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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of stakeholders’ involvement in public primary schools resource management on pupils’ academic achievement in Imenti South District, Kenya. The study was guided by four research objectives. The research objectives sought to determine how involvement of school management committee (SMC) in resource management influence KCPE performance; determine how involvement of teachers in resource management influence KCPE performance; establish how involvement of parents in resource management influence KCPE performance; and lastly assess how involvement of sponsors in resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti south district. The study was based on Atkinson and Feather’s (1966) theory of achievement. The study adopted a descriptive survey design. The sample comprised of 85 SMC members, 170 parents and 280 teachers. Data were collected by user of questionnaires. Data were analysed by use of qualitative and quantitative means. Findings revealed that involvement of school management committee (SMC) in resource management affected pupils academic performance. Findings also revealed that parents’ involvement in schools resource management influenced pupils’ academic performance. Findings also revealed that teachers’ involvement in school resource management influenced pupils’ academic performance. Findings also showed that involvement of sponsors in resource management KCPE performance in public primary schools. Based on the findings, the study concluded that the SMC held meetings to discuss school matters. The SMC also prepared minutes which they could visit to during meetings. Findings also revealed that the SMC prepared budget for the School Management Committee. The SMC indicated that they evaluated the school’s performance once national results were released. The findings show that the SMC were involved in the reviewing of budget hence implying that SMC who are part of school stakeholders were involved in schools resource management. The conclusions of the study were that parents as stakeholders were involved in school management; that parents were encouraged to participate in decision making; that teachers agreed that solving administrative problems with parents improved student academic progress; that teachers were frequently invited by the school administration to discuss matters pertaining pupils discipline. The study further concluded that involvement of sponsors in resource management KCPE performance in public primary schools. The study recommended that there need
to put in place structures that ensure that parents are fully involved in resource management. There also need for the sponsors to be empowered on their roles so that they can play an important role in schools resource management. There is need to ensure that there is coordination between different stakeholders in the area of resource management.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Education is the best legacy a nation can give to her citizens especially the youth. This is because the development of any nation depends largely on the quality of education and the basis for any meaningful development must begin with the development of the human resource thus formal education remains the vehicle for socio-economic development and mobilization in any society. Jomtien (1990) pointed out that, one of the main objectives of developing countries and international organizations, in the educational sector is to make basic education available to all. This means the need to meet the basic learning needs of all children, youths and adults.

Since the World Conference on Education for All, the expansion and improvement of basic education has regained a prominent place on the agenda of the main international organizations and bilateral co-operation agencies, and in the action plans prepared by educational authorities in the majority of developing countries. In addition, the Convention on the Rights of the Child ratified by over 160 States has helped to establish education not only as a necessity but also as a fundamental right (Jomtien, 1990). Despite the economic difficulties experienced in the 1980s, advances have been achieved in the last thirty years in terms of spreading primary education. Moreover, enrolment in schools has grown
considerably since 1970s and the number of schools has doubled and that of teachers tripled. Both in Asia and in Latin America, the education systems of many countries now have sufficient capacity to attend to their whole school-age population, and would already be in a position to ensure universal access to primary education (Lockheed & Verspoor, 1992; UNESCO, 1991; 1993d; UNESCO/UNICEF, 1993).

Governance is concerned with structures and processes for decision making, accountability, control and behaviour at the top of organisations. Corporate governance is a concept that involves practices that entail the organization of management and control of companies. Corporate governance is the means by which an organisation is directed and controlled. In broad terms, corporate governance refers to the processes by which organizations are directed, controlled and held accountable. Corporate governance encompasses authority, accountability, stewardship, leadership, direction and control exercised in corporations. It reflects the interaction among those persons and groups, which provide resources to the organisation and contribute to its performance such as shareholders, employees, creditors, long-term suppliers and subcontractors (Brownbridge, 2007).

Corporate governance is defined as the formal system of accountability and control for legal, ethical and socially responsible decisions and use of resources in business organizations. It is based on certain institutions like; laws, contracts,
norms and regulations that create self-governing system in the organization. A corporation has various stakeholders, internal and external groups whose support is essential for the survival and growth of any corporation (Freeman 2004; Lozano 2000; Mitroff 2003). An school frequently interacts with commonly acknowledged stakeholders who include employees, customers, shareholders, suppliers, government agencies, managers, creditors and community groups.

Cheng and Cheung (2003) have observed that efforts to enhance organizational performance have featured stakeholders’ involvement in schools corporate governance. This encourages the involvement of stakeholders at all levels of an organization in the analysis of problems, development of strategies and implementation of solutions. In this case employees are invited to share in the decision-making process of the firm by getting involved in activities such as setting goals, determining work schedules, and making suggestions. Involvement in governance has been acknowledged as an essential ingredient in quest for better school performance. This is in terms of involvement of teachers, pupils, parents and school management committees. For example, Fullan (1999) assert that high levels of parental involvement in school governance, has a direct link with the school’s academic performance.

Schools are an inextricable part of society as well as the community to which it belongs. They are social subsystems which cannot function isolated from the hyper system on the social environment (Polydorou, 1995). Therefore there is
need to set common aims that are solid to school, family along with the rest of the society (Pasiardis, 2004). Characteristically, Holly and Miskel (2001) maintain that schools are open systems and depend on exchanges on environmental elements to survive. Furthermore, multiple environmental influences come from different levels of society and affect what happens in schools. They further pointed out that school effectiveness cannot be seen in other terms than those of consolidation of parents in the school processes, capitalization and potential benefit that can be gleaned from bringing schools, parents and community agencies together in order, to help pupils academic and social achievement. This will enable teachers and school managers to be active change agents and team builders in order to guide their institutions in preparation of future educators that will conduct effective family and community involvement programmes and practices (Epstein & Sanders, 2006).

According to Watson and Reigeluth (2008), education in Africa is undergoing a systematic perceptual change, as a result of society’s dissatisfaction with individual learners’ achievement in the education arena hence more system transformation efforts have been put up in the education sector which sees to it that stakeholders are involves to achieve the desired changes (Eldah, 2005).

Primary education is the stage where children acquire basic skills, attitudes and values for life and form basis for further education and employment, thus the persons in charge of the primary school management are expected to play a
pivotal role in ensuring the smooth functioning of schools and the proper and efficient use of the available resources. Therefore, the school management has to undertake tasks that are aimed at ensuring that education is equitable, efficient and accessible to all Kenyan children. This means that they are charged with the responsibility of ensuring proper utilization of school finances, curriculum implementation and maintenance of discipline.

A study conducted in Philippine public schools (2006) indicated that effective involvement of stakeholders in corporate governance would lead to a more democratic approach in which planning and decision making are devolved to the individual schools which leads to high academic performance. In South African education according to the Task Team Report (DoE, 2006), new education policy required schools to involve all the stakeholders who included parents, pupils, school committees and other stakeholders to ensure efficient and effective delivery of services. This view is supported by literature for instance Peters cited in Smith, (2003) who advocated the development of organization systems, structures and processes that are conducive to, and supportive of participation, empowerment and change.

