ASSESSING EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF
DECENTRALIZATION OF TEACHING & LEARNING BY
TEACHERS SERVICE COMMISSION IN PUBLIC PRIMARY
SCHOOLS IN MOMBASA SUB-COUNTY, KENYA

EDWARD OTIENO OBUYA
E55/MSA/CE/24306/2013

A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF
EDUCATION IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT FOR THE AWARD
OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION KENYATTA
UNIVERSITY

DECEMBER, 2015
DECLARATION

I declare that this project is my original work and has not been presented in any other university/institution for consideration of any certification. This project has been complemented by referenced sources duly acknowledged. Where text, data (including spoken words), graphics, pictures or tables have been borrowed from other sources, including the internet, these are specifically accredited and references cited using APA system and in accordance with anti-plagiarism regulations.

.................................................................................................................................

EDWARD OTIENO OBUYA .................................................. DATE
E55/MSA/CE/24306/2013

Supervisors’ Declaration: We confirm that the work reported in this project was carried out by the candidate under our supervision as University supervisors.

.................................................................................................................................

DR. DANIEL MANGE .................................................. DATE
Lecturer
Department of Educational Management,
Policy and Curriculum Studies,
Kenyatta University

.................................................................................................................................

DR. MARY OTIENO .................................................. DATE
Lecturer
Department of Educational Management,
Policy and Curriculum Studies,
Kenyatta University
DEDICATION

This research project is dedicated to my wife Esther, my two daughters Michelle and Valerie and the entire family whose comfort and my attention to them was totally denied in the course of my research work. Their patience and support humbled me. God bless them.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, my gratitude goes to my academic supervisors Dr. Daniel Mange and Dr. Mary Otieno, both from the Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies, Kenyatta University, who worked tirelessly to constantly provide academic direction to the entire project. Their suggestions and insights led to this quality work.

I wish also to acknowledge the support I received from the Ministry of Education, notably the County director - Teachers Service Commission (TSC), and his staff, the County Education Department - Mombasa, District Education Officer (DEO) - Mombasa, Head teachers and Teachers who assisted me in my research work.

I also cannot forget the School Management Committees of the selected schools within Mombasa Sub-County for the assistance given by sharing the necessary information required without holding any back, no words can explain how sincerely grateful I am.

God bless you all.
### TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECLARATION</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATION</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>xiii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION ................................................................. 1

1.0 Introduction ......................................................................................... 1
1.1 Background to the Study ................................................................... 1
1.2 Statement of the Problem ................................................................ 7
  1.2.1 Purpose of the Study ................................................................. 7
  1.2.2 Objectives of the Study ............................................................. 8
  1.2.3 Research Questions .................................................................... 8
1.3 Significance of the Study .............................................................. 9
1.4 The Scope and Limitation of the Study ......................................... 9
  1.4.1 Limitation .................................................................................. 10
  1.4.2 Delimitation of the Study .......................................................... 10
1.5 Assumptions of the Study ................................................................ 11
1.6 Theoretical Framework .................................................................... 11
1.7 Conceptual Framework ..................................................................... 14
1.8 Operational Definitions of Terms ................................................... 16

#### CHAPTER TWO ......................................................................................... 20

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .................................................................. 20

2.1 Introduction ...................................................................................... 20
2.2 Background to Decentralization of Education .................................. 20
2.3 Decentralization of Education Management in Teaching & Learning in Developed Countries .......................................................... 24
2.3.1 Decentralization of education in Teaching & Learning in Developing Countries .................................................................25
2.3.2 Decentralization of Education in Teaching & Learning in Africa....26
2.3.3 Decentralisation of Education Management in Teaching & Learning in Kenya .................................................................30

2.4 Summary ..................................................................................................................................................................................................................34

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ........................................37
3.1 Introduction ..................................................................................................................................................................................................................37
3.2 Research Design ...........................................................................................................................................................................................................37
  3.2.1 Locale of the Study ..........................................................................................................................................................................................38
3.3 Target Population ........................................................................................................................................................................................................38
3.4 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size ........................................................................................................................................................39
  3.4.1 Sampling Techniques ....................................................................................................................................................................................39
3.5 Research Instruments ................................................................................................................................................................................................40
3.6 Pilot Study ..................................................................................................................................................................................................................40
3.7 Validity ......................................................................................................................................................................................................................40
3.8 Reliability ..............................................................................................................................................................................................................41
3.9 Data Collection Procedure ................................................................................................................................................................................41
3.10 Data Analysis and Presentation ..................................................................................................................................................................41
3.11 Logical and Ethical Consideration ................................................................................................................................................................42

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION .................................................................................................................................44
4.1 Introduction ...........................................................................................................................................................................................................44
4.2 General and Demographic Information ........................................................................................................................................................45
  4.2.1 Instrument Return Rate ..............................................................................................................................................................................45
4.3 Findings from the Objectives ......................................................................................................................................................................50
  4.3.1 Findings on the Teachers’ Perception on Effectiveness of Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by the TSC. ........51
  4.3.2 Head Teachers’ View on Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning By TSC ........................................................................54
4.3.3 Operational Challenges Facing Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning in Public Primary Schools ......................................................... 56
4.3.4 Benefits of Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in Public Primary Schools in Mombasa County .......................................................... 61

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ................................................................................. 64

5.1 Introduction ................................................................................................................................................................................... 64
5.2 Summary of the Findings ................................................................................................................................................................. 64
  5.2.1 Teachers’ Perception on the Effectiveness of Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by Teachers’ Service Commission (TSC) in Public Primary Schools .................................................. 64
  5.2.2 Head Teachers’ view on Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by the Teachers Services (TSC) ................................................................. 65
  5.2.3 Operational Challenges Facing Management of Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by TSC in Public Primary Schools in Mombasa Sub-County .................................................................................. 66
  5.2.4 Benefits of Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in Public Primary Schools ......................................................... 66

5.3 Conclusion .................................................................................................................................................................................... 67
5.4 Recommendations of the Study ..................................................................................................................................................... 68
  5.4.1 Policy Recommendations .......................................................................................................................................................... 70
  5.4.2 Recommendations for Further Research .................................................................................................................................... 70

REFERENCES .......................................................................................................................................................................................... 71

APPENDICES ....................................................................................................................................................................................... 75

APPENDIX I: COUNTY DIRECTOR -TSC & EDUCATION OFFICIALS QUESTIONNAIRE .................................................................. 75
APPENDIX II: HEAD TEACHER’S QUESTIONNAIRE ......................................................................................................................... 79
APPENDIX III: TEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE ............................................................................................................................... 82
| APPENDIX IV: | RESEARCH SCHEDULE/WORK SHEET | 84 |
| APPENDIX V:  | RESEARCH BUDGET                | 85 |
| APPENDIX VI: | MAP OF MOMBASA COUNTY          | 86 |
| APPENDIX VII:| APPROVAL OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL  | 87 |
| APPENDIX VIII:| RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION         | 88 |
| APPENDIX IX: | AUTHORIZATION LETTER FROM COUNTY | 89 |
|              | DIRECTOR                       |    |
LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Sample Size ................................................................. 39
Table 4.1: Instrument Return Rate .................................................. 45
Table 4.2: Leadership Experience of Head Teachers ......................... 47
Table 4.3: Academic Qualification of Head Teachers ....................... 47
Table 4.4: Years of Experience for Teachers .................................... 48
Table 4.5: Academic Qualification of Teachers ............................... 49
Table 4.6: Presence of Non-Teaching Staff .................................... 49
Table 4.7: The Teachers’ Perception on Effectiveness of Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by the TSC ............. 51
Table 4.8: Head teachers’ Perception of Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by TSC ............................................. 55
Table 4.9: Response of Head Teachers on School Management Committees (SMC) Members Constrains .................................. 57
Table 4.10: Head Teachers’ Responses .......................................... 58
Table 4.11: Benefits of Decentralization of Teaching and Learning in Public Primary Schools .................................................... 62
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Correlates Effectiveness of Managing Decentralization of Teaching & Learning by TSC ................................................................. 14
Figure 2.1: Structure of the Ministry of Education ........................................... 32
Figure 4.1: Gender of Respondents .................................................................. 45
Figure 4.2: Ages of the Respondents ................................................................ 46
Figure 4.3: Response of Teachers’ on the Effectiveness of Managing Decentralization by TSC ................................................................. 53
# ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BoG</td>
<td>Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BQs</td>
<td>Bills of Quantities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEB</td>
<td>County Education Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEB</td>
<td>District Education Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDSE</td>
<td>Free Day Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>Free Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDA</td>
<td>International Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPAR</td>
<td>Institute of Policy Analysis and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JKF</td>
<td>Jomo Kenyatta Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIE</td>
<td>Kenya Institute of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLB</td>
<td>Kenya Literature Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENAO</td>
<td>Kenya National Audit Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KESI</td>
<td>Kenya Education Staff Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KESSP</td>
<td>Kenya Education Sector Support Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNEC</td>
<td>Kenya National Examination Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSSHA</td>
<td>Kenya Secondary School Heads Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEO</td>
<td>Municipal Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTEF</td>
<td>Medium Term Expenditure Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEOP</td>
<td>National Commission on Education Objectives and Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCST</td>
<td>National Council of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization of European Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parents Teacher Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGAs</td>
<td>School Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC</td>
<td>School Infrastructure Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMU</td>
<td>School Infrastructure Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>School Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAP</td>
<td>Sector Wide Approach to Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSC</td>
<td>Teachers Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational Scientific Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

In the recent past all over the world, there has been a lot of interest in decentralization of government functions all over the world and Kenya has not been left behind as a way of enhancing efficiency and effectiveness and taking governance to the people. Despite decentralization of education functions through delegation and deconcentration of functions, there are still concerns of ineffectiveness in service delivery especially at the local level. The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of management of decentralization by Teachers Service Commission (TSC) focusing on the teaching and learning in public primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County. The objectives of the study were: to describe teachers perception on the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by Teachers’ Service Commission (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County, to find out the Head teachers’ view on managing decentralization of teaching and learning by the Teachers Services (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa County. The study used descriptive survey design to target all the head teachers in the 8 public primary schools in Mombasa County. The area DEO and the County Director of Education -TSC also participated in the study. Simple random sampling was used to select 8 primary schools that participated in the study while purposive sampling was used to select the 8 head teachers and the area DEO. The study used questionnaires as the main tools for data collection. A pilot study was carried out among three head teachers in the target sub- County. Data collected were both quantitative and qualitative. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the quantitative data obtained. Qualitative data was then analyzed by arranging the responses thematically in line with the objectives of study. The study established that majority of the teachers and the head teachers had a positive perception on the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC in public primary schools in Mombasa County. The study also established that head teachers and the County Education Officials were very supportive on the decentralization, noting that it has a number of benefits including enhancing accountability as the schools account for the funds and services received, brings services closer to the people while the central office left for policy formulation and provision of funds. The study further established that there were a number of challenges faced by both the head teachers and education officials which included inadequate funds by the ministry of Education, lack of training in school management by the head teachers, conflict of interest among the SMC, inadequate teaching staff, Problem of prioritization of items purchased by the head teachers and political interference by the local leaders when it comes to transfers, promotion and discipline. The study recommends sensitization of all the stakeholders and the community on their roles and also on the contents of the Education Acts and Policies. Finally the Education officials should visit schools regularly in order to monitor schools instructional programmes, assess the teachers’ suitability and ensure that there is a good communication channel within the Sub-County.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

The focus and key contents of this chapter covers the following areas: background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives that the researcher aims to achieve, the research questions, significance of the study to the educational sector, scope and limitations of the study, assumptions of the study, the theoretical framework, conceptual and operational definition of terms used.

