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ABSTRACT

This study attempted to find out the perception of teachers towards Performance Contracting (PC). The study explored the teachers’ level of exposure and also sought their opinion on the proposal to introduce performance contracting of teachers. Performance Contracting (PC) is a modern management instrument adopted in Kenya as part of the government’s public policy initiative to improve efficiency and performance under the wider reform initiatives of the government which began in 2003. The concept of performance contracting is often cited as an effective strategy to assure accountability for results. The calls for introduction of PC in schools is to a great extent fuelled by a persistent belief that the fundamental issues and problems in education could be resolved or at least better managed if schools and those who teach in them were more ‘accountable’. However, the teaching force in Kenya has persistently resisted performance contracting in schools leading to speculations that teachers do not fully understand the concept and benefits of PC or that if they do, then they have fundamental reasons for the outright rejection of the idea. The main purpose of the study was to find out the teachers’ perception of the concept of PC and the reasons for their opposition to the introduction of PC in schools. The Scientific Management Theory offered the theoretical framework for the study. The study adopted an exploratory approach using the survey design to investigate the perception of teachers towards performance contracting. The study was carried out in Laikipia Central district. The research targeted all of the one hundred and thirty (130) teachers in the eleven (11) public secondary schools in the district. Simple random, purposive and systematic sampling procedures were employed to draw a sample of forty eight (48) subjects. The questionnaire was utilized to elicit responses on the extent of the teachers’ knowledge of the PC concept, as well as their opinion on the introduction of PC in schools. A pilot study was conducted in two schools to enhance the research instrument’s reliability and validity. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the data collected. Qualitative analysis considered inferences that were made from the respondents’ opinions. First primary data from the research instruments was edited and coded to organize and reduce data into manageable summaries; the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the coded items. The findings were quantified and then presented in percentages and frequency tables according to the study objectives. The results of the findings revealed that the teachers’ level of knowledge of performance contracting was relatively low, and that their main sources of information on changes proposed in education was the media, the teachers unions and professional associations. The study also established that although there was a high level of resistance among teachers to their performance contracting; there was also evidence that they could change the stance and accept PC if certain conditions were met. The study recommends that the government, through the Ministry of Education and the TSC should work on a strategy to address the information gaps concerning PC of teachers and also ensure that all schools meet the institutional preconditions for successful implementation of PC in schools.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION
This chapter deals with the background to the study; statement of the problem; purpose and objectives of the study; research questions, assumptions, limitations and delimitations of the study; theoretical and conceptual framework of the study; and operational definition of central terms.

1.1 Background to the study
In this era of globalization where there are many rapid changes in all fields; systems, organizations, institutions and even individuals are forced to adapt to the changing circumstances. Most discussions on development issues stress the demand for reforms to begin with the political and educational systems. Developments in the Kenyan education system have attracted a great deal of interest over the past few years. There have been debates on the issues of quality, relevance and effectiveness of the education system which have resulted in the consideration for extensive reforms and innovations. The role of the teachers and educational administrators is especially in sharp focus particularly in issues of teacher management. The Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP) includes a teacher management investment programme at a cost of Kshs 19.1 million, (Republic of Kenya, 2005).

To improve efficiency and service delivery in the public sector, the Kenyan government has adopted several initiatives and improved management practices, among them, that of Performance Contracting (PC). Performance Contracting falls under the key initiative of Results Based Management (RBM), which seeks to ensure that the public sector is transformed into being more focused and responsive to the needs of those it serves.
According to the RBM Guide, Kenya 2005, the key elements of RBM are performance target setting, performance planning, performance monitoring and reporting and performance appraisal. Performance Contracting, Rapid Results Approach and Performance Appraisal System provide a structured methodology for building and practicing RBM. Performance Contracting thus is a key concern of RBM as it is a critical component in the performance management cycle. Performance Contracting is considered to be the process of establishing a shared understanding of what is to be achieved, how it is to be achieved and managing resources to ensure successful implementation (Republic of Kenya, 2005).

The use of Performance Contracting has been acclaimed as an effective and promising means of improving the performance of public enterprises as well as ensuring their accountability. There has been a persistent belief that the fundamental issues and problems in education could be resolved or at least better managed if schools and those who teach in them were more ‘accountable’ (Wagner, 1989). The Economic Survey in Kenya, 2004 indicates that the recurrent government spending on education has been higher than any other social sector spending i.e. 73% of the social sector expenditure. Further, the education recurrent budget rose from 35% of public sector recurrent budget in 2000 to 39% in 2004. Therefore, with the ever increasing spending on education, stakeholders and financiers require evidence of effective and responsible use of resources allocated. Wagner (ibid) further asserts that there is general agreement that school performance and the quality of school programmes are best understood in terms of results and output and that agencies, have a right to know about these results and the cost/benefits associated with their schools. He also points out that many proposals on accountability focus on the accountability of teachers because they assume that teachers are responsible for student performance. Of the various forms of accountability proposed for education, the concept of
performance contracting is often cited as the most effective strategy to assure accountability for results (CER, 1997).

The Performance Contract System originated in France in the late 1960s and has since spread to other countries. Contracts are essentially agreements in which one party promises to render goods, services or particular results to another for some consideration of value, which the second promises to give in return once the service has been provided. Consequently, the promises involved in a contract are mutually binding and of central importance to a relationship which often involves some manner of redress for non-fulfillment on either side. Performance Contracting is a branch of management science referred to as Management Control Systems. A Performance Contract is a freely negotiated performance agreement between government, organization or individual on one hand and the agency itself according to the Kenya Sensitization Training Manual (Republic of Kenya, 2004 at www.go.ke). It is an agreement between two parties that clearly specify their mutual performance obligations. Trivedi (2004) defines performance contract as a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). MOU is rooted in an evaluation system, which not only looks at performance comprehensively but also ensures improvement of performance management by making autonomy and accountability aspects clearer and more transparent. Governments all over the world view PC as a useful tool of articulating clearer definitions of objectives and supporting new management monitoring and control methods. The fundamental principle of PC is the devolved management style where emphasis is on management by outcome rather than by processes- also referred to as Results Based Management (RBM). The Kenya PC Steering Committee Secretariat states that Performance Contracts are based on the premise that what gets measured gets done; if you
cannot see success, you cannot reward it; if you cannot recognize failure, you cannot correct it; and if you can demonstrate results, you can win public support (Republic of Kenya, 2005).

Proponents of PC have identified a number of institutional preconditions for successful implementation of PC in any organization. First, is the need for governments (as principals) to explicitly state their objectives, prioritize and translate them into performance improvement targets. Second, the principals need to credibly signal their commitment to the contract such as through delegation of meaningful autonomy to senior managers. Also necessary is functional and reliable managerial information systems where quality information is available and well managed. Monitoring and evaluation of activities and outcomes is also necessary to ascertain the level of performance. There are also critical management tools in PC which are pre-requisite for effective performance management. These include strategic plans, work plans, service charters, balanced score cards and performance appraisal systems to which performance contracts are aligned. These tools are essential in establishing standards, objectives and targets to be met; as well as, measuring of performance.

In Education, PC involves first establishing a fairly definitive set of performance or learning objectives, followed by evaluating or measuring student progress - which reflects teacher performance - toward the set objectives over a period of time. There is then reporting of the progress as measured after which rewards are assigned or withheld on the basis of such performance. The teachers are mainly held accountable because it is assumed they are responsible for the management of the school plant and student performance – the output which defines the school quality (Eshiwani, 1993).
Some of the places where PC is practiced in education include the United States of America (USA), England, New Zealand, Sweden and Singapore to mention a few. A more recent innovation related to PC in the USA is the Pay-for-performance programs. The programs award teachers with differential compensation based on some combination of measurable outputs and observed teacher performance. Measurable outputs typically aim to capture student learning attributable to a teacher or school, and can be derived from scores on standardized tests or other more complex assessments of student work. In the UK, as part of the overall aim of raising educational standards, there is the Threshold Assessment located within a performance management model which is outlined in the 1998 Green Paper. It brings together a tighter system of annually assessing individual teachers' performance, in order to set targets for improvement, and a new pay policy that rewards good performance. From induction up to Threshold, teachers progress by yearly increment. Threshold is highly significant as the point at which, normally after five years, teachers submit themselves to an assessment process which involves providing evidence that they have met eight performance standards. In Sweden, a comprehensive approach to performance-related-pay was instituted in 1995 and fully implemented in 1999. In Singapore, there is no tenure for teachers. Teachers are graded along two professional tracks- teaching and leadership. There are four levels on each track each carrying increased salary and responsibilities. Teachers' grades are based on the criteria of performance (students' test results, teacher observation and feedback from stakeholders); contribution (extra-curricular activities); and estimated potential.