Although it is the Kenyan government’s policy to ensure the delivery of quality education in schools, performance has remained poor despite the various interventions by policy makers and implementers. In the pursuit of improvements, that schools like other organisation involve stakeholders in the school governance.
Most of these innovations towards better school outcomes assign utmost importance to the quality of governance in schools. According to Caldwell (1998) schools need support of the other stakeholders such as teachers, parents, community leaders and students to succeed.

This study will define stakeholders using an educational focus described by Freeman (1984) as follows; “those interest groups which can affect or be affected by the achievement on the institutions objectives regarding educational matters in structure or manner regardless of level”. Therefore in our study, the key stakeholders of public primary schools in Imenti South District will be the parents, school management committee, sponsors and teachers.

A study by Otach (2008) revealed that majority of SMCs are not aware of the situation in their schools because they are allowed to participate in monitoring of schooling activities. In most cases they are unaware of the poor performance of children and the type of facilities and resources that should be offered. A study by APHRC (2010) on the other hand showed that most teachers emphasized on procedural fluency and conceptual understanding rather than problem solving and adaptive reasoning. Mumbe (2008) in his study on leadership style and teacher satisfaction in primary schools identified that delegation of authority can only be successful when the subordinates have ability, information and are knowledgeable about the task and their willingness to perform and take decisions while Ali and Machungwa (2005) found significant differences between teachers involvement in
school governance and pupils academic performance. These studies did not however focus on the influence of stakeholders on resource management hence this study therefore seeks to understand the influence of stakeholders in involvement of resource management on KCPE performance in Imenti South District, Kenya.

1.2 Statement of the problem

In the Kenya primary schools setup, school governing bodies and other stakeholders are mandated to manage the funds and run the affairs of schools (Eldah, 2005). The Education Act provides guidelines for the school governing body and the head teacher on their roles and responsibilities in managing the affairs of the school. However, some members of school governing bodies and head teachers either have little or no knowledge of the Education Act or simply interpret it incorrectly, which results in many schools experiencing resource mismanagement and poor pupils academic results (Okwach, & George, 1997). They also pointed out that although the Ministry of Education has been providing management training through the Kenya Educational Management Institute (KEMI) for school governing bodies and stakeholders especially the head teachers, many schools still encounter problems in this area and this translates into poor or low mean grades in pupils’ academic results. Therefore, this study south to establish the influence of stakeholders’ involvement in public primary
schools resource management on pupils’ academic achievement in Imenti South District, Kenya.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of stakeholders’ involvement in public primary schools resource management on pupils’ academic achievement in Imenti South District, Kenya.

1.4 Objectives of the study

The following were the objectives of the study

i. To determine how involvement of school management committee (SMC) in resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti south district

ii. To determine how involvement of teachers in resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti south district

iii. To establish how involvement of parents in resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti south district

iv. To assess how involvement of sponsors in resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti south district
1.5 Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions

i. How does involvement of school management committee (SMC) in resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti South District?

ii. How does involvement of teachers in resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti South District?

iii. How does involvement of parents in resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti South District?

iv. How does involvement of sponsors in resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti South District?

1.6 Significance of the study

The study may add to existing knowledge in the area of study on the influence of stakeholders’ involvement in public primary school management on pupils’ academic achievement particularly in KCPE performance. This study may contribute to addition of knowledge to education policy makers on how effective involvement of stakeholders is influencing academic performance. The study may shed light on the relationship between stakeholders’ involvement in corporate governance and the schools’ performance. This study may be useful in developing
guidelines for head teachers and school stakeholder bodies to enable them to
manage their school efficiently and effectively and achieve desired KCPE results
in Imenti South District. The information from this study may also be useful to
the Ministry of Education when formulating training materials for head teachers
and other stakeholders for in service courses.

1.7 Limitations of the study

The sampling frame of the study only covered Imenti South district thus limited to
generalization of the findings. The researcher may also be faced with socio
economic and environmental challenges like bad weather, distance and lack of
receptiveness from the respondents because they could be wary of divulging their
personal information. This can be avoided by visiting the respondents and create a
rapport and also explain to the purpose of the exercise. Also use of research
assistants selected from the area to avoid social, cultural and personal influence
on the findings may be the alternative option.

1.8 Delimitation of the study

The study aimed to cover only public schools in Imenti South District. It intended
to collect data from the parents, school management committee and teachers on
the influence of stakeholders’ involvement in public primary schools management
on pupils’ academic achievement in the area focusing on KCPE performance. The
study excluded the sponsors, pupils, union bodies, politicians and quality
assurance officers because of the wide scope of the study.
1.9 Assumptions of the study

In this study, the following assumptions were made;

i. The respondent understood and be able to answer the questions in the survey tool.

ii. Respondents would provide accurate and honest answers to the best of their ability.

iii. The stakeholder involvement in resource management affected the activities undertaken in the school environment.

1.10 Definition of significant terms

**Academic achievement** refers to the outcome of education. It is the extent to which a student, teacher or institution has achieved their educational goals.

**Corporate governance** refers to the set of processes, customs, policies, laws, and institutions affecting the way a corporation (or company) is directed administered or controlled.

**Education management** is ensuring that people have the most recent and sustainable education to do their work.

**Governance** refers to the decisions that define expectations for the purpose of administering the running of a school.

**Influence** refers to a power affecting a person, thing or cause of events especially one that operates without any direct or apparent force.
Management is the process of reaching organizational goals by working with and through people and other organizational resources.

Stakeholder is a person, group or organization that has interest or concern in an organization. They can affect or be affected by the organization actions, objectives and policies.

1.11 Organization of the study

This study is organized into five sections each detailing a different content. The first chapter is introductory and therefore highlights the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study research questions and significance of the study, assumption of the study, limitations/delimitations and operational definitions of terms used in the study. The second chapter presents the literature review, theoretical/conceptual framework of the study. The third chapter deals with research methodology and focussed on research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, data collection instruments validity and reliability of the instrument as well as data collection procedures and analysis techniques. The forth chapter will deal with data analysis, presentation and interpretation. The last chapter will cover summary of the findings, conclusion and recommendation of areas for further studies.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the related literature review under the following sections:. Overview of corporate governance, stakeholders in public primary schools, influence of involvement of SMC on pupils performance, influence of teachers’ involvement in school governance of pupils performance, influence of parents’ involvement in school governance on pupils’ performance and influence of involvement of sponsors in school governance on pupils performance. The chapter presents the summary of literature review, theoretical and conceptual framework of the study.

