FACTORS INFLUENCING COMMITTEE MEMBERS’ COMPLIANCE WITH PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN NYAMIRA NORTH SUB-COUNTY, KENYA

Mungēi Nyaboe Vera

A Research project Submitted in partial fulfillment for the Requirements of the degree of Master of Education in Corporate Governance.

University of Nairobi

2018
DECLARATION

This research project is my original work and has not been presented for award of degree in any other university.

_______________________
Mungéi Vera Nyaboe
E55/78805/2015

This research project report has been submitted for examination with our approval as university supervisors

______________________________
Dr. Jeremiah M. Kalai
Department of Educational Administration and Planning
University of Nairobi

______________________________
Dr. Ursula Okoth
Senior lecturer
Department of Educational Administration and Planning
University of Nairobi
DEDICATION

This research project is dedicated to my Parents; Mary and Clement Mung’ei, my sisters Everline, Genevieve, Dorothy, Consolata, Madeline and Perpetual, my brother Felix, my husband Radcliff Tzogillo and my daughter Marygianna Awando.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My gratitude goes to my supervisors; Dr. Jeremiah M. Kalai and Dr. Ursula Okoth for their guidance, assistance, the understanding and encouragement offered during the various stages of this study. I am also grateful to the sub county education auditor, principals and procurement committee members in the public secondary schools in Nyamira north sub-county for their support and cooperation during the data collection session. May God bless you all.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Content .......................................................................................................................... page

Declaration....................................................................................................................... ii

Dedication......................................................................................................................... iii

Acknowledgement ........................................................................................................... iv

Table of contents............................................................................................................. v

List of tables..................................................................................................................... ix

List of figures.................................................................................................................... x

Abbreviations and acronyms ........................................................................................ xi

Abstract........................................................................................................................... xiii

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION.

1.1. Background to the study ....................................................................................... 1

1.2. Statement of the problem .................................................................................... 6

1.3. Purpose of the study ............................................................................................ 7

1.4. Objectives of the study ....................................................................................... 7

1.5. Research hypotheses ............................................................................................ 7

1.6. Research questions ............................................................................................... 8

1.7. Significance of the study ...................................................................................... 9

1.8. Limitations of the study ....................................................................................... 9

1.9. Delimitations of the study ................................................................................... 9

1.10. Basic assumptions of the study ........................................................................ 10

1.11. Definition of significant terms ......................................................................... 10

1.12. Organization of the study ................................................................................. 11

v
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction................................................................................................................. 13
2.2. The concept of compliance with procurement regulations................................. 13
2.3. Committee members’ level of sensitization and compliance with .................... 15
2.4. Committee members’ training and compliance with procurement..................... 16
2.5. Committee members’ level of education and compliance with............................. 17
2.6. Aggregation of goods and services and compliance with procurement.............. 18
2.7. Summary of review of related literature..................................................................... 19
2.8. Theoretical framework............................................................................................... 20
2.9. Conceptual framework............................................................................................... 21

Figure 2.1: Conceptual framework .................................................................................... 22

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction.................................................................................................................. 23
3.2. Research design.......................................................................................................... 23
3.3. Target population....................................................................................................... 23
3.4. Sample size and sampling procedure.......................................................................... 24
3.5. Research instruments................................................................................................. 25
3.6. Validity of the research instruments.......................................................................... 25
3.7. Reliability of research instruments............................................................................ 26
3.8. Data collection procedures......................................................................................... 27
3.9. Data analysis technique.............................................................................................. 27
3.10. Ethical considerations............................................................................................... 28
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Instruments return rate

4.3. Demographic data

4.3.1 Gender of respondents

4.3.2. Age of respondents

4.3.3. Distribution of principals by experience

4.3.4: Members’ position in the procurement committee

4.4. Level of sensitization and compliance with procurement regulations

4.4.1. Attendance to sensitization seminars

4.4.2. Members’ sensitization and compliance with procurement

4.5. Influence of the level of education on compliance with procurement

4.5.1. Highest level of education

4.5.2. Procurement committee members’ competency in compliance with procurement regulations

4.5.3. Influence of procurement committee members’ education level on compliance with procurement regulations

4.6. Level of training and compliance with procurement regulations

4.6.1. Frequency of attendance

4.6.2. Attendance to training programmes by procurement committee members

4.6.3. Influence of training on procurement procedures

4.7. Aggregation of procurement and compliance with procurement regulations

4.7.1. Aggregation of school supplies

4.7.2. Concept of aggregation of procurement

4.7.3. Aggregation of Procurement
4.8. Committee members’ understanding of the legal framework .................. 51

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction ........................................................................................................ 54
5.2. Summary of the study .......................................................................................... 54
5.2.1. Level of sensitization and compliance with procurement regulations .......... 55
5.2.2. Level of education and compliance with procurement regulations ............ 56
5.2.3. Level of training and compliance with procurement regulations ............. 56
5.2.4. Aggregation of procurement and compliance with procurement regulations ............................................................... 57
5.3. Conclusion .......................................................................................................... 57
5.4. Recommendations .............................................................................................. 58
5.5. Suggestions for further studies ............................................................................ 59
References .................................................................................................................. 60
Appendices ................................................................................................................ 65
Appendix I: Letter of introduction ............................................................................ 65
Appendix II: Questionnaire for principals ................................................................. 66
Appendix III: Procurement committee members’ questionnaire ...................... 71
Appendix IV: Sub county education auditor’s interview guide ............................. 76
Appendix V: Research permit .................................................................................... 78
Appendix vi: Authorization letter .............................................................................. 79
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.1 Sample size</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.1: Instruments return rate</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.2: Distribution of respondents by gender</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.3: Distribution of respondents by age</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.4: Distribution of principals by experience</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.5: Respondents attendance to sensitization seminars</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.6: The influence of sensitization on compliance</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.7: Chi-Square test of sensitization and compliance levels</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.8: Respondents Highest level of education</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.9: Rating of procurement committee members’ competency</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.10: Cross tabulation on influence of level of education on compliance</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.11: Chi square tests</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.12: Tendering committee members’ exposure to training</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.13: Cross tabulation of exposure to training influence on Compliance</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.14: Chi-Square computations</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.15: Comprehension of aggregation of procurement</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.16: Understanding of the legal framework and provisions</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.1: Conceptual framework</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.1: Position in the procurement committee</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.2: Attendance of training problems</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.3: Frequency of attendance</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.4: Responses on school supplies</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.5: Understanding of aggregation of procurement</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

BOM  Board of Management.
EAC  East African Communities
EU   European Union
GDP  Gross Domestic Product
HOD  Head of Department.
KISM Kenya Institute of Suppliers Management
MOE  Ministry of Education.
NACOSTI National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation
PPA  Public Procurement Authority.
PPDA Public Procurement and Disposal Act.
PPOA Public Procurement Oversight Authority.
SPSS Statistical Package for Social Sciences
ABSTRACT

This study aimed at investigating the various aspects which influence the procurement committee members’ compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub-County. The study was guided by the following objective and hypotheses: To find out the influence of the aggregation of procurement on compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub-County.

H01: There is no significance relationship between the levels of sensitization of the procurement committee members on compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools.

H02: There is no significance relationship between the level of education of procurement committee members on compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools.

H03: There is no significance relationship between the level of training of procurement committee members on compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools.

Nyamira North sub county has 55 public secondary schools and each school has 9 committee members giving a total of 495 members. The study employed descriptive survey design to gather data from 33 secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub County. The 33 school principals of these schools, 165 committee members and the Sub County Education Auditor were all enjoined in the study as respondents. A total of 199 respondents were used selected through stratified sampling technique, the researcher grouped the schools into four categories. Purposive sampling was used to choose the 33 school principals. Data was gathered by means of structured questionnaires, administered to the school principals, the procurement committee members and the Sub County Education Auditor. Data analysis was through the use of SPSS computer package (Version 21) whereby data was coded, sorted, analyzed descriptively by the help of Chi-Square test and presented using tables and figures like pie charts and bar charts. Content validity of the research instruments, expert judgment technique was used. Test-re-test method of reliability was used. The researcher established that sensitization, level of education and level of training do not significantly influence the compliance levels of procurement committee members to procurement regulations. Therefore the three null hypotheses after being tested using chi-square test at significance level 0.05 were accepted. It was concluded that aggregation of procurement influences compliance with procurement procedures. The researcher recommended that there is essence to stress on sensitization of procurement committee members on matters of procurement and compliance with procurement regulations.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the study

Procurement refers to acquiring of commodities through buying, leasing, contracting, hire purchase, permit, tenure, charter or through any other predetermined means of various types of jobs, possessions, amenities or services (PPDA 2005). Public procurement keeps growing both theoretically and structurally, a growth that is fast-tracked in the course of the 1990s as all levels of governments faced growing pressure to deliver more services with less resource (Thai 2009).

