International Journal of Asian Social Science

SCHOOL - BASED MANAGEMENT PROSPECTS AND CHALLENGES: A CASE OF PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN MURANG'A SOUTH DISTRICT, KENYA

Joyce Wangari Kiragu

Administrator, Directorate of Medical Services, Kenyatta University

John Ogamba King'oina

Administrator, School of Humanities & Social Sciences, Kenyatta University

Joash A. Migosi

Chairman, Department of Education Administration and Planning, South Eastern Kenya University

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to find out what the principals and teachers perceived were the prospects of school-based management (SBM), the accrued benefits of SBM and challenges schools would experience if SBM was introduced in Murang'a South district. The study adopted descriptive survey design. Stratified sampling was used to select 16 schools which participated in this study. A sample of 80 respondents was selected to participate in the study. The sample for the study included 64 teachers and 16 principals. Data for this study was collected using structured questionnaires which were administered by the researcher to a sample of principals and teachers in each of the sampled schools. A pre-testing of the research tools was carried out in four institutions which were not included in the study to ascertain validity and reliability of the instrument. The data was analysed manually and was presented in descriptive statistical tables using frequencies and percentages. The result of findings indicated that the introduction of SBM would be a way of addressing the current crisis in management of secondary schools, bringing about accountability, commitment by teachers in discharging their duties, efficient use of resources, timely syllabus coverage, delivery of quality education, improve efficiency and reduce need for supervision among other prospects if it was introduced in secondary schools in the district. The study made the following recommendations: Firstly, principals and teachers should be actively involved in making decisions about secondary schools management because they are the people on the ground and understands the school environment better. Secondly, the Ministry of Education should consider involving all the education stakeholders in formulating policies, this way they will own the policies and it will be easy to implement them without being seen like they are forcing them on schools.

Keywords: School-based management, Prospects, Challenges and Public secondary schools

INTRODUCTION

Good education involves not only physical input such as classrooms, teachers and textbooks but also incentives that lead to better instruction and learning. Education systems place extreme demands on the managerial, technical and financial capacity of governments; thus, education as a system is too complex to be produced and distributed efficiently in a centralized fashion (King and Cordeiro-Guerra, 2005). In many education systems there has emerged recognition that school-based decision-making and management has potential to bring improvement in the quality of education. It is against this background that there has been growing interest in the decentralization of education services including the human resources management function (Purcell and Ahlstrand, 1994) SBM is the decentralization of authority from the central government to the school level (Caldwell, 2005). Malen *et al.* (1990), posit that SBM can be viewed conceptually as a formal alteration of governance structures, as a form of decentralization that identifies the individual school as the primary unit of improvement and relies on the redistribution of decision making authority as the primary means through which improvement might be stimulated and sustained. Thus in SBM responsibility for and decision making authority over school operations are transferred to principals, teachers, parents and sometimes to students and other school community members. However, these school level actors have to conform to or operate within a set of policies determined by the central government. SBM programs exist in many different forms, both in terms of who has the power to make decisions and in terms of the degree of decision making devolved to the school level.

The management of education system in Kenya is highly centralized. Responsibility for most education services typically remains centralized in semi autonomous government agencies, complicating local school management and accountability. For instance, the management of public secondary schools is vested on the BOGs appointed by the Minister for Education in accordance with section 10 of the Education Act cap 211(1980). District Education Boards (DEB) also has authority to manage schools in their respective districts. However, the ongoing process of decentralization is distributing responsibilities slowly, but the local levels remain largely dependent on county or district education offices and have little autonomy. Responsibility for teacher training, deployment and evaluation typically remains centralized in semi autonomous government agencies, complicating local school management and accountability. This has led to a number of challenges over the past few years which include: lack of financial transparency, access, equity, curriculum relevance and quality. This prompted a need to undertake a study on how SBM can be honed for assurance of quality education in public secondary schools in Murang'a South district.

