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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.O.G</td>
<td>Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.E.O</td>
<td>District Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O.K</td>
<td>Government of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.C.S.E</td>
<td>Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.O.E</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.T.A</td>
<td>Parents teachers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.P</td>
<td>School development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.M.C</td>
<td>School Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMB</td>
<td>School Management Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.S.C</td>
<td>Teachers Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIVET</td>
<td>Technical, Industrial, Vocational and Entrepreneurship Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

In the recent past years, there have been concerns over the issues of disagreement between secondary school head teachers and Board of Governors on management issues such as qualifications of BOG, staff recruitment, decision making, and the general performances of schools. Sometimes the disagreements have been so acute such that school operations have been brought to a complete halt to the detriment of the students and the whole school community. This study sought to establish the influence of the board of governors in secondary schools' management in Lari district-Kenya. The choice of the location was influenced by the fact that over the last 5 years there have been cases of BoG and the school administration conflicting or differing on various decisions making issues temporally halted operations in six (6) institutions. The study population involved a total of twenty two (22) secondary schools in the district. Out of the 22 schools, simple random sampling was used to select ten (10) schools for the investigation, representing 45.5% of the total population. Most scholars have recommended that a sample of 30% is representative for statistical analysis (Kothari, 1999). Data was collected using questionnaire for teachers, head teachers of the ten schools and BOG members in these schools. Data collected was analyzed thematically-by use of frequencies, percentages and tables. The study findings showed that the BOG disciplined teachers and students and were involved in school development. Further the respondents indicated that BOGs ‘influence on KCSE performance was good while a similar percentage stated that BOG contribution towards teachers’ motivation was fair. It was evident that participation of BOG in decision making in schools did not achieve its mandate. The study findings indicated that the BOG failed to include teachers and non teaching staff in implementation and decision making thus the arising conflicts. The study recommended that school stakeholders should select neutral sponsor during the nomination of BOG. The sponsor should also have minimum control on the school management to avoid destabilizing the instructive activities of the schools. Secondly, the study recommends that BOG should further tighten the discipline of student as provided for in education Act cap 211 legal notice No 40/1972 part 4 to 10. Thus the BOG of school should take administrative rule to disciplining all non adherence students in their schools. Lastly the BOG should play a vital role in decision making of the school management. On the other hand they should take every stakeholders decision on board to avoid conflicting interests in the running of the school. In general the study showed that BOGs’ qualification, their decisions and involvement on staff recruitment, has great influence in school management. This further influence the schools’ performance in national examinations
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study
In session paper No. 6 of 1988, the government accepted the recommendations of the presidential working party on manpower training famously known as Kamunge report that: Members of Boards of Governors (BOG) and school committees be appointed from among persons who have qualities of commitment, competence and experience which would enhance the management and development of educational institutions (MOEST, 1988). The education act Cap. 211 of the laws of Kenya section 10 (Republic of Kenya, 1980) indicates that the minister appoints members of the BOG through a selected committee comprising of provincial administration, local leaders, members of parliament and local councilor, sponsors, local education officer and the head teacher. This committee selects 3 persons representing local community, 4 representing bodies and organizations like sponsor and 3 representing special interest groups. Once officially appointed by the minister, the 10 members select the chairperson of the board and co-opt 3 other persons from the parent’s teachers association (PTA) into the board (Opot, 2006). The Teachers Service Commission (TSC) on the other hand posts School head teachers (Principals) to these schools to work with the BOGs in managing the schools as a secretary.

From 1980s, the ministry of education in Kenya has provided in-service management training for principals of schools. In 1988, the government of Kenya (GoK) established Kenya education staff institute (KESI) to offer in service training for heads of educational institutions including school principals. Further, the KESI mandate was to be diversified both serving and potential school leaders.

However, trained or not trained the two teams (BOG and the head teachers) are supposed to work together to manage the schools without any bias either to their own interest or to the interests of the people who appointed them to that post. Based on this, the research aimed to establish the influence (both the merits and demerits) of BOG in school management in Lari District-Kenya.
1.2 Statement of the problem

Managing schools in Kenya has been left in the hands of the school head teachers and the board of governors nominated by stakeholders and appointed by the minister of education. The success of any school program depends on the overall cooperation between the two parties. These bodies are responsible for the management of both human and other resources so as to facilitate smooth operations, infrastructure, development and the provision of teaching and learning materials (Session Paper No. 1 2005: 63). The BOG are legally mandated by the Ministry of Education under the education Act Cap 211 to manage secondary schools in Kenya. Although their immediate roles have been defined in the laws, there are no standards that have been adopted to measure their effectiveness.

The secondary schools BOG in Kenya have not been exposed to adequate management training (Kindiki, 2009). Majority of them lack adequate supervisory competencies to utilize available information for management purposes. The inquiry of Koech report (Republic of Kenya, 1999) pointed out that management of educational institutions in Kenya was found to be weak because most of the boards of governors lacked quality management capabilities.

Much as the BOG play a vital role in the school management, there have been several incidents that have been witnessed where school operations have ceased, stakeholders have fought and schools have been closed. These challenges sometimes lead to poor performance in the Kenya certificate of secondary education (KCSE). Poor examination performance leads to high wastage rate due to finances invested in education. The appointment of secondary school governing bodies in Kenya is occasionally coupled with persons who have no qualities of commitment, competence and experience which would enhance the management and development of schools (Kindiki 2009).

This study sought to investigate influence of the BOG in schools management in secondary schools so as to answer the main research question- Does BOG’s influence Secondary school management?

1.3.1 General objective of the study

The general objective of the study was to establish the influence of Board of Governors in Secondary Schools management.
1.3.2 Specific objectives of the study
The specific objectives of the study were:

i. To establish how board of governors’ qualifications, influences school management.

ii. To determine how board of governors decisions influence stakeholders participation in school management.

iii. To assess to what extent the boards of governors’ involvement in the recruitment of staff influence school management.

iv. To investigate whether board of governors influence the general performance of the school management.

1.4 Research questions
To achieve the purpose and specific objectives, this study sought to answer the following questions:

i. To what extent does the board of governors’ qualifications influence school management?

ii. To what extent does the board of governors’ decisions influence on the stakeholders’ participation in school management?

iii. How does the board of governors’ involvement in the recruitment of teachers and other staff affect the school management?

iv. How does board of governors influence the general performance of the school?

1.5 Significance of the study
The findings of this research will be of importance to the following:

1. Policy makers at government level: - The research findings will help the stakeholders in education and the government to make any necessary changes to make BOG have a positive influence on school management.

2. BOG:-The study findings will help the BOG members to re-align their mandate in order to harmonize their roles with that of the principals and other stakeholders for better school management.
3. School Principals: - The findings will enable the principals in Lari district and other parts in Kenya to understand the influence of BOG as a crucial stakeholder and manager and hence strive to work in harmony for the benefit of the school.

4. PTA: - The PTA being also a stakeholder in the school, will benefit from the findings by understanding the role and influence of BOG in school management and hence work hand in hand with them to benefit the institution. The PTA will turn help the teachers and the students comprehend the BOG's task in school management.

5. Parents: - These are key stakeholders in the school. The study findings will help them comprehend the role and influence of the BOG members in school management.

1.6 Scope of the study
The scope of the study was to cover Lari district public secondary schools in Kiambu County - Kenya. The district has 22 registered public secondary schools out of which 10 were picked through random sampling for the study. The private secondary schools were excluded from the study.

1.7 Assumption of the study
The following were the researcher’s assumptions

i. That the information given by the respondents was true and free from bias.

ii. That those members of the boards and head teachers interviewed knew their role in school management and understands the scope in which they operated on.

iii. That the District Education Office (Lari) had adequate data concerning the subject matter.

1.8 Delimitations of the study
i. The study was based on some selected secondary schools in Lari District whose environment and background may be the same.

ii. The study dwelt more on the role of the board of governors in school management and how they affect the school

1.9 Limitations of the study
i. Lack of cooperation between the interviewers and respondents as some feared to give the true information of their school position. Some never returned the questionnaires.
ii. Tendencies of the respondents to conceal information, especially in cases where they were not sure of how the information collected were to be used.

iii. Lack of full knowledge of the interviewees about the subject under study which may have led them to giving unreliable and incorrect information.

1.10 Definition of significant terms
For the purpose of this study, the following terms will have the attached meaning:

**Board of governors** - Refers to members nominated to manage schools on behalf of the community, the sponsor, the political group and parents of those particular schools.

