European Journal of Business and Management
ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online)
Vol.8, No.32, 2016

Influence of School Administration's Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures on Utilization of Education Subsidy in Public Secondary Schools Kisumu County Kenya

Dr. Raphael Nyonje
Project Planning and Management of the University of Nairobi Kenya

Moses Aol Jabuya
School of Project Planning and Management of the University of Nairobi Kenya

Abstract
Overtime since its inception disparities in effective utilization of education subsidy in public secondary schools in Kenya have been noted. Researcher and educationists attribute this to non application of monitoring and evaluation procedures in schools and final shortage of its provisions for quality education in Kenya in the 21st century. In countries where education subsidy had been introduced, complains of its ineffectiveness is overwhelming and suggestions is that only monitoring and evaluation procedures in institutions can save the situation. The introduction of quality assurance and standards department in the ministry of education science and technology was seen as a way out in solving such problems but not much has been achieved. School administration through staff meeting, supervision and general assembly meetings has helped to monitor and evaluate effective utilization of education subsidy but 100% target is yet be attained. Based on the above the purpose of the study was help in establishing the extent to which school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures influences the effective utilization of education subsidy in public secondary school Kisumu County, Kenya y. The study was guided by one study objective and one hypothesis that was to establish the extent to which school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures influences effective utilization of education subsidy and the hypothesis that there was no significant relationship between school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures and effective utilization of education subsidy. Descriptive survey and correlation study designs were used. Target population was 347 comprising of principals, teachers and students presidents. Data collection instruments was questionnaires and key informant guide. Data analysis was both qualitative and quantitative. Study findings were that school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures had strong positive correlation with effective utilization of education subsidy as" r" value was r=.541, p =.000 (P< 0.05), it contributed 29.3% of the variance in effective utilization of education subsidy. The conclusion was that there was a positive relationship between the two variables. The study recommends further research on other stake holders such as Parents' and Board of Management monitoring and evaluation procedures and their influence on effective utilization of education subsidy in public secondary schools in Kisumu and other Counties.
Keywords: Monitoring and Evaluation, School Administration, Education Subsidy

1.0 Introduction

This paper discusses school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures and how it influences effective utilization of education subsidy in public secondary school in Kisumu County, Kenya, it gives statement of the problem, purpose, Purpose of the study, objectives and hypothesis of the study, literature reviewed supporting the study, research design and paradigm of the study and finally a detailed discussion of study findings, conclusions and recommendations

1.1 Background of the Study

Over the years, Kenya is striving to grow from an economy comprising of high illiteracy level, low access to educational facilities, high level inequality in education, equity issues in education, low per capita income, high poverty level, poor infrastructural facilities, high population growth rate and unemployment among others (World Bank, 2008). Kenya like other nations in the World has never enjoyed the fruits of a well growing literacy level that can enrich its process of economic recovery from colonial era and disadvantages of technological advancement it has faced for good time span. The problems that result from the above mentioned economic issues are interrelated and have backward and forward linkages thus sustainability of child education for many families have been and have continued to be a night mare in Kenya. The cost of education has been on the upward trend leading to high dropout rates, inequality, and gender issues in education (MOE, 2008). Prompted by such problems in the economy, the government of Kenya under the Coalition government in 2008 introduced Free Secondary School Education Subsidy whose aim was to reduce the cost of education and to improve accessibility to instructional facilities and equity in education sector. The policy has been that every

child in public Secondary school receives Kshs 12,725 from the government (MOE, 2014).

At the time of inception, free secondary education subsidy has had its short falls as inadequacy and ineffectiveness in utilization has been noted against the background of government monitoring and evaluation procedures by quality assurance and standards department within the ministry of education science and technology and school administration on the other hand. Such checks have not given the required fruits to the public domain as complaints still exists of inadequacy of instructional facilities as well as access to secondary schools. The prevailing situation is therefore revealing that there are more issues influencing utilization of education subsidy than was thought of at its inception. The study therefore sought to understand the influence of students' monitoring and evaluation procedures on effective utilization of education subsidy.