School-Based Management, Prospects and Challenges

Murphy (1997) postulates that SBM is primarily a strategy to decentralize decision making to the individual school site and it facilitates the empowerment of parents and the professionalism of teachers by allowing shared decision making among key stakeholders at the local level. The

concept of SBM and shared decision making fall under the umbrella of participative management. It has become an accepted belief that when people participate in decisions affecting them, they are more likely to have a sense of ownership and commitment to the decisions and situations that involve them (Glickman, 1993). The conceptualization for SBM is based on the autonomy-participation nexus. This dimension is based on who gets the decision-making power when it is devolved to the school level. Wohlstetter and Odden (1992), identified three different models of SBM. In the first Model, the community has most control over decision making and the objectives of the reform tend to focus on accountability to parents and choice; in the second model it is teachers who receive most of the authority and many of these reforms have teacher empowerment as a primary objective; lastly, the third model has the principal as the key decision maker and is intended to provide increased accountability to central or local authority and improve efficient use of resources. Leithwood and Menzies (1998) identified a fourth model on balanced control whereby decision making authority is vested between parents and teachers who are the two main stakeholders in any school. According to Malen *et al.* (1990) the central tenet of all SBM reforms is to place the locus of decision –making and authority closer to those at the school level.

There are wide ranging rationales that explain the significance of SBM. First, advocates of SBM argue that SBM fosters educational demand in the community. They emphasize that SBM ensures that schools provide the social and economic benefits that are more responsive to the priorities and values of those in local communities (World Bank Report, 2007). One of the simplest theories for SBM is that people who primarily benefit from education (i.e. children, their parents, and other community members) should have a say in the provision of education (Abu-Duhou, 1999). Second, in an economic crisis, many governments have found themselves incompetent to guarantee the quality of education in the daily workings of the very bottom of the educational bureaucracy i.e. at the school level (Shaeffer, 1994). To supplement this financial shortage, deploying limited financial and human resources, and sharing costs become more the focus (Colletta and Perkins, 1995). Third, advocates for the reforms emphasize that by giving local authorities decision making authority over school management, they become aware of educational problems such as low enrolment, attendance and academic performance, and begin to realize key disincentives to schooling (Uemura, 1990). SBM exists in different forms some of them include: One, community participation and decision making. This form deals with parental involvement in the management of schools (Karim *et al.*, 2004; Patrinos and Kagia, 2007). DeStefano (2004), contends that community schools are not only effective at increasing access to basic education and raising the completion rate of primary education, but also students from community schools perform as well as or better than students in traditional public schools as measured by language and mathematics test scores. Two, principals / administrative control. This is how SBM devolves authority to the school principal. The participative management required of SBM structures means that authority is delegated from higher to lower levels (Mosoge and Van, 1998) the principal is assumed to be key player in the decentralization and restructuring process in school (Herman and Herman, 1993). Some of the challenges of SBM include: lack of involving parents and teachers in school

management and lack of skills on operations of SBM by stakeholders of schools. However, in SBM principals, teachers and parents' involvement create a positive development for their schools (Southworth, 1999); improves efficiency in the operation of educational systems (Abu-Duhou, 1999); and promotes concepts like increased school autonomy, accountability, democratization, legitimacy, flexibility and responsiveness, redistribution of decision power, and participatory planning (Brown, 1990; Abu-Duhou, 1999; Briggs and Wohlstetter, 1999; Caldwell, 2005).

Statement of the Problem

Despite the efforts by various stakeholders in the education sector to reform education in Kenya, the current decentralization of education services has not been able to yield any worthwhile results with education quality being the major problem. The education sector faces management problems ranging from delays in decision making, ineffectiveness in implementing recommendations, lack of adequate resources, inadequate remuneration leading to low morale and lack of accountability at the district and school levels. The people who know what goes on in the school are never involved in decision making pertaining school management policies and this has hindered the improvement of services delivered by the education stakeholders particularly principals and teachers in secondary schools. It was against this back drop the study sought to investigate the perceptions of principals and teachers in regard to SBM prospects, benefits and challenges if it was introduced in public secondary schools in Murang'a South district.