**Education Act** - A Legislative law set by parliament to help regulate the running and management of schools in Kenya.

**Board nomination** - Refers to proposing names of the members who are to serve in the board for a period of three years by the relevant groups mentioned above.

**Board Inauguration** - This refers to formally ushering in the new board to the school management. It is usually done or chaired by the District Education Officer (DEO) who spells out the board’s role.

**Parents Teachers Association** - An Association formed to articulate the interests of the parents and teachers in school matters especially of development in the board meetings.

**School management** - Refers to the general administration and governance of the school where all the stakeholders are included.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
The study was guided by the structural functionalism theory; Talcott Persons (1991). According to this theory, formal organizations consist of many groupings of different individuals, all working together harmoniously towards a common goal. It argues that most organizations are large and complex social units consisting of many interacting sub-units which are sometimes in harmony but more often than not they are in diametric opposition to each other. Functionalism is concerned with the concept of order, formal work in organizations and in particular how order seems to prevail in both systems and society irrespective of the changes in personnel which constantly takes place. The theory seeks to understand the relationship between the parts and the whole system in an organization and in particular identify how stability is for the most part achieved. Structural functionalism further advocates for an analysis of the perceived conflicts of interests evident amongst groups of workers. In this case the parents, sponsors, teachers and the Ministry. However, it is crucial to take into account conflicts of interests and differing value-basis in order to understand the organizations (Carr and Capey, 1982). The theory thus appropriately explains some conflicts between the head teachers and the board of governors’ influence in the management of public secondary schools in Kenya. The school as a social system has within it a series of sub-systems which interact with each other and the environment. Such school sub-systems include sponsors, teachers, BOG, PTA, students, support staff and the government. Their interactions should be harmonious for effective achievement of educational goals.

However, the BOG being the managers has a greater influence in the management of the schools. It is on this ground that the study looked at the BOG’s influence in schools management under the following headings; the theoretical framework, the broad aspect of secondary school management in Kenya, the role of board of governors in the school management, the merits of board of governors in school management and the demerits of school boards in management.

The chapter was sub-divided into the conceptual and empirical literature. The empirical literature entailed both studies done outside Kenya and inside Kenya on the influence and effectiveness of BOGs in school management. Some of the findings on the same topic done outside Kenya may not directly apply in the Kenya situation but can help resolve some of the underlying problems in
school management or serve as lessons to learn from. The figure below gives a theoretical
framework on the same.

2.2 Conceptual Literature: Education Act in Kenya

The boards of governors (BOG) are legally mandated by the ministry of education under the
education act Cap 211 to manage secondary schools in Kenya. In the management of education
in Kenya, at primary school level school management committees (SMCs) and parents teachers
association (PTAs) are responsible for their respective schools while secondary schools, middle-
level colleges and TIVET (Technical, Industrial, Vocational and Entrepreneurship Training)
institutions are managed by boards of governors (BOGs) and universities by councils.

These bodies are responsible for the management of both human and other resources so as to
facilitate smooth operations, infrastructure, development and the provision of teaching and
learning materials (Session Paper No. 1 2005). In some countries these bodies are known as
School Management Bodies (SMBs).

In the Kenyan case management of secondary schools by boards of governors (BOGs) came into
place after independence following recommendation by the Kenya education commission report
of Ominde (Republic of Kenya, 1964). This aimed at giving each school its own personality and
decentralization of authority for effectiveness. Education act Cap. 211 and sessional paper
No.1of 2005 state that the boards of governors have been given the role of managing human and
other resources so as to facilitate smooth operations, infrastructural development and provision
of teaching and learning materials (MOEST, 2005; Kamunge, 2007).

The education act Cap. 211 of the laws of Kenya section 10 (Republic of Kenya, 1980) indicates
that the minister appoints members of the boards of governors through a selected committee
comprising of provincial administration, local leaders, members of parliament and local
councilor, sponsors, local education officer and the head teacher. This committee selects 3
persons representing local community, 4 representing bodies and organizations like sponsor and
3 representing special interest groups. Once officially appointed by the minister, the 10 members
select the chairperson of the board and co-opt 3 other persons from the Parent's Teachers
Association (PTA) into the board (Opot, 2006). It is this team of 13 members plus the principal as
the secretary, area chief, area member of parliament and the District Education Officer which
oversees the running of Kenyan secondary schools. Appointments of members of the boards of
governors in Kenya as in other parts of the world such as in the United Kingdom is obvious with
some purposely elected as channel for varied interests and hence such boards lack power and
important interests by pass it as pointed out by Kogan (1984). The inquiry of Koech report
(Republic of Kenya, 1999) pointed out that management of educational institutions in Kenya was
found to be weak because most boards of governors lacked quality management capabilities.
These challenges sometimes lead to poor performance in the Kenya certificate of secondary
education (KCSE). Poor examination performance leads to high wastage rate due to finances
invested in education. The appointment of secondary school governing bodies in Kenya is
occasionally coupled with political interference which is contrary to the government policy
pertaining consideration of persons who have qualities of commitment, competence and
experience which would enhance the management and development of schools (Kindiki 2009).
To this end, the study looked at some of the evidences to establish the influence of board of
governors.

2.3 Empirical evidence on BOG and school performance
The literature in this study was obtained from studies done earlier on the role of board of
governors in secondary schools both in Kenya and elsewhere in the world.

Smolley (1999) carried out research on the role of BOGs in the state of Delaware United State of
America. The objective of the study was to find out the effectiveness of board of governor in the
managing of state in Delaware. The study also sought to find out what strategies can be used to
improve board performance. The study revealed that ineffectiveness in BOG is a result of
improper decision making process. Many respondent attributed ineffectiveness of difficulty in
assessing and use of relevant information that could facilitate decision making. Other causes of
ineffective decision making process according to this study were absence of proper deliberation
during meeting and not considering alternative in decision making. Hence the board does not
agree on issues which affect the school as brought forth by other stakeholders in and outside the
school.

A study was done by Isherwood and Osgood (1986) in Canada on administrative effectiveness of
Board of Governors in political environment. The objective of the study was to find out how
Board of Governors chairman defined effective school board operation. The results of this study
depicted some characteristics of effective school board chairman. A chairman pointed out that
he became effective and influential because he listened to the concerns of other BOG members
and other stakeholders. Also ability to control the board or being in authority, ability to foresee solutions and problems making sure BOG members are informed on what is going on, learning to use the school administration effectively and representing the BOG with regard to the public and the media was a sign of effective management (Isherwood & Osgood, 1986). However the study reveals that most BOG members were frustrated when they felt that they didn’t get chance to deal with real educational issues and when meetings deal with unimportant issues like talking seriously issues with the principal and other development agenda rather than educational issues.

Banks (2002) working for the Scottish executive carried out research in Scotland to evaluate the quality of current support to school boards and extent to which needs of the school boards were being met. The objective of the study was to evaluate the level of local authority support to school boards, identify needs of BOG and establish if there was need for initial and continuing training for BOG members. The study revealed that management of finances of the BOG left a lot to be desired as there was no clear rational for the allocation funds. It also noted that board members viewed training positively and thought it as the only way their skills on school management could be improved. The study revealed that there was need for the parent members to be upgraded so as to make contribution with the quality of education provided in their schools.

2.4 Review of researches done in Kenya on school management.

A similar study was done by Monly (2003) in Bureti District to establish the effectiveness of board of Governors in management of public secondary school. He used the survey research design he targeted all head teachers and bursars of all public in Bureti district; District Education Officer (DEO) and the Quality assurance and standard officer (DQASO).The research findings indicated that majority of respondent perceived the BOG members as effective and influential in participation in resource management of school similarly majority of them perceived the BOG as effective in provision of physical facilities.

The BOG was also found to be effective in their participation in financial management in their schools. Decision making role is a crucial function of management the fact that study reveals poor participation BOG in decision making process therefore calls for study to investigate why BOG are not fully involved in this vital task of management discipline of student and lecturer, supervisor and evaluation is, are the roles of BOG clearly defined? Clear cut and over stamping their mandate and some cases just rubber stamping decisions.
Okoth (1987) carried out a research about the love of community participation in the administration of Harambee secondary schools in South Nyanza District in Kenya. The purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of BOG members' participation in Harambee School administration and effect of that participation on school leadership in Rangwe Division of South Nyanza. The target population comprised of all head teachers of Harambee School in the district plus the BOG members of those schools. The study revealed that in schools that the head teachers and the BOG did not enjoy cordial relationship, the BOG tended to usurp the authority of the head teacher and proceeded to recruit their own relatives as schools staff. The BOG always ganged against head teachers and interfered with the day to day running of the institutions. Decision making was not approached for the corporate venture. The study revealed that the role conflicts between head teachers and BOG was due to the BOG members were not adequately knowledgeable on their duties and powers.