The cost of education has become a nightmare to many families as the world's economic depression is felt in every country leading to the support of education by various governments. This has assisted various economies to change their growth pattern as a result of manpower from education sector. Even though these have taken place, not every country have benefited from this government support due to other competing variables that also influence economic growth. However, studies reveals that effective utilization of education subsidy in public secondary schools today is a function of monitoring and evaluation procedures used by stakeholders at school level one of which is school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures which is done to follow up whether education subsidy have been effectively utilized in acquiring instructional facilities as was the intention (Cloete, 2009). However, Gogo (2002) study in Kisumu district on utilization of education subsidy confirmed that where availability of such facilities like electricity, water and conservancy; tuition materials; repairs, maintenance and improvement; personal emoluments; co curriculum activities funding; administration costs; local transport and travel and medical funding are inadequate it shows that education subsidy has not been utilized effectively in such public secondary schools to achieve 100% adequacy target.

Mackay (2009) noted that even though schools have acquired facilities using education subsidy as provided by governments, their adequacy and accessibility has not reached 100% target that was the national goal confirming that their supply in schools is a function of other variables such as use of monitoring and evaluation results; principal's knowledge and skills in monitoring and evaluation procedures, his general attributes that is age and style of leadership; institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation procedures in the school (Osuga & Mutavisa, 2010). Study by Jotia *et al.* (2011) in South Asia and Sub-Sahara Africa on the relationship between participatory monitoring and evaluation procedures and utilization of government funding to schools noted that there is a significant positive relationship between monitoring and evaluation procedures and effective utilization of education subsidy in public secondary schools. UNECSO (2005) noted that one of strategies used by schools administration in monitoring and evaluation is students' parades; students' council meeting and students' representation at Board of Management meetings the result of which according to empirical literature reviewed has been positive in influencing effective utilization of education subsidy.

.

1.2 Historical Analysis of Education Subsidy in the World

Historically free secondary education subsidy started in the 20th century in United States and Soviet Union through models established for creation of massive education systems that emphasized open students' access to educational programs in schools (World Bank, 2005). In a number of countries, it was in form of government grants; construction of classrooms; provision of textbooks; provision of food, laboratory chemicals, computers; fee payment; employment of teachers; bursaries and increase of household's income to help in improving access to instructional facilities in secondary schools (Teddlie & Tashakori, 2011). After 1945 it began to spread from Northern Europe to Southern Europe (UNESCO, 2010). Later, free secondary education developed rapidly in Eastern Europe and to other parts of the world such as Africa with the main aim of enhancing students' access to instructional facilities (Lewin, 2009).

To date, Free Secondary Education Subsidy (FSES) is in a number of countries in the world for instance in Britain (1944); Canada (1930s); Germany (1919); France (1933); New Zealand (1936); Austria (1962); Belgium (1959); Malawi (1994); Uganda (1997); Cameroon (1999); Lesotho (2000); Tanzania (2001); Zambia (2002); Kenya (2008); Cambodia (2001); Sweden; Denmark; Netherlands; Mexico; and Spain only but to mention a few. Its development in Kenya dates back to various commissions whose recommendations led to establishment of free education subsidy to improve accessibility and completion rate in secondary schools in Kenya. According to a Presidential Working Paper on Education and Manpower Training for the Next Decade and beyond (Republic of Kenya, 1988) noted that school learning resources should be planned for properly and utilized in an effective manner to bring about efficient provision of quality and relevant education to the Kenyan people. That was the essence of supplying instructional facilities to schools through free secondary education subsidy. Given the world picture on how various countries have utilized education subsidy, it is clear that to some extent improvement have been realized through use of monitoring and evaluation procedures only that the gaps still exist between where we are and where we ought to have been. The Table 1.1 below explains this.

