

# An Evaluation of the Impacts of Decentralized Resources Allocation by the Community on the Performance of Secondary Schools in Gucha District, Kenya.

Dr. Justus Mochama Gori

Department of Education, The Presbyterian University of East Africa, Kenya, P.O Box 387, Kikuyu

\* [mochamagori@yahoo.com](mailto:mochamagori@yahoo.com)

## Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether there exists a relationship between decentralized resources allocation by the community to secondary schools and academic performance in Gucha. Cross-sectional design was used in Gucha where quantitative research strategy was used for the collection of data using questionnaires. The target population comprised of 138 secondary schools. Stratified random sampling strategy was used to select the 3 strata from which 41 schools and 164 teachers were selected as accessible population. A Cronbach's alpha index was used to ascertain reliability and it was found to be .815 for all items. Data collected by questionnaires from 145 teachers were analyzed using Pearson's correlation coefficient with the help of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings of the analysis revealed that there exists a relationship between resources allocated to schools by the community and academic performance of secondary schools in Gucha. From the findings, it was concluded that resource allocation to schools by the community was vital for school performance with implications that there exists inefficiency in decentralized resources allocation to schools. Out of this study, recommendations were made to the Gucha community, the County and National Governments and education stake holders in Kenya.

**Key words:** District Focus for Rural Development, Community, Resources, Cost-sharing, *Harambee*

## Introduction

For the past few years, the demand for participation in government and development activities has increased in Africa and Kenya in particular. Okojie (2009) contends that most governments have decentralized in order to increase the efficiency of public services, for example to allow for greater local participation. Smith (1985) quoted in Gori (2012) on the other hand holds that "one of the most distinctive features of modern state administration is the need for close contact between the individual citizen and officialdom" (p.47). Prior to decentralization policy that was effected under the umbrella of District Focus for Rural Development (DFRD), the government experienced difficulties in funding of schools. To solve these problems, Kariuki (1995) notes that the government quickly adopted DFRD policy that was implemented hand in hand with decentralization of education from 1983. Koech (1999) notes that with decentralization, the government introduced cost-sharing in education and the involvement of communities in the running of secondary schools in the 1980s and the 1990s as a measure to minimize costs. Secondary schools in Kenya and Gucha for that matter became semi-autonomous under decentralization of education.

According to Kibua and Mwabu (2008) and Koech (1999), decentralizing funding of education was part of the government's plan to solve some of the problems linked to school funding. Part of the decentralization policy that was effected in Kenya as a whole and Gucha in particular from 1983 empowered the local communities to fund local schools and above all avail all the materials, land and human resources that are used in

these schools. With the element of devolution, it is evident that the local communities used their devolved resources in their schools. This study is to investigate whether academic performance of secondary schools in Gucha has links to funding by the community under decentralized governance policy.

## Background to Study

Smith (1985) claims that decentralization had its origins in the 1960s. On the other hand, Zajda (2006) on origins of decentralization has shown that "concern with decentralization in its various dimensions, namely the political, economic, and administrative aspects of social policy, can be traced to the 1960s" (p.11). Smith (1985) points out that "decentralization to large urban areas was recommended by the council of Europe in 1966 while neighbourhood councils were proposed by the US Adversary Commission on Intergovernmental relations in 1967" (p.166). However, it was not until the 1980s when decentralization of education, perceived as a new education policy panacea, began to be widely implemented in many parts of the world (Zajda, 2006). In the 1980s and 1990s economic globalization, as a new policy direction of the neo-conservative thought and of new-liberalism reached the status of a new worldwide hegemonic stance and led to the erosion of national welfare state model in favour of neo-liberal model characterized by state withdrawal, privatization, and localization (Zajda, 2006).

Bonnal (2006) argues that economists justify the origin of educational decentralization on the grounds of efficiency in the location of schools within the state. The rationale is that decisions about public expenditure that are taken by a level of government closer, and more responsive, to a local constituency are more likely to reflect the demand for local services than similar decisions taken by the central government. However, it is noted that although demand for democracy and participation in Africa is coming from within, much of the work of democratization and political decentralization has been done by external forces. In this regard, Gershberg and Winkler (2003), Clemons (2007) and Geo-Jaja (2006) have pointed out that World Bank (WB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF) in the mid-1980s with the emphasis on political restructuring of the economy led to most African countries to decentralize their governments.