1.1 Background to the Study

Decentralization is a new undertaking in Africa Countries and Kenya in particular and its debate on the implementation has been on the public domain for a while. The promulgation of the Kenyan constitution in 2010 enabled the central government to cede some of its powers and responsibilities to the county levels with a view of bringing services closer to the electorate or rather the users of the services. Teachers Service Commission (TSC) a Semi-Autonomous Body was not left behind just like other state departments.

Teacher Service Commission in an effort to redress the challenges in teacher management in the country decentralized teacher recruitment and management. The responsibility for providing basic education is firmly written in to law in nearly all countries. National constitutions often mandate free and universal primary education, national and state legislatures enact laws to govern the provision of basic education, governments and the local administrations adopt regulations to
implement these laws. Every major attempt to decentralize basic education system throughout the world has involved changes in the law.

Decentralization does not just come with the passing of the law or signing decrees. Like most types of reforms, it is built rather than created. It happens slowly because the organizational culture (e.g. “the way we have always done things around here”) must be transformed, new roles transformed, new roles learnt, leadership styles altered (i.e. shifting from controlling to supportive behaviors), communication patterns revised, planning procedures revised (e.g. bottom up and top down) and regional policies and programs developed.

Indeed, decentralization has sometimes taken place without any legislative action. In a number of African countries, Haiti in particular for example, the transfer of service provision has been more de facto than de jure as central governments have simply become unable to exercise their established financial and administrative responsibilities in various sectors, instead, passes them to a lower level by default. (Florestal and Cooper, 1997), this can indeed be used to inform educational policy makers, planers, and practitioners about the international experience in the legal aspects of decentralizing basic education. It also provides a basic understanding of how instruments such as laws and regulations can be used for education reforms and decentralization. Decentralization in this context basically means the transferring decision making power in basic education from the administrative centre of a country (such as central ministry of education) to authorities closer to the users.

In Kenya, the central government decentralized the education system for two main reasons, one is to improve the management efficiency and flexibility, transfer the
responsibility to the most capable level of government and secondly to conform with a wider administrative reforms or with the general principle that administrative responsibilities should be vested in the lowest capable level of government to give users greater voice in decision making that affect them. (The Kenya Constitution, 2010).

The decentralization of services by the Teachers Service Commission is a very new undertaking in Kenya and its implementation comes with a number of both positive and negative challenges, the research therefore was intended to identify the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC in Public Primary Schools within Mombasa County.

Politicians and educational policy makers are always attracted to the simultaneous "all-regions-at-once" mode of decentralization because of the potential for quick and dramatic change. However, the complexity of a decentralization program (often coupled with the lack of experience with the process, the unequal distribution of human and material resources, and the existence of both weak and strong regional infrastructure) makes this strategy extraordinarily difficult to execute successfully Hanson, (1997). Further, the exercise of power in a large organization brings psychological as well as material rewards that senior officials are often reluctant to give up or share with regional officials. This research looked at how it improves the teaching and learning between the centre and peripheral decentralized units and the efficacy of such arrangements if they do exist. Further, how do these decentralized units interact with the centre and other devolved units such as the County government, Ministry of Education and its devolved branches and others.
Decentralization in reality involves the devolution of responsibilities and resources to independent and autonomous sub-national authorities that are accountable to both the central government and their communities (Rosenbaum, 2000).

It would be necessary at this point to mention the confusion within many counties over the issue of decentralization, devolution and deconcentration. Many efforts meant to encourage decentralization failed in many African countries because efforts were focused on deconcentration rather than decentralization i.e. the central governments devolved power not to independent, autonomous local governments, rather they created administrative structures through which they maintained control at the local level. The study therefore sought to look into the transfer of power by the Teachers Service Commission to the decentralized unit (Mombasa) and its effectiveness in managing teaching and learning in primary schools within Mombasa County.

While decentralization in Kenya came by through passing of the constitution, Hanson (1997) has argued that decentralization must be built by overcoming a series of challenges at the center and the periphery, not merely through passing of a law. In this ambit therefore, this research sought to investigate critical issues related to decentralization in this manner (by law) in Kenya in the broader sense, and Mombasa County specifically. It sought to establish whether positive opportunities have been transferred to the periphery or whether challenges at the centre have been simply transferred to the regions. Did educational planners at the centre have realistic plan for decentralization? And if so, are their objectives achieved or not achievable? What level of independence or autonomy in terms of decision-making functions do these decentralized units have? Is it a case of delegation (redistribution...
of authority and responsibility to local units of government or agencies that are not always necessarily, branches or local offices of the delegating authority, with the bulk of accountability still vertical and to the delegating central unit) or of deconcentration (transfer of authority and responsibility from one level of the central government to another with the local unit accountable to the central government ministry or agency which has been decentralized) according to Rondinelli (1999).

This research sought to assess how effective decentralization strategies have been employed to ensure resource mobilization capacity at the county level and what challenges this poses to viability of the devolved unit of the Teachers’ Service Commission with reference to Teaching and Learning in public primary schools in Mombasa County. Evidence suggests that financing implications are country specific at macroeconomic level in attempt to reduce the central government’s education costs through decentralization (Gaynor 1998: 53). To what extent is this true in the Kenyan context? According to Anon (1995) in Africa, most decentralization programmes often failed because of the lack of personnel management skills at the local level. This is compounded by the weakness of supervisory and planning capability which frustrated rationalization generally and exacerbated by the effects of structural adjustment programmes in 1980s and reduced public spending, leading to dire and sorrow situation of education in Africa. Bearing this in mind, this research looked at how the decentralized TSC unit in Mombasa has taken into account personnel management at the county level and its effectiveness in improving teaching and learning in public Primary schools in Mombasa County.
The research therefore in a broader scope aimed at assessing the effective management of decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County. Although decentralization can play a very vital role in broadening participation in political, economic and social activities in developing countries, it may not unless it entails a mixture of all the three: political, fiscal and administrative (Minor, 1999). If properly implemented, decentralization has the potential of reducing the bottlenecks in bureaucracy, enhancing public accountability and tailoring development plans to a particular needs.

This research intended to make a modest contribution to the literature of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC in public primary schools in Mombasa County as well as present the current state of affairs in Mombasa County. The research crucially explored whether or not decentralization has been able to increase efficiency in terms of service with reference to teaching and learning in public primary schools in Mombasa County.

Mombasa County and Coast region by extension has always been condemned for dismal performance in National Examinations in the recent past when all the management services were centralized by the TSC, (hhh://www.knec.org kcperresults). With this decentralized system of management by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC), the study sought to find out the effectiveness of these decentralized management services by TSC in terms of teaching and learning and their manifestation visa via the performance in the national examinations.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Experiences from primary schools all over the world reveal little evidence on the extent to which decentralization of teacher management improves teaching quality and learning outcomes. In Kenya for instance, decentralization does not necessarily increase teacher morale neither does it improve the quality of teaching and learning. Although teacher recruitment and management in Kenya was decentralized since 2001, perception of teachers on decentralization has not been looked into, yet teachers are among the main stakeholders in education. Without proper and frequent evaluation of such issues as teachers' perceptions and feelings on effectiveness of teaching and learning by Teachers Service Commission, the government may be forced to follow the same path as countries like Colombia, Mexico, Nigeria and Zimbabwe, all of which saw policy swings back to centralization after it became clear that there was inefficiency in handling teacher management at the levels to which it had been devolved. Kenya has also enacted legislation which allows decentralization of Education and to which extent is it effective? There has been lack of clear guidelines and policies to regulate the effective operationalization of decentralization issues of funds which hinder the effectiveness of decentralization of teaching and learning in Public primary schools. To address this problem, this study sought to assess the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC in Primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County.

1.2.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to assess the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by Teachers’ Service Commission (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County, Kenya.
1.2.2 Objectives of the Study

The research was guided by the following objectives:

i. To describe the teachers perception on the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning in Mombasa Sub-County,

ii. To find out Head teachers’ view on managing decentralization of teaching and learning by the Teachers Services (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County,

iii. To identify operational challenges facing management of decentralization of teaching and learning by Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in Mombasa Sub-County.

iv. To analyze the benefits of decentralization of teaching and learning by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County.

1.2.3 Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions.

i. What are the teacher’s perceptions on the effectiveness of decentralization of Management by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) on the teaching and learning in primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County?

ii. What are the Head Teachers’ view on the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by the Teachers Service Commission in primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County?

iii. What are the operational challenges facing the management of decentralization of teaching and learning by the Teachers Service Commission in public primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County?
iv. What are the benefits of decentralizing teaching and learning by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County?

1.3 **Significance of the Study**

It was expected that the findings from the study may guide and inform policy makers including Teachers Service Commission (TSC) and other stakeholders on any gap which may exist on the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in public primary schools and how it influences the teaching and learning and to explore ways of addressing the challenges with a view to enhancing efficiency in the Teachers Service Commission in its effort towards service delivery. Thus the timing of this study was appropriate at this particular time in our history when decentralization is put into perspective more so by the Teachers Service Commission.

The findings of the study may therefore benefit policy makers in educational sectors in determining the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC in Mombasa Sub-County. It may also provide education administrators and school managers with information regarding the structures of decentralization by the TSC and for scholars to raise issues for further exploration by researchers.

1.4 **The Scope and Limitation of the Study**

The research was conducted in public primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County of Mombasa County. It focused on human resource development, staffing and the supervision, teacher management issues both at the TSC Units and schools level,
teacher proficiency and other mandates of the TSC at the County level, with the focus of teaching and learning in public primary schools in Mombasa sub-County.

1.4.1 Limitation

The research study faced the following problems:

i. Finance

The financial constrain hindered the coverage of a wider scope considering that this was a self-sponsorship hence limited target sample. But the researcher tried to reach a wide range of target at a minimal cost.

ii. Uncooperative respondents

Some respondents were not cooperative and did not submit the questionnaires back hence the low return rate realized.

1.4.2 Delimitation of the Study

The study was only based on matters of decentralization of Management by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) and its effectiveness on the teaching and learning in public primary schools in Mombasa sub-County.

The study was carried out in public primary schools and not private nor faith based primary schools which are not under the Teachers Service Commission (TSC).

The research study was delimited to only members of the staff of the TSC Units present during the visit, members of staff of the schools present during the survey and reachable community members during the specific days of the visits.
1.5 Assumptions of the Study

The study assumed that the sample population co-operated and responded truthfully to the information and data capture instruments. It further assumed that the selected sample was representative enough and gave an indicative picture of the facts on the ground. This study also assumed that the decentralization of management by the Teachers Service Commission has been taking place in line with the other Government policies on decentralization. In addition, the study assumed that since the promulgation of the new constitution in 2010 and its effective, the County Education Office and the Schools’ Management Committees have been operating under the devolved system.