2.2 Overview of corporate governance

The issues of corporate governance and role of institutions in the development of corporate governance is widely discussed in the literature. The academicians have paid their attention to the variety of issues regarding corporate governance such as ethics, management practices, owner’s role, regulatory mechanism and policies of state centered for good governance. Corporate governance is the set of processes, customs, policies, laws and institutions affecting the- way a corporation is directed, administered or controlled (Knell, 2006). Corporate governance also
includes the relationships among the many players involved (the stakeholders) and the goals for which the corporation is governed.

The principal players are the stakeholders who in a school set up are the parents, teachers, school management committee, sponsors, and pupils among others. In the corporate world, they include management and the board of directors. Other stakeholders include employees, suppliers, customers, bankers and other lenders, regulators, the environment and the community at large (Knell, 2006). Improvements in the management and administration of many organisations are essential if the global efforts to halt corruption and other types of irregularity are to achieve desired results.

Good corporate governance shields a firm from vulnerability to future financial distress (Bhagat & Jefferis, 2002). The argument has been advanced time and time again that the governance structure of any corporate entity affects the firm's ability to respond to external factors that have some bearing on its financial performance (Donaldson, 2003). In this regard, it has been noted that well governed firms largely perform better and that good corporate governance is of essence to firm’s financial performance. According to Demsetz and Villalonga, (2002), a well functioning corporate governance system helps a school to achieve its objective which is pupils academic performance.
2.4 Stakeholders in public primary schools

Plome and Pelgrum (1993) states that, an education system is a complex system, with systems comprising of sub-systems at different levels, macro level of the educational system of a country, micro level that is the school level and the macro level that is the classroom and the student. At these levels, educational decisions are influenced by different actors for example at the school level the school committee, the head teachers, teachers and parents make certain decisions and give opinion on the management of the school. The school management is constantly interacting with different stakeholders namely the parents, pupils, school committees, quality assurance and standard officers, politicians, sponsors and trade unionists among others who influence the activities in school. Their contribution can lead to positive or negative changes. Different stakeholders interact to ensure that there is efficiency, the politician influence the policy formulation at the national level, the donors provide the funds, the head teachers serve as secretaries and executive officers of the school management committee and the school management committee are responsible for the higher and remuneration of support staff. They are the custodians and trustees of movable and immovable properties of their schools thus the school committee is the legal trustee of the school. The Public Procurement and Disposal Act 2005 has granted the teachers the power to control the tendering in public primary schools. Thus it would be true to say that everyone is a stakeholder in education.
2.5 Involvement of SMC on pupils’ performance

School Management Committees (SMC) has an important role to play in the functioning of schools. The new education Act in Kenya has made the formation of SMCs compulsory. Govinda and Bandyopadhyay (2010) suggested that the involvement of communities in the running of schools through SMC is essential in ensuring school good quality and hence good performance among students. A study by Otach (2008) revealed that majority of SMCs are not aware of the situation in their schools because they are allowed to participate in monitoring of schooling activities. In most cases they are unaware of the poor performance of children and the type of facilities and resources that should be offered. Therefore Eldah (2008) suggested that, SMCs need more awareness of the relevant standards and the possible interventions in cases where the education provided is of poor quality. Otach (2008) highlighted that due to high enrolment of pupils in public primary schools, the government has not been able to recruit enough teachers to manage the influx of pupils. Therefore, SMCs have taken it upon themselves to supplement the government efforts by hiring volunteer teachers from the communities in order to bridge the gap of teacher shortage in schools which has seen most schools improve tremendously in their performance.

A study conducted by Otach (2008) showed that Community School Management Committees across the country are not playing their roles and teachers are gripped by job insecurity. School supervisors and resource persons do not visit schools,
according to a recent report commissioned by the Department of Education. Wawirie (2012) explained that with the aim of making communities responsible, the government had started the process of handing over schools to communities a decade ago. Currently according to Wawirie (2012), there are 11,140 Community Managed Schools (CMS) in the country and they receive government grants as financial. Waririe however suggested that for better performance in schools, SMC job description should be clearly mentioned, and district education offices should assist in the evaluation of SMC’s performance.

Smolley (1999) carried out research on the role of school management committees in the state of Delaware United State of America. The objective of the study was to find out the effectiveness of the school management committees in the managing of state in Delaware in enhancing school performance. The study revealed that involvement of the school management committees had a positive impact on pupils’ academic performance. A study was done by Isherwood and Osgood (1986) in Canada on administrative effectiveness of school management committees in enhancing school performance. Banks (2002) working for the Scottish executive carried out research in Scotland to evaluate the quality of current support to school boards and extent to which needs of the school boards were being met. The objective of the study was to evaluate the level of local authority support to school boards, identify needs of the school management committees and establish if there was need for initial and continuing training for
SMC members. The study revealed that there was need for the parent members to be upgraded so as to make contribution with the quality of education provided in their schools.

Monly (2003) conducted a study in Buret District to establish the effectiveness of SMC in management of public primary school. He used the survey research design he targeted all head teachers and bursars of all public schools in Buret district; District Education Officer (DEO) and the Quality assurance and standard officer (DQASO). The research findings indicated that majority of respondents perceived the school management committees members as effective in enhancing schools academic performance.

2.6 Teachers’ involvement in school governance of pupils performance

Edwards (2012) in a report on global campaign for education pointed out that it is important to invest in teachers for all better pupils’ learning and for their well being, since well trained teachers’ are able to manage diversity in classrooms. He recommended that in order to achieve high quality education, there is need to recruit sufficient teachers who are trained, well supported, paid and managed as professionals. Edward (2012) further explained that recruitment of low skill, untrained teachers has led to disastrous education quality.

According to a study conducted by Rwenji (2012) teachers absenteeism is one of the main causes of poor performance in primary schools in Kenya. The parents that were interviewed indicated that teachers did not show up in the classes which
resulted to dismal results in examinations. According to Wesa (2012), 45% of teachers do not appear in class to teach.

A study by APHRC (2010) showed that some of the reasons that led to poor performance of students in school included; most teachers emphasized on procedural fluency and conceptual understanding rather than problem solving and adaptive reasoning. They recommended that teachers need to go through periodic in-service training in order to improve their teaching practices and to rejuvenate the teachers pedagogical knowledge. The second reason raised by APHRC (2010) was that most teachers had low knowledge on the subjects they taught and hence they were more likely to focus on low level cognitive tasks which are not able to develop adaptive reasoning and critical thinking among the students. Consequently the policy that implies that primary school teachers are a master of all may compromise quality of subjects’ content that is delivered to the students. Thirdly, for effective teaching that delivers results, APHRC (2010) suggested that the teacher needs to be creative and proactive to the extent that they are able to develop teaching aids to enable that the students capture the content easily. They concluded by highlighting that head teachers are the immediate quality assurance officers at the school level and therefore they have a professional obligation to coach and mentor teachers.

have all the willingness and skills needed to the job but will always need to be involved in school activities and decision making processes. Mumbe (2008) in his study on leadership style and teacher satisfaction in primary schools identified that delegation of authority can only be successful when the subordinates have ability, information and are knowledgeable about the task and their willingness to perform and take decisions.