Ndegwa (2002) has given two major factors responsible for political decentralization in Africa: "One consists of SAPs that sought to reform the public sector starting in the 1980s while the other is the on-going transition towards more democratic and competitive politics that started in the 1990s" (p.1). Political decentralization has strong links to empowerment of communities and/or counties as far as revenue collection and its utilization is concerned. Political decentralization movement in Kenya has strong links to educational decentralization and its aspect of funding. In the 1980s, Bray (1996), found out that because the mode of funding (*harambee*), most secondary schools in Kenya under decentralization were referred to as *harambee* schools. Bray (1996), Bogonko (1992), Koech (1999) and Kariuki (1995) on the *harambee* mode of funding of projects in Kenya note that *harambee* contributions are made to all levels of education from kindergartens to tertiary institutions.

Gucha is one of the regions in Kenya with the highest number of secondary schools that were erected, funded and resourced by the community through the spirit of *harambee*. Prior to 1983 which is believed to be the genesis of decentralization in Kenya under DFRD strategy, Gucha district had only four secondary schools out of the current 138 that were funded by the government. This left Gucha community to stand out as the major contributor to education in terms of resource allocation, a phenomenon that has had a legacy to date. By 1990, three quarters of all secondary schools in Kenya were

community funded (Bray, 1996). Bush (2000) notes that one key ingredient of decentralization is the allocation of resources with the argument that "resource allocation has become more important in many countries as educational organizations have been accorded more autonomy" (p.99). In Gucha, the allocation of resources to schools from the community is erratic and lacks uniformity among schools (Gori, 2012).

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether allocation of resources, involvement and frequency at which resources are availed by the community has any impacts to academic performance of secondary schools in Gucha.

### **Research Hypotheses**

The following speculations were used in this study.

1. There is no relationship between the amount of the allocation of resources availed by the community and performance of secondary schools in Gucha district.
2. There is no relationship between involvement of the community in funding and academic performance of secondary schools in Gucha district.
3. There is no relationship between frequency at which resources for use are availed by different localities within Gucha and academic performance of secondary schools.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC) on the number of students joining public universities under government sponsorship at undergraduate level for the past twelve years indicate that secondary schools in Gucha have not been performing well. Eshiwani (1993) and Kariuki (1995) have argued that since decentralization with its element of devolution took root, more educational problems emerged including that of academic performance and mismanagement of secondary schools.

School output in Gucha in terms of students joining public universities under government sponsorship policy based on merit has been very low. Table 5 shows that in 2000 the district had one A and 8 A- while only 175 out of 5, 279 had an average of B grade and above that were required to gain entry to the then five public universities under government sponsorship. This was only 3.3% of the total candidates who sat for the examination. The

majority of the students scored between grades C and E with a total of 4,235 representing 80.2% of all the 5,279 candidates. In 2004, the district did not produce an A but had 23 A- and in total, only 84 students who scored between A and B+ qualified for university entry under government sponsorship that year. This was 1.3% of the total population of the candidates from Gucha that year. The percentage of university entrants remained low between 2000 and 2011 with 2007 having had the highest number at 193 or 2.5% of the total candidates that year (see Table 1). The district did not produce more than three As in a single year between 2004 and 2011.

The Kenya Education Directory (2006 and 2008) indicate that schools from this district rank lowly when external examination results are released at the beginning of every year. They further show that between 2000 and 2010, it was in 2001, 2004 and 2010 when only one school made it in the top 100 best schools in Kenya in order of merit in the KCSE results. In 2011 and 2012 the district did not have a slot in the top 100 best schools in Kenya (KNEC, 2012).

