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ABSTRACT

Teachers’ participation in the management of change has been highlighted as a significant contributor to teacher motivation. The purpose of this study was to establish the level of teachers’ participation in management of school change in the secondary schools and its effect on teachers’ motivation. The objectives of the study were to establish: the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction on their motivation, the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of physical facilities on their motivation, the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers motivation, the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of school-community partnership on teachers’ motivation and the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of school financial resources on teachers’ motivation. The study was anchored on Change Management Model and Hertzberg Motivation Theory. The study used correlation design. Proportional stratified random sampling technique was used to select a sample size of 403 respondents comprising of 58 principals and 345 teachers. Data were collected using questionnaires for teachers and principals and self-administered check list. The study used Quantitative statistics. Means were computed to compare the teachers’ and principles opinions on the level of teachers’ participation in management of change. Mean of below 2.00 was considered low level, mean between 2 to 3.5 was moderate whereas as mean above 3.5 was regarded high level. Simple and multiple Regressions was used to establish the effect of teachers’ level of participation in the management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, school-community partnership and financial resources on teachers’ motivation. The study established that teacher were at different levels of participation in the five areas of school management (means were between 2.00 and 5.0). In objective one, the study revealed that teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction had a statistical significant effect on their motivation (β= .28, p-value< .01). In objective two, the study showed a statistical significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in the management of physical facilities and their motivation (β= .399, p-value< .01). For the third objective, it was found that teachers’ level of participation in the management of students’ and teachers’ activities had a statistical significant effect on teachers’ motivation (β= .652, P-value< .01). In the fourth objective, the study established that teachers’ level of participation in the management of school community-relations significantly affected their motivation (β = .641, p-value< .01). For the fifth objective, it was found that teachers’ level of participation in management of school finances had a statistical significant effect on teachers’ motivation (β = .35, p-value< .01). It was concluded that teachers’ level of participation in the management of the five task areas of school management was a positive determinant of teachers’ motivation. It was recommended that schools embrace participatory structures that encourage high levels of teachers’ participation in management of change in order to increase their motivation. The study recommended sensitization of school principals and other stakeholders on the need for teachers’ participation in management of school change through their conferences workshops.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

This Chapter focuses on background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives and research questions, significance of the study, limitations, delimitation, assumptions, theoretical frame work and conceptual framework.

1.2 Background to the Study

Teachers’ motivation has been viewed as an outstanding factor that contributes to employee performance (Matoke, Okibo, and Nyamongo, 2015). A study by Mazandarani and Abedini (2015) revealed a positive relationship between participation in management of school change and teachers’ motivation. They argued that participation in management of school change boosted teachers’ motivation and helped them to identify with their institutions because they felt recognized. According to Vanbaren (2010) teacher motivation is a process of stimulating teachers’ desire and energy to perform their jobs effectively. Muindi (2011) defined teachers’ participation as direct engagement in consultations and resolutions relating to their immediate work. Other studies show that teachers’ participation in management of change was not only a motivation strategy but also a community agenda (Sarafidou, Chatziioannidis (2013); Gardinier (2012); Ali, (2011). Beardwell and Claydon (2007); and Mualuko, Mukasa, and Achola (2009); Mohammed (2011) argued that school principals needed to focus on making use of teachers’ suggestions as well as securing their motivation. They stated that most of the decisions in schools were made by management authorities without teachers’ involvement.
According to Millet (2010); Akinfolarin 2015; Mazandarani and Mahnoosh, 2015; teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ and school community partnership led to productivity, innovation, minimal absenteeism, commitment and quality work. Millet (2010) states that lack of teachers’ motivation led to lack of commitment and motivation among the teachers. In Australia, Mulford (2010) argued that teachers’ participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities had a direct relationship with motivation, authority, autonomy, and commitment to duty. However, in Singapore, Squire (2007) established a negative relationship between teachers’ participation in management of students’ and staff activities and motivation.

In Eastern Europe, Gardinier (2012) observed that the Albanian educational policy adopted democratic and competency-based curriculum which embraced high level of teachers’ participation in management of teachers’ and students’ activities. These models viewed students as self-determined, autonomous and independent who would later succeed in democratic governance as well as worldwide economy. Teachers were portrayed as stable information-based workers who would be apprised through their participation in transforming schools. Cheng maintained that teachers participated in school management as team leaders, change agents, counselors and curriculum developers.

Curriculum change implemented internationally was politically initiated with little participation of teachers (Fullan, 2007). Nations of Latin America were not exempted from worldwide calls for education change through teachers’ participation (Bradley, Janet & Valerie, 2013). They argued that in Mexico, Reforma de la Educacion Secundaria (RES) (Education reforms in secondary schools) investigated the level of
teachers’ participation in managing curriculum and instruction. The findings revealed that in spite of efforts to provide transparency and opportunities for participation in curriculum and instruction, most secondary teachers only participated in the implementation phase. According to Millet (2010), teachers’ were not motivated to fully participate in management of school change.

In Israel, Somech (2010) argued that teachers did not participate fully in management of school community partnership, and physical and material resources. He added that teachers’ did not take part in change relating to various allowances such as housing, health band travel which were critical issues in relation to their motivation. Somech (2010) further argued that teachers’ participation in budget preparation generated a feeling of ownership, efficiency and organizational commitment. Further, Somech asserted that teachers’ partnership with parents and sponsors was designed to provide adequate physical and material resources for instructional purpose. Somech states that lack of motivation among teachers was as a result of poor management styles since school principals involved teachers mostly in students’ activities compared to other aspects of management.

In Southeast Asia’s most rapidly developing nations, Singapore’s schools adopted a new mission, seeing schools as learning societies, which emphasized the connection between teachers’ and the local community partnership (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone, 2006). Carson and Chase (2009) argued that work conflicts, poor management styles, inadequate career opportunities, lack of skills and autonomy were some of the reasons for low level motivation among teachers. Further, Mazandarani and Mahnoosh (2015) stated that teachers’ participation in decision making created a sense of belonging. They observed that the consequence of management styles that
had consistently sidelined teachers from participation in issues affecting them directly had significant affects commitment and motivation. Equally, World Bank (2007) observed a challenge in increasing self-esteem and inspiring teachers in the profession due to poor management styles.

In South Africa, Swanepoel (2009) revealed that teachers’ participation in management of change relating teachers activities comprised of facilitating and coordinating staff recruitment, selection, induction and orientation and advising on specific departmental needs. He added that teachers’ participation in managing students’ activities involved organizing curriculum activities, discipline, students’ leadership, guidance and counseling and extracurricular activities. In a comparative study of educational institutions across the continents, Swanepoel and Booyse (2006) established that effective outcomes of change occurred when teachers participated at the highest level in management of students of students disciplinary activities. Swanepoel (2009) stated that teachers’ participation in management of school finances comprised of preparing and revising school budget, taking control measures and coordinating school development projects. However, Swanepoel and Booyse (2006) observed that most teachers were not motivated in teaching profession. Similarly, De Klerk Foundation (2012) reported lack of teachers’ motivation as the cause of South Africa’s problems as manifested in forms of unemployment, poverty and inequality. Teachers’ participation fought centralized systems and had been associated with school decentralization (Cheng, 2008).

participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities was not only of utmost importance in receiving, considering, and executing change, but also in quality decisions. Specifically, Ikediugwu (2007); Ofojebe and Ezugoh (2010) observed that truancy, vandalism, burning of schools, strikes and destruction of property was as a product of teachers’ contribution in management of students’ and teachers’ activities. Further, Omobude and Igbudu (2012) argued that policy makers spend a lot of time and money on consultations in relation to school change, yet teachers were capable of providing the same information. Similarly, Bennel and Akyeampong (2007); Ndu and Anogbov (2007) observed that lack of teachers’ participation in students’ and teachers’ activities led to absenteeism, poor time management, poor pedagogical practices and engagement in income-generating activities due to poor management styles.

In Zimbabwe, Wadesango (2013) identified the following indicators of lack of motivation: poor attendance, poor time management, absenteeism, occurrence of hold-ups because of not meeting the deadlines, lack of professional skills and negative attitude to work. Farther, in Zimbabwe, debates on control of activities at the central level and transfer of authority to the low level led to change agendas to increase participation (World Bank, 2007). Wadesango (2013) revealed that teachers with low motivation tended to spend most of their time working out modalities on how best to secure satisfying engagement. In Tanzania, Kitila (2012) found that teachers’ loyalty to the teaching career was shockingly low with the majority of them indicating that they were compelled to teaching because it was easy to get the job because they did not meet the basic requirement for other professions.
The Republic of Kenya, Sessional Paper No.12 (2013), Kenya Policy Framework for Education and Training (PFET) indicates governments' commitment in provision of quality education through partnership with stakeholders. Further, the role of Board of managers (BoMs) as stipulated in the basic education Act (2013) was to encourage partnership and participatory governance. Similarly, the aim of the Kenya Vision (2030) was to make Kenya globally competitive by transforming it into industrialized and middle income country through provision of competency-based curriculum, Republic of Kenya, Sessional Paper No.12 (2013). This development could only be achieved through partnership between the government, management bodies, teachers associations and local communities (Vision Kenya, 2030). Also, Majanga, Nasongo and Sylvia (2010) argued that introduction of Free Secondary Education created challenges of increased class sizes, inadequate teachers and increased work load which affected teachers’ motivation.

The foregoing discussion shows that teachers’ participation in the management of curriculum and instructional management, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, community partnerships and finances was an avenue to enhance teachers’ motivation. However, Mncube, (2007); Wadesango, (2013); Mazandarani & Abedini (2015); Mualuko, Mukasa, and Achola (2009); Momanyi (2015); Ireri, (2015) report little or none participation of teachers in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, school-community partnership and financial resources in Kiambu, Machakos and Kajiado secondary schools. The paucity of such literature and teachers outcry on how they are neglected by the school management in decision making forms the basis of this study. The study therefore sought to answer the following question “Does teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and
instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, community partnership and school finances affect teachers’ motivation in Kajiado, Kiambu and Machakos Counties in Kenya? This was done by use of a correlation design with the aim of establishing the real status quo of teachers’ level of participation in management of change and its effects of their motivation.

1.3 Statement to the Problem

Many studies shows that teachers’ participation in the management of change in curriculum and instructional, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, community partnership and finances was an avenue to enhance teachers’ motivation, Wadesango (2015). However, in Kenya, the education system places school management in a position to make all major decisions with little participation of teachers (Republic of Kenya, Basic Education Act, 2012; Mualuko, Mukasa, and Achola (2009). Recommendations have been made and implemented. However, teachers’ motivation has continued to be low, Momanyi (2015); Ireri (2015); Ali, Naeimeh, Javad, Hatam (2015); Mualuko, Mukasa, and Achola (2009). Probably the neglect and the outcry of teachers’ lack of participation leads to the lack of low motivation which is manifested in form of absenteeism, technical appearances, high turnover, lack of commitment, poor time management, poor performance in national examinations, strikes and destruction of property. The study therefore sought to answer the following question “Does the teachers level of participation in management of curriculum and instructional, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, community partnership and finances affect teachers’ motivation in Kajiado, Kiambu and Machakos Counties in Kenya?
1.4 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to establish the relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, school community partnership and school finances on teachers’ motivation in public secondary schools in Machakos, Kiambu and Kajiado counties in Kenya.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The study aimed at meeting the following objectives:

i) To establish the relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction on teachers’ motivation in secondary schools.

ii) To establish the relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources on teachers’ motivation in secondary schools.

iii) To establish the relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation in secondary schools.

iv) To establish the relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of school community partnership and teachers’ motivation in secondary schools.

v) To establish the relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of school finance and teachers’ motivation in secondary schools.
1.6 Hypothesis

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction on teachers’ motivation in secondary schools.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources on teachers’ motivation in secondary schools.

H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation in secondary schools.

H₀₄: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of community-partnership on teachers’ motivation in secondary schools.

H₀₅: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of school finance on teachers’ motivation in secondary schools.

1.7 Assumptions of the Study

The study was carried out on the basis of the assumption that the teachers’ level of participation increases or decreases teachers’ level of motivation. The researcher also assumed that the respondents answered the questions correctly and truthfully to demonstrate the level of teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, community partnership and school finances on teachers’ motivation.
1.8 Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

1.8.1 Limitations of the Study

Clerk (2009) argued that limitations refer to those characteristics of design which set parameters on the application or interpretation of results. Some of the respondents found it hard to spare time to respond to the questionnaire due to tight schedule and negative attitudes which was frustrating. The researcher encountered financial and time constrains as most schools in the sample size were wide spread across the counties. However, the researcher lobbied financial assistance to solve financial challenge. The researcher persuaded the respondents to find time to fill the questionnaire and also research assistances followed the respondents persistently until most of questionnaires were returned.

1.8.2 Delimitations of the Study

The study was concerned with the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, community partnership and school finances on teachers’ motivation in public secondary schools in Kiambu, Kajiado, and Machakos. The sample size was selected on the basis of Girls, Boys and Mixed secondary schools. The study considered only the views of principals and teachers in the selected schools counties. Due to time and financial constraints, the study left out the opinions of other stakeholders such as the Parent Teacher Associations (PTA), Board of managers (BOMs), support staff, and County educational officials. The findings of the study should therefore be generalized with caution as the opinion of these stakeholders may have a bearing on teachers’ participation in school management and teachers motivation in the three counties. Data was collected from a small sample of 58 secondary principals and 341
teachers using proportional stratified random sampling techniques. The study used correlation design, questionnaires and data was analyzed using regression analysis.

1.9 Significance of the Study

The finding of this study may be utilized by various educational stakeholders. For instance, the study may create awareness and understanding among the school principals on the importance of engaging teachers in management of school change. The Ministry of Education may use the findings to formulate policies that would ensure that all teachers are involved in the management of school through participatory decision making. The teachers Service Commission who are the employers of the teachers may use the findings to encourage principals of the schools to ensure that when making critical decision of the school teachers are involved. The Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QASOs) may use the findings to develop evaluation tools that would ensure that teachers are involved in decision making of schools management chance. Teachers may use the findings to redefine their role in participative management especially in improving school discipline, students’ grades and performance of duties. It may also provide important information to KEMI in strengthening managers’ and administrators training programs. Finally, the study may serve as a springboard from which further research may be conducted in relation to various aspects of school management.

1.10 Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by Kurt Lewin change management model (1951) in Stephen, Todd and Kenneth (2015). This study was guided by a 3-step process (Unfreeze-Change-Freeze) which provides a new approach to change. It gave change agents a framework to implement change efforts. Unfreeze was the diagnostic stage which involves identifying the status quo and breaking through before building up new ways
of operation. Unfreezing was dissatisfaction with the present existing practices. Moving to the new state required identifying the resisting and the driving forces thus reducing the impediments while enhancing driving forces. Using the analogy of a building one examined the preparedness of change, the existing foundations as they might not support add-on otherwise the building could collapse. However, the transition did not happen overnight as some took much longer time to recognize the benefits. Unfortunately, some individuals would be harmed by change particularly those who benefited strongly from the status quo.

After the change has been put into operation, a process of refreezing (consolidation) became necessary. The signs of refreeze included a stable organization, consistent job descriptions, new roles, new organization structure, new work methods, constructive amendments. The refreeze stage helped employees and organizations to institutionalize change. With a new sense of stability, they would be confident and comfortable with the new ways of working. Care would be taken to avoid getting caught up in a transition trap where nothing ever got done to full capacity. The Lewin’s theory has been criticized by several scholars, for instance Dawson, (1994); Dent & Goldberg, (1999) Kanter et al., (1992) argued that the theory was outdated, unfashionable and simplistic. Others argued that Lewin’s perspective to change was too mechanistic and therefore not suitable for open-systems that were subject to unknown and unstable conditions (Dawson, 1994; Kanter et al., 1992).

Despite the criticism, some scholars supported the theory by advancing that the theory was more relevant to incremental models which were frequent occurrences in Australian local government (Dawson, (1994). Lewin’s contribution in describing individual and group conduct during the change undertakings was still relevant in
local government context (Burnes, 2004a). The model was also considered to be more applicable to county schools that were based on conservative top-down management-driven approaches, with segmented, small units and slow change timelines. Therefore, Lewin’s (1951) model was suitable for top-down management, which was similar to the change management perspective employed in city schools (Dawson, 1994; Kanter et al., 1992; Wilson, 1992).

For this study, the model was considered suitable because schools in Kenya used top-down management styles. This was as evidenced in the Basic Education Act, (2012) which indicated that the education system in Kenya placed school principals in a position to make all major decisions with little participation of teachers. Mualuko, Mukasa, and Achola (2009) observed that most school principals often applied non-participatory management styles which had effects on teachers’ participation in management of school change on their motivation. Consequently, school principals were enjoying monopoly of managing schools while teachers felt demoralized at work.

Herzeberg Motivation Hygiene Theory (Herzeberg, Mouser & Snyderammn, 1959) elaborates the factors that caused satisfaction and dissatisfaction among the workers. The theory was later used by, for example, Tan and Waheed (2011) to elaborate on factors which lead to motivation and demotivation of the workers. According to Herzeberg, Mouser and Snyderammn (1959) factors that produced satisfaction were very different from those leading to dissatisfaction. One concern could produce satisfaction but the absence of it would not necessarily produce dissatisfaction. They identified extrinsic and extrinsic factors. The intrinsic factors were the motivators while the hygiene factors (extrinsic) were the organizational policies in relation to
appraisal, rules and regulations, working hours, schedules, remunerations, physical conditions, and security. These extrinsic factors (motivators) caused workers to be dissatisfied while their presence consequently failed to increase job performance. But motivators made workers to work hard and they were associated with the physical environment, interpersonal relationships, supervisors and technology. They also included achievement, recognition, work-itself, responsibility, and growth or advancement. They were based on a persons’ view point towards the organization and profession.

Kurt Lewin dealt with change and stated that change as a motivator was inevitable. This change could either be from within or from outside. Externally, the Teachers Service Commission (TSC), Ministry of Education (MoE), Bill of Rights, Kenya Vision (2030). From within, there was need to set a social environment where teachers saw their personal needs as being satisfied for motivational purposes. If these personal needs were satisfied, it would promote teachers’ self-esteem and motivation which then leads to job satisfaction. Change itself was a motivator and therefore the Kurt Lewin model and Herzerberg theory complemented each other. This study contended that school administrators and managers would focus on maximizing production and performance while at the same time ensuring that teachers’ concerns were catered for in an attempt to achieve the institutional goals. Hence, school management practices emphasized on the teachers’ level of participation in the management of change and its effects on teacher motivation.

1.11 Conceptual Framework

This study sought to investigate teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’
activities, school community partnership, finances and its effects on teachers’ motivation. The conceptual framework shown in Figure 1.1 illustrates the relationship between the independent variable (teachers’ level of participation in management of change) and the dependent variable (teachers’ motivation).
Intervening variables

Figure 1.1: Conceptual framework of teachers’ level of participation in management of change and teacher motivation

Source: Researcher (2017)
As shown above, the independent variables in this study are teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, school community partnership and finances. Teachers’ participation was expected to influence teachers’ motivation. This means that teachers’ motivation would depend on teachers’ level of participation in the management of change. If this was to happen, teachers would become more motivated to participate in school change.

Variables and their Relationship

Management of Curriculum and instruction and Motivation

The teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction entails teaching and developing materials, setting and administration of exams at the school level. This study therefore sought to establish whether the teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction influences their motivation. The indicators for participation in management of curriculum include teaching and developing materials, setting and supervision of exams and curriculum implementation. This implies that the more the teachers are involved in such activities that more they get motivated to work more. The motivation would lead to reduced absenteeism and improvement in the choice of teaching techniques hence quality grades as well as creativity. Teacher teachers’ motivation would be manifested in form of creativity, good time management, new knowledge and skills, efficiency and effectiveness and quality teaching. Therefore, the level of teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction acted as the control variable in this study. This means that change in participation in management of curriculum and instruction
leads to change in motivation. However, teachers’ unions and government policy did not interfere with teachers’ level of participation in management of school change.

**Management of Physical and Material Resources and Motivation**

The teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources entails requisition of materials and management of infrastructures such as laboratories, classrooms, toilets, sanitation, water sources and offices among others as well as material resources like textbooks, chemicals, tools and equipment, teaching aids. This means that the more teachers participate in management of physical and material resources the more they became motivated. This may lead to low level of absenteeism, increased creativity and good time management because of good facilities which provide favorable environment for work.

**Management of School Community Partnership and Motivation**

The teachers’ participation in management of school community partnership involves listening to community sentiments, building team-work, establishing linkages between the school and local community, collaboration in setting goals, sourcing funds for infrastructure development, promoting good relationships between the school, sponsors, parents and the local community, liaising with parents/guardians over students difficulties, organizing the school in local community activities like tree planting/charity walks and facilitating research activities. Teachers’ loyalty to school community partnership leads to reduced absenteeism and improvement in dealings with parents and the local community. Thus teachers’ motivation would be manifested in form of creativity, efficiency and effectiveness in dealing with parents and the community. Therefore, the level of teachers’ participation in management of school
community partnership acted as the control variable in this study. This means that participation in management of school community leads to change in motivation.

Management of Students’ and Teachers’ Activities and Motivation

The teachers’ participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities entails teacher empowerment in decision relating to their welfare such as professional growth and development, performance appraisal and conflict management. Other activities relates to student achievement, subject selection, guidance and counseling, and discipline. Teacher teachers’ motivation would be manifested in form of creativity, improved grades, good time management, professional development, new knowledge and skills, good interpersonal relationships and quality teaching. Therefore, the level of teachers’ participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities acted as the control variable in this study. This means that positive participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities leads to change in motivation. This implies that the more the teacher are involved more they feel recognize and appreciated which would lead to self-efficacy, autonomy, efficiency and discipline among students and teachers. Thus participation promoted teachers’ morale and motivation, job satisfaction, responsibility and commitment to organizational effectiveness.