Open procurement has a big part to play in emerging nations where it accounts for an estimate of nine to thirteen per cent of their Gross Domestic Products (GDPs). Consequently, in the emerging nations, effective procurement to a high extent is recognised as very important in service delivery (Basheka & Basangabasaija, 2008). Public procurement in Kenya caters for 60 per cent in expenditure (Akech 2005), in Malawi, it accounts for 40 per cent and in Angola it accounts for 58 per cent (Wittig, 1999). In Uganda, public procurement accounts for 70 per cent of public spending as cited by Basheka and Basangabasaija (2010).

Large sums of money are involved in public procurement and as a consequence transparency and accountability is needed in the procurement process (Hui, Othman, Normah, Rahma & Haron, 2011). This has led to reforms in the public procurement process. In Uganda, reforms started in 1997, this resulted
in the enforcement of the Public Procurement and Disposal Assets (PPDA) (Act and Regulations, 2003). As observed by Agaba and Shipman (2007), numerous dominant government ministries and agencies had never followed the laid down procedures and practices.

In the developed world, public procurement has turned out to be an issue of public consideration plus argument, its subject to improvement, rearrangement, guidelines as well as procedures. Public procurement denotes the attainment of goods and services by a procuring body by means of public monies (World Bank, 2005). According to Mlinga (2009), public organisations have at all times remained being giant procurers, dealing with enormous finances. Lisa (2010) likewise restated that public procurement signifies eighteen per cent of the global GDP. There is global evolution in the public procurement especially in the past ten years of the twentieth century (Tukamuhabwa, 2012). The public procurement officials have faced a constantly changing environment which is typified by rapidly emerging technologies, increasing product choice and environment concerns (Thai, 2009). There are precise supervisory frameworks for the state regime to abide by in respect to when, how as well as with whom to go into contracts (Blenkinsopp, 2011). Public procurement regulations differ based on diverse powers for instance systems functioning on the rule of law share key governing philosophies for example transparency, rivalry as well as accountability (Anderson, 2011).

In Africa, some countries like Ghana, Rwanda, Uganda and Tanzania all have instituted fresh procurement guidelines (McDonald, 2008). Despite the reforms
in public procurement as well as the engagement of Supply Chain Management (SCM) equally a premeditated device, nonconformity with the laid down procurement guidelines as well as SCM-associated law and strategies as well as tender irregularities are some of the predicaments facing procurement (Smart Procurement, 2011). The Supply Chain Management was introduced in the public sector to be a strategy of the insufficiencies as well as the Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act (PPPFA) Act no 5 of 2000’s disintegrations in authority, comprehension and execution (Kenya National Treasury, 2005). The East African Community (EAC) member states mutual joint procurement manual which became out-of-date in the advent of the downfall of the community in 1977 which forced every state to revert to customized procurement arrangements (Odhiambo & Kamau, 2003). Public procurement is progressively acknowledged to be a vital element in the provision of services (Basheka & Bisangabasaija, 2010), besides, it is also responsible for a great percentage of an entire disbursement. In Ghana a study by Roodhooft and Abbeele (2006), revealed that the problems in public procurement are far above the procurement guidelines but consist of the procurement entity administrative structure, procedures as well as the staff involved.

According to Agaba and Shipman (2007) in Uganda, notwithstanding the move to have public procurement guidelines as a measure of guaranteeing accountability and transparency, many government departments and agencies do not follow the stipulated procedures and practices. Additional audit inquests
completed indicated that observance of public procurement in Uganda remains far from what is anticipated (Tukamuhabwa, 2012).

In Kenya, these evolutions started back in the 1960s and since 1970s, the procurement system was regulated by the treasury circulars. This made public procurement more complex than ever as the officials had to deal with a broad range of issues. The Kenya Public Procurement Oversight Authority (PPOA) was established and given all powers to make sure that the procurement guidelines formulated as per the requirements of the PPDA are in accordance with (PPDA, 2005).

The level of sensitization of people who are involved in procurement means the awareness creation on procurement guidelines, laws and processes. Schools have procurement committees which are composed of the chair person who is the Deputy Principal appointed in writing by the Principal, deputy chair person who is the officer in charge of finance, at least six members who are Heads of Departments (HODs) together with the matron or officer in control of boarding in the schools where relevant and the secretary who is the person at the helm of the procurement entity, who ought to be well sensitised on all procurement procedures laid down (Makori, 2008).

The procurement committee members’ level of education is one of the factors that ensure that the procurement committee members are effective in procurement (Wambui, 2013). The procurement committee members should follow the rules and regulations stated in the PPOA and as such one’s level of education and exposure to the relevant knowledge ensures they perform their
duties appropriately (Makori, 2008). Francis and Onyango, (2010) set to
determine the effect of procurement guidelines have among secondary schools
in Kisii County, and established that it has affected the prices of various
commodities significantly.

Aggregation of procurement supplies denotes the ability to use a single
supplier for numerous goods as well as services which ensures efficiency in
supplies as well as success (Marendi, 2015). According to Njagi (2016), the
aggregation of goods and services as well as exposure to training were found to
be very important factors that influence compliance with procurement
regulations and procedures. According to Rogers (2005), the partnership inside
coalition organisations permits a serious risk division evaluation in addition to
suitable risk distribution, refining logistics sequence periods in addition to a
chance to ensure joint supply chain openings or restrictions.

Various studies have been done in Kenya on compliance with procurement
regulations but they still indicate frustration for the participants caused by
ambiguities and gaps associated with the formulated guidelines. Thai (2009),
identified various factors affecting compliance as procurement processes,
internal efficiency and capability of the workforce in addition to the embrace of
ICT. Research findings by Makori (2008) identified the challenges in the
implementation of 2005 procurement ACT in the Kenyan ministry of higher
Education, science and Technology. Mulwa, Kalai and Migosi (2014)
established the determinants of implementation of Public Procurement
Regulations in Kenya’s secondary schools in Migwani District while
Kenyanya, Francis and Onyango (2010) evaluated the influence the Public Procurement Regulations on procurement practices among secondary schools in Mosocho Division Kisii County and Njagi (2016) investigated the individual characteristics influencing Board of Management members’ conformity with procurement guidelines in secondary schools in Kirinyaga East sub-county.

Despite the fact that public procurement regulations are in place, there are still several challenges in public procurement due to lack of efficiency and transparency and for this reason, the PPOA came up with initiatives to examine the levels of compliance with the set Procurement Regulations Act of 2005. The principal as the leader of the acquiring body is squarely answerable in making sure that PPDA guidelines in addition to any directives issued by the PPOA are observed in line with all procurements. (Procurement Manual for Schools and Colleges, 2009).

1.2. Statement of the problem

Levels of compliance to procurement regulations in Kenya remain low in spite of the Public Procurement Oversight Authority (PPOA) efforts to institute measures aimed at improving conformity to the guidelines (Gelderman Ghijsen and Brugman, 2006). Public secondary schools are challenged by procurement problems such as the lack of competence, restricted career advancement openings for procurement committee members, weak organisational culture and lack of innovations thus affecting compliance with procurement regulations.
Despite the studies by Thai, 2009, Mulwa, Kalai, Mogosi, 2014 and Njagi 2016, seemingly, there are still underlying factors influencing compliance with procurement regulations. Also there is limited literature from Nyamira County and specifically Nyamira North-Sub County. Therefore this study will investigate the factors influencing procurement committee members’ acquiescence with and conformity to procurement guidelines in public secondary schools in Nyamira North-Sub County.

1.3. Purpose of the study

The study sought to investigate the various factors which influence the procurement committee members’ compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub-County.

1.4. Objectives of the study

The study was guided by the following objectives;

i. To determine the influence of the aggregation of procurement on compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub-County.

1.5. Research hypotheses

H_01: There is no significance relationship between the levels of sensitization of the procurement committee members and compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools.
**H₀₂:** There is no significance relationship between the level of education of procurement committee members and compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools.

**H₀₃:** There is no significance relationship between the level of training of procurement committee members and compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools.

### 1.6. Research questions

The research was guided by the following questions:

i. Is there a significant relationship between the level of sensitization of the procurement committee members and compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub-County?

ii. Is there a significant relationship between the procurement committee members’ level of education and compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub-County?

iii. Is there a significant relationship between the level of training of the procurement committee members and compliance with procurement regulations by in public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub-County?

iv. In which ways does aggregation of procurement influence procurement committee members’ compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub-County?
1.7. Significance of the study

The research findings may be of great benefit to the school principals as it may enable them to understand the determinants of successful compliance with procurement regulations during procurement process in public secondary schools. The Ministry of Education at the sub-county level may also find this research useful in that the findings may provide useful insights on how to ensure compliance with procurement laws for effective and efficient utilization of public funds. Secondary school policy makers may find the study findings and knowledge useful in understanding issues related to public secondary school procurement procedures. Finally, future researchers, students and other scholars may also find this work a useful addition to the already existing literature.

1.8. Limitations of the study

This study faced a few limitations. Some of the respondents were not cooperative in providing necessary information for the study. This was overcome by explaining to them the benefits of the study to the stakeholders. The respondents also tended to give socially acceptable and pleasing answers to avoid offence. They were assured confidentiality of their identities and the names of their schools on the responses they provide.