In Kenya, implementation of the process of PC began in 2004 with many ministries and state corporations signing performance contracts with their respective agencies as stipulated in Legal Notice No. 93 of 2004. At the launch of the KESSP (2005) the education Permanent Secretary
(PS) reiterated that by implementing the proposed programmes, the government expected effective delivery of services at all levels of education and training, and that there would be need to build reform minded teams with a commitment for change towards a result based management. Teachers were asked to be reform minded and willing to adapt to the continuously changing education system and accept to enter into performance contracts with their employer by July 1, 2005. Also, stakeholders in education have intermittently indicated that schools and teachers should be held accountable for school performance. The Daily Nation January 14, 2010 reported that parents in Taita District-Kenya, said teachers should sign PCs for improved quality learning in public schools. They argued that teachers were guaranteed their salaries hence did not care about performance unlike their counterparts in private schools.

Most organizations placed on PC have reported improved service delivery. The Review of PC in the Public Sector (Republic of Kenya, 2010) and the National Customer Satisfaction Survey Report (Republic of Kenya, 2009), show that PC in public service in Kenya has yielded significant benefits to the country. The reports point out some of the benefits as: improved transparency, accountability and responsiveness in the public service as well as improved profitability levels. The Center for Education Reform (CER) 1997 Action Paper, USA; reports that PC has provided a real professional impetus for school employees to measurably improve educational delivery; for public officials and communities it has offered greater leverage in demanding and getting higher achievement from students and schools.

However, the teaching force in Kenya has persistently resisted PC in schools leading to speculations that “teachers do not fully understand the concept and benefits PC or that if they do, then they have fundamental reasons for the outright rejection of the idea.” (Oswago, 2005). The
general observation is that the raging dispute between teachers and the government over PCs is a clear demonstration of poor communication about a new policy. Indeed, a cursory perusal of circulars from the Ministry of Education (MOE) and the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) to schools does not reveal any official communication concerning PC for teachers. It is therefore necessary that steps be taken to explain the PC concept to teachers. The aversion teachers had for the idea of PC, was clearly demonstrated when they shouted down the education minister and his PS at the 2005 Kenya Secondary Schools Heads Association (KSSHA) Annual General Meeting in Mombasa as reported in The Standard, 15 September 2005. Although the TSC in 2008 hardened its stance saying that those teachers who failed to sign the PCs would be sacked (The Daily Nation, 26 June 2008), the KNUT had asked teachers not to participate in the PC consultative process (The Kenya Times, 28 May 2008).

1.2 Statement of the problem

The report on the Review of Performance Contracting in the Public Sector, 2010 indicates that in Kenya, 38 ministries and accounts departments, 130 public enterprises and 175 local authorities have entered into performance contracts. Among these are the Ministry of Education, the TSC, Public universities and the Boards of Governors of Tertiary institutions. The National Customer Satisfaction Report (2009), points out some of the significant benefits of performance contracting in the public service in Kenya has improved transparency, accountability and responsiveness. Performance contracting in education has been largely associated with improved quality learning, professional impetus for teachers to measurably improve educational delivery and increased leverage for public officials and communities in demanding and getting higher achievement from schools (The CER Action Paper 1997, USA). In Kenya, despite the TSC
having entered into a performance contract with the Ministry of Education, the teachers have refused to enter into performance contracts with their employer, the TSC. Therefore with the continued teachers’ reluctance to sign performance contracts with their employer, the education sector stands to lose on these benefits of PC. Thus, the study was concerned with identifying the conditions that would make PC acceptable to teachers for the education sector to reap the benefits associated with PC.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The main purpose of the study was to find out the teachers’ perception of the concept of Performance Contracting and the reasons for their reluctance to accept the introduction of PC in schools. The study also sought to find out if the institutional preconditions that are necessary for successful implementation of Performance Contracting in schools had been put in place.

1.4 Objectives of the study

In order to achieve the intended purpose, the study was concerned with the following specific objectives:

a) To explore the level of teachers’ knowledge of the PC concept.

b) To find out teachers’ opinion on the benefits of PC in education.

c) To establish the factors that make teachers reluctant to accept PC.

d) To determine the conditions necessary to make PC acceptable to teachers.

e) To establish the extent to which institutional preconditions have been developed in schools for successful implementation of PC.
1.5 Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

a) What is the level of teachers' knowledge of the PC concept?

b) What is the teachers' opinion on the benefits of PC in education?

c) What factors make teachers reluctant to accept PC?

d) What conditions would make PC acceptable to teachers?

e) To what extent have the institutional preconditions been developed in schools to facilitate PC?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The findings of the study will offer valuable insights to the government and policy makers in education on significant considerations in introducing performance management strategies in Kenya's public secondary schools. The findings will also offer a basis for further research on performance based management in education.
1.7 Limitation of the Study

Due to time constraints, it was not be able to cover the opinion of other education stakeholders such as parents and students; yet, they too, are greatly affected by and concerned with the issues of standards and accountability which Performance Contracting addresses.

1.8 Delimitation of the Study

Due to scarcity of time and financial constraints, the study limited itself to one district, which may not provide a conclusive result that can be generalized to the whole country. Further, the study concerned itself with public secondary schools only and private schools were not studied as they operate on different management structures and teachers may have been reluctant to voice their opinions freely.

1.9 Assumptions of the Study

The study was based on the following basic assumptions:

a) That all teachers were aware of and had an opinion on the proposal to introduce PC in schools.

b) That the respondents would provide accurate and reliable information.

c) That the sampled population would be a fair distribution representing the whole population studied.
1.10 Theoretical Framework

The study adopted the Scientific Management Theory (Taylor, 1911). The theory has its roots in the industrial revolution which begun in England around 1750 AD. The proponents’ main concerns were: increasing the productivity of individuals performing work; and increasing the productivity of organizations within which work was performed (Taylor, 1911). According to the theory, workers should be assigned tasks which are clearly defined and that will take a day’s effort to complete, and should be given standard conditions to complete the task. Further, the theory proposes that pay should be based on a worker’s productivity; where high productivity is rewarded with high pay and low productivity is punished by loss of pay. The PC concept is concerned with increasing efficiency and productivity at work. It involves listing key result areas to be achieved under standard conditions within a stipulated period, which relates to the Scientific Management Theory. Similarly, in PC the achievement of performance targets should lead to assignment of rewards while failure should lead to sanctions such as termination, demotion or loss of wages.

Another theory informing performance management is the Goal Setting Theory of Motivation (Locke and Latham, 1990). The theory places emphasis on focused efforts on high performance toward an aim of action (goal) and is based on the premise that conscious goals affect action (Locke and Latham, 2002). In relation to PC, the Goal Setting Theory itself applies to objectives, key performance indicators and targets. Locke and Latham (ibid) argue that goal setting is effective for any task where people have control over their performance. Following the principles of the Goal Setting Theory, it is clear that elements of goal setting are present in various degrees in all aspects that relate to performance management practice.
1.11 Conceptual Framework

With respect to PC in schools, the model was conceptualized in the following flow chart:

**Poor Performance**
- Poor management of schools
- Low test scores
- Low achievement of critical competencies
- Anti-social traits in graduates

**Demand for Increased Accountability**

**Independent variable**

**Performance Contracting**
- Prioritization of objectives
- Setting of performance targets
- Performance monitoring and appraisal mechanisms

**Dependent variables**
- Teachers' Unions and Professional Groups

**Improved Performance**
- Proper Management of Schools
- Quality Learning Outcomes
- Increased Accountability
- Transparency, Responsiveness
- Increased Public Support

**Dependent variables**
- Teachers' attitude
  - Perception
  - Preparedness
  - Involvement
- Institutional preconditions
  - Management tools
  - Information systems
  - Managers’ autonomy

Figure 1.1 Researchers' Conceptual Framework on Performance Contracting in Schools.
The framework illustrates that poor performance and falling standards in schools leads to increased demand for accountability by the stakeholders, whose main concern is to see efficiency in translating spending into desirable learning outcomes. Performance contracting of teachers and school managers is perceived to be suitable, for it provides the platform for managers and teachers to break down institutional strategic objectives into deliverables. In addition, PC practice is believed to provide a basis for monitoring and evaluation of performance while at the same time giving stakeholders leverage in demanding and getting higher achievement. However, the successful implementation of PC in school is dependent on various factors (the dependent variables). These are mainly resistance from teachers’ unions and professional groups, the teachers themselves and the extent to which institutional preconditions have been put in place to facilitate successful implementation of PC.
1.12 Operational Definition of Central Terms.