Table.1.1. Changes in effective utilization of education subsidy over time

S/No.	Country	Before M&EP %	After M&EP %	Deviation	Gap
1	Asia	32%	52%	20%	48%
2	Europe	35%	65%	30%	35%
3	France	28%	67%	39%	33%
4	Ireland	28%	67%	39%	33%
5	Japan	28%	67%	39%	33%
6	Spain	28%	67%	39%	33%
7	USA	42%	77%	35%	23%

Source**:** World Bank Survey (2005)

In Kenya, the overall education policy goal is to achieve Education for All (EFA) by 2015. This vision is guided by the understanding that quality education and training contribute significantly to economic growth and the expansion of employment opportunities (MOE, 2008). The vision is in tandem with the Government's plan as articulated in the Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS) paper. The Government of Kenya has demonstrated its commitment to the development of education and training through sustained allocation of resources to the sector (Republic of Kenya, 2005). However, despite the substantial financing of education and notable achievements attained, the sector still faces major challenges that prevent students from accessing facilities for quality education (MOE, 2008). Ayoo (2009) study in Kisumu County noted that even though monitoring and evaluation procedures are in place, shortages of what ought to have been there is in schools acquired using education subsidy is a worrying trend.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Kenya started free secondary education subsidy in public secondary schools in 2008 (MOE, 2008). The subsidy was aimed at improving supply of teaching-learning facilities among other funding so that students can get quality education (Republic of Kenya, 2005). Ayoo (2009); Achoka (2005); Chabari (2010); Asayo (2011); Lewin and Litle (2011) studies found that the perceived benefits of education subsidy have failed to bridge the gap prior to its inception in terms of facilities' supply to schools against the background of monitoring and evaluation procedures by stakeholders in schools. Literature reviewed from different countries in the world, reveal that to some extent it has improved provision of teaching -learning facilities in public secondary schools. However, the 100% target mark in facilities provision as was the intention has not been attained and gaps still exists in public secondary schools due to inadequacy of instructional facilities that existed prior to its inception (Ayoo, 2009) and that introduction of education subsidy compared to already existing situation of low instructional facilities have worsened as enrolment has continued to grow in secondary schools demanding more instructional facilities. As Gogo (2002); Asayo, (2009) and Chabari, (2010) posits supply of adequate, accessible and standardized instructional facilities has remained limited against budgeted requirements in schools as 100% target has not been achieved in almost all school The above issues have raised concerns in schools in Kisumu County especially why parents have continued to buy text books, exercise books, and other additional support school to budget requirements (MOE, 2009).

Schools are registering declining standards of education due to poor instructional facilities in schools against the background of education subsidy to every public secondary school and monitoring and evaluation by Quality Assurance and standards department and other stakeholders acting as watchdog, adequacy is far from reaching 100% targeted goal by the government even though monitoring and evaluation procedures are adopted by stakeholders in every public secondary school in Kenya (Ananga, 2011). It is against this background that the study sought to know the influence of school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures on effective utilization of education subsidy in Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu County, Kenya.

1.4 Study Objective, Research Question and Hypothesis

The study was guided by the following study objective, study question and study hypothesis**.** The study objective was to establish how school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures influences effective utilization of education subsidy in public secondary schools in Kisumu County, Kenya. The research question was to what extent does school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures influences effective utilization of education subsidy in public secondary schools in Kisumu County, Kenya while hypothesis of the study was that "there is a significant relationship between school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures and effective utilization of education subsidy in public secondary schools in Kisumu County, Kenya".

1.5 Literature Review

For purposes of sufficiently and effectively linking and putting facts together to answer research objective, literature was reviewed in accordance to major variables of the study that is influence of school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures on effective utilization of education subsidy in relation to public

secondary schools, effective utilization of education subsidy, theoretical framework on which the study was anchored and knowledge gap.

1.5.1 Influence of School administration's Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures on Effective Utilization of Education Subsidy (EUES)

In the present world today secondary schools are managed by school administrators being principals, deputy principals and senior teachers alike. They control school operations and follow every activity in schools starting from general operations to execution of financial expenditures. More importantly as administrators they monitor and evaluate use of government funds given to their public secondary schools (MOeST, 2008).

