participated in the study.
The respondents sampled for the study were executive Board of Management (BOM), parent representatives appointed to the BOM, teachers in charge of boarding, guidance and counseling, teachers’ representation in the BOM and student leaders. The return rate for the study is shown in Table 4.1.

### Table 4.1 Questionnaire Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents category</th>
<th>Number administered</th>
<th>Number returned</th>
<th>Percentage returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOMs</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student leaders</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The return rate for the BOM members was 64.6 percent; participation rate for teachers was 84.1 percent while that of students was 99.1 percent. The questionnaire return rate for the teachers and students was well above 70 percent, which according to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) is an acceptable proportion adequate for analysis in Social Science research. According to Kothari (2008) a response rate of above 50 percent is adequate for descriptive survey study and consequently the return rate of 64.6 percent for BOMs was adequate.

The return rate of questionnaires from students and teachers was high due to the ability of the researcher to visit schools in person, administer the questionnaires to the respondents and collect them immediately.
Some teachers however failed to fill in the questionnaires in good time due to their busy schedules and assignments out of the schools. Some questionnaires given to the BOM members were not returned after more than three attempts to contact them failed.

4.2 Demographic Information

This section presents characteristics of personal attributes of individual respondents. They include, gender, age, highest academic qualification, length teaching in the school, and tenure of service in the BOM. Demographic data for board of management, teachers, and students were obtained by questionnaires and this information was tabulated.

4.2.1 Gender Distribution of Respondents

In this study it was found necessary to determine the gender distribution among members of the BOM, teachers and students in order to establish gender participation of males and females in management, teaching and learning respectively. The findings were presented in the Figure 4.1

Figure 4.1 Gender Distribution of the respondents
Figure 4.1 shows that of BOM members were males while minority were females. Females were therefore marginalized hence majority of them were not involved in decision making at school management level. However, it was noted that the composition of BOM had complied with the requirement of one third of either gender as enshrined in the Constitution of Kenya 2010 and Basic Education Act 2013. Male teachers in-charge of boarding, guidance and counselling and representation in the BOM comprised of the majority. This implied that TSC had not achieved gender parity in the staffing of schools. Majority of the student leaders were males while females were minority and this implied that gender parity in enrolment and constitution of student councils had not been realized.

The implementation of safety standards policy at all levels was therefore articulated mostly by males than females. In such circumstances, gender sensitivity to the unique safety needs of either male or female persons in schools had not been observed. Mulwa (2017) noted that gender equality promotes teamwork among individuals irrespective of their sex and also provides a favorable environment where individuals interact with colleagues without discrimination.

4.2.2 Age Distribution of BOM and Teachers

The study sought to determine the age distribution of BOM members and teachers in order to establish its influence on their capacity to implement safety standards policy in secondary schools. The findings were presented in Figure 4.2.
Figure 4.2 Distribution of respondents’ age

The Figure 4.2 shows that a majority of BOM members at 48 percent were in the age bracket of 36-45 years. This implied that the BOMs comprised of individuals who are old enough and had acquired reasonable conceptual, and professional competencies required in corporate governance. The findings were similar to Kamau (2017) noted that age and experience enables the respondents to give reliable information on the subject of investigation.

The appointment of principals according TSC Act 2012, require a minimum qualification of job group N, which in turn require one to have a cumulative teaching experience of at least 12 years, hence principals in the BOM executive were over 36 years.
Majority teachers were below 35 years, implying that most teachers in charge of boarding guidance and counselling, and representation in the BOM had gained reasonable experience in addressing issues of safety standards implementation.

4.2.3 Respondents’ Academic Qualifications

The study sought to determine the level of education of BOM members and teaching staff. This was done to assess whether academic qualifications was a significant factor in corporate governance and safety standards policy implementation in secondary schools. In addition, this was done to determine whether the composition of the BOM had been done in accordance with the provisions of Basic Education Act No 14 2013 and TSC Act 2012 which stipulate that principals and BOM chairmen must possess a minimum of undergraduate degree qualification. Other members of the BOM are required to possess secondary school education certificates as the bare minimum.