**Accountability** refers to obligation by teachers to give a report, description, explanation, or justifying analysis on their performance at work to their employer (the TSC) and the stakeholders who may include parents, sponsors and school management boards.

**Performance** refers to degree of accomplishment of tasks that make up a teacher’s job. These tasks include implementation of curriculum and instruction (teaching), involvement in co-curricular activities, student welfare management and the management of human, financial and physical resources of a school.

**Performance appraisal** refers to a set of activities such as observation, filling forms and interviews used within the school organization to determine the extent to which duties are performed effectively.

**Performance contract** refers to a freely negotiated performance agreement between teachers and their employer (the TSC) in which the intentions, obligations, responsibilities and powers of the parties are clearly specified.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter covers a review of literature related to performance contracting. The sources of information in this literature review include the daily newspapers and other media reports, seminar papers and discussion paper series, empirical research reports, published books on educational management and various policy documents. The review seeks to synthesize definitions of PC; outline the successes and challenges in implementing PC in education; as well as, the lessons learned from the experiences. The themes under which the literature was reviewed are: Management of schools in Kenya, Rationale for introducing PC in Education, Evaluating School Performance and International Experiences with PC in Education.

2.1 Management of Schools in Kenya

Education in Kenya is managed by the Ministry of Education (MOE) which includes a number of Semi Autonomous Government Agencies (SAGAs) responsible for the development and management of the various aspects of education and training. The County Director of Education and the District Education Officer (DEO) coordinate education activities at the county and district levels respectively. The Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (DQAS) in the MOEST is mandated to ensure the quality of educational services offered and has officers at the county and district levels too. The minister of education is given extensive latitude to delegate his powers to local authorities, who in turn appoint School Management Committees (SMCs); District Education Boards (DEBs), and Boards of Governors (BOGs). In the management of public secondary schools, the BOGs act as trustees of all resources (human, physical and financial) in their schools and have to facilitate smooth operations. Head teachers are secretaries
and executive officers to the BOGs (The Kenya Education Bill, 2012). Further, the TSC Bill (2012), in the function of monitoring the conduct and performance of teachers in the teaching force, allows TSC to delegate its powers relating to hiring, control and discipline of teachers to BOGs. Other key players in the management of secondary schools in Kenya are the Parents Teachers Association (PTA) and the sponsors. Recently, the MOE and TSC have embraced decentralized administration of educational services and school based management as part of educational reforms. This was done to enable policy makers refine strategies and facilitate choice between possible functional options for system restructuring (IPPAR, 2008).

The statutes (The Kenya Education Bill, 2012 and The TSC Bill, 2012) presume that members of these management agents and the teachers are knowledgeable in law, human resource management, supply chain management, accounting and project management. However, studies show that these skills are lacking. For instance, a study by Munyiri (2008) on Management in Kenyan Schools, presents the findings that that there is generally weak management of public schools. There is no definite criteria enumerating the skills necessary for appointment to a BOG; also, service on the board is not remunerated, so professionals avoid it resulting in public schools managed by old and unenergetic retirees, semi-illiterate business people or other semi-skilled professionals often ignorant of human resource and organizational management. Munyiri (ibid) further notes that the problem is worse in rural public schools. The study recommends that the MOE needs to create standard project monitoring and evaluation tools for managers of public schools.

Worthy of note, is that with the decentralized administration of educational services in the country, the MOE and the TSC have laid the ground for PC to be instituted. This is because PC
thrives on a devolved management style, which emphasizes the autonomy of managers, and outcome-based management. It is therefore clear that the managers of schools have a critical role to play in the performance management of schools. It has been suggested that PC is one such tool that can be used by managers to monitor and evaluate performance. The principles of PC also demand that managers must show commitment to the contract and possess skills that instill confidence in their employees relating to the managers' capability to manage the PC process.

Though the literature reviewed clearly indicates the importance of the managers' role in the PC process, it does not however take into consideration the teachers' perception of such managers, their level of preparedness for PC and the state of institutional preconditions necessary for the successful implementation of PC in schools. It is in view of this, that this study sought to find out the teachers' view on who should manage the PC process in schools, their level of knowledge of the PC concept, as well as the extent to which critical management tools had been developed in schools to facilitate PC.

2.2 Rationale for Introduction of PC in Education

The introduction of contracts and management by results is used to increase performance and pursue among other objectives, that of accountability. Basic concerns which comprise a major component of the rationale behind the demand for greater accountability on the part of teachers and school managers are related to efficiency and effectiveness. Rising costs in the provision of education have led taxpayers and other financiers to demand that teachers and schools be held accountable for greater efficiency especially when increased funding is required. In addition, the education sector is very important to the society especially for development goals. The Economic
Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERSWEC 2003-2007) identified education as one of the key pillars in bridging the poverty gap in Kenya. With teachers accounting for about fifty five per cent (55%) of the public service workforce, the TSC had to take key reform measures in line with the government public service reform agenda which put emphasis on improved service delivery. To enhance the reform agenda, the commission adopted the performance improvement strategy that entails strategic planning, introduction of PC and other results-based management initiatives (www.tsc.go.ke).

The need for transparency and accountability in all spheres of life make it necessary for educational enterprises to be subjected to accountability. PC is perceived as a way of improving student performance and accountability in schools especially where standardized test scores, graduation rates and school attendance are poor (Pordgusky and Solmon, 2000). For example, with the rapid expansion of education in Kenya especially with the inception of the Free Primary Education (FPE) and Free Secondary Education (FSE), emphasis has shifted from the mere provision of education to the issue of quality of education offered in schools. Studies designed to assess learning outcomes at various stages of schooling in Kenya, have come up with reports indicating high rates of graduates found to be functionally illiterate. One such report released by Uwezo in 2010 indicates that only one in three children can read at the required level in standard two. Another research report by the Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC) in June 2010 indicates that Early Education of Kenyan children requires intervention. The study, ‘Monitoring Learner Achievement for Class Three in Literacy and Numeracy’ found out that 52% of Class three pupils cannot read, write or count to the required standards and 60% of standard three pupils interviewed had repeated a class.
Rising public spending on education and falling standards implies considerable inefficiency in translating spending into learning outcomes; a key factor that has led the stakeholders to call for PC of schools and teachers. For instance, following poor performance in schools in the USA, maverick educators, administrators and elected officials pushed for introduction of PC starting in the mid 1990s. School officials nationwide have since then adopted pay-for performance policies designed to increase individual ability by linking compensation and job security directly to operational and academic outcomes. Salaries and work contracts of teachers are dependent on student outcome measures such as attendance and test scores (CER, 1997). Similarly, in Sierra Leone, the government has accepted the recommendation to implement PC of head teachers and principals of secondary schools and tertiary institutions informed by the principles of RBM as outlined in the Government White Paper, 2010. This followed an inquiry into the poor performance of pupils in two major examinations - the 2008 Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE) and 2009 West African Senior School Certificate Examination (WASSC).

Educations experts concur that if the essential competencies of reading, writing, simple calculations and appreciation of the environment are not adequately achieved, then the education system can be said to be highly inefficient. It has also been noted that management experts argue that result based management is the most ideal type for those in the teaching profession. This is because among other things, the PC practice enables management to break down institutional strategic objectives into deliverables and provide indicators of the impact of efforts made through compliance with set budgetary levels and costs (IPPAR, 2008). Such concerns have led to increased calls for teachers to sign performance contracts to ensure accountability and improved educational outcomes.
Clearly, the general feeling among stakeholders is that the education system in Kenya has issues relating to efficiency and effectiveness, and that placing teachers and managers of schools on PC can, to a great extent, address these issues. However of great concern is that over five years since the idea was first proposed, it has not yet been implemented. The implication is that for as long as PC is not implemented, then the desired accountability, improved performance and by extension public support will continue to be elusive in the education sector. It has also been observed that the teaching force may constitute a major inertial factor in the introduction of any educational change (Fullan, 2001). It is therefore imperative for the policy makers to win the support of teachers for PC, so as to gain its benefits.