Ali and Machungwa (2005) found significant differences between teachers involvement in school governance and pupils academic performance. This correlational study indicated that those headteachers who held the most favourable attitudes towards stakeholders involvement perceived the stated organizational conditions as barriers to participation and those headteachers who held less favourable attitudes towards participation did not perceive these conditions as barriers to involvement.

2.7 Parents’ involvement in school governance on pupils performance

Parents play an important role in their children’s ability to achieve academically. Every parent should be involved in their children’s education. In order for children to succeed in academics, there needs to be a good foundation in place in their homes as well as routines, boundaries, support, and rules that govern the home. These components create stability and an environment that is conducive to learning and achieving success in their academic studies as well as life in general (Livingstone, 2012).
The role of parents in their children’s education has long been recognized as a significant factor in educational success and school improvement (Epstein, 1996). In recent years as explained by Safran (1996), certain educational organizations and international conferences have concentrated almost entirely on the issue of partnership between schools and parents; for example the Parents in Education Research Network, European Research Network about Parents in Education. Education is Partnership Conference, Copenhagen, November 1996 among others. This is an indication that within this area of parents’ role in education lies a vast spread of concerns and purposes. Hughes (1994) pointed out that parents have rights in terms of their children’s education. He introduced an insight of viewing ‘parents as consumers’. This view demonstrates education as a commodity and parents are given the right to ‘shop’ for their children’s education in the school of their choice. However, Vincent and Tomlinson (1997) differed by explaining that this view of parent power, together with the notion of schools’ partnership with parents is rhetoric since in reality there is little opportunity for parents to exercise an individual or collective ‘voice’ which will have an effect on the children’s school experience.

An alternative view suggested by Tizard and Hughes, (2004) is that parents can be seen as a ‘problem’ for teachers. Since in particular children are frequently judged to come from ‘poor backgrounds’, from a home environment which is unsupportive to the school and unsupportive of the educational process. There is
also the widespread belief amongst educationalists that working class parents do not stimulate their children adequately and in particular do not develop their education performance.

Many projects have sought to develop work with parents starting from this ‘deficit’ view of the family background and set out to educate the family in order to help to educate the child. Even where the deficit model is less apparent projects are designed to suggest activities which develop school methods at home (Merttens and Vass, 1990). However Jones (1996) argued that this appears to offer the parents the chance to participate in the culture of the school, but offers no opportunity for them to recognize the contribution of their own knowledge and social background to their children’s education.

2.8. Involvement of sponsors in school governance on pupils performance

In Kenya there are various sponsors that are stakeholders in public primary education. These include; the Government, Corporate bodies, Non-Governmental Organizations and religious bodies. The British Commission in Kenya (2012) reported that school sponsors make a huge contribution to academies, bringing drive, expertise and capacity as well as experience from a wide variety of backgrounds and sectors. They defined a good sponsor as one who can play a pivotal role in turning round and improving the life chances of pupils in some of the most disadvantaged and under-performing schools in the country.
Sponsors come from a wide range of backgrounds and are spread at different levels of education centres like primary schools, high schools, universities among others. Sponsors may come from organizations such as dioceses, universities, businesses, charities, independent schools, educational foundations or faith communities and some are individual philanthropists with strong interests in improving education who are all believed to be bringing a record of success either in education or other enterprises and a diverse range of experience and expertise. The report by British Commission in Kenya (2012) also pointed out that sponsors are usually held accountable for improving the performance of their schools. This they do by challenging traditional thinking on how schools are run and what they should be like for students. Sponsors seek to make a complete break with cultures of low aspiration and achievement. Church sponsors are involved in maintenance of the religious tradition and church doctrines, in the curriculum, supervision and provision of advice to ensure religious education is well conducted in the schools, appointment of head teachers. Provision of guidance and counselling to students to enhance and maintain academic standards and discipline of the school.

The Government has been a major sponsor of the public primary schools. This has been so by the introduction of Free Primary Education programme (FPE) that was started in January 2003 by the NARC (National Rainbow Coalition) government with the aim of providing more opportunities to the disadvantaged school age children (Otach, 2008). This programme created an affirmative result
since it led to a major increase in enrolment to public primary schools (Otach, 2008).

The policy got rid of school fees and other charges claiming that fees and levies were a hindrance to children access to education in schools (Okwach & George, 1997). The free primary education policy has been described as impressive (Rob et al., 2004), due to its effect on the gross enrolment rate (GER) which increased from 92% in 2002 to 104% in 2003 of the school age children population (Otach, 2008)), leading to more than 1.5 million children who were previously out of school joining primary schools (UNESCO, 2005). However according to UNICEF & World Bank (2009) it has led to serious challenges have bedevilled the implementation of the FPE policy. This include; congested classrooms, limited physical facilities and shortage of qualified teachers, which negatively impacted on the quality of teaching and learning on one hand and contributed to indiscipline in schools on the other and hence grossly affecting the performance of public primary schools in Kenya. This has seen public school lagging behind private primary schools that have smaller and manageable classes (Okwach & George, 1997).

2.9 Summary of literature review

This chapter has reviewed relevant literature on the influence of stakeholders involvement in public primary school management on pupils’ academic achievement in Imenti south district. It has evaluated that SMCs are essential in
ensuring good quality of education hence better performance. However, previous studies (Otach, 2008; Jones, 1996, Tizard and Hughes, 2004, Hughes, 1994, Mumbe, 2008) and Armstrong (2004) have shown that SMC are not involved in school management and in curriculum implementation. Teachers are the implementers of the curriculum in school hence are directly accountable for the academic performance. For success in academics, parents should lay a good foundation in their homes as well as routines, boundaries, support and rule that govern the home.

2.10 Theoretical framework

This study is based on the Atkinson and Feather (1966) theory of achievement that explains the phenomenon behind a person’s achievement orientation towards a certain task. Atkinson and Feather (1966) suggested that performance comes from two separate motives: to achieve success, and to avoid failure. They argued that the motive to achieve success is determined by three things: one, the need to succeed or need achievement; two, the person's estimate of the likelihood of success in performing the particular task and lastly, the incentive for success, that is how much the person wants to succeed in that particular task. The motive to avoid failure is determined by three similar considerations. One, the need to avoid failure which, like the need to achieve success, varies among individuals; secondly, the person's estimate of the likelihood of failure at the particular task and lastly the incentive value of failure at that task, that is, how unpleasant it
would be to fail. The relative size of the motives to perform well and to avoid failure determines the level of task difficulty stakeholders will prefer. When the motive to perform well is stronger, as it is for most stakeholders who have a high need to achieve, the preferred tasks are those intermediate in difficulty, in which the likelihood of success is reasonable and the pride in accomplishment is fairly high. However, when the motive to avoid failure is dominant, stakeholders prefer either very simple tasks in which the probability of failure is low or very difficult tasks in which the shame in failing is low.