1.6 Theoretical Framework

According to Kerlinger (1973:9), theory is a set of interrelated concepts, definitions and proposition that present a systematic view of phenomena by specifying relations among variables with the purpose of explaining and predicting a phenomenon.

According to Oso and Onen (2008), theoretical framework refers to a set of interrelated variables and definitions that present a systematic view of a phenomenon by specifying the relationship among variables. Its main objective is to explain a phenomenon.

This study was based on the systems theory. The theory according to Owens (1981) posits that an organization is a system of independent structures and functions that work together towards common outcomes. It comprises many subsystems which
must function harmoniously and complement each other towards attainment of the organization objectives.

This theory was developed by Hegel in the 19th century to explain historical development as a dynamic process. It was later used by L. von Bertalanffy, a biologist, in 1940’s as the basis for the field of study known as ‘general system theory’, a multidisciplinary field (1968) to react against reductionism and attempt to revive the unity of science. He emphasized that real systems are open to and interact with their environment. (Bertalanffy, 1968).

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), should one of the sub-systems fail in their role, the organization’s performance is affected. For this study therefore the social system theory as an open system will be the focus of the study.

A formal social system according to available literature on the theory is an open system which is affected by the environment. Whatever takes place in the environment affects the system. It consists of a sub-system or interdependent parts, characteristics and activities that affect and contribute to the system. In order for a system to function effectively, it must have goals that are pursued and made functional by human resources (people). As an organization, it has formal rules, regulations, norms and structures. It is also characterized by division of labour. A social system normally does not condone non-conformity; otherwise the achievement of the set goals is compromised. Further, since a social system is political, it is driven by power relations and it has its own culture.
The education sector has the above characteristics at all levels from the national to the school levels. For instance, according to Owens (1981), a school is an open system which receives input from the environment and the processes them into outputs which are given back to the environment. The interactions between all the subsystems have to function harmoniously to attain the organizational goals and in this case, determine the factors that affect the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of decentralized management and the quality of the education services.

The structures are the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) headquarters, the County, District Units and the schools are the subsystem that are critical in ensuring that there is effective service delivery. The school which is the ultimate delivery point focus on the learner and will function effectively if it receives appropriate support from the other sub-systems. If one sub-system is not playing its role effectively, the system as a whole cannot function effectively.
1.7 Conceptual Framework

Effective decentralization by the Teachers Service Commission

A conceptual framework is a scheme of concepts or variables which the researcher will use in order to achieve set objectives (Oso and Onen 2008). Basically, it is a diagrammatic presentation of a theory. As shown in the fig 1.1 the independent variables which include operational challenges, teaching and learning styles and teachers and head teachers perceptions which are independent variables will affect the effectiveness of decentralization of teaching and learning which are dependent variables even if the intervening variables are present or not. The study argued that


Figure 1.1: Correlates Effectiveness of Managing Decentralization of Teaching & Learning by TSC
independent variables have strong correlation with dependent variables but presence of intervening variables will enable realization effective decentralization of teaching and learning.

The study also expected that where guidelines were available, clearly followed by the management of education institutions, there would be improved services especially in the posting and giving advice to teachers and personnel involved. The result would be improved service delivery and management.

The study further argued that where there was motivation and support among stakeholders who include the Ministry of Education, Teachers Service Commission (TSC) headquarters, County directorate, District Units and the School Management Committees, School Administration among others, would result in effective decentralization of teaching and learning.

Financial resources from the National government which formulates policy, provides resources and monitors and support lower level structures is important for effective service delivery.

Management styles together with the right skills, clear roles, responsibilities and expectations are important for any system. The human resource provided must have the capacity to administer and manage resources in a transparent and accountable manner throughout all the structures. In an effective decentralized system, all the structures from the centre to the periphery in this case from the TSC headquarters to the school levels must have clear delineated roles and expectations.
1.8 Operational Definitions of Terms

Decentralization: The Webster’s Third New International Dictionary defines decentralization as “the dispersion or distribution of functions and powers from central authority to regional and local government bodies”. It is conceptualized in different ways by academicians and administrators. According to Fiske (1996), Decentralization is the process of re-assigning responsibility and corresponding decision making authority for specific functions from higher to lower levels of governments and organizations units”. The concept takes many forms from delegation, devolution and deconcentration.

According to Bray (1991), decentralization involves the authorization of lower level structures to take decisions regarding the utilization of resources. The central authority in this case, authorizes the lower levels to make certain decisions and undertake delegated functions.

The TSC has decentralized the managements of its services to the local level to enable teachers receive services with ease and to identify, solve issues affecting teachers and improve service delivery.

These functions range from authority to recruit, evaluating and promoting personnel, allocating and reallocating budgets. It is a form of delegation of authority and functional responsibilities and decision making to lower levels. Education decentralization therefore means the transfer of decision making from central government or Teachers Service Commission (TSC) to its local offices of such as the province, districts, divisions and school.
**Administrative decentralization:** This involves providing services to the public at different levels of government. It also implies the transfer of authority for planning, financing and management of some functions from central government to agencies and Semi-Autonomous Government Agencies (SAGAs). The major forms of administrative decentralization include: deconcentration, delegation and devolution. The TSC has devolved its administrative organs to County and the Sub-County level for effective management of teaching and learning at the local levels.

**Deconcentration:** This term denotes the transfer or delegation of responsibility for managing services/functions from the national level to a local level of a central organization such as the Ministry of Education.

In this case, decision making and policy direction are centralized by the TSC. But basically, the lower levels such as the County, sub-County and schools are allowed to implement policy, apply the regulations or guidelines but have nothing to do with their formulation. All the services that used to be offered at the National level are now decentralized at the local /district level to ease supervision and improve service delivery.

**Delegation:** It implies assignment by the central government Ministry of Education/Teachers Service Commission (TSC) to school committees or principals the responsibilities of maintaining the school plan, appoint principals, preparing school development plan, preparing revenue and spending plans. It can also be done by creating Semi-Autonomous Government Agencies and giving regional government that is Ministry of Education offices in Municipal or Public schools.
power such as that of maintaining the physical school plans, preparation and approval of School development Plan (SDP) and budgets.

From the above definitions, decentralization in education adopts many forms and aspects. All the above definitions have a common meaning, that is, the transfer of powers and functions from a central government to lower level structures.

For the purpose of this study, it was to identify the influence of decentralization by the TSC on the teaching and learning in schools. Administrative decentralization embraces concentration, which is the transfer of responsibility of managing services from the national level to lower level structures. It also means delegation whereby powers and responsibilities are delegated to lower level structures. It means the transfer of decision making from central government to an elected local government school committee. Funding for the lower level structures is by the central government although the structures can raise their own revenues with the approval of the central authority. This is done through the office of the County Director of Education–TSC.

**Effectiveness:** Effectiveness on the other hand means the quality or state of being effective, the capability of bringing out an effect or accomplishes a purpose (Webster Third International Dictionary, 1986). Simply put; it focuses on the goal and production of the desired results from the customer’s point of view. In this case how effective is the decentralization of teaching and learning at the sub-county level.

**Efficiency:** According to Webster’s Third New International Dictionary, efficiency means “capacity to produce desired results with minimum expenditure of energy,
time, money or materials. “This implies achieving a purpose economically. It means the ability to choose and use most effective and least wasteful means of doing something or accomplishing a purpose or “efficient operation as measured by a comparison of actual results with those that could be achieved with the same expenditure of energy” (Webster’s Third International Dictionary, 1986). It means attaining a result at minimum wastage. Efficiency as regards this study refers to the best method that can lead to speedy decision making and implementation, and less wastage of time and resources.

In this connection, how efficient and effective are the decentralized services by the TSC benefit the locals in terms of teaching and learning in public primary schools?
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

The focus of this chapter is literature review related to the study. It covers the following areas: background of the decentralization of Education in developed countries, decentralisation of education in developing countries of Asia and South America, decentralisation of education in Africa and finally in Kenya focusing on the Teachers Service Commission and its influence of teaching and learning in primary schools.

2.2 Background to Decentralization of Education

The concept of education decentralization has been witnessed in both developed and developing countries with the belief that it can bring about reforms in service delivery. (Rondinelli et al., 1983). Western countries have used the strategy in the belief that it will bring about reforms in the education and other social sectors. Developing countries have been encouraged to decentralize education by the World Bank through projects. However, different countries understand the concept in various ways and therefore apply different practices (Siry, 2007).

Interest of decentralization is based on the belief that decentralized functions/activities or authority to lower level structures confers responsibility and enhances transparency and accountability hence increasing efficiency and effectiveness (Vespoor, 2008).
It also envisages less bureaucratic, speedy decision making, strengthens democracy and ownership and therefore reduces transactional cost of administrative burden. In short, it is assumed that it will contribute to quick decision making and more effective utilization of resources. This implies that in education, school management should be given a freehand to manage and account for the resources granted to them. The study sought to find out if decentralization enhances the effectiveness of management of schools in terms of teaching and learning in primary schools in Mombasa County. By 1960, some countries in Europe had decentralized education management functions. For instance, In Norway communities had been given rights to participate in school decision making as shown in the curriculum guidelines of 1974 and 1987(Karlsen, 1999).

The history of decentralization of education functions in Kenya dates back to the pre-colonial times when education was the responsibility missionary and colonial government and later communities until the government began supporting it at independence. Both the education commissions of pre-independence and independence eras recommended the need to include the colony and protectorate of Kenya African Education in Kenya Report (1949), the Kenya Education commission report (1964), the Education Act Cap 211, Report of the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Structure and remuneration(1971), Commission of Inquiry into the education system in Kenya (1999), The task force on student discipline and unrest in secondary schools (2001), The National Commission on Educational Objectives and Policies(1976) and the Presidential Working Party on Education and Manpower Training for the Next Decade and Beyond.(1988) among others, the Colony and
Protectorate of Kenya African Education in Kenya, Report (1949) recommended that primary and intermediate schools be placed under the DEBS.

This report was implemented through the Education Act which established governance structures such as the Provincial Education Board (PEDS), the District Education Boards (DEBS), and Boards of Governors (BOGs) for Secondary Schools and Tertiary Institutions and School Management Committees (SMCs) for Primary Schools (Republic of Kenya, 1968).

The legal notice No 50/1970, entrusted the education functions to local authorities order under section 5 of the education Act cap 211, the minister responsible for the education can entrust any of his functions with respect to education to a local authority. The evidence of this is found in Municipalities. However, finances come from the ministry of education since over time local authorities have been financially constrained for various reasons. A commission of inquiry into the education system of Kenya (Republic of Kenya, 1993), observed that growth and development of education had been impeded by centralization of decision making in formal education at the headquarters” coupled with poor coordination of education services by various ministries.

Through these commission and Task force report’s recommendations, policy have evolved to direct the management of education services. The education Act 211 (1968) set the pace for the establishment of specialized structures to promote and develop education in Kenya. These include the establishment of semi –autonomous government agencies (SGAs) with specific mandates such as the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) to manage the teaching service, the Kenya Institute of
Education (KIE) to develop curriculum, Kenya Staff Education Institute (KESI) for sector capacity building, the Kenya national examination council (KNEC) for examination and certification, Jomo Kenyatta Foundation (JKF) and Kenya Literature bureau(KLB) to publish education books and Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE) to focus on the capacity to teach learners with special needs among others.