Much of the literature reviewed, focused on the benefits associated with PC in Education but had not sought to find out the teachers’ perception of the rationale presented for the introduction of PC in schools and in particular their opinion of the benefits of PC in education. This study sought to establish the factors that hinder teachers’ acceptance of PC, and conditions that would lead to acceptance, in addition to establishing their opinion on the rationale presented for the introduction of PC in schools.

2.3 Evaluating School Performance

At the school level, head teachers as managers, work with the teachers and non teaching staff to ensure efficiency in implementation of curriculum and instruction, student welfare, management of the physical and financial resources as well as school- community relations (MOE: School Management Guide, 1999). These are the key task areas that QAS officers assess to determine the performance of a given school. Effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and financial viability
have been identified as the variables addressed in determining any organization’s performance (Luthas et al, 2000). With regard to a school as an organization, effectiveness is the degree to which it moves towards attainment of its mission and realizes its goals. In Kenya, effectiveness is measured through schools mean scores in national examinations. Schools with high mean scores are seen to be effective. Efficiency in schools is viewed from the allocation and use of resources in providing exceptional services. Schools which are able to provide such services within an appropriate cost structure are said to be efficient from an administrative perspective. Relevance relates to the ability to adapt to changing contexts and capacities, in order to remain agreeable to the key stakeholders. Schools that adapt themselves to change fast especially in curriculum are said to be relevant. Moreover, schools with multiple sources of funding (mainly fees and income generating projects), and which are able to manage their finances to ensure positive cash flow, are termed as financially viable and are an indication of efficient financial management (Wango, 2009).

Individual teacher performance is generally evaluated from a professional perspective based on observation in the course of their work (classroom practice), administrative duties, and student performance in their subject areas. In particular, high student achievement scores in the examinations are taken to be an indication of good performance. The accountability model of teacher appraisal aims at identifying incompetent teachers, assesses performance for purposes of pay and promotion, and provides evidence for any disciplinary procedures (Goddard and Emerson, 1992).
However, there have been arguments among scholars about what constitutes school quality or performance. Wagner (ibid) argues that a diagnosis of the school quality problem that focuses on outputs (pupils’ performance) fails to inform about the antecedent causes (inputs and practice).

Eshiwani (ibid) opines with this view pointing out that learning is not an exclusive responsibility of teachers and it’s not solely as a result of their classroom experiences. They propose that parents, students themselves and other groups bear responsibility for the experiences that children have while they are in school, which also influence learning as well as behavior. Other factors that have been mentioned include: economic advantage, available resources, emotional well-being, basic intelligence of child, language proficiency and class size among others (Pordgusky and Solmon, 2000). The argument; therefore, is that all these factors need to be considered in developing an accountability model to determine the performance of a school and its teachers.

Moreover, there are arguments that children learn more from schools than just academic skills that achievement examinations measure. According Wagner, there are important excellences in education that cannot be defined in behavioral terms since they are of an indeterminate nature. He therefore argues that PC as a form of educational accounting would either be unacceptable as an educational practice or limited in its application to the extent that such excellences do exist. A group of distinguished educators interviewed by Pordgusky and Solmon (2000) for a Milken Family Foundation study on performance based compensation raised a similar concern- that test scores are a very narrow indicator of a student’s performance. Furthermore, the unwritten curriculum might be more important and more long-lasting than any other subject matter learned i.e. life lessons. The educators suggested that clear targets to measure performance must be developed. Eshiwani (1993) concludes that a clearer definition is needed to sharpen how the
problem of quality education is conceptualized and to show how intervention strategies may be formulated.

The literature review clearly reveals that monitoring and evaluation are key components of the PC process. On the other hand, evaluation of school and teacher performance is a delicate balancing act that calls for consideration of a variety of factors in developing an accountability model or evaluation procedure. Evaluation tools would be expected to consider antecedent causes as well as effectively measure performance in spite of the indeterminate nature of some important excellences in education. The literature however only proposes the need for teachers' involvement in the PC process, but does not identify specific aspects of schools' and teachers' performance that need to be taken into consideration in performance evaluation. Based on the belief that acceptable evaluation tools and procedures would significantly influence the acceptance of PC, the study also sought to establish teachers' views on how their performance can be objectively determined.

2.4 International Experiences with PC

The USA, England, New Zealand, Sweden, Singapore, and Finland to mention a few, are some of the countries that have implemented PC in their educational systems.

In the USA, where PC is well entrenched in the education system across the states, with school boards as the PC managers. The National Education Assessment by the US Department of Education (2010) indicates thirty six states already provide some form of merit pay for teachers. PC programs begun receiving nationwide public attention in 1970-71 and were spurred by the US Office of Economic Opportunity (OED). Initially there were implementation problems arising from challenges from teachers unions and professional groups, but eventually the
proponents have been able to overcome the barriers. However, the practice continues to draw mixed reactions and empirical studies have produced contradicting evidence. A 2009 analysis of a major program in Texas that linked teacher pay to student achievement gains on tests, showed no evidence of success. According to a Study by Solmon and Podgursky (2009), on the Pros and Cons of Performance-based Compensation for Teachers in the USA, it was concluded that although the PC practice faces a serious number of objections, these can be dealt with. They recommend that assumptions underlying the dislike for performance-based compensation need to be challenged; while, other objections may require changes in the way schools operate. Despite the voices of dissent in the USA regarding PC in education, performance-based-pay continues to be the new mantras in school reform adopted in various states to win favour and federal funding. It in fact forms a key part of the teachers new contract negotiated in Washington DC by the schools chancellor and ratified by members of the Washington Teachers Union.

The PC experience in England indicates a lot of opposition from teachers' unions which has eventually been overcome. The National Union of Teachers in 1999 launched an opposition in response to the introduction of performance management and the Threshold, and organized a number of protest events, including a march and a rally in London, February 2000. In 2006, there was another flurry of activities when it became clear that the UK proposed to use performance management in schools as a way of promoting performance-related pay. Currently, the teaching practice is guided by the School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document (STPCD); an annually-published document which forms part of the contract of all teachers in maintained schools in England and Wales. Worthy of note, is that each new document is formed following proposals from School Teachers' Review Body. The body makes recommendations to the
secretary of state, having received evidence from various bodies including the Secretary of State, teaching unions and the Department for Children, Schools and Families.

Proponents of PC in education propose that merit pay should be practiced along with high quality teacher training and improved professional development. A study on ‘Benefits of Performance Pay Without other Reforms’ by the National Center for Performance Incentives, (US Department of Education, 2010) in the USA offers useful insights. The study found out that performance pay without other supports for teachers did not help students; it requires a more comprehensive approach such as providing tools, resources, conditions and robust curriculum; as witnessed in Singapore, South Korea and Finland which are identified as having high performing education systems. Singapore is cited as having developed a comprehensive system for selecting, training, compensating and developing teachers- teachers are entitled to 100 hours of professional development per year. The Study also concluded that results of such programs are not based on poor implementation; so even a well-executed plan, in isolation of other reforms, makes no difference.

Review of literature on the Kenyan experience reveals that PC has drawn the heaviest criticism from teachers unions. Similarly, teachers and school administrators shift blame for poor performance on other factors such as social ills and funding issues, and are not keen on PC. A study by Nzyoka (2009) on Teachers’ Opposition to PC in Yatta- Kenya, established that teachers were opposed to introduction to PC due to different operational environments for schools and difficulty in setting targets. Other challenges identified in the implementation of PC in Kenya include limited resources, highly ambitious targets, inadequate training of staff involved and negative attitude due to disparities between PC and other performance management
tools and instruments (Kenya PC Review Report, 2010). Another key challenge in implementation of PC in the teaching profession in Kenya has been identified to be sabotage by teachers unions who claim that they have not been incorporated in the process by the government and lack of sensitization of teachers on the PC concept (Gaconi, 2007).