Ambucha (2004) conducted a study to establish the effectiveness of BOG in recruitment of teachers in public secondary schools in Taita Taveta District. The purpose of the study was to find out if there were malpractices in teacher recruitment. The target population comprised of teachers recruited by selection panels, head teachers and BOG members. The researchers' findings indicated that majority of BOG members felt the process of recruiting teachers through the BOG recognized their managerial role in having say to who is to teach in their schools. However, the study revealed that some panel members had vested interest and wanted a candidate either of their choice or from the community to be given undue advantage over others. Similarly the study revealed that some BOG members possessed low academic qualifications not beyond primary level.

The above studies have focused on the various issues on the management of school by school boards. The studies have not fully focused on how the BOG influences (either positively or negatively) secondary schools management particularly in settings like that of Lari district-Kiambu County. This is the gap the study aimed to fill. The fact that each of the members has been nominated by different organizations with different interests including the principal, conflicts sometimes arise that threaten the peace and proper management of the institution.
2.5 BOG qualifications and Secondary School Management in Kenya

Provision of education is seen as a vehicle for progressive development. That is why it is given prominence in the Kenya Education Act cap 211 (1968) Revised (1980). The Act established District Education Boards to superintend the management of public schools and the Kenya Institute of Education to coordinate the training for teachers conduct research and prepare educational materials for the development of education. The Act allows an agreement to be made between the Ministry of Education, community, special interested groups like the area Member of Parliament, the councilor and the sponsoring churches in management of schools in Kenya (Banr J, 1990). Members to the BOG are selected irrespective of their academic qualification until the Kamunge Report (2007) recommended at least a grade of fourth form. This indeed affected the management of public schools where churches that were managers of schools before became sponsors of such schools (Wachira and Kigotho, 2007).

The BOG consists of a Chairman, Secretary and the members. The BOG elects from itself an executive committee that has delegated powers to manage the school on behalf of the Board of Governors. The Principal of the school is delegated to administer the school on daily basis as the Secretary of the Board. The BOG is also guided by; the Education Act chapter 211 of the laws of Kenya (Revised 1980), the Teachers Service Commission Act Chapter 212(1967) of the laws of Kenya, the Teachers Service Commission code of regulations for teachers (Revised 1986), the code of management for secondary schools and teachers’ training colleges approved by the minister for education (order of 1969) and the Kenya National Examination council Act Chapter 225 A (Revised).

The board of governors as stated above is mandated and guided by the Education Act 211. Its core functions include:

2.5.1 Provision of physical facilities

Although the parents are responsible for the payment of school fees which go to provision of physical facilities. BOG budgets and comes up with viable projects, for example building of dormitories, purchase of school bus, and construction of laboratories among other essential infrastructure within the school. This is an important function of the BOG as without facilities, curriculum implementation and objectives will be hampered. It is within the role of the BOG to make sure that learning takes place effectively and efficiently. (Section II of Education Act
1968). The BOG is also supposed to provide physical resources that can make curriculum implementation possible. These are discipline things like classrooms, desks, chairs and teaching aids. In most cases these facilities are inadequate in most Kenyan schools hence making effective curriculum implementation a great challenge.

2.5.2 Monitoring and supervision of approved school projects
This function means that the project they approve in their meeting must be monitored to completion. School principals (secretary to the board are mainly entrusted this role by the rest of board members as they oversee day to day running of the school. However, in many cases project committees are constituted on ad hoc basis by board of governors and are mandated to monitor projects. These committees report the development of projects regularly to the board of governors and have the mandate to advise the contractor where need be on development of the projects (Section II of Education Act 1968)

2.5.3 Participation on Key decision making.
BOG is supposed to be proactive rather than reactive on matters that affects the school community, parents, teacher and students. The board also ensures that school principal doesn’t sleep on the job. In addition, BOG is supposed to play center/pivotal role as far as every school decision is made. More successful school BOG always seeks opinion of the head or politicians, for example during expulsion of indiscipline students, scraping school uniform or even changing the menu items. (Section II of Education Act 1968)

2.5.4 Recruitment of staff and maintenance of discipline
BOG is mandated with staffing and sourcing of staff is done through posting advertisement in the newspaper or notice board, then the applicants are interviewed by as BOG recruitment committee. The discipline of student is provided for in education Act cap 211 legal notice No 40/1972 part 4 to 10. It gives the laid down procedure of taking disciplinarily measures to student including suspension, exclusion and expulsion the Act further states BOG of school may take administrative rule to disciplining or non adherence students in their schools. The BOG is also mandated to discipline errant teachers and advice the Teachers Commission for disciplinary action. In regard to organizational roles, members of school BOG play 5 major organizational roles in schools mainly by organizing workshops and seminars, organizing in-service training courses, organizing academic trips, benchmarking in other schools and motivation of staff.
through award schemes. BOG members in Kenya provide teachers with incentive through annual award schemes that improves their overall outputs. Other organizational roles that are not played out very frequently by the BOG members are benchmarking and organizing workshops and seminars; all of which are aimed at increasing the cognitive skills acquired by the BOG members in the schools and consequently help the school in the curriculum implementation. Organization of in-service training is also supposed to be conducted by the BOG members, however since such trainings require a lot of financial expenditure, they are undertaken by BOG in less frequent periods to scale down the financial expenditure of the schools.

2.5.5 Effective and efficient management of resources

After independence, there was a lot of decentralization of responsibilities from the central government to schools which necessitated change in role for school staff, head teachers and board of governors. The financial and managerial delegation to schools is meant to enable the governors and head teachers of each of the schools to make the most effective and efficient use of the resources available to them; give schools greater flexibility and freedom within an agreed budget to spend according to local priorities. Though the legislation provides that the governing body (BOG) is charged with the responsibility of financial management in schools, this is often delegated to the head teachers as the accounting officer. The head teacher therefore, must cultivate and be trusted by the BOG and Parent Teachers’ Association (PTA) who are the major financiers. The social system of the school comprising staff, students as well as the Community of parents at large, looks up to the head teacher for leadership and an inclusive atmosphere.

While the School Development Plan is available in all institutions as an indication of the direction to follow, the head teacher needs support and resources to make critical decisions on a day-to-day basis. These decisions may well relate to pedagogical matters as much as to disciplinary cases. Nevertheless, it is also vital to understand that a Head of School cannot do it alone. She/he will have to resort to some delegation of responsibility from the BOG and other staff members.

In fact, Eshiwani (1993) has underscored the fact that adequate and proper learning materials are a pre-requisite in any learning situation. Thus if the board does not make provision for better physical facilities, the school running and especially curriculum implementation cannot easily be achieved. According to Bishop (1985), the greatest single drawback to the implementation of the
new ideas and techniques in schools is often not lack of funds but delays and problems in connection with ordering and delivering of equipment. Majority of the BOG are involved in getting support to provide library books, textbooks, building of classrooms, purchase of teaching aids, construction of laboratory, provision of laboratory equipment, construction of library as well as providing assistance to acquire chairs and desks.

Running schools require a lot of funds to purchase various kinds of resources and other materials as well as payment of dues and other allowances to the teachers and other workers. Therefore when the school lacks adequate funds, it become difficult to achieve curriculum implementation and most schools often find it difficult to cope with the changing societal needs. Therefore, some schools often engage the BOG members in raising funds through PTA. In their study of the funding of schools Abagi and Odipo (1997) established that primary schools that had good funding bases through active participation of the members of BOG were established to be performing well.