1.9. Delimitations of the study

The study was confined only to the public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub-County, Nyamira County because they are managed partially using government funds. The respondents of this study were secondary school
principals, the school procurement committee members and the sub county Education Auditor. The theoretical focus of this study selected the factors which have influence on the procurement committee members’ submission with procurement regulations in public secondary schools. These factors are: sensitization of the procurement committee members, training of the members, their level of education and aggregation of procurements.

1.10. Basic assumptions of the study

The study was based upon the following assumptions;

i. The selected procurement committee members will be accessible and they would answer the questions truthfully and without bias.

ii. The schools within the area of study had functioning procurement committees and they met regularly for procurement related issues.

1.11. Definition of significant terms

Some significant terms used in the study are defined as follows:

**Aggregation of procurement** refers to the consolidation of school goods and services procurement to one or few suppliers to ensure that one supplier handles many areas of supply.

**Level of education** refers to the highest level of education of the secondary school principals and procurement committee members.
**Level of sensitization** refers to seminars and workshops on creation of awareness on procurement regulations, laws and procedures attended by principals and procurement committee members.

**Level of training** refers to the number of times committee members have been exposed to training opportunities that are relevant and in line with public procurement processes.

**Public secondary schools** refer to schools in which government funds are appropriated and whose sources of income and expenditure are approved and controlled by the ministry of education.

1.12. **Organization of the study**

The project is divided into five chapters. Chapter one contains the background to the study, statement of the problem, study purpose, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations and delimitations of the study, basic assumptions of the study and finally definition of significant terms. Chapter two covers the review of related literature presented under the sub topics: procurement committee members’ sensitization and compliance with procurement regulations, procurement committee members’ training and compliance with procurement regulations, committee members’ level of education and compliance with procurement regulations, aggregation of goods and services and compliance with procurement regulations. Chapter three contains the research methodology presented under: the introduction, research design, target population, sample population and sampling procedure, research instrument, instrument validity, instrument reliability, data collection
procedures, analysis technique and ethical issues. Chapter four contains data analysis, presentation and interpretation while chapter five contains summary, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction
This chapter contains the concept of compliance with procurement regulations, committee members’ level of sensitization and compliance with procurement regulations, committee members’ training and compliance with procurement regulations committee members’ level of education and compliance with procurement regulations and aggregation of goods and services and compliance with procurement regulations. It shall also look at summary of the related review, the theoretical framework and lastly the conceptual framework of the study.

2.2. The concept of compliance with procurement regulations
Generally, compliance with procurement procedures implies following the five key steps. The steps may possibly be different according to different viewpoints of looking at procurement. These steps are the description of the need, development of a procurement plan, supplier assessment and selection, negotiation and award of contract and the final step is that of induction and integration (Purchasing Insight, 2012). The procurement steps may easily be distinguishable from each other.

Gradually procurement has been evolving to comprise of different features such as premeditated sourcing, electronic based procurement in addition to performance based provision. While carrying out outsourcing of commodities, decent practice and commercial effectiveness require that the procurer needs to seek for a dealer who is steadfast as well as one that will offer products or services which show
value for money (Fisher, 2004). Farmer and Weele (2000) go further to raise a set of challenges that cut across most countries especially the third world countries. Their study findings in Gambia show that there is generally a problem of donor funds being accompanied by donor rules which may not always rhyme with the provisions and requirements of the procurement act.

Kenya, similar to most other countries over the world, has its public procurement structures that are run by an Act of parliament. This is an effort to ensure that public funds are properly used to obtain goods and/or services of a required value to the organization. The function of overseeing and streamlining public procurement in Kenya is carried out by the PPOA. Procurement in the public secondary schools is itemized as one among the six support services that will sustain the implementation of the Ministry of Education Strategic Plan 2013 – 2018 and the subsequent delivery of services (MOE Strategic Plan 2013 – 2018).

Public secondary schools are categorised under public bodies because their procurement is sponsored by means of public funds (Kenyanya, Francis and Onyango, 2010). Procurement practices in schools are ruled by the requirements stipulated in the PPDA of 2005, the Public Procurement Guidelines of 2006 and the Public Procurement Manual for Schools and Colleges of 2009 (Republic of Kenya, 2009).

Common methods of procurement adopted in the secondary schools include tendering where open tendering is advocated for as the preferred method (Makori, 2008). However, in some specific situations though, restricted open tendering and selective tendering also get to be employed. In procurement there is an inclination towards reliance more on prices as the important deliberations. However, schools
and other institutions may find themselves at times additionally attracted towards local dealers for explanations like handier collaboration, communal obligation, cheap transportation expenses, better emergency circumstances as well as subordinate industries (Lysons & Farrington, 2006).

2.3. Committee members’ level of sensitization and compliance with procurement regulations

De Boer and Telgen (1998) observed that the major cause of non-consent with procurement regulations is the sensitization level with the procurement regulations. They vindicated that during the initial stages of commencement of public procurement guidelines in Netherlands, most of the municipalities could not conform because of unfamiliarity with them. Gelderman, Ghijsen and Brugen (2006) also found the same in their research on compliance with EU procurement guidelines. Since procurement profession in Kenya is still new and given that the regulations came into force in 2007, there is a possibility that the level of sensitization is still low.

One indicator of thorough knowledge on procurement is the conformity to the formalised aspects of procurement, Rossi (2006). Also, Gelderman, Ghijsen and Brugen (2006) maintain that the public entity procurers always follow with the regulations when they think of them to be clear and precise. According to them, the managers in public entities sensitized with essence of European Union (EU) procedures may possibly operate as managerial enticement to follow. Consequently, it is believed that absence of clarity increases the possibilities for non-compliance. Absence of sensitization about the guidelines
and processes of procurement lead to lowered compliance (Eyaa & Oluka, 2011). These scholars observed that in Uganda, sensitization with procurement guidelines projected the compliance with the same guidelines significantly.

Many corporate tender committee members have limited understanding of their roles thus easily manipulated by the management or the principal stakeholders. In any institution, the members who deal with procurement have to be sensitized with the procedures undertaken in the fulfilment of procurement policies. According to PPOA 2003, procurement exercise follows a given number of steps and these should be followed to the letter logically to guarantee that all participants in procurement acquire impartial handling. Sensitization with procurement regulations improves compliance with regulations.

2.4. Committee members’ training and compliance with procurement regulations

Okumbe, (2007) defines training as the act of giving specific skills to lower and middle class of employees. A study by Fayomi (2013) on public procurement in Nigeria established that strategy had been made to perform below expectation. His study recommended that the governments, current and future ought to come with measures to ensure the strategies and policies are actualisable and also lower the problems arising thereof. There is urgency for BPA to train and retrain the main procurement employees to obtain important procurement skills, competence and professionalism to bring up to date their knowledge in the current issues in the procurement practices.
A research done by the Kenya Institute of Suppliers Management (KISM) (2008) and the PPOA (2007) established that the procurement stakeholders in many firms do not have sufficient knowhow on the legal framework, principals, guidelines and procedures of procurement. Gachoba (2012) mentions that even where training has been conducted on those charged with procurement in schools; the same people are willing to receive more training as this will improve performance.

The committee members have to strive in order to achieve the commercial interests which include obtaining value for money, economy, efficiency and effectiveness; regulatory interests also include rivalry, transparency, equality and compliance as well as the needs of the societies like employment concerns, social marginalisation, economic development and environment policy (Erridge & Mcllroy, 2002). For all these demands to be met, organizations source for workers with skills necessary to deal with a variety of tasks including purchasing professionals (Monczkal,Petersen,Handfeild and Ragatz,1998).

2.5. Committee members’ level of education and compliance with procurement regulations

Thai (2001) asserts that the procurement personnel and professionals have two major responsibilities; they make sure that the concerned procurement bodies involved directly in acquiring goods, services as well as capital resources as authorised. Lysons and Farrington (2006) add the process of arriving at best decisions within the shortest period of time is needed for success in procuring
supplies. Professionalism in procurement is correlated to education level, qualification of the personnel and likewise the specialised tactic in carrying out of commercial undertakings (Raymond, 2008).

According to Kwagbenu (2003), absence of professionalism in procurement in Uganda is the key challenge facing procurement bodies. The Ugandan PPDA audit report (2008) also dislodged that non-existence of professionalism was a major issue among procurement participants. It’s therefore for this reason that the PPA pays attention of its capitals on training, promotion, specialized growth and backing for the persons involved in public procurement in order to guarantee observance of procurement regulations (Adjei, 2006). The level of education is therefore very important as it affects the decisions made by the procurement committee members.