Management of School Finances and Motivation

Teachers’ participation in the management of school finances comprises of budget preparation and advising on the specific departmental needs, cash flow and expenditure, allocation of resources to departments, tendering process, procurement and accounting. It also involves fundraising committees, organizing school trips, parties, exhibitions and competitions. Therefore, the level of teachers’ participation in
management of school finances was considered as a control variable in this study. This means that high level of participation in management of school finances activities leads to change in motivation. Thus participation in management of school finances promoted teachers’ motivation, job satisfaction, responsibility and commitment to organizational effectiveness. This implies that teachers’ participation in financial activities may lead to trust and commitment which leads to motivation. This means that participation in management of financial activities would therefore led to use of expertise, increased levels of job satisfaction and low turnover rates.

1.12 Operational Definition of Key Terms

Management of change - refers to all the initiatives that are aimed towards school improvement in relation to curricular activities, physical facilities, students’ and teachers’ activities, school community relations and finances.

Teacher motivation - the drive that starts and maintain the teachers’ work related behaviors towards performance of duties.

Teacher participation - The degree of involvement in management of five areas

Level of participation - Means of <2 (is considered low level), Mean between 2.5 to 3.5 (moderate level) and Mean 3.5 to 5 (high level)

Curriculum and instruction - Curriculum implementation at the school level involves teaching and developing materials, setting and supervision of exam, moderate and reporting.

Physical facilities - Comprises of infrastructures, equipment, and material resources
Students’ and teachers’ activities - Includes recruitment selection process, orientation and induction, training; appraisal, remuneration and discipline.

Community-partnership - Involves collaboration or partnership between school community developments for development purposes.

School Finances - Involves budget preparation, sources of income, expenditure, control and budget review.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction
This chapter gives a summary of literature review used that has been used to conceptualize the study. It presents the review of research that has been done in Kenya and other parts of the world on teachers’ participation in management of curriculum activities, physical facilities, students’ and teachers’ activities, school community partnership and finance and on teachers’ motivation. The literature is organized according to the objectives of this study.

2.2 Concepts of teachers’ Participation and Motivation
Teachers’ participation in management of school change is a crucial element educational system. According to Wadesago (2011) teachers’ participation refers to their involvement in decision making relating to various aspects of school management. Muindi (2011) defines teachers’ participation as direct involvement of teachers in issues affecting their immediate work. According to Goksoy (2014) and Wadesango (2012) participation in decision making led to positive interpersonal communication, quality decisions and positive work environment which attracted and retain quality teachers. Further, Goksoy (2014) argued that participation in school change played a significant role in developing commitment and achievement of organizational goals thereby decreasing resistance to change. According to Gardian and Rathore (2010); and Algoush (2010), teachers’ participation in decisions relating to school change was an important aspect in creating trust as well as acquisition of new knowledge and skills.
2.3 Teachers’ Participation in the Management of Curriculum and Instruction on Teachers’ Motivation

Motivation is an important factor which influences productivity and students academic achievement (Matoke, Okibo, and Nyamongo, 2015; Somech, 2010). According to Bennell & Akyeampong (2007) there was a close relationship between teachers’ participation in the management of curriculum and instruction and teachers’ motivation. Other studies revealed the importance of teachers’ participation in managing curriculum and instruction (World Bank, 2008; Handler, 2010; Cheng, 2008) and teacher’s motivation (Pryor, Westbrook ad Lustier 2012). A study by Okeke (2004) revealed that social-economic development in most countries was a reflection of the type of its curriculum and teachers. This is because teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction facilitated students’ access to quality education as well as equality (Wadesango and Bayaga, 2013). Wadesango (2012) argued that teachers’ participation in decision making was not only important to achievement of educational goals but it also made teachers feel respected and empowered. Further, Lou (2007) states that lack of motivation leads to burn out, pessimism and lack of initiative when it comes to pedagogical practice. In addition, Handler (2010) revealed that majority of teachers were lacked the necessary pedagogical skills and motivation to successfully implement curricular activities.

Mavrou and Meletiou (2013) conducted a study on how to bridge the gap between participation in pedagogy by exploiting digital simulations. The sample comprised of undergraduate students in the universities and high school teachers using simulation method. The findings revealed that simulations had great potential on reality learning contexts, learner-centered and inquiry-based pedagogical models in a safe environment. However, the study by Mavrou and Meletiou did not focus on the
effects of teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction on teachers’ motivation which is the purpose of this study.

In China, Selingo (2015) argued that most teachers lacked technological skills for ICT integration in teaching and learning. The traditional teacher exaggerated the theoretical and pedagogical knowledge with due to lack limited knowledge and skills in classrooms (Andreasen & Haciomeroglu, 2009; Oonk, 2009; Zhang, 2009). Similarly, Valliamah, Khadijah, and Subramanian (2016) carried a study on instructional leadership and teachers’ commitment. The sample consisted of 111 participants using quantitative approach. The reliability for the instrument was 0.95. The results revealed that teachers’ participation in formulating instructional objectives, supervising, evaluating, coordinating and time management had direct relationship with motivation. However, the study did not show the effect of relationship and the qualitative approach was not quantified. This is the aspect which was addressed by this study where by a regression was done to establish the relationship between teachers participation in management of curriculum and instruction on teachers’ motivation in order to provide a detailed information on the level of effect.

In Hong Kong, Cheng (2008) conducted a study on the effect of shared decision-making on teachers’ job development in secondary schools using structural equation model. The purpose of the study was to establish the relationship between teacher participation in decision-making and their affective outcome for developing a participatory decision model in relation to different domains. Instructional activities comprised of leaning objectives, selection of teaching-learning resources, examination rules and regulations, and instructional design and the affective outcome were job
satisfaction, job commitment and perception of workload. The study used 335 participants. Data was analyzed using chi square. The results showed significant statistical significance on the overall model, $\chi^2 (140.39, \ N=120)$, $P< 0.09840$. All the affective outcomes were related to the form and extent of teachers’ participation in decision-making. The study recommended the school administrators to encourage teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction in order to increase job satisfaction and greater commitment. This sturdy by Cheng (2008) used chi square to establish the effect of shared decision-making on teachers’ job development but the current study used regression to establish the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction on teachers’ motivation.

Similarly, Samira, Hossa, Konstantinos, and Marios (2015) carried a study on participative decision-making and job satisfaction for teachers in the UAE. The purpose was to examine whether there was any significant differences between teachers’ participation in decision making and job satisfaction by genders, type of school and nationality. Participation in decision making comprised of planning lesson plans, developing assessment tools, classroom management and preparing students’ progress reports. Motivation was manifested in form of ability to meet the students’ emotional needs and opportunities to discuss challenges with the supervisors. The findings indicate that teachers’ participation in decision making and job satisfaction differed by gender, and nationality, but there was no significant statistical difference between teacher’s job satisfactions by school type. The study by Samira et., al. (2015) focused on teachers’ participation in decision making and job satisfaction by genders, type of school and nationality did not show the weight and direction of the
relationship. However this study focused on teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction on motivation by indicating the weight.

Gardinier (2012) carried out a study of the pivotal role of teachers in Albanian educational reform and democratization. Teachers’ role comprised of discipline management, teacher leadership, mediation, mentorship, guidance and counseling and subject knowledge. The findings revealed that teacher selectively adopted reform policies and created hybrid forms of practice. He found that teachers’ participation in curriculum and instruction led to political and social transformation at the national and local level. He described teachers as intermediaries between educational authorities, parents, students and communities. He maintained that the teachers’ role involved localizing the global educational models and responding to these constructions in diverse ways. Apparently, Gardinier focused on the pivotal role of teachers while the current study focused on the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction on motivation.

Aliakbari and Amoli (2016) examined the effect of teacher empowerment on their commitment and student achievement. The study sample comprised of 356 teachers at Payam-e-Noor University using questionnaires. The study used Spearman correlation and cronbach alpha in data analysis. Teacher empowerment involved solving students’ problems, consulting parents and providing guidance and counseling. The findings revealed that professional growth, status, self-efficacy and autonomy played a significant role in teacher commitment and students’ achievement. All subcategories of teacher empowerment were significant (P=.000). He concluded that teachers’ participation in decision making in classroom and instructional decisions enhanced their motivation and students’ overall performance. This study focused on the effect
of teacher empowerment on teachers’ commitment and student achievement by use of correlation which only shows the direction of relationship. However, this current study went a notch higher to establish the effect of the relationship through a regression equation.

In Nigeria, Oluruntegbe, Duyilemi, Agbayewa, Oluwatelure and Omoniyi (2010) examined science teachers’ involvement, commitment and innovativeness in curriculum development and implementation. The sample comprised of 630 secondary school teachers. The study used descriptive. Data was gathered though a questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive statistics. The findings indicate that majority of teachers focused on teaching and preparing students for national examinations rather than the holistic development of learners. He further indicated that teachers were yet to embrace modern strategies and techniques such as computer interactivity and internet resources. The study concluded that teachers often show resistance and lack of commitment to curricular activities. The researcher recommended appropriate structures to be put in place to facilitate teachers’ participation in all stages of curriculum development and implementation. The study on science teachers’ involvement, commitment and innovativeness in curriculum development and implementation used only descriptive approach. This study went further to show the relationship and effect of teachers’ involvement in the management of curriculum and instruction by using inferential statistics.

Duze (2011) investigated on students’ and teachers’ participation in decision-making and it impact on school work and internal discipline. The sample included 3,318 students and 612 teachers. Decision making involved educational visits, communicating and teaching strategies. Data was analyzed using frequency, simple
percentage, mean, t-test, Chi-square and Pearson’s correlation. The findings indicated that irrespective of gender, lack of teachers’ participation had a significant effect on teachers’ motivation and general discipline thus undermining accomplishment of instructional objectives. It was recommended that school administrators should adopt participatory mechanisms that facilitate achievement of institutional goals. The study focused on students’ and teachers’ participation in decision-making and its impact on school work and school internal discipline using t-test, Chi-square and Pearson’s r. However, the current study went a notch higher to establish the effect of teachers’ participation in curriculum activities on motivation using regression analysis.

Wadesango, Mutekwe, Ndofirepi, Maphosa and Machingambi (2015) investigated the involvement of teachers in school-based management in South Africa. Teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction comprised of curriculum interpretation, designing learning programs and materials, teacher leadership and evaluating the learners’ performance. The study adopted a case study design. The findings indicated that most of the decisions were made by the principals and their deputies without taking into consideration the views of teachers. Further, they stated that lack of participation made teachers to be passive and resistant to change. The study recommended participative structures to be put in place in order to avoid regarding teachers as mere recipients of the imposed curriculum. The study on involvement of teachers in school-based management was purely descriptive as it did not look at the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of curricular activities on their motivation which is the purpose of this study.

Bademo and Tafera (2016) carried out a study on the desired and actual levels of teachers’ participation in decision-making in secondary school of Ethiopia. The study
employed a cross-sectional survey design using stratified sampling technique. Participation in decision making comprised of preparing schemes of work, lessons plans, and lesson notes. The researchers concluded that teachers did not participate in decision making and that the efforts made by school administrators to empower teachers were not satisfactory. The findings revealed that teachers had higher desire ($X = 3.90$, $SD = .36$) to participate in managing change related to curriculum and instruction while their actual level of participation was moderate ($X = 3.19$, $SD = .39$). There was a significant statistical difference between teachers’ actual and desired participation in management of curriculum and instruction ($t (151) = 16.5$, $P = .000$).

This study by Bademo and Tafera (2016) focused on the actual and desired levels of teachers’ participation in decision-making while the current study focused on the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction on teachers’ motivation.

Wedesanga and Bayaga (2013) carried out a study on teachers’ involvement in decision making processes in Zimbabwe. The study adopted an interpretive qualitative research methodology and a case study research design. A sample consisted of 251 teachers and five principals. Teachers’ participation in school decision making involved allocating teaching-learning materials, preparing schedules, schemes of work, lesson plans and teaching. The study established that most teachers were not involved in teaching work load allocations and that they did not have the necessary qualifications. It was further revealed that teachers were involved in ordering textbooks and in extra-curricular activities such as sports, entertainment and school trips. Teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction led to a collective understanding of the job and promoted a sense of ownership. The study adopted an interpretive qualitative design using case-study, however, the current study
used correlation design with a view of establishing the strength of the relationship between the teachers’ level of participation in curricular activities and its effect of teachers’ motivation.

In Kenya, Mualuko, Mukasa, & Achoka (2009) investigate the level of teachers’ actual and desired level of participation in decision making. The study used ex-post facto design and split half method to determine the reliability coefficient using the Pearson product formula. Participation comprised daily schedules, preparing schemes of work, lesson plans and sharing workloads. The sample comprised of 123 teachers. And data were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The findings revealed significant difference between the teachers’ actual and desired participation in management of curriculum and instruction. A gap existed as the study used ex-post facto design and split half method to determine the reliability coefficient using the Pearson product formula while the current study used correlation design and cronbach alpha to determine reliability coefficient.

Kiprop and Kandie (2012) investigated teacher participation in curriculum implementation in public secondary schools in Kenya. Curriculum implementation involved preparing teaching learning aids, students’ progress records and procurement of teaching learning materials and equipments. The study used adopted descriptive survey design. The sample comprised 13 principals and 104 teachers were selected using simple random sampling technique. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics. The findings indicate that teachers did not participate in decisions relating to curriculum and instruction as they desired because most principles perceived participatory management negatively. A combination of factors such as witch hunting, victimization, divisions among the teachers, fear and double standards by head
teachers contributed to lack of motivation among teachers. The study Kiprop and Kandie focused on descriptive survey while the current adapted correlation design and regression analysis to determine the direction of relationship and the effect.

Although researchers such as Handler (2010), Oloruntegbe (2011), Cheng (2009), Mavrou and Meletiou (2013); Wadesango, Mutekwe, Ndofirepi, Maphosa and Machingambi (2015); and Mualuko, Mukasa, & Achoka (2009) focused on teachers’ participation in management of curriculum activities, they deviate in the areas of participation. For example, Kiprop and Kandie (2012); Mualuko, Mukasa, & Achoka (2009); Wedesanga and Bayaga (2012); Bademo and Tafera (2016) did not provide a comprehensive and detailed account of the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction and its effects on teachers motivation. Therefore this study sought to investigate the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction on teachers’ motivation in Kiambi, Machakos and Kajiado counties, Kenya.

2.4 Teachers’ Participation in Management of Physical Facilities on teachers’ Motivation

Over the last decade, research shows that the major problem in provision of education has always been attributed to lack of physical and learning resources in school environment. Many schools in developing and developed countries indicate lack of adequate physical and material resources which had detrimental effects on motivation (Olatunji, 2013; Isaiah 2013; Akinfolarin 2015). Vanbaren (2010) defines teacher motivation as a process of encouraging and inspiring teachers to perform their duties effectively. Teacher’s participation in management of physical facilities and material resources was critical aspect because knowledge, skills and values were learned at
school. According to Freeman, Greene, Dreibelbis, Saboori, Muga, Brumback and Rheingans (2011) school facilities and materials comprised of sanitation, hygiene and water reservoirs. They argue that students and teachers in developing countries spend most of their time absent from schools due to diseases contracted within the school environment. The evidence of inadequate facilities suggested the need for greater infrastructural investment in most institutions.

A study by Leithwood & Jantzi (2006) established that teachers’ motivation was associated with positive attitudes, optimistic views, and enthusiasm whereas low motivation was associated with cynicism and feelings of despair. Further, he found that low morale among teachers included poor teaching performance of duties, absenteeism, high turnover and resistance to change.

Duran (2008) examined the influence of availability of infrastructure and its effects on the achievement of educational goals in Zimbabwe. School facilities comprised of classroom, laboratories, toilets waters, libraries, furniture and books. The study used qualitative design. The sample size comprised of 52 respondents. The findings revealed that teachers did not participation in provision of physical and material resources. Further, the study revealed that equipped school provided better experiences and learning opportunities. Apparently, a gap existed, as the study did not shown how teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources affected teacher’s motivation. Thus the current study sought to establish the effect of teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources on teachers, motivation in Kiambu, Machakos and Kajiado Counties. Earthman (2004) argued that building features such as provision of ventilation, lighting, acoustic, design classification and overall impression have effect on teachers’ motivation.
According to Dorman (2008), physical and materials resources comprises of textbooks, laboratories, chemicals, teaching tools and equipment, stores and offices. He reported that factors affecting teachers’ motivation included the nature policies on the use of the physical and material resources and working conditions. Sergiovanni (2009) stated that school managers needed to recognize the importance of teachers’ participation in management of school facilities and material resources. He asserted that effective schools strived to motivate teachers by providing adequate learning resources. A study by Bush, Joubert, Kiggundu and Rooyen (2010) examined the significance of participative management in enhancing instructional and learner outcome in South Africa. The study used case study design. The study revealed that most of the schools lacked teaching-learning materials and teachers were poorly motivated.

Geert, Melissa, and Hulpia (2014), conducted a study on the relationship between principles’ leadership styles and teachers organizational commitment. Data were collected from 1495 teachers in secondary schools. The study used structural equitation model. The findings indicate that the principals’ leadership style as well as teachers’ commitment was as a result of distributed leadership (deputy principal, teacher, participative decision making, and collaboration). The path model revealed satisfactory model fit results $\chi^2 = 231.41$ (DF=27; p<.001) TLI = .925, AGFI = .938, RMSEA = .071. The principals’ leadership style explains 20% of the variance in teacher leadership; 36% of the variance in participative decision making; 44% of variance in teachers’ commitment was attributed to distributive leadership and principals’ leadership. However, the direct influence of the principal leadership on teachers’ commitment was rather weak. This study focused on relationship between principles’ leadership styles and teachers’ organizational commitment while the
current study focused on the effect of teachers’ level of teachers’ participation on their motivation.

Lewin (2008) states that teachers’ participation in the management of physical and material resources comprised of maintaining, procuring equipment and learning materials. Slouti and Barton (2007) argued that lack of ICT facilities, mentorship, lack of opportunities for apprenticeship and poor time management had negative effects on teachers’ motivation. The focus of the current study is the teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources using regression analysis in order to illustrate the direction and weight of the relationship.

Korkmaz, İhsan, Yıldız and Fikret (2011) undertook a study on the effects of 12-weeks recreational activities on university students’ self-esteem. The sample consisted of 40 students from Duzce University. Teachers participated in management of facilities relating to football, volleyball, swimming among other facilities. Post-test applications were made after 12 weeks. The study used experimental design comprising of 40 students. Descriptive, independent sample t-test, paired sample t-test and Pearson’s correlation analysis were used in data analysis. The findings revealed lack of significant statistical difference between pre-test and post-test control group (p >0.05), pre-test and post test scores of experimental group significantly differed (p=0.05). There was a significant statistical significant between post-test self-esteem points of experimental group and control group (p=0.05). The recreational activities had significant effects on university students’ self-esteem. The study by Korkmaz, İhsan, Yıldız and Fikret focused on effect of recreational activities on university students’ self-esteem, however, the current study attempted to establish the effect of
teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources on
teachers’ motivation.

Issah, Abubakari and Wuptiga, (2016) carried out a study on the state of academic
facilities and its influence on teachers’ job stress in Tamale Polytechnic in Ghana. The
study use case-study approach. Accidental sampling technique was used to select the
study size. Data was collected using a questionnaire. For reliability, Cronbach’s Alpha
revealed coefficients of 0.734 to 0.755. The study used Pearson Product Moment
Correlation and multiple regressions. Results revealed a significant statistical
relationship between provision of facilities and teachers’ motivation. It was concluded
that inadequate physical and material resources exerted pressure on teachers in
relation to students’ academic productivity. This study focused on the effect of
recreational activities on motivation, however, the current study focused on the
teachers’ level of participation in management of physical facilities on motivation.

Ali, Naeimeh, Javad, Hatam (2015) examined the relationships between teachers’
perceptions of organizational commitment and school health in Turkish primary
schools. The sample comprised of 323 randomly selected teachers from 20 primary
schools. The study established that there was no significant relationship between
teachers’ compliance, commitment, identification and internalization. Professional
leadership was the only health dimension that was significant in predicting
identification and commitment. Moreover, health, academic performance and material
resources were not significant predictors of teachers’ commitment. The study
examined the relationships between teachers’ perceptions of organizational
commitment and school health while the current study focused on the level of
teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources on their motivation.

Jasper, Le, Bartram (2012) carried out a study on water and sanitation in schools in relation to health and educational outcomes. The purpose of the study was to establish the effect of water and sanitation on the school environment. The findings show that water shortage had negative effects on students’ and teachers’ social and psychological aspects. The study also revealed higher rates of absenteeism during menses due to poor sanitation facilities. Furthermore, there was decrease in diarrheal and gastrointestinal diseases with increased access to sanitation facilities and clean water. The findings indicate that provision of clean water and toilets influenced their motivation. The study by Jasper, Le, and Bartram focused on provision of water and sanitation in relation to health and educational outcome, however, the current study focused on the effects of teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources on teachers’ motivation.

A study by Garipagaoglu (2013) revealed that lack of physical facilities and poor salaries had negative effects on teachers’ commitment and motivation. According to Ayeni and Afolabi (2012) lack of teachers’ participation in management of facilities and material resources (furniture, ventilation, incinerators, urinals and audio-visuals) resulted into low morale among teachers. They also stated that teachers’ participation led to creativity and commitment while absence of such facilities led to poor performance of duties. The study focused on teachers’ work performance while the current study investigated the effect of teachers’ participation on their motivation.

Gouri, Pravat and Soumen (2012) carried out a study on school infrastructure at primary and upper primary level, a geospatial analysis. The study focused on
infrastructure accessibility, type and conditions of the classrooms. The study used Moran’s I statistics to establish the spatial distribution of infrastructure. The facilities comprised of toilets, drinking water, library, electricity, ramps, perimeter wall, playground, and kitchen and computer facility. The facilities were assigned weights based on Saaty’s analytical hierarchy. The study used GIS software to establish the infrastructure index. Mean values were categorized into eight groups which were collapsed into five whereby 1 to 1.5 was regarded poor; 2 to 3.5 moderate; 4 to 5.5 good; 6 to 7.5 very good; 8 to 9 excellent. Four different zones were assigned numbers 1 to 4 whereby 4: represented very good, 3: good, 2: moderate and 1: poor. The study concluded that geo-informatics technology was significant and useful in identification of infrastructure development. A gap existed as the study failed to establish the effects of the teachers’ level of participation in management of physical facilities and its effects on teachers motivation which is the purpose of this study.