As already noted earlier, teaching and learning materials are very essential for effective teaching, which are directly linked to the curriculum implementation. They help learners to achieve the specific objectives constructed for the content. Curriculum developers point out that no curriculum can be adequate and effectively implemented without adequate teaching and learning materials. This can be done through money raised by fund raising organized by the BOG. However, organization fund raising will not translate to curriculum implementation (Kindiki, 265) because the money being raised from the fund raising exercise could be misused if the BOG is not well versed with management skills. Such a scenario will easily reveal some of the negative influences the BOG may impact on school management as highlighted below:

2.6 Organizational and interpersonal conflicts
Interpersonal Conflict involving different individuals within the board may occur thus hindering the cordial working relationship. The above forms of conflict may arise due to ineffective communication, change, social prejudices, dissatisfaction of roles, territorial encroachment, difference in opinions, attitudes, values, interests and beliefs, managerial gap and incompetent administration. Different management strategies may lead to either desirable outcome or undesirable outcome depending on their effectiveness or ineffectiveness respectively. Effective management strategy may result in desirable outcome such as smooth management, enhanced
discipline, and effective management of time, team spirit, and effective use of resources, achievement of goals, good relationships and great value by stakeholders. However, when ineffective management strategy is used, undesirable outcome such as strikes, demonstrations, destruction of property, poor performance, emotional stress, and misallocation of resources, absence and frustration may affect the running of any school. (Ageng’a and Simatwa 1077)

2.7 Supervisory incompetency
The secondary school boards of governors in Kenya have not been exposed to adequate management training. Also, majority of them lack adequate supervisory competencies to utilize available information for management purposes. Such a scenario may end up bringing conflicts that can easily bring down the performance of a school. Leaders in organizations are expected to create organizational systems that members perceive as fair, caring and open. In a just and ethical organization, decisions that leaders make should reflect fair treatment of people and concern for their welfare (Deventer and Kruger, 2005). Failure to address concerns can often lead to conflicts and organizational dysfunction. The inquiry of Koech report (Republic of Kenya, 1999) pointed out that management of educational institutions in Kenya was found to be weak because most the boards of governors lacked quality management capabilities which may influence negatively to school management.

As elsewhere in the world, internal management of schools is done by teachers who are the core pillars and are in constant touch with the students sometimes influencing their decisions immensely. The school governing bodies on the other hand are the external managers of the schools. They are expected to be in constant touch with school, students and teachers as well as with other stakeholders. In Kenya, boards of governors in many secondary schools are often in constant touch with the school authority and less with students. This naturally implies that if a decision that touch a student has to be made by the head teachers, then it is imperative that the boards of governors be fully involved in the whole decision so as to reach the intended beneficiary (Kindiki 2009).

2.8 Vested interests interference
According to the Education Act a school sponsor is allowed to nominate four (4) of the thirteen (13) members of the school Board of Governors and to propose the chairman who should be ratified by the Ministry (Republic of Kenya, 2004). This organ champions the sponsors’ interest
in school management. The historical roles where sponsors were the main developers and providers for educational institutions have changed. Initially, the missionaries were the main developers and providers for educational institutions they owned. They developed facilities and provided nearly all essential learning resources. These gave significant roles to sponsors in the management of schools in Kenya.

However, changes in the Education Act on school sponsorship seem to be causing some misunderstanding between sponsors, community, teachers and the Government. Some sponsors have been accused of interfering with the schools’ core business by closing down schools indefinitely. In other instances, some have rejected and even evicted principals posted to schools by the Ministry (Cheruiyot, 2001). According to Gikandi (2005) some sponsors meddling in schools destabilize the instructive activities in the system.

The sponsor provides the chair of the board of governors. This makes the rest of the stakeholders feel that they are less represented owing to the fact that the same sponsor is also given 4 slots to nominate the members. On the other hand, the head teacher who is the secretary to the board is not allowed to vote on any decision to be made though he is the officer who is to implement the decision and also the accounting officer of the institution. This to a large extent affects the school management.

2.9 Conceptual framework.

By applying the theoretical model from the past literature, the researcher came up with number of key implications of the study. These implications enabled the researcher to develop a set of conceptual framework that was expected to explain the influence of BOG on secondary schools management. The following schematic diagram explains the relationship between the independent variables and the dependant variable.
The conceptual framework shows how the independent variables (academic qualifications of the BOG, their influence on stakeholders' participation, staff recruitment and their influence in school performance in general) influences the dependant variable (school management) though there are policies that guide the teams involved (moderating variables). School management depends on the influence of the BOG in almost every activity in school. However, this study looked on how the BOG's qualifications, decisions, involvement in staff recruitment and their influence on school performance affects secondary schools management despite the fact that the government has put in place policies to guide on the same.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter provided the description of the research methodology that was used in achieving the study objectives. The chapter described the study design, the target population, sample size and sampling techniques. It also gave the description of the study instruments, their validity and reliability, collection procedures and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research Design
The study adopted descriptive survey design with the intention of capturing the effects of BOGs in management of public secondary schools in Lari District. The design was appropriate for the study because it revealed variables like, the BOGs qualifications, experience, gender, age, interests and bias that contribute positively or negatively to school management.

Research design is the plan and structure of investigation so conceived as to obtain answers to research questions. It is actually an outline or a scheme used to generate answers to the research questions. According to Adams and Schveneldt (1985), it is a set of rules that enables the investigator to conceptualize and observe the problem under study.

3.3 Target population
Population is a group of human beings, animals or objects which have one or more characteristics in common and have been selected as a focus of the study (Mulusa, 1988) The study population involved a total of twenty two schools secondary schools in Lari district. Out of the twenty two schools, simple random sampling was used to select ten (45.5%) schools for the investigation. The total number of teachers, head teachers and BOG in the sampled schools was one hundred and one. From each school, three respondents were picked making a total of thirty (30%) respondents for the study. Scholars have recommended that a sample of 30% is representative for statistical analysis (Kothari, 1999).

3.4 Sample size and sampling techniques.
Ten schools were chosen out of the twenty two schools, representing 45.5% of the total population. This sample size was considered adequate for the study as most scholars recommend a sample size of 30% and above (Kothari, 1999). Data was collected from 10 head teachers in these ten schools, ten teachers and ten governors represented by three members from each school.
using simple random sampling totaling to 30 people for the sample population study. The sample size was determined using simple random sampling method. This method helps to reduce bias or prejudices in selecting samples (Kasomo D, 2006).

3.5 Research instruments
The data was collected using questionnaires for the principals, teachers and BOG members in the sampled schools. An interview schedule was also arranged between the researcher and the District Education Officer, the sampled principals and the PTA member. Data collected was analyzed thematically-by use of frequencies, percentages and tables. The questionnaires method was preferred for the study as they have advantages over other instruments in that they seek for large amount of data and also that respondents in the study were literate and hence able to answer items adequately.

3.6 Data collection method
After obtaining the authority to collect data from the District Education Officer (DEO), the researcher distributed the questionnaires in person to the selected schools. The questionnaires included both open-ended and closed questions. The open-ended questions encouraged the respondents to express their views while the closed questions gave the respondents a chance to express their opinions and gave the researcher a chance to get specific answers towards the research. The questionnaire included the construct items adapted from previous studies (Venkatesh and Bala, 2008) modified to meet the needs of the research.

3.7 Validity of the instrument.
The researcher administered a pre-test of the data collecting instrument to a set of respondents from a population picked randomly from schools in the neighboring district-Limuru before carrying out the full scale survey (Mugenda & Mugenda 2003) in Lari district. The purpose of pre-testing was to identify problems with the data collection instrument and find possible solutions. The pre-test was done in 3 public secondary schools whose environment was almost the same as that of the selected schools where the study was carried out.

Validity is the degree to which the empirical measure or several measures of the concept accurately measure the concept (Orodho, 2004). Validity in this case was to establish whether the questionnaire content is measuring what it purports to measure. The study used content validity...
which is the degree to which the content of a given test are related to the traits for which it is
designed to measure (Best and Khan, 2004).

3.8 Reliability of the instrument
The reliability of a standardized test is expressed as a co-efficient which measures the strength of
association between the variables. Reliability was ascertained by placing all odd numbers on one
sub set and all even numbers in one sub- set and then finding out the co-efficient of internal
consistency. Reliability of the research instrument is the degree of the consistence that the
instrument demonstrates (Best and Khan, 2004).