Objectives of the Study

The study was based on the following objectives

(i)   To find out what the principals and teachers perceived were the prospects of SBM if it was introduced in Murang'a South district.

(ii)   To establish what the principals and teachers perceived were the accrued benefits of SBM if it was introduced in Murang'a South district.

(iii)   To find out what challenges schools would experience if SBM was to be introduced in Murang'a South district.

METHODOLOGY

Survey design was used in this study. This is because it provides the advantage of sampling a large group of randomly selected people to measure their attitudes and behaviour (Scott and Deirdre, 2009). The target population comprised of principals and teachers in Murang'a South district. The sample consisted of 16 principals and 64 teachers representing (23 %) out of 280 teachers. The public secondary schools were selected using stratified sampling technique. A list of all the schools was obtained from the District Education Officer's office and a sample number that is proportional to size of the population was allocated. 16 schools in this case were selected. This would ensure each stratum contributed to the sample a number that was proportional to its size in the population (Orodho, 2009). Research instrument used to collect data was Principals and

Teachers Questionnaires. Piloting was done to authenticate the instruments and the study by checking out whether they were within the threshold in terms of content and language. Pilot study took place in four secondary schools which were not included in the study. Validity was undertaken to ascertain that the subject matter was clear and was relevant in generating a meaningful data. Reliability of the instruments was also measured in two boarding and two mixed day secondary schools that were not used in the real study. The results were presented in form of descriptive statistical tables using frequencies and percentages.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to find out what the principals and teachers perceived were the prospects of SBM, the accrued benefits of SBM and challenges schools would experience if SBM was introduced in Murang'a South district. To achieve this objective, the study examined principals' and teachers' perception on prospects of SBM, principals' and teachers' perception on benefits of SBM and challenges of SBM if introduced in secondary schools.

(a) Principals' and Teachers' Perception on Prospects of SBM
The researcher sought to find out the attitudes of the respondents on the following aspects that touch on the day to day management of secondary schools if SBM was introduced in the study district. These aspects included: management of physical and material resources, management of staff and student personnel, financial management, management of curriculum and instruction and school community relations.

Table-1. Principals' and teachers' attitudes on management of physical and material resources under SBM

	Principals					Teachers				
	S.A	A	N	D	S.D	S.A	A	N	D	S.D
Efficient use of resources	12.5	62.5	0	25	0	28.0	61.0	3.0	8.0	0
Improve efficiency	18.8	56.3	18.8	6.3	0	23.4	53.0	18.8	4.7	0
Timely procurement of resources	43.8	43.8	6.3	6.3	0	26.6	57.8	11.0	3.0	1.6
Greater mobilization of resources	31.3	50.0	0	18.8	0	26.6	59.4	7.8	6.3	0

Table 1 above indicates majority of the principals (75.0%) and also the teachers (89.0%) concurred with the statement that SBM would bring about efficient use of resources in secondary schools.

Majority of the principals (87.6%) and teachers (84.4%) indicated that SBM would also contribute to timely procurement of resources and also greater mobilization of resources in the schools.

Table 2. Principals' and teachers' attitude on management of staff and student personnel under SBM

	Principals					Teachers				
	S.A	A	N	D	S.D	S.A	A	N	D	S.D
Commitment by teachers	12.5	56.3	12.5	18.8	0	32.3	50.0	12.5	3.0	1.6
Increase teachers motivation	37.5	43.8	0	18.8	0	23.4	54.7	15.6	4.7	1.6
Reduce supervision	12.5	62.5	0	25.0	0	50.0	36.0	3.1	7.8	3.1
Teachers' professional development	12.5	18.8	25.0	43.8	0	17.2	51.6	18.8	4.7	7.8
Enhance students discipline	43.8	56.3	0	0	0	29.7	50.0	3.1	15.6	1.6
High degree of freedom	56.3	37.5	0	6.25	0	28.1	46.9	7.8	4.7	12.5
Improved communication	18.8	56.3	6.3	18.8	0	31.3	42.2	9.4	17.2	0
Reward for progress	18.8	62.5	6.3	12.5	0	21.9	46.9	23.4	4.7	3.1
Shared school leadership	25.0	62.5	0	12.5	0	35.9	42.2	14.1	3.1	4.7
Easy management of staff & Students	18.8	62.5	0	18.8	0	31.3	57.8	7.8	3.1	0