In Ghana, Salifu (2014) carried out a study on barriers to teacher motivation in relation to professional practice. The study used the qualitative approach method. The findings revealed that frustrations and stress was as a consequence of poor working conditions. Further, he argued that the size of the classes, working hours, management styles and the school location were some of the factors affecting teachers’ motivation. However, the study did not look at teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources in relation to teachers’ motivation which is the focus of this study. In Zambia, Wadesango (2012) reported that teachers’ participation in management of physical facilities resulted into low morale and stressful school governance. He observed that teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources led to improve the working conditions. However he did not
indicate the level of participation and the nature of the relationship in teachers’ motivation.

Ayeni and Afolabi (2012) investigated on teachers’ instructional and quality assurance in Nigerian secondary schools. Teachers’ participation in instructional work involved preparation of lessons, evaluating students work, students’ discipline, and providing feedback to school management and parents. This study focused on teachers’ instructional work, however, the current study focused on the level of teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources on teachers’ motivation.

Ayele (2014) carried out a study on teachers’ job satisfaction and commitment in public secondary schools of Hadiya Zone in Nigerian. The purpose was to establish the influence of the internal and external factors of teachers’ job satisfaction and level of teachers’ commitments. The study sample comprised of 159 respondents. The study used questionnaire and interview schedules for data collection. The statistical techniques were mean, standard deviation and Pearson product correlation coefficient. The findings indicate a significant statistical relationship between job satisfaction and commitment \( (r = .77, \ N = 105), \ (r = .71, \ N = 30) \). The study also indicated a significant relationship between job satisfaction and commitment. The study recommended provision of adequate facilities, equipment and materials such as staff houses, water, electricity, transport, refreshments and good working conditions. The study, however, did not show the effects of the teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources in relation to motivation which is the purpose of this study.
Further, Kimutai and Kosgei (2012) and Ayeni and Afolabi (2012) reported a significant statistical difference between quality teaching and students’ academic performance. The two authors focused on teachers’ work performance and therefore the gap was to establish effect of teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources on their motivation. Ayele (2014) reported teachers’ lack of positive attitudes towards change due to students’ poor performance in national examinations. The study by Ayele failed to investigate the effect of teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources on their motivation which was the focus of this study.

King’oina, Kadenyi and Ngaruiya (2015) investigated on the effect of teachers’ morale on standard eight pupils’ academic achievement in public primary schools in Marani Sub-County, Kenya. The study used ex-post facto design. Simple random sampling technique was used to select a sample size of 100 teachers. Data was collected using a questionnaire and was analyzed using coefficient correlation. The findings indicated that there was a significant statistical relationship between the variable under study. The study recommended school managers to embrace teachers’ participation in managing internal quality assurance programmes. Educational stakeholders were encouraged to be supportive and to motivate teachers in order to improve academic performance in schools. Apparently, the study focused on effect of teachers’ morale on pupils’ academic performance while the current study focused on the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources on teachers’ motivation.

Ireri (2015) carried out a study on the factors of motivation on employee performance in non-governmental institutions in Kenya. The study focused on compensation,
promotion, recognition and supervision on employee performance in Kenya Tenri Society. The study employed a descriptive design. A questionnaire was used to gather data was analyzed using Pearson co-efficient correlation. The results revealed a significant statistical difference between compensation, promotion and employee performance in relation to four aspects. The study recommended the NGOs to develop and implement clear promotion structures, career advancement policy, communication channels to enhance financial rewards that attract competent employees. It was however not known how teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources affected teachers’ motivation which is the purpose of this study.

Momanyi (2015) investigated teachers’ motivation in public secondary schools in Marani sub county, Kisii County. The study focused on the effect of job satisfaction, reward system, growth, development and situational factors. The study used descriptive design. Random sampling and sampling techniques were employed to select a sample of respondents. Questionnaires and interview schedules were used to collect data from 112 teachers and 14 principals. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics. The findings indicated a significant relationship between job satisfaction, reward system, training and development and work situational factors on teachers’ motivation. Apparently, the study used descriptive statistics and did not establish the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources on teachers’ motivation which is the purpose of the current study using regression analysis.

Matoke, Okibo, and Nyamongo (2015) investigated on determinants of teacher motivation in public secondary schools in Masaba South Sub-County. He used
regression analysis to establish the effect of working conditions, work-load and teaching resources on motivation. The study revealed that physical and material resources had a significant effect on teacher motivation (p-value of .041). The standardized beta value of 0.764 indicated that an increase in participation in management of physical and material resources led to 1 unit increase in teachers’ motivation. The study focused on determinants of motivation in masaba while the current study was done in Kiambu, Machaks and Kajiado Counties Kenya. In addition, Juma (2011) revealed that teachers’ participation in provision of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, playing fields and textbooks had positive effects on teachers’ motivation.

Most of the review focused on principles’ leadership styles, teachers organizational commitment, recreational activities, students’ self-esteem, effect of teachers’ morale on pupils’ academic achievement and factors affecting teacher motivation (Korkmaz, İhsan, Yıldız, Fikret (2011); Geert, Melissa, and Hulpia (2014); Ireri (2015). Matoke, Okibo, and Nyamongo (2015) focused on determinants of teacher motivation while Momanyi (2015) focused on factors affecting teacher motivation. King’oina, Kadenyi and Ngaruiya (2015) focused on the effect of teachers’ morale on pupils’ academic performance. However, this study was set to investigate the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources on teachers’ motivation in Kajiado, Kiambu and Machakos counties in Kenya.

2.5 Teachers’ Participation in Management of Students’ and Staff Activities on teachers’ Motivation

Numerous studies suggested that teachers’ level of participation in the management of teachers’ and students’ activities is a factor of motivation (Maulana, Opdenakker,

Squire and Valerie (2012) carried out a study on the relationship between teacher empowerment and student achievement. The study focused on teachers’ empowerment, professional growth, status, self-efficacy and autonomy and student achievement. A Pearson Correlation was computed. The findings indicate that there was no relationship between teacher empowerment and student achievement ($r = .098$, $n = 115$, $p = .298$; teachers’ status and student achievement ($r = 0.185$, $n = 115$, $p = 0.048$). Apparently, the study by Squire and Valerie (2012) focused on teacher empowerment and students’ achievement; however, the current study went a step higher to establish teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation using regression analysis.

In Greece, Sarafidou and Chatziioannidis (2012) carried out a study on teachers’ participation in decision making and its impact on teachers in Greek primary schools. The study used correlation design. The sample consisted of 141 teachers. Data was analyzed using multivariate analysis. Teachers’ participation in students’ activities comprised of teaching, extra-curricular activities, assignment of students to classes attendance and discipline. Participation in management of teacher activities comprised of allocation of teaching work load and other duties, discipline
management, professional development activities, and collaboration with subject teachers, teacher behavior and teacher-parent interactions. The findings revealed that teachers’ actual participation in management of students and teachers’ activities was moderate while their desire to participate was high. The findings showed significant statistical differences between teachers’ participation in school and teachers (Wilk’s $\lambda=0.819$, F $(9, 331) =3.15$, P= 0.001). There was a significant linear relationship between participation in managerial issues (p<0.001) and teachers’ issues (p=0.001). The regression on managerial issues was significantly increased the predictive value of the model ($R^2=27$ percent) and teachers’ perceptions about collegiality ($R^2=25.5$ percent). This study by Sarafidou and Chatziioannid focused on teachers’ participation in decision making and its impact on school and teachers, however, the current study focused on teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation in selected counties, Kenya.

In Asia, teachers’ level of participation in students’ activities facilitated students’ interest, active engagement in learning, healthy social and mental development (Opdenakker & Maulana 2010 a, b; Maulana et al.2012a,b). In Netherlands, Opdenakker, Maulana, and Brok (2012) carried out a study on teacher-student interpersonal relationships and academic motivation in secondary school. The study explored the developmental changes of teacher-student interpersonal relationships on students’ academic motivation. The data were collected from 566 students from 3 secondary schools in The Netherlands. Multilevel growth curve modeling was applied. The findings revealed that teacher-student interpersonal relationships were significant predictors of autonomous motivation. 9% of autonomous motivation is as a
result of differences in teacher–student interpersonal relationships, teacher influence and proximity accounted for 59% of the variance at class level and 24% of the variance at student level. Teacher proximity had a significant effect on autonomous motivation, while the effect of teacher influence was significant in the absence of teacher Proximity. 2% of the variance is as a result of joint effect of the two dimensions on autonomous motivation. Opdenakker, Maulana, and Brok (2012) focused on teacher-student interpersonal relationships and on academic motivation, however, the current study focused on the effects of teacher’s level of participation in management of students and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation.

In Pakistan, Baig, Rehman and Khan (2012) carried out a study on the relationship between organizational commitment, teachers’ participation and teachers’ organizational citizenship. Study examined the nature, strength, predictive value, organizational commitment, justice, decision making and organizational citizenship behavior of schoolteachers. The study sample consisted of 243 teachers from 35 public and private schools. The study used correlation design and regression analysis. The results indicated a strong significant statistical relationship between the variables. Participation in decision making accounted for 36%; procedural justice 6%; organizational commitment 14.3%; and 23.3% jointly with procedural justice and participation in change relating to organizational citizenship behaviour. Maulana et al. 2011(a, b), Baig, Rehman and Khan (2012) focused on the relationship between organizational commitment with teachers’ participation in decision and organizational citizenship behaviour. However, the current study established the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of teachers’ and students’ activities on teachers’ motivation.
In Hong Kong, Cheng (2008) carried out a study on the effect of shared decision-making on improvement of teachers’ job development. The study used structural equation model and correlation design. Teachers’ participation involved creativity, innovation in instruction and maintaining strong membership in the profession. The findings showed that lack of participation in students’ discipline, and staff development activities’ affected teachers’ motivation. Cheng concluded that teachers’ participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities enhanced teachers’ motivation, self-esteem, responsibility and commitment. A gap exited because the purpose of the current study is to establish the teachers’ level of participation in management of teachers’ and students’ activities on teachers’ motivation.

In Iran, Asgari and Mahjoob (2013) carried out a study on the relationship between participative management and institutional commitment. The study used correlation approach. The sample size included 217 teachers based on Krejie and Morgan’s sampling table (1990). The study employed stratified random sampling technique. Data analysis included correlation coefficient, multiple regression and stepwise. The findings indicate a significant statistical relationship between participatory management and organizational commitment F=0.817, P=0.001 and 83% of the variation in organizational commitment was as a result of participatory management. Delegating authority 90.3%; giving suggestions by manager 21.1%; creating an atmosphere of cooperation by administration 23.7%; respecting and giving attention to teachers’ needs 56.5%. The researcher concluded that teachers’ level of participation led to organizational commitment and motivation. Asgari and Mahjoob focused on relationship between participative management and institutional commitment. However the current study went a step further to examine the effects of
teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation.

According to Ho (2010) teachers’ participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities provided a platform where teachers worked collaboratively with their colleagues. However, he was of the opinion that teachers’ participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities did not necessarily relate to quality work, motivation and positive outcomes. Further, Mazandarani and Mahnoosh (2015) carried out a study in Iran on the effect of participatory management on organizational change and enhancement of staff efficiency in Free Zone of Qeshm. The purpose of the study was to establish the effect of participative management, staffs performance and organizational change. The study used the correlation descriptive approach. The sample size consisted of 169 respondents using random sampling. The study used t-test, Pearson and regression analysis. The results revealed a significant statistical significant relationship between participatory management and efficiency components (creating commitment and sense of responsibility, decrease of negative resistance against changes and work motivation) and participatory management and organizational change components (empowering staffs and instituting new cultural perspectives) The findings reveals lack of statistical significant relationship between participatory management and integration components of organizational change. Apparently, the study by Mazandarani and Mahnoosh focused on the effect of participatory management on organizational change and enhancement of staff efficiency. However, the currents study focused on the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation.
Duze (2011) carried out a study on students’ and teachers’ participation in decision-making and its impact on school work and internal discipline. The study used survey design. The sample comprised of 3,318 students and 612 teachers selected using multi-stage random sampling technique. T-test, Chi-square and Pearson’s r were employed. The findings revealed a significant statistical relationships between participatory management and efficiency components (creating commitment and sense of responsibility, decrease of negative resistance and work motivation), and participatory management and organizational change components (empowering staffs and instituting new cultural perspectives). However, there was no significant relationship between participatory management and integration components of organizational change. A gap existed as Duze focused on students’ and teachers’ participation in decision-making and its impact on school work and discipline. However, the currents investigated the effects of the teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation.

Likewise Omobude and Igbudu (2012) carried out a study on the influence of teachers’ participation in decision making on job performance in public and private secondary schools in Oredo. Teachers’ participation involved preparing teaching learning material, teaching, career guidance, guidance and counseling, training needs assessment and teachers’ appraisal. The study consisted of a sample of 400 teachers from public and private secondary schools. The study adopted the expost-facto design and data was analyzed using Fisher’s Z test. The findings revealed lack of significance statistical differences between teachers’ participation in decision making and the job performance of male and female teachers (+1.96, \(Z= 1.01\) ). Both the experienced and the inexperienced teachers participated in decision making (\(Z = .34\)
with a table value of +1.96), $Z = -9.603$ with a value of + 1.96. This means that that there is no significant statistical difference between the job performances of teachers that participate more in decision making and those that participated less in decision making. The study by Omobude and Igbudu (2012) focused on the influence of teachers’ level of participation in decision making on their job performance in public and private. The current study went further to show the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers activities’ on teachers’ motivation.

In Zambia, Wadesango (2012) argued that lack of teachers’ participation in management of teachers’ activities led to lack of staff morale which culminated into stressful school governance. He further stated that teachers’ participation in management of teachers’ and students’ activities involved the risk of conflicts, slow decision making process, increased workload, work alienation and frustration. Wadesango also argued that lack of motivated was manifested in form of poor time management, absenteeism and negative attitude to work which were detrimental to the performance of duties. He reported that lack of motivation resulted into spending a lot of time working out modalities of how best to secure job satisfaction at the expense of students’ learning.

Matoke, Okibo, and Nyamongo (2015) carried out on determinants of teacher motivation in public secondary schools in Masaba south sub-county, Kenya. The study examined the effect of development and remuneration factors on teacher motivation. The study employed regression analysis. The findings indicate that 74.6% of motivation was as a result of remuneration; 25.4% was attributed to other factors; 41.2% was attributed to training and development while 58.8% was explained by
other factors. The study by Matoke, Okibo, and Nyamongo (2015) focused on determinants of teacher motivation while the current study focused on the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation.

Consequently, a study by Muindi (2011) investigated into the relationship between teachers’ level of participation in decision making and job satisfaction at the School of Business in University of Nairobi. The sample size included all the non-management members of academic staff. The study used a questionnaire to collect data. The study employed Pearson Correlation and regression model. The findings revealed a significantly positive correlation between job satisfaction and participation in decision-making ($p=0.888$); job satisfaction and working conditions ($p=0.640$); pay and promotion potential ($p=0.703$); skills and abilities ($p=0.895$); job design ($p=0.750$); and job feedback ($p=0.632$). The level of job satisfaction increased proportionately with an increase in the level of participation in decision-making. The study by Muindi (2011) examined the relationship between teachers’ level of participation in decision making and job satisfaction while the current study focused the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation.

Further, Khan, Murtaza, and Shafa (2012) investigated the role of teachers in providing educational and career counseling in secondary school students in Gilgit-Baltistan of Pakistan. The key findings indicated that teachers’ participated in career guidance and counseling, and students’ subjects’ selection. They acted as role models and attached high value to guidance in subject selection and career choices. The study by Khan, Murtaza, and Shafa (2012) focused on role of teachers in providing
educational and career counseling. The current study focused on the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation.

Studies by Muindi (2011); Khan, Murtaza, and Shafa (2012); Omobude, Igbudu and Ujiro (2012); Asgari and Mahjoob (2013); Wadesango (2011); Kiprop and Kandie (2012); focused on teachers’ participation in management in various aspects of students’ and teachers’ activities. Matoke, Okibo, & Nyamongo (2015); Barenge (2016); Farahiyanfar and Ghandehari (2016); Asgari and Mahjoob (2013) focused on teachers’ motivation and commitment. However, none of the studies investigated the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation in selected counties in Kenya which is the purpose of this study.

2.6 Teachers’ Participation in Management of School Community partnership on teachers’ Motivation

Throughout the past decade, research has increasingly focused on the importance of partnership between the teachers, families and communities and teachers’ motivation (Walker, Shenker & Hoover, 2010; Epstein and Van, 2010). According to Vanbaren (2010) teacher motivation is a process of encouraging and inspiring people to perform their duties effectively. Sardjito (2011) defines motivation as feelings and confidence of employees in relation to performance of duties. He further states that motivation is the interest and individual’s commitment in making organizations more productive and profitable. According to Muindi (2011), participation refers to direct involvement of employee in issues relating to their immediate work. Participation in school-community partnership is a process in which two groups living in the same
geographical location are collectively involved in decision making (Tibebu, 2011). Teachers’ participation in school community partnership was an effective way of motivating teachers in providing instructional leadership (Bandur, 2008; Antonio & Gamage, 2007); Anderson (2006). Further, Goksoy (2014) argued that teachers’ participation played a significant role in developing commitment and achievement of organizational goals thereby decreasing resistance to change. Gardian and Rathore (2010) and Algoush (2010) revealed that participation in management of school community partnership led to trust, acquisition of new knowledge, skills and commitment.

The school is an open system which establishes linkages with the local community to facilitate realization of educational goals and objectives (Allawan, 2012). In America, teachers’ participation in community partnership led to good relationship between the school, families, and communities (Scheerens & Demeuse, 2005). According to Shirin & Alaeddin (2014), school community partnership involved physical, social and mental development of learners. School community partnership provided an avenue for collaboration between the school, families and community in relation to guidance and counseling for teachers, parents and students (McCarthy, 2014). Teachers participation therefore assumed an expert knowledge role providing caregivers, guardians and parents with the information that would mitigate the challenges affecting them (Jones, 2013; Amatea, 2013). This requires teachers to assess and identify parental and children’ needs through consultation and collaborate with administrators and community organizations (Perera, Moe, & Mason 2011; Amatea & Cholewa, 2013). Similarly, interaction between schools, communities and families is a vital function for a child’s academic success (McCarthy, 2014). According to Shirin and Alaeddin (2014) teachers’ participation in community created awareness of
community involvement in school improvement through provision of financial resources. Teachers’ participation in school community activities was considered a key factor in the implementation of change and in determining the level of motivation and commitment (Khasawneh, Omari & Abu-tineh, 2012).

Epstein and Van (2010) carried out a study on the relationship between district support and principal leadership for reforming schools. The study was based on socio-cultural learning theory. The purpose of the study was to find out whether NNPS reform was better supported by participative approaches or not. Hierarchical linear modeling analyses revealed that principals’ support for family and community engagement and district assistance contributed significantly to schools’ reform implementation. The school interventions (grade and poverty levels) and district leaders’ facilitation contributed to the quality of programs. The findings indicated that schools took steps to improve partnership programs when district support was sustained for at least 3 years. The study by Epstein and Van explored the relationship between district support and principal leadership for reforming schools while the current study focused on the effect of teachers’ participation in school community in relation to teachers’ motivation.

A study carried out by Farahiyanfar and Ghandehari (2016) investigated the relationship between participation, empowerment and organizational commitment in secondary school in Iran. The study used Pearson correlation and multiple regressions. The results revealed a significant statistical effect between participation in goal setting and organizational commitment (Beta=0.123, P<.01); decision making (Beta=0.379, P<.01); problem solving (Beta=0.205, P<.01); competence (Beta=0.117, P<.01). However, the current study went a step further to establish the effect of
teachers’ level of participation in management of school community partnership on teachers’ motivation in Kenya using regression analysis.

Soutullo, Smith, Sanders and Navia (2016) carried out a study on discouraging partnerships: Teachers’ perspectives on immigration-related barriers to family-school collaboration. This study focused on barriers of family-school partnerships with immigrant families as identified by teachers in an urban school district with high rates of immigration. The sample size consisted of 18 respondents. The study used focus group interviews to collect data. Hindrances to engagement for immigrant families comprised of language, culture, family resources, and family status. The study revealed that parental partnership and school policies accounted (94.4%); unproductive communication (83.3%); families’ absence from school functions (88.9%); and unresponsiveness to school-initiated communication (72.2%); lack of resources (88.9%); and reluctant to screening procedures (55.6%). The study concludes that school family partnership reduces challenges facing immigrants and provides strategies to meaningful participation for needy families. However, the study by Soutullo, Smith-Bonahue, Sanders-Smith and Navia did not go a step further to establish the direction of relationship using regression analysis which is the purpose of this study.

A study by Kheang and Luz (2012) focused on the implementation of school-based management in selected public schools in Cambodia with an emphasis on devolution of decision making. Teachers’ participating in school community partnership involved creating awareness of partnership, sourcing funds for training and development, purchasing materials, and infrastructure development, supervision, and motivation. The sample size involved 45 respondents comprising of principals, teachers, school
support committees, parents and community members. The study adopted case study design which was grounded on triangulation method. The findings indicated that various roles of stakeholders in initiating and implementing school change. Success of partnership was particularly determined by principal leadership, active participation of local stakeholders as well as support from non-government organizations. The study concluded that successful partnership is determined by clear policies, accountability and autonomy in relation to stakeholders’ participation. The study recommended systematic professional development for stakeholders in order to equip them with knowledge and skills to implement school based programmes effectively. The study focused on the implementation of school-based management and therefore a gap existed in relation to the effect of teachers’ level of participation in school community partnership on teachers’ motivation.

Wadesango (2011) reported lack of teachers’ participation in critical issues relating to community partnership. He reported that change decisions made by the school administration without teachers’ and community participation suffered low success rate during the implementation phase due to lack of clarity, precision and low motivation. A study by Mualuko, Mukasa and Achoka (2009) indicated a significance statistical difference between teachers’ actual and desired level of participation in school community relations. Consequently, teachers’ participated in community partnership provided a platform for guiding parents on school development projects as well as exploring ways of motivating teachers and students (Republic of Kenya, Basic Education Act, 2012).