3.9 Data Analysis Techniques
The returned questionnaires were checked and edited for errors. The quantitative data from the
questionnaire was coded and analyzed by use of Statistical Package for social science (SPSS).
Qualitative data from open ended questions as well as interviews were analyzed thematically.
The analyzed data results were presented using frequencies, tables and percentages.
### Fig. 2. Operationalization of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective or Research question</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Level of measurement</th>
<th>Data collection method</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
<th>Measuring scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To what extent do BOG qualifications influence school management? | **Independent**  
- B.O.G. Qualification | - Credentials & testimonials | - No. of certificates  
- Level of education  
- Experience | - Ordinal | Questionnaire  
- Observation | Descriptive survey | - Frequencies  
- Percentages |
| | **Dependant**  
- School management | - Well managed school | - Performance  
- Physical facilities  
- KCSE results | - Ordinal | Questionnaire  
- Descriptive survey | - Frequencies  
- Percentages |
| How does BOG decision influence on stakeholders participation in school management? | **Independent**  
- B.O.G.'s Decisions | - Resolutions passed | - Acceptance of the resolutions  
- Disagreements | - Ordinal  
- Interval | Questionnaire  
- Descriptive survey | - Frequencies  
- Percentages |
| | **Dependant**  
- School management | - Stakeholders satisfaction or dissatisfaction | - conflicts  
- performance  
- No. of students in school | - Interval  
- Ordinal | Questionnaire  
- Observation | Descriptive survey | - Frequencies  
- Percentages |
| To what extent does BOG involvement in staff recruitment affect school management? | **Independent**  
- BOG involvement on staff recruitment | - workers recruited  
- Quality of teachers recruited | - Qualified or unqualified staff  
- KCSE performance | - Ordinal | Questionnaire  
- Descriptive survey | - Frequencies  
- Percentages |
| | **Dependant**  
- School management | - General performance of the school | - Well managed school without conflicts | - Interval | Questionnaire  
- Descriptive survey  
- Interviews | - Frequencies  
- Percentages |
| Does BOG influence school general performance? | **Independent**  
- Performance | - KCSE results  
- Teacher satisfaction | - No of students joining university | - Ordinal | Questionnaire  
- Descriptive survey  
- Interviews | - Frequencies  
- Percentages |
| | **Dependant**  
- School management | - A well co-ordinated and managed team | No. of conflicts | - Interval | Questionnaire  
- Observation | Descriptive survey | - Frequencies  
- Percentages |

**Source:** The researcher

The operational table above shows how the independent variables: BOG’s qualifications, decision making, involvement in recruitment and their influence in performance influence the dependant variable-school management. The table gives the indicators, measurements and the level of measurement used to determine the degree of the performance for each variable. Data collection and analysis methods used are also outlined alongside with the measuring scale adopted for the study.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND PRESENTATION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter focuses on the questionnaire return rate, demographic information of the respondents namely the teachers, head teachers and members of board of governors, presentations of and interpretation findings. The presentations were done based on the research questions. Items addressing the same research question were grouped together and conclusions drawn.

4.2 Questionnaire return rate
Questionnaire return rate is the rate of percentage of the questionnaires that were returned to the researcher and which were deemed well completed for the sake of analysis. The study had 100% return rate in that thirty out of thirty questionnaires issued to teachers, head teachers and BOG were returned. These percentage return rates were deemed adequate for data analysis because (Kothari 1999) recommend a representative of 30% of the total population.

4.3 Demographic Information
In order to capture the general information of the respondent, issues such as gender, age, years served, level of education and size of the school were addressed in the first section of the questionnaire.

4.4 Gender of Respondents
This section represents the gender of the respondents in their various categories. Table 4.1 shows the distribution of the responses.
Table 4.1 Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>F. Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study shows that majority of the teachers and head teachers were male as represented by 20.00% respectively. The board members had 26.66% who were represented by male. This is a clear indication that the study was dominated by male.

4.5 Age of Respondents

Table 4.2 below shows distribution of responses on age.

Table 4.2 Ages of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>21-30 years</th>
<th>31-40 years</th>
<th>41-50 years</th>
<th>Over 50 years</th>
<th>F. Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of governors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.67</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 above shows that 10.00% of the teachers indicated that they were between the age brackets of 21-30 years while 20.00% of the head teachers stated that they were 41-50 years. On the other hand 10.00% of the teachers indicated that they were between the ages of 41-50 years. The age difference differed because the head teachers and board members required people who had experience while the teachers were in their dynamic age.
4.6 Years served in the school

This section shows the distribution of responses on the years served by the key informants in the schools they served. Table 4.3 and 4.4 shows the responses.

Table 4.3 Years served in the school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 years and below</th>
<th>4-6 years</th>
<th>7-9 years</th>
<th>Above 15 years</th>
<th>F. Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F  %</td>
<td>F  %</td>
<td>F  %</td>
<td>F  %</td>
<td>F  %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3  10.00</td>
<td>5  16.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2  6.67</td>
<td>10  33.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>7  23.33</td>
<td>3  10.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10  33.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of governors</td>
<td>1  3.33</td>
<td>2  6.67</td>
<td>4  13.33</td>
<td>3  10.00</td>
<td>10  33.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>11  36.66</td>
<td>10  33.33</td>
<td>4  13.33</td>
<td>5  16.67</td>
<td>30  100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study shows that 16.76% of the teachers indicated that they had served the school for a period of 4-6 years while 23.33% of the head teachers stated that they had served their school for a period of 3 years and below. This clearly shows that both the teachers and head teachers had worked for a long duration thus the information they gave would be viable to the researcher.

The table above on the other hand showed that 46.33% of the board members indicated that they had served the school for a period of 2-3 years and 3-4 years respectively.

Further the study gathered that some teachers had revealed that they had served in other schools namely ol-kalou for 1 year, Kerwa 7 years, Nyandarua 10 years, Loreto Limuru 4 years, Nyamweru 20 years and Itego for 3 years. On the other hand some of the head teachers said that they had served other schools for 3 years in Nyandarua while the BOG had served in other schools for 2 years.

4.7 Level of Education

Table 4.4 shows the distribution of responses on the basis of level of education.
Table 4.4 Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secondary (form 1-4)</th>
<th>High school (form 5-6)</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>F. Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>7 23.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of governors</td>
<td>5 16.67</td>
<td>2 6.67</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5 16.67</td>
<td>5 16.67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study shows that 23.33% of the teachers had degree as their academic qualification while 33.33% of the teachers were head teachers. Fifty percent of the board members had secondary education (form 1-4) while a few had degree education. This is a clear indication that both the head teachers and teachers were well qualified for their profession.

4.8 Size of the school

This section shows distribution of responses on the size of the schools under study.

Table 4.5 Size of the school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 200 students</th>
<th>200-500</th>
<th>Over 800</th>
<th>F. Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6 20.00</td>
<td>4 13.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>7 23.33</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of governors</td>
<td>7 23.33</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20 66.66</td>
<td>10 33.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the findings, 20.00% of the teachers indicated that they had less than 200 students in their schools while 23.33% of the head teachers said that they had less than 200 students in the schools. On the other hand 23.33% of the B.O.G said that they had less than 200 students in their schools. This is a clear indication that the schools had fewer students.

4.9 Influence of BOG in school management: (Meetings)
This section shows responses on the effectiveness of the BOG in running of the school management.

Table 4.6 shows responses on how regular the board of governor held meetings in their schools.

**Table 4.6 Meetings of BOG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Once per term</th>
<th>Twice per term</th>
<th>Thrice per term</th>
<th>Once a year</th>
<th>F. total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F %</strong></td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head teachers</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F %</strong></td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board of governors</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F %</strong></td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study shows that 26.66% of the teachers indicated that the board of governors held meetings once per term while 23.33% of the head teachers stated that the board of governors held meetings once per term. Further 33.33% of the board members indicated that they held meetings once per term.

**4.10 Roles of BOG in influencing general performance**

The teachers echoed their sentiments on the roles of BOG. They indicated that the BOG disciplined teachers and students and were involved in school development. Further they said that it was the BOG role to discuss on how to improve the infrastructure in the school, recruitment of teachers. Further they felt that it was the role of BOG to check on the improvement of academic performance of students and manage schools resources through disbursement of funds.

The head teachers on the other hand indicated that the BOG role was to act as a consultant in management issues at the same time offering moral support to teachers and learners. Their role further included offering financial management and disciplinary to the students and teachers. The BOG also provided financial management in school development and further sourced for funds for school’s infrastructure.
The BOG indicated that their roles in the school management included decision making, management of school resources and finances, initiating and overseeing overall programs and development of the school infrastructure. On the other hand roles such as advisory to the principal, improvement of academic performance and discipline of teachers and students was attributed to them. Lastly it was the duty of the BOG to resolve issues among the members.