Table 2 above shows both the principals and the teachers concurred with the statement that SBM would lead to commitment by teachers in discharging their duties. Both groups also agreed with the statement that SBM would increase teachers' motivation. However majority (43.8%) of the principals disagreed with the statement that SBM would lead to teachers' professional development unlike the teachers who thought otherwise. It was clear that both groups agreed with the statement that SBM would bring about improved communication and high degree of freedom in the school.

Table-3. Principals' and teachers' attitude on management of finances under SBM

	Principals					Teachers				
	S.A	A	N	D	S.D	S.A	A	N	D	S.D
Increase accountability	18.8	50.0	0	18.8	12.5	34.4	54.7	9.4	1.6	0
Sound financial management	12.5	56.3	0	25.0	6.3	25.0	50.0	15.6	7.8	1.6
Competency in decisions	18.8	62.5	0	18.8	0	31.3	42.2	6.3	18.8	1.6
Realistic budgeting	25.0	62.5	6.3	6.3	0	25.0	46.9	14.1	14.1	0
Improve decision making	18.8	62.5	0	18.8	0	31.3	57.8	7.8	3.1	0

As Table 3 indicates majority of the principals (68.8%) and the teachers (89.1%) concurred with the statement that SBM would increase accountability at the school. Both groups also indicated that SBM would lead to sound financial management in the schools. Also majority of the principals (81.3%) and teachers (57.8%) indicated that SBM would improve decision making at the school while 62.5% of the principals and 46.9% of the teachers indicated that SBM would lead to realistic

budgeting while 62.5% of the principals and 42.2% of the teachers agreed that SBM would lead to competent decisions in the school.

Table-4. Principals' and teachers' attitude on management of curriculum and instruction under SBM

	Principals					Teachers				
	S.A	A	N	D	S.D	S.A	A	N	D	S.D
Timely syllabus coverage	18.8	50.0	0	31.3	0	28.0	56.3	9.4	4.7	1.7
Delivery of quality education	12.5	56.3	18.8	12.5	0	18.8	46.9	23.4	9.4	1.6
Improve instructional programmes	12.5	50.0	12.5	25.0	0	25.0	43.8	12.5	15.6	3.1
Change in school culture	25.0	68.8	6.3	0	0	25.0	54.7	7.8	7.8	4.7
Changes in classroom practices	18.8	56.3	6.3	18.8	0	15.6	48.4	15.6	15.6	4.7
Use of knowledge and skills	12.5	43.8	18.8	25.0	0	26.6	50.0	7.8	15.6	0
Creativity in programmes	12.5	75.0	0	12.5	0	23.4	50.0	15.6	10.9	0

As Table 4 shows both the principals and the teachers indicated that introduction of SBM would lead to timely coverage of the syllabus in schools. Majority of the principals (68.8%) and teachers (65.7%) also indicated that SBM would lead to delivery of quality education in schools. Majority of the principals (93.8%) as compared to the teachers indicated that SBM would lead to changes in school culture.

Table-5. Principals' and teachers' attitude on school community relations under SBM

	Principals					Teachers				
	S.A	A	N	D	S.D	S.A	A	N	D	S.D
Distribution of power in school	18.8	62.5	6.3	12.5	0	31.3	57.8	7.8	1.6	1.6
Lead to active school vision	31.3	43.8	6.3	18.8	0	23.4	50.0	23.4	3.1	0
Determination of policies	18.8	62.5	6.3	12.5	0	32.8	46.9	15.6	4.7	0
Gives entire school communication voice	18.8	81.3	0	0	0	29.7	46.9	10.9	12.5	0
Change roles of the B.O.G	25.0	68.8	0	0	6.3	10.9	46.9	7.8	34.4	0
Work place democracy	18.8	62.5	6.3	12.5	0	20.3	54.7	10.9	12.5	1.6

Table 5 indicates that majority of the principals (81.3%) and teachers (79.7%) indicated that introduction of SBM would lead to determination of policies by the entire school community. The principals unlike the teachers highly indicated that the introduction of SBM would give the entire school community a voice leading to work place democracy and determination of policies by the entire school community.