Barenge (2016) investigated the influence of head teachers’ leadership styles on teachers’ motivation in Kajiado County, Kenya. The study focused on democratic,
laissez-faire and transformational leadership styles on teachers’ motivation. This study adopted a descriptive methodology design. The sample size comprised of 113 respondents. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and Chi Square was used. The study revealed a significant positive correlation between leadership styles and teachers’ motivation. The research concluded that leadership styles were some of factors for teacher motivation. The study recommended the school head teachers to familiarize themselves with various leadership styles in order to enhance teachers’ motivation. The study by Barenge (2016) focused on the relationship between leadership styles and motivation using chi square, however, the current study focused on the effects of the teachers’ level of participation in school community partnership on teachers’ motivation.

Matoke, Okibo and Nyamongo (2015) carried out a study on determinants of teacher motivation in public secondary schools in Masaba South Sub-County. He used regression analysis to establish the effect of working conditions, work-load and teaching resources on teachers’ motivation. The R square value indicated that a change in development factors caused a 41.2 % variation in teacher motivation while other factors explained 58.8% of the variation in motivation. The multi-linear regression model revealed that environmental factors explained 32.5% of the variation in teacher motivation. The study recommended that school managers to sponsor workshops and seminars for teachers in order to motivate them. Matoke, Okibo, and Nyamongo focused on determinants of teacher motivation while the current study dealt with the effects of teachers’ level of participation in community partnership on the teachers’ motivation.
Mualuko, Mukasa and Achoka (2009) carried out a study to investigate the level of teachers’ actual and desired level of participation in decision making. The study used ex-post facto design and split half method to determine the reliability coefficient using the Pearson product formula. The sample comprised of 123 teachers. And data were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The findings revealed a significant statistical difference between the teachers’ actual and desired participation in management of school community partnership. The study recommended that school managers to increase participatory structure to improve quality of decisions and to boost teachers’ morale. However, the current study went further to establish the effect of teachers’ participation in management of school community partnership on teachers’ motivation.

Kiprop and Kandie (2012) investigated into teacher participation in decision making in public secondary schools in Kenya. The study adopted descriptive survey design. The sample comprised 13 principals and 104 teachers were selected using simple random sampling technique. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics. The findings indicate that teachers did not participate in decision making as they desired because most principles perceived participatory decision negatively. A combination of factors such as witch hunting, victimization, divisions among the teachers, fear and double standards by head teachers hindered effective participation. The study by Kiprop and Kandie (2012) adopted descriptive survey while the current study focused on teachers’ participation in school community partnership on teachers’ motivation using correlation design.

Studies by Matoke, Okibo and Nyamongo (2015); Wadesango (2011); Kiprop and Kandie (2012); Mualuko, Mukasa and Achoka (2009) focused more teachers
participation in various aspects of school - community partnership. Matoke, Okibo, and Nyamongo (2015); Barenge (2016); Farahiyanfar and Ghandehari (2016) focused on teachers’ motivation and commitment. However, none of the studies investigated the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of school community partnership on the teachers’ motivation.

2.7 Teachers’ Participation in Management of School Finances on Teachers’ Motivation

Organizational theorists suggest that participatory management often leads to more effective organizations and higher staff motivation. Many studies reveal that participation in budget preparation facilitates improved communication, employee motivation, job satisfaction and job performance (Jermias & Setiawan, 2008). According to Chalos and Haka (2007), financial management involved participative budget preparation for various activities. Wisegeek (2012) defined participative financial management as a plan strategy that involves active participation of employees in creating a workable budget for implementation. He argues that financial plan provides feedback in line with organizational targets through monitoring and evaluation. Financial plans results in increased outputs, reduction in unnecessary spending leading to expand markets (Suharman, 2011).

Studies by Chalos and Haka (2007; Chenhall and Brownell (2011) report that a well-organized financial systems encourages stakeholder participation and agreed performance standard with positive motivating effects on the teachers. According Hammond (2007), planning for instructional resources required budget preparation and provision of adequate finance. Moreover, learning outcomes required adequate budgetary allocation to ensure quality and motivated employees. According to Njagi
and Jagongo (2013) lack of effective management of school finances was detrimental to teachers’ motivation. However, other studies (Noor and Othman, 2012; Suharman, 2011) report a negative association between participative financial management and public sector performance.

Mehta (2015) carried a study of teacher’s participation in decision making in relation to gender roles in India. The purpose of the study was to establish the impact of gender on teachers’ participation in decision making process. Data were collected from 281 university lecturers through a questionnaire measuring participation in budget preparation, budget control, project development and research. Construct validity was also established by calculating Cronbach Alfa values for financial aspect indicating actual participation .90 and desired participation .83. Data were analyzed using one-way Annoa. The findings revealed a state of deprivation in teachers’ participation in management of school finance; however, there was no significant statistical significance between participation and gender. Both male and female teachers recorded high participation in management of finance. Further the study established that teachers participative in management of finance led to increased job satisfaction, job involvement, responsibility and commitment and decreased role conflict and ambiguity. Mehta focused on participation in management of finances in relation to gender while the current study focused on the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of finances and its effect on teachers’ motivation.

Sukandani and Istikhoroh (2016) carried a study on participatory budgeting in improving the performance of managerial heads of department in East Java. Financial management comprised of budget preparation, accounting and auditing in relation to expenses such as transport, materials, equipment, stationary and remuneration. The
sample size comprised of 105 respondents who were in charge of the budget plans. A questionnaire was used in data collection. Data was analyzed using Multiple Regression. The results indicate significance statistical difference between participatory Budgeting and managerial performance (Beta =0.212, \( t= 2.889, P=0.005 \); and organizational commitment (t= 2.289 = 0.014). However, Sukandani and Istikhoroh (2016) focused on participatory budgeting in improving the performance of managerial heads of department while the current study went a step further to establish the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of finances and its effects on teachers’ motivation using regression models.

Kunwaviyah (2010) examined the role of organizational commitment and innovation in relation to budget participation in public sector. Participation in budget preparation involved the institutional commitment, creativity, alignment, planning, co-ordination and policy formulation. Data was collected through questionnaires. The sample size consisted of 160 managers. The study revealed a statistical significance difference between budget involvement and managerial performance. Apparently, a gap exists in this study because Kunwaviyah (2010) did not go a step further to establish effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of school finance on teachers’ motivation.

Wittayapoom and Limsuwan (2008) examined the effects of budgetary involvement and institutional commitment to job execution in Thailand. Data were gathered from 48 managers and were analyzed using regression analysis. Financial construct measurement comprised of gross and net profit, sales, and market expansion. The findings indicate that fiscal participation had significant statistical effect on job performance (Beta= 0.30, \( P<0.05 \)), budgetary participation (Beta= .65, \( P< 0.01 \));
organizational commitment (Beta = .27, P< 0.05). Wittayapoom and Limsuwan (2008) focused on the effects of budgetary participation and organizational commitment to job performance. However, the current study focused on the effects of teachers’ level in participation in management of financial resources on teachers’ motivation.

Hussein (2015) carried out a study on participative school decision making in secondary schools of Arsi Zone. Participation in management of finances comprised of mobilizing community to raise funds, budget preparation, awareness of monthly cash flow and expenditure and allocation of resources to departments. The study used descriptive survey design using a sample size of 231 respondents. The study used independent sample t-test. The findings revealed that teachers did not participated in decision relating to management of school finance. Non-participatory leadership, untrustworthy teachers and principals, incompetent, irresponsible and lack of support were some of the factors that impeded teachers’ participation in management of finances. Apparently a gap existed because Hussein focused on teachers’ participation in school decision making in relation to financial resources, however, the current study focused on the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of financial resources on teachers’ motivation.

Asgari & Mahjoob (2013) carried out a study on the relationship between participatory management and teacher’s institutional commitment in the city of Rasht. A sample size of 217 teachers was selected using stratified random sampling technique based on Krijie and Morgan’s sampling table. Pearson correlation coefficient and multiple regression analysis were used to establish the relationship between the variables. The study used a questionnaire in data collection. The study
revealed a significant statistical relationship between participatory management and institutional commitment ($F=0.817$, $P=0.00$). The study revealed that 83% of the variation in organizational commitment was attributed to participatory management, delegating authority 90.3%; suggestions by manager 21%; creating an atmosphere of cooperation by administration 24%; amount of respect and attention to the needs of teachers 57%. Asgari & Mahjoob focused on the relationship between participatory management and teacher’s organizational commitment. However, the current study went a step further to determine the effect of teachers’ the level of participation in management of finances on teachers’ motivation in Kenya using regression analysis.

Kadir & Kamarudin, (2012) examined the relationship between educational support and enterprising intentions in Malaysian. The study focused on the employees’ attitudes, behaviour, educational support and entrepreneurial intentions. The study utilized correlation and regression statistics to establish the relationship and effect between the variables. The finding shows that there was a significant statistical relationship between attitudinal factor ($r=0.5324$); behaviour factor ($r=0.5668$); and educational support ($r=0.6241$). Educational support contributed 40.8% to attitude factor and 57.6% to behaviour factor. Attitude, behaviour and education support contributed 43.3% towards entrepreneur intentions. Kadir & Kamarudin focused more on educational support and entrepreneur intentions and therefore a gap existed in relation to the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of finances on their motivation.

Abata (2014) carried a study on participative budgeting and organizational achievement in the Nigerian Food Products Sector. Participative budget preparation involved goal setting, evaluation standards, communication, and control checks and
employees motivation. The study used survey design. Data was gathered from managers using a questionnaire. The study used regression analysis to determine the effect of relationship. The findings revealed a significant statistical relationship between managerial performance and participatory budgeting. Managerial performance contributed 12% of managerial performance. Participative budget preparation and control was significant in reducing resentment among the employees. The study concluded that participative financial management was an essential element of budget preparation and control, goal setting, monitoring and evaluation, communication, as well as employees’ motivation. The study therefore recommends participatory involvement of staffs in budget preparation, implementation and budgetary control. Apparently, a gap existed and therefore the current study went a step further to establish the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of finances on their motivation

Adenuga and Ojediran (2017) carried out a study on the impact of budgetary participation and institutional commitment and performance in Nigeria. The study examines the relationship between budget participation, organizational commitment and managerial performance. The sample size comprised of 129 respondents. The study used correlation and regression analysis. Findings indicated that participation in budget activities and commitment to work had positive effects on managerial performance, budget Participation (r= 0.318, n=192, p=0.000); institutional commitment (r= 0.296, n=192, p=0.000); and managerial performance (r= 0.424, n=192, p=0.000). The regression analysis established a positive significant relationship (Beta=.228, t-value=3.419, p=0.001); and organizational commitment (Beta=.164, t-value=0.832, p=0.00). The findings also indicated that each effort contributed towards goal commitment and budget participation, managerial
performance increases by 0.26 and 0.235 respectively holding other variables constant. The study recommended organizations to engage employee in activities that promote participatory budget preparation and employee commitment. The study by Adenuga and Ojediran was conducted in Nigeria while the current study was done in Kenya.

In Zimbabwe, Wadesango (2011) argued that teachers’ participation in management of school finance was a critical source of motivation. Participation in management of finances comprised of budget preparation, fundraising committees, organizing school trips, parties, exhibitions and competitions. The findings indicated that a very small percentage of teachers did not want to be involved in management of finances because majority of principals and management committees were characterized by corruption. However, Wadesango asserted that teachers felt respected when their interests and expertise were recognized. He concluded that teachers’ participation in decisions relating to school finances was critical area for their motivation. Apparently, a gap exists in this study by Wadesango as it does not go further to indicate the direction of relationship by use of the regression analysis.

In Kenya, Mualuko, Mukasa, & Achoka (2009) carried out a study on the level of teachers’ actual and desired level of participation in decision making. The study used ex-post facto design and split half method to determine the reliability coefficient using the Pearson product formula. The sample comprised of 123 teachers. T-test was employed. The findings revealed significant statistical difference between the teachers’ actual and desired participation in management of budget preparation t-value = 21.58, p <0.05. It was recommended that school managers should embrace participatory structures in management of finance in order to boost teachers’ morale.
A gap existed because this study used t-test to make comparisons however the current study went a step further to establish the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of school finance using regression analysis.

In Kenya, Serem and Kipkoech (2012) carried out a study on the role of community in the management of free primary education in Kenya. Teachers’ participation involved budgeting, tendering, procurement and accounting. The study used descriptive survey. Data was collected from principals, teachers and education officers. Purposive sampling techniques were used to select a sample size of 260 respondents. The findings revealed that provision of financial and material resources was a joint effort between parents and teachers. Most of the head teachers experienced challenges in planning and managing school funds. Teachers’ were required to participate in the budget preparation in order to allocate funds adequately to various departments. However, tendering process was characterized by corruption and some of the administrators and managers lacked skills in financial management. Lack of teachers’ participation in tendering and procurement processes led to dissatisfaction among teachers. The study by Serem and Kipkoech (2012) used descriptive statistics to investigate teacher participation in decision making in public secondary schools in Kenya, however, the current study went a step further to establish the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of school finance using regression analysis.

Magunga (2014) reported lack of teachers’ participation in management of school change with regard to school finances. Participation in management of school finances comprised of maintenance and repairs, fund-raising and learning resources. His findings further indicated that teachers’ participation in financial management
boosted their morale, improved the quality of decisions, enhanced commitment and enabled them to gain experience. Similarly, Nuthu (2013) carried out a study on factors influencing Board of Managements’ (BoMs) competence in financial management in public secondary schools in Kitui, Kenya. The study employed correlation analysis. The findings indicates a significance statistical relationship between BoMs’ competencies and level of education \((r = 0.546, p = 0.006)\); in-service training \((r = 0.626 p = 0.001)\); occupation \((r = 0.508, p = 0.03)\); experience \((r = 0.820, p = 0.047)\). The study by Nuthu (2013) focused on factors influencing BoMs competence in financial management while the current study focused on the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management school finances on their motivation.

Mwangi, Nyang’wara, Kulet (2015) carried out a study on factors affecting the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of constituency development projects in Kenya. Participation involved monitoring and evaluation on projects in relation to technical, political, stakeholders’ participation and budgetary allocation. The study used descriptive design. Sample size was selected using stratified random sampling technique. Data was gathered through the use of questionnaires. Data was analyzed using correlation, ANOVA and multiple regressions. The findings revealed a significant statistical relationship in monitoring and evaluation \((t = 2.429, P\text{-value} = 0.018)\). However, there was no statistical significant between stakeholder participation \((t = 2.232, P\text{-value} = 0.023)\) and budgetary allocation \((t = 2.308, P\text{-value} = 0.024)\). The study concluded that an increase in one unit of technical competency means 28% increase in effectiveness of the programs projects. Apparently, this study focused on the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of constituency development fund,
however, the current study focused on the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of school financial resources on teachers’ motivation.

Although several studies have focused on teachers’ participation in management of financial resources, they are limited in a number of ways (Kiprop and Kandie, 2012; Magunga, 2014). Mwangi, Nyang’war, Kulet (2015) focused on factors influencing monitoring and evaluation of constituency development projects in Kenya. Adenuga and Ojediran (2017) focused on the impact of budgetary participation and Organizational Commitment on Managerial Performance. However, these studies did not establish the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of school finances on teachers’ motivation in selected schools in Kiambu, Machakos and Kajiado Counties in Kenya.

2.8 Summary and Gaps Identification

It is apparent clear from the literature review that the independent variables for this study which was teachers’ participation in management of curriculum management, physical facilities, students and teachers’ activities, school community-partnership and school finance were thoroughly addressed by previous studies. However, they deviate in a number of ways in different aspects. For instance, Magunga (2014); Mualuko, Mukasa, and Achoka (2009); Duze (2011); Ho (2010); Sarafidou and Chatziioannidis (2013); Somech, (2010); Cheng (2008); Bradley, Janet, and Valerie (2013); Swanepoel and Booyse (2006); Gardinier (2012); have all demonstrated that teachers’ participation in the management of various aspects of school change at different levels and intensity. Various aspects of teachers’ motivation was also addressed by Nyakundi (2012); Hafiza, Shah, Jamsheed, and Zaman, (2011); Ali and Ahmed (2009); Bennell and Akyeampong (2007); Golshan, Kaswuri, Aghashahi,
Amin, and Wan (2011); Khan (2007, 2012). However, none of the studies investigated the effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, school community-partnership and school finance on teachers’ motivation in Kajiado, Machakos and Kajiado Counties, Kenya. Hence, this study set out to investigate the status of this in the selected areas.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This Chapter presents the strategies and procedures that were used in this study. The research design and the study locale have been adequately explained. The target population, the sample and sampling procedures were then defined. Three instruments that were utilized as well as piloting, validity and reliability, data collection procedures were also presented. These research and methodology sections concluded with overview of logistical and ethical considerations

3.2 Research Design
The study used correlation design. A correlation research design determines relationships between variables in order to make meaningful predictions (Creswell, 2012). Correlation design was suitable for this study because it enabled the researcher to determine the effect of the teachers’ levels of participation in management of change in relation to curriculum management, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, community partnership and school finance on teachers’ motivation. The responses were rated from a likert scale of 1-5 hence enabling correlation test to be carried out.

3.3 Study Variables
In this study, the independent variable was the teachers’ level of participation in the management of change. This independent variable had five dimensions namely: management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, school-community relations and school finance. The
dependent variable was teachers’ motivation. Motivation was operationalized into improved attendance, low turnover, commitment, efficiency and effectiveness in work, acquisition of new knowledge and skills and improved performance of duties. The intervening variables were assumed not to interfere with teachers’ level of participation in the management of change and its effects on teachers’ motivation, and therefore were not measured.

3.4 Location of the Study

The study was conducted in Kiambu, Machakos and Kajiado Counties in Kenya. In Kiambu much of the population was found around and within trading centres, where physical infrastructures such as schools, health centres, electricity and roads were found. The County was economically empowered and able to provide the basic resources such as textbooks, learning materials, furniture, and buildings and online resources. However, the general KCSE performance was rather poor. A combination of many factors made Kiambu County a suitable choice of the study: (a) both a rural and urban setting which gave the researcher a broader insight into the problem under study; (b) a readily available mix of 252 Boys, Girls and Mixed secondary schools; (c) developed networks of transport and communication which facilitated access to the schools; and (d) high number of students’ population and teachers. The general performance of Kiambu County in KCSE results contrasted sharply with Kajiado and Machakos and this enriched the study by capturing diversity.

Kajiado County was in the former Rift Valley Province of Kenya. A combination of the following factors made the Kajiado County a suitable choice of study location: (a) Home to the mainly nomadic and pastoralist Maasai community; (b) It was prone to frequent and prolonged droughts due to harsh climatic conditions; (c) In contrast to
Kiambu and Machakos, 90% of Kajiado was Arid and Semi-Arid Land (ASAL) and the County was incapacitated since many of the schools had limited infrastructures, facilities, books, materials and teachers (d) Most of the region had poorly developed transport and communication networks which was quite a challenge, (e) Droughts over the years had affected school enrolment and attendance; (f) There were 55 Boys, Girls, and Mixed secondary schools. (g) There were gender and regional disparities with the females being more disadvantaged. The difficult educational circumstances and the high rates of illiteracy provided the researcher the compulsion for this study. In addition, the county’s geographical and socio-economic nature enriched the study by capturing the diversity. The county enjoyed fairly good security as compared to other ASALs. Residents had raised serious concerns over the Countys’ poor performance in national examinations.

The bigger part of the County was ASAL with rural characteristics. Majority of the people grew drought resistant crops and were not economically empowered because of unemployment and under-employment. There was high rate of poverty manifested in form of dropout rates and poor performance in national examinations. The availability of some physical infrastructures such as schools, health centers, electricity and roads contrasted sharply with Kajiado but not better than Kiambu.

3.5 Target Population

The target population of this study included 578 principals and 3052 subject teachers totaling to 3630. The Principals were targeted because they were the managers at the school level and were in the position to provide insights on the teachers’ level of participation in management of school change and their motivation. Teachers were targeted because the researcher wanted to capture their views on their level of
participation in the management of school change and their motivation. The
distribution of target population is as presented in Table 3.1

Table 3.1: Target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent category</th>
<th>Kiambu</th>
<th>Machakos</th>
<th>Kajiado</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject teachers</td>
<td>2172</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2424</strong></td>
<td><strong>883</strong></td>
<td><strong>323</strong></td>
<td><strong>3630</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.6 Sampling Techniques and Sampling Size

3.6.1 Sampling Techniques

(a) Secondary School Principals (SSP)

Proportional stratified random sampling technique was used to select 58 principals comprising of 25 from Kiambu, 27 Machakos, and 5 from Kajiado County respectively. The researcher obtained the list of secondary school principals from the County Directors of Education (CDE) stratified according to locations and the type of schools (Boys, Girls, or Mixed schools). Proportional stratified technique was then used to select schools principals that constituted the sample from each county across all strata. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) states that a sample size of between 10% and 30% of the population is considered sufficient, hence 10% was considered for this study. The sampling fraction of school principals was the same within all the counties. This technique ensured that the three categories of school principals and their locations were represented.

The researcher then selected randomly the school principals within each category. Random sampling ensured equal representation and provided equal chances of being
selected which captures diversity. This way all the uniqueness in the experiences related to teacher participation in the management of school change was captured. The study sample comprised of a total of 58 principals from 58 secondary schools from the three counties. This is indicated in Table 3.2:

Table 3. 2: Sampling of school Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kiambu</th>
<th>Machakos</th>
<th>Kajiado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pop</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Boys’ Sch Princ</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Girls Sch Princ</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Mix Sch Princ</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>252</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2018

Table 3.2 shows that Kiambu had 252 secondary school principals comprising of 33 from boys schools, 44 from Girl schools, and 175 from mixed schools. Thus a sample size of 25 principals in Kiambu was selected comprising of 3 principals from Boys’ schools, 4 principals from Girls’ school, and 18 principals from mixed public secondary.

Equally, Table 3.2 indicates that Machakos County had a total of 271 principals, that is, 24 principals from Boys’ schools, 35 principals from Girls’ schools and 212 principals from mixed secondary schools. Therefore a sample size of 27 principals comprising of 2 principals from Boys schools, 4 principals from Girl’s schools, and 21 principals from mixed secondary schools. Further the Table above shows that Kajiado County had 55 secondary schools principals comprising of 13 from Boys schools, 15 from Girls Schools and 27 from mixed secondary schools. Therefore a
sample size of 6 principals was selected; 1 from Boys’ school, 2 from Girls’ schools and 3 from Mixed secondary schools.