2.11 Conceptual framework

The conceptual framework is presented in figure 2.1
The study is conceptualised based on the variables used in this study which are represented diagrammatically to show relationship between them by illustrating the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variables in order to give coherence. Independent Variables include: teachers’ involvement, Parents’ involvement, school sponsors and the school management committee in this case the achievement of public primary schools is the dependent variable. There are also intervening variables that influence the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The intervening variables include technological factors, demographic factors and the government education policy.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter is a description of the methodology to be used in the research. This includes aspects such as the research design, the population targeted by the researcher, the sample size and sampling procedure, research instruments, instrument validity and reliability, data collection method and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research Design

The study adopted a descriptive survey design. Descriptive survey according to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) is the process of collecting data in order to test hypothesis or to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject under study. Descriptive study also involves an examination of the state of affairs describing, analyzing and reporting conditions that exist or that existed (Kothari, 1993). The researcher used this research design since the research intends to generate statistical information to be used to describe the then current relationship between the influences of stakeholder’s involvement in primary schools management and pupils’ academic achievement in public primary schools in Imenti South District Kenya.
3.3 Target population

The target population is all the members of the real set of people, events or objects to which the researcher wishes to generate the findings as defined by Borg and Gall (1982). There were 114 public primary schools in Imenti south district with 1,198 teachers, 1,596 SMC distributed in the 3 divisions in the district. Since it is challenging yet the number of parents in Imenti south district this study purposively used the class representatives of each school to represent the parents’ body. Therefore the number of parents’ was 912.

3.4: Sample Size and Sampling Procedures

Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) explained that “where time and resources are available researcher may take as big a sample as possible”. However, the sample size depends on factors such as the number of variables in the study, type of design, method of data analysis and the size of the accessible population. This study utilized a multi- sampling approach whereby the researcher began by applying stratified random sampling technique using the formulae below that was suggested by Israel (1992); the technique that suggests a sample size of 114 schools and further formulates a sample of 299 teachers. The study further applied proportionate sampling method as suggested by Trochim (2006) in order to distribute the total teachers sample per school in the division. Sampling was done using the following formula.
n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}

Where n = sample size

N = Target population

e = Acceptable error (5% for this study)

This sample size was distributed as shown in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2: Sampling frame**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Number of schools (X)</th>
<th>Number of Teachers (Y)</th>
<th>Number of teachers per school (Y/X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nkuene</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogeta</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igoji</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>299</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selection of the individual respondents was done using simple random sampling where the researcher from each school got a list of the teachers and randomly select the required number as per the sampling frame.
3.5 Research Instruments

A self-administered questionnaire with close ended questions was administered to the sample chosen for the study so as to be used in collection of primary data. A questionnaire is a research instrument that gathers data over a large sample (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). The advantages of using questionnaires are: the person administering the instrument has an opportunity to establish rapport, explain the purpose of the study and explain the meaning of items that may not be clear. According to Bryman and Bell (2003) close ended questions have an advantage over open ended questions since they are easy to process answers, enhance comparability of answers and make them easier to show relationship between the variables. However, the questionnaire also enabled the researcher to use open-ended questions to the minimum thus permitting a greater in-depth response from the respondents. These particular responses enabled the researcher to get greater insight into the feelings, decisions and thinking of the respondents.

3.6 Instruments Validity

Data validity refers to the degree to which results obtained from analysis of data actually represents phenomenon under study, Mugenda and Mugenda (1999). To achieve content validity the researcher gave the tools to the supervisors for their appraisal on various sections in the questionnaire which were the primary
instruments for data collection. Adjustment were made to accommodate the recommendations.

### 3.7 Instruments Reliability

Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) defines reliability as a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated tests when administered a number of times. To enhance the reliability of the instrument, a pilot study was conducted. The aim of pre-testing was to gauge the clarity and relevance of the instrument items so that those items found to be inadequate for measuring variables were either be discarded or modified to improve the quality of the research instruments. This was to ensure that the instrument captures all the required data. Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficient formula was used.

\[
r = \frac{\sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{[\sum (x^2) - (\sum x^2)][\sum (y^2) - (\sum y)^2]}}
\]

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) a coefficient of 0.80 or more showed that there is high reliability of the instruments. The questionnaire revealed a coefficient of 0.72 hence it was deemed reliable.
3.8 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher applied for a permit from the National Council for Science and Technology (NCST) before embarking on the study to assure the authenticity of the study. The researcher then proceeded to report to the District Commissioner and District Education Officer, Imenti south District and thereafter write letters to the headteachers to be allowed to do the study. The researcher visited the selected schools, create rapport with the respondents and explain the purpose of the study and then administer the questionnaire to the respondents. The respondents were assured that strict confidentiality would be maintained in dealing with the identities. The completed questionnaires were collected once they have been filled.

3.9 Data analysis procedure

Data analysis is the categorizing, ordering, manipulating and summarizing data obtained to answer research questions (Keringer, 1993). Quantitative data obtained from the likert scale while qualitative data obtained from open ended questions. Data generated from the study were analyzed on the basis of questions and specific objectives both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Data organization started with coding of the question items, then coded data will be tabulated in excel and computer program statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics while frequency distribution tables were used to present data. The SPSS computer software
(Version 17) aided the analysis. The results of the survey were presented using tables, charts and graphs.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

Presented in this chapter is data presentation, analysis, and interpretation of findings. The data presented in this chapter were processed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). All themes discussing the same research questions were presented and analyzed together. The analysis of data is presented in frequency distribution tables and described by use of frequencies and percentages.

4.2 Involvement of school management committee (SMC) in school

The first objective was to determine how involvement of school management committee (SMC) in resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti south district. The study therefore sought to establish the involvement of the school management committee (SMC) in school, the SMC were asked to indicate the number of meetings they held previous term of study. They indicated as Table 4.1.
Table 4.1 Frequency of SMC meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shows that majority 48(56.5%) of the SMC had between 1 and 3 meetings in the last term of the study. The data shows that the stakeholders were involved in public primary schools resource management. To establish whether the SMC prepared minutes which they can visit to, during meetings, majority 72(84.7%) of SMC indicated that they prepared the minutes. The finding agree with Plome and Pelgrum (1993) states that, an education system is a complex system, with systems comprising of sub-systems at different levels, macro level of the educational system of a country, micro level that is the school level and the macro level that is the classroom and the student. School Management Committees (SMC) has an important role to play in the functioning of schools.
Table 4.2 SMC involvement in school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have hired a teaching staff in the past one year</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have hired a non teaching staff in the past one year</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We usually have a budget for the School Management</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that majority 54(63.5%) of the School Management Committee had been not hiring teaching staff in the past one year, majority 63(74.1%) of SMC had hired a non teaching staff in the past one year while majority 72(84.5%) of the SMC usually had a budget for the School Management Committee. The data implies that the SMC were involved in schools resource management.