Table-6. Principals' and teachers' perception in regard to task areas in SBM

	Principals		Teachers	
Task Areas	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
Budgeting	14	87.5	36	56.3
Staffing	13	81.3	24	37.5
Curriculum & Instruction	8	50.0	15	23.4
Goals	12	75.0	10	15.6
Organizational structures	10	62.5	15	23.4

Table 6 indicates that majority of the principals (87.5%) and teachers (56.3%) perceived budgeting as the most important task area in which schools should be given autonomy to control. Staffing was the second task area that the respondents felt they should be allowed to control if SBM was effected. However the respondents differed in the other areas with principals preferring autonomy over school goals and teachers preferring curriculum and instruction and also organizational structures.

Table-7. Principals' and teachers' views on power over SBM

	Principals		Teachers	
Stakeholders	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
Principals	13	81.3	15	23.4
Teachers	0	0	10	15.6
Principals and teachers	0	0	35	54.7
Board of Governors	10	62.5	15	23.4
Parents	0	0	3	4.7
Principals, teachers & students	0	0	20	31.3

Table 7 indicates who the respondents perceived should be given the power to manage schools if SBM was introduced in secondary schools. Majority of the principals (81.3% and 62.5%) indicated that the principals and the Board of Governors should be given the powers to manage schools. This was contrary to the views of the teachers who the majority (54.7%) preferred principals together with the teachers to be given power to manage the schools under SBM. Also quite a big percentage (31.3%) of the teachers indicated that the principals together with the teachers and the students should also be given power to manage the schools under SBM.

(b)Principals' and teachers' opinion on the impact of School Based Management on their roles

When principals and teachers were asked to indicate whether SBM would impact on their roles, 56.3% (9) of the principals agreed that SBM would affect their roles while 73.4% (47) of the teachers also agreed with the statement. Only 43.7% (7) of the principals and 26.6% (17) of the

teachers indicated that SBM would not affect their roles in the school. It is clear from the findings that majority of the respondents felt that their roles would change upon introduction of SBM.

(c) Principals' and teachers' opinions on the involvement of teachers in secondary school management.

The respondents were asked to give their opinions on the involvement of teachers in secondary school management. All the principals and 92.2% (59) of the teachers indicated that involvement of teachers in secondary school management was useful. However, only a small percentage 7.8% (5) of the teachers indicated otherwise. It is quite evident that both the principals and the teachers strongly supported the idea.

(d) Teachers' opinions on the relationship with the school principal amid introduction of School Based Management approach in the management of secondary schools

The researcher sought to find out the views of the teachers on what they anticipated would be their relationship with the school principal amid introduction of SBM in Murang'a South district. 21.9% (14) of the teachers indicated that SBM would affect their relationship with the school principal while 78.1% of them disagreed with the statement. This clearly indicated that most of the teachers did not anticipate any changes on the part of their relationship with the school principal amid introduction of SBM.

(e) The opinions of the principals and teachers on the benefits of SBM approach in the management of secondary schools

Further to rating, the respondents were also requested to indicate what they perceived would be the benefits of SBM if it was introduced in secondary schools. The following were some of the responses they gave: SBM would reduce conflicts between the principal and teachers, SBM would bring about ownership of school decisions, SBM would bring about transparency in management of school finances and resources, SBM would bring about creativity and innovation by the stakeholders, problem solving would be fast, smooth implementation of decisions, improved curriculum, proper time management, more loyalty to the school, SBM would ensure there was proper supervision, creation of social unity, reduced bureaucratic tendencies, promotion of school patriotism and greater focus on part of learning.