Teachers on the other hand are employed by TSC upon acquiring professional training at diploma or undergraduate levels. The findings were presented in Figure 4.3.
Figure 4. 3 Distribution of respondents’ academic qualifications

Figure 4.3 shows that majority of BOM members had bachelors degrees, postgraduate level of education, doctoral degrees. This implied that the BOM members in the sub county were academically qualified and professionally equipped to manage their respective institutions. This also indicates that the BOM members had acquired academic qualifications for BOM appointments and participation in managerial affairs of the secondary schools which incude; planning, financial management, communication and problem solving skills. Their academic and professional competencies enabled them to interpret and contextualize the safety standards policy within their school environments and formulate strategies of mobilizing resources required for implementation. This finding concurs with Okumbe (2011) BOM members should be persons with good education.
Majority of teachers had undergraduate and post graduate qualifications respectively. No teacher had doctorate degree qualification, which was not a mandatory requirement for teaching at secondary school level. The teachers were therefore professionally endowed to perform their curriculum implementation duties and interpret safety standards policy.

4.2.4 Distribution of Student Leaders per Class,

The study sought to establish the classes from which student leaders were drawn. This was done to determine whether effectiveness of student leadership council was influenced by the length of stay in the school. The findings were presented in Figure 4.4.

![Figure 4.4 Distribution of Student Leaders per Class](image)

Majority of the students leaders were in form four and form three. They had stayed in the school for a longer time and were conscious of safety standards requirements and the implementation gaps that prevailed in their respective schools.
4.2.5 Years of service

The researcher sought to establish the length of service by BOM members and teachers in the school. This was to determine whether length of service had a significant link with their capacity to implement safety standards policy. The findings were presented in Figure 4.5.

![Bar chart depicting years of service](chart)

**Figure 4.5 Years of service**

Figure 4.5 shows that most BOM members had served in the board for 4-6 years.

This implied that majority were serving in their second and final term of three years as stipulated in the Basic Education Act, 2013 and were therefore in a better position to interpret and entrench policies regarding school safety, budget execution, maintenance of physical facilities and enforcement of student discipline. In addition, they had the capacity to formulate strategies of addressing the gaps in safety standards implementation.
The findings further indicate that most of the teachers in charge of boarding, guidance and counseling and representation in the BOM had served in their the schools for 4-6 years. They too, had the capacity to identify safety gaps that required the attention of the BOM for implementation.

4.3 BOMs’ involvement in operationalization of the safety standards policy and implementation.

The first objective of the study sought to establish the influence of BOMs’ operationalization of safety standards policy on the implementation in secondary schools in Homa-Bay sub-county. The BOM members were given a statement which required them to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with the statement that; BOMs had made available legal and policy documents on safety standards policy from which the management, teachers and students could make reference for awareness creation and as a measure to operationalize the policy. The results are shown in Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 shows that majority of BOMs had not availed legal and policy documents on safety to facilitate making reference and capacity building. This finding pointed to the reality that operationalization of the safety standards policy could not be effected in the absence of awareness on the specific details in the policy framework. The SCDE summed it all when he said that:

“it was impossible to implement safety standards in schools without grounding the implementation strategy on the policy requirements”.

These findings concur with Kitheka (2016) that 64 percent of schools lacked copies of the safety standards manual for schools.

The study also sought information from the students in which they were required to state the extent to which the statement that; the BOM had constituted school based safety standards committees in which students were represented, was true.

In response to this they were asked to choose from; No Extent, or Small Extent or Not Sure or Great Extent or Very Great Extent. The results were presented as shown in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3 Constitution of school based safety committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No extent</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small extent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Great Extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows that majority of student leaders indicated that the statement was true to no extent or simply not true. This finding showed that the BOMs had not constituted school based safety committees in which students were represented as stipulated in the safety standards manuals for schools in Kenya. This was an important requirement for operationalization of the policy at institutional level. This finding was in disagreement with Mburu (2012) who found that schools had formed safety committees.