Many countries, especially since 1990 have adopted some form of decentralization in the social sector such as education and health. In Kenya, there has been a clamour for devolution as ways of getting resources and services closer to the people. Decentralization would basically lower transactional costs; improve access, governance and accountability by eliminating bureaucratic processes.

The sessional paper that culminated as a result of the recommendations of the conference recognized the need to develop and improve infrastructure and fast track the attainment of education for all (EFA). One of the targets as set out in the sessional paper No. 1 (2005) is to construct/renovate physical facilities/equipment in public learning institutions in disadvantaged areas particularly in ASAL and urban slums by 2008’. The ministry will mobilize resources to develop infrastructure in regions of high poverty levels (pockets of poverty).

Many countries in the world including developed and developing countries have decentralized educational service by adapting different forms by moving responsibility from the ministry of education headquarters to Ministry offices at the provinces, district and school levels. In most of cases, different forms are used by practicing different aspects in accordance with their objectives. The central
educational ministry retains the responsibilities of policy and curriculum development.

2.3 Decentralization of Education Management in Teaching & Learning in Developed Countries

In the United States of America (USA), which is administratively divided into federals states and counties, education management is by school councils run by School Boards and the local school district supported by finances from the state government. In the case of Canada, education is funded by municipal governments from taxes since the central government does not have an education ministry. The municipal governments which is elected, fund the school boards who manage education services including infrastructure development and maintenance in liaison with schools governance structures.

New Zealand has elected schools boards with parents as the only members and gives them responsibilities to select their own schools managers and recruit their own teachers. Most financing comes from the government through capitation grants but schools may raise their own revenues but not though charging tuition. In addition the central government has created Semi-Autonomous Government Body to carry out school evaluation, the results which are posted on the schools public bulletin boards. The Netherlands’ central government provides financing to community or privately managed (mainly religious affiliated) schools with advisory schools councils. The schools have autonomy to recruit teachers. The central government sets the core curriculum and minimum performance standards.
On the other hand, Cyprus has a decentralized education system and has decentralized some education services such as school infrastructure building and maintenance to the school board. However the state provides funds in the form of grants. Teachers’ management, curriculum and policy are the reserve of the central education ministry. In England, the administration of education service is devolved to local authorities ‘while in Switzerland education authority and functions are vested on the regional authorities and schools. However, policy formulation remains the preserve of the central government.

In the Wales, devolved governance was established by Wales National Assembly for Wales in 1999. Responsibilities for nearly all aspects of education and training have been decentralized. (Gareth, 2007).

Armenia has entrusted education to local schools committees with members elected by teachers and parents and with broad authority. The central government finances all recurrent cost through transfer of funds to the school boards.

2.3.1 Decentralization of education in Teaching & Learning in Developing Countries

In 1978, Argentina transferred nearly all primary schools education to provinces while it transferred secondary and higher education and disbursement of responsibilities and functions between National and Provincial levels in 1992. The provincial governments pay teachers. The central governments have the responsibilities for assessing students’ performance, financing special education and charting education reforms. This was meant to reduce public spending and improve
efficiency. In Colombia, decentralization of education is focused on allocating resources, functions and responsibilities as at different levels of power.

Brazil has schools’ councils composed of parents, teachers and students. The councils are charged with the responsibility of selecting the school improvement plan as proposed by electoral candidates during election contests. Candidates propose what they would do once elected. They also select the school director. The states also provide each school council with capitation grants. Teachers continue to be employees of the state since their terms of service are negotiated with the state.

India and Bangladesh are federated countries and education management and schools construction is by communities while in Peru, it is by elected regional governments who have the responsibilities of planning and budgeting for school infrastructure and procurement of goods and services.

Lessons from Latin America suggest that for decentralization to be effective, it is necessary to undertake legal framework review to align education with the framework. Further, client demand through the roles and influence of the civil society and community is critical for enhanced accountability. Capacity of the decentralized structures is very important for effective implementation of education services (Verspoor, 2008).

2.3.2 Decentralization of Education in Teaching & Learning in Africa

Decentralization in many developing countries especially in Africa takes the form of decentralization adopted is concentration of responsibilities to regional and local governments (Winkler, 2003).
In most of African countries, decentralization has been through donor funded projects championed by the World Bank (Winkler, 2003). This is evidenced in countries such as Mali, Tanzania, Uganda, Nigeria and Guinea among others through grants from the central governments. The objectives have been to enhance efficiency and effectiveness by holding service providers at whatever level accountable.

Uganda is divided into districts, elected councils and sub counties. Funds are transferred to the districts on per capita bases and the ministry of education provides guidelines to schools on the administration of the funds. Grants are then transferred to schools accounts who manage the funds. Teachers are recruited by the district but paid by central government since teacher salaries are set at the national level following pay negotiations.

In Morocco schools are managed by boards of management with representation of parents, teachers and local professionals. The central government defines the functions and the responsibilities such as supervision of schools, infrastructure and human resources.

Ghana has decentralized education services by empowering district assemblies to be in charge of primary and secondary schools. Schools managements committees exist but play an advisory role on teacher management and supervision. The central government regulates curriculum materials and the curriculum (Yolande et al., 2002). Ghana therefore practices de-concentration by shifting responsibilities from ministry of education headquarters to its offices at the regional and district offices.
Ethiopia has many levels of administration or governments. These are national, regional bureaus, schools district and Kebeles each with its own department of education and reporting to the next level. Regional bureaus are responsible for curriculum development, provision of instructional materials and teacher training (AED 1996). As such it has devolved system of government, in respect to education, teacher recruitment and management is by regional government using central government guidelines. Financing is however from central government.

With federal and local forms of governments which are responsible for provision of primary and secondary education. Nigeria has shared responsibilities between federal and local governments. The federal government provides policy directions and standards for both curriculum delivery and school infrastructure construction. PTAs and SMCs raise funds for operations and maintenance and sometimes PTAs hire teachers (world Bank. 1998).

Tanzania is administratively divided into regions, districts and locals authorities, sub districts (villages or wards). Education decentralization therefore corresponds to the general government decentralization. Primary education is managed by local government authorities and school committees with strong parental representation who oversee the running of schools by managing the funds and developing school development plans. Teacher salaries are nationally set (Maclean Keith, 1997).

However, administration is at the regional level. This is also replicated in teacher management including recruitment. Guinea has decentralized teacher management to the regional level with power over non salary budgets.
The republic of South Africa has a strong regional government just like Nigeria and Ethiopia. Administratively, it is divided into provinces and municipalities. Education services are provided by provincial ministries of education. Financing is from central government mixed with community and regional contributions. Schools are funded through capitation grants. There are school council comprising of staff and parents established by the school Act of 1996(Sayed, 2002). They can make decisions on curriculum, personnel and budgeting using national and provincial guidelines. In Malawi, upon the introduction of Free Primary Education in 1994, the result as is the case everywhere, enrolment increased leading to insufficient classrooms. With the support of the development partners the education sector embarked on classrooms construction supported by the World Bank and used local constructors. Mali runs community schools where parents have a strong voice and authority on the management (Tiefjen, 1999). They select the governing body. The governing body selects the school head and other required personnel. They therefore hire and fire teachers. School infrastructure development and maintenance is undertaken by communities using locally available materials.

From the above, countries have used different forms of decentralization and are at different levels of decentralization. These range from deconcentration to regional and local government authorities and MOE offices; delegation to regional, local governments and schools. The bulk of the resources come from the central governments. According to Winkler et al., (2003), efficiency and effectiveness are likely to improve under decentralization when service providers are held accountable for results and more so when the lower level structures contribute a portion of financing.
2.3.3 Decentralisation of Education Management in Teaching & Learning in Kenya

The Kenyan case in development of formal education commenced with the missionaries who established schools with a view to acculturate the people and provide them with rudimentary skills to read the bible. Upon the onset of colonial government, education continued along the same lines especially for Africans. The colonial government ran education along racial lines that is for Europeans, Indians, Arabs and Africans (Republic of Kenya, 1993).

Following the end of World War II, in 1945, the Africans who had participated in the war began clamoring for education and by the 1950’s the Africans established independent schools (community) especially in central Kenya (Wamagatta, 2008). The central government would then support the schools with teachers.

This trend continued even in independent Kenya where communities established Harambee schools (community schools) (Sifuna, 1990). The Central government would then support the schools with teachers. The communities, besides constructing also maintained the schools. Although the government eventually took over the community schools, schools through the Parents Teachers Association (PTA) continued raising funds for expansion and maintenance. The government introduced the Free Primary Education (FPE) and Secondary Education in 2003 and 2008 respectively. However the government provides capitation and maintenance grants and infrastructure to the target schools.
Management of these grants is by the school management committees for primary schools and Board of Governors for the secondary schools. Construction and maintenance is administered by these bodies. (Ministry of Education 2005, and 2007)

In Kenya, decentralization of functions in education service delivery has been centered on teacher management, financial and procurement management (Ministry of Education Science and Technology, 2005). The education management structure of the education sector implies shared responsibilities between the center and lower level structures. For instance the frontline service providers are supposed to account to the Minister of Education in accordance with Education Act Cap 211 (Republic of Kenya 1968). Accountability is horizontal and vertical as is the case of Provincial Education Boards (PEBs), District Education Boards (DEBs) and District Education Officer’s (DEO’s) offices, communities and School committees. The teacher management by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) has taken equal measure in teacher management at the county and the district level with a view of improving efficiency and service delivery. The figure 2.1 shows the management and accountability structure.
Figure 2.1: Structure of the Ministry of Education
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The Education Act Cap 211 (1968), Laws of Kenya, established specialized agencies of the Ministry known as Semi-Autonomous Government Agencies (SAGAs) to perform specialized supportive functions (Republic of Kenya, 1968). These include the Kenya Institute of Education (KIE), Kenya Education Staff Institute (KESI), Jomo Kenyatta Foundation (JKF) and the Kenya Literature Bureau (KLB), Teachers Service Commission (TSC) among others. The same legal framework established governance structures such as the Provincial Education Boards (PEBs), the District Education Boards (DEBs), and Boards of Governors (BOGs) for Secondary Schools and Tertiary Institutions and School Management Committees (SMCs) for primary schools. These bodies are entrusted with certain functions which they perform at their level. The Education Act also entrusts local government authorities with the running of education especially primary school education at the Municipalities, hence the creation of Municipal Education Offices (MEOs) in their jurisdictions.

The County Education Boards are charged with the responsibility of co-ordination of all programmes activities of the districts, monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of education activities, advising the District Education Officers, supervising District Education programmes and ensuring implementation of timely mitigation measures as recommended by Monitoring and Evaluation and audit reports.

In Kenya, decentralization of functions in educational services has been centered on teacher management, financial and procurement management. The center has continued to retain authority to develop and formulate policy, formulate budget, provide guidelines and conduct monitoring and evaluation. In other countries the
level of decentralization depends on whether a country is in federal or centralized system.

The functions of the Teacher Service Commission (TSC) are devolved to the lower level structures and include recruitment of teachers’ assignment and transfer, teacher discipline and deployment (Olembo et al., 1992). The function of recruitment of teachers has some time now been devolved to the County Education Board for Public Primary School teachers and that of post primary to the Boards of Governors (Republic of Kenya 2005).