(b) Sample Size for the Subject Teachers (STs)

The three Counties had a total population of 3052 teachers. The study used Krejie and Morgan (1990) sampling Table to determine the sample size. Subject Teachers for the study sample were selected using proportional stratified random sampling technique. The formula used stated: the total number of teachers per county divided by total number of teachers from the three counties, multiply by the sample size gotten from Krijie and Morgan sampling table. For example, for Kiambu County, 2172 divide by 3053 multiply by 345 which is 242 teachers. Therefore the sample size for Kiambu was 246, Machakos 69 and Kajiado 31. To get the percentage of the teachers

From a total population of 2172 teachers in Kiambu 242 teachers were selected. Machakos had a total population for 612 teachers of which 72 teachers were selected whereas Kajiado had 268 teachers of which 31 teachers was selected as a study sample. The total number of teachers included in this study sample was 345: 242 from Kiambu; 72 from Machakos; and 31 from Kajiado County. The sample size of the school principals and teachers is presented in Table 3.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent category</th>
<th>Kiambu</th>
<th>Machakos</th>
<th>Kajiado</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population/Sample</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject teachers</td>
<td>2172</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2424</strong></td>
<td><strong>267</strong></td>
<td><strong>883</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: N= target population in the respondent category  n= Sample size for the respondent category

Source: Researcher’s calculations (2018)
Table 3.3 shows the sample size comprised of 58 principals and 345 subject teachers.

3.7 Research Instruments

The researcher used participation and motivation questionnaires for school principals and teachers, and observation guide to collect data based on the objectives of the study. The questionnaire was employed in this study in order to obtain comparable responses. According to Kothari (2004); Mugenda and Mugenda (2003); Orodho (2009), a questionnaire covers a large population within a short time. Anonymity of the respondents helped to get honest responses and allowed time to reflect on the questions before answering in order to avoid hasty responses. The questionnaire measured the likelihood of straight, even and blunt answers (Kombo & Tromp, 2009). Closed-ended questions provided for structured responses which were easy to tabulate and analyze. The questionnaire items sought to obtain information to establish teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, school-community partnership and school finance on teachers’ motivation.

3.7.1 Questionnaires for Teachers and Principals

The study sought to seek information from teachers and school principals regarding the teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, school-community partnership and school finance and teachers motivation. The dependent variable was teachers’ motivation. The researcher used a questionnaire to collect data from the principals and teachers based on the objectives of the study. The questionnaire contained closed ended items. Each of these two questionnaires was divided into three
sections. Section A sought to capture demographic information of the respondents such as age, gender, the level of education and the teaching experience. Section B comprised of statements on teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, school community-partnership and finances. Section C comprised of items on teachers’ motivation. Items on both Section B and C were based in five point Likerts scale. Respondent were asked to indicate the extent to which the agreed with items on the five point scale whereby 5 represented to a greater extent; 4: To some extent; 3: Not sure; 2: To a little extent and 1: Not at all.

3.7.2 Observation Check List

Observation technique in research provides rich, objective and accurate data (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2008; Orodho, 2009). For this study, observation guide was used on teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, school community-partnership and finances. It was possible to record information, rather than having to rely on an individual’s recall of a particular activity;

3.8 Piloting of Research Instruments

According to Orodho (2009), a pilot study is a mini experiment designed to test logistics and gather information prior to the main study in order to improve on quality of the instruments. Pretesting established whether there were weaknesses in the research instruments. The respondents who participated in the pilot study were not included in the main study. This was because experience gained by respondents in the pilot could bias the results if the same ones were included. The pilot study also helped the researcher in ensuring proper wording, logical arrangement of words to facilitate
good responses to eliminate redundancies and repetitions and to also ensure that data was quantifiable, analyzable and useful.

3.9 Validity and Reliability

3.9.1 Validity of the instruments

Kombo and Tromp (2006) argued that validity is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of data actually presented the phenomena under study. Content validity was initiated at the design stage because instrumentation was a major threat to internal validity. According to Creswell (2013), researchers went to a panel of experts to address the issue of content validity. The purpose was to test the understanding of the instruments, construct validity, time required to complete the instrument and to ensure that the questions were relevant to specific variables under the study. Content validity for this study was established through consultation of experts in the field of educational management and was recommended for use in data collection. Therefore, the instruments were found relevant in what they were measuring as well as what was supposed to be measured.

3.9.2 Reliability of instruments

According to William and Donnelly (2006), reliability is the quality of measurement. Reliability was ascertained by use of Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. This was because Cronbach’s alpha did not require splitting of respondents’ or repeating the same test for any given construct. It required a single administration and provided quantitative estimate of the internal consistency of the scale. The value of the alpha coefficient ranges from 0 to 1. A high value shows a more reliable generated scale. Saunders, Kombo (2009) stated that a co-efficient of 0.70 or more is acceptable. The questionnaires were found reliable as they were within the range of between 0.5 and
The researcher had postulated accepting accept 0.8 and above. This meant that the questionnaire was very reliable. Cronbach’s alpha reliability statistics for particular items are presented in Table 3.4:

Table 3.4: Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cronbach’s alpha was (0.953) indicating a high level of reliability.

3.10 Data Collection

3.10.1 Data collection Procedures

After approval of the research proposal by the Graduate School of Kenyatta University, a research permit was obtained from National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). Then the researcher established a detailed implementation plan to allow a smooth conduct of the study. The researcher made a courtesy visit to the three County Education Officers (CEOs), which were the designated regions for the study. The researcher also visited the Sub-County Offices to ensure that the officers were aware about the planned data collection within the regions of their educational jurisdiction.

This researcher recruited four research assistants due to the vastness of the study sample and the large number of the questionnaires. The researcher assistants were then trained to make then understand the research problem, methodology and how to administer the questionnaires. They then proceeded to the field and paid courtesy calls to each of the three County Education Directors and Sub-County Education Officers. Appointments were made with the principals before going to the targeted secondary
schools to seek permission to conduct the study. The researcher administered the questionnaire personally to the respondents. The research assistants waited for the questionnaires to be filled and followed-up which ensured almost 90% response rate. The questionnaires were therefore collected immediately after the respondents completed filling them. The research observation schedule forms were also completed immediately after administration of the questionnaires. Finally, the completed research instruments were sorted out for analysis.

3.11 Data Analysis

The questionnaires generated quantitative data which was processed, managed, and analyzed using SPSS based on the objectives of the study. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, mean values and standard deviations) were used to measure the magnitudes of the variables based on their indicators. The Pearson correlation and regression analysis were used on each of the five objectives used to establish the association between the variables and the weight of the relationship. Findings were represented and reported using tables to summaries the variables.

3.12 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

Ethical consideration is important for the purpose of respondents’ protection, Kombo and Tromp (2009). According to Orodho (2009) ethical issues are part of research. In this context, the researcher made sure that respondents made neutral contributions in responding to the questionnaire. Therefore, the researcher observed the principle of informed consent, anonymity, confidentiality and protection of data in respect of the human rights of the respondents.
3.12.1 The Right of Voluntary Consent

The principle of voluntary consent does not allow coercing the respondents to participate in the study (Orodho, 2006). He argues that the potential respondents must be aware of the positive and negative consequences of participating in the study. In addition, research involves stress, discomfort and could even harm the participants directly or indirectly. According to Orodho (2009), the concept of intentional participation was directly related to informed consent. Therefore, this researcher obtained consent of the respondents before administering the questionnaire to ensure that they participated voluntarily. When the researcher visited the sampled schools she requested the respondents to complete and sign the consent form (Ref. Appendix E). The consent form indicated that participation was voluntary and the respondents had a right to withdraw from the study if they did not wish to participate.

3.12.2 The Principle of Anonymity

The principle of anonymity was based on the understanding that the respondents would remain anonymous throughout to guarantee their privacy in participating in the study (Kombo, 2009). It was to protect the identities of the individual respondents who participated. This meant replacing their real names with pseudonyms. According to Creswell (2012) researchers inform the respondents the purpose of the study and its consequences on their lives. He argued that the information provided by the individual and their anonymity ought to be protected and guaranteed by the researcher. This implied that all the information gathered was used for the research and individual names and official titles were excluded from the report. The respondents were, therefore, not required to write their names in the questionnaires.

3.12.3 Implication of Confidentiality
The researcher operated within the ethical considerations which required the respondents to be assured of confidentiality of the information given to the researcher and her assistants (Kombo, 2009). It was therefore critical to maintain confidentiality. In this regard, the information collected from the respondents was treated with strict confidentiality and was only used for the purpose of this study.

3.12.4 Necessity of Data Protection

It was the obligation of this researcher to protect the data obtained from the respondents. In this case, it was securely kept as personal data with regard to the facts and opinions by any given individual respondent (Kombo & Tromp, 2006).
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to establish teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, school community-partnerships and school finances on teachers’ motivation. This chapter presents the findings of the study focusing on the following thematic areas: effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction on their motivation; effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources on their motivation; effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on their motivation; effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of school community-partnership on their motivation; and effects of teachers’ level of participation in management of school finances on their motivation.

4.2 Instruments Return Rate

Instruments return rate was the proportion of the research instruments that were returned after they had been administered to the respondents. According to Wilson Pollack and Rooney (2003), a response rate of 50 was also considered reasonable. In this case, questionnaires were administered to the school principals and teachers as the main respondents. The return rate is presented in Table 3.4.
Table 4.1: Questionnaire return rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Respondent</th>
<th>Questionnaires administered</th>
<th>Questionnaire Returned</th>
<th>Return rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Principals</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>403</strong></td>
<td><strong>379</strong></td>
<td><strong>94.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

As shown in Table 4.1, the questionnaire return rate for the teachers was 93.9% while that of the school principals was 94.8%. This made an average of 94.4% of all the questionnaires administered. Various scholars have suggested a reasonable instrument return rate to allow data analysis. For instance, Saunders, Lewis and Thornbill (2000) recommended an average response rate of 30% to 40% as reasonable while Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) observed that a 50% response rate was adequate, 60% was good and above 70% rated very good. According to Wilson Pollack and Rooney (2003), a response rate of 50 was also considered reasonable. Based on the above recommended return rates by various scholars, the response rate of 94.4% from the school principals and teachers was considered excellent for data analysis.

4.2 Demographic Information of Principals and Subject Teachers

The study sought to investigate the demographic characteristic of the respondents. The demographic information comprised of gender, age, level of education and teaching experience. The study involved a sample of 58 secondary schools comprising of 42 mixed schools, 10 Girls’ schools, and 6 Boys’ school secondary schools. Table 4.2 depicts demographic information for the teachers and principals.
Table 4.2: Demographic information of the teachers and principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>133(42%)</td>
<td>30(54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>191(58%)</td>
<td>26(46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 yrs.</td>
<td>125(39%)</td>
<td>2(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 yrs.</td>
<td>110(33%)</td>
<td>13(23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 yrs.</td>
<td>70(22%)</td>
<td>35(64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and above</td>
<td>19(6%)</td>
<td>5(9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>36(11%)</td>
<td>1(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed. degree</td>
<td>235(73%)</td>
<td>39(70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/PGDE</td>
<td>8(3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSC PGDE</td>
<td>17(5%)</td>
<td>2(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd degree</td>
<td>25(8%)</td>
<td>14(25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD degree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Experience in years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 yrs.</td>
<td>129(40%)</td>
<td>2(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yrs.</td>
<td>31(10%)</td>
<td>4(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 yrs.</td>
<td>66(20%)</td>
<td>4(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 yrs.</td>
<td>45(14%)</td>
<td>20(36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 yrs.</td>
<td>53(16%)</td>
<td>23(41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 30 yrs.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3(5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With modernization, gender balance is increasingly becoming an important consideration in almost all spheres of life. Psychologists argue that males and females perceive and interpret things differently when they are exposed to the same kind of environment. The study sought to establish whether there was gender balance in the teaching staff in the area of study. Table 4.2 shows the distribution of the respondents in the sampled secondary schools. The analysis reveals that more than half 30(54%) of the school principals were male compare to 26(46%) female teachers. This indicated that there were generally more male principals than female ones based on
their gender in the three counties. It was also evident that there were more 191(59%) female teachers compared to 133(42%) male teachers. This implied that female teachers were more than male teachers. Gender of a principal may affect teachers’ motivation because teachers of same gender may feel more satisfied working under the leadership of a preferred gender. For example female principals may influence the motivation of female teachers as a result of their successful leadership.

The study sought to establish whether age had any influence on participation and motivation. Age factor is a factor of motivation in one way or another. For example, younger teachers have more conflicting issues and diverse aspirations than older ones who may have settled in their jobs due to age. On the other hand, older teachers may be more motivated than the young ones. This concurs with Okumbe (2000) that younger employees give higher expectations and aspirations which may not be met by the organization. Table 4.2 also shows the age distribution of Principals and teachers. This analysis also revealed that majority of teachers were below 40 years while most principals were between 40-50 years. This is an indication that most of the principals and teachers in the three counties were in their active years of their life hence could participate in management of school change.

The study sought to establish the respondents’ level of education which is a factor of motivation. According to Okumbe (1992) professional variables showed some significant influence in workers’ motivation and job satisfaction. Table 4.2 indicates that 39(70%) principals and 235(73%) teachers had B/Ed degree as their highest level of education. The Table also shows that 14 (25%) principals and 25(8%) subject teachers had M.Ed. degrees. This shows that majority of teachers and principals in the three counties teachers had the minimum qualifications. Both principals and teachers
are encouraged to join universities for the attainment of higher education qualifications.

The study sought to establish the working experience of the respondents. Teachers and principals who had taught for many years were able to compare large classes in relation to workload and the level of motivation. Table 4.2 shows that 24 (43%) school principals had taught for 10-20 years followed by 23 (41%) who had taught for 21-30 years. The results indicated that 160 (49%) subject teachers had taught for less than ten years with 111 (34%) of them having taught for 10-30 years. Findings concur with Gakuru (1982) that those teachers who taught for a longer periods of time were in a better position to give their information in regard to participation and motivation.

The demographic information shows that an attempt was made to get the views of the respondents across all the ages, gender, education level and working experience. These indicated that the information gathered gave a general opinion of the respondents on teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, teachers’ and students’ activities, school community partnership and school finance.

4.3 Teachers’ Participation in Management of Curriculum and Instruction on their Motivation

The first objective of this study sought to determine the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction on teachers’ motivation.

To realize this objective, the study was guided by the hypothesis H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction on teachers’ motivation. The views of teachers and principals were sought. They were expected to indicate their responses on a five point
Likert’s scale whereby 5 represented a greater extent; 4: To some extent; 3: Not sure; 2: To a little extent and 1: Not at all. Teachers’ motivation comprised of creativity, commitment, time management, responsibility, efficiency and effectiveness, recognition, positive interpersonal relationships and integrity. From the summated scores, mean was computed ranging from 0 to 5. According to Lee (1999) in Bademo and Tafera (2016) a mean of below 2.00 is termed low level, mean between 2 to 3.5 is moderate level whereas as mean of 3.5 to 5 is regarded high level. The subject teachers’ responses on teachers’ level of motivation is presented in Table 4.3
Table 4.3: Views of teachers on their level of motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing teaching and learning materials.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity in performance of duties</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment in schemes of work/ lesson plans</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality on duty and attending classes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced cases of absenteeism and turn over</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good time management.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the quality of KCSE grades</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm in the execution of duties</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in curriculum implementation</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved efficiency and effectiveness</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being happy and satisfied with the profession</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on individual students’ problems.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in students’ character formation.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary performance.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and respect from the public.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in professional growth and development.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities and promotions.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good interpersonal relationships.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation of work done/ good working conditions.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism and integrity at work.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate efforts to achieve the set goals.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total grand mean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 shows analysis of teachers’ responses on teachers’ level of motivation. The analysis indicated that 183 (60%) of teachers reported that teachers demonstrated interest in implementation of curriculum and instruction. This means that majority of teachers were interested in curriculum implementation. The results indicate that 156 (52%) teachers reported that they had recorded improvement in the quality of KCSE grades. This result shows that 173 (60%) of teachers indicated that teachers observed good time management. In line with time management, it can be concluded that teachers observe time when reporting to work and this enables them to prepare for the day’s activities in time. The analysis revealed 173 (59%) of the subject teachers stated that teachers demonstrated efficiency and effectiveness in performance of duties. This can be attributed to good time management as observed above. It was also reported that 101 (34%) subject teachers reported that teachers were happy and satisfied with the teaching profession. This implies that the majority (66%) of the teachers are not satisfied with their teaching profession. However, this is beyond the scope of this study since it focuses on the levels of motivation and not reasons for non-satisfaction.

On the aspect of the extent to which teachers were recognized and respected by the community and public, the results shows that 177 (61%) of teachers indicated that they are recognized. This implies that there is a good relationship between the teachers and the community and public in general. The general conclusion from the findings is that there is evident of teachers’ motivation.

Table 4.3 presents the results of levels of motivation by use of means. The results shows that the mean for teachers who demonstrated interest in implementation of curriculum and instruction was (Mean = 3.61). This implies that there is high level of motivation for the teachers in relation to curriculum implementation and instructional activities. This can therefore be concluded that the schools highly motivate teachers.
on matters of curriculum and instruction. This means that teachers are highly motivated as they demonstrate interest in curriculum implementation. The results indicated high level (Mean = 3.48) for efficiency and effectiveness in performance of duties implying high level of teachers’ motivation. This analysis further revealed moderate level (Mean=3.47) for recognition and respect from community and public. Teachers were also happy and satisfied with the teaching profession (Mean=3.45). The total cumulative mean of 3.21 indicated a moderate level of teachers’ motivation. This could be interpreted to imply that teachers’ level of motivation was moderate.

The study sought to establish teachers’ level of participation in management of change curriculum and instruction. Teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction comprised of integrating, administering, supervising and marking exams in line with Kenya National Examination Council, advising on acquisition of text books for the new syllabus and integrating ICT in teaching and learning. The teachers’ responses are presented in Table 4.4:
Table 4.4: Views of teachers on their level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management of Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration students for national examinations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising on acquisition of text books.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life skills integration in various subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing teaching- learning materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT integration in teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking academic performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating awareness changes in curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 5= To a greater extent; 4= To some extent; 3 =Not sure; 2=To a smaller extent; Legend: 1= No extent
Table 4.4 shows analysis of subject teachers’ responses on teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction. The analysis revealed that 166(80%) of subject teachers reported that teachers participated in integrating, administering, supervising and marking exams in line with the Kenya National Examination Council (KNEC) and Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD). This implies that most teachers’ participated in issues to national examinations. The results also shows that 251(80%) of subject teachers said that teachers participated in change relating to advising on acquisition of text books for the syllabus. This means that teachers were participated in acquisition of the reference books. It was also reported that 128(41%) of teachers reported that teachers participated in change relating to life skills integration in various subjects. The results revealed that 217 (69%) of the subject teachers reported that teachers participated in change relating to creating awareness of current changes in curriculum. The findings provide some evidence of teachers’ participation in management of change in teachers and students’ activities.

Table 4.4 further shows computed means of each items with highest level (Mean= 4.03) for integrating, administering, supervising and marking exams in line with the changes from Kenya National Examination Council (KNEC) and Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD). This implies that teachers participated highly in change relating to integrating, administering, supervising and marking exams. The results indicate high level (Mean = 4.00) for teachers participation in advising on acquisition of text books for the new syllabus. This means that teachers were highly involved in acquiring text books for use by both teachers and students. The analysis revealed high level (Mean=3.63) for deciding on life skills for integration in various
subjects. The total cumulative scores (Mean= 3.62) indicate high level of teachers’ participation in management of change relating to curriculum and instruction. The findings from the views of the subject teachers provided evidence of high level of teachers’ participation in change management of change relating to curriculum and instruction.

The study sought to triangulate the views of subject teachers on their level of motivation and participation as shown in Table 4.3 and 4.4 with the views of school principals on the teachers’ level of motivation and participation as shown in Table 4.5 and 4.6. These principals were expected to respond to a questionnaire regarding teachers’ level of motivation and participation. They were expected to indicate their responses on a five point Likert’s scale whereby 5 represented a greater extent; 4: To some extent; 3: Not sure; 2: To a little extent and 1: Not at all.

The mean score of Likert scale items on teachers’ level of motivation and participation was computed in order to make comparisons. From the summated scores, mean was computed ranging from 0 to 5. According to Lee (1999) in Bademo and Tafera (2016) a mean of below 2.00 was deemed low level, mean between 2 to 3.5 was moderate whereas as mean above 3.5 was regarded high level. The principals’ responses on teachers’ level of motivation is presented on Table 4.5 below:
Table 4.5: Views of Principals on teachers’ level of motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparing teaching and learning materials</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of new knowledge and skills</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing schemes of work and lesson plans</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual in performance of duties</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced absenteeism and turnover/attrition</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good time management</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the quality of KCSE grades</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiasm in the execution of duties</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in curriculum implementation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency and effectiveness in performance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy and satisfied with the profession</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in students’ problems</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in students’ character formation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition from the public</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing exemplary performance</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest in professional growth</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being assigned responsibilities / promotion</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal relationships</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appreciation of work done/ work conditions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating professionalism and integrity</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making deliberate efforts to achieve targets</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5 shows analysis of principals’ responses on teachers’ level of motivation. The analysis indicated that 40(74%) of school principals reported that teachers demonstrated interest in professional growth and training. This means that teachers were interested in their own professional growth and training in order to acquire new skills and knowledge for better performance of duties. This means that teachers were motivated to acquire new skills and knowledge. The results indicate that 44(79%) principals reported that teachers received recognition and respect from the community and the public implying that teachers’ services were valued and appreciated by the general public. The result shows that 43(81%) principals indicated that teachers were given responsibilities and promotions as a result of good performance. This means that a small percentage of principle did not encourage teachers’ to take up new responsibilities and to be promoted. The analysis revealed 42(76%) principals stated that teachers had interest in the implementation of curriculum and instruction. It was also reported that 26(47%) principals reported that teachers had demonstrated efficiency and effectiveness in performance of duties, implies that teachers had mastered the art of time management. The analysis showed that 40(72%) of subject teachers reported that teachers were taking initiatives in preparing teaching and learning materials. This could be interpreted to mean that teachers were self-driven and had control over their work. It can be concluded that a small percentage of teachers were not motivated to demonstrate initiative and creativity performance of duties.