Teachers were equally requested to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with the statement that; the BOM involve teachers and students in safety trainings. The results are shown in Table 4.4

Table 4.4: Involvement of teachers and students on safety training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the results in Table 4.4, majority of teachers strongly disagreed that the BOMs had prioritised and facilitated trainings on safety in which teachers and students were involved. Such trainings would equip the management, teachers and students with knowledge and skills of identifying safety needs, mobilizing resources towards addressing safety concerns and disaster preparedness.

Trainings on safety played a significant role in operationalizing safety standards policy, which in turn influences implementation of the policy. This finding was in concurrence with Kirui, Mbugua and Sang (2011) who found that only 21.4 percent of BOM members had attended safety and security management trainings. In addition, this finding was in agreement with Wanyama (2011) majority of the schools were yet to involve teachers and students on safety training.

The responses from the BOMs, teachers and students with regard to the influence of BOMs’ operationalization of safety standards on the implementation of the policy, indicated that majority of BOMs had not availed copies of legal and policy documents to members of the BOM, teachers and students for awareness creation. The findings also indicate that majority of the students were of the opinion that safety committees in which they were involved had not been constituted by most BOMs.
The study further, found that majority of teachers were of the view that BOMs had not facilitated the provision of trainings for teachers and students on measures of mitigating against safety risks. The Sub County Quality Assurance and Standards Officer said that:

“When teachers and students lack skills in handling safety hazards and management of disasters, then they are rendered handicapped when faced with threatening situations like fires, thunderstorms, acts of indiscipline and disease outbreaks”.

Operationalization of safety standards policy at the institutional level therefore, had a significant influence on the implementation of safety standards policy.

4.4 BOMs’ Execution of school budget and implementation of safety standards policy

In the second objective of the study, the researcher sought to determine the influence of BOMs’ execution of school budget on the implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay sub-county.

BOM members were requested to show their level of agreement or disagreement with the statement that; BOM receives adequate funds for budget execution and implementation of safety standards policy. The results were displayed in Table 4.5.
Table 4. 5: Availability of adequate funds for budgeting process and implementation of safety standards policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis presented in Table 4.5 shows that majority of BOMs strongly disagreed with the statement. This implied majority of BOMs were of the perception that inadequate funds were available for implementation of the policy. This finding concurred with Opiyo (2014) inadequate funds had a strong influence on the execution of the budget by the BOMs.

The study further sought the opinion of students in which they were required to state the extent to which the statement that; BOMs ensure that funds disbursed to schools by MOE are displayed at strategic place and that students are issued with receipts for the capitation grants from MOE, was true.

They were expected to choose from (No Extent, or Small Extent or Not Sure or Great Extent or Very Great Extent). Results were presented as shown in table 4.6.
Table 4.6: Display of MOE capitation Funds and issue of receipts to students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No extent</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small extent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Great Extent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis in Table 4.6 shows that majority of students viewed the statement as not true. Most students were therefore not aware of the funds disbursed to schools, which also had a vote head components on guidance and counselling; repairs and maintenance; and discipline issues. The BOMs had therefore contravened corporate governance principles of transparency and accountability Njeri (2014). It therefore followed that BOMs had not adhered to guidelines regarding disclosure of financial transactions, which had a spill over effect on budget execution.

Execution of School Budgets has been acknowledged to be one of the factors that influence implementation of safety standards. The researcher wanted to establish the claim.
Teachers were requested to show their level of agreement or disagreement with the statement that; the BOM allocates sufficient financial resources towards safety standards implementation. The results are shown in Table 4.7

**Table 4. 7: BOMs allocates sufficient financial resources towards safety standards implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis in Table 4.7 shows that majority of teachers strongly disagreed with the statement. When sufficient funds are not allocated for; repairs or modifications of existing structures, equipment and machinery; capacity building for school community; guidance and counseling services; and entrenchment of safety standards policy, then implementation might not be achieved.

These findings agree with Omolo and Simatwa (2010) revealed that late disbursement by MOE capitation grants made execution of the budget difficult because the procurement of goods and services is hampered with, leading to delays in implementation of budgetary components addressing safety.
In brief, adequacy of funds to the BOMs for budgeting, disclosure of capitation funds and allocation of sufficient funds for standards implementation were important factors on which execution of budgets was dependent.