The Sessional Paper No.1 of 2005 on “A Policy Framework for Education, Training and Research” regards the implementation of Primary Education as the perfect vehicle for attainment of Universal Primary Education (UPE and Education for All (EFA) goals). In 2003, the Government introduced free Primary Education to stem the declining enrolments and increase access for the poor and marginalized populations. Under this programme, the decentralized educational components all geared towards enhancing access, retention, quality and equity education (Ministry of Education Science and Technology 2007).

2.4 Summary

In the Kenyan case, decentralization education is not new as it started missionaries in colonial era and the government and communities in the post-independence era. It is evident that both colonial and post-colonial commissions and taskforce reports have recommended decentralization of education to lower level structures for various reasons. The concept of decentralized education management in Africa has been in recent times supported by the World Bank through projects based on the
argument that it enhances efficiency and client voice and good governance. Decentralization of education in Kenya is not backed by law as is clear from the current education Act cap 211 laws of Kenya. The current education Act entrusts education to local governments which has proved difficult in the face of scarce financial resources. International experience shows that: efficiency and effectiveness are likely to improve when service providers are held accountable; when there is clear delineation of authority and responsibility; increase potential for community and parental participation and school managers must acquire leadership and management skills (Winkler, D.R. and Alen, Ian Gershberg, 2003).

The logic on decentralization in Kenya has not been vigorously studied as in other countries such as those in Latin America and Europe. Hence, there is little data and information on the subject like in the cases of Ethiopia, South Africa and Nigeria in Africa and this presents a research gap. Studies by IPAR (2004), on District focus for rural development strategy highlighted challenges of decentralization of a general nature and not education in particular. The study lacked legal backing, relied on an institutional framework that did not facilitate local decision making and resource mobilization and lacked capacity in participatory planning and implementation among stakeholders. The review of the literature did not come across studies on decentralization of instructional materials and supervision except for infrastructure in decentralized schools in Nigeria which showed that the involvement of local community in the infrastructure leads to lower cost (Ikoya, 2008).

In most countries various forms of decentralization are practiced and decentralized education service is financed from the central government. Decentralization in
education management in Africa has been gaining momentum in search of efficiency in service delivery (Winkler et al., 2003). However, there are so many lingering questions such as what forms of educational decentralizations are in applicable, if the roles of different actors are clearly defined, or whether its adoption improves accountability and effectiveness? Therefore, this study sought to assess the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by the TSC in public primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This Chapter comprises of the following sections, research design, target population, sample sizes and sampling procedures, research instruments, validity and reliability of instruments, data collection procedures and analysis plan.

3.2 Research Design

The study used descriptive survey design. A survey design enabled the researcher to obtain information from responses from the selected sample. Survey of the County Education Offices, the County director- Teachers Service Commission (TSC) and its staff, the Head teachers of Public Primary Schools and selected sampled teachers through the administration of questionnaires to generate data.

According to Orodho (2008), descriptive designs are used to facilitate the collection of information, summarizes, present and interpret the information hence these components were instrumental in this study as data obtained were described in detail.

Borg and Gall (1998), opines that descriptive survey research is focused on production of statistical information about aspects of education of interest to educators and policy makers. In this case, descriptive survey is the best for the study as it allows the researcher to study the prevailing situation.
3.2.1 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in Public Primary schools within Mombasa County specifically in Mvita Sub-County. The sub- County borders Likoni to the South, Changamwe to the West and Kisauni to the North. The sub-county acts as commercial and tourist town.

The choice of the location for research was influenced by the fact that it has a long history of underperformance in national examination with the centralized education system (KCPE 2000-2013 Result Analysis District Education Office Mombasa).

With the decentralized system of management by the TSC, the research sought to establish the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning in these schools. Furthermore the familiarity and rapport with the community made it easier for researcher to receive cooperation.

3.3 Target Population

The target population of the study included the County Director of TSC, the District Education Officer (DEO), District Quality Assurance and Standards Officer, the staffing officer, the District Auditor and Teachers Advisory Center Tutors, the Head teachers and teachers from public primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County. The study targeted twelve (12) public primary schools.

The county director of TSC was targeted because he was better placed to evaluate the effectiveness of managing decentralization in his county. The other target sample also had the capacity to read and interpret the survey instruments and give their professional view.
3.4 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

3.4.1 Sampling Techniques

A sample is a portion of the target group. According to Orodho (2000), a sample is a small part of a large population which is thought to be representative of the larger population.

Gay (1992) opinionated that minimum sample of 20% of the target population can be adequate for a research work in social science. Sample random and non-probability (purposive) was used. Where there was one respondent as in the case of Director –Teachers Service Commission, District Education Officer and District Quality Assurance Standards Officer, purposeful sampling technique was applied. However, where there was more than one respondent as in the case of the Head Teachers and teachers, simple random sampling method was used. The sample was therefore 8 schools in the Sub-County and 6 educational officials in the County. The sample size was between 50% and 100% well above Gay’s recommendation.

Table 3.1: Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Director TSC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Education Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Quality Assurance &amp; Standards Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSC Staff at the county level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above sample size is determined using Krejcie and Morgan Table (1970)
3.5 Research Instruments

The study used a set of questionnaires. It was easier to administer as observed by (Kiess and Bloquist, 1985). The use of questionnaire was appropriate because it was easy to administer as 78 respondents participated simultaneously. Questionnaires provided the respondents with latitude to give their views freely since they were anonymous as the respondents did not append their names or signatures on them. In this way we expected truthful responses.

The questionnaires comprised of open and closed ended items. Section A captured information on personal and contextual information from the respondents, Section B captured data on decentralization in use whereas section C collect data on the benefit of decentralization Section D captured on challenges on decentralization and how to improve on them from respondents.

3.6 Pilot Study

The questionnaires were pre-tested on small sample of three head teachers from the target sub-county. The procedure used was the same as the actual data collection. Piloting helped to identify unclear questionnaires items which needed to be changed or discarded altogether.

3.7 Validity

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), Validity means the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences which are based on research results. Orodho (2008) opines that it is the degree to which the results obtained from the data analysis actually represent the phenomenon under investigation. According to Borg and Gall
(1989), validity was enhanced through expert judgment. In this case, the researcher subjected the instruments to scrutiny from expert in order to enhance clarity.

3.8 Reliability
Reliability according to Mugenda (1999) is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields results after repeated trials. The researcher used the Test-pre-test technique to assess the reliability of the instrument. The spearman’s rank order correlation, a correlation coefficient helped to establish if the questionnaire were reliable. A correlation coefficient of 0.75 was deemed to be reliable of the questionnaires.

3.9 Data Collection Procedure
Approval and permission was sought from Kenyatta University Graduate School, then a letter of authority to conduct research obtained from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). This letter was then be presented to the County Director Ministry , County Director -TSC and the District Education Officer for consent before data collection. The letter was then sent to the sampled population before data capture instruments with the assistance of the field officers. Contact persons were assigned to help distribute and collect the completed instrument back.

3.10 Data Analysis and Presentation
Once qualitative data was collected, it was coded manually using highlighter pens to identify categories and themes on assessing effective managing decentralization of teaching and learning by the TSC in public primary schools. Quantitative data was analyzed using computer software Statistical Programme for Social Scientist (SPSS)
software. Cross tabulation was used to determine the variations in terms of age
groups, gender, experience and academic qualifications of respondents.

This procedure involves identification of those areas were relevant to the research
objectives and questions thereby classifying the themes covered and coding the data
obtained. The data captured was both quantitative and qualitative. Descriptive
statistics enabled the researcher to summarize and organize data in a meaningful
way for interpretation and presentation. In words and presented using percentages,
tables, pie-chart and graphs. Data was analyzed using the Descriptive statistics was
used to analyze the data in order to facilitate generalization. Frequency distribution
was used to show the number of respondents making similar responses. Descriptive
statistics enabled the researcher to summarize and organize data to make some
meaning. Descriptive statistics involved tabulation, graphing and describing data in
an organized and simplified way.

3.11 Logical and Ethical Consideration

The researcher had pre-field work where the layout of the research instrument was
done. This included the physical layout for example the questionnaires were neat,
easy to use and easy to code and analyze.

An identification number on each questionnaire distributed was done sender’s name
and address included, use of good quality paper with clear instructions and
explanations was ensured. Research permit was obtained from the County Director
of Education with proper work plan.
Given that the researcher was familiar with the geographical location, the language barrier was not a problem and all the respondents are professionals so it was easier to communicate with them.

On ethical consideration, the study was conducted with utmost confidentiality and where anonymity was required, the same was upheld. Appropriate chain of command was followed with main and decorum and references made without plagiarism and fraud.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents data analysis, interpretations and discussion of the study findings. The general objective of the study was to establish the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by Teachers’ Service Commission (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa sub-County. The findings of the research are presented based on the following four research objectives:

i. To determine the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by Teachers’ Service Commission (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa sub-County

ii. To find out Head teachers’ view on managing decentralization of teaching and learning by the Teachers Services (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa sub-County.

iii. To identify the operational challenges facing management of decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC in public primary schools.

iv. To analyze the benefits of decentralization of teaching and learning by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa sub-County

The general and demographic data of the respondents is given first, followed by the analysis and findings of each of the four research objectives.
4.2 General and Demographic Information

The study participants comprised of County Director –TSC(1), District Education Officer(1), District Quality Assurance & Standards Officer(1), TSC Staff at the County level (3), Head teachers(6) and Teachers(30) making a total of 40 respondents.

4.2.1 Instrument Return Rate

Table 4.1: Instrument Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Numbers administered</th>
<th>Number returned</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Officers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>85%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 78 instruments were administered to the education officers, head teachers and teachers and the number returned were 66 with the return rate indicated as 83.33% for the education officers, 75% for the head teachers and 88% for the teachers respectively showing a higher number of instruments returned.

Figure 4.1: Gender of Respondents
From the figure above, it is evident that there were more female 36 (65%) respondents than male 20 (35%) indicating that there were more female than male in the County Educational Management in Mombasa County. Majority of who comprised of the teaching staff.

**Figure 4.2: Ages of the Respondents**

From the figure 4.2, it is evident that most of the teachers fall between age group 41-45 years 13(32%), followed by age group 46-50 years 8(20%), 36-40 years 8(20%) 31-35 years 6(15%), 25-30 years 3 (7.5%) and 51 years and above at 3(7.5%). This implies that most of the personnel in the education fraternity fall between age group 41-45 years. The teachers’ service commission must have reduced recruitment at a given period of time especially of late hence the fewer young staff to the field.
Table 4.2: Leadership Experience of Head Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>No of Head teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- 10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that none of the head teachers had less than 5 years of leadership, 2(25%) had 5-10 years of experience in the school management while 6 (75%) had indicated that they had over 10 years of experience. This implies that the head teachers had adequate experience in leadership, meaning that they were conversant with the issues and challenges related to education decentralization in primary schools. Waithaka (2010) demonstrated that work experience is related to school leadership effectiveness as well as readiness to change.