2.6. Aggregation of goods and services and compliance with procurement regulations

Issuing one supplier who is reliable a greater volumes of goods and services gives the supplier a chance to discount the selling price considering the volume yet protects the supplier’s profit to be obtained. Furthermore, this collaboration in alliance structures gives room for a critical assessment of risk sharing together with appropriate risk distribution, making better logistics cycle moments plus an opportunity to deal with mutual supply chain opportunities or constraints (Rogers, 2005). In a study on compliance with procurement procedures in Kirinyaga East Sub County, Njagi (2016) established that aggregation of procurement leads to improvement in compliance with the set
procedures. This finding however contradicted previous findings by Mlinga (2009) and Lisa (2010) whose studies established that aggregation of goods and services does not influence compliance with procurement procedures and laws. These inconsistencies in findings therefore present a conceptual gap which the current study seeks to fill.

2.7. Summary of review of related literature

Review of related literature has been done on the influence of level of sensitization, level of education, level of training and aggregation of procurement on compliance with procurement procedures. A study by Rossi (2010) found that committee members’ levels of sensitization influences the levels of conformity with procurement guidelines and procedures. This finding was contrary to Makori (2008) finding that sensitization levels do not significantly influence compliance with procurement procedures. On level of education, Kipchilat (2006) study found that it influences the level of compliance with procurement procedures. This finding also agrees with those by Mlinga (2009) and Njagi (2016). On level of training, it was found by Gelderman, *et al* (2006) that level of training influences compliance with procurement. This finding was in agreement with that by Hui *et al*, (2011). Finally on aggregation of procurement, Rogers (2005) found that aggregation of goods and services in procurement does not influence the compliance levels with procurement procedures. No similar study has been done in Nyamira County.
2.8. Theoretical framework

The study was directed by institutional theory proposed by DiMaggio & Powel in 1983. This was the traditional approach that examines the aspects of procurement (Obanda, 2010). Institutions are composed of three pillars which are regulatory, normative and cultural cognitive which together with other related activities and resources make life meaningful (Scott, 2004). Meyer & Rowan, (1977) vindicated that organization’s atmosphere can strongly affect the formal structures development in an institution. They add that the myths in the organization are just received ceremoniously in order for the institution to attain or maintain law in the organizational environment. Public procurement in Kenya is guided by the PPDA of 2007. These regulations must be formulated with attention paid to the respective suppliers. The psychological approach give a ground necessary for success or failure of institutional compliance (Lisa, 2010). It is therefore perceived per this theory that the legality of procurement regulations is one of the antecedents to public procurement conformity behaviour. This theory has an advantage in that it gives room for a better understanding of ‘diversity and dynamics’ of procurement. The theory has a disadvantage in that there is much less theoretical understanding of what leads organizations to implement proper procurement.

The institutional theory was found relevant for this study because it asserts that if organizations complied with the public procurement regulations then they would be assured of competition in bids, transparent processes, and professional approach in procurement process (Aketch, 2008). The theory also
identifies sensitization, education and training and aggregation of procurement among others as likely factor that determine the efficiency and effectiveness of procurement process.

2.9. Conceptual framework

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2007), a conceptual framework denotes the formulation of the association of the constructs in the study. The conceptual framework was developed as follows:

- **Level of sensitization**
  - No. of times exposed to workshops/seminars on procurement laws
  - Duration of workshops/seminars
  - Depth of coverage

- **Level of training**
  - Level of certification attained in procurement
    - Certificate
    - Diploma
    - Higher diploma

- **Level of education**
  - High - degree and masters
  - Middle - diploma & P1

- **Aggregation of procurement**
  - Number of goods and services consolidated

- **Procurement process (Government amendments)**

- **Compliance with procurement regulations**
  - Effectiveness in procurement process
  - Following the laid down procurement procedures
  - Traceable and open tendering process in schools
Figure 2.1: Conceptual framework

The study’s conceptual outline was developed using the input-process-outcome model. The inputs are the independent variables namely: sensitization, aggregation of procurements, level of education and training. The process is procurement and a likely outcome is compliance with procurement regulations.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction
This chapter comprises of the methodology adopted in the study. The chapter begins with the research design used, the target population, the sample size and sampling procedure, research instruments, their validity and reliability, the data collection procedures used and finally the ethical considerations.

3.2. Research design
The study adopted a descriptive survey type of research design. Descriptive survey involves assembling statistics from a sample population by the use of interviews or by administering questionnaires (Orodho, 2003). A design is descriptive when it is concerned with why and how a variable produces change in another variable, (Cooper and Schinder, 2003). Descriptive survey was found suitable for the study since it helps to establish likely aspects influencing conformity to procurement guidelines in public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub-County.

3.3. Target population
A target population is the entire number of entities that the investigator intends to make generalizations about the results of a study. (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). This study targeted a total of 55 public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub County. Also targeted were all the 495 procurement committee members in all the public secondary schools. All the 55 principals in the public secondary schools in the sub-county were also targeted and the sub county
Education Auditor. This made a total target population of 551 (all procurement committee members, the school principals and the sub county education auditor).

3.4. Sample size and sampling procedure

Sampling is a course of choosing a fraction among individuals from a target population which is representative enough of the features found in the whole collection (Orodho & Kombo, 2002). The researcher used stratified random sampling to pick 33 schools as a representative sample of all the schools.

Each school category formed a stratum from which representatives were drawn random. This method was appropriate as all categories had equal chances of being represented.

Table 3.1: Sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sample population</th>
<th>Committee members</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys Boarding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Boarding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Day</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Day/Boarding</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 shows the sample size for the study.

The principals from each sampled school were chosen to represent the entire population of principals by census. The researcher randomly selected five members of the procurement committee from the sampled schools from the list
The sub county education auditor was purposively selected as the key informant. This led to a total sample population of 33 principals and 165 committee members and one sub county education auditor hence a grand total of 199 respondents.

3.5. Research instruments

Data was collected using questionnaires. Both the principals’ questionnaire and the committee members’ questionnaire had six sections. Section A had items on the personal data, section B had items on influence of procurement committee members’ sensitization on compliance with procurement regulations, section C had items on influence of committee members’ exposure to training on compliance with procurement regulations while section D had items on aggregation of goods and services on compliance with procurement regulations. Section E had items on committee members’ level of education and compliance with procurement regulations and lastly section F of the principals’ questionnaire had items on understanding the legal framework related to public procurement while Section F of the committee members had items measuring compliance levels with procurement procedures.

The interview guide was used to gather data from the sub county education auditor. This information was used to triangulate the information gathered by the questionnaires.

3.6. Validity of the research instruments

Validity of an instrument is the ability of to measure exactly what it is meant to measure (Orodho, 2004). It is the correctness of the implications which are
grounded on the study outcomes. Validity is concerned with the accuracy of data results (Kothari, 2004). Content validity for the research instruments was appraised by the supervisors who are experts. Also a pre-test was done in three schools involving the principals and five committee members in each of these schools (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Necessary adjustments were done as content validity was used to measure the extent to which data collected using the questionnaires represent specific domain of indicators in the study.

3.7. Reliability of research instruments

Orodho (2004) asserts that reliability measures the degree to which the research instrument gives consistent findings on repeated trials. It’s the extent to which experimental pointers are reliable and similar in repeated trials (Kothari, 2006). The researcher employed test-retest technique where same instrument was administered twice in a span of two weeks to at least three schools in the study sample. After manual scoring, the results from the testing were then computed by the use of Pearson product moment correlation coefficient (r) formula:

\[
r = \frac{N\sum XY - \sum X \cdot \sum Y}{\sqrt{(N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2) \cdot N\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2}}
\]

Where:

\(\sum X\) = the addition of scores in x distribution.

\(\sum Y\) = the addition scores in the Y distribution.

\(\sum X^2\) = the addition of the squared scores in the X distribution.

\(\sum Y^2\) = the addition of the squared scores in the Y distribution.

\(\sum XY\) = the addition of the product of paired X and Y scores.

\(N\) = the number at paired X and Y score.
A reliability co-efficient of 0.8 was obtained for both the principals and the committee members. This is sufficient enough to judge an instrument as reliable for use in conducting a study, (Orodho, 2004).

3.8. Data collection procedures

The researcher sought for a research authorisation from the National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). This permit was then taken to the county and sub county directors of education of Nyamira North sub-county. A prior visit to the sampled schools was done in order to familiarize with the respondents and explain to the principal the procedure and purpose of the study after which the questionnaires were administered. Drop and pick technique was used.

3.9. Data analysis technique

After collecting all the data, the instruments were checked for completeness. The data was coded then analyzed assisted by the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0 which is recommended for use due to its accuracy and speed processing. Descriptive data analysis techniques such as frequency and percentages were used. The Chi-square test was used to test the three null hypotheses 1: There is no significance relationship between the levels of sensitization of the procurement committee members and compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools, 2: There is no significance relationship between the level of education of procurement committee members and compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools and 3: There is no significance relationship between the
level of training of procurement committee members and compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools. The results were then presented using visual diagrams like tables and pie and bar charts.