4.11 BOG inclusion of stakeholders in decision making

This section of the study shows how the respondents rated the influence of BOG in decision making in the school management. Table 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 shows the distribution of the responses.

Table 4.7 BOG inclusion of stakeholders in decision making (teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Fairly effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>F. Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The extent to which B.O.G participate in decision making in school management.</strong></td>
<td>1 3.33</td>
<td>6 20.00</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The extent to which B.O.G supports decision made by the head teachers, teachers and the heads of departments</strong></td>
<td>1 3.33</td>
<td>6 20.00</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion of teachers and non teaching staff into decision making by the B.O.G</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>4 13.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>2 6.67</td>
<td>15 50.00</td>
<td>9 30.00</td>
<td>4 13.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7 shows that 20.00% of the teachers indicated that the participation of board of governors in decision making processes was effective while a similar percentage stated that the extent to which BOG participate in decision making in school management was most effective thus influencing almost every school decision. Further 20.00% said that the extent to which BOG support decisions made by the head teacher, head of departments and teachers was effective while 13.33% pointed out that inclusion of teachers, and non teaching staff into decision making by BOG in secondary was ineffective and hence the views of these stakeholders are never factored in school management.

Table 4.8 BOG inclusions of stakeholders in decision making (head teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Fairly effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>F. Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which B.O.G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate in decision</td>
<td>2 6.66</td>
<td>4 13.33</td>
<td>4 13.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making in school management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which B.O.G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports decision made by the</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>4 13.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head teachers, teachers and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the heads of departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of teachers and non</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching staff into decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making by the B.O.G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5 16.66</td>
<td>8 26.66</td>
<td>11 36.67</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The study shows that 13.33% of the head teachers indicated that Participation of board of governors in decision making processes was most effective while 10.00% said that the extent to which BOG participates in decision making in school management was effective. Further 10.00% stated that the extent to which BOG support decisions made by the head teacher, head of departments and teachers was fairly effective while 10.00% indicated that inclusion of teachers and non teaching staff into decision making by BOG in secondary was ineffective. This makes them feel less active in the school management.

Table 4.9 BOG inclusion in decision making (Board Members)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Fairly effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>F. Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which B.O.G participate in decision making in school management.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 26.67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 6.66%</td>
<td>10 33.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which B.O.G supports decision made by the head teachers, teachers and the heads of departments</td>
<td>3 10.00%</td>
<td>2 6.67%</td>
<td>3 10.00%</td>
<td>2 6.66%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 33.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of teachers and non teaching staff into decision making by the B.O.G</td>
<td>3 10.00%</td>
<td>2 6.67%</td>
<td>3 10.00%</td>
<td>2 6.67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 33.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6 20.00%</td>
<td>12 40.00%</td>
<td>6 20.00%</td>
<td>4 13.32%</td>
<td>2 6.66%</td>
<td>30 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study shows 26.00% of the respondents said that BOG are involved recruitment of teachers in the school was effective. The study further established that 13.33% said that BOG are involved in recruiting non teaching staffs based on qualification was very effective while 20.00% said that BOG are involved in motivation of both non teaching and teaching staff in the school was effective.

4.12 Participation of BOG staff Recruitment
Table 4.11, shows distribution of responses on participation of BOG in the appointment and recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Fairly effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>F. Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOG are involved in recruitment of teachers in the school</td>
<td>8 26.67</td>
<td>1 3.33</td>
<td>1 3.33</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>1 3.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG are involved in recruiting non teaching staff based on qualifications</td>
<td>4 13.33</td>
<td>4 13.33</td>
<td>2 6.66</td>
<td>1 3.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG are involved in motivation of both non teaching staff and teaching staff</td>
<td>6 20.00</td>
<td>1 3.33</td>
<td>1 3.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12 40.00</td>
<td>11 36.66</td>
<td>5 16.67</td>
<td>2 6.66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study shows that 26.6% of the respondents said that the BOG involvement in recruitment of teachers in school was effective. The study established that 13.33% said that the BOG involvement in recruiting non teaching staff based on qualification was very effective. While
20% said that the BOG in motivating both non teaching and teaching staff in secondary schools was effective.

4.13 Influence of BOG qualification in school management.
This section shows the extent the respondents agreed or disagreed on BOG characteristics influence on the management of public schools. Table 4.14, 4.15 and 4.16 shows the results of the responses.

Table 4.11 Influence of BOG qualification on management (teachers, head teachers and BOG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>F. Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most of the BOG are too old to serve and there is a huge gender gap in representation in school management</td>
<td>1 3.33</td>
<td>7 2.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 6.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG are well knowledgeable/qualified to handle their management roles</td>
<td>4 13.33</td>
<td>4 13.33</td>
<td>2 6.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The influence of BOG can be attributed to their experiences</td>
<td>5 16.66</td>
<td>3 10.00</td>
<td>1 3.33</td>
<td>1 3.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10 33.32</td>
<td>14 46.66</td>
<td>3 9.99</td>
<td>3 9.99</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 shows that 46.67% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that most of the BOG are too old to serve in the school management effectively while 33.33% agreed that there exists a huge gender gap representation in BOG and this hinder effective school management by
the board. Further 19.99% agreed that board members are well knowledgeable /qualified for handling their management roles which greatly influence school management.

4.14 Influence of BOG on schools' general performance

This section of the study shows how the BOG had contributed positively or negatively in the school management in the following areas. Table 4.16, 4.17 and 4.18 shows the responses.

Table 4.12 Influence of BOG on performance (teachers, head teachers and BOG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>F Total</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KCSE examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 33.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>16 53.33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study shows that 53.33% respondent indicated that BOG’s contribution or influence on K.C.S.E examination performance was good while 40.00% stated that BOG’s influence towards teachers’ motivation was fair. Further 20.00% said that the BOG contribution to the general standards of schools was good. Hence the study concluded that the BOG who is fully qualified academically can greatly influence positively the KCSE examination results and vice versa.

4.15 Suggestions on effective influence on school Management

The teachers suggested that nomination should not be pegged on political sponsor but academic qualification and experience. They should get development conscious members that have a good academic background. The teachers felt that the BOG should be engaged in refresher courses and exchange programs with other board members from other schools to enhance exposure. In addition they should attend meetings when they are called without fail and constantly hold meetings to discuss the various issues affecting the school.
The head teachers on the other hand indicated that the BOG should be inducted for at least one week before inauguration and training done immediately after appointment. Competitive recruitment is to be applied where academic qualification and positive attitude was considered not on vested interests and nepotism. The head teacher further felt that the BOG should be taken for in service training. Lastly the head teachers felt that there should be a non partisan member who should be permanently placed in school instead of waiting for issues to be reported to them.

The board members indicated that the BOG should be trained so as to have qualified members. Secondly there should be reduction of sponsor members and instead any parent selected to be a representative together with inclusion of two teachers. Lastly the board members suggested that the BOG should be allowed to own the school.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter provides a summary of the findings, conclusions drawn and recommendations based on the research findings.

5.2 Summary of findings
From the analysis the following were the summary of the research findings upon which the conclusions and recommendations of the study were made:

Based on the study findings 57.1% of the respondents strongly disagreed and 42.9% agreed that most of the BOG members are too old to serve in the school management effectively while 66.7% agreed and 33.3% disagreed that there exists a huge gender gap representation in BOG and this hinder effective school management by the board. Further 53.4% of the respondents agreed that board members are well knowledgeable /qualified for handling their management roles while 46.6% disagreed on the same. The head teachers disagreed that most of the BOG are too old to serve in the school management effectively while a similar percentage disagreed that there exists a huge gender gap representation in BOG and this hinder effective school management by the board. The study shows that a good number of the respondents indicated that sponsor nomination on BOG procedure was appropriate while majority indicated that community nomination procedure on BOG was appropriate. On the other hand the respondents said that political group nomination on BOG procedure was not appropriate while a good number stated that Co-opted PTA members’ nomination on BOG procedure was most appropriate.

On the involvement of the BOG in recruitment, the research findings shows that 71.4% of the respondent indicated that BOG are involved recruitment of teachers in the school was effective while 42.9% said that BOG are involved in recruiting non teaching staffs based on qualification and that they motivated both the teachers and the non-teaching staff. This concludes that the BOG does not motivate the staff though they recruit them and hence low morale among them
that affects the performance. The respondents echoed their sentiments on the roles of BOG. They indicated that the BOG disciplined teachers.