4.5 BOMs’ Maintenance of Institutional Infrastructure and implementation of safety standards policy

In the third objective of the study, the researcher sought to examine influence of BOMs’ maintenance of institutional infrastructure of the implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay sub-county.

BOM members were required to show their level of agreement or disagreement with the statement that; BOMs had ensured periodic repair and modifications of school fence and buildings to ensure that they were user friendly. The findings were shown in Table 4.8.

Table 4. 8 Periodic repairs and modifications of fence, buildings and school grounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings in Table 4.8 shows that majority of BOM members were of the opinion that BOMs had ensured periodic repair and modification of existing physical infrastructure in order to enhance their safety status. When the physical facilities, machinery and equipment are habitable and in good conditions respectively, then cases of injury are greatly reduced.

According to Picus (2013) effective school facility at the bare minimum should provide a physical environment that is comfortable, safe, accessible, well illuminated, well ventilated and aesthetically pleasing, through regular maintenance repairs and modifications. The layout and design of a facility contributes to the place experience of students, sense of ownership and privacy.

Programed maintenance of physical infrastructure by the BOMs therefore had a significant influence on maintenance of physical infrastructure and the implementation of safety standards.

Teachers were also equally requested to show their level of agreement or disagreement with the statement that;BOMs had ensured that the school physical facilities and the compound were cleaned and made free of harmful materials. The findings were presented in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9: Cleaning of school compound and physical facilities and removal of harmful materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis in Table 4.9 shows that majority who indicated level of agreement were of the perception that BOMs had ensured sanitation and removal of harmful materials from the school compound. This implied that the building and compounds were free of dirt, litter, and germs which could cause infections; sharp objects that could cause bodily harm; and unfriendly animals that could bite and inflict poison on bodies. This finding supported the assertion by Kitheka (2016) that school facilities that are clean and free of harmful materials have a marked influence on safety standards implementation.

BOMs’ maintainance of institutional infrastructure had a significant influence on the implementation on implementation of safety standards policy through; periodic repairs and modifications on physical facilities; and regular cleaning of buildings and keeping the school environment free of harmful materials.
4.6 BOMs’ Enforcement of school rules and regulations and implementation of safety standards policy

Finally, in the fourth objective of the study, the researcher sought to establish the influence of BOMs’ enforcement of school rules and regulations on the implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay sub-county. BOM members were requested to show their level of agreement or disagreement with the statement that; BOMs ensures that students are issued with copies of school rules and regulations and that the copies were also displayed on notice boards in order for students to internalize the rules and regulations. The results are shown in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10: Issuing of copies of school rules and regulations students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis in Table 4.10 shows that majority of BOMs indicated level of disagreement with the statement. It would therefore be difficult to enforce student discipline when BOMs have not ensured that students are exposed to the detailed contents of school rules and regulations for awareness creation and ownership.
This finding concurs with Maingi (2015) that when students are fully sensitized on the school rules and regulations, majority of the students follow them to the letter, particularly when each student is given a copy of school rules and regulations, resulting in self-control, orderliness, good behavior and obedience to school authority.

Teachers were also requested to show their level of agreement or disagreement with the statement that; BOM had facilitated guidance and counseling services to the students. The results are shown in Table 4.11

**Table 4.11: Facilitation of Guidance and Counseling services in the school.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.11 shows that the majority of teachers disagreed that the BOMs had provided resources that would facilitate the provision of guidance and services to students. This had the implication that students were not provided with knowledge and skills of acquiring positive values and coping with emotions, and peer pressure.
The provision of guidance and counseling would empower the students to make the right decisions for their lives and avoid engagement in situations that endanger their psychosocial well-being.

This finding is in agreement with the study by King’oina, Ngaruiya and Mobegi (2017) established that majority of BOMs did not participate in matters of students discipline, promotion of culture of dialogue, democratic governance and making provisions for guidance and counseling of students.