3.10. Ethical considerations

The researcher sought after for permission from the ministry of education through the county education office and the school principals before starting the study. The norm of voluntary participation was strictly followed in the sense that the respondents were not coerced to take part in the study but rather the purpose of the study was clarified unto them. Throughout the whole study process, the respondents were assured total confidentiality of their identities.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the data analysis, presentation and interpretation of the study. The study aimed at investigating the factors influencing committee members’ compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub County, Kenya. The data was collected using the questionnaires and interview guide. So as to make the discussion easier, the researcher provided tables and figures to summarize the reactions and responses from the respondents.

4.2 Instruments return rate

The study was conducted in 33 public schools in Nyamira North Sub County of which 33 principals and 165 procurement committee members totaling to 198 respondents and obtaining 100 percent response rate. The study response rate is presented in Table 4.1

Table 4.1: Instruments return rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Instruments issued</th>
<th>Instruments returned</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procurement committee</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This response rate was taken to be commendable for statistical inference because it agrees with Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) assertion that a response of 50 percent is good enough, a response rate of 60 percent is better and a response rate of 70 percent and over is best for analysis and reporting. This meritorious rate of response can be accredited to the efforts of the researcher who maintained constant communication as well as easiness of availability of the respondents.

4.3. Demographic data

The demographics of the respondents were the first item to be analysed in this study. The analyses were computed in frequencies and presented in tables and figures under the subsequent sub-sections:

4.3.1 Gender of respondents

The respondents were requested to indicate their gender. The findings are presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Distribution of respondents by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Procurement committee members</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings show that majority, 63 percent of the respondents were female. For the principals, majority, 62 percent were female whereas for the committee members, majority 61 percent were also female. This shows that most of the sampled schools had female principals. This contrasts Okoth (2000) who found out that most heads 56 percent were males in Nairobi and Okoth 2008 who also found most heads 70.0 percent were males in Siaya County.

4.3.2. Age of respondents

The respondents were also requested to provide their ages. According to Mwenda (2015), on average those with many years of understanding are more effective and committed in the direction of their work. The results are presented in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Procurement committee members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.3 shows that majority, 65 percent of the principals were over 40 years. This could be explained by the fact that the study required senior respondents in the management structure of secondary school who would be of higher age brackets. This finding was in congruence with that by
Kenyanya, Francis and Onyango (2010) who found that majority of school principals were above 40 years of age.

The findings in Table 4.3 also indicate that majority 65.0 percent (108) of the procurement committee members were 40 years and above in age concurring with the findings of Wachira (2013) whose study found that all tendering committee members were above forty years of age.

4.3.3. Distribution of principals by experience

The study also sought to find out the experience of the principals working in the schools. The findings are presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Distribution of principals by experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 33 100.0

The findings in Table 4.4 show that majority 71 percent of the school principals had an experience of between five and nine years as principals in their schools. The implication of this is that the respondents had remained in their workstations long enough to comprehend the matters on procurement regulations.
4.3.4: Members’ position in the procurement committee.

The members were requested to show their position in the procurement committee. The findings are presented in Figure 4.1.

![Pie chart showing members' position in the procurement committee]

**Figure 4.1: Position in the procurement committee.**

From the data collected, the study noted that a high percentage of 61.5 percent were members of the procurement committee while 23.1 percent of the respondents were chairpersons. This enabled the researcher to obtain the requisite information concerning procurement regulations since the procurement officers are conversant with procurement. These findings were in line with Kremer (2011) who argue that dependable information is acquired from individuals who are knowledgeable in the area of research.
4.4. Level of sensitization and compliance with procurement regulations

The first hypothesis formulated was: \( H_0:1 \): There is no significance relationship between the levels of sensitization of the procurement committee members on compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools. The findings on the items under this hypothesis are discussed under the following sub-headings:

4.4.1. Attendance to sensitization seminars

The school principals and procurement committee members were required to indicate whether they had attended any sensitization courses. They were required to respond by a simple yes or no ticked response in regard to attendance. The item was also followed by a question on the frequency of attendance. The findings are summarized in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Respondents attendance to sensitization seminars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attending sensitization workshops/seminar</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended sensitization workshop within the past 3 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never attended sensitization workshop for the past three years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.5, four school principals had attended sensitization workshops, representing 25 percent of the total sample size of principals. A total of nine principals (75 percent) had not attended any sensitization workshops and seminars on procurement. Of those who recorded attendance of sensitization of workshops and seminars on procurement, two had attended the workshops annually in three years while two had attended the workshops quarterly in the past three years. This finding agrees with that by Njagi (2016) who found that majority of school principals had not attended any procurement sensitization seminars or workshops.

Further findings from Table 4.4 indicate that only 34 (28%) of the procurement committee members had attended sensitization workshops. A total of 86 committee members (72 percent) had not attended any sensitization workshops and seminars on procurement. Of those who recorded attendance of sensitization of workshops and seminars on procurement, two had attended the workshops monthly, two had attended the workshops quarterly and 30 had attended the workshops annually (trice) within the past three years. The finding agrees with that by Mogoi (2010) who found that most procurement committee members have never attended any procurement sensitization workshops.

4.4.2. Members’ sensitization and compliance with procurement regulations

**H₀₁**: There is no significance relationship between the levels of sensitization of the procurement committee members and compliance with procurement
regulations in public secondary schools. Chi square calculations were done and the cross tabulations were as follows in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: The influence of sensitization on compliance with procurement regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of sensitization score</th>
<th>Compliance with procurement guidelines</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>60.40%</td>
<td>39.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>48.20%</td>
<td>51.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>49.00%</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.6 show that generally, most (51.80%) of the procurement committee members were compliant to procurement regulations while 48.20% were non-compliant. Thus sensitization levels considerably influenced compliance with procurement regulations. This finding concur with Eyaa and Oluka, (2011) who found that absence of sensitization with procurement procedures caused low compliance levels. Eyaa and Oluka also established that in the Ugandan perspective, sensitization with procurement guidelines significantly projected compliance with procurement guidelines. Gelderman, Ghijsen and Brugman (2006) argue that one of the reasons for non-compliance with procurement guidelines is sensitization level on the regulations. Consequently, based on the study findings, the researcher affirmed that sensitization on procurement regulations increases compliance levels with the regulations.
The chi-square test statistic was chosen because it is very versatile and can be easily used to investigate a wide range of situations and especially in analysis of a range of questionnaire question types where nominal data is involved such as in this study. The chi-square statistics was calculated at a 0.05 level of significance and are presented in Table 4.7 below:

**Table 4.7: Chi- Square test of members’ sensitization and compliance levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.701b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correlation^n</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher’s Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear- by- Linear</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid cases</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P=0.05**

The findings in Table 4.7 show that the test statistic (Chi- square) was 0.701 and the Yate’s correlation condensed it to 0.109. These levels of sensitization were found to be a significant factor influencing the compliance levels. Therefore the null hypothesis was accepted. This finding disagrees with the findings by Wachira (2013) who found that sensitization level is not a significant determiner of compliance levels.

In an interview, the sub county education auditor indicated that procurement sensitization fora and seminars were being conducted at the ministry level and
that in his view they influence the compliance with procurement regulations in secondary schools.

4.5. Influence of the level of education on compliance with procurement regulations

The second hypothesis was: $H_02$: There is no significance relationship between the level of education of procurement committee members on compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools. The question under this objective was analysed using nine items in the questionnaires which were analysed using frequencies and discussed under the following sub-topics:

4.5.1. Highest level of education

The researcher desired to determine how the education level of the principals and procurement committee members influence their compliance with procurement regulations. The findings are presented in Table 4.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals Frequency</th>
<th>Principals Percent</th>
<th>Procurement committee members Frequency</th>
<th>Procurement committee members Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (PGDE)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.8, majority (69%) of the principals in Nyamira North sub-county have a masters’ degree. This is because currently the TSC employs mostly principals with masters’ degrees. This finding agrees with previous findings by Wachira (2013) and Kenyanya, Francis and Onyango (2010). Principals in government sponsored secondary schools in Nyamira North sub-county had met the required TSC training. Consequently it was noted that a good number (94) of the procurement committee members had a bachelor’s degree. However, 7.0% had Post Graduate Diploma in Education (PGDE) and 1% had Ph.D while 13% of the procurement committee members had a master’s degree. This finding was in disagreement with that by Gachomba (2012), who found that most procurement committee members in schools were very educated having post graduate education.

4.5.2. Procurement committee members’ competency in compliance with procurement regulations

The study on competency of an individual in most cases is used as an amount of their ability and probable to accomplish and offer services with respect to the set standards, expectations and codes of professional conduct. This study found the opinions of the procurement committee members with respect to their expertise in handling procurement and complying with procurement regulations in their individual institutions. The results are presented in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9: Rating of procurement committee members’ competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Procurement committee members</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very competent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very incompetent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from Table 4.9 show that majority (77.0%) principals rated their committee members as competent. 15 percent of the principals rated procurement committee members as very competent while 8 percent principals rated the school procurement committee members as incompetent. With regard to the procurement committee members, majority (72%) of them provided a rating of competent. This is represented by a total of 119 procurement committee members while only 3% rated themselves as very incompetent. This means that most of members are competent enough to handle matters on procurement. Correspondingly, there is a high level of confidence among the principals that procurement committee members are competent enough and as a result, compliant with procurement regulations.