The school management committee responses on the frequency at which they reviewed the budget. Their responses are presented in Table 4.3
Table 4.3 School management committee and frequency of budget review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a year</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than yearly</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As requested by the headteacher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shows that of the SMC had never been reviewing the budget. The findings show that the SMC were involved in the reviewing of budget hence implying that SMC who are part of school stakeholders were involved in schools resource management. Asked whether they evaluated the school’s performance once national results were released, they responded as Table 4.4.
Table 4.4 SMC frequency of evaluation of performance of national results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the SMC indicated that they evaluated the school’s performance once national results were released.

Table 4.5 shows SMC rate on the pupils’ academic performance.

Table 4.5 SMC rating of pupils’ academic performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just fine</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5 shows that majority of the SMC indicated that the performance in the school was good. The data shows that the performance in the school was average. The findings is in line with Smolley (1999) who found that carried out research on the role of school management committees in the state of Delaware United State of America. The study revealed that involvement of the school management committees had a positive impact on pupils’ academic performance.

When teachers were asked to indicate the involvement of the SMC in the school, they responded as Table 4.6.
Table 4.6 SMC involvement in school management teachers perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMC are encouraged to participate in decision making</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC are consulted before making decisions pertaining to academic progress</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC are involved in making school programmes for the school</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC are engaged in addressing administrative problems</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC are involved in solving administrative problems with parents</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative problems with parents improves student academic progress.
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Data shows that 120(42.9%) of teachers agreed that SMC were encouraged by the headteacher to participate in decision making, 130(46.4%) of teachers strongly agreed that SMC are consulted before making decisions pertaining to academic progress, 88(31.4%) of teachers strongly disagreed that the SMC were involved in making school programmes for the school. The data indicated that SMC were involved in the management of schools. Data further indicated that majority 142(50.7%) of teachers disagreed that the SMC were involved in solving administrative problems with parents improves student academic progress while 114(40.7%) of teachers disagreed that the SMC were engaged in addressing administrative problems. These findings indicate that schools involved stakeholders such as the SMC in the school administration which could have an impact of pupils academic performance.

When the parents were asked whether the SMC were involved in making school programmes for the school, they responded as Table 4.7.
Table 4.7 Parents’ responses on SMC involvement in making school programmes for the school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shows that majority of parents disagreed that the SMC were involved in making school programmes for the school. The findings imply that parents were of the opinion that the SMC were not involved in the making of school programmes. This finding agrees with a study conducted by Otach (2008) showed that Community School Management Committees across the country did not playing their roles teachers are gripped by job insecurity.
Table 4.8 Parents’ response on SMC engagement in addressing administrative problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 shows that 114(40.7%) of parents disagreed that the SMC were engaged in addressing administrative problems, 52(18.6%) of parents strongly disagreed while 88(31.4%) of parents strongly agreed with the statement. The data further indicates lack or minimal involvement of SMC in addressing problems. Asked whether SMC were involved in solving administrative problems with parents improves student academic progress, majority 142(50.7%) of parents agreed with the same number agreed with the statement.

The above findings are in line with Otach (2008) revealed that majority of SMCs were not aware of the situation in their schools because they were allowed to participate in monitoring of schooling activities. In most cases they are unaware of the poor performance of children and the type of facilities and resources that
should be offered. The findings further concur with Monly (2003) whose research findings indicated that majority of respondents in that study perceived the school management committees members as effective in enhancing schools academic performance.

4.3 Parent’s involvement in school’s resource management

Parents play an important role in their children’s ability to achieve academically. Every parent should be involved in their children’s education. The role of parents in their children’s education has long been recognized as a significant factor in educational success and school improvement (Epstein, 1996). The study sought to establish how involvement of parents in resource management influenced KCPE performance. Table 4.9 shows teachers’ responses on whether parents were provided with opportunities to elect their representatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 Teachers’ responses on parental provision of opportunities to elect representatives
Majority of teachers indicated that the parents were provided with opportunities to elect their representatives, while some teachers indicated that parents were not provided with opportunities. The data shows that parents as stakeholders were involved in school management.

Teachers were further asked to indicate how parents’ were involved school governance.
Table 4.10 Teachers responses on parents’ involvement in school governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents are encouraged to participate in decision making</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are consulted before making decisions pertaining to academic progress</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are involved in making school programmes for the school</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are engaged in addressing administrative problems</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving administrative problems with parents improves student academic progress</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shows that teachers agreed that parents were encouraged to participate in decision making, majority 153(54.6%) of teachers disagreed that parents were
consulted before making decisions pertaining to academic progress, 116(41.4%) of teachers disagreed that parents were involved in making school programmes for the school. Data further indicates that 112(40.0%) of teachers strongly disagreed that the parents were engaged in addressing administrative problems while majority 164(58.6%) of teachers strongly agreed that solving administrative problems with parents improved student academic progress.

The data implies that in as much as parents were encouraged to participate in decision making and involved in solving administrative problems with parents there was improvement in student academic progress. This agrees with Hughes (1994) who pointed out that parents have rights in terms of their children’s education.

The parents respondents were further asked to indicate whether they were involved in making school programmes. Their responses are presented in table 4.11.
Table 4.11 Parents’ responses on their involved in making school programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shows that parents 145 (85.3%) disagreed that they were involved in making school programmes for the school. The data shows that parents were not involved in making of school programmes. This is in line with (Epstein, 1996) who states that the role of parents in their children’s education has long been recognized as a significant factor in educational success and school improvement. In recent years as explained by Safran (1996), certain educational organizations and international conferences have concentrated almost entirely on the issue of partnership between schools and parents; for example the Parents in Education Research Network, European Research Network about Parents in Education. Education is Partnership Conference, Copenhagen, November 1996 among others.
4.4 Teachers’ involvement in school resource management

To determine how involvement of teachers in resource management influenced KCPE performance in public primary schools, the teachers were asked to respond to the item that sought to determine the same. Data is presented in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12 Teachers’ response on involvement in school governance matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less extent</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority teachers indicated that they were involved in the governance matters in their school at a less extent. The data shows that teachers were involved in governance matters in a less extent. This is in line with a study by APHRC (2010) which showed that some of the reasons that led to poor performance of students in school included; most teachers emphasized on procedural fluency and conceptual understanding rather than problem solving and adaptive reasoning. They recommended that teachers need to go through periodic in-service training in
order to improve their teaching practices and to rejuvenate the teachers pedagogical knowledge.

Asked whether the school administration sought their opinions before making major decisions in the school, majority 218(77.9%) of teachers indicated that they were not involved. Table 4.13 shows teachers’ response on the frequency at which the school administration invited them to discuss matters pertaining pupils discipline.