It is generally observed that in Europe and North America PC and variable pay has become somewhat less controversial and has even been given a high priority on some unions’ bargaining agendas. Eberts (2007) on ‘Teachers Unions and Students Performance’, notes that of late unions have begun to be more supportive of school reform, moving from an adversarial bargaining model to a more collaborative one in which teachers and administrators share common goals and hold joint responsibility. Eberts’ view is that one reason that unions have been slow to embrace reform efforts is the lack of consensus on their effectiveness. He argues that in principle, adopting standards that help teachers focus on lessons they want their students to learn, aligning their teaching to the lessons, and devising measurements that demonstrate that students are responding to these lessons can improve teaching as long as the public, policy makers and school administrators acknowledge the complexity of the learning process and the broad outcomes that society desires.

The review on International experiences with PC in education reveals the significant role played by teachers’ unions and professional groups in the successful implementation of PC. The England case further reveals that involvement of stakeholders in developing the contract is vital. Other key factors noted are high quality teacher training and improved professional development which should be established alongside other educational reforms. The Kenyan context reveals that the policy makers have not yet succeeded in bringing the teachers’ unions and professional
groups on board, and that these groups have adopted an adversarial bargaining stance, which may have contributed to the teachers' reluctance to accept PC. The literature however does reveal any studies focusing on the role of the unions and professional bodies in introducing PC of teachers. Therefore, this study sought to establish the extent of the unions' influence on teachers' acceptance of PC. The findings would be significant in informing any efforts that may be adopted in persuading these groups towards a more collaborative bargaining model, so that the education sector may reap the benefits associated with PC.

2.5 Chapter Summary

The literature reviewed indicates that PC can indeed be successfully introduced into educational practice as in the case of the USA, the UK, Singapore and Sweden among others. The literature however doesn't detail how the district boards overcame the teachers' and unions' resistance to PC. Perhaps the success can be attributed to the highly decentralized educational management. Also, though PC has been suggested as a way of improving accountability of educational providers and improving education outcomes in schools, the theoretical predictions regarding its effectiveness are ambiguous and the empirical evidence to date is limited and mixed. It also clear that the students' outcomes are not a conclusive basis for teacher performance but that there should also be observed performance entailing the rigorous documentation of the skills, knowledge, and behaviors associated with effective teaching. Further research is therefore necessary to establish not only how stakeholders can be involved in developing such criteria, but also the level of teachers' and institutional preparedness that exist so that PC can be readily accepted by teachers and successfully implemented in schools. This is the gap that this study addresses.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter describes the procedures that were followed in carrying out the study. The areas discussed include: research design, locale of the study and target population, sample selection and sampling procedures, research instruments and data collection methods, as well as data analysis procedures.

3.1 Research Design

The study adopted an exploratory approach using a survey design to investigate the perception of teachers towards performance contracting. The survey design had been chosen for this study since it is the most suitable method for collecting information about people’s attitudes, opinions, habits or any of the variety of educational and social issues (Orodho, 2008). Further, the survey can be applied to collect information about the popularity or success of a particular programme.

3.2 Locale of the Study

The study was carried out in Laikipia Central district. The district is situated towards the extreme East of the Rift Valley province. Laikipia Central district has recently been carved off from the expansive Laikipia East district with most of the land being semi-arid, and its district headquarters is located in Lamuria town. The rationale for selecting that area for study was that the researcher was familiar with the area and therefore would be convenient due to limitations of time and resources that were available for the research. Also review of related literature did not reveal a similar study having been carried out in the area.
3.3 Target Population

The research targeted all of the one hundred and thirty (130) teachers in the eleven (11) public secondary schools in Laikipia Central district. Head teachers were purposively involved in the study as they are considered to be opinion leaders on issues to do with teacher management and the teaching practice in general.

3.4 Sampling Techniques

Simple random sampling using raffle papers was conducted to select eight out of the eleven schools; where each and every school in the target population had an equal chance of being selected. There was purposive sampling of eight head teachers. Since the eight sampled schools had one head teacher each, the eight school heads were included in the sample. Selection of forty (40) teachers, five from each of the eight schools, was done through systematic interval sampling. The researcher obtained a numbered list of teachers in each school from the head teacher. The total number of teachers in each school was divided by five to get the interval for picking the five teachers to be included in the sample.

3.5 Sample Size

The sample comprised of eight (8) head teachers, and forty (40) teachers drawn from the eight randomly selected schools. The total sample size was forty eight (48) subjects to represent the one hundred and nineteen (119) teachers, and eleven (11) head teachers who make up the target population. The sample translates to about thirty seven per cent (37%) of the target population.
3.6 Construction of Research Instruments

The research instrument that was used in this study was the questionnaire. The questionnaire for teachers had both structured and unstructured questions which were used to elicit responses from teachers. This instrument was preferred because questionnaires are suitable for collecting data from a large number of individuals who are able to read and write independently. Orodho (2008) observes that the questionnaire is the most commonly used method when the respondents can be reached and are willing to cooperate. The first section of the questionnaires was used to collect information on the biographical data of the respondents, such as gender, academic and professional qualifications, and administrative duties. Section two of the questionnaire collected information on the extent of the teachers' awareness and knowledge of the PC concept, the implementation of critical management tools at the school level, as well as their opinion on the introduction of PC in schools.

The researcher also collected secondary data on Performance Contracting from publications and policy review reports. Some of the publications used include the daily newspapers to get the citizens' views on PC in schools, empirical research reports, electronic journals and seminar papers.

3.7 Pilot Study

Piloting of the research questionnaires was carried out in two schools which were randomly selected from the target population. The pilot schools were not included in the sample for the study. Through the piloting the researcher was able to identify ambiguities and problems that the respondents would encounter in completing the questionnaire. The piloting resulted in changing the wording of some questions in the instrument for clarity. The information collected from the pilot study was useful in improving the instrument and enhancing its reliability.
3.8 Validity

Validity is concerned with the degree to which the research instrument accurately measures the concept intended in the study (Orodho, 2004). The research instrument was pre-tested by piloting in two schools in the area of study. Respondents were asked to comment on the clarity and suitability of language used and the content on each item in the questionnaire. The researcher also engaged the services of the study supervisors to assess the relevance of the questionnaire’s content.

3.9 Reliability

Reliability is the degree to which measures of a theoretical concept are consistent across repeated attempts to measure the theoretical concept (Orodho, 2004). There was a test-retest of individual questions during the pilot study. The scores were then correlated question by question using the Statistical Package for Social science (SPSS) computer software. A reliability coefficient of 0.86 was obtained and accepted as good. Orodho (2004) states that a correlative coefficient of about 0.8 should be considered high enough to judge the instrument as reliable for the study.

3.10 Data Collection Techniques

The researcher sought for a research clearance permit from the Ministry of Education by applying through Kenyatta University. A letter of introduction was obtained from the District Education Officer to be presented to the Head teachers of the sampled schools. A preliminary visit was made to each school to inform the head teachers of the intended research and to agree upon convenient times to administer the questionnaires. The respondents were also assured that
confidentiality would be ensured and that the findings of the study would be confined to the purpose of the study. The questionnaires were administered directly to the respondents for the researcher to have a chance to convince the respondents on the importance of the study and also to deal immediately with any problems or questions that would arise. The researcher collected the questionnaires two days after they were administered as agreed upon with the respondents.

3.11 Data Analysis Procedures

Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the data collected. First, primary data from the research instruments was validated, edited, and then coded. The validation process enabled the researcher to determine the return rates of the questionnaire. In editing, the instruments were scrutinized to determine completeness and relevance of the responses. All questionnaires returned were 100% complete, thus none was discarded. A coding frame was constructed from the responses to each of the survey questions to translate the responses into specific categories. The coding helped to organize and reduce data into manageable summaries. In this study the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the coded items. The findings were quantified and then presented using descriptive statistics. Percentages, frequency distributions and graphs were used to describe and present the data as per the objectives of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of the findings from the study whose purpose was to investigate the perception of teachers towards Performance Contracting. The responses presented were gathered from forty six respondents drawn from eight public schools in Laikipia Central District using questionnaires. Data is presented in descriptive statistics with responses summarized in narrative form, frequency tables, bar graphs and pie charts. The demographic data of the respondents is given first, followed by the analysis and discussion of the data based on each of the following five research questions:

a) What is the level of teachers' knowledge of the PC concept?
b) What is the teachers' opinion on the benefits of PC in education?
c) What factors make teachers reluctant to accept PC?
d) What conditions would make PC acceptable to teachers?
e) To what extent have the institutional preconditions been developed in schools to facilitate PC?