Table 4.3: Academic Qualification of Head Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>No. of Head teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved teacher Status (ATS)/Diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 1 (P1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 illustrates that head teachers in Mombasa County had advanced much in their academic qualifications. This is shown by the fact that none of the head teachers had the minimal P1 qualification while 3(37.5%) were Diploma/ Approved...
Teachers Status (ATS), 4(50%) Bachelor degree holders and 1(12.5%) have MED qualifications. The findings from the table implies that although most of the head teachers had the required pre-service education for the primary school management, they had advanced much in their education to equip themselves with the new managerial techniques. Previous research by Njoka (2009), showed that the level of education achieved by education administrators and the in-service training influences their performance on various leadership tasks, such as implementation of TSC decentralization policies.

**Table 4.4: Years of Experience for Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>No of Head teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- 10 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows that out of the 56 teachers who took part in the research, 25 (44%) had more than 10 years of teaching experience, 18(32%) had between 5- 10 years of teaching experience. And only 13(23%) had less than 5 years of teaching experience. This implies that majority of the teachers had adequate teaching experience and were conversant with the decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC in Mombasa County.
Table 4.5: Academic Qualification of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>No of teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BED</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved teacher Status (ATS)/Diploma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 1 (P1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 illustrates that above 50% of the teachers in Mombasa sub-County have advanced their education either to Diploma or Degree level up from the P1 minimal entry level. The findings in the table imply that although most teachers had the requisite pre-service training for primary teaching education, they had advanced their level of education to enhance their knowledge which in turn improves their performance.

Table 4.6: Presence of Non-Teaching Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursar/Accounts Clerk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Keeper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Officer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident that majority of the schools have the bursar /Accounts clerk 5(83.33%) with only one school without that staff (16.67%), only 2 (33.33%) schools had the storekeeper and 4(66.67%) did not have. However it was noted that all the schools had the security officer in their respective schools.
Since there is free primary education including supply of stationary to school through the government funding, most schools needed adequate security for the school properties including computers hence the need for security in all the schools.

4.3 Findings from the Objectives

The respondents were expected to give their views related to the objectives of the study. These objectives were divided into four:

The first objective of the study was to determine the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by Teachers’ Service Commission (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa County.

To address this, teachers were given itemized statement to state their level of agreement or disagreement of a 5- point Likert Scale to measure their level of agreement or disagreement and to which extent ranging from strongly agree to not sure.
4.3.1 Findings on the Teachers’ Perception on Effectiveness of Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by the TSC

Table 4.7: the Teachers’ Perception on Effectiveness of Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by the TSC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective supervision being done by TSC agents in the school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent assessment on the teaching pedagogy done by TSC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward and promotion opportunity by TSC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of the TSC on the conducive working environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity available for the teachers advancement professionally</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness in recognizing teachers’ effort.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** SA- Strongly Agree  A-Agree  D- Disagree - SD- Strongly Disagree NS – Not Sure
Table 4.7 shows that over 53.33% of the teachers agreed with the statement that effective supervision by the TSC agents in schools lead effectiveness in managing decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County, 60% agreed that there was frequent assessment on the teaching pedagogy done by the TSC and 66% agreed that they are opportunities available for the teachers to advance professionally. However, 56.67% left that they were no fairness in recognizing teachers’ effort by the TSC. This could be best explained by the fact that remuneration and reward of teachers are still centralized and the County Directors have no autonomy over the same.

Ikoya (2008), in his study of decentralization and infrastructure in Nigeria concluded that the level of maintenance and teachers motivation can easily be addressed in a decentralized system than in centralized system. The study concluded that decentralization of TSC services enhances effective supervision in schools hence improve quality of education.53.33% agreed that there was supervision being carried out by the TSC agents in their schools to facilitate teaching and learning. However, most teachers 56.67% felt that there was no fairness in recognizing teachers hence they felt demotivated.

Figure 4.3 shows teachers satisfactory level on the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC in public primary schools.
Figure 4.3: Response of Teachers’ on the Effectiveness of Managing Decentralization by TSC

**KEY:** VS- Very Satisfied   S- Satisfied   M- Moderate   NA- Not Sure.

As shown in Figure 4.3, the response of teachers’ on effectiveness of managing decentralization by TSC varied distinctly from one teacher to the other. Only 2(6.67%) of the respondents were very satisfied with the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC in primary schools, 11(36.67%) were satisfied, 10(33.33%) were for the opinion that TSC were moderate on their effectiveness in managing decentralization while 7(23.33%) were not sure.

It is therefore evident that teachers were satisfied (36%) on the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools by TSC but they needed to improve on some areas like inspection and enumerations.
4.3.2 Head Teachers’ View on Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by TSC

The second objective of the study sought to find out Head teachers view on managing decentralization of teaching and learning by the Teachers Services (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa Sub-County.

To address this objective, first it was important to establish whether head teachers were aware of major policies that govern decentralization of education in Kenya.

It turned out that more than three quarters 5(83.33%) were aware of the policies that govern education while only 1(16.67%) was not very sure. The head teachers indicated that policies that govern decentralization include, Kenya Constitution (2010), The TSC Act 2012 and the Basic Education Act 2013. This implies that majority of the head teachers are aware of the policy documents governing decentralization of education in the country.

Head teachers were then given a list of items regarding their perception on a 5- point Likert scale to measure their level of agreement or disagreement on the extent to which managing decentralization on teaching and learning by TSC in their schools meet various targets. They were required to state their level of agreement ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Their responses were as shown in the table 4.8
Table 4.8: Head teachers’ Perception of Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by TSC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th>NS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accelerates economic development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases management efficiency and service delivery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves teaching and learning in public primary schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps to solve staffing problems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improves teachers attendance and reduce absenteeism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps in solving teachers problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improves supervision and accountability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 shows that majority of the head teachers were not convinced (33.33%) that decentralization of teaching and learning accelerates economic development. More than three quarters (66.67%) agreed that decentralization of teaching and learning increases management efficiency and service delivery, improves teaching and learning in public primary schools (50%), improves teachers attendance and reduce absenteeism (50%) strongly agreeing, helps in solving teachers problems at 50% strongly agreeing and another 50% agreeing and improving supervision and accountability at 50%. However, Head teachers were divided on whether decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC helps to solve teachers’ problem and accelerate economic development.
Study therefore concludes that head teachers are happy with the effectiveness of decentralization of teaching and learning by the TSC in public primary schools.

4.3.3 Operational Challenges Facing Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning in Public Primary Schools

The third objective of the study was to identify operational challenges faced by Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in managing decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools in Mombasa County. In order to address this, head teachers were asked first to indicate whether finances received from the government meet the instructional materials and infrastructural needs. In response, all the head teachers (100%) reported that there were inadequate funds and were not disbursed in schools in time which also contributed to late completion of school projects. Similar findings were reported by Nyagaka (2011), in Nyamira, in addition to other challenges such as schools failing to get money for no good reasons; some funds were being diverted to other institutions other than primary schools. Lack of transparency in the management of the funds, lack of accountability in the usage of funds and delay in disbursement of funds.

Some head teachers also mentioned problems with the school management committees as major constrains. They were given statements on the SMC constrains that affect the school management and management of decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools and were required to accept or deny if the SMC have the said constrains.
Table 4.9: Response of Head Teachers on School Management Committees (SMC) Members Constrains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response on SMC Members Constrains</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and experience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of membership over 4 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 illustrates that major constrains that affect the school management as indicated by the head teachers were: Education and experience 83.33%, Period of membership (50.00%) and conflict of interest at 100%. This shows that education and working experience should be put in to consideration when selecting SMC members. All the head teachers agreed that all the SMC members have conflict of interest when it comes to procurement and purchases in schools and that the conflict of interest slows down the process This result is in consistent with the findings of Kiprono (2011) whose study in Eldoret revealed that some of the challenges faced school head teachers in decentralization in teaching and learning emanated from SMC members lacking the requisite training in schools management issues. The TSC County Director and the DEO also confirmed that Education, experience and conflict of interests were major challenges that hinder SMC in their work. On the other hand, the DEO hinted that the period of membership has no effect on their effectiveness in managing decentralization of education.

Purchase and tendering was also cited as a challenge to the decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC. To capture this head teachers were given statement touching on tendering, procurement, and support from other government agencies.
Table 4.6 Shows head teachers’ responses on challenges of decentralization of management in terms of purchase, tender and procurement.

**Table 4.10: Head Teachers’ Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th></th>
<th>NO</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you receive support from County Public Works Officer?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the contractors/tenders deliver in time?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the procurement committees have the capacity to undertake their responsibilities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the Table 4.10 another notable challenge that was highlighted by a big number of respondents was lack of enough support from the county public works officer (83.33%). However, nearly three quarters of the Head teachers indicate that materials were delivered by the contractors in time and procurement committee have capacity to undertake their responsibilities respectively. Similar results were reported by Walker (2000), whose research in New Jersey revealed that school management teams faced the challenge of securing adequate involvement from all potential constituent groups. Walker’s study reported that the guideline in the regulations which preclude in district employees from serving in the capacity of parent or community representative had hampered their ability to recruit membership from these groups. This is linked to SMC who at the same time serve as members of the tendering committee.
The result findings presented above contradict with the DEO responses where he indicated that schools received support from the County Public Works officer and materials were not delivered in time from the contractors. This was an indication that the District Public Works did not fully support the school projects and construction materials were not delivered in time.

The Head teachers and the Education Officials were asked to list some of the challenges that were encountered by the schools in managing decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools in Mombasa County. In response, the head teachers gave their responses as: Inadequate and untimely funds (64.3%), lack of expertise (42.9%), conflict of interest by school management committee (14.3%), and poor of delivery of materials (21.4%). On the other hand, the DEO and TSC agents indicated that the challenges experienced included poor budgeting, poor documentation of financial management, problems in prioritizing the projects, Lack of knowledge of the Basic Education Act 2013 and lack of in-service training of financial management and procurement procedures.

To solve the above stated challenges, the school heads were asked to suggest what the Ministry of Education and Teachers Service Commission (TSC) could put into consideration in order to improve school management. The following were their opinions: The Ministry Headquarters should increase funds to schools and disburse them in time (42.9%), put more emphasis on training of SMC (28.6%), sensitizing the school stakeholders and the community on the Basic Education Act 2013 (71.4%), and appoint adequate personnel (67.1%). One head teacher also noted that the County Director Office should ensure there are good communication
channels and should also visit schools frequently in order to monitor the school instructional programmes.

The head teachers recommended that the TSC should increase the number of staff in order to improve the office services (35.7%), inspect schools regularly (14.3%) and ensure teachers are conversant with the changing curriculum (14.3%). They also recommended that the school management committee should attend seminars and workshops in other institutions which would help them acquire skills hence improving their management and also organize for regular meetings with all school stakeholders (7.1%). Parents should feel that it is their duty to attend school PTA meetings in order to give out their opinions on the school development progress and also suggest on ways they can be improved better, give the school the necessary financial support without relying on Free Primary Education (FPE). This would help set goals. Sponsors should only concentrate on donation of materials and financial support and stop interfering with the school management.