In brief, BOMs enforcement of school rules and regulations through issuing students with copies of school rules and regulations; and facilitating provision guidance and counseling to the students had a notable influence on implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
The purpose of this study was to examine influence of Board of Managements’ Governance Practices on implementation of Safety Standards Policy in Secondary Schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County. This chapter presents discussion of the findings, conclusion, recommendations and suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of the Study
The study examined Board of Managements’ Governance Practices influencing effective implementation of Safety Standards Policy in Secondary Schools in Homa-Bay Sub-County. It was guided by the following variables as the research objectives; operationalization of the safety standards policy, execution of school budget, maintenance of institutional infrastructure and enforcement of school rules and regulations influencing implementation of Safety Standards Policy in Secondary Schools in Homa-Bay sub-county. The study was guided by Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory (1943). The conceptual framework which showed the inter relationships between the independent and dependent variables was presented. The study employed descriptive survey research design because of its appropriateness to the researcher in obtaining information that describes existing phenomena by asking individuals about their perceptions, attitudes, behavior and values.
The target population comprised of SCDE, SCQASO, BOMs of public secondary schools, teachers and students in public secondary schools. The sample size of 370 comprising of 1 SCDE, 1 SCQASO, 184 BOM members, 69 teachers and 115 student leaders from 23 public secondary schools were earmarked for participation in the study. However, 119 BOM members; 58 teachers in charge of guidance and counseling, boarding and representation in the board; and 114 students returned the questionnaires.

The research tools were tested and retested to enhance their reliability. Validity was assured by seeking advice of university supervisors. Purposive sampling was used to select executive BOM members, while both purposive and roundom sampling was used to select parent representatives appointed to the BOMs. Purposive sampling was also used to select the boarding master, teacher in charge of guidance and counseling and teachers representative in the BOM of every school. Purposive and simple random sampling was used to select 4 student leaders and while purposive sampling was used to select the overall student leader. The SCDE and SCQASO were selected purposively. Data analysis was done using SPSS Computer Software version 20.0 because of its effectiveness and efficiency in analyzing large amounts of data. The findings were presented in tables and bar graphs relation to the study objectives.
5.3 Summary of the Findings

5.3.1 To establish the influence of BOMs’ operationalization of the safety standards policy on its implementation in secondary schools in Homa Bay Sub-County.

The study found that Most of BOMs in Homa-Bay sub-county had not operationalized safety standards policy by; availing copies of the legal and policy documents for creation of awareness on specific details of school safety requirements; constituting school safety committees in which teachers and students are involved; and facilitating the provision of trainings for teachers and students on measures of mitigating against safety risks. Operationalization of safety standards policy as a governance practice, significantly influenced the implementation of safety standards policy.

5.3.2 To determine the influence of BOMs’ execution of school budget on the implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa-Bay Sub-county.

The study findings indicated that majority of BOMs in Homa-Bay sub-county secondary schools had not executed school budgets as a governance practice by; making available adequate funds in time for allocation to vote-heads; displaying the capitation funds disbursed to schools by MOE and issuing receipts acknowledging the disbursements; and allocating adequate funds, for safety standards implementation. Execution of school budgets had a significant influence on the implementation of safety standards policy.
5.3.3 To examine the influence the BOMs’ maintenance of institutional infrastructure on the implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa Bay Sub-county.

The study found that majority of BOMs in Homa-Bay sub-county secondary schools had maintained institutional infrastructure by; ensuring periodic repair and modifications on the school fence and buildings to enhance their safety status; and cleaning school compound to get rid of materials that were harmful. Maintenance of institutional infrastructure, as a governance practice influenced implementation of safety standards policy.

5.3.4 To establish the influence of BOMs’ enforcement of school rules and regulations on the implementation of safety standards policy in secondary schools in Homa Bay Sub-County.

The study found that most BOMs in Homa-Bay sub-county had not enforced school rules and regulations through; issuing of copies of school rules and regulations to students for awareness creation on what they ought to do and not to do while in school; and facilitating the provision guidance and counseling to the students. Their mandate of enforcement of school rules and regulations, as a governance practice, influenced implementation of safety standards policy.
5.4 Conclusion

The study findings led to the conclusion that: BOMs’ operationalization of safety standards policy in Homa-Bay sub-county secondary schools, had not been practiced and this had a marked negative influence on the implementation of safety standards policy. BOMs’ execution of school budgets in Homa-Bay sub-county secondary schools, had not been practiced and this negatively influenced implementation of safety standards policy. BOMs’ enforcement of school rules and regulations in Homa-Bay sub-county secondary schools, had not been practised by majority of BOMs and this negatively influenced the implementation of safety standards policy in schools. However, BOMs’ maintenance of institutional infrastructure in Homa-Bay sub-county secondary schools had been practised out by most BOMs and this positively influenced the implementation of safety standards.