### Significance of the study

This study will benefit the government (Ministry of Education), parents, community members, members of parliament and county representatives and the entire stakeholders in education from Gucha and Kenya as a whole. To the parents, this study will inform them the state of affairs as far as secondary schools' performance is concerned. It will reveal to the parents the importance of decentralized resource allocation to schools in relation to school performance. For the community members, the study will be used as an informer on what is happening in the schools and what they need to do as resource allocators if they are to improve the performance of their schools. To the national government, the study will reveal what the schools are lacking in terms of resources and how this affects school performance. To the local members of parliament and county representatives who happen to have influence on schools' management, it will help them to look for better methods of getting resources to their schools for better performance.

Table 1  
 KCSE Gucha District Grade Summary Analysis for the Years 2000 and 2004 – 2011.

Year	Entry	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	E	X	Y	Z	W	M.S
2011	1291	1	7	19	33	50	85	119	156	208	274	248	36	14	4	3	34	4.10
2010	2356	2	18	46	97	107	255	210	296	341	396	331	55	23	188	0	1	4.02
2009	7056	3	35	127	201	290	446	545	781	1012	1419	1560	350	67	206	9	5	3.95
2008	6313	1	37	111	172	251	357	505	689	910	1285	1526	403	64	33	14	6	3.96
2007	7584	3	57	133	240	377	566	741	925	1112	1451	1528	303	0	12	75	61	4.27
2006	7945	2	34	155	304	477	563	589	813	1098	1267	1068	93	0	136	0	0	3.48
2005	8786	1	51	158	297	387	590	833	1169	1372	1778	1778	284	99	112	16	0	4.32
2004	6339	0	23	61	128	229	291	463	660	880	1233	1250	381	0	350	0	0	3.83
2000	5279	1	8	56	110	210	321	352	778	981	1261	816	47	87	251	0	0	4.11

Note. Adapted from the DEO Gucha. [Key: x=Absent, y=Cheating, z=Fail, w=Withdrawal]

### Literature Review

The Oxford Dictionary of English (1998) defines resources as the supply of money, materials, staff and other assets that can be drawn on by a person or organization in order to function efficiently. Bush (2000) notes that one key ingredient of decentralization is the allocation of resources with the argument that "resource allocation has become more important in many countries as educational organizations have been accorded more autonomy" (p.99). In England, this trend is represented by Local Management of Schools (LMS). Everard, Morris and Wilson (2004) and Preedy, Glatter and Levacic (1997) have identified three major groups of resources which are used in schools. These are: Human resources; material and financial. There is a distinction between financial and real resources. Anderson, Briggs and Burton (2001) note that "financial resources refer to the money available to purchase real resources. The latter are those human and material resources that are required to deliver educational services. Human resources include teachers, support staff and, perhaps, unpaid volunteers. Material resources include buildings equipment, furniture, books and teaching materials" (p.23). Managers need to understand management resource cycle: - Obtaining resources- Allocating resources - Using resources- Evaluating resources, if utilization of the same in schools has to be done properly for the benefit of schools.

Anderson et al. (2001) further note that a combination of human and material resources lead to meeting educational outcomes through the provision of educational activities. Allocating and managing resources is an

important phenomenon that has direct links to school performance. Levacic (2000) and Ross and Levacic (1999) in linking resources to

learning outcomes have indicated that one of the major functions of resource management is to attract resources to the organization. Levacic (2000) has argued that “there is a strong link between utilization of available resources and performance of schools. On the link between resources utilization and outcomes, Levacic (1997) asserts

that: “If giving educational organizations greater choice in how they allocate and use resources is to result in improvements in teaching and learning then logically there must be a link with the resulting educational outputs and outcomes for students” (p.128).

According to Bray (1996), “the extent to which community financing is tolerated or encouraged partly depends on the strength of the state and on official perceptions of its role” (p.14). Bray has further noted that community financing is most dramatic where demand for schooling is strong but government inputs are inadequate particularly in parts of Africa e.g. Chad, Togo and Uganda. Community involvement in educational decentralization has several benefits to the education system. Bullock and Thomas (1997), Lauglo and McLean (1985), Zajda (2006 and Bjork (2006) have indicated that in the decentralization of education, communities play an important role in terms of management and funding of schools. Mc Ginn and Welsh (1999) on the importance of communities in educational decentralization have highlighted that:

In practice, all reforms proceed with some caution, gradually extending authority to communities as they acquire and demonstrate capacity to govern...Participation by community members ranges along a scale from involvement in decisions for which professionals have limited special knowledge, to activities that are the core of the professionals’ expertise (pp.34-35).