4.1 Demographic Data of the Respondents

The study was conducted in eight public secondary schools in Laikipia Central district with a sample size of forty eight (48) subjects. The rate of questionnaire return was 96%; out of the 48 questionnaires administered only two (about 2%) were not returned. The demographic data presented shows the gender distribution, professional qualifications and administrative responsibilities of the respondents.
Figure 4.1 indicates that the male respondents were 28 (61%) making the majority, while the female respondents were 18 (39%). This reflects gender imbalance in the teaching force working in Laikipia Central district. The imbalance could be attributed to the fact that the district being semi-arid and a hardship area, not many females would be willing to work there.

Table 4.1 presents the distribution of respondents by their highest professional qualifications.
Table 4.1: Professional Qualifications of Respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 4.1, majority of the respondents, 28 (60.9%), had a first degree in Education. Those with a diploma in Education followed at 9 (19.6%). Respondents with a Masters degree in Education were three (3) representing 6.5% of the teachers sampled. Three (3) respondents did not state their highest professional qualifications, and were categorized as others. None of the respondents had a PhD which could mean that teachers do not register for PhD degrees, or that those who did PhD, got jobs elsewhere, and did not remain in the secondary schools. The data shows that most of the teachers were professionally qualified and therefore are eligible for PC, since proponents of PC in education propose that quality teacher training and improved professional development are critical considerations.
Table 4.2 below shows the administrative responsibilities of the respondents.

Table 4.2: Respondents' Administrative Responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head teacher and Class Master</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department (HoD)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoD and Class Master</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Master/Mistress</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that all the respondents had some administrative responsibility in their schools. Many of them held multiple responsibilities, with 12 (26%) being heads of departments as well as class masters, and one (2.2%) was a deputy head and also a class master. There were 7 (15.3%) serving as head teachers and 8 (17.4%) deputy head teachers. There were 8 (17.4%) class masters and 10 (21.7%) HoDs. The implication is that since all teachers held some administrative responsibility in addition to that of teaching, they were therefore prime candidates for the practice of performance contracting which would help to ensure and evaluate effective service delivery.
4.2 What is the Level of Teachers’ Knowledge of the PC Concept?

The study sought to find out the level of teachers’ knowledge of the PC concept. The following is a presentation and analysis of their responses to several items of the questionnaire.

Table 4.3 shows the respondents’ first source of information on the proposal to introduce PC in schools.

**Table 4.3: Respondents’ Source of Information on the Proposal to Introduce PC in Schools.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Officers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG/PTA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Officials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows that the teachers first got information that they would be put on performance contracts from various sources. Twenty-two (47.8%) teachers got the information from the media, while 10 (21.8%) were informed by the union officials. Another 10 (21.8%) got the information from other teachers. Only 2 (4.3%) teachers were informed by the BOG/PTA and Education officials. The data shows that the bodies mandated with management of schools mainly the BOG and PTA and the MOE agents played a minimal role in passing on information concerning PC to teachers. This could perhaps be attributed to either lack of information or to the minimal opportunities for contact with teachers. The data also shows that the media and union officials play a significant role in informing teachers on policy changes in the education sector; and that teachers also discuss such changes amongst themselves.
Functional and reliable managerial information systems are a precondition for successful performance management in any organization. The implication from the data is that since teachers mainly got information on PC from unofficial sources, there was a high likelihood of the information being inaccurate and biased hence contributing to their reluctance to accept PC.

Table 4.4 below shows the level of the respondents’ exposure to and their understanding of the PC concept. The information is based on their responses to three items of the questionnaire.

**Table 4.4: Respondents’ Awareness and Knowledge of Performance Contracting.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had seen a PC document</th>
<th>Had received training on PC</th>
<th>Gave correct definition of PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 indicates that only 7 (15.2%) of the respondents had seen a PC document, and only another 5 (10.9%) had received any kind of training on PC. Two of those trained indicated that their training had been done during a management course by the then Kenya Education Staff Institute (KESI), while the other three had been trained during their masters degree studies. A large number of the respondents, 39 (84.8%), had not seen a PC document and an even larger number (89.1%) had not received any kind of training in PC. Those who gave a correct definition of PC were 21 (45.7%) while those who did not give a correct definition of PC were 25 (54.3%). This information shows that despite a large number of teachers not having been trained or exposed to PC procedures, still a considerable number (45.7%) had an idea of what PC entails.
This could be attributed to the discussions in the Media and/or with colleagues in other careers where PC is practiced. Based on the average number of respondents who answered in the affirmative to all of the three questions, it can be concluded that 11 (24%) clearly understood what PC entails, whereas the larger number (76%) did not clearly understand the concept of PC.

This data is further illustrated in the pie chart below:

**Figure 4.2: Respondents’ Understanding of PC.**

Figure 4.2 shows that a smaller number (24%) clearly understood PC; whereas the majority (76%) of the respondents did not have a clear understanding of the performance contracting concept. Since PC involves a mutual agreement between the parties, a clear understanding of the obligations is essential. The findings reflect lack of adequate sensitization of teachers on PC which has also been cited in previous studies as a major challenge to the implementation of PC in the teaching force.
4.3 What is the Teachers’ Opinion on the Benefits of PC in Education?

The study sought to find out what the teachers thought about the intended purpose and benefits of introducing PC in education. Table 4.5 shows how the respondents agreed or disagreed with statements on possible reasons for introducing PC in schools. The responses are on a scale of 1-5 ranging from ‘agree to no extent’ up to ‘agree to a very great extent’.

Table 4.5: Reasons for Introducing PC in Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>No extent %</th>
<th>Small extent %</th>
<th>Moderate extent %</th>
<th>Great extent %</th>
<th>Very Great extent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) To measure and evaluate teachers’ performance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) To improve effectiveness of teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) To dismiss ineffective teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) To institutionalize performance-oriented culture and accountability in schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows that 13% of the respondents did not agree that introduction of PC in schools would help measure and evaluate teachers’ performance, while 50% agreed it would do so to a small extent. Those who felt that PC would help to evaluate teachers to a moderate extent were 13%. An equal number of 12% each felt that PC would do so to a large extent and to a very large extent. Respondents who were of the opinion that PC would improve teachers’ effectiveness to a small extent were 10% and those for to a moderate extent were 52%. Those who felt that PC
would improve effectiveness to a large extent and to a very large extent were 23% and 15% respectively. Those of the opinion that PC would be to a large extent used to dismiss ineffective teachers were 50% and 37.5% believed it would be used to a very large extent. Only 12.5% felt PC would be used to a moderate extent to dismiss ineffective teachers. Many of the respondents felt that PC would institutionalize performance-oriented culture and accountability in schools; with 25.5% stating it could be to a large extent, 25% to a very large extent, and 27.5% to a moderate extent. Those who stated PC would institutionalize accountability in schools to no extent were 10% and to a very small extent were 12%.

This data shows that the major benefits that teachers associate with PC are: improvement of teachers' effectiveness, and establishment of performance-oriented culture and accountability in schools. This data also shows that though teachers do acknowledge the benefits that PC would bring into education, there was also the fear that it could be used to dismiss teachers who failed to meet the set out expectations. This fear could be due to the information gaps among teachers on what PC entails. The large number of respondents who indicated that PC would only measure and evaluate teachers' performance to a small extent, could be attributed to the fact that, teachers were doubtful that PC enforcers would be able to come up with a satisfactory evaluation tool for teachers' performance. Literature review on evaluating school performance reveals that monitoring and evaluation are key components of the PC process and therefore evaluation tools must be developed through a consultative process to ensure fairness in the appraisal of performance.

The implication of these findings is that since a considerable number of teachers do acknowledge the benefits of PC in education, then all that would be required is more
sensitization of teachers to bridge the information gaps, as well as forums to iron out contentious issues such as that of performance evaluation procedures.

4.4 What Factors Make Teachers Reluctant to Accept PC?

The study also sought information on the extent of consultation with teachers on the necessity, impact and criteria of introducing PC in schools; their opinion on whether evaluation of teachers' performance in schools was adequate; and whether schools and teachers, like the rest of state institutions, should be placed on performance contracts. The responses are presented in Figures 4.3 and 4.4.

**Figure 4.3: Extent of Consultation with Teachers on PC**

It emerged that there had been little consultation on PC of teachers. Only 10 (21.7%) of the respondents had been consulted while those not consulted were 36 (78.3%). Those consulted indicated that they had held discussions mainly with union officials who had sought their views on whether teachers should be put on performance contracts.
Figure 4.4 below presents the respondents' opinion on whether schools and teachers should be placed on Performance Contracts.