5.5 Recommendations

The researcher made the following recommendation based on the findings of the study;

i) The Ministry of Education should ensure that BOMs in Homa-bay Sub-County schools operationalize the safety standards policy by availing policy documents, forming of inclusive safety committees and facilitating training of key stakeholders on safety and disaster management.
ii) The Ministry of Education and parents in Homa-Bay Sub-County should ensure that adequate funds are disbursed or paid to schools in good time. Procedures and regulations on financial transactions should also be adhered to by the BOMs.

iii) The Ministry of Education should ensure that BOMs in Homa-Bay Sub-County make available copies of the school rules and regulations to the students in order to enhance compliance with them. The BOMs should also facilitate the provision of guidance and counseling services to the students.

5.6 Suggestions for Further Study

The study proposes further research in the following areas:

i) Given the scope and limitations of this study, the researcher recommends a replica of the study to be performed in other public secondary schools in other Sub-Counties across the country to provide comparison to the findings.

ii) Influence of BOMs’ management practices on the implementation of Life Skills Education in secondary schools.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Adera Daniel Odhiambo
Department of Educational Administration and Planning
University of Nairobi
P.O. BOX 30197
Nairobi

Dear Sir/Madam,

REQUEST FOR COLLECTION OF RESEARCH DATA

I am a Master of Education (M.Ed.) student at the University of Nairobi. As part of the requirement for the award of the degree, I am expected to undertake a research study. I am requesting for your participation in a study that examines “Board of Managements’ Governance Practices influencing effective implementation of Safety Standards Policy in Secondary Schools in Homa-Bay sub-county”. Please fill in the questionnaires. The research results will be used for academic purposes only and information provided will be treated with confidentiality.

Your cooperation will be appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Adera Daniel Odhiambo
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BOM MEMBERS

This questionnaire is developed to gather information about your school. The purpose of the study is to examine influence of BOM’S corporate governance practices on implementation of safety standard policy in Secondary Schools in Homa Bay Sub County, Kenya.

You are requested to participate in this study by filling in this questionnaire. You are assured that your identity will not be disclosed and that the information you will provide will be treated with at most confidentiality.

Instructions

Please respond to the questions items given as honestly and accurately as possible.

For each statement tick (✓) against the most appropriate answer as per your opinion.

Section A: Background Information

1. Please indicate your gender. Male ( ) Female ( )
2. Please indicate your age.
   Below 35 years ( ) 36-45 years ( ) 46-55 years ( ) 56 years and above ( )
3. What is your highest level of education? Certificate ( ) Diploma ( ) Undergraduate ( ) Postgraduate ( ) Doctorate ( )
4. For how long have you been a member of BOM in the school? Below 3 years ( ) 3-7 years ( ) 8-12 years ( )
The following sections provide you with items related to BOMs governance practices. The items are divided into sub-items according to the study objectives. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements.

The key to the scale is provided below.

1 - Strongly Disagree (SD) 2 - Disagree (D) 3 - Neutral (N) 4 – Agree (A) 5 – Strongly Agree (SA)