(f) Principals' and teachers' attitudes on challenges of School Based Management approach in the management of secondary schools

Principals and teachers also indicated their attitude on what they perceived would be the SBM challenges through a 5.0 point Likert scale on the questionnaires with 5 being strongly agree (S.A); 4 – Agreed (A) ; 3 – Neutral (N); 2 – Disagree (D) and 1 – Strongly disagree (S.D). The following research items were rated to find out principals' and teachers' attitudes on SBM challenges.

Table-8. Principals' and teachers' attitudes on challenges of SBM approach in the management of secondary schools

Challenges of SBM	Principals					Teachers				
	S.A	A	N	D	S.D	S.A	A	N	D	S.D
Create tension in the school	12.5	25.0	12.5	37.5	12.5	10.9	32.8	9.4	31.3	15.6
Increased workload	6.25	50.0	0	31.3	12.5	10.9	31.3	23.4	31.3	3.1
Considerable initiative & efforts	62.5	31.3	0	6.3	0	39.1	48.4	6.3	3.1	3.1
Create frustration and slow decision making	12.5	12.5	0	75.0	0	3.1	21.9	12.5	46.9	15.6
Devote less time to other aspects	6.3	12.5	0	62.5	18.6	7.8	18.8	14.1	51.6	7.8

According to Table 8 respondents were rated on what they perceived would be the challenges of SBM if it was introduced in the study district. Majority of the principals (93.8 %) and teachers (87.5%) concurred with the statement that SBM would require considerable initiative and efforts from the stakeholders. 50% (8) of the principals agreed with the statement that SBM would lead to increased workload for the stakeholders. Apart from rating, the respondents were requested to indicate what other challenges would arise from introduction of SBM. The following were some of the responses from the respondents: local politics, limited resources, lack of commitment, inadequate personnel, conservatism/rigidity, lack of accountability and transparency, conflict among the stakeholders, misuse and embezzlement of funds, delays in decision making, lack of clear demarcation of duties, lack of cooperation from stakeholders, conflict of interest, corruption, lack of competent administrators and lack of goodwill.

DISCUSSION

From table(s) No. 1 - 5 the findings focused on prospects of SBM in regard to the following task areas of school management: Management of physical and material resources, management of staff and student personnel, management of finances, management of curriculum and instruction and management of school community relations. It was clear that both the principals and teachers indicated that SBM would increase accountability at the school level. This finding was in tandem with World Bank Report (2007) which emphasized that SBM ensures that schools provide the social and economic benefits that are more responsive to the priorities and values of those in local communities On the part of teachers this could have stemmed from the fact that the current system of school management does not involve fully teachers on issues of management and thus they have always questioned the transparency and accountability of school management by the board of governors (BOG) whom they feel are not competent enough to govern affairs of secondary schools. Both the parents and teachers have always blamed the school principal of colluding with the BOG to misappropriate school funds since he /she plays a pivotal role being the secretary to the board and also due to the fact that most of his / her recommendations on school improvement are easily adopted and approved by the BOG. Only a small percentage of the principals disagreed with the statement. This group perhaps constituted the veterans, who felt that if other parties were involved in the management of secondary schools, they would probably seal the loopholes that existed and thus they will not enjoy the freedom of spending and misappropriating school funds. The

respondents also gave their opinions on what they perceived were the impacts of SBM on their roles. Majority of the principals and teachers believed that SBM would to some extent impact on their roles in the following ways: add more responsibilities, they would own up the school policies put in place, would increase teachers' motivation and would be held more accountable on results. These findings is contrary to a study conducted by Caldwell (2005) which indicated that SBM has in several cases made life harder for school principals by increasing their administrative and managerial workload to the detriment of their role as pedagogical leaders. The findings on principals' and teachers' opinions on the involvement of teachers in secondary school management clearly showed that teachers have for a very long time yearned to be involved in management of schools in order to ensure their plight is addressed. They also felt that they have been sidelined on deciding on very important issues that affect them in the course of their duties. Those who felt that teachers should not be involved felt that involvement would make them accountable, an issue they want to be distanced with and that teachers were not adequately prepared for management issues in their training. Indeed, improving teachers' skills seems to be one of the main goals in several SBM programs although the limited evidence available found no benefit of spending on teacher training. However, Southworth (1999) supports the findings that in SBM principals, teachers and parents' involvement create a positive development for their schools. On teachers' opinions on the relationship with the school principal amid introduction of SBM approach in the management of secondary schools, 21.9% teachers indicated that their relationship would change citing reasons such as: There would be constant consultations, the principal would not be seen to enforce policies from without, SBM would bring conflicts and teachers will be able to give their views freely without fear of intimidation or interdiction.