4.5.3. Influence of procurement committee members’ education level on compliance with procurement regulations

To assess the influence of procurement committee members’ education level on compliance with procurement regulations further the researcher used Cross
tabulation to compare procurement committee members’ level of education and compliance with procurement guidelines. The results are shown in Table 4.10:

Table 4.10: Cross tabulation on influence of level of education on compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Compliance to procurement regulations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors’</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that procurement committee members with masters are less compliant than those members with bachelor’s degree of education. Thus, level of education may not necessarily influence compliance with procurement regulations but other factors may. This finding is in agreement with that by Njagi (2016) who found that level of education is not a significant predictor of compliance levels and in disagreement with that by Wachira (2013) who found it to be a significant factor.

The chi-square statistic was calculated for the association between level of education and compliance with procurement regulations. The null hypothesis being tested was subjected to the chi-square test statistic which was considered at a 0.05 level of significance and the finding is presented in Table 4.11:
Table 4.11: Chi square test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Assymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.713b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correlation</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.715</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher’s Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>1.696</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid cases</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P=0.05

The findings in Table 4.7 show that the test statistic (Chi-Square test) is 1.713 and the Yates correlation reduces it to 1.219. This means that the level of education is not a significant factor influencing the compliance of procurement procedures by the procurement committee members. The null hypothesis was therefore accepted. This finding disagrees with the findings by Wachira (2013) who found that level of education was a significant determiner of compliance levels.

The sub county education auditor indicated during the interview that the level of education does not have any significant influence on the compliance with procurement procedures.

4.6. Level of training and compliance with procurement regulations

The third hypothesis was: H03: there is no significant relationship between exposure to training and the levels of compliance with procurement regulations.
procedures. The items were analysed through frequencies and summarized under the following sub topics:

4.6.1. **Frequency of attendance**

The principals were asked to show their attendance of training on compliance with procurement regulations in the past three years and their responses are delineated in Figure 4.3:

![Figure 4.3: Frequency of attendance](image)

The findings of Figure 4.3 show that many (50%) of the principals had attended training workshops and seminars on procurement regulations on a
yearly basis in the past three years. Only 8 percent had attended on a monthly basis. This finding agrees with that of Wachira (2013) who found that majority of secondary school principals had been attending training on compliance with procurement regulations on an annual basis.

4.6.2. Attendance to training programmes by procurement committee members

The procurement committee members were also asked to indicate their attendance to training programmes on compliance with procurement principles and their responses are delineated in Table 4.12:

Table 4.12: Procurement committee members’ exposure to training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attending training on procurement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never attended</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frequency of attendance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-annually</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.12 shows that 45 percent of the procurement committee members had attended training workshops and seminars on procurement regulations with 63 percent had not attended any of such training. Of those who had attended the training workshops, 84 percent had attended on
an annual basis while 2 percent on a monthly basis. This finding agrees with that by Wachira (2013) who established that majority of the tendering committee members had never attended any training on procurement.

4.6.3. Influence of training on procurement procedures

The study sought to establish the influence of training on compliance with procurement procedures. To establish this influence, chi-square test statistic was computed. Cross tabulation to associate exposed procurement committee members against non-exposed procurement committee members to training and level of compliance. The results are shown in Table 4.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence of training on compliance score</th>
<th>Compliance to procedures of procurement</th>
<th>Non-compliance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in table 4.13 show that highly trained procurement committee members were more compliant (54.9%) to procurement guidelines compared to 40.4% of the lowly trained. This means that training programmes attended on procurement procedures contribute to compliance with procurement procedures. This finding is in line with Mestry (2004) recommendation that training is a remedy to nonconformity with procurement guidelines. Having
trained officers responsible of procurement is likewise important to the course being practiced as would be obligatory. The finding is also similar with that by Okumbe (2007) that training increases the establishment of precise skills to the workers that include the procurement officials in schools.

The Chi-Square test statistic was computed to establish the association between exposure to training on compliance with procurement procedures. The null hypothesis being tested was “there is no significant relationship between exposure to training and the levels of compliance with procurement procedures. The chi-square statistic was determined at a 0.05 level of significance and the findings are presented in Table 4.14.

| Table 4.14: Chi-Square computations for level of training and compliance to procurement procedures |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Value | df | Assymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (1-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 1.824<sup>b</sup> | 1 | .243 |
| Continuity Correlation<sup>a</sup> | 1.329 | 1 | .254 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 1.845 | 1 | .174 |
| Fisher’s Exact Test | 1.824 | 1 | .243 | .195 |
| Linear- by- Linear Association | 1.806 | 1 | .156 |
| N of Valid cases | 165 | |

P=0.05

The findings in Table 4.14 show that the test statistic (Chi) is 1.824 and the Yate’s correlation condensed it to 1.329. This implies that training is not a significant factor influencing the levels of compliance to procurement
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procedures by the procurement committee members. The null hypothesis was therefore accepted. This finding disagrees with the findings by Munywoki (2016) who found that level of training was a significant determiner of compliance levels.

During the interview, the sub county education auditor indicated that the level and exposure of training on procurement does influence the committee members’ compliance with procurement procedures

4.7. Aggregation of procurement and compliance with procurement regulations

The fourth objective was to establish the influence of the aggregation of procurement on compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub County. The question under this objective was answered using 14 items in the 2 sets of questionnaires. Aggregation denotes combining numerous items together or seeing an item as one. It can similarly be seen as the process of assembling things. The Public Procurement Regulations, 2006 indicates that the major purpose of the tender committee in a securing body is to recommend to the body on aggregation of procurement. Items have been analysed through statistics and discussed under the following sub headings:
4.7.1. Aggregation of school supplies

The procurement committee members were asked to indicate whether the procurement in their schools was done by one supplier. The findings are presented in Figure 4.4.

**Figure 4.4: Responses on school supplies**

From the findings in Figure 4.4, majority (60%) of the procurement committee members indicated that their schools do not receive supplies from one single supplier. This is in agreement with the finding of Wachira (2005) who found that public secondary schools in Mathioya district rely on many suppliers for their supplies.
4.7.2. Concept of aggregation of procurement

The respondents were asked to indicate their understanding of aggregation of procurement. The question asked was “Do the committee members in your school understand the concept of aggregation of procurement?” the respondents were required to indicate with a yes or no response. The findings are presented in Figure 4.5.
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**Figure 4.5: Understanding of aggregation of procurement**

From the findings in Figure 4.5, majority (80%) of the school principals indicated that indeed their procurement committee members understood the concept of aggregation of procurement. The findings are in disagreement with those by Kinuthia, Namusonge, Chegge and Ogol (2015) who established that most procurement committee members did not understand the concept of aggregation of procurement.
4.7.3. Aggregation of Procurement

The respondents were given some statements to gauge their understanding of aggregation of procurement and the findings were as presented in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15: Comprehension of aggregation of procurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No .</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Aggregation of procurement entices inventory holding expenses</td>
<td>F 26</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 18.6%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Insufficient funds in the start of the term prevents schools from buying goods in bulk</td>
<td>F 105</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 75.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Absence of storage facilities daunts schools from buying goods in large scale</td>
<td>F 99</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 70.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>My school undertakes aggregation of procurement</td>
<td>F 8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 5.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the findings in Table 4.15, insufficient money at the commencement of the term was noted by 75.0% of the respondents as the main deterrent to obtain goods in stacks. This can be attributed to the assumption that majority of the parents are unable to clear their levy balances as the school term commences and also the delays by Education Ministry in disbursing the capitations for free education.

Ninety percent of the respondents indicated that aggregation of procurement attracts stock holding expenses and consequently numerous schools wished to instead operate without it. This kind of stockholding expenses consist of storing space, wear, safety, burglary, reduction, indemnity and outmodedness.

Only 20.0% of the procurement committee members pointed out that aggregation of procurement was practiced in their schools. This findings are in agreement with the findings by Kinuthia, Namusonge, Chegge and Ogol (2015) who found that aggregation of procurement is the major factor that influence compliance with procurement procedures.

**4.8. Committee members’ understanding of the legal framework**

The study sought to establish the levels of understanding of the legal frameworks related to public procurement. A legal framework denotes the stipulated measures put up to oversee the procurement process in legal terms. The committee members were presented with items on their adherence to and familiarity with the legal frameworks regarding public procurement. The findings are presented in Table 4.16.
Table 4.16: Committee members’ understanding of the legal framework and provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>The predominant legal framework is very rigid as well as one that encourages fraudulent practices</td>
<td>F 34</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 24.3%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Adherence of the legal framework makes the whole procurement process a lengthy one</td>
<td>F 41</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 29.3%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Legal frameworks accord a standard comprehension of the procurement course</td>
<td>F 46</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 32.9%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>School administrators sensitize the staff on procurement processes</td>
<td>F 5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 3.6%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>The legal framework is strictly adhered to in the procurement practices in my school.</td>
<td>F 10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 7.2%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.16 show that majority (70.0%) of the procurement committee members agreed with the statement that the predominant legal framework is very rigid as well as one that encourages fraudulent practices. This implies that the restrictive nature of the legal framework related
to procurement could well be an impediment to successful implementation. This finding agrees with that by Njagi (2016) who found that the legal frameworks were very rigid and restrictive.