McGinn and Welsh have further noted that to the communities, there is transfer of authority to make budgets, which is linked with decisions about the number and kind of personnel to hire, and then authority for hiring and firing and above all have helped in increasing the overall amount of money spent on education. (Winkler 1991) quoted in Zajda (2006) on the role of communities in education reveals that “various models of decentralization in education focused on decentralization of power and knowledge, political/administrative decentralization, and the transfer of “decision making process” concerning the distribution of finances and resources to local bodies” (p.11). From the above literature it can be inferred that community involvement in education during decentralization era had and has a conduce to reducing the burden of the central government in terms of management, funding and availing of resources that are used in education among others. However, the question is how do communities meet these important obligations and how efficient are they in doing that? There are different methods that are used in injecting community funds and involvement in education.

Bray (1996) has given methods of funding by communities from five African countries (Uganda, Togo, Chad, Malawi, Kenya and Botswana), while Pellin (2007) has given Cambodia as one country where the communities play a vital role in the funding of clustered schools. Bray has noted that when education collapsed in Uganda in the 1970s and remained deficient during the 1980s and 1990s, the gap was bridged by parents and broader communities. In Togo, communities and parents contributed one to two thirds of the resources needed to operate schools. In Chad, Bray notes that communities employed about 40% of primary school teachers and made contributions in building schools and infrastructure. A more notable and spectacular example of community involvement in education is Kenya, where the strategy of self-help movement locally known as “*harambee*” has a long history. The word “*harambee*” means let us all pull together. Most secondary schools under decentralization were referred to as *harambee* secondary schools because of their mode of origin and funding. Bray (1996) on the *harambee* mode of funding of schools in Kenya notes that:

*Harambee* activities finance a wide range of projects, including roads, wells, cattle dips, and medical dispensaries. Their role in education however, far outweighs that

in any other single sector...Harambee contributions are made to all levels of education, from kindergartens to tertiary institutions. In addition to cash donations, contributions are made of labour, materials and land. Harambee has become part of the fabric of Kenyan society, and is a major force in development (p.4).

Quoting Ruda (1993, p.45), Bray (1996) found out that among the Batswana, some individuals and households contribute cattle, but others contribute money according to minimum and maximum rates determined at village *kgotla* meetings. In Cambodia, Pellin (2007) has indicated that under cluster schools, “communities were successfully involved as a source of local contributions (cash,

labour, material) for the construction and maintenance of school buildings” (p.182). However, community participation under clusters has not achieved the expected results. Other methods of funding include donations and fund raisings organized by PTA for example in Cameroon and Kenya, racially- based groups and community levies for example in Singapore, religious run schools (SDA, Catholics, Hindu and Muslim), cash-crop co-operatives run schools

for example in Tanzania while in Asia, the community employs teachers teaching in public secondary schools in China with a proportion of about ten percent. Bray further notes that in 1991, 18% of secondary schools in Nepal were operated by communities with little or no support from the government.

Others include Indonesia and Papua Guinea where communities are involved in financing education. Community funding in education comes in different methods and as noted by Bray, sometimes it is difficult to quantify the contributions made by the community as in the case for Malawi where the parents and community contribute immensely to public sector schools. Bray (1996) concludes that though quantification of the communities’ contribution towards education funding is sometimes difficult, their overall effect in education is immense. For example, Bray (1996) notes that in Kenya three quarters of all secondary schools by 1990 were community funded.