From the findings, the respondents indicated various aspects which they perceived would be the benefits of SBM in secondary school management. Among them included: increased accountability and transparency, creativity and innovation by the stakeholders, smooth implementation of decisions and creation of social unity among others. These findings are in line with a study by Briggs and Wohlstetter (1999) which indicated that under SBM arrangements, schools are managed more transparently, thus reducing opportunities for corruption. In addition, SBM often gives parents and stakeholders opportunities to increase their skills. In some cases, training in shared decision-making, interpersonal skills, and management skills is offered to school committee members so that they can become more capable participants in the SBM process and at the same time benefit the community as a whole. According to table 8 above in regard to principals' and teachers' attitudes on challenges of SBM approach in the management of secondary schools, 37.5% of the Principals disagreed that SBM would create tension between them and the teachers. This could have resulted from the fact that principals have always wanted to work very closely with the teachers for the welfare of the school. Concerning workload, 50.0% of the principals agreed that SBM would lead to increased workload for both principals and teachers. 31.3% of the teachers also agreed with the statement. It is evident from the findings that principals felt that this would lead to increased work especially for them. These findings corroborates with the findings of another study

conducted by Wohlstetter and Odden (1992) which states that initiatives based on SBM pose new and important challenges for some of the school actors like principals and teachers. Whilst, SBM is about participatory decision making the bulk still lies with the principals to oversee implementation of every decision in the school. In whatever circumstances the principals should always lead by example and play a very important role in the modeling among the teachers and the students. SBM requiring considerable initiative and efforts by individuals at the school site was rated highly as a challenge of SBM by both parties. 62.5% of principals and 39.1 of the teachers supported the opinion. This perhaps resulted from the fact that SBM being a new concept would require a lot of collaboration among the stakeholders in implementing new ideas and trying to make it work. There would also be a lot of expectations by the stakeholders hence need for concerted efforts. In addition, undertaking reforms would require a lot of initiative in order to fade away frustrations that were likely to occur along the way. When respondents were asked whether SBM would create frustration and slow decision making in the school, 75.0% of principals and 46.8% of teachers disagreed with the statement. These findings indicate that both the principals and teachers did not expect that the challenge of frustration and slow decision making would arise as a result of SBM. This perhaps resulted from the fact that they were uncomfortable with the current system due to inefficiency and anything that would allow them make decisions was highly welcomed. The challenge of whether SBM would make principals and teachers devote less time to other aspects of their jobs was also raised. 62.5% of the principals and 51.6% of the teachers disagreed with the statements. These findings implied that both parties were committed to their work and nothing would interfere with their task performance. It could also mean that both parties were motivated to undertake their assignments and nothing could distract them. This perhaps stemmed from the fact that SBM was meant to improve efficiency at the school.

CONCLUSION

It emerged from the findings on SBM prospects and challenges that:-

(i)   Most principals and teachers in the study district were optimistic of better school management if SBM was introduced in secondary schools in the district. Perhaps this was due to the fact that there were many challenges facing secondary schools in the district which included: poor academic performance, high dropout rates, limited spaces in secondary schools, high student/ teacher ratio, inadequate resources, high levels of students' indiscipline and rigidity in academic programs among others.

(ii)   The respondents were positive that if SBM was introduced in secondary schools in the study district, many aspects would change and there would be increased accountability and transparency, efficient use of resources, improved decision making, timely syllabus coverage and timely procurement of resources, better management of staff and student personnel with the aim of enhancing performance and this in turn would improve quality of education and lead to improved performance in examinations among other things.