Table 4.5 further shows computed means of each items with highest level (Mean = 4.11) demonstrating interest in professional growth and development. This means that teachers were highly motivated by promotions, training and professional development. The results indicated high level (Mean =4.04) for interest in the
implementation of curriculum and instruction implying that teachers were highly motivated to implement curriculum. This analysis further revealed high level (Mean=4.00) on responsibilities and promotions as a result of good performance. This means that teachers’ promotions and responsibilities were a source of motivation. The mean (Mean=3.91) shows high level, meaning that teachers were happy and satisfied with the teaching profession. The total cumulative scores shows high level (Mean=3.73) indicating high level of teachers’ motivation according to the principals. This implies that the school principals indicated high level of teachers’ motivation (Mean=3.73) while teachers indicated moderate level of motivation (Mean 3.21).

The study sought to compare the views of teachers Table 4.4 with the views of principals Table 4.6 on the teachers’ level of participation in management of Curriculum and Instructional activities. The mean score of the eight Likert items in curriculum and instruction was computed. From the summated score, mean was computed ranging from 0 to 5. According to Lee (1999) in Bademo and Tafera (2016) a mean of below 2.00 was deemed low level; mean between 2 to 3.5 was moderate level and mean of 3.5 to 5 was high level. Mean of each item and total mean values were computed in order to make comparisons. The principals’ responses are presented in Table 4.6:
Table 4.6: Views of Principals on teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management of curriculum and instruction</th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administering examinations</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering students for national exams</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising on acquisition of text</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on the life skills integration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing reports/teaching and learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT integration in teaching-learning</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking academic performance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating awareness of current changes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand mean                                      3.85

Legend: 5= To a greater extent; 4= To some extent; 3 =Not sure; 2=To a smaller extent; Legend: 1= No extent
Table 4.6 shows analysis of principals’ responses on teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction. The results indicates that 49(89%) school principals reported that teachers participated in integrating, administering, supervising and marking of exams according to Kenya National Examination Councils (KNEC) and Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD) regulations. This means that teachers participated in setting and administering exams in line with the set rules and regulations. The result shows that 20(36%) principals indicated that teachers advised on acquisition of text books for the new syllabus. This means that majority of teachers participated in change relating to test book acquisition. The analysis revealed that 61(110%) of the school principals stated that teachers participated in registering students for national examinations. It was also reported that 59(107%) principals reported that teachers participated in change relating to creating awareness of current changes in the curriculum among teachers.

Table 4.6 further shows computed means of each items with high level (Mean = 4.77) for advising on acquisition of text books for the new syllabus implying that teachers’ level of participation in acquisition of text books was high. The results indicate high level (Mean = 4.52) for integrating, administering, supervising and marking exams in line with the new changes in the curriculum from Kenya National Examination Council (KNEC) and Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD). This means that teachers’ level of participation in integrating, administering, supervising and marking exams in line with the new changes was high.

The findings reveals high level (Mean=4.35) for registering students for national examinations. This implies that teachers’ level of participation in registering students for national examinations was high. The analysis further revealed high level (Mean=4.20) for
creating awareness of current changes in the curriculum among teachers implying high level of teachers’ participation on the same. The total cumulative indicates high level (Mean= 3.85) implying that teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction according to the school principals was high. This implies that both subject teachers and school principals indicated that teachers level of teachers’ participation in management of curriculum and instruction was high (Mean=3.62) and (Mean=3.85) respectively.

The teachers’ level of participation was supported by the results from the observation guide which indicated that most of the teachers had schedules of exam invigilation, analyzed exams and records of work on curriculum, all signed by concerned teachers. This was clear indication of teachers’ participation in change management in curriculum and instruction. Through the observation guide, the study also established that most teachers had details of students’ records, implying that the teachers tracked the students’ academic performance. The observation guide also gave evidence that most teachers had signed minutes of departmental and academic meetings, and professional documents such as Schemes of Work and Records of Work, an indicator of teachers’ participation. This implied that teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction was high.

The study sought to test the hypothesis on whether the teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction was a significant predictor of motivation. The null hypothesis, HO₁: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction and teachers’ motivation. The level of significance was set at 0.01. A Simple Linear regression test was run. A model summary was generated as presented in Table 4.7:
Table 4.7: Teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction and motivation model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Squared</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.313&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>1.023239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Predictors: (Constant), curriculum management

Table 4.7 shows the adjusted R<sup>2</sup> as .094, which implied that teachers’ level of participation in change management of curriculum and instruction accounted for 9% of the variance in teachers’ motivation. It also suggested that 9% of the total variability in motivation was explained by the teachers’ level of participation. Although the adjusted R<sup>2</sup> was less than 20%, the discrepancy between the R and adjusted R<sup>2</sup> was minimal, implying that teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction predicted teachers’ motivation. This means that 91% of the variation in motivation cannot be explained by the teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction.

To test the goodness of fit of the regression model on curriculum and instruction, F value was obtained. The results are presented in Table 4.8:

Table 4.8: Teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>26.685</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.685</td>
<td>25.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>245.002</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271.687</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Dependent Variable: motivation
- Predictor: (Constant), curriculum management

Table 4.8 shows that the model is fit and therefore acceptable for the regression equation. This was indicated by F value (1, 234) = 25.487, which is significant at P < .05. This means...
that although $R^2$ is 9.4%, it is significant. A simple regression test was conducted to establish the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instructions and teachers’ motivation. This is presented in Table 4.9:

**Table 4.9: Simple Regression on Teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Un-standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum management</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>5.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: motivation. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Table 4.9 shows that the teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction had a statistical significant effect on their motivation as indicated by ($P$ value <0.01). This leads to rejection of the null hypothesis that “There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in the management of curriculum and instruction and teachers’ motivation”. This result shows that the coefficient of teachers’ motivation was positive (2.52) which implied that, the slope was statistically significant.

This result also show the intercept of the regression line,

$$Y = 2.52 + 0.28X,$$

This means that when teachers’ level of participation increased by 1 unit, teachers’ motivation increased by 2.8 units.

The regression equation is expressed as:

$$Y = a + bX,$$
Whereby $Y$ is the expected value of teachers’ motivation, “$a$” is the value of teacher motivation if the level of participation is zero; “$b$” is the effect of teachers’ motivation for each unit change in participation while “$X$” is teachers’ level of participation. The standardized beta value of 0.313 indicates that an increase in participation by 1% would cause an increase in teachers’ motivation by 31.3%. This implies that the more teachers participate in management of curriculum and instruction the more they are motivated to carry the teaching activities in school.

This study established that teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction had significant statistical effect on motivation. These findings concur with studies by Bates (2008); World Bank (2008) and Pryor, Westbrook and Lustier (2012) who found that teachers’ level of participation in preparation and utilization of teaching learning materials was a factor of teachers, motivation. The finding also confirms studies by Ayeni (2012); World Bank (2008); Duze (2011) who stated that teachers’ participation in lesson preparation, lesson notes and scheme of work led to commitment in the profession. This study finding mirrors the study by Mualuko, Mukasa, and Achoka, (2009); Ofojebe and Ezugoh (2010) who found that that teachers’ participation in curriculum activities led to commitment, effectiveness and achievement of school goals. Further, this study finding are in line with Mueller and Gokturk (2010); Matoke, Okibo and Nyamongo (2015) who stated that teachers’ capacity building on teaching and learning processes had a significant effect on teachers motivation.
4.4 Teachers’ Level of Participation in Management of Physical and material Resources on their Motivation

The second objective sought to determine the effect of teachers’ level of participation in the management of physical and material resources on teachers’ motivation. To realize this objective the study was guided by the following hypothesis: H\textsubscript{02}: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in the management of physical and material resources on teachers’ motivation. To this effect, the views of teachers and school principals were sought. Their responses were organized in a five point Likert’s scale whereby 5 represented a greater extent 4: To some extent 3: Not sure 2: To a little extent and 1: Not at all. Teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources comprised of maintaining and servicing school facilities, inventory of equipment and supplies, requisition of materials and equipment and review of strategic plan. Mean of each item and total mean values were computed in order to make comparisons. According to Lee (1999) in Bademo and Tafera (2016) mean of below 2.00 was deemed low level, mean between 2 to 3.5 was moderate whereas as mean above 3.5 was regarded high level. Teachers’ views are presented in Table 4.10:
Table 4.10: Views of teachers on their level of participation in management of physical and material resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management of physical and material resources</th>
<th>5 n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>4 n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>3 n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2 n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1 N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and servicing of the facilities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of equipment and supplies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requisition/ acquisition of facilities/ equipment</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of school strategic plan</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand mean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 5= To a greater extent; 4= To some extent; 3 =Not sure; 2=To a smaller extent; Legend: 1= No extent
Table 4.10 shows the descriptive analysis of subject teachers’ responses on their level of participation in management of physical and material resources. The results indicates that 145(46%) of subject teachers indicated that teachers participated in the review of school strategic planning to address emerging issues while 149(46%) did not participate in the same. This means that teachers did not fully participate in the review of school strategic planning. The analysis revealed that 131(40%) subject teachers stated that teachers participated in change relating to requisition and acquisition of modern school facilities and equipment while 177(55%) of them said that teachers did not participate on the same. This means that majority of the teachers did not participation in requisition and acquisition of modern school facilities and equipments. Table 4.10 further shows computed means of each item indicated moderate level (Mean = 2.87) for reviewing school strategic plan to address any emerging issues. This means that teachers’ level of participated in the review of strategic plan was moderate. The results also indicate moderate level (Mean = 2.65) for requisition and acquisition of modern school facilities and equipment. Consequently, (Mean= 2.53) implied moderate level of teachers’ participation in the management of physical and material resources.

The study sought to triangulate the views of subject teachers on Table 4.10 with the views of school principals on the teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources as presented in Table 4.11:
Table 4.11: Views of principals on teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management of Physical Facilities</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and servicing of the facilities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of equipment and supplies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requisition and acquisition of modern facilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of school strategic planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand mean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 5= To a greater extent; 4= To some extent; 3 = Not sure; 2= To a smaller extent; Legend: 1= No extent

Table 4.11 shows analysis of principals’ responses on teachers’ level of participation in the management of physical and material resources. The results indicates that 39(50%) of principals reported that teachers participated in change relating to maintenance and servicing of the facilities. This means that teachers participated in maintenance and servicing of the facilities. The analysis also shows that 43(77%) of the school principals reported that to a great extent teachers participated in change relating to requisition and acquisition of modern facilities and equipment. This means that teachers participated to a greater extent in requisition and acquisition of facilities and equipment. Table 4.11 further shows computed means of each items with highest level (Mean = 3.84) for requisition and acquisition of modern school facilities and equipment. This implies that teachers’ level of participation in requisition and acquisition of modern school facilities and equipment was high. The results also
indicate moderate level (Mean= 3.48) for maintenance and servicing of the facilities. Consequently, on average the study reveals moderate level (Mean= 3.49) for teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources. This implies that both teachers and principals indicated that teachers’ were at moderate level of participation in management of change relating to physical and material resources.

However, the observation schedule lacked evidence of teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources. This was evidenced by the fact that teachers did not have lists of inventory of equipment and supplies. In other words, teachers did not fully participate in decision making relating to inventory of equipment and supplies in the departments. Also, the observation guide showed that teachers did not have records on maintenance and servicing of facilities such as classrooms, laboratories and library and even revised framework on emerging issues. This clearly showed that most of the teachers did not fully participate in change relating to management of physical facilities.

The study sought to test the hypothesis on whether the teachers’ level of participation in the management of change relating to management of physical and material resources was a good predictor of motivation. The null hypothesis was: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation the management of physical and material resources on their motivation. A Simple Linear regression test was conducted. This generated a model summary and is presented in Table 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Squared</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.429a</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.985741388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), physical facilities
As presented in Table 4.12, it can be deduced that 18% of the total variability in the motivation was explained by the teachers’ level of participation in the management of change relating to management of physical and material resources. The results showed that the adjusted $R^2$ was 0.181, which implied that teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources accounted for 18.1% of the variance in teachers’ motivation. The value of adjusted $R^2$ which was 0.18 implied that the levels of teacher’s participation in management of physical facilities predicted their motivation.

To test the goodness of fit of the regression model of the levels of teachers’ participation in the management of physical and material resources, F value of ANOVA was obtained and the results were as below. The ANOVA Table result is presented in Table 4.13:

**Table 4.13: Teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.824</td>
<td>57.45</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>302.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: motivation  
b. Predictors: (Constant), physical facilities

Table 4.13 shows that teachers’ participation in the management of change in relation to physical and material resources helped to explain variation in teachers’ motivation. This is as indicated by F value $F(1, 254) = 55.824, P < .01$ suggesting that the model is good and therefore acceptable for the regression equation. Therefore $r^2$ which is 18% is significant.
To establish the effect of teachers’ level of participation in the management of physical and material resources on teachers’ motivation, a simple regression test was conducted. This is shown in Table 4.14:

**Table 4.14: Simple Regression on teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources on motivation coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.288</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: motivation, Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Table 4.14 shows that teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources had an effect on teachers’ motivation. This is as shown by the (p value < 0.01). This leads to rejection of the null hypothesis that “There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in the management of physical and materials resources on teachers’ motivation”. The results also show that the coefficient of teachers’ motivation is positive (2.29) which implies that, the slope “a” is statistically significant.

The intercept of the regression line is:

\[ Y = 2.29 + 0.399 \times X \]

This means that when teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources increases by 1 unit, teachers’ motivation increases by 2.68.

The regression equation is expressed as follows:

\[ Y = a + bX \]
Where “Y” is the expected value of teachers’ motivation, “a” is the value of teacher motivation if teachers’ level of participation in the management of physical and material resources is zero, “b” is the effect of teachers’ motivation for each unit of change in teachers’ level of participation while “X” is teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources. The standardized beta value of .429 indicates that an increase in participation by 1% would cause an increase in teacher motivation by 42.9%. This generally implied that the more the teachers participated in management of physical and material resources more they were motivated.

The regression results of this study indicate that there is a significant relationship between teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources and teachers motivation as evidenced by a (P < 0.001). The findings concur with the Ali, Naeimeh, Javad, Hatam (2015); Lewin (2008) who established that teachers’ level of participated in management of water, sanitation, procurement of equipment and learning materials was an important aspect of teachers’ motivation. He added that teachers’ participation in budget preparation, maintenances of classrooms, laboratories, and toilets had effects on teachers’ motivation. Similarly, Jasper, Le, Bartram (2012) reported higher rates of absenteeism from schools during menses due to poor sanitation facilities. The study mirrors the findings of Afshari, Bakar, Luan, Samah, and Fool (2009) who also found that teachers’ participation in ICT integration in teaching-learning was a factor of teachers’ motivation. Also the results concur with the work of Matoke (2015) that teachers’ participation in provision of material resources such as reference books had a significant statistical effect (p-value of .0126) on teacher motivation. Similarly, Chimombe (2011) reported that provision of
teaching-learning materials created an environment that promoted teachers’ motivation and effective performance of duties. Chimombe further stated that teachers’ participation in management of facilities and material resources had a significant effect on social and health issues which is a factor of motivation.

4.5 Teachers’ Participation in Management of Students’ and Teachers Activities and motivation
The third objective of this study sought to determine the effect of teachers’ level of participation in the management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation. To realize this objective the study was guided by this hypothesis: $H_{03}$: there is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in the management of students’ and teachers’ activities on their motivation. To this effect the views of subject teachers and principals were sought. Their responses were organized on a five point Likert’s scale whereby 5 represented a greater extent, 4: To some extent, 3: Not sure, 2: To a little extent and 1: Not at all.

Teachers’ participation in management of change in relation to management of students’ and teachers’ activities comprised of career programmes, identifying institutions for career training; guidance and counseling, students’ welfare, school discipline, recruitment and selecting process, professional growth and development self-appraisal and conflict management. From the summated score, mean was computed ranging from 0 to 5 in order to make comparisons. According to Lee (1999) in Bademo and Tefera (2016) a mean of below 2.00 was deemed low level, mean between 2 to 3.5 was moderate whereas as mean between 3.5 to 5 was regarded high level. Teachers’ views on their level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities are presented in Table 4.15
Table 4.15: The Views of teachers on their level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students/ Teachers Activities</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N % n</td>
<td>N % n</td>
<td>N % n</td>
<td>N % n</td>
<td>N % n</td>
<td>N % n</td>
<td>N % n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing and facilitating career programmes.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting students in identifying institutions career training.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counseling for peer counselors.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing and facilitating students’ council’s activities.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating students in revising rules and regulations.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the school discipline.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating teaching and non-teaching duties.</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging assumptions which are no longer relevant.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning from personal problems.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting and selecting teaching /non-teaching staff.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending training/ in-service courses</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraising on teaching and non-teaching duties.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting others to use of technology in teaching.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inducting and orienting new teachers.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating / coordinating staff development activities.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing conflict management programmes.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 5= To a greater extent; 4= To some extent; 3 =Not sure; 2=To a smaller extent; Legend: 1= No extent
Table 4.15 shows descriptive analysis of subject teachers’ responses on their level of participation in the management of teachers’ and students’ activities. The results indicate that 168(53%) of subject teachers reported that teachers participated in change in relation to facilitating career programmes for students. This means that majority of teachers participated in guiding students in selecting future career on basis of their ability. The analysis showed that 182(58%) of the teachers stated that teachers participated in change relating to assisting students in identifying institutions for further education and career training. This implies that teachers are assisting students in identifying institutions for further education and career training. It was also indicated that 199(62%) subject teachers confirmed that teachers participated in change relating to facilitating teaching and non-teaching. This means that teachers played an active role in relation to the performance of their duties. The results indicated that 165(52%) of the subject teachers participated in change relating to facilitating training for guidance and counseling for peer counselor implying that teachers were involved in solving students’ problems,

Table 4.15 further shows computed means of each items for comparison purposes. The highest level (Mean =3.74) for learning from personal experience. The analysis indicated moderate level (Mean=3.54) for facilitating teaching and non-teaching duties. This means that teachers’ level of participation in facilitating teaching and non-teaching duties was moderate. The results also shows moderate level (Mean=3.35) for assisting students in identifying institutions for further education and career training. This implies moderate level of teachers’ participation in assisting students in identifying institutions for further education and career training. Further
the findings reveals moderate level (Mean=3.22) for overseeing, organizing and facilitating students' council activities. Consequently, the total mean scores (Mean=3.01) implied moderate level of teachers’ participation in the management of students and teachers activities.

The study sought to triangulate the views of subject teachers on Table 4.15 with the views of school principals as presented in Table 4.16:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students/ Teachers Activities</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing / facilitating career programmes for students.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting students to identifying career institutions.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counseling for peer counselors.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing/ facilitating students’ council’s activities.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating students in revising rules and regulations.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the school discipline.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating teaching and non-teaching duties.</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging assumptions which are no longer relevant.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from personal problems.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting and selecting teaching and non-teaching staff.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending appropriate training/ in-service training.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-appraising and evaluating other teachers on performance of teaching and non-teaching duties.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Students'/ Teachers' Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students'/ Teachers' Activities</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting in the use of technology in teaching learning.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating and coordinating staff development activities.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating conflict management programmes.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating teaching and non-teaching duties.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging assumptions which are no longer relevant.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberately incorporating change in carrying out duties.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from personal problems.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating professional training programmes for teachers.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting and selecting teaching and non-teaching staff.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending appropriate in-service training.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal on performance of duties.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inducting and orienting new teachers.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 5= To a greater extent; 4= To some extent; 3 =Not sure; 2=To a smaller extent; Legend: 1= No extent
Table 4.16 shows descriptive analysis of principals’ views in relation to teachers’ level of participation in management of teachers’ and students’ activities. The study revealed that 44(81%) of school principals reported that teachers’ participated in inducting and orienting new teacher. This means that teachers participated fully in giving orientation and induction to new teachers. The results indicated that 44(83%) school principals indicated that teachers participated in change relating to deliberately incorporating change in carrying out their duties. This means that teachers were not resistant to any change relating to performance of their duties. It was also reported that 44(80%) of the principals reported that teachers participated in change relating to facilitating professional development training programs for teachers. This implies that generally teachers participated in professional development training programs. The study also revealed that 44(78%) of the principals reported that teachers participated in training and in service for professional development implying that majority of teachers attended in service training programs. The analysis showed that 42(77%) of the school principals said that teachers participated in staff self-appraising and evaluation other teachers on performance of teaching and non-teaching duties implying that they participated in staff appraisal.

Table 4.16 further shows computed means of each items, the highest level (Mean =4.09) for inducting and orienting new teacher indicating. This implies high level of teachers’ participation in inducting and orienting new teacher in various departments.

The results indicate high level (Mean 3.96) for deliberately incorporating change in carrying out their duties. The analysis also shows high level (Mean=3.88) for facilitating professional development training programs for teachers implying high
level of teachers participation on the same. Further the findings indicated high level (Mean=3.87) for self-appraising and evaluation other teachers on performance of teaching and non-teaching duties. This indicates high level of teachers’ participation in teachers’ appraising on performance of teaching and non-teaching duties. However, the results reveals low level (Mean=2.2) for facilitating conflict management programs. This implies that the level of teachers’ participation in facilitating conflict management programs was low. Consequently, the total cumulative mean scores indicates moderate level (Mean= 3.34) for teachers’ participation in the management of physical and material resources. This could be interpreted to imply that both the principals and subject teachers indicated moderate level of teachers’ participation in relation to the management of students’ and teachers’ activities.