Effective management of decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools by TSC requires adequate participation by all stakeholders at the local level. Lawler (1986) argues that legitimate participation has four requirements: knowledge and skills, power, information and rewards. This framework has been used by Wohlstetter and Mohrman (1996), to explain variations in implementations and effects among school management teams operating in different contexts. The research by Walker (2000), revealed that training is an important component in the development of knowledge and capacity of teams to function effectively in making quality decisions. The school management teams in the Walker’s study had adequate training related to curriculum, test score analysis and professional development, than
they were in the training provided around technology, school-based budgeting, hiring decisions and developing school-based reward systems.

The Education official sited the negative political interference when it comes to discipline of teachers, transfers, staffing and promotion of head teachers. They therefore recommended that educational matters should be left to professional and there should be minimal interference from the politicians when it comes to transfers, promotions, and disciplines.

4.3.4 Benefits of Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in Public Primary Schools in Mombasa County

The forth objective of the study was to analyze the benefits of decentralization of teaching and learning by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa County. Decentralization is the transfer of authority and responsibility for public functions from the central government to subordinate quasi-independent government organization and/or private sector. The importance of decentralization is to enhance transparency, accountability and flexibility hence increasing efficiency and effectiveness. It also provides for speedy decision making, strengthening democracy, ownership and therefore reduces transitional costs and administrative burden.

To address this objective, head teachers and educational officials were presented with sets of statements to tick as appropriate as possible the benefits of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC.
Table 4.11 shows the response from both the head teachers and the education official on the benefits of decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools.

Table 4.11: Benefits of Decentralization of Teaching and Learning in Public Primary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response from Head teachers and Education Officials</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances greater local responsibility, involvement and ownership</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lowers level feels part of the actions, guards and contribute to the envisaged goals both morally and materially</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances accountability as the schools account for the funds and services received</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brings services closer to the people hence administrative and transaction cost reduced</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks are spread to various level structures.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The central authority is left with the responsibility of policy formulation, providing direction, monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower structure concentrates on day today routine management and administration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table 4.11 majority of the head teachers and education officials indicated that decentralization of management enhances accountability as the schools account for the funds and services received, brings services closer to the...
people hence administrative and transaction cost reduced, and that the central authority is left with the responsibility of policy formulation, providing direction, monitoring and evaluation, and that lower structure concentrates on day today routine management and administration of education services.

Less than a half of the respondents agreed with the statement that decentralization lowers level feels part of the actions, guards and contribute to the envisaged goals both morally and materially and that risks are spread to various levels of structures because risk is risk whether spread or concentrated will ultimately still affect the central government. More than half of the respondents agreed with the statement that decentralization enhances greater local responsibility, involvement and ownership. Previous studies have shown that decentralization of education has a number of benefits. For example, Winkler Gershberg (2003), in a review of research on decentralization of education in Latin America and Eastern Europe, established that the decentralization of teacher management is crucial to creating accountability and realizing the potential benefits of decentralization, efficiency and effectiveness are most likely to improve under decentralization when service providers, schools, local governments or regional governments are held accountable for the results, decentralization of real decision making power to schools or school councils can significantly increase parental participation in the school, and high levels of parental and community participation are associated with improved school performance.

It can therefore be said that the respondents were in agreement that decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools by the TSC have many benefits to the local community as opposed to the central government.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the study findings, discussion, conclusions and recommendations arrived at. The chapter also contains suggestions of related studies that may be carried out in future.

5.2 Summary of the Findings

The purpose of the study was to establish the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by Teachers’ Service Commission (TSC) in public primary schools in Mombasa County. Data was collected from County Director – TSC, District Education Officer, Quality Assurance and Standards Officer (QASO)–, 1 TSC staff, 3, 8 Head teachers and 56 teachers from Mombasa Sub-County. Given below is the summary of the study findings:

5.2.1 Teachers’ Perception on the Effectiveness of Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by Teachers’ Service Commission (TSC) in Public Primary Schools

The study established that more than half of the teachers agreed with the statement that there was an effectiveness of management of decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools by TSC through: effective supervision by the TSC agents in schools, frequent assessment on the teaching pedagogy done by the TSC and that they are opportunities available for the teachers to advance professionally. However, more than a half left that there were no fairness in recognizing teachers’ effort by the TSC. This could be best explained by the fact that
remuneration and reward of teachers are still centralized and the County Directors have no autonomy over the same. But generally, there was a strong indicator that TSC was effectively managing decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools in Mombasa County which had led to a positive impact on performance.

5.2.2 Head Teachers’ view on Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by the Teachers Services (TSC)

Regarding the Head Teachers’ view on managing decentralization of teaching and learning by the Teachers Services (TSC) in public primary schools, the study findings revealed that more than three quarters of the head teachers (66.67%) agreed that decentralization of teaching and learning in the public schools by TSC had increased management efficiency and service delivery, improved teaching and learning in public primary schools, improves teachers attendance and reduce absenteeism and helped in solving teachers problems.

It was also revealed that three quarters 5(83.33%) of the head teachers were aware of the policies that govern education. The head teachers indicated that policies that govern decentralization include, Kenya Constitution (2010), The TSC Act 2012 and the Basic Education Act 2013. This implies that majority of the head teachers were aware of the policy documents governing decentralization of education in the county. The study therefore established that majority of the head teachers were very positive on the management of decentralization of teaching and learning by the TSC in public primary schools.
5.2.3 Operational Challenges Facing Management of Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by TSC in Public Primary Schools in Mombasa Sub-County

The study established that a number of challenges were encountered on the management of decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC in public primary schools.

More than three quarters of the head teachers indicated inadequate and untimely funds, lack of expertise, conflict of interest by school management committee, poor quality of materials and inadequate teaching personnel.

On the other hand, the DEO and TSC agents indicated that the challenges experienced included poor budgeting, poor documentation of financial management, problems in prioritizing the projects, Lack of knowledge of the Basic Education Act 2103 and lack of in-service training of financial management and procurement procedures. The Education officials also cited the negative political interference when it comes to discipline of teachers, transfers, staffing and promotion of head teachers.

5.2.4 Benefits of Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in Public Primary Schools

On the benefit of decentralization of teaching and learning by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC), the study established that there are a number of benefits of decentralizing teaching and learning by TSC: Majority of the head teachers and education officials indicated that decentralization of management enhances accountability as the schools account for the funds and services received, brings
services closer to the people hence administrative and transaction cost reduced, and that the central authority is left with the responsibility of policy formulation, providing direction, monitoring and evaluation, and that lower structure concentrates on day today routine management and administration of education services.

5.3 Conclusion

Based on the findings as summarized above, it can be concluded that majority of teachers, head teachers and education officials had a positive perception on the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by the TSC in public primary schools in Mombasa County. They all agreed that decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC has led to effective supervision by the TSC agents in schools, frequent assessment on the teaching pedagogy done by the TSC and that there were opportunities available for the teachers to advance professionally.

It can also be concluded that head teachers had a positive perception on the decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools as it had increased management efficiency and service delivery, improved teaching and learning in public primary schools, improved teachers’ attendance, reduced absenteeism and helped in solving teachers’ problems. It also concludes that most of the head teachers are aware of the policies that govern decentralization of education in the county.

It further concludes that there are a number of operational challenges facing the decentralization of teaching and learning by the TSC as cited by both head teachers and education officials, these included: inadequate and untimely funds, lack of
expertise, conflict of interest by school management committee, and poor of delivery of materials and inadequate teaching personnel. The education official also cited the following as their major challenges in managing decentralization of education: poor budgeting, poor documentation of financial management, problems in prioritizing the projects, lack of knowledge of the Basic Education Act 2103 and lack of in-service training of financial management and procurement procedures by the head teachers and negative political interference when it comes to discipline of teachers, transfers, staffing and promotion of head teachers.

Lastly, the study concludes that there are a number of benefits of decentralization of teaching and learning by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) as cited by both the head teachers and education officials. These includes: enhancing accountability as the schools account for the funds and services received, brings services closer to the people hence administrative and transaction cost reduced, and that the central authority is left with the responsibility of policy formulation, providing direction, monitoring and evaluation, and that lower structure concentrates on day today routine management and administration of education services.

5.4 Recommendations of the Study

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

i. The Ministry headquarters should increase the funds allocation to schools and disburse them in time.

ii. The Ministry should put more emphasis on training and sensitizing the school stakeholders (SMC) on their roles in management of schools and the contents of the Basic Education Act in relation to Decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC.
iii. The County Director both TSC and Ministry and the County education officials should regularly visit schools in order to monitor the schools’ development programmes and ensure that teaching and learning are taking place effectively.

iv. The TSC and the Ministry should increase the number of their staff including teachers to ensure that there is no shortage of teachers and field officers to improve service delivery and ensure that all the staff is very conversant with the changing curriculum.

v. Training, in-service and seminars should be conducted regularly for the head teachers and School Management Committee (SMC) on prudent management of schools.

vi. Politicians should be discouraged from interfering with the management of schools and leave it in the hands of professional.

vii. Promotion and motivation should purely be based on merit and not tribal or political affiliations.

viii. Parents should understand that it’s their duties to attend PTA meetings in order to give out their opinions on the school development progress and also suggest on ways they can be improved better. They should also financially support the schools’ budgets without relying entirely on Free Primary Education Funds which sometimes does not come in time. This would help schools meet their set goals.
5.4.1 Policy Recommendations

The processes of decentralization of Education in Kenya started with the promulgation of the New Constitution in 2010 and the enforcement of the Basic Education 2013. Even though the decentralization is being enforced, there is still some hindrance to the same.

Policies are formulated at the headquarters by policy formulators, some of which are not educationists and are expected to be implemented at the local level without due consultation to all stakeholders. Policy formations need to be a consultative process that should include all the stakeholders and professional at the local level and not only leave it to the central government.

5.4.2 Recommendations for Further Research

i. This study was carried out in one county only – Mombasa County. Further studies should be carried out in other counties to find out if similar findings would be obtained.

ii. A study should be conducted on the effects of centralization of education services on examinations and academic performance of pupils and students in Kenya.
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APPENDIX I

COUNTY DIRECTOR - TSC & EDUCATION OFFICIALS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire aims at obtaining information on the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by the TSC in public primary schools in Mombasa County. The key issues are; how decentralization is perceived, effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning, benefits and challenges of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC at the county level.

Please give your precise and honest answers. The responses will be treated with confidentiality.

SECTION A: Personal and contextual information

✓ Tick as Appropriate

1. Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. Age: 25-30 [ ] 31-35 [ ] 36-40 [ ]
   41-45 [ ] 46-50 [ ] 51 and Above [ ]

3. Academic Qualifications:
   Diploma in Education [ ] BED [ ] MED [ ]
   Others Specify .................................................................

4. Number of members of the TSC staff at the county:
   Education officers [ ] QASOS [ ]
   School auditors [ ] Staffing Officers (TSC) [ ]
SECTION B: Nature and Perceptions of Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by TSC in Mombasa County

Answer where appropriate

5. Are you aware of the major policies that govern education in Kenya?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   If yes, they include: ...............................................................
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................

6. What type of services are provided/Performed by the decentralized County Education Boards (CEBs):
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................

7. What kind of Management services are decentralized by the Teachers Service Commission in the County?
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................

8. How do the services above affect the Teaching and Learning in public primary schools?
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................
   ............................................................................................