### **Methodology**

Gucha district has a population of 138 secondary schools that formed the target population for this study. In this study, Cross-sectional research design and quantitative research strategy were used in Gucha. Stratified random sampling was used to select both schools and teachers as accessible population. Stratified random sampling was used to divide the population of the study into three strata according to the three parliamentary constituencies that form Gucha district (Bomachoge, Bobasi and South Mugirango). Out of the 138 schools in the three strata, the researcher used the general minimum sample size criterion (30%) to select 41 schools as the accessible population. To select the sample schools from each stratum, the researcher identified the number of schools in each as 50 (Bomachoge), 47 (Bobasi) and 41 (South Mugirango) out of which simple random sampling was used to select the accessible schools at the rate of 30%. The accessible schools for each stratum at the rate of 30% were selected thus 15 schools (30% of 41) for Bomachoge, 14 schools (30% of 41) for Bobasi and 12 schools (30% of 41) for South Mugirango.

The selected 41 schools had a total of 545 teachers. Using the 30% criterion (30% of 545 teachers), 164 teachers were selected to form the accessible population for this study. To select teachers for each school out of the 164, the researcher divided 164 by 41 schools and this translated to 4 teachers each from the 41 sampled schools across the 3 strata. To arrive at the 4 teachers who were given questionnaires at each of the 41 schools, the researcher selected them using simple random sampling out of the total number of teachers in that school. This was done by using ID numbers given to the teachers in the main school time table in that particular school and randomly selecting the 4 who were

issued with questionnaires. This means that from Bomachoge stratum, 60 teachers (15 sample schools x 4) were selected; from Bobasi, 56 teachers (14 sample schools x 4) were selected; and for South Mugirango, 48 teachers (12 sample schools x 4) were selected and given questionnaires.

Questionnaires were administered to 164 teachers to react to items which were measuring various variables involved in the main theme of the relationship between availing of resources by the community and performance of secondary schools in Gucha district. However, filled questionnaires were collected after one week from 145 teachers. The data collected were scored, coded and analysis done using Pearson’s correlation analysis with the help of SPSS software. Study variables, means, standard deviations, *df* and *r* critical that were used in the analysis for the production of results are shown in Table 2. The hypotheses were tested at an alpha level of .05, while *r* value and *r* critical of .166 were used to determine relationships between variables.

### **Instrumentation and Reliability**

The researcher designed and developed questionnaire items for use in this research. The questionnaire items were derived from the research hypotheses and they were geared towards establishing relationships for the same research hypotheses. Different questionnaire items were dedicated to the three different aspects that were tested. As Gall, Gall and Borg (2003), Gay, Mill and Airasian (2006) and Bryman (2004) note, it was necessary to test the reliability of questionnaire items that were used. This was estimated using Chronbach’s alpha and found to be .815.

Table 2

*Study Variables' Means and Standard Deviations*

Variable	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
Frequency at which resources for use are availed by different localities.	1.55	.38
Involvement of community in funding.	1.73	.37
Amount of allocation of resources.	1.67	.39
Academic performance of secondary schools.	1.63	.33

$p < .05$ ,  $df = 143$ , critical  $r = .166$

**Data Analysis and Research Findings**

The first hypothesis which stated that “There is no relationship between the amount of the allocation of resources availed by the community and performance of secondary schools in Gucha district” was tested using a Pearson product-moment correlation analysis to determine the relationship between the amount of the allocation of resources availed by the community (M=1.67, SD= .39) and performance of secondary schools in Gucha district (M=1.63, SD= .33) as indicated in Table 2. With 143 degrees of freedom ( $df$ ), the critical  $r = .166$  at an alpha level of 0.05. The analysis produced an  $r$  of .887 which was greater than .166 (see Table 3). The results displayed in Table 3 indicates that there is a positive correlation between the amount of the allocation of resources availed by the community and performance of secondary schools in Gucha. The two variables were strongly correlated ( $r(143) = .887$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

The second hypothesis which stated that “There is no relationship between involvement of the community in funding and academic performance of secondary schools in Gucha district” was also tested using Pearson’s correlation coefficient by comparing the means of the items that collected information on the involvement of the community in funding (M=1.73, SD=.37) and academic performance of secondary schools in Gucha district (M=1.63, SD=.33). With 143 degrees of freedom ( $df$ ), the critical  $r = .166$  at an alpha level of 0.05. The analysis produced an  $r$  of .406 which was greater than .166 (see Table 4). The results displayed in Table 4 indicates that there is a positive correlation between the amount of the allocation of resources availed by the community and performance of secondary schools in Gucha. The two variables were moderately correlated ( $r(143) = .406$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