**Section B: Operationalization of Safety Standards Policy by BOM and its Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The BOM has ensured that the school has legal and policy documents for sensitization on safety standards policy implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The BOM has formalized the appointment of the school’s safety standards technical committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programmes on disaster management in which the BOM staff and students are involved have been provided and facilitated by the BOM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The BOM must ensure that teaching of life Skills Education is effectively done in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section C: BOMs’ Execution of School Budget and Implementation of Safety Standards Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The BOM receives and allocates adequate funds to the departments for the implementation of safety standards policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. The BOM ensures that procedures and guidelines for budget controls, procurement and recording of transactions are adhered to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. The BOM ensures that goods, services and works delivered to the school meet the specifications in the budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. The BOM carries out monitoring and evaluation of the budget to ensure that the intended objectives are realized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section D: BOMs’ Maintenance of Institutional Infrastructure and Implementation of Safety Standards Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. The BOM engages experts in the inspection of physical amenities in order to identify defects for repair and modifications required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. BOM ensures that machines, vehicles and equipment’s are operated by qualified personnel to prevent accidents and injuries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. BOM ensures that the physical infrastructure are repaired periodically and on schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. BOM ensures that the school physical facilities and compound are cleaned and free of harmful materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section E: BOMs’ Enforcement of School Rules and Regulations and Implementation of Safety Standards Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. The BOM ensures that copies of the school rules and regulations are issued to each student or displayed at strategic places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. The BOM ensures that there is a functional student leadership body constituted through a democratic process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. The BOM ensures that consequences of violating school rules and regulations are adhered to without any bias.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Counseling sessions in the school are programmed and facilitated by the BOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

This questionnaire is developed to gather information about your school. The purpose of the study is to examine influence of BOM’S corporate governance practices on implementation of safety standard policy in Secondary Schools in Homa Bay Sub County, Kenya.

You are requested to participate in this study by filling in this questionnaire. You are assured that your identity will not be disclosed and that the information you will provide will be treated with at most confidentiality.

Instructions

Please respond to the questions items given as honestly and accurately as possible.

For each statement tick (✓) against the most appropriate answer as per your opinion.

Section A: Background Information

1. Please indicate your gender. Male ( ) Female ( )

2. Please indicate your age. Below 35 years ( ) 36-45 years ( ) 46-55 years ( ) 56 years and above ( )

3. What is your highest level of education? Certificate ( ) Diploma ( ) Undergraduate ( ) Postgraduate ( ) Doctorate ( )

4. For how long have you been a member of teaching staff in the school? Below 3 years ( ) 3-7 years ( ) 8-12 years ( )
The following sections provide you with items related to BOMs governance practices. The items are divided into sub-items according to the study objectives. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements.

The key to the scale is provided below.

1- Strongly Disagree (SD) 2- Disagree (D) 3- Neutral (N) 4 – Agree (A) 5 – Strongly Agree (SA)

Section B: Operationalization of Safety Standards Policy by BOM and its Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) The BOM has ensured the legal and policy documents on safety standards policy implementation are made available to the teaching staff and students for sensitization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) The BOM has formed the school’s safety standards technical committee in which students and teachers are represented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) BOM has organized for trainings of teachers and students on handling of safety hazards and disaster management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) The BOM has supported the teaching of life skill education curriculum in all classes in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C: BOMs’ Execution of School Budget and Implementation of Safety Standards Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) BOM allocates adequate funds to departments for safety standards implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) BOM adheres to procedures and regulations pertaining to budget controls, procurement and recording of transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) The BOM ensures that goods services and works meet the specifications in the budget and tendering processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) BOM monitors and evaluates the implementation of the budget to ensure that the intended objectives are met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: BOMs’ Maintenance of Institutional Infrastructure and Implementation of Safety Standards Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) BOM inspects the physical infrastructure in consultation with the experts in order to identify defects that require either repair or modification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) The BOM engages the services of qualified personnel to operate machines, vehicles and equipment to ensure that they don’t cause accidents or injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) BOM draws a schedule of periodic repair or modification of the physical infrastructure to ensure that they are user friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) The BOM ensures that the physical facilities and the compound are cleaned and free of harmful materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section E: BOMs’ Enforcement of School Rules and Regulations and Implementation of Safety Standards Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) The BOM through the principal has ensured that students are issued with copies of school rules and regulations which are also pinned on the notice boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) The BOM through the principal has allowed students to elect their leaders through a democratic process so as help their decision in ensuring discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) The consequences of not adhering to the school rules and regulations are implemented without favoring anyone involved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) The BOM has facilitated guidance and counseling programmes in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

This questionnaire is developed to gather information about your school. The purpose of the study is to examine influence of BOM’s corporate governance practices on effective implementation of safety standards policy in Secondary Schools in Homa Bay Sub County.