The findings also indicate that majority (62.1%) of the committee members agree with the statement; “adherence of the legal framework makes the whole procedure of procurement to be a lengthy one”. Only 3 (2.1%) of the committee members strongly disagree with the statement.

The findings also show that majority (55.7%) of the procurement committee members agree with the statement that “legal frameworks accord a standard comprehension of the procurement course”. This finding is in agreement with that by Wachira (2013) who found that familiarity with the procurement legal provisions is an aspect that affects the procurement process in schools.

Further findings show that many (47.1%) of the procurement committee members indicated that the school administrators were not sensitizing the staff on procurement legal frameworks. Majority (51.4%) of the committee members indicated that they were neutral on the statement that “the legal frameworks were strictly adhered to in the procurement practices within my schools. The findings also agree with those by Kinuthia, Namusonge, Chegge and Ogol (2015) who established that majority of the committee members were strictly adhering to procurement legal frameworks in their schools. During the interview, the sub county education auditor noted that aggregation of procurement does influence compliance with procurement procedures to a certain level.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter carries the summary of the findings, conclusions and offers recommendations to the challenges that have been brought forth by this study. In addition the researcher suggests areas of further research.

5.2. Summary of the study

The study set out to establish how a number of aspects influence compliance with public procurement guidelines. The selected factors were sensitization, level of education, level of training and aggregation of procurement. Four research objectives were formulated in line with the four independent variables where by three of them were in form of null hypotheses. These are:

$H_01$: There is no significance relationship between the levels of sensitization of the procurement committee members and compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools.

$H_02$: There is no significance relationship between the level of education of procurement committee members and compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools.

$H_03$: There is no significance relationship between the level of training of procurement committee members and compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools. Lastly, to determine the influence of the aggregation of procurement on compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub-County.
The researcher employed descriptive survey design to gather data from 33 public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub County. The 33 school principals of these schools, 165 school procurement committee members and the sub county education auditor were all enjoined in the study as respondents making a total of 199 respondents. Through stratified random sampling technique, the researcher grouped the schools into four categories. Purposive sampling was used to select the 33 school principals. The study data was gathered by means of structured questionnaires, administered to both the school principals and the procurement committee members. Content validity of the research instruments and expert judgment technique were used. Test-re-test technique was used to ensure reliability of the research instruments. Data analysis was done using descriptive and inferential statistics such as thematic discussions and chi-square statistics and presented using tables and figures such as pie charts and bar charts.

5.2.1. Level of sensitization and compliance with procurement regulations

On the level of sensitization, it was established that it significantly influences the levels of compliance with procurement procedures. It was established that procurement committee members and principals were fully in agreement with statements concerning the influence of sensitization on compliance with procurement procedures and consequently they were affirmative that sensitization influences compliance. Despite the existence of a cluster of respondents who articulated views that sensitization has no influence on compliance, the study established with confidence that as revealed by the huge
proportion of the respondents that were affirmative, sensitization influences compliance with procurement regulations.

5.2.2. Level of education and compliance with procurement regulations

On the level of education, it was established that all the individuals involved in issues of procurement in the schools are well educated. It was established that the highly (masters) educated procurement committee members are less likely to be more compliant than those committee members with lower levels of education. Consequently, level of education was found not to be a significant factor influencing compliance to procurement regulations but other factors may.

5.2.3. Level of training and compliance with procurement regulations

On the level of training, it was established that majority of the procurement committee members and principals had not attended training workshops and seminars on compliance with procurement regulations. Correspondingly, amid those who had attended training seminars and workshops, the attendance was not frequent. Amazingly, only a small proportion of both procurement committee members along with the principals agreed to all the statements that concerned the exposure to training and therefore, were affirmative that exposure to training influences compliance with procurement regulations while the majority indicated that exposure didn’t. This was confirmed using the chi-square test which gave values of 1.329 indicating that training does not
significantly influence the compliance levels of procurement committee members to procurement guidelines.

5.2.4. Aggregation of procurement and compliance with procurement regulations

On the aggregation of procurement, it was established that aggregation of goods and services actually influenced procurement committee members’ compliance with procurement procedures. This influence was more towards the negative side since those who practiced it, said that it encourages harmful competition between dealers, it is time consuming and thus affects school calendar greatly. It was also found that most schools did not employ the act of aggregation of procurement but to those who did, aggregation of procurement somehow helped to improve the process.

5.3. Conclusion

The following conclusions were made in relation to the dominant issues arising from the study and in line with the objectives:

Sensitization on procurement is crucial not just among the procurement committee members but also among the school principals because the sensitized people get to obtain an extensive collection of information concerning their areas of service delivery.

The level of education did not influence compliance with procurement guidelines. Most of the procurement committee members used for the study
were competent. However those with highest levels of education were not necessarily the most compliant as established thus leading to the conclusion that level of education does not influence compliance to procurement procedures.

Exposure to appropriate training is precisely vital in ensuring that persons fulfill with procurement guidelines. If individual conform, it unswervingly interprets that procurement committee will be compliant to procurement guidelines. Thus, it was correct to accomplish that exposure to training opportunities influenced compliance with procurement guidelines.

Aggregation of procurement was found to influence the compliance with procurement guidelines. This is because it was revealed that it encourages harmful competition among dealers, it is time wasting and it has impact on the school. It was further concluded that aggregation of goods and services leads to countless impediments and the procurement guidelines are not complied with. Additionally, aggregation of procurement invites inventory holding expenses hence it becomes very expensive and unbearable for the schools.

5.4. Recommendations

The researcher made the following recommendations:

(i) Aggregation of procurement of joint purchases by the ministry of education should be guided by the Ministry’s procedure in order to understand the economies of scale and minimize on the expenses that ascend out of disjointed and dispersed procurements by specific institutions.
(ii) There is need for school principals to advise the procurement committees on the significance of subcontracting each and every time the institution lacks the ability to convey definite procurement issues. This would be according to line the provisions of the Kenyan PPOA (2006) as per the PPDA (2005)

(iii) There is necessity for stress on sensitization of school Board of Management (BoM) and procurement committee on procurement matters and explicitly compliance with procurement guidelines amongst procurement committee members of secondary schools in the sub county.

(iv) All participants in procurement process should establish consistent training to instill skills in those involved in procurement besides being updated on developing matters and market inclinations upsetting the procurement course.

5.5. Suggestions for further studies

Further studies should be done on the following topics:

(i) A study should be done focusing on the private sector for generalizations to be made and comparison with the findings of the current study.

(ii) A wide-ranging study on the effect of compliance with procurement statutes and performance of schools in the country should also be done.

(iii) A comparative research should be carried out on the procurement process among diverse groupings of public schools for instance day secondary schools against boarding secondary to establish how the variances in schools upsets the procurement practices.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

University of Nairobi
P.O. Box 30197
NAIROBI.
12 April, 2018

The Principal
……………………………Secondary School
P.O. Box ………………..
NYAMIRA.

Dear sir/madam,

RE: PERMISSION TO UNDERTAKE RESEARCH IN YOUR SCHOOL

I am a post-graduate student at the University of Nairobi pursuing a masters’ degree in education. The attached questionnaire is intended to investigate the “Factors that influence compliance with procurement regulations in public secondary schools in Nyamira North sub-county.” You have been identified as one of the respondents. Your responses will be very crucial to this study and indeed will shade more light on what affects compliance especially integrity and accountability. Kindly answer all the questions as objectively as possible. All the information that you will provide will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will be used for research purposes. Your name shall remain anonymous, therefore please do not write your name or the name of your school anywhere on the questionnaire.

Yours faithfully

Vera Mung’ei.
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS

This study is intended purely for academic purposes. Please answer all the questions and use a (✓) where appropriate and where no choices are provided, write your responses in the spaces provided.

Section A: Personal data

1. What is your Gender?  Male [ ]  Female [ ]
2. What is your Age in years? 22-30 years [ ]  31-40 years [ ]  41-49 years [ ]  50 and above years [ ]
3. Level of education Bachelor’s degree [ ]  Masters [ ]  PhD [ ]
4. How many years have you been the head in this school?  1-3 years [ ]  4-6 years [ ]  7-9 years [ ]  10-12 years [ ]  Over 13 years [ ]
5. How often do you meet as BoM Members or BOM over procurement issues?  Once a month [ ]  Once a term [ ]  Once a year [ ]  Only when there is an emergency [ ]

Section B: Influence of procurement committee members’ sensitization on compliance with procurement regulations

6 (a). Have you attended any sensitization workshops/seminar on procurement held in the sub-county/school?  Yes [ ]  No [ ]
(b) If yes, how often have you attended the sensitization programs on procurement within the past 3 years?
  Annually [ ]  Monthly [ ]  Quarterly [ ]  Never [ ]
7. Please indicate by use of a tick [✓] in the relevant column the extent to which procurement committee members’ sensitization to procurement regulations influence compliance in your school.
Strongly Agree (1), Agree (2), Disagree (3) or Strongly disagree (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procurement committee members;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Have knowledge on procurement rules and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Are aware of various procurement methods that ensure fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Are familiar with the pre-qualification procurement procedures and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Are properly informed about various forms of procurement communication used in tendering process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C: Influence of procurement committee members’ exposure to training on compliance with procurement regulations:

8. Have you attended any training workshops/seminar on procurement held in the sub county/school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes, how often do you attend training programmes on procurement?