It was evident that the teachers indicated that participation of board of governors in decision making processes was effective while a similar percentage stated that the extent to which BOG participates in decision making in school management was effective. The study shows that 85.7% of the respondents indicated that Participation of board of governors in decision making processes was most effective while 14.3% said it was ineffective. Further 42.9% stated that the extent to which BOG support decisions made by the head teacher, head of departments and teachers was fairly effective while 28.6% indicated that inclusion of teachers. This is an indication that the BOG does not involve other stakeholders in decision making process in most cases and hence the wrangles emerge. Further a good number said that the extent to which BOG support decisions made by the head teacher, head of departments and teachers was effective while majority pointed out that inclusion of teachers, and non teaching staff into decision making by BOG in secondary was ineffective. The respondents indicated that Participation of board of governors in decision making processes was effective while majority said that the extent to which BOG participate in decision making in school management was effective. Further the respondents stated that the extent to which BOG support decisions made by the other stakeholders was fairly effective while a few indicated that inclusion of teachers, and non teaching staff into decision making by BOG in secondary was ineffective.

The study shows that 28.6% of the respondents indicated that BOG contribution to K.CSE performance was good while 71.4% indicated that their influence on the same was minimal. 42.9% of the respondents said that BOG contribution to teacher motivation was good. Further 57.1% indicated that BOG contribution on development of infrastructure was good while 42.9% said that BOG contribution on spiritual/guidance and counseling was fair. Most of the respondents 71.4% also indicated that the BOG’s contribution to school development and general standards was good These findings on performance therefore indicates that the BOG does not influence the national examination (KSCE) and teacher motivation was minimal as compared to their support to other school development
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5.3 DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that the respondents stated that the nomination procedure used for BOG members i.e. community and Co-opted PTA members was appropriate. However they felt that political groups and sponsors were inappropriate as they hindered school development as they focused more on individual interests; consequently interfering with the school management. This is in alignment with findings by Cheruiyot, (2001) that some sponsors have been accused of interfering with the schools’ core business by closing down schools indefinitely. In other instances, some have rejected and even evicted principals posted to schools by the Ministry. According to Gikandi (2005) some sponsors meddling in schools destabilize the instructive activities in the system. Further the literature review argues that the sponsor provides the chair of the board of governors. This makes the rest of the stakeholders feel that they are less represented owing to the fact that the same sponsor is also given 4 slots to nominate the members. On the other hand, the head teacher who is the secretary to the board is not allowed to vote on any decision to be made though he is the officer who is to implement the decision and also the accounting officer of the institution. This to a large extent affects the school management.

The study gathered that it was the role of the BOG to provide discipline teachers and students. They were attributes with resource management of the school resources and development. Their role included overseeing the school development and infrastructure through making of crucial decisions in the school management. This concurs with the literature review that BOG is mandated with staffing and sourcing of staff is done through posting advertisement in the newspaper or notice board, then the applicants are interviewed by as BOG recruitment committee. The discipline of student is provided for in education Act cap 211 legal notice No 40/1972 part 4 to 10. It gives the laid down procedure of taking disciplinarily measures to student including suspension, exclusion and expulsion the Act further states BOG of school may take administrative rule to disciplining or non adherence students in their schools.

It was evident that participation of BOG in decision making in schools did not achieve its mandate. The respondents felt that the BOG failed to include teachers and non teaching staff in implementation and decision making thus the arising conflicts. Such conflicts hindered school management as the teachers and parents felt left out in the school management. However this differed with Section II of Education Act (1968) that stipulated that BOG is supposed to be
proactive rather than reactive on matters that affects the school community, parents, teacher and students. The board also ensures that school principal doesn’t sleep on the job. In addition, BOG is supposed to play center/pivotal role as far as every school decision is made. More successful school bog always seeks opinion of the head or politicians, for example during expulsion of indiscipline students, scraping school uniform or even changing the menu items. On the other hand the study concluded that the BOG was involved in recruitment of staff and non staff based on qualification. They further motivated the staff may be through incentives such as reward systems. This is in line with the literature review that organization of in-service training is also supposed to be conducted by the BOG members, however since such trainings require a lot of financial expenditure, they are undertaken by BOG in less frequent periods to scale down the financial expenditure of the schools.

The study concluded that there exists a huge gender gap representation in BOG and this hinder effective school management by the board. This has however resulted to poor spiritual guidance and counseling and poor solving of disputes among the staff. Some of BOG members lack knowledge and training in their respective roles prompting to poor school management. This concurs with the literature review that interpersonal conflict involving different individuals within the board may occur thus hindering the cordial working relationship. The above forms of conflict may arise due to ineffective communication, change, social prejudices, dissatisfaction of roles, territorial encroachment, difference in opinions, attitudes, values, interests and beliefs, managerial gap and incompetent administration. Different management strategies may lead to either desirable outcome or undesirable outcome depending on their effectiveness or ineffectiveness respectively.

5.4 Recommendations
The study recommends that:

- The school management should have a neutral sponsor from whom some of the BOG can be nominated based on academic qualifications and experience. The sponsor should also have minimum control on the school running or management to avoid destabilizing the instructive activities of the schools. On the other hand the there should be equal chances on selection of BOG members from all the stakeholders namely the community and the Co-opted PTA members to enable effective administration and smooth running in the
management. The BOG members should be holders of at least KCSE certificate. The board should also be gender balanced.

- Apart from motivating teachers and staff, the BOG should provide mechanism and materials to enable easy delivery of the curriculum and hence good KCSE results. BOG should be mandated with responsibilities such as provision of facilities, curriculum implementation and selection of viable projects. They should further implement the discipline of student is provided for in education Act cap 211 legal notice No 40/1972 part 4 to 10. Thus the BOG of school should take administrative rule to disciplining or non adherence students in their schools. It is within this role of the BOG that learning will take place effectively and efficiently.

- The BOG should play a vital role in decision making of the school management. On the other hand they should take every participant decision on bound to avoid conflicting interests in the running of the school. The study recommends that all the stakeholders in the school should be involved in decision making thus the BOG should be proactive rather than reactive on matters that affects the school community, parents, teacher and students. The head teachers should be further given a chance to vote on any decision since they are the ones to implement them. Teachers, who are stakeholders at the school level, should also have a stake in the BOG resolutions for easy implementation.

- The BOG who is charged with the responsibility of recruiting teachers and other non-teaching staff should do the exercise without bias but based on qualifications and experience. They should also ensure a cordial working relationship among the head teachers and teachers. This could be achieved through effective communication, administering the managerial gap and competent administration. This could only be achieved through selection of BOG members who are thorough and qualified in their respective roles. Their training will ensure that different management strategies lead to desirable outcomes due to effectiveness on management of the school.

5.5 Suggestions for further research
Based on the research findings that emerged from this particular study, there are several areas of future research.
• The study recommends that further study could be conducted on the role of government in ensuring BOG members carry out their duties effectively.

• The researcher concentrated his study in Lari district-Kiambu County, hence more research could be conducted on other districts to compare and contrast the findings.


Carr and Capey (1982) *Conflicts and differing value-basis in understanding organizations*.


Nyabwari Kinara; (2005), *effective management and administration of public Secondary schools in Machakos*. Unpublished PhD Proposals- University of Nairobi


The code of management for secondary schools and teachers training colleges approved by the Minister of Education (order of 1969)

The Education Act Chapter 211 of the Laws of Kenya (Revised 1980)

The Kenya National examination Council Act Chapter 225A (Revised)


The teachers Service Commission code of regulation for teachers (Revised 1986)


Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: INFLUENCE OF BOG ON SECONDARY SCHOOLS' MANAGEMENT-LARI DISTRICT-KIAM BU COUNTY.

I am a post graduate student at the University of Nairobi currently undertaking a research to investigate the influence of Board of Governors in secondary schools in the District.

The questionnaires are designed for this research only. You are kindly requested to fill in the questionnaire which will be used in the study. I assure you that the information gathered will be used for the purpose of this research only and will be treated with strict confidentiality. To ensure this, please do not write your name anywhere in this questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for your co-operation.