Table 3

*Pearson’s Correlation Analysis of the Amount of Allocation of Resources Availed by the Community and Academic Performance of Secondary Schools.*

Variable		Amount of allocation of resources availed by the	Academic performance of secondary schools community
Amount of allocation of resources availed by the community	Pearson correlation	1	.887*
	Sig. (2- tailed)		.000
	n	145	145
Academic performance of secondary schools	Pearson correlation	.887*	1
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.000	
	n	145	145

$p < .05$  (2-tailed);  $df = 143$ ; critical  $r = .166$

Table 4

*Pearson's Correlation Analysis Between the Involvement of the Community in Funding and Academic Performance of Secondary Schools.*

Variable		Involvement of community in funding	Academic performance of secondary schools
Involvement of community in funding	Pearson correlation	1	.406*
	Sig. (2- tailed)		.000
	n	145	145
Academic performance of secondary schools	Pearson correlation	.406*	1
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.000	
	n	145	145

$p < .05$  (2-tailed);  $df = 143$ ; critical  $r = .166$

Table 5

*Pearson's Correlation Analysis Between the Frequency at which Resources for use are Availed by Different Localities within Gucha and Academic Performance of Secondary Schools.*

Variable		Frequency at which resources for use are availed by different localities	Academic performance of secondary schools
Frequency at which resources for use are availed by different localities	Pearson correlation	1	.485*
	Sig. (2- tailed)		.000
	n	145	145
Academic performance of secondary schools	Pearson correlation	.485*	1
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.000	
	n	145	145

$p < .05$  (2-tailed);  $df = 143$ ; critical  $r = .166$

The third hypothesis was on whether “there is no relationship between frequency at which resources for use are availed by different localities within Gucha and academic performance of secondary schools”. To realize this, analysis using Pearson’s correlation was done by comparing items’ means that collected information on frequency at which resources for use are availed by different localities within Gucha ( $M=1.55$ ;  $SD=.38$ ) and academic performance of secondary schools ( $M=1.63$ ;  $SD=.33$ ). Results of the analysis gave an  $r$ -value of .485, a  $p$ -value of .000 at a  $df$  of 143 at an alpha level of .05 (see Table 5). A  $df$  of 143 at  $\alpha$  of .05 = .166. This analysis shows that an  $r$ -value of .485 is greater than an  $r$ -critical of .166, a value required for  $\alpha = .05$ . Based on this result of the analysis of hypothesis 3, there is a relationship between frequency at which resources for use are availed by different localities within Gucha and academic performance of secondary schools ( $r(143)=.485, p < .05$ ).

### Discussions

Funding of secondary education in Kenya is done in many forms. Two of these forms are first formula funding and cost sharing that puts the community in the forefront by doing it in form of giving of materials, labour, animals and money among others in the *harambee* system that is difficult to quantify in monetary terms. From the results of the analysis done to test Hypothesis 1 (see Table 3), it was found that there is a significant relationship between the amount of the allocation of resources availed by the community and performance of secondary schools in Gucha. The two variables were found to be strongly correlated. With a Pearson’s correlation value of .887, it means that the relationship was significantly strong. This means that the amount of resources availed have an impact on academic performance of secondary schools in the district. The results of the analysis also indicate that the  $r$ -critical (.166) was less than the observed  $r$  (.887) that was used to determine the rejection or retention of the null hypothesis in this study. This means that the null hypothesis was rejected, thus there is a relationship between the amount of the allocation of resources availed by the community and performance of secondary schools in Gucha.

However, although some available literature indicates that it is management of the availed resources that

determine performance, this study revealed that indeed the amount availed do contribute significantly to performance. It is therefore essential for more resources to be availed regularly for use for better performance. In Gucha this was found to be important, a reason that warrants more from the community. Non availability, availing insufficiently, or erratic availing of resources impacts negatively for secondary schools' performance in Gucha district. How the allocation of the already acquired resources is done in schools is the responsibility of the school managers in Gucha. However, the question is whether there is accuracy in resource allocation with linkages to expected outputs from different departments. The allocation of resources in various departments can affect outcomes and outputs of schools. This means that school budgets and proper planning on how to allocate them is essential in schools for better performance.