Monthly [ ] Quarterly [ ] Yearly [ ] Semi-annually [ ]

9. What Intervention strategy does your school use to improve members’ compliance with procurement regulations?

Training and development [ ] Mentorship [ ] Benchmarking [ ] Counselling [ ]

10. Please indicate by use of a tick [√] in the relevant column the extent to which exposure to training influence compliance to procurement regulations in your school.

Strongly Agree (1), Agree (2), Disagree (3) or Strongly disagree (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members’ level of training on procurement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Meet the procurement needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ii.</th>
<th>Has contributed to compliance with procurement regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Has helped in ensuring fairness and openness in the procurement process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Has assisted in termination of procurement Proceedings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section D: Influence of aggregation of goods and services on compliance with procurement regulations:**

11. Does your school allow one supplier to tender for more than one item?
   
   Yes [ ]  
   No [ ]

If yes, what are some of the aggregated goods? (Can tick more than one items)

- Kitchen items [ ]
- Cleaning agents [ ]
- Building materials [ ]
- Uniforms [ ]
- Cereals [ ]
- Stationaries [ ]

12. Please indicate your agreement or otherwise with the following statements on the extent to which aggregation of procurement influence compliance to procurement regulations in your school.

   **Strongly Agree (1), Agree (2), Disagree (3) or Strongly disagree (4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregation of procurement;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Helps in reduction in purchasing costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Entices inventory holding expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Is not done due to lack of funds at the beginning of the term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Is daunted due to lack of storage facilities for large amount of goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section E: Influence of procurement committee members’ level of education level on compliance with procurement regulations:

13. How competent are the procurement committee members in application of procurement regulations?

Very competent [ ] Competent [ ]
Incompetent [ ] Very incompetent [ ]

14. Tick either yes or no for the availability of the following items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tender documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement for tenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What would you recommend to be done to improve compliance with procurement regulations by procurement committee members?

……………………………………………...
………………………………………

SECTION E:

16. Rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements on the legal framework in the scale provided below:

5= strongly agree, 4= agree, 3=No decision, 2=Disagree and 1= Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No decision</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>The predominant legal framework is very rigid as well as one that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>Adherence of the legal framework makes the whole procurement process a lengthy one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II</strong></td>
<td>Legal frameworks accord a standard comprehension of the procurement course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III</strong></td>
<td>School administrators sensitize the staff on procurement processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV</strong></td>
<td>The legal framework is strictly adhered to in the procurement practices in my school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thank you for your time and cooperation.*
APPENDIX III: PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

This study is purely intended purely for academic purposes. Please answer all the questions and use a (✓) where appropriate and where no choices are provided, write your responses in the spaces provided.

Section A: Personal data

1. What is your Gender? Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. What is your Age in years? 22-30 years [ ] 31-40 years [ ] 41-49 years [ ] 50 and above years [ ]

3. How many years have you been member of the procurement committee in this school? 1-3 years [ ] 4-6 years [ ] 7-9 years [ ] 10-12 years [ ] Over 13 years [ ]

4. How often do you meet as procurement committee Members? Once a month [ ] Once a term [ ] Once a year [ ] When there is an emergency [ ]

Section B: Influence of Procurement committee members’ sensitization on compliance with procurement regulations:

5.(a) Have you attended any sensitization workshops/seminar on procurement held in the sub county/school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) If yes, how often have you attended the sensitization programs on procurement within the past 3 years? Annually [ ] Monthly [ ] Quarterly [ ] Never [ ]

6. Please indicate by use of a tick [✓] in the relevant column the extent to which procurement committee members’ sensitization to procurement regulations influence compliance in your school.
Strongly Agree (1), Agree (2), Disagree (3) or Strongly disagree (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procurement committee members;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Have knowledge of procurement rules and regulations for compliance with procurement regulations in schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Are aware of various procurement methods that ensure fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Are familiar with the pre-qualification procurement procedures and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Are properly informed about various forms of procurement communication used in tendering process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C: Influence of Procurement committee members’ education level on compliance with procurement regulations:

7. Level of education Diploma [ ] Higher Diploma [ ] Bachelor’s degree [ ] Masters [ ] PhD [ ]

8. How competent are the Procurement committee members in compliance with procurement regulations

Very competent [ ] Competent [ ]
Incompetent [ ] Very incompetent [ ]

Section D: Influence of procurement committee members’ exposure to training on compliance with procurement regulations:

9. Have you attended any training workshops/seminar on procurement held in the sub county/school? Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes, how often do you attend training programmes on procurement?

Monthly [ ] Quarterly [ ] Yearly [ ] Semi-annually [ ]
10. What Intervention strategy does your school use to improve procurement committee members’ compliance with procurement regulations?

Training and development [ ]  
Mentorship [ ]  
Benchmarking [ ]  
Counselling [ ]

11. Please indicate by use of a tick [✓] in the relevant column the extent to which committee members’ exposure to training on compliance with procurement regulations apply in your school.

**Strongly Agree (1), Agree (2), Disagree (3) or strongly disagree (4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members’ level of training on procurement;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Meets procurement needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Has contributed to compliance with procurement regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Has helped in ensuring fairness and openness in the procurement process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Has assisted in termination of procurement proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section E: Influence of aggregation of goods and services on compliance with procurement regulations:**

12. (a). Does your school allow one supplier to tender for more than one item?

Yes [ ]  
No [ ]

(b) If yes, what are some of the aggregated goods? (Can tick more than one items). Kitchen items [ ]  
cleaning agents [ ]  
Building materials [ ]  
Uniforms [ ]  
Cereals [ ]  
Stationaries [ ]

13. Please indicate your agreement or otherwise with the following statements on the extent to which aggregation of procurement influence compliance to procurement regulations in your school.
Strongly Agree (1), Agree (2), Disagree (3) or Strongly disagree (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregation of procurement;</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I  Helps in reduction in purchasing costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii Entices inventory holding expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii Is not done due to lack of funds at the beginning of the term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv Is daunted due to lack of storage facilities for large amount of goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section F: Measuring compliance to procurement regulations

14. Does your school procurement committee follow all the procurement procedures from needs recognition to the awarding of the tender? Yes [ ] No [ ]

15. Does the school adhere to the specified procurement deadlines in the secondary and primary schools procurement manual? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Tick either yes or no for the availability of the following items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tender documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement for tenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. By which means does your school advertise for the tenders?

17. Rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements on the scale provided:

5= strongly agree, 4= Agree, 3=No decision, 2=Disagree and 1=Strongly disagree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No decision</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>The predominant legal framework is very rigid as well as one that encourages fraudulent practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Adherence of the legal framework makes the whole procurement process a lengthy one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Legal frameworks accord a standard comprehension of the procurement course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>School administrators sensitize the staff on procurement processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>The legal framework is strictly adhered to in the procurement practices in my school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your time and cooperation.
APPENDIX IV: SUB COUNTY EDUCATION AUDITOR’S INTERVIEW GUIDE

My name is Mungéi Vera Nyaboe, a postgraduate student at the University of Nairobi undertaking a Masters of Education course in the Department of Educational Administration and Planning. I am carrying out a research in public secondary schools in Nyamira North Sub-County as a requirement for the course. The information gathered shall only be used in tabulation and presentation of the data and making valid conclusions. Please feel free to respond to the following questions.

1. What is your age bracket below 25 [ ] 25-29 [ ] 30-34 [ ] 35-39 [ ] 40-44 [ ] 45-49 [ ] 50-above [ ]

2. For how long have you served as an auditor in this sub county?

3. a) Has there been any procurement sensitization workshops or seminars organized nationally and at county levels for school procurement committee members in the last 3 years? Yes [ ] No [ ]

   b) If yes, how often are they held?

   Annually [ ] Monthly [ ] Quarterly [ ]

4. To what extent does sensitization on procurement influence compliance with procurement procedures among the procurement committee members?

5. To what extent does exposure to training on procurement influences compliance with procurement procedures?

6. How would aggregation of procurement influence on compliance with procurement procedures?
7. How does the level of education of committee members affect their compliance with procurement regulations?

8. To what extent do you agree with the stat that predominant legal framework is very rigid and it encourages fraudulent practices?

Thank you for your time.
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