Yours faithfully,

OMBATI NYANDUSI.
APPENDIX II

AUTHORITY TO COLLECT DATA

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

District Education Office
Lari
P.O. Box 353-00601
Narathiwa

All Principals
Lari District Sec. Schools

RE: AUTHORITY TO COLLECT DATA

This is to kindly inform you that Mr. Ombati Evans Nyandusi, who is a Masters Student, University of Nairobi, registration number L50/65/29/2010, has been authorized to collect data from Lari District secondary schools. This is in pursuance of his Masters project entitled “To investigate the effectiveness of BOG administration in Secondary schools management- a case study of Lari District.

Any assistance accorded to him will be highly appreciated.

Thanks in advance.

A. NTABO
FOR: District Education Officer
Lari
APPENDIX III

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HEADS OF SCHOOLS

PART A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

(Please indicate responses by ticking ( ) the appropriate box be precise in your responses. Do not indicate your name or that of your school. Your information will be highly confidential)

1. What is your gender?
   i. Male
   ii. Female

2. Which age bracket below do you belong?
   21-30 years ( ) 31-40 years ( ) 51-60 years ( )
   Over 60 years ( )

3. (a) How many years have you served in this school?
   3 years and below ( ) 4-6 years ( ) 7-9 years ( )
   Above 15 years ( )

   (b) In other schools (please specify)

4. What is your academic qualification?

   Secondary (form 1-4) ( ) High school (form 5-6) ( ) Diploma ( )
   Degree ( )

   Others (please specify)

5. What is the size of your school?

   Less than 200 student ( ) 200-500 ( ) Over 800 ( )

PART B: BOG Effectiveness

6. How regular the board of governors does meets in your school?
   Once per term ( ) Twice per term ( ) Thrice per term ( ) Once a year ( )
Others specify

7. In your opinion what are the most salient roles of BOG in management of your school. Please list them.

8. Please read the following questions and how you rate the effectiveness of BOG in your school management. Indicate your response by ticking in the bracket provided ( ) in one of the boxes provided to the right of each task on scale 5 – 1. Give one response for every question. Use the key below.
5. VE = Very effective 4. E = effective 3. FE = fairly effective 2.1= ineffective 1.VI = very ineffective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation of board of governors in decision making processes</th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A The extent to which BOG participate in decision making in school management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B The extent to which BOG support decisions made by the head teacher, head of departments and teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Inclusion of teachers, and non teaching staff into decision making by BOG in secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Participation of BOG in the appointment and recruitment

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>BOG are involved in recruitment of teachers in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>BOG are involved in recruiting non teaching staffs based on qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>BOG are involved in motivation of both non teaching and teaching staff in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. To what extent do you agree with the following statements on BoG characteristics influence on the management of public schools?

1- Strongly Disagree  2- Disagree  3. neither agree or Disagree  4- Agree  5- Strongly Agree

- Most of the BOG are too old to serve in the school management effectively
- There exists a huge gender gap representation in BOG and this hinder effective school management by board
- Board members are well knowledgeable/qualified for handling their management roles
- The effectiveness of Board member can be strongly attributed to their experienced in school management

11. How has the BOG in your school contributed positively or negatively the school management in the following areas?

5- Excellent  4- Very good  3- Good  2- fair  1- Poor

- K.C.S.E performance
- Teacher’s motivation
- Resolving dispute
- Contributing to disputes
- Development of infrastructure
- Spiritual/ guidance and counseling

12. What are your suggestions that you think will make the board of governors to be more effective in management of your school?
APPENDIX IV

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BOARD MEMBERS

PART A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

(Please indicate responses by ticking ( ) the appropriate box be precise in your responses. Do not indicate your name or that of your school. Your information will be highly confidential)

1. What is your gender?
   iii. Male
   iv. Female

2. Which age bracket below do you belong?
   21-30 years ( ) 31-40 years ( ) 51-60 years ( )
   Over 60 years ( )

3. (a) How many years have you served in this school?
   1 years and below ( ) 2-3 years ( ) 3-4 years ( )
   Above 5 years ( )
   (b) In other schools (please specify)

5. What is your academic qualification?
   Secondary (form 1-4) ( ) High school (form 5-6) ( ) Diploma ( )
   Degree ( )
   Others (please specify)

   What is the size of your school?
   Less than 200 student ( ) 200-500 ( ) 500-800 ( ) Over 800 ( )

PART B: BOG Effectiveness

13. How regular the board of governor does meets in your school?
   Once per term ( ) Twice per term ( ) Thrice per term ( ) Once a year ( )
   Others specify
14. In your opinion what are the most salient roles of BOG in management of your school. Please list them.

15. Please read the following questions and how you rate the effectiveness of BOG in your school management. Indicate your response by ticking in the bracket provided ( ) in one of the boxes provided to the right of each task on scale 5 – 1. Give one response for every question. Use the key below.

5. VE = Very effective 4. E = effective 3. FE = fairly effective 2. I = ineffective 1. VI = very ineffective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation of board of governors in decision making processes</th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A The extent to which BOG participate in decision making in school management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B The extent to which BOG support decisions made by the head teacher, head of departments and teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Inclusion of teachers, and non teaching staff into decision making by BOG in secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Participation of BOG in the appointment and recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOG are involved in recruitment of teachers in the school</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOG are involved in recruiting non teaching staffs based on qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG are involved in motivation of both non teaching and teaching staff in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. To what extent do you agree with the following statements on BoG characteristics influence on the management of public schools?

2- Strongly Disagree 2- Disagree 3. neither agree or Disagree 4- Agree 5- Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most of the BOG are too old to serve in the school management effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There exists a huge gender gap representation in BOG and this hinder effective school management by board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members are well knowledgeable/qualified for handling their management roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effectiveness of Board member can be strongly attributed to their experienced in school management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. How has the BOG in your school contributed positively or negatively the school management in the following areas?

5- Excellent 4- Very good 3- Good 2- fair 1- Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K.C.S.E performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving dispute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to disputes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual/ guidance and counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. What are your suggestions that you think will make the board of governors to be more effective in management of your school?
APPENDIX V

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

PART A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

(Please indicate responses by ticking ( ) the appropriate box be precise in your responses. Do not indicate your name or that of your school. Your information will be highly confidential)

1. What is your gender?
   v. Male
   vi. Female

2. Which age bracket below do you belong?
   21-30 years ( ) 31-40 years ( ) 51-60 years ( )
   Over 60 years ( )

3. (a) How many years have you served in this school?
   3 years and below ( ) 4-6 years ( ) 7-9 years ( )
   Above 15 years ( )

(b) In other schools (please specify)

4. What is your academic qualification?
   Secondary (form 1-4) ( ) High school (form 5-6) ( ) Diploma ( )
   Degree ( )

   Others (please specify)

5. What is the size of your school?
   Less than 200 student ( ) 200-500 ( ) Over 800 ( )

PART B: BOG Effectiveness

6. How regular the board of governor does meets in your school?
Once per term ( ) Twice per term ( ) Thrice per term ( ) Once a year ( )
Others specify

7. In your opinion what are the most salient roles of BOG in management of your school. Please list them.

8. Please read the following questions and how you rate the effectiveness of BOG in your school management. Indicate your response by ticking in the bracket provided ( ) in one of the boxes provided to the right of each task on scale 5 – 1. Give one response for every question. Use the key below.

VE = Very effective  5 E = effective 4, FE = fairly effective 3, 1 = ineffective 2, VI = very ineffective 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation of board of governors in decision making processes</th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A The extent to which BOG participate in decision making in school management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B The extent to which BOG support decisions made by the head teacher, head of departments and teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Inclusion of teachers, and non teaching staff into decision making by BOG in secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Participation of BOG in the appointment and recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BOG are involved in recruitment of teachers in the school</th>
<th>VE</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>FE</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>BOG are involved in recruiting non teaching staffs based on qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>BOG are involved in motivation of both non teaching and teaching staff in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. To what extent do you agree with the following statements on BOG characteristics influence on the management of public schools?

1. Strongly Disagree 2- Disagree 3. Neither agree or Disagree 4- Agree 5- Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most of the BOG are too old to serve in the school management effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There exists a huge gender gap representation in BOG and this hinder effective school management by board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members are well knowledgeable/qualified for handling their management roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effectiveness of Board member can be strongly attributed to their experienced in school management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How has the BOG in your school contributed positively or negatively the school management in the following areas?

5- Excellent 4- Very good 3- Good 2- fair 1- Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K.C.S.E performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving dispute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to disputes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual/ guidance and counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What are your suggestions that you think will make the board of governors to be more effective in management of your school?