Literature reviewed noted that the use of monitoring and evaluation procedures in China by the government in education institutions through School administration monitoring and evaluation procedures such as supervising utilization of education subsidy; the use of staff meetings; assemblies and seminars to make a follow up of whether there is effective utilization of education subsidy for provision of electricity, water and conservancy; funding administration costs and general improvement of teaching-learning facilities in schools noted improvement in utilization of education subsidy as more schools acquired more facilities than before (Khan & Hussein, 2004). However, it was noted that the level of school population determined the level of funding and therefore caused limited acquisition of tuition facilities in schools that had few students leading to inadequacies in such schools. It was also noted that in most rural schools, monitoring and evaluation results showed that there was virtually non-existent of such provisions in some schools against the background of education subsidy to all public secondary schools in the Republic of Kenya (Boon & Gopinathan, 2008).

Miguel *et al.* (2010) noted that when all provisions of education subsidy is done by school administration as required in schools and right decision making is reached by stakeholders, the sustainability of education subsidy would be possible. None the less, Bullock (2007) and Buckland (2011) noted that monitoring and evaluation procedures' results in Virginia by school administration indicates that it is not effective utilization of government education subsidy that matters per se, but quality of instructional facilities acquired and frequency of access to them is what matters in its effective utilization in schools. This was confirming the study carried out in Kenya by Ayoo (2009) on the level of education subsidy provisions in public secondary schools that found that quality and frequent of access to such facilities is a concern to stakeholders

The success of any project in a school depends on the ability of those with management responsibilities to make informed decisions and take action (Ricks, 2006). It is the work of management to plan properly; monitor and evaluate the process of implementation, analyze information from monitoring and evaluation procedures, draw up a list of options for action to sort out consequences, get consensus from other stakeholders on what should be done and mandate to take action, share adjustments and plans with the rest of stakeholders, implement actions to correct the situation, monitor and evaluate the process of implementation for meaningful change (Merrified *et al.,* 2012). The above processes lead to effectiveness in the utilization of education subsidy in schools. However, studies by World Bank (2008) in Sub-Saharan Countries on the role of administrators in schools, noted that the core role is provision of a learning environment conducive for learning that details all provisions relating to teaching- learning process.

An examination by UNICEF (2008) on the role of teachers in implementation of monitoring and evaluation procedures, found that teachers operate as a reflective practitioners. They take stock regularly and routinely of the classroom process and its outcomes that includes what went right? What went wrong? Why some of the learners are still not grasping the lesson, why students are so disinterested in what is going on? And how can they make things better?" Teachers who are reflective practitioners understand that their role is not to act as a founders of knowledge, dispensing information and skills that students simply have to absorb successfully, but to find out input into the teaching-learning process such as tuition facilities so that teaching-learning process is aided, to find out why morale of student are low during the teaching-learning process, what causes such and better solutions that can be offered. Such actions display the monitoring and evaluation procedures leading to effectiveness in utilization of education subsidy given by government to schools.

Revelations by Collaborative Action Research in Education (CARE) in Asia and Africa that successfully engaged school administrators as genuine partners in monitoring and evaluation activities in schools aimed at influencing utilization of resources in schools especially financial resources to acquire teaching-learning materials (Riddel, 2009) was an important fact in the history of monitoring and evaluation in schools. School administrators monitor how departmental heads utilize resources acquired through subsidy, they check whether the input into school budgets really come from departments. They also check students' departmental needs for action (Likolo *et al.,* 2013). However, Baird *et al.* (2010) study on principal's role in implementing monitoring and evaluation procedures' results noted that their attitude towards availing instructional facilities depends on their experience, age and status of school even if subsidy is provided 100%. The study emphasizes that whenever they are negative about provision of facilities even with 100% provision of subsidy not much will be achieved with monitoring and evaluation procedures. The revelation was that principals who are about to retire care less about the welfare of students' proper learning but will always set priorities wrong based on their

selfish-interest.