Figure 4.4: Teachers' Response on whether PC should be Introduced in Schools.

Figure 4.4 shows that 24% of the respondents were of the opinion that schools and teachers should be placed on PC while the majority (63%) were not for the idea. Only 6 (13%) were undecided on whether PC should or should not be introduced in schools. Some of the reasons given by the respondents for their reluctance to accept PC included: lack of information on criteria for performance evaluation leading to fear of victimization; variation in external factors that may influence learning, such as working conditions, socio-economic environment, and basic intelligence of learners. The findings resonate with those of previous studies which identify different operational environments for schools as a major reason for teachers' opposition to PC (Nzyoka, 2009). It has also been established that applying PC in schools requires a comprehensive approach such as providing tools, resources, conditions and a robust curriculum (US Department of Education, 2010).
4.5 What Conditions would Make PC Acceptable to Teachers?

An analysis of the responses given to various items of the questionnaire, established several conditions given by the respondents, that would increase the acceptance level of PC by teachers. The responses are presented in Table 4.6 and Figure 4.5.

Table 4.6 below, shows the teachers’ preference of managers of the PC process if it were to be instituted in schools.

Table 4.6: Teachers’ Preferred Managers of the PC Process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Manager</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEB</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 shows that 20 (43.5%) of the respondents preferred head teachers to the rest in the management of the PC process. The DEB was also highly preferred by 17 (37%) of the respondents. The PTA was preferred by 4 (8.7%) and the BOG by 3 (6.5%) of the respondents. The TSC and the District Education Office were also suggested as possible managers of the PC process by one respondent each (4.3%) and are categorized as others. The least preferred was the school sponsors with none of the respondents suggesting them to manage the PC of teachers and schools. The high preference for head teachers and the DEB by the teachers as their PC
managers could be attributed to the feeling that they would be better placed to appreciate the variables that could determine the performance of individual teachers and schools. The low preference by teachers for BOG and PTA and Sponsors could be an indication of low confidence in their management capabilities. Literature review on PC reveals that the principles of PC not only demand that managers must show commitment to the contract, but also that they must possess skills that instill confidence in their employees in their capability to manage the PC process. The findings of this study therefore imply that teachers have considerable confidence in Head teachers and the DEB as managers of PC in schools. This further implies that since PC thrives on a devolved system of management, there is need to empower these managers for the successful implementation of PC in schools.

Figure 4.5 shows the extent to which teachers’ opinions are influenced by their trade unions and professional associations. The chart is drawn from the teachers’ responses to whether they would accept to sign PCs if persuaded to do so by either the teachers unions or the KSSHA.

**Figure 4.5: Extent of Unions and Professional Associations Influence on Teachers’ Opinions.**
Figure 4.5 shows that the teachers unions and associations had a lot of influence on the decisions made by teachers, especially pertaining to acceptance or rejection of contentious policy matters that affect the teaching practice and educational management. Those who would accept to enter into PC if persuaded by either of the two bodies were 28 (61%) while those who would make independent decisions were 18 (39%). Literature review on international experiences with PC reveals that PC has drawn the heaviest criticism from the teachers unions. Countries that have successfully implemented the performance-based compensation for teachers, such as England and the US have had to first overcome the unions’ opposition. This data implies that the policy makers would succeed in making teachers accept PC if they first garnered the support of the unions and professional associations. However, it is also evident that the policy makers would also need to develop a strategy to reach individual teachers in order to persuade them.

Other conditions, that would influence acceptance of PC, mentioned by the respondents, included the desire for objective performance evaluation tools, developed for each school after adequate consultation among all stakeholders. The respondents indicated that the evaluation criterion adopted should take into consideration teachers’ performance in all areas that make up their job including performance in administrative duties, co-curricular and student welfare activities, and management of school resources. The respondents also cited the need to take into consideration the disparities in the operational environments found in different schools. Successful implementation of PC in schools therefore, would require that these conditions be met since PC is basically a mutual agreement between parties that clearly specifies their mutual performance obligations.
4.6 To What Extent have the Institutional Preconditions been Developed in Schools to Facilitate PC?

The study sought to establish the number of schools that had developed management tools that are essential in establishing standards, objectives and targets to be met, as well as measuring performance. These tools are a pre-requisite for effective performance management on which PC is based. Table 4.7 below, shows the extent to which management tools, which would be critical for effective PC, had been developed in the eight respondent schools.

Table 4.7: Management Tools Developed in Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Tool</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision &amp; Mission Statement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Work Plans</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Work Plans</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Charter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal Form</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Score Card</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows that all eight schools had developed Vision and Mission Statements as well as Subject Work Plans also referred to as schemes of work. The high compliance rate could be attributed to the fact that the schemes of work is a mandatory professional document for every
teacher, and is often checked by QAS officers during school inspections. Similarly, the MOE through the DEOs has in the last three years demanded that all public learning institutions should develop and publicly display their vision and mission statements, hence the high compliance rate. It was also noted that 5 (62.5%) of the schools sampled, had developed a strategic plan, which has also been another of the MOE’s directives in a bid to institute results-based management in public schools. Departmental work plans, which are used to direct school activities, were in place in 6 (75%) of the schools. Only 2 (25%) of the schools sampled had developed a service charter to direct the delivery of services in their schools. None of the sampled schools had developed either the Balanced Score Card or Performance Appraisal Forms, which would facilitate measurement of teachers’ performance.

This data reveals that only those management tools that had been made mandatory by the Ministry of Education had been taken seriously, though it was not established whether the tools were actually being utilized as envisioned. This implies that the MOE could use their agents mainly the DEOs and QAS officers to ensure development of critical management tools which would then ensure that schools were prepared to institutionalize PC in their management practices. The absence of some management tools in the schools indicates that schools were not fully prepared for the introduction of PC, and that there was need to train and enlighten school managers on the importance and use of such tools, to which performance contracts are aligned, for PC to be successfully instituted in schools.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction
The study set out to find out the teachers’ perception of performance contracting in public secondary schools with a view to establishing the reasons for their reluctance to accept PC. The findings of the study were expected to offer valuable insights to the policy makers in education on significant considerations in introducing performance management strategies in Kenya’s public secondary schools. The study adopted an exploratory approach using a survey design in which a questionnaire was used to gather data from forty eight teachers drawn from eight schools in Laikipia Central District, Laikipia County. This chapter presents the summary of findings of the study, the conclusions and recommendations drawn from the study. It also gives suggestions for further study.

5.1 Summary of the Research Findings
The summary of the findings from analyzed data is presented under themes derived from the following research questions of the study:

a) What is the level of teachers’ knowledge of the PC concept?

b) What is the teachers’ opinion on the benefits of PC in education?

c) What factors make teachers reluctant to accept PC?

d) What conditions would make PC acceptable to teachers?

ee) To what extent have the institutional preconditions been developed in schools to facilitate PC?
5.1.1 Teachers’ Level of Knowledge of the PC Concept.

The study found out that a big proportion of the teachers had a relatively low exposure to PC procedures and did not clearly understand what PC entails. Most of the respondents had not seen a PC document and had not received any training in PC. The teachers’ main sources of information on the proposal to introduce PC of teachers, was the media and union officials. The implication is that since teachers mainly got information on PC from unofficial sources, there was a high likelihood of the information being inaccurate and biased hence contributing to their reluctance to accept PC. Since PC involves a mutual agreement between the parties, a clear understanding of the obligations is essential. The findings reflect the need for adequate sensitization of teachers on PC by the MOE, the TSC and its agents.

5.1.2 Teachers’ Opinion on the Benefits of PC in Education

The study found out that teachers do acknowledge the benefits that PC would bring into education. Many of the respondents felt that introducing PC would institutionalize a performance-oriented culture and accountability in schools, and would also improve teachers’ effectiveness. However, a significant number of teachers also expressed doubt over whether PC could effectively evaluate teachers’ performance and an equally large number were of the opinion that PC would be used to dismiss ineffective teachers. This further emphasizes the need for more sensitization of teachers to bridge the information gaps and make teachers accept PC.