**Table 4.13 Teachers’ response on the frequency of school administration initiation to discuss pupils discipline matters pertaining**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shows that of teachers were frequently invited by the school administration to discuss matters pertaining pupils discipline. The findings therefore imply that teachers were involved in school discipline matters. The findings are in line with Armstrong (2004) found out that teachers’ involvement in decision making enhance pupils’ academic performance. Lahler (2006) discovered that teachers
have all the willingness and skills needed to the job but will always need to be involved in school activities and decision making processes. Teachers were asked how their involvement in the school governance affected pupils’ academic performance. They indicated that teachers indicated that it did. They reported that involvement of teachers in school governance ensured cooperation in the mission of the schools. This is because the main aim of the school is to ensure good academic performance. The teachers said that they should be involved in school governance to enhance pupils’ academic performance.

The teachers were further asked to indicate how frequently they were involved in school decision making body. Their responses are presented in Table 4.14.

**Table 4.14 Teachers’ response on the frequency of their representation in school decision making**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of teachers indicated that they were rarely represented in the school decision making body. The teachers indicated they were rarely involved in school
decision making. Asked whether their views and opinions were adequately considered in the decision making body, majority of teachers indicated that their opinion were not considered. Data further shows that majority teachers were provided with opportunity to discuss pupils academic performance during school meetings.

The above findings are in line with Ali and Machungwa (2005) who found significant differences between teachers involvement in school governance and pupils academic performance. This co-relational study indicated that those headteachers who held the most favourable attitudes towards stakeholders involvement perceived the stated organizational conditions as barriers to participation and those headteachers who held less favourable attitudes towards participation did not perceive these conditions as barriers to involvement.

4.5 Influence of involvement of sponsors in resource management KCPE performance in public primary schools

To assess how involvement of sponsors in resource management influenced KCPE performance in public primary schools, the respondents were asked to respond to the items that investigated the same. Data is presented in the following section.
Table 4.16 Parents’ response on sponsors’ role in the school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings shows that of parents strongly disagreed that sponsor played a vital role in the school and were guided on how to use the powers given to them. The data showed that the sponsor did not play their role in the school. Parents were asked whether the sponsor was always consulted in decision making. In their response, they disagreed with the statement, the same number of parents disagreed that administration consulted the sponsor before making decisions pertaining to academic progress. The data indicated that the sponsors were not involved in decision making.

Parents were further asked whether the sponsor was consulted during decision making in their school. The data is presented in table 4.17.
Table 4.17 Parents’ responses on sponsor consultation during school decision making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Majority 243(86.8%) of parents indicated that the sponsor was not consulted during decision making in their schools. The findings further indicated that the sponsor was not involved in resourced management in the schools. The study further sought to establish the input of the sponsor on governance matters in the school, when the teachers were asked to indicate the same, they said that the sponsor had no important input in school matters. Teachers further indicated that the stakeholders’ involvement in school governance would contribute to better school performance.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The study set out to establish the influence of stakeholders’ involvement in public primary schools resource management on pupils’ academic achievement in Imenti South District. This chapter presents the summary of the study, conclusion and recommendations. The chapter also presents the suggestions for further research.

5.1 Summary

The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of stakeholders’ involvement in public primary schools resource management on pupils’ academic achievement in Imenti South District, Kenya. The study was guided by four research objectives. The research objectives To determine how involvement of school management committee (SMC) in resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti south district; To determine how involvement of teachers in resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti south district; To establish how involvement of parents in resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti south district; To assess how involvement of sponsors in
resource management influence KCPE performance in public primary schools in Imenti south district

The literature review presented an overview of corporate governance, stakeholders in public primary schools, influence of involvement of SMC on pupils’ performance, influence of teachers’ involvement in school governance of pupils performance, influence of parents’ involvement in school governance on pupils’ performance and influence of involvement of sponsors in school governance on pupils performance. The chapter presents the summary of literature review, theoretical and conceptual framework of the study. The study was based on Atkinson and Feather’s (1966) theory of achievement. The study adopted a descriptive survey design. The design was used since the research intends to generate statistical information to be used to describe the then current relationship between the influences of stakeholder’s involvement in primary schools management and pupils’ academic achievement in public primary schools in Imenti South District Kenya. The sample comprised of 85 SMC members, 170 parents and 280 teachers. Data were collected by user of questionnaires which were validated and checked for reliability. Data were analysed by use of qualitative and quantitative means.

Findings revealed that involvement of school management committee (SMC) in resource management affected pupils academic performance. For example the
SMC held meetings to discuss school matters. The SMC also prepared minutes which they could visit to during meetings as revealed by majority 72(84.7%) of SMC. Findings also revealed that the majority 72(84.5%) indicated that they prepared budget for the School Management Committee. The data implies that the SMC were involved in schools resource management. The majority 79(92.9%) of the SMC indicated that they evaluated the school’s performance once national results were released. The findings show that the SMC were involved in the reviewing of budget hence implying that SMC who are part of school stakeholders were involved in schools resource management.

Findings also revealed that parents’ involvement in schools resource management influenced pupils academic performance. For example, majority 170(60.7%) of teachers indicated that the parents were provided with opportunities to elect their representatives. while 110(39.3%) of teachers indicated that parents were not provided with opportunities. The data shows that parents as stakeholders were involved in school management. A further 133(47.5%) of teachers strongly agreed that parents were encouraged to participate in decision making, majority 153(54.6%) of teachers disagreed that parents were consulted before making decisions pertaining to academic progress, 116(41.4%) of teachers disagreed that parents were involved in making school programmes for the school. The Majority 164(58.6%) of teachers strongly agreed that solving administrative problems with parents improved student academic progress.
Findings also revealed that teachers’ involvement in school resource management influenced pupils’ academic performance. The findings showed that majority 188(67.1%) of teachers indicated that they were involved in the governance matters in their school at a less extent. A further 110(39.3%) of teachers were frequently invited by the school administration to discuss matters pertaining pupils discipline. Teachers also revealed that involvement in the school governance affected pupils’ academic performance, they indicated that teachers indicated that it did. They reported that involvement of teachers in school governance ensured cooperation in the mission of the schools. This is because the main aim of the school is to ensure good academic performance. The teachers said that they should be involved in school governance to enhance pupils’ academic performance.

Findings also showed that involvement of sponsors in resource management KCPE performance in public primary schools. For example, 82(48.2%) strongly agreed that sponsor played a vital role in the school and were guided on how to use the powers given to them. Majority 243(86.8%) of parents indicated that the sponsor was not consulted during decision making in their school. The findings further indicated that the sponsor was not involved in resourced management in the schools. Teachers further indicated that the stakeholders’ involvement in school governance would contribute to better school performance.
5.3 Conclusions

The study concluded that the SMC held meetings to discuss school matters. The SMC also prepared minutes which they could visit to during meetings. Findings also revealed that the SMC prepared budget for the School Management Committee. The data implies that the SMC were involved in schools resource management. The SMC indicated that they evaluated the school’s performance once national results were released.