(iii)   There would be challenges of implementing SBM if introduced in secondary schools in the district. The respondents indicated that SBM would lead to increased workload both for teachers and principals. They also viewed SBM as requiring considerable initiative and efforts from the stakeholders such as commitment, resources, skills, tolerance and understanding from each of the parties.

Recommendations

Guided by the findings of the study, researchers recommended the following:-

(i)   Principals and teachers should be actively involved in making decisions about secondary schools management because they are the people on the ground and understand the school environment better.

(ii)   Principals and teachers being the major stakeholders should also be involved in formulating secondary school policies. In this way, they will own the policies and implement them with due diligence.

(iii)   The Ministry of Education should mount capacity development courses regularly in order for principals and teachers to keep abreast on the emerging issues and trends on school management and curriculum.

Suggestion for Further Research Study

On further study, the researchers recommend that a study should be undertaken to investigate on the perceptions of principals' and teachers' preferences on decentralization of personnel management to the school level.

REFERENCES

Abu-Duhou, I., 1999. School-based management. Paris: Unesco, IIEP.

Briggs, K. and P. Wohlstetter, 1999. Key elements of a successful school-based management strategy. Working Paper, University of Southern California.

Brown, D., 1990. Decentralisation and school-based management. London: Falmer Press.

Caldwell, B.J., 2005. School-based management. Education policy series. The international institute for educational planning and the international academy of education. Paris and Brussels.

Colletta, N.J. and G. Perkins, 1995. Participation in education. Environment department papers. Paper no.001. Participation series. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

DeStefano, J., 2004. Meeting efa, mali case study: Community schools (equip2 case   study). Washington, dc, educational quality improvement program 2 (equip2), united states agency for international development (usaid), academy for educational   development (aed).

Glickman, C.D., 1993. School improvement programs; educational change. 1st Edn., United States: Jossey-Bass (San Francisco) Publishers, ISBN 1555425437.

Herman, J.J. and J.L. Herman, 1993. School-based management: Current thinking and practice. Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas.

Karim, S.C.A., R. Santizo and E.C. Mendoza, 2004. Transparency in education. International institute for educational planning and international academy of education. Paris and Brussels: UNESCO.

King, E.M. and Cordeiro-Guerra, 2005. Education reforms in East Asia: Policy, process and impact. "In east asia decentralizes: Making local government work, 179-208 Washington, DC: World Bank.

Leithwood, K. and T. Menzies, 1998. A review of research concerning the implementation of site-based management. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9(3): 233-285.

Malen, B., R, , T. Ogawa and J. Kranz, 1990. What do we know about site-based management: . London: Falmer Press.

Mosoge, M.J. and d. Van, P. C., 1998. School-based management and school effectiveness: Implications for the new roles of principals and teachers. Koers, 63(1-2): 73-87.

Murphy, J., 1997. Restructuring through school-based management. London: Routledge.

Orodho, J.A., 2009. Elements of education and social science research methods. Maseno: Kanezja Enterprises Publisher.

Patrinos, H. and R. Kagia, 2007. Maximizing the performance of education systems: The case of teacher absenteeism Washington, DC: World Bank.

Purcell, J. and B. Ahlstrand, 1994. Human resource management in the multidivisional company. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Scott, W.V. and D.J. Deirdre, 2009. Research methods for everyday life: Blending qualitative and quantitative approaches, 989 market street, San Francisco: C a 94103, jossey – bass publishers.

Shaeffer, S., 1994. Partnerships and participation in basic education: A series of training modules and case study abstracts for educational planners and mangers. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Southworth, G., 1999. A teacher training agency report into successful heads of small primary schools. University of Reading School of Education.

Uemura, M., 1990. Community participation in education: What do we know? The word bank paper on effective schools and teachers and the knowledge management systems.

Wohlstetter, P. and A. Odden, 1992. Rethinking school-based management policy and research. Educational Administration Quarterly 28(4): 529-549.

World Bank Report, 2007. What do we know about school-based management? Washington, DC: The World Bank.