Out of the analysis of variables for hypothesis two, this study revealed that the community's involvement in the supply of resources to schools had an impact to secondary schools' academic performance in Gucha. The results of analysis that gave an observed  $r$  of .406 that was compared to  $r$  critical of .166 shows that there exists a moderate relationship between the involvement of the community in funding and academic performance of secondary schools. With this result, it shows that the community's involvement in the supply of resources to secondary schools for use affects the academic performance of schools in Gucha. By involving the community and making

it aware of the importance of involvement, there is a likelihood of members supplying more to schools and this will have some impact on performance. First formula funding by the national government to schools is not sufficient to purchase all the necessary and essential resources for use. There is therefore need for the community's involvement in the supply of resources in Gucha. Hypothesis two was however, limited to testing whether the community's involvement was essential for schools' academic performance and not to what extent the community's involvement affected academic performance.

On whether the frequency at which resources for use are availed by different localities within Gucha affected performance of secondary schools, hypothesis three was used which stated that there is no relationship between frequency at which resources for use are availed by different localities within Gucha and academic performance of secondary schools. The result of the analysis which produced an observed  $r$  of .485 that was compared to an  $r$  critical of .166 indicates that indeed there is a moderate relationship. This therefore shows that the frequency at which the community avails resources for use in Gucha secondary schools has an impact on academic performance. Consistency in funding is essential for better performance. As Levacic (200) indicates, in the developed world first, second and third funding formulae are consistent and this ensures regularity in terms availing and allocation for continued better school performance.

At times when there is no supply of resources, there is likely to be a strain or overuse of the already available resources. Students may also not get access to the meagre resources available and this has negative consequences on schools' academic performance. For example text books for use need to be availed at all times as the student number increase. This is also a case for the availing of teachers who teach various subjects. Less, lack of and/or erratic supply will mean strain on the few teachers available, no teaching or teaching done only when supply is enough. This will adversely affect teaching thus its negative impact on academic performance.

### **Summary and Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to find out whether allocations of resources, involvement and frequency at which resources are availed by the community under decentralized governance have any impacts to academic performance of secondary schools in Gucha district. Analysis of quantitatively collected data from teachers was done using Pearson's correlation coefficient analysis strategy. The analyzed results from data collected by questionnaires revealed that the amount of the allocation of resources availed by the community; involvement of the community in funding and frequency at which resources for use are availed by different localities within Gucha had a relationship with academic performance of secondary schools though with varying degrees. All these positive relationships that were revealed through the analysis of data corresponded to the way secondary schools performed in Gucha district. The findings of this study are significant in that the community as a resource of availing resources to schools was found to be influential to school performance and this had implications on academic performance of secondary schools in the district.

### **Recommendations and Further Research**

As it is documented, communities are not only financiers of education but also suppliers of human resources

used in secondary schools, a phenomenon that puts communities a head as far as education and schools' performance is concerned. In view of this, the following are recommended that can help in filling the gaps that this study did not address.

- First, it is recommended that research should be done to establish to what extent the community needs to be involved and what effects it will have on the performance of secondary schools.
- Secondly, there should be an introduction of compulsory educational county tax. For example in England (Reading Borough Council (2004)), the Borough Council taxes people, property and services within the council and gives 43% of the collected tax to finance education. The Kisii County Government should do the same so as to avoid disparities and erratic funding among schools that put some of them at jeopardy in terms of learning resources.
- Thirdly, there should be constituted regular community educational meetings. County Government officials in collaboration with the National Ministry of Education should have purposeful regular educational meetings with the community so as to educate community members on educational matters in relation to allocation of resources to secondary schools. Stress by such community seminars should be meant to address the creation and development of human capital that is crucial in such schools as a resource for better performance.