These results were compared with the observation checklist. The analysis showed that teachers had lists of career programmes for students as well as scheduled for career guidance and counseling activities. This meant that teachers participated in careers, and guidance and counselling activities. In most schools, teachers had lists of elected students’ council and documented school rules and regulations which were used in guiding students in their daily activities as well as school expectations in relation to their behavior. On students’ discipline, most of the teachers indicated that they participated in promoting students’ discipline in various ways. The study also established that teachers had programmes of students’ induction and orientation schedules. This was an indication that teachers participated in change relating to induction and orientation of students. Generally, the observation guides indicated that there were documents to support teachers’ participation in change relating to teachers’ and students’ activities.
The study sought to test the hypothesis on whether the teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities was a significant predictor of motivation. The null hypothesis $H_0$: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in the management of students’ and teachers’ activities and their motivation. A Simple Linear regression test was conducted and a model summary was generated. This is presented in Tables 4.17:

Table 4. 17: Teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities and motivation model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Squared</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.846992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), teachers participation on student and staff activities

The model summary showed that 40% of the total variability in the motivation was explained by teachers’ level of participation in the management of students’ and teachers’ activities. The results showed that the adjusted $R^2$ was 0.397, which implied that teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities explained 40% of the variance in teachers’ motivation.

In order to establish whether teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities helped to predict the variation in teachers’ motivation, ANOVA Table was generated. The results are presented in Table 4.18:
Table 4.18: Teachers’ participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99.719</td>
<td>139.001</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>249.655</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: motivation  
b. Predictors: (Constant), teachers’ participation on student’ and staff activities

Table 4.18 shows that teachers’ level of participation in the management of students’ and teachers’ activities would be used to explain variation in teachers’ motivation. This was as demonstrated by F Statistics which had value $F (1, 209) = 139.001$, $P < .05$ suggesting that the model is fit and therefore acceptable for the regression equation. R is 40% and therefore significant as shown in Table 4.19:

Table 4.19: Simple Regression analysis of teachers’ participation in management of students’ and staff activities and motivation coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Constant)</th>
<th>Unstandardized</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Standardized</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student and teachers’ activities</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>8.047</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: motivation, Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

The results in Table 4.19 show that teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities had effect on teachers’ motivation. This is indicated by the $P value < 0.01$. This leads to rejection of the null hypothesis “There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in the management of students’ and teachers’ motivation”. This implied that the change in teachers’ level of
participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities increased teachers’ motivation. The results showed that, the slope “a” was statistically significant.

The intercept of the regression line is:

\[ Y = 1.42 + 0.65X \]

This means that when teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers activities increased by one unit, teachers’ motivation increased by 2.07 units.

The regression equation is expressed as:

\[ Y = a + bX \]

Where \( Y \) is the expected value of teachers’ motivation, “a” is the expected value of teacher motivation if participation is zero. In this case “b” is the effect of teachers’ motivation for each unit of change in teachers’ level of participation while \( X \) is the teachers’ level of participation. The standardized beta value of 0.632 indicates that an increase in participation by 1% would cause an increase in teacher motivation by 63.3%. It could therefore be deduced that the more teachers participated in the management of students’ and teachers’ activities the more they were motivated.

This study established that teachers’ level of participation in management of students and teachers’ activities have significant statistical effects on teachers’ motivation. These findings mirror the work of Juma (2011) that human resource as a factor of production is affected by the adequacy and quality as reflected by the level of training and motivation. The result concurs to a study by Nyakundi (2012); Duze (2011) that teachers’ participation in management of reward strategy, rules and regulations and
better working conditions had a positive effect on their motivation. This study finding mirrors the works of Mualuko, Mukasa, and Achoka (2009) that the level of teachers’ participation in students’ discipline, career programmes, guidance and counseling, students’ welfare management as well as teachers’ welfare motivated teachers to make use of their expertise. The findings concur with Irawanto (2015) that teachers’ participation in students and parents affairs increase work commitment which subsequently reduced the cost of supervision. The findings mirrors the work of Wadesango (2011) that lack of teachers’ level of participation in issues affecting teachers directly suffered low success rate during the implementation phase due to lack of clarity and suspicion.

Further, findings by Duze (2011) revealed that high level of teachers’ participation in students’ welfare, students’ admission and in-service training enhanced productivity, interest and commitment while low level of participation created discord and chaos. The findings of the current study concurs with the works of (Minnaert & Opdenakker (2011); Maulana, Opdenakker, Stroet & Bosker (2013)) who further revealed that teachers level of participation facilitated active engagement and healthy working environment. The findings are in line with other studies Farmer, Lines & Hamm 2011; Wentzel 2010) that teachers’ of participation in management of change in relation staff appraisal and conflict management facilitated positive peer relationships. Teacher’s level of participation in students’ and teachers’ activities in relation to supportive environment was closely linked to self-efficacy, achievement, active engagement and goal orientation (David, Gest & Welsh, 2010). But, Odhiambo (2005); Datche (2007) argued that lack of teacher’ participation in appraisal practices
in Kenya secondary schools led to lack of motivation and commitment due to poor management styles.

4.6 Teachers’ Participation in Management of School Community partnership and Motivation

The fourth objective of this study sought to determine the effect of teachers’ level of participation in school community-partnerships. To realize this objective, the study was guided by null hypothesis $H_04$: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in the management of school community-partnerships and teachers’ motivation. The views of subject teachers and principals were sought. Their responses were organized in a five point Likert’s scale whereby the value of 5 represented a greater extent 4: To some extent 3: Not sure 2: To a little extent and 1: Not at all. Teachers’ participation in management of school community-partnership involved promoting good relationships between the school, sponsors, parents and the local community; liaising with parents/ guardians over students difficulties; planning for school community educational days; organizing the school in local community activities like tree planting/charity walks; and facilitating research activities in liaison with other institutions, government departments and the local community.

The categorization of the Likert scale was guided by Bademo and Tefera (2016) who asserted that the mean of below 2.00 was deemed low level of participation, mean between 2 to 3.5 was moderate, whereas mean above 3.5 was regarded as high level of participation. Mean scores of the Likerts scale items for each and every respondent was computed in order to make comparisons as shown in Table 4.20:
### Table 4.20: Views of teachers on their participation in management of community-partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managing Community partnership</th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting good relationship between the school and the local community.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaising with parents/guardians over students’ difficulties.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for school community educational days.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing the school in local community activities like tree planting/charity walks.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating research activities in liaison with other institutions, government departments and the local community.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand mean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 5= To a greater extent; 4= To some extent; 3 = Not sure; 2= To a smaller extent; Legend: 1= No extent

Source: Primary data
Table 4.20 shows descriptive analysis of teachers’ responses regarding their level of participation in management of school community-relations. The results revealed that majority 165(51%) of subject teachers reported that they participated in change relating to promoting good relationship between the school, sponsors and the local community. This can be interpreted to mean that teachers promoting good relationship between the school, sponsors and the local community. The analysis also indicated that 223(69%) of the subject teachers stated that teachers participated in change relating to liaising with parents and guardians over students difficulties. This means that teachers majority of teacher liaised with parents and guardians over their children’s difficulties. It was indicated that 114(35.3%) of the subject teachers participated in change relating to planning for school community educational days.

Table 4.20 further shows computed means of each items, the highest level (Mean =3.67) for liaising with parents and guardians over students difficulties. This means that teachers recorded high level of participation in liaising with parents and guardians over students’ difficulties. The results indicated moderate level (Mean=3.20) for promoting good relationship between the school, sponsors and the local community indicating moderate level of participation. This implies moderate level of teachers’ participation in promoting good relationship between the school, sponsors and the local community. The analysis also shows moderate level (Mean=2.62) for planning for school community educational days implying moderate level of participation on the same. Total cumulative mean score reveals moderate level (Mean =2.73) indicating moderate level of teachers’ participation in management of school community partnership. This could be interpreted to imply that teachers’ level of
participation in change relating to management of school-community partnership was moderate.

The study sought to triangulate the views of subject teachers on Table 4.20 with the views of school principals on the teachers’ level of participation in management community partnership. The principals’ responses are presented in Table 4.21:
Table 4.21: Views of principals on teachers’ level of participation in management of community-partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managing School Community Relations</th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting good relationship between the school and the local</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaising with parents/guardians over students difficulties</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for school community educational days.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize the school in local community activities like tree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planting/charity walks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating research activities in liaison with other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.59
Table 4.2 shows descriptive analysis of principals’ responses regarding teachers’ level of participation in management of change in relation to school community-partnership. The study revealed that 51(91%) of school principals indicated that teachers’ participated in liaising with parents and guardians over students’ difficulties. This means that teachers consulted parents and guardians over students’ difficulties. The analysis indicated that 49(86%) of principals stated that teachers participated in change relating to promoting good relationships between the school, sponsors, parents and the local community. This implies that teachers’ worked collaboratively to promote positive image of the school. The analysis indicated that 35(69%) of school principals stated teachers participated in change relating to planning for community educational days implying that teachers were positive in promoting school community service.

Table 4.2 further shows computed means of each items, the highest level (Mean =4.46) for participating in liaising with parents/ guardians over students difficulties. This means that teachers’ level of participation in liaising with parents/ guardians over students difficulties was high. The results indicated high level (Mean=4.22) for promoting good relationship between the school, sponsors and the local community indicating high level of teachers’ participation on the same. The analysis also shows high level (Mean=3.63) for planning for school community educational days. This means that teachers level of participation in planning for school community educational days. Similarly, the total cumulative reveals high level (Mean= 3.59) indicating a high level of teachers’ participation in management of school community partnership. This could be interpreted to imply that teachers’ level of participation in change relating to management of school-community relations was high according to the school principals. This implies that subject teachers reported moderate level
(Mean=2.73) while the principals revealed high level (Mean=3.59) which means that teachers were at different level of participation in management of school-community partnership.

The observation guide was used to establish whether there was any evidence of teachers’ level of participation in management of school community partnership. Indeed, teachers participated during open days by communicated effectively to various audiences. To this effect, the study established that teachers participated in managing educational days. Similarly, teachers facilitated research activities as well as school-community service such as tree planting and charity walks. This indicated that teachers embraced research network within organizations, communities, and groups who had a shared vision.

The study sought to test the hypothesis on whether the teachers’ level of participation in management of school community partnership was a significant predictor of motivation. The null hypothesis was stated: $H_{04}$: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in the management of school community partnership and teachers’ motivation. A Simple Linear regression test was run. This led to generation of summary model and as presented in Table 4.22

**Table 4.22: Teachers’ participation in management of community partnership and motivation Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.645a</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.829383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), teachers’ participation on community relations

The model summary shows that 41% of the total variability in motivation was explained by teachers’ level of participation in management of community-
partnership. The adjusted $R^2$ was 0.414, implying that teachers’ level of participation in management of community-partnership explained 41% of the variance in teachers’ motivation.

To test the goodness of fit of the regression model, F value was obtained. The ANOVA coefficient is presented in Table 4.23:

Table 4.23: Teachers participation in management of school-community partnership and motivation ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>123.253</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123.253</td>
<td>179.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>172.657</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295.91</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: motivation  
b. Predictors: (Constant), teachers’ participation in community-relations.

Table 4.23 suggests that the model was fit and acceptable for the regression equation. This was as revealed by F Statistics which had value $F (1, 251) = 179.178$, $p < .01$. $R^2$ is 41% and is significant.

The study also sought to establish the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of school community-partnership on teachers’ motivation. The results are presented in Table 4.24:

Table 4.24: Simple Regression on teachers’ participation in management of school -community partnership and motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.479</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>9.789</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>13.386</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: motivation, Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level
Results in Table 4.24 show that teachers’ level of participation in management of school community-partnership increased teachers’ motivation. This was indicated by the P < 0.01. This led to rejection of the null hypothesis that “There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of school community partnership and teachers’ motivation”. This implied that the change in the teachers’ level of participation in school community relations increased teachers’ motivation.

The intercept of the regression line is:

Y = 1.48 + 0.64 X.

This implied that when teachers’ level of participation in management of school community-partnership increased by 1 unit, their motivation increases by 2.12.

The regression equation is expressed as,

Y = a + bX,

Whereby “y” is the expected values of teachers’ motivation, “a” is the expected value of teacher motivation if teachers’ level of participation is zero, “b” is the effect of teacher motivation for each unit change in the level of participation and “X” is teachers’ level of participation. The standardized beta value of 0.645 indicates that an increase in participation by 1% would cause an increase in teacher motivation by 65.5%. It can therefore be deduced that the more the teachers were involved in the management of community-partnership, the more they are motivated.

These findings indicate that the teachers’ level of participation in management of school community partnership affected teachers’ motivation significantly. This
finding is consistent with the works of Hargreaves and Fink (2003) who found that teachers’ level of participation in management of community culture, shared beliefs, values and vision had effects on teachers’ motivation. This position was highlighted by Bandur (2008) and Anderson (2006) who also revealed that teachers’ role in guidance and counseling for parents, sponsors and students was a significant factor of teachers’ commitment and responsibility. The same findings are mirrored in the works of Cheng (2008) that teachers’ involvement in promoting in fostering positive image of the school fought poor management styles that were associated with low level of motivation among teachers. Other scholars mirrors the findings of this study that teachers’ participation in sourcing funds for motivation purposes and explaining the school activities to the community increased teachers’ dedication, job satisfaction, motivation and greater responsibility (Cheng, 2008). Further, this finding concurs with the work of Farahianfar and Ghandehari (2016) that teachers’ participation in facilitating research activities is detrimental to teachers’ motivation and commitment.

However, the findings seem to contradict the study done by Sarafidou and Chatziioannidis, (2013) who established insignificant difference between teachers’ level of participation in school community affairs and teachers’ motivation.

4.7 Teachers’ Participation in Management of School Finances on Teachers’ Motivation

The fifth objective of this study sought to determine the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of change relating to management of school finances. To realize this objective the study was guided by the following hypothesis: $H_{05}$: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in the management of school change in relation to the management of school finance and teachers
motivation. To this effect the views of the teachers and school principals were sought. Teachers were expected to indicate their responses on a five Likerts’s scale whereby 5 represented a greater extent 4: To some extent 3: Not sure 2: To a little extent and 1: Not at all.

Teachers’ participation in the management of change in relation to management of school finances comprised of budget preparation and revision; advising on the specific departmental needs; procurement and accounting. Summation score of the four Likerts scale items for each and every respondent was computed. The executed variable of teachers’ level of participation in change relating to management of school finances was recorded as a new variable. According to Bademo and Tafera (2016), the mean value below 2.00 was deemed low level, mean of 2 to 3.5 was moderate whereas mean above 3.5 was regarded high level of participation. Mean of each item and total mean for new recorded variable was computed. The subject teachers’ responses are shown in Table 4.25:
Table 4.25: Views of teachers on their participation in management of school finances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management of School Finances</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in budget preparation and revision</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising on the specific departmental needs.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in the school procurement.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting for the school expenditure</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand mean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: 1= Not at all; 2=To a smaller extent; 3 =Not sure; 4= To some extent; 5= To a greater extent
Table 4.25 shows descriptive analysis of subject teachers’ responses to teachers’ level of participation in the management of school finances. The results revealed that 154(48%) of subject teachers reported that teachers participated in advising on the specific departmental needs implying that teachers were active in their specific departments. The analysis shows that 72(22%) of subject teachers participated in change relating to school procurement. This means that teachers were able to purchase relevant materials and resources for teaching-learning. It was also indicated that 58(18%) of the subject teachers participated in change relating to accounting for the school.

Table 4.25 further shows computed mean of each Likert item with the highest level (mean= 2.99) for advising on the specific departmental needs. The results indicated low (Mean=1.90) for accounting for the school expenditure. The total cumulative score indicated moderate (Mean = 2.16) implying that teachers were at moderate level of participation in management of school finances. This could be interpreted to mean that teachers’ participation in management of school finances was moderate.

The study sought to triangulate the views of teachers in Table 4.25 with the views of school principals regarding teachers’ level of participation in change in relation to management of school finances. Summation score of the four Likerts scale items for each and every respondent was computed. The executed variable of teachers’ level of participation in change relating to management of school finances was recorded as a new variable. According Bademo and Tefera (2016), the mean value below 2.00 was deemed low level, mean of 2 to 3.5 was moderate whereas mean above 3.5 was regarded high level of participation. Mean of each item and total mean for new recorded variable was computed as shown in Table 4.26:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management of School Finances</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget preparation and revision</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising on departmental needs.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in procurement.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting for expenditures</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand mean** 3.82

Legend: 5= To a greater extent; 4= To some extent; 3 =Not sure; 2=To a smaller extent; Legend: 1= No extent
Table 4.2 shows descriptive analysis of school principals’ responses on teachers’ level of participation in change relating to management of school finances. The results indicated that 35 (63%) school principals reported that to a greater extent teachers participated in change relating to procurement of material resources while 10 (18%) of them stated that to some extent teachers participated in the same. The analysis revealed that 29 (53%) of the school principals stated that to a greater extent teachers participated in change relating to advising on specific departmental needs while 17 (31%) of them stated that to some extent teachers participated on the same.

Table 4.2 further shows computed mean of each Likert item with the highest level (Mean=4.20) for participating in change relating to procurement of material resources. The results indicated high level (Mean=4.16) for advising on the specific departmental needs. The total cumulative score (Mean =3.82) indicated high level of teachers’ participation in change relating to the management of school finances. This could be interpreted to mean high level of teachers’ participation in management of school finances. Therefore subject teachers indicated moderate level (Mean=2.16) while school principals reported high level (Mean=3.82). This implies that teachers were at different level of participation in managing change relating to school finances.

Through observation guide, the results showed that there was evidence of teachers’ level of participation in change relating to management of finances. The check list was used to determine whether the documents which related to the school budget were available. To this effect, this study established that teachers did not fully participate in budget preparations and revision. This implied that most schools did not comply with financial management regulations and guidelines for educational institutions. However, the study established that teachers participated in advising on
specific departmental needs. There were lists of recommended books by teachers for use in the classes. To some extent, therefore, most of the teachers had the required financial documents, an indication of their participation in change in relation to finances.

The study sought to test the hypothesis on whether the teachers’ level of participation in management of change in relation to management of school finance was a significant predictor of motivation. The null hypothesis was stated as: H₀: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in the management of change in relation to the management of school finance and teachers’ motivation. A Simple Linear regression test was run. This resulted into a model summary as presented in Table 4.2:

Table 4.27: Teachers’ participation in management of finance and on teachers’ motivation model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.438*a</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.981202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), participation in management of school finances

Table 4.27 shows a model summary which indicates that 19% of the total variability in motivation is explained by teachers’ level of participation in change relating to management of finances. The adjusted R² was 0.188, implying that teachers’ level of participation in management of finance explained 19% of the variance in teachers’ motivation.

To test the goodness of fit of the regression model, F value was obtained. The ANOVA coefficient is presented in Table 4.28:
Table 4.28: Teachers’ participation in management of finance ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>57.075</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.075</td>
<td>59.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>240.689</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>297.764</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: motivation
b. Predictors: (Constant), participation in management of school finances

Table 4.28 indicates that the model was fit for this study and was therefore acceptable for the regression equation. This was indicated to by F Statistics which had value $F (1, 250) = 59.282, p < .05$. $R^2$ is 19% and is significant.

Table 4.29: Simple regression on teachers’ participation in management of finance coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.504</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of school finance</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: motivation, Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

The regression results showed that there was significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in the management of change relating to management of school finance and teachers’ motivation. This was indicated by $p$ value $<0.05$. This leads to rejection of the null hypothesis that “There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in the management of change in relation to the management of finance and teachers’ motivation”. This means that the more the teachers participated in the management of change relating to management of finance the more they were motivated. This implied that teachers’ level of participation in management of change relating to finances increased their motivation.
The intercept of the regression line is:

\[ Y = 2.50 + 0.35X. \]

This confirmed that when teachers’ level of participation in the management of change relating to management of finances increased by 1 unit, teachers’ motivation increased by 2.85.

The regression equation is expressed as,

\[ Y = a + bX, \]

Whereby “Y” is the expected value of teachers’ motivation, “a” is the value of teacher motivation if the teachers’ level of participation is zero, “b” is the effect of teachers’ motivation for each unit of change in teachers’ level of participation while “X” is teachers’ level of participation. The standardized beta value of 0.438 indicates that an increase in participation by 1% would cause an increase teacher motivation by 43.8%. It could therefore be deduced that the more the teachers participated in the management of school finances the more they were motivated.

This study indicates that teachers’ level of participation in management of financial resources had a significant effect on teacher motivation. This finding concurs with the work of Mazandarani and Abedini (2015); Somech (2010) who asserted that that teachers’ level of participation in budget preparation in various departments’ motivated them to push educational standards to higher levels. The study mirrors the findings of (Millet (2010); Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter and Taris (2008); that teachers participated in budget preparation and allocation led to improved performance of duties, productivity, creativity, reduced absenteeism, higher attention rates, commitment and quality education. The same findings concurs with the works of
Swanepoel and Booyse (2006) who established that the most positive consequences of change occurred when teachers participated at the highest level in management of financial resources. This study affirms the findings of Wadesango (2013) that teachers’ participation in budget control was critical factor for teachers’ motivation as they felt respected when their interests and expertise were put into considered. Likewise, the study results support the views of Khake and Worku (2013) that allocation of financial resources for monitoring and evaluation involved not only the process of allocation but also planning, management and control of the same resources to achieve the desired results.

The finding is supported Agbejule and Saarikoski (2006) who found significant positive relationship between budgetary participation and job performance. The findings revealed that teachers were interested in annual budget preparation and saw the need to discharge their own responsibilities towards improvement of organizational performance (Weil and Maher, 2005). This finding are also in line with a study carried out by Ali and Ahmed (2009) who found a strong link between participation and reward strategy, recognition and channels of communication. However, Ali (2011) argues that participation in the management of finance was time consuming and unrealistic as it generated mediocre and disruptive conflicts which perpetuated loss of managerial authority.

Finally, this study sought to test the hypothesis on whether teachers’ levels of participation in the management of physical and material resources, curriculum and instruction, students’ and teachers’ activities, community-partnership and school finances were significant predictors of motivation. The null hypothesis was stated as: 

$H_0$: Teachers’ level of participation in the management of school change in the five
selected areas was not a significant predictor of motivation. Multiple regression analysis was run and a model summary was generated as presented in Table 4.30:

**Table 4.30: Teachers’ participation in management of change and motivation model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.705a</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), school finance, curriculum management, community relations, facilities, students/staff activities

Table 4.30 indicates that 48% of the total variability in motivation was explained by teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, community partnership and finance. The adjusted R² was 0.48, implying that teachers’ level of participation in management of school change in the five areas explained 48% of the variance in teachers’ motivation.