9. How often do the TSC agent or personnel/Education Officials visit schools?
   Very often [ ] Often [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]
10. What are some of the functions performed by the County Director TSC/ District Education Officer in the Management and supervision of Teaching and learning in public primary schools?

11. How effective in your view are the mandates of the TSC Director or his agents/ Education Officer in enhancing teaching and learning in public schools

   Very effective [ ]   Effective [ ]   Moderate [ ]
   Not at all [ ]

SECTION C: Benefits of Decentralization of Management of Teaching & Learning by TSC

Tick ✓ as appropriate where applicable

12. What are the benefits of decentralization in education?
   Enhances greater local responsibility and involvement and ownership the lower level structures feel part of the action and hence guards and contributes to the envisaged goals both morally and materially. [ ]
   Enhances accountability as the structures such as the schools account to the service recipients [ ]
   By bringing services closer to the people administrative and transactional costs are reduced. This is because service seekers do not have to travel to the center for services and bureaucracy is reduced [ ]
   Risks are spread to various level structures
   The central authority is left with the responsibilities of policy formulation, providing direction and monitoring and evaluation [ ]
   The lower structures concentrate on day to day routine management and administration [ ]

13. What is your honest view on the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by the TSC/ of his agents in the public primary schools in Mombasa?

   ..................................................................................................................................................................................
SECTION D: Challenges of Decentralized Management

14. How does the legal framework (education Act Cap 211) support education decentralization? ................................................................. ................................................................. .................................................................

15. How do members of the school community rate decentralized management services by the TSC with regard teaching and learning in public primary schools?
   Very Satisfied [ ] Satisfied [ ] Moderate [ ]
   Not at all [ ]

16. Which challenges faces the TSC/ Education or their agents in managing decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools? ...................
   ......................................................................................................................
   ......................................................................................................................
   ......................................................................................................................

17. How can the above challenges be overcome to improve efficiency and effectiveness in managing decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC in public primary schools in the County? .................................................................
   ......................................................................................................................
   ......................................................................................................................
   ......................................................................................................................

18. Any other relevant information? .................................................................
   ......................................................................................................................
   ......................................................................................................................
   ......................................................................................................................

MANY THANKS
APPENDIX II

HEAD TEACHER’S QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire aims at obtaining information on the effectiveness of Managing decentralization of Teaching and Learning by the TSC in public primary schools in Mombasa District. The key issues are; how decentralization is perceived, its effectiveness on teaching and learning, benefits and challenges of decentralization of management services by TSC.

Please do not write your name or the name of your school on this questionnaire. Please give your precise and honest answers. The responses will be treated as confidential

SECTION A: Personal and Contextual Information

Tick ✓ as appropriate where required

1. Gender
   - Male [ ]
   - Female [ ]

2. Age
   - 25-30 [ ]
   - 31-35 [ ]
   - 36-40 [ ]
   - 41-45 [ ]
   - 46-50 [ ]
   - 51 and above [ ]

3. Academic qualification
   - P1 [ ]
   - Diploma in Education [ ]
   - BED [ ]
   - MED [ ]
   - Other specify ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

4. Experience
   - Less than 5 years [ ]
   - 5-10 [ ]
   - More than 10 years [ ]

5. Does the school have the following:
   - Bursar/Accounts Clerk [ ]
   - Storekeeper [ ]
   - Watchman [ ]

6. What do you suggest as the head teachers should be done to improve teaching and learning in schools by TSC?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..
SECTION B: Benefits of Decentralization of Management of Teaching & Learning by TSC

Tick √ as appropriate where applicable

7. What are the benefits of decentralization in education?

- Enhances greater local responsibility and involvement and ownership
- The lower level structures feel part of the action and hence guards and contributes to the envisaged goals both morally and materially. [ ]
- Enhances accountability as the structures such as the schools account to the service recipients [ ]
- By bringing services closer to the people administrative and transactional costs are reduced. This is because service seekers do not have to travel to the center for services and bureaucracy is reduced [ ]
- Risks are spread to various level structures [ ]
- The central authority is left with the responsibilities of policy formulation, providing direction and monitoring and evaluation
- The lower structures concentrate on day to day routine management and administration [ ]

SECTION C: Perception of Head teachers on Benefits of Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by TSC

The following table has been itemized in perceptions on managing decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased management efficiency and service delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved teaching and learning in public primary schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped to solve the staffing problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved teachers absenteeism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped to solve teachers discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved supervision and accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kindly tick in the space provided according to your agreement level

Key:  SA=Strongly Agree  A=Agree  D=Disagree  SD=Strongly Disagree  NS= Not Sure
Section D Operational challenges facing Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in managing decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools.

8. What are the operational challenges facing TSC in managing decentralization of teaching and learning in public primary schools?

9. In your view how can these challenges be overcome?

10. How effective are the School Management Committees (SMC) in the management of decentralization of teaching and learning by TSC in your school?

   Very Effective [ ]  Effective [ ]  Moderate [ ]
   Not Effective [ ]

   Give reasons for your answer above

11. What is the tendering process in your school?

12. Do you receive any support from the County Public Works Officer when doing construction?

13. Do the procurement committees have the capacity to undertake their responsibilities?
APPENDIX III

TEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire aims at obtaining information on the effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by the TSC in public primary schools in Mombasa District. The key issues are; how decentralization is perceived, effectiveness on teaching and learning, benefits and challenges of decentralization of management services by TSC.

Please do not write your name or the name of your school on this questionnaire. Please give your precise and honest answers. The responses will be treated as confidential.

SECTION A: Personal and Contextual Information

Tick ✓ as appropriate where required

1. Gender
   Male [ ]
   Female [ ]

2. Age
   25-30 [ ]
   31-35 [ ]
   36-40 [ ]
   41-45 [ ]
   46-50 [ ]
   51 and above [ ]

3. Academic qualification
   P1 [ ]
   Diploma in Education [ ]
   BED [ ]
   MED [ ]
   Other specify ...................................................................................................................

4. Experience
   Less than 5 years [ ]
   5-10 [ ]
   More than 10 years [ ]

5. How often are teachers involved in making decision in school improvement?
   Very often [ ]
   Often [ ]
   Rarely [ ]
   Not at all [ ]
**Section B: Job Satisfaction**

6. Are you satisfied with your job as a teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kindly give reasons for your answer above.................................................................

.................................................................

7. Are you satisfied by the effectiveness in which TSC is managing decentralization of teaching and learning in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kindly give reasons for your answer above.................................................................

.................................................................

8. The following are the perceived factors influencing effectiveness of managing decentralization of teaching and learning by Teachers Service Commission (TSC) in public primary schools.

**Kindly answer appropriately.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective supervision being done by the TSC agents in your school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent assessment on the teaching pedagogy done by TSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding and promotion opportunity by the TSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of the TSC on the conducive work environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity available for the teachers to advance professionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness in recognizing teachers effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** SA=Strongly Agree  A=Agree  D=Disagree  SD=Strongly Disagree  NS= Not Sure
## APENDIX IV

### RESEARCH SCHEDULE/WORK SHEET


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification or research topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting research proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing research instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal presentation and correction of proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APENDIX V**

**RESEARCH BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Rate (Kshs)</th>
<th>Cost (Kshs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>Purchase of lap-top for research project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>Upkeep cost and expenses in Kenyatta University</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>Travelling allowances during data collection procedure</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td>Typesetting and printing proposal</td>
<td>60pgs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v)</td>
<td>Typesetting and printing project</td>
<td>65pgs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi)</td>
<td>Photocopying project (4items)</td>
<td>100pgs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii)</td>
<td>Binding Proposal and project</td>
<td>6copies</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viii)</td>
<td>Photocopying proposal (3items)</td>
<td>60pgs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ix)</td>
<td>Document wallet</td>
<td>3pieces</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>56,580</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VI
MAP OF MOMBASA COUNTY

Fact file
Data of independence – 12 December 1963
Capital city – Nairobi
Number of counties – 47
Area – 591,958 km²
Highest peak – Mount Kenya 5,199m

Key: Counties
International boundary
Counties/Provinces
Capital city
Main town
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APPENDIX VII

APPROVAL OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL

E-mail: dean-graduate@ku.ac.ke
Website: www.ku.ac.ke

FROM: Dean, Graduate School
TO: Edward Otieno Okuya
     C/o Educational Management Policy &
     Curriculum Studies

DATE: 11th August, 2015
REF: E55/MSA/CE/24306/2013

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL

We acknowledge receipt of your revised Research Proposal as per our recommendations raised by the Graduate School Board of 29th July, 2015.

You may now proceed with your Data Collection, subject to clearance with Director General, National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation.

As you embark on your data collection, please note that you will be required to submit to Graduate School completed Supervision Tracking Forms per semester. The form has been developed to replace the Progress Report Forms. The Supervision Tracking Forms are available at the University’s Website under Graduate School webpage downloads.

Thank you.

DAVID NJOROGOE
FOR: DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL

11 AUG 2015

cc. Chairman, Department of Educational Management Policy and Curriculum Studies

Supervisors:

1. Dr. Daniel Mange
   C/o Department of Educational Management Policy and Curriculum Studies
   Kenyatta University

2. Dr. Mary Otieno
   C/o Department of Educational Management Policy and Curriculum Studies
   Kenyatta University

DNN/ewm
Our Ref: E55/MSA/CE/24306/2013

DATE: 11th August, 2015

Director General,
National Commission for Science, Technology
and Innovation
P.O. Box 30623-00100
NAIROBI

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION EDWARD OTIENO OBUYA – REG.
NO.E55/MSA/CE/24306/2013

I write to introduce Mr. Edward Otieno Obuya who is a Postgraduate Student of this University. He is registered for M.Ed degree programme in the Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies.

Mr. Obuya intends to conduct research for a M.Ed project proposal entitled, “Effectiveness of Managing Decentralization of Teachers’ Salaries by Teachers’ Service Commission in Public Primary Schools in Mombasa County”.

Any assistance given will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

MRS. LUCY N. MBAABU
FOR: DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL

INM/rom
APPENDIX IX

AUTHORIZATION LETTER FROM COUNTY DIRECTOR

Republic of Kenya
Ministry of Education, Science and Technology
State Department of Education

Telephone: Mombasa 2315271
229062
When replying please quote
Email: dpc0905@yahoo.com

Ref.No: MC/ED/GEN/23/5/VOL.III

Date: 16th August, 2015

The Head teachers
Mombasa district

AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT A RESEARCH: EDWARD OTIENO OBUYA REG.
NO. ESS/M3A/CE/24306/2014

This is to confirm that Mr. Edward Otieno Obuya, a post graduate student at
Kenyatta University has been authorized to carry out research on
"Effectiveness of Managing Decentralization of Teaching and Learning by Teachers’ Service Commission in Public Primary Schools in
Mombasa County, Kenya" at your school up to October, 2015.

He is expected to conduct the programme without interfering with the normal
school routine and he is expected to furnish this office with a copy of the research
work upon completion.

Please accord him the necessary co-operation.

NEWTON E. OKWATSA
FOR: COUNTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
MOMBASA

Copy to: The Sub county Director of Education
Mombasa

Dean, Graduate school K.U.