Through use of staff meetings, monitoring and evaluation procedures on government education subsidy has improved service delivery to students in schools (Stephen, 2007). In Central and East Asia, more than ten school administrators are now using computerized Microsoft excel systems as monitoring and evaluation procedures to implement effective utilization of government subsidy by following every transactions made from education subsidy towards provisions. That has maintained level of service delivery using subsidy against school budget requirements. Students' needs and complaints are tracked down for action and causes of deficiencies on their needs are identified (UNICEF, 2008).

In Pakistan, internal efficiency of education system has been altered positively by administrators using the subsidy. They noted that it is availability of modern electricity lines and water resources that have a positive effect on the achievement of the students in schools (Khan & Hussein, 2004). They observed that access to water and electricity contributes positively to improved learning process and that water and electricity were determining factors of effectiveness of administrators in use of subsidy and this was confirmed by Colgan (2008) and Kremer *et al.,* (2010). However, Anttanasio (2009) while establishing the role of instructional facilities in education in Mexico found that it is not the facilities per se that matters but accessibility and adequacy of the facility as was expressed through staff meeting as an evaluation procedure.

In a number of nations, public secondary schools administrators have been criticized for ill-equipping schools and in many rural settings lack of instructional resources such as electricity and water which has impacted negatively on school effectiveness (Erlichson, 2001). However, Bray (2007); Munavu (2008); Earthman (2002); Edwards (2006) and Hines (1996) in Asia found that availability of electricity and water were an important precondition for student enrolment and school effectiveness but all rely on school administration's concern on monitoring and evaluation of effective utilization of the subsidy as given by government. It was noted by Khan and Hussein (2004) in South East Asia that positivity of the school administration on effective utilization of subsidy will always facilitate availability of water and electricity, textbooks, laboratory equipment and chalk all for learning effectiveness**.**

Literature reviewed revealed that in South Asia, school administrators' organized seminars showed that distance learning has been supported by availability and accessibility to electricity in public schools (Croft, 2010). It was confirmed that payment of electricity bills by free secondary education subsidy made its use in public schools be beneficial in attracting students (Hale, 2002). In other areas, application of ICT in teaching has improved students' attitude towards teaching-learning process unlike before (Benveniste, 2008). This was also confirmed in Malaysia by MOEsT (2005) and in Philippines by UNESCO (2005) studies that found that there is positive correlation between provision of electricity, water, and tuition facilities and teaching –learning effectiveness.

1.5.2 Effective Utilization of Education Subsidy

The introduction of education subsidy in schools in the world was a reaction by various governments to enhance access and completion in public secondary schools (World Bank 2008). However, in a number of countries, the conditions in public secondary schools in terms of facilities provision was in pathetic situation as some schools had nothing at all, while others considering their size had where to start from. This situation was prompted further by ever increasing enrolment in schools resulting from free education. In some schools, this was a change in their general life pattern since everybody had to access school. The public expectations were high but this was not fulfilled by government disbursements.

Oladejo *et al.,* (2011) study in Asia on effective utilization of education subsidy noted that it is very important for stakeholders especially Boards of Management to understand the procedures of monitoring and evaluation so that schools can effectively benefit from programs sponsored by the government. They noted that whenever inputs are utilized well, their outcome or impact must be ascertained by stakeholders. However, revelations by Abdo and Semela (2010) through their study in Southern Ethiopia on effective utilization of government grant in public schools, reported that insufficient provisions from education subsidy would obviously discourage learners and teachers and that their participation in teaching-learning process will always be low showing ineffectiveness in utilization of subsidy towards acquisition of learning materials.

Colcough and Otieno (2009) posits that in a number of poverty engulfed countries, the use of monitoring and evaluation procedures in public secondary schools has declined consistently over the years, for instance in Lao PADRO it was (40%), Philippines it was (40%), Vietnam it was (37%), Cambodia it was (36%), Indonesia it was (27%), and Myanmar it was (25%) and that the reason given to support this was lack of resources that could support full use of monitoring and evaluation procedures in public secondary schools and that effective utilization of education subsidy was deteriorating due to low training on skills of managing monitoring and evaluation procedures by stakeholders and supporting financially M&E procedures adoption. Literature reviewed posits that it was (10.4%) in Thailand and 8% in Malaysia and that such inadequacies of monitoring and evaluation procedures have created ineffectiveness in utilization of education subsidy significantly (Motala, Dieltiens & Sayed, 2009). However, UNESCO (2005) affirms that availability and

adequacy of training on monitoring and evaluation skills has changed the situation and that it has led to efficiency in utilization of education subsidy on different resources in secondary schools over the years.