To test the goodness of fit of the regression model, F value was obtained. The ANOVA coefficient is presented in Table 4.31:

**Table 4.31: Teachers’ participation in management of school change on motivation ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>109.392</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.878</td>
<td>36.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>110.590</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219.982</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: motivation
b. Predictors: (Constant), school finances, curriculum management, community relations, physical facilities, students and staff activities
Table 4.31 indicated that the model was fit and therefore acceptable for the regression equation. This was indicated by F Statistics which had value $F(5, 184) = 36.401, p < .01$.

**Table 4.32: Multiple Regressions on teachers’ participation in management of change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Un-standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.156</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>6.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Facilities</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers’ and students’ activities</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School finances</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

The standard beta coefficient in Table 4.32 indicates that teachers’ participation in management of physical and material resources explains 5.2% of variation in teacher motivation holding the other factors constant. Teachers participation in relation to curriculum and instruction account for 0.5% of motivation, students and teachers activities accounts for 26.3% of motivation, school community relations accounts for 45% of motivation while school finances accounts for 6.5% of teachers motivation.

The multiple linear equations is expressed as

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5$$

Whereby

$Y$ is the value of the dependent variable (Motivation)

$a$ (Alpha) is the constant or intercept
$b_1$ is the slope (Beta coefficient) for $X_1$

$X_1$ First independent variable (physical facilities)

$b_2$ is the Slope (Beta coefficient) for $X_2$

$X_2$ Second independent variable (Curriculum and instruction)

$b_3$ is the Slope (Beta coefficient) for $X_3$

$X_3$ Third independent variable (teachers and students activities)

$b_4$ is the Slope (Beta coefficient) for $X_4$

$X_4$ Fourth independent variable (School community relations)

$b_5$ is the Slope (Beta coefficient) for $X_5$

$X_5$ Fifth independent variable (school finance)

The findings revealed that teachers’ participation in management of change relating to curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, school community partnership and school finance. Teachers’ and students’ activities, and community relations was more significant than others. This implies that there is need to involve teachers more on community partnership, and students and teachers activities for them to be more motivated.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes research findings, presents the conclusions and makes recommendations. Lastly, it makes suggestions for further research arising from this study.

5.2 Summary

The purpose of this study was to establish the relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction, physical and material resources, students’ and teachers’ activities, school community partnership and school finances on teachers’ motivation in public secondary schools in Machakos, Kiambu and Kajiado counties in Kenya. The respondents in this study were secondary school principals and subject teachers. To achieve its objectives, data was collected from 403 respondents through the use of questionnaires. It was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics in order to adequately respond to research questions. The study embraced correlation design as the framework to guide the study. The next section gives the findings of the study.

5.2.1: Effects of Teachers’ level of participation in management of Curriculum and Instruction on their Motivation

The first objective sought to establish the effect of teachers’ level of participation in the management of curriculum and instruction on their motivation. The findings established that teachers are highly involved in management of curriculum and instruction as indicated (Mean = 3.62) as per the teachers’ responses and (M=3.85) principals’ opinion. Further, the findings showed that level of participation in the
management of curriculum and instruction had a statistical significant of P<.01 and effect 28% as the beta on their motivation. This means that we reject the null hypothesis “There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of change relating to curriculum and instruction and teachers motivation.” This implies that the more the teachers participate in management of curriculum and instruction the more they became motivated.

5.2.2 Effects of teachers participation in management of Physical and material resources on their Motivation

The second objective sought to establish the effect of teachers’ level of participation in the management of physical facilities on their motivation. The findings shows that teachers were at moderate levels of participation as indicated by a (Mean = 2.53) as per the teachers’ responses and (Mean= 3.49) as per principals’ opinions.

Similarly, the regression results revealed that teachers’ level of participation in the management of physical and material resources had a statistical significant P<.01 and effect 39% as the beta on their motivation. This means that we reject the null hypothesis “There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources on teachers’ motivation.” This implied that the more teachers participated in the management of physical facilities the more they were motivated.

5.2.3 Effects of teachers participation in Students’ and teachers Activities’ on teachers’ Motivation

The third objective sought to establish the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on their motivation. The results indicate that teachers moderately participated in the management of teachers’ and
students’ activities. This is evidenced by a mean of 3.01 as per the teachers’ responses and 3.34 as per principals’ opinions. Further, the results shows a significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities and their motivation as indicate by P<0.01 and a beta of 65%. Hence we reject the null hypothesis: “There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation in secondary schools”. This implies that an increase in teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities leads to an increase of teachers’ motivation.

5.2.4 Effects of teachers participation in Management of Community partnership on Motivation

The fourth objective sought to establish the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of school community on their motivation. The study revealed that teachers were at different levels of participation as indicated by a mean of 2.73 as per the teachers’ responses and 3.59 as per principals’ opinion. The principals’ response indicated high levels of teachers’ participation while the subject teachers indicate moderate levels. The regression results indicated that there was a significant relationship between teachers’ the level of participation in management of community-partnership and teachers’ motivation as evidenced by P<0.01 and 64% as the beta. Therefore we reject the null hypothesis “There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of community-partnership on teachers’ motivation in secondary schools.” This implied that the higher the teachers level of participation, the higher was their level of motivation.
5.2.5 Effects of teachers participation in management of school Finances on their Motivation

The fifth objective sought to establish the effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of school finances on their motivation. The study revealed that teachers were at different level of participation. The principals’ response indicated high level of participation as indicate by mean of 3.82 while the teachers’ responses revealed moderate of 2.16 on the same. The regression analysis established a statistical significant effect of teachers’ level of participation in the management of school finances on teachers’ motivation (P<0.01 and a beta of 35%). Hence we reject the null hypothesis “There is no significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation in management of school finance and teachers’ motivation in secondary schools.

5.3 Conclusions

From the foregoing results, the researcher concludes teachers’ level of participation in management of curriculum and instruction was high. The findings further revealed that teachers’ level of participation in the management of curriculum and instruction had a statistical significant effect on teacher motivation. Frequent practice of participation in management of curriculum and instruction enhanced teachers’ motivation.

On the second objective, the study established that teachers were at moderate levels of participation in management of physical and material resources. The findings further revealed that there was a statistical significant effect of teachers’ level of participation in management of physical and material resources and on teachers’ motivation. This
implied that teachers’ participation in management of physical and resources increased enhanced their motivation.

In line with third objective teachers’ level of participation in management of students’ and teachers’ activities was moderate. Similarly, the study established a statistical significant effect of the teachers’ level of participation in the management of students’ and teachers’ activities on teachers’ motivation. This is an indication that the more the teachers are involved in management of teachers’ and student activities’ the more they get motivated.

Teachers’ participation in the management of Community relations was also a variable of interest. The study revealed that teachers were at different levels of participation. Furthermore, the findings indicated that teachers’ level of participation in community partnership was statistically significant to teachers’ motivation. This was an indication that the more the teachers were involved in community partnership the more they got motivated.

Finally, the study established that teachers were at different level of participation in management of school finances. The results also revealed a statistical significant relationship between teachers’ level of participation and teachers’ motivation. This implied that the more they were involved in community partnership the more they were motivated.

5.4 Recommendations
This section makes recommendations in the light of the findings after data analysis. The recommendations borders along policy, practice and suggestions for further research.
5.4.1 Recommendations

Based on the findings, the study recommends the following

i. The school principals should embrace the strategy of allowing teachers to participate in management of curriculum and instruction since they are the key implementers. This can be done through empowering teachers in teaching and developing curriculum materials, setting and supervising exams as well as creating a curriculum team within the department. Failure to engage them in management of curriculum would demotivate them when executing their teaching duties which are detrimental to students’ performance in examinations.

ii. While planning for and procuring physical and material resources, the BOM and PTA should involve teachers in all the stages of planning and procurement of such equipments and materials. The BOM should give teachers a chance to make inventory and maintenance of equipment, materials and supplies and in formulation of standard operation procedures of utilizing such facilities. This could enhance their motivation leading to quality education.

iii. The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology should formulate rules and regulation that compels the school principals to allow teachers to participate in guiding students in subject selection, admission and orientation of students, disciplinary actions as well as conducting needs assessment on matters of students and teachers activities. This would empower and motivate teachers to remain in the teaching profession and even enhance the quality education.

iv. The County Director of Education in partnership with County administration and the area Chief should involve teachers in community matters such as identifying projects that benefit both the community and school, develop linkage with donors and carry out research activities. This would make the teachers develop a
sense of belonging in the community hence encourage them to stay longer in the community and develop sense of commitment and responsibility to community affairs.

v. The Board of Management should allow teachers to participate in budget preparation and to take control measures in relation to budget implementation. This could promote transparency, commitment and prudent utilization of school finances hence enabling schools to attain internally set educational goals.

5.4.2 Suggestions for Further Research

This study suggests further research in the following areas:

i. To investigate teachers’ level of participation in ICT integration in instructional leadership.

ii. Investigate status of teachers’ level of participation in management of school change through the inclusive process of all stakeholders.

iii. A study could be carried out regarding the level of participation of the various school stakeholders to the different school-initiated activities.

iv. A study could be carried out on the relationship between the level of teacher participation in management of students’ discipline and performance in national examination.

v. Expand the study to include demographic data. It would be beneficial to see if teacher’s primary schools participated in management of school change.

vi. To expand the study and analyze the data by teacher content area. It would be interesting to see if science teachers were more empowered than math teachers
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Dear Respondent,

Re: Participation in Research

I am a postgraduate student pursuing a doctoral programme in Kenyatta University. I am conducting a research entitled: “Secondary school teachers’ participation in management of school change and its effect on teacher motivation in selected Counties, Kenya.”

In this regard, you have been selected to take part in this study as a respondent. Kindly respond to all the items to reflect your opinion and experience. Please answer all the questions freely. The information will be treated in confidentiality. The data will be used for academic research only. Your participation is of great importance to the success of this study. Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

KINGI M. PETRONILLA
APPENDIX II: Respondents’ Consent Form

Title of the study: “Secondary school teachers’ participation in the management of change and its effects on teachers’ motivation in selected counties in Kenya.

Please respond to the questions given below:

Have you read the letter of introduction to this study? Yes/ No

Have you received satisfactory answers to all of your questions regarding this research? Yes/No

Have you received enough information about the study? Yes/No

Do you consent to participate in the study? Yes/No

Do you understand that you are free to either accept or refuse to participate in the study? Yes/No

NB: Please commit yourself by signing with your initials only and do not write the name of your institution.

Sign…………………………… Date…………………………
APPENDIX III: Teachers’ Level of Participation in Management of Change and Motivation Questionnaire for Teachers

PURPOSE

The purpose of this questionnaire was to seek for information relating the teacher levels of participation in management of school change and its effects on their motivation in secondary school level in Kiambu; Machakos and Kajiado counties in Kenya.

INSTRUCTIONS

The researcher requests that you kindly respond to the questions related to the study. You are assured that the responses given will be kept in confidence and used for research purposes only. Kindly do not to write your name. Tick the suitable responses (√) tick where suitable in the spaces provided.

SECTION A

Background Information of the Respondents

Tick where applicable.

1. Age: Below 30yrs □ 31 to 40yrs □
   41 to 50yrs □ 50 yrs and above □
2. Level of education:
   Diploma □ BED □ BA/ PGDE □
   BSC PGDE □ MED □ PhD □
3. Sex: Male □ Female □
4. County: Kiambu □ Machakos □ Kajiado □
5. School work experience:
   Below 5yrs □ 6-10years □ 11-15yrs □
   16- 20 years □ 21 - 30yrs □ Over 30yrs □
6. Type of school:
   Girls only □ Mixed school □ Boys only □
7. To what extent do you participate in the management of school change in the following areas? Tick the extent to which you agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5: To a greater extent</th>
<th>4: To some extent</th>
<th>3: Not sure</th>
<th>2: To a smaller extent</th>
<th>1: No extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**To what extent do you participated in school change in the following areas?**

**a) Management of Physical and Material Resources**

i) Maintenance and servicing of the facilities: classrooms, laboratories and library.

ii) Inventory of equipment and supplies in the department using computer software.

iii) Requisition and acquisition of modern school facilities and equipment.

iv) Review of school strategic planning to address emerging issues

**b) Management of Curriculum and Instruction**

i) Integrate, administer, supervise, and mark exams in line with the new changes in the curriculum from KNEC/ KICD.

ii) Registration of national examinations on line.

iii) Advise on acquisition of text books for the new syllabus.

iv) Decide on the life skills to integration in various subjects.

v) Prepare reports/teaching and learning materials using computer programs.

vi) Integrate of ICT in teaching and delivery of instructions

vii) Membership in the school academic board

viii) Awareness in current changes in the curriculum

**c) Students’ Activities**

i) Organize and facilitate career programs for students.

ii) Assist students in identifying institutions for further education and career training.

iii) Facilitate training for guidance and counseling for peer counselors.

iv) Oversee, organize and facilitate student’s council’s activities.

v) Incorporate students in revising school rules and regulations.
(d) **Staff Management**

1. Facilitate teaching and non-teaching duties.
2. Challenging assumptions which underpin structures that are no longer relevant.
3. Deliberate incorporate change in carrying out duties.
4. Ability to learn from personal problems.
5. Take part in recruitment and selection activities for teaching and non-teaching support staff.
6. Attend appropriate training/ in-service for professional development.
8. Assisting other teachers on the use of technology in teaching-learning.
9. Giving induction and orientation to new teachers.
10. Facilitate and coordinate staff development training programs and activities.
11. Facilitate and manage conflict management programs.

(e) **Managing School Community Partnership**

1. Promoting good relationship between the school, sponsors, parents and the local community.
2. Liaising with parents/guardians over students difficulties.
3. Planning for school community educational days.
4. Organizing the school in local community activities like tree planting/charity walks.
5. Facilitating research activities in liaison with other institutions, government departments and the local community.

(f) **Management of School Finances**

1. Participating in budget preparation and revision.
2. Advising on the specific departmental needs.
3. Membership in the school procurement committee.
4. Accounting for the school expenditure.
SECTION C

8. Rate teacher motivation in the following areas. Tick the extent to which you agree

5: To a greater extent
4: To some extent
3: Not sure
2: To a smaller extent
1: No extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements on Motivation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Taking initiatives in preparation of teaching and learning materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Being creative in the use of new knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Being committed in supervising students’ activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Being committed in preparing schemes of work and lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Being punctual in reporting on duty, attending classes and not leaving work before time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Reduced cases if absenteeism and turn over/attrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) Good time management and punctuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) Improving the quality of KCSE grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) Exhibiting enthusiasm in the execution of duties and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x) Developing positive attitudes in implementation of curriculum and instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi) Improved efficiency and effectiveness in performance of duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii) Being happy and satisfied with the teaching career profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii) Showing interest and attentions to individual students’ problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv) Being interested with character formation of the learners/students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv) Showing exemplary performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi) Recognition and respect from the community and public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii) Showing interest in professional growth and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii) Being assigned responsibilities and promotion as a result of good performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix) Positive interpersonal relationships between colleges, students and supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx) Showing a sense of responsibility with regard to students learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi) Showing appreciation of work done/ good working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii) Demonstrating professionalism and integrity at work place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiii) Making deliberate efforts to achieve the set goals and targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements on Motivation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv) Being persistent in actions and behaviours that produce good results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv) Being committed, consistent and a team player</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvi) Interest in teaching and improving individual subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvii) Being excited by the duty of contributing to the learners’ knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV: Teachers Level of participation in Management of change and Motivation Questionnaire for School Principals

PURPOSE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to seek for information relating the teacher levels of participation in management of school change and its effects on their motivation in secondary school level in Kiambu; Machakos and Kajiado counties in Kenya.

INSTRUCTIONS

The researcher requests that you kindly respond to the questions related to the study. You are assured that the responses give will be kept in confidence and used for research purposes only. You are reminded not to indicate your name anywhere in this questionnaire. In section A tick the responses that you find suitable in the provided boxes. In section B and C (✓) tick where appropriate in the spaces provided.

SECTION A

Background Information of the Respondents

Tick where applicable.

1. Age: □ Below 30 years □ 31 to 40 years □ 41 to 50 years □ 50 years and above □

2. Level of education:
   □ Diploma □ BED □ BA/PGDE □
   □ BSC PGDE □ MED □ PhD □

3. Sex: □ Male □ Female □

4. School work experience:
   □ Below 5 years □ 6-10 years □ 11-15 years □
   □ 16-20 years □ 21-30 years □ over 30 years □

5. County: □ Kiambu □ Machakos □ Kajiado □

6. Type of school:
   □ Girls only □ Mixed school □ Boys only □
SECTION B

7. To what extent do teachers participate in the management of school change in the following areas? Tick the extent to which you agree

5: To a greater extent
4: To some extent
3: Not sure
2: To a little extent
1: No extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do teachers participate in school change in the following areas?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Management of Physical Material Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Maintenance and servicing of the facilities: classrooms, laboratories and library.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Inventory of equipment and supplies in the department using computer software.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Requisition and acquisition of modern school facilities and equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Review of school strategic planning to address emerging issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Management of Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Integrate, administer, supervise, and mark exams in line with the new changes in the curriculum from KNEC/ KICD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Registration of national examinations on line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Advise on acquisition of text books for the new syllabus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Decide on the life skills integration in various subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Level of personal computer literacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Prepare reports/teaching and learning materials using computer programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) Integration of ICT in teaching and delivery of instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) Membership in the school academic board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness in current changes in the curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Students’ Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Facilitate and organize students on subject selection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Organize and facilitate career programs for students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Assist students in identifying institutions for further education and career training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do teachers participate in school change in the following areas?

| iv) Facilitate training for guidance and counseling for peer counselors. |
| v) Oversee, organize and facilitate students’ council’s activities. |
| vi) Incorporate students in revising school rules and regulations. |
| vii) Membership in the school disciplinary committee. |

(d) Staff Management

| i) Facilitate teaching and non-teaching duties. |
| ii) Challenging assumptions which underpin structures that are no longer relevant. |
| iii) Deliberately incorporate change in carrying out duties. |
| iv) Ability to learn from personal problems. |
| v) Facilitate professional development training programs for teachers. |
| vi) Take part in recruitment and selection activities for teaching and non-teaching support staff. |
| vii) Attend appropriate training/in-service for professional development. |
| viii) Self-appraisal and evaluation of other teachers on performance of teaching and non-teaching duties. |
| ix) Assisting other teachers on the use of technology in teaching-learning. |
| x) Giving induction and orientation to new teachers. |
| xi) Facilitate and coordinate staff development activities. |
| xii) Facilitate and manage conflict management programs. |

(e) Managing School Community Partnership

| i) Promote good relationship between the school, sponsors, parents and the local community. |
| ii) Liaise with parents/guardians over students difficulties. |
| iii) Planning for school community educational days. |
| iv) Organize the school in local community activities like tree planting/charity walks etc. |
| v) Facilitate research activities in liaison with other institutions, government departments and the local community. |

(f) Management of School Finances
To what extent do teachers participate in school change in the following areas?

| i)     | Participate in budget preparation and revision. |
| ii)    | Advise on the specific departmental needs.       |
| iii)   | Membership in the school procurement committee. |
| iv)    | Account for the school expenditure.             |

SECTION C

8. Rate teacher motivation in the following areas. Tick the extent to which you agree.

5: To a greater extent
4: To some extent
3: Not sure
2: To a smaller extent
1: No extent

**Statement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Taking initiatives in preparation of teaching and learning materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Being creative in the use of new knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>Being committed in supervising students’ activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>Being committed in preparing sachems of work and lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v)</td>
<td>Being punctual in reporting on duty, attending classes and not leaving work before time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi)</td>
<td>Reduced cases if absenteeism and turn over/attrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii)</td>
<td>Good time management and punctuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii)</td>
<td>Improving the quality of KCSE grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix)</td>
<td>Exhibiting enthusiasm in the execution of duties and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x)</td>
<td>Developing positive attitudes in implementation of curriculum and instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi)</td>
<td>Improved efficiency and effectiveness in performance of duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii)</td>
<td>Being happy and satisfied with the teaching career profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii)</td>
<td>Showing interest and attentions to individual students’ problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv)</td>
<td>Being interested with character formation of the learners/students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv) Showing exemplary performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi) Recognition and respect from the community and public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii) Showing interest in professional growth and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Being assigned responsibilities and promotion as a result of good performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Positive interpersonal relationships between colleges, students and supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Showing a sense of responsibility with regard to students learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Showing appreciation of work done/ good working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Demonstrating professionalism and integrity at work place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Making deliberate efforts to achieve the set goals and targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) Being persistent in actions and behaviours that produce good results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) Being committed, consistent and a team player</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) Interest in teaching and improving individual subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x) Being excited by the duty of contributing to the learners’ knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V: Observation Check List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of teachers participation in management of education change at school level</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Not Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) Management of Physical and Material Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Evidence of availability and management on inventories of school assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Record of repairs and maintenance of equipments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Availability of revised framework on emerging issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) Curriculum and Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Analyzed internal and national examinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Students notes on life skills curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Minutes of academic/departmental/subject meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Professional documents e.g. Schemes of work/record of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) List of books recommended by teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) Students Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) List of career programs for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Guidelines and counseling programs/ activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) List of elected students’ council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) School rules and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) List of teacher membership in the disciplinary committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Program of students induction and orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) Availability of Students permission /forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) Duty rosters of staff duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) Staff appraisal and development reports and records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x) Records on staff recruitment, induction, orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi) Legal documents e.g. constitution, TSC Act 2012, code of regulation for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii) Records of staff handling staff/public complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii) Evidence of legally constituted parent teachers Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5) Managing Community Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Numbers of open days to communicate to various audiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Number of school community research activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Number of school community service activities e.g. tree planting, Charity works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Numbers of research network with organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators of teachers participation in management of education change at school level</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities, and groups with shared vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Numbers of research network with organizations, communities, and groups with shared vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) School Finances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Use of School budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of compliance /adherence to financial management regulations and guidelines for education institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Submission of books as required for accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Evidence of school strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) List of school income generating activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Availability of constituted tender committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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