The study also concluded that parents were involved in schools’ resource management. Parents were provided with opportunities to elect their representatives. The data shows that parents as stakeholders were involved in school management. Parents were encouraged to participate in decision making. Teachers agreed that solving administrative problems with parents improved student academic progress.

The study also concluded that teachers’ involvement in school resource management influenced pupils’ academic performance. The findings showed that teachers were involved in the governance matters in their school at a less extent. Teachers were frequently invited by the school administration to discuss matters pertaining pupils discipline. Teachers also revealed that involvement in the school governance affected pupils’ academic performance. They reported that involvement of teachers in school governance ensured cooperation in the mission
of the schools. This is because the main aim of the school is to ensure good academic performance. The teachers said that they should be involved in school governance to enhance pupils’ academic performance.

The study further concluded that involvement of sponsors in resource management KCPE performance in public primary schools. The sponsor played a vital role in the school and was guided on how to use the powers given to them. The sponsor was not consulted during decision making in their school. The findings further indicated that the sponsor was not involved in resourced management in the schools. Teachers indicated that the stakeholders’ involvement in school governance would contribute to better school performance.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following were the recommendations of the study

i. There need to put in place structures that ensure that parents are fully involved in resource management.

ii. There also need for the sponsors to be empowered by KEMI on their roles so that they can play an important role in schools resource management.

iii. There is need to ensure that there is coordination between different stakeholders in the area of resource management.
5.5 Suggestions for further research

The following are areas of further research

i. An investigation on challenges facing SMC in the management of human and physical resources

ii. A study on the influence of parents involvement in school human and physical resource on pupils academic performance

iii. A study on role of headteachers in facilitation of stakeholders involvement in school resource management.
REFERENCES


A Family Numeracy Project based in London, Department of Educational Studies, Goldsmiths University.


APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Janice Ikianya,
School of Education.
Department of Educational Administration and Planning,
University of Nairobi

The head teacher,
____________________-primary school,

Dear sir /madam

REF: PERMISSION TO CARRY OUT RESEARCH IN YOUR SCHOOL

I am a student from the University of Nairobi Department of educational administration and planning, school of education. As part of my masters in education course am required to carry out a study on influence of stakeholders involvement in public primary schools management on pupils’ academic achievement in Imenti South District –Kenya. In this regard I kindly request for your permission to collect data in your school. I wish to assure you and your staffs idenity be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Thanking you in advance

Yours faithfully

Janice Ikianya
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

You are kindly required to respond to the items in the questionnaire with the highest degree of honesty. Do not write your name anywhere in the questionnaire. Issues outside the questionnaire can be discussed with the researcher at personal level. This questionnaire is strictly meant for the study therefore please feel free to respond since the information provided will be used for the purpose of this study and your identity will be confidential.

Involvement of school management committee (SMC) in school governance

1. To what extent are you involved in the governance matters in your school?

   Great extent [ ]  Less extent [ ]  Not at all [ ]

2. Does the school administration seek your opinions before making major decisions in the school?

   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

3. How often does the school administration invite you to discuss matters pertaining pupils discipline?

   Frequently [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]
4. Are parents provided with opportunities to elect their representatives in the school council? Yes [ ] No [ ]

5. How does your involvement in the school governance affect pupils' academic performance?

__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________

6. In the following table, indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of involvement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMC are encouraged to participate in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC are consulted before making decisions pertaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC are involved in making school programmes for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC are engaged in addressing administrative problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC are involved in solving administrative problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Involvement of teachers in school governance**

7. To what extent are teachers represented in the school decision making body?

Frequently [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]

8. Are teachers' views and opinions adequately considered in the decision making body?
9. Do teachers provided with opportunity to discuss pupils' academic performance during school meetings?
   Yes [  ] No [  ]

10. Is the sponsor consulted during decision making in your school?
    Yes [  ] No [  ]

11. What is the input of the sponsor on governance matters in your school?
    ______________________________________________________________
    ______________________________________________________________

In the following table, indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of involvement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents are encouraged to participate in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are consulted before making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are involved in making school programmes for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are engaged in addressing administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving administrative problems with parents improves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How would stakeholders' involvement in school governance contribute to better school performance?
    ______________________________________________________________
    ______________________________________________________________
APPENDIX III

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS

You are kindly required to respond to the items in the questionnaire with the highest degree of honesty. Do not write your name anywhere in the questionnaire. Issues outside the questionnaire can be discussed with the researcher at personal level. This questionnaire is strictly meant for the study therefore please feel free to respond since the information provided will be used for the purpose of this study and your identity will be confidential.

Teacher involvement in school administration

In the following table, indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of involvement of SMC</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMC are encouraged to participate in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC are consulted before making decisions pertaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC are involved in making school programmes for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC are engaged in addressing administrative problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC are involved in solving administrative problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Teacher involvement in school governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of involvement of teachers</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this school teachers are involved in the budget planning for this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are involved in developing visions and missions for the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are involved in the organizing function: defining and structuring roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ involvement in designing school programmes in this school is highly supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are involved in directing function; (clarify uncertainties and risk; providing knowledge, experience and judgment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are involved in developing discipline policies of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are involved in developing the strategic plan for the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are involved in the procurement of goods and services in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parent’s involvement in school governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of involvement of pupils</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents are encouraged to participate in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are consulted before making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are involved in making school programmes for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are engaged in addressing administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving administrative problems with parents improves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sponsors involvement in leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of involvement of sponsors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor plays a vital role in the school and are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor is always consulted in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Administration consults the sponsor before making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SCHOOL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

You are kindly required to respond to the items in the questionnaire with the highest degree of honesty. Do not write your name anywhere in the questionnaire. Issues outside the questionnaire can be discussed with the researcher at personal level. This questionnaire is strictly meant for the study therefore please feel free to respond since the information provided will be used for the purpose of this study and your identity will be confidential.

1. How many meeting did you hold in the last term of study?
   - None [ ]
   - 1-3 [ ]
   - 4-6 [ ]
   - 7-11 [ ]
   - More than 11 [ ]

2. Do you prepare minutes, which you can visit to, during meetings?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

3. Have you hired any teaching staff in the past one year?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

4. Have you hired any non teaching staff in the past one year?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

5. Do you usually have a budget for the School Management Committee?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

If yes, how often do you review the budget?
   - Never [ ]
   - after more than one year time [ ]
   - Yearly [ ]
   - Less than yearly [ ]
   - irregularly [ ]
6. Do you evaluate the school’s performance once national results are released?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

7. What is your opinion on the pupils’ academic performance
   Very good [ ]   Good [ ]   Just fine [ ]   Bad [ ]   Very poor [ ]
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