5.1.3 Teachers’ Reluctance to Accept PC

The study established that there was great reluctance by teachers to accept PC, with the majority indicating that teachers and schools should not be placed on PC. Among the reasons given for the reluctance was that the evaluation process to be employed may not be all-inclusive of the
many activities and responsibilities involved in teaching, and may only focus on academic aspects. Others were of the opinion that teachers were already being adequately evaluated through the national examinations and inspections carried out by the QAS directorate. Due to inadequate consultation with teachers by policy makers, there was lack of information on the criterion that would be used for performance evaluation. Teachers were apprehensive that the criterion might not take into consideration the disparities in operational conditions and external factors that influence learning and teachers’ performance. These issues which had remained unaddressed had greatly contributed to the reluctance by teachers to embrace PC regardless of its benefits.

5.1.4 Conditions for Acceptance of PC

The study identified some conditions that would influence teachers to accept PC: The respondents indicated that their most preferred managers of the PC process were the head teachers and the DEB if PC were to be instituted in schools. The study also established that the teachers unions and professional associations were highly influential in policy matters affecting teachers. A majority of the respondents indicated that they would readily sign PCs if persuaded to do so by their unions. Thus, it is imperative that the government would need to strategize on garnering the support of the unions and professional associations by moving them from an adversarial bargaining model to a more collaborative one since acceptance of PC by these groups was a significant precondition for acceptance by the teachers. Another significant condition for acceptance of PC by teachers was the need to develop a performance evaluation criterion that would be objective and aligned to the conditions of individual schools. The respondents also cited the need for extensive consultation with the teachers and other stakeholders before introducing PC in schools.
5.1.5 Institutional Preconditions in Schools for Implementation of PC

The study found out that though some of the critical management tools had been developed in some of the schools, none of the schools sampled was fully prepared for implementation of PC. Performance Appraisal Forms and Balanced Score Cards were two of the critical performance management tools that were missing in all of the schools in the study. The management tools are essential in establishing standards objectives and targets to be met as well as measuring performance, for it is on such management tools as strategic plans, work plans and service charters that Performance Contracts are aligned to. Under the devolved system of management, the MOE could easily use its agents and the QAS directorate to ensure high compliance rates in schools in order to meet these crucial institutional preconditions for successful implementation of PC.

5.2 Conclusion

The study found out that the teachers' level of knowledge of PC was relatively low. A big proportion of the respondents did not indicate a clear understanding of what PC entails, had not seen a PC document and had not received any training on PC.

The study also established that teachers do acknowledge some of the benefits of PC in education. Many of them believed that PC would institutionalize a performance-oriented culture and accountability in schools and also improve teachers' effectiveness.
It also emerged that there was still a high level of resistance by teachers to PC in schools. This arose mainly from information gaps, misconceptions and apprehension of the resultant changes such as that PC would be used to dismiss ineffective teachers.

However, it was also established that teachers could accept PC if certain conditions were taken into consideration. The conditions identified include developing an acceptable criterion for performance evaluation, identifying managers of the PC process who would be acceptable to the teachers and garnering the support of the teachers unions and associations who would in turn persuade teachers to accept PC.

The study also established that the schools did not meet the institutional preconditions for implementation of PC. None of the schools sampled had developed all the critical management tools to which PCs would be aligned and which would facilitate setting of standards and evaluation of performance.

5.3 Recommendations of the Study

i) The Ministry of Education and the TSC should ensure that all the teachers and stakeholders get adequate information and training and should also strive to garner the support of teachers’ unions and associations on the proposed performance contracting of teachers. This would help to dispel the apprehension and information gaps that contribute to the teachers’ reluctance to accept PC.

ii) The Ministry of Education should work on a strategy to ensure that all schools meet the institutional preconditions for effective implementation of PC. This would involve
ensuring that all schools develop the critical management tools to which PCs would be aligned.

iii) The Ministry of Education and the TSC should consult with the stakeholders and the teachers to identify and train managers of the PC process in schools who would be acceptable to the teachers. This would ensure that the teachers have confidence in the management of the PC process hence contribute to their acceptance of PC.

iv) The Ministry of Education and the TSC should consult with the teachers and other stakeholders in order to come up with acceptable tools and criteria that would be used to measure teachers’ performance. Such tools should effectively evaluate all aspects of teachers’ performance in curricular, co-curricular, student welfare and administrative duties that make up a teacher’s job.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

i) Since the study restricted itself to Laikipia Central district, other studies on a larger area or in different districts of the country could be done for comparison of the findings.

ii) The study was limited to teachers in public secondary schools only. Further studies could be conducted in private schools and in primary schools to establish their perception of PC in education.
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Appendix A:

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS
The researcher is a student of Kenyatta University. This questionnaire is designed to gather information on the perception of teachers to Performance contracting (PC) in schools, and all information gathered will be used for the purpose of this study only. Your responses are confidential and anonymous; you don’t have to indicate your name anywhere in the questionnaire. This survey provides an opportunity to share your thoughts on issues affecting the teaching profession and will take you fifteen (15) minutes to complete. The researcher can be contacted on mobile phone number: 0720-804856 for any questions about the survey.

SECTION A: Biographical data
Please answer in the space provided or by placing a tick (✓) on the items that apply to your response.

1. Gender:
   - Male [ ]
   - Female [ ]

2. Your Highest Academic/Professional Qualification
   - Bachelor [ ]
   - PGDE [ ]
   - Masters [ ]
   - Diploma [ ]
   - Others (Specify).................................

3. Administrative responsibility in the school (you can tick more than one)
   - a) Class teacher [ ]
   - b) HoD [ ]
   - c) Deputy Head teacher [ ]
   - d) Head teacher [ ]
   - e) Others (specify).................................
SECTION B

This section is designed to gather information on your opinion with regard to the proposal to introduce performance contracting in schools. Please be frank in your response.

1. Briefly explain what you understand by the term 'performance contracting'

2. Have you ever seen a performance contract document? Yes [ ] No [ ]

3. Where did you first get information that teachers would be required to sign performance contracts?
   - Media [ ]
   - Education officer(s) [ ]
   - Head teacher [ ]
   - BOG/PTA [ ]
   - Other teachers [ ]
   - Union officials [ ]
   - Other Sources (specify) ..............................................

4. Have you received any training or attended a discussion forum on the principles of performance contracting? Yes [ ] No [ ]

   If yes, please indicate the year when you attended and the convener of the training forum.
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................

5. Has anyone ever sought your opinion on the necessity, impact or criteria for the introduction of performance contracting in schools? Yes [ ] No [ ]

   If yes, briefly explain who .................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................
   ...........................................................................................................
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6. In your opinion, should schools and teachers like the rest of state institutions be placed on performance contracts? Yes [ ] No [ ] Not sure [ ]

Please give reasons for your answer in 6 above.

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

7. What conditions do you think would make performance contracting be accepted by teachers?
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................

8. Personally, would you accept to sign a performance contract if persuaded to do so by your trade union or by the Heads Association? Yes [ ] No [ ]

9. In the table below please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements concerning the reasons for introduction of signing performance contracts by teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>No extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) To measure and evaluate teachers performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) To improve effectiveness of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) To dismiss ineffective teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Institutionalize performance oriented culture and accountability in schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Please mention the aspects of schools’ and teachers’ performance that need to be taken into consideration in performance evaluation.

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

11. If performance contracting were to be instituted in schools, who among the following do you think should manage the contracting process?

DEB [ ] BOG [ ] PTA [ ] HEADTEACHERS [ ] SPONSORS [ ]

Others (Specify) .................................................................

12. Please indicate which of the following management tools have been developed in your School.

a) Strategic plan [  ]

b) Vision and Mission statements [  ]

c) Performance appraisal forms [  ]

d) Service charter [  ]

e) Departmental work plans [  ]

f) Balanced score card [  ]

g) Subject work plans/ schemes of work [  ]

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Phyllis Wangui Muriithi  
Kenyatta University  
P. O. Box 43844  
NAIROBI

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Teachers’ perception of performance contracting in public schools: A case of Laikipia Central District, Laikipia County” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Laikipia Central District for a period ending 30th December 2012.

You are advised to report to the District Commissioner & the District Education Officer, Laikipia Central District before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit one hard copy and one soft copy of the research report/thesis to our office.

P. N. NYAKUNDI  
FOR: SECRETARY/CEO

Copy to:  
The District Commissioner  
Laikipia Central District  

The District Education Officer  
Laikipia Central District