Instructions
You are requested to participate in this study by filling in this questionnaire.
You are assured that your identity will not be disclosed and that the information you will provide will be treated with at most confidentiality.
Instructions
Please respond to the questions items given as honestly and accurately as possible.
For each statement tick (✓) against the most appropriate answer as per your opinion.

Section A: Background Information

1. In which class are you? Form 1 ( ) Form 2 ( ) Form 3 ( )
   Form 4 ( )
2. Please indicate your gender? Male ( ) Female ( )

In the following sub sections, state whether the extent to which the following statement are true on a scale of 1-4 where 1 = No extent, 2 = Small extent, 3 = Not sure, 4 = Great extent and 5 = Very great extent by ticking (✓) against the correct box given.
Section B: Operationalization of Safety Standards Policy by BOM and its Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) The BOM has made available to the students, policy documents reading materials and posters with messages which create awareness on safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>The BOM has formed the school safety committee in which students, teachers and BOM are represented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) The BOM has provided for training sessions to teachers and students on safety hazards management and how to cope with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) The BOM has ensured that Life Skills Education is taught regularly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section C: BOMs’ Execution of School Budget and Implementation of Safety Standards Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) The BOM has provided for adequate funds to the activities carried out by departments that ensure the school becomes safe for learners and staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) The BOM ensures that the student are issued with receipts for fee payments made by MOE and that funds disbursed are displayed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) The BOM ensures that school funds are used to provide sufficient goods and services of high quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) The BOM hold regular meetings in the school and evaluate progress made on the implementation of safety standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section E: BOMs Maintenance of Institutional Infrastructure and Implementation of Safety Standards Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) The BOM engages experts and students to inspect the school buildings and physical facilities in order to identify safety threats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) The staff employed by the BOM to operate the machines equipment’s and vehicles used in the school are qualified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) The repair works four buildings are done periodically and on schedule by the BOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) The BOM provides resources for cleaning the buildings and school compound to get rid of harmful materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) The BOM ensures that the principal issue each student with a copy of school rules and regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) The BOM through the principal has ensured that student leaders are elected through a democratic process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) The BOM through the principal has ensured that the consequences of violating school rules are implemented without favoritism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) The BOM through the principal has provided the students with guidance and counseling services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SUB-COUNTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION AND SUB-COUNTY QUALITY ASSURANCE AND STANDARDS OFFICER

Thank you for accepting to take part in this interview

The purpose of this interview is to collect data on the Board of Managements’ Governance Practices Influencing Implementation of Safety Standards Policy in Secondary Schools in Homa Bay Sub-County Kenya.

I would wish to assure you that the responses that you will give will be confidential.

1. In your opinion what are the indicators of a safe learning environment at a secondary school level?

2. What roles do the BOMs’ play in;
   a) Entrenching safety standard policy in secondary schools
   b) Budget execution process to ensure safety standards implementations in secondary schools.
   c) Maintenance of institutional infrastructure in order to create a safe learning environment.
   d) Enforcement of school rules and regulations in secondary schools

3. What roles do your office play in;
   a. Ensuring that schools operationalize the safety standards policy
   b. Ensuring that budget executions is done to ensure and assure safety of learners and teachers in secondary schools.
   c. The maintenance of physical infrastructure in secondary schools.
d. Enforcing compliance to school rules and regulations by students in secondary schools.

4. What are some of the resources provided by MOE to schools with regard to the Implementation of safety standards policy?

5. a) With reference to the following identify other government agencies that work with the MOE and BOMs to implement safety standards policy in secondary schools

i. Operationalization of safety standards policy.

ii. Execution of school budget.

iii. Maintenance of physical infrastructure.

iv. Enforcement of school rules and regulations

b. How effective are the agencies identified in 5 (a)

c. which non-governmental organizations have complimented the efforts of your office and the BOM in the implementations of safety standards policy in the sub county.

6. a) What components of the safety standards policy have proved difficult to implement in secondary schools in the sub-county

b) Which safety standards policy components would you recommend for review by the policy makers?

Thank you for your participation in the interview
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