## References

- Anderson, L, Briggs, A., & Burton, N. (2001). *Managing finance, resources and stakeholders in education*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Bogonko, S.N. (1992). *Reflection on education in East Africa*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Bonnal, J. (2006, August 24). *Strengthening the competences: Experiences gained by the FAO*. Paper presented at the 2006 at the 25th International course on vocational training and education in agriculture at FAO, Rome. Retrieved from: [www.ciea.ch/](http://www.ciea.ch/)
- Bray, M. (1996). *Decentralization of education: Community financing*. Washington D.C: WB.
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Social research methods*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bullock, A., & Thomas, T. (1997). *Schools at the centre? A study of decentralization*. London: Routledge.
- Bush, T. (2000). Management styles: Impacts on finance and resources. In M. Coleman & L. Anderson (Eds.). *Managing finance, resources and stakeholders in education* (pp.99-116) London: Paul Chapman.
- Clemons, A. (2007). Decentralization in Senegal-ambiguous agenda for community education. In H. Daun (Ed.). *School decentralization in the context of globalizing governance: International comparison of grassroots response* (pp.115-131).Dordrecht: Springer.
- Eshiwani, S.G. (1993). *Education in Kenya since independence*. Nairobi: East African Education Publishers.
- Everard, K.B., Morris, G., & Wilson, I. (2004). *Effective school management*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Gall, D.M., Gall, P.J., & Borg, W.R. (2003). *Educational research*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: Competences for analysis and applications*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Geo-Jaja, M. (2006). Decentralization and privatization of education in Africa: Which one for Nigeria? In J. Zajda (Ed.). *Decentralization and privatization of education* (pp. 57-73). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Gori, J. M. (2012) *Decentralized educational management: Its implications on academic performance of secondary schools in Gucha district, Kenya*. (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Botswana, Gaborone, Botswana.
- Kariuki, M. (1995). Kenya. In T. Nivil. *International encyclopedia of national systems of educational Systems of education* (p.501). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kibua, T.N & Mwabu, G. (2008) (Eds.). *Decentralization and devolution in Kenya*. Nairobi: Nairobi University Press.
- Koech, D.K. (1999). *Totally integrated education and training, a commission of enquiry into the education system in Kenya*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Levacic, R. (1997). Managing resources in educational institutions: An open systems approach. In M. Preedy, R. Glatter & R. Levacic (Eds.). *Educational management, strategy, quality and resources* (127-136). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Levacic, R. (2000). Linking resources to learning outcomes. In M. Coleman & L. Anderson (Eds.). *Managing finance and resources in education* (pp. 3-23). London: Paul Chapman.
- McGinn, N., & Welsh, T. (1999). *Decentralization of education: why, when, what and how?* Paris: UNESCO.
- Mclean, M. & Lauglo, J. (1985). Introduction: Rationales for decentralization and perspective from organization

- theory. In M. Maclean & J. Langlo (Eds.). *The control of Education: international perspectives on the centralization–decentralization debate* (p.1). London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Ndegwa, S.N. (2002, November 20). *Decentralization in Africa: A stocktaking survey Africa region*. Paper presented at the 2002 World Bank symposium on decentralization in Africa. New York. Retrieved from [www.istr.org/conferences/barcelona](http://www.istr.org/conferences/barcelona)
- KNEC (2012). *KCSE 2011 top 100 secondary schools nationally*. Nairobi: KNEC.
- Okojie, C. (2009). *Decentralization and public service delivery in Nigeria*. Washington DC: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI).
- Pearsall, J. (Ed.) (1998). *The new oxford dictionary of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pellin, A. (2007). Decentralization and community participation: School clusters in Cambodia. In H. Daun (Ed.), *School decentralization in the context of globalization governance International comparison of grassroots responses* (pp.175-194). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Reading Borough Council (2004). *Live Reading*. Reading: Reading Borough Council.
- Smith, B.C. (1985). *Decentralization: The territorial dimension of the state*. London: George Allen & Anwin.
- Zajda, J. (2006) (Ed.). *Decentralization and privatization in education. The role of the state*. Dordrecht: Springer.