In Mexico, study by Colgan (2008) affirms that most of the schools lack students' preparation rooms for practical and the inadequacy in laboratory chemicals is attributed to financial problems they face because of inadequate subsidy to supply teaching-learning facilities. This was confirmed by Behrman *et al.,* (2005) study in Mexico as well as Benveniste (2008) study in Thailand. They noted that the effectiveness of using monitoring and evaluation procedures in schools is determined by a number of other salient factors .that are interlinked and are interdependent rather than M&E procedures as per se and that was the concern of this study

According to World Bank (2005 & 2006) and Sharma (2011) in Africa it was established that low level use of monitoring and evaluation procedures in schools as a follow up to utilization of subsidy remained high leading to inefficient use of subsidy and complaints by students in public secondary schools. Mackay (2009) in Ghana confirms that a teacher who has to work with fifty learners under a shelter with no visual aid such as models and charts as provisions from subsidy to enhance understanding would not do much especially where the principal does not listen to advice of from teachers' monitoring and evaluation procedures' results.

In Kenya, education subsidy was a blessing in disguise as parents expected no further support to schools in terms of facilities since this was solely a government role (Olembo & Ross, 2008). The government was expected to meet the tuition and operation at a cost of Kshs.12, 870 per year while the parents were to meet other requirements such as lunch, transport, uniform and boarding fees besides development projects, however, currently they are paying Kshs. 9374 per year which was not expected (MOE & Kibaki, 2008 & MOE, 2014). However, Achoka (2007) study on Kenya's management of secondary education in 21st century and (Adan, 2012) study on socio-economic implications of subsidized secondary education in Kenya, found that the government subsidy is inadequate and disbursed late and that school management always misdirect the funds to other functions not meant for it thus failing to meet its objective against the background of monitoring and evaluation procedures in schools. This was confirmed by Ayoo (2002) study on availability of teaching-learning facilities in secondary schools in Kisumu district that indicated gaps still exists and that 100% mark has not been reached by most schools.

He noted that optimal utilization of education subsidy towards tuition facilities at (19.35%), electricity and water (49%); employees salary payment was (37%); administration cost was (21%); medical funding was (19%) and activity funding was (17%) which have affected efficiency in public secondary schools. He concluded that limited subsidy provision in secondary schools was a major contributory factor to inefficiency even though M&E procedures are applied in all schools.

1.5.3 Theoretical framework

The study is anchored on Systems theory which was proposed in 1940's by the biologist Ludwig von Bertalanffy (General Systems Theory, 1956), and furthered by Ross Ashby (Introduction to Cybernetics, 1968). They argued that a system is a collection of parts unified to accomplish an overall goal. If one part of the system is removed, the nature of the system is changed as well. Systems theory focuses on the relations between the parts. The way the parts are organized and how they interact with each other determines the properties of that system.

The system theory is applicable to the study because management of schools is viewed as a system comprising of parts such as government, policymakers, students, the community and facilities that play interactive roles for the success of students and school effectiveness. If one part does not co-operate, management fails especially when its' participatory nature is not effective the whole system collapses. In the same way quality education can only be achieved if government releasing enough funds to schools in good time to facilitate school operations; parents recognizing their role and effectively playing it at the right time so that students are not discouraged from going to schools and head teachers as managers do not waste government subsidy but utilizes it in acquiring instructional facilities that enables teaching-learning process to go on as required of them without replacements. Teachers, parents, school administration and boards of management as educators and evaluators remain the central implementers of all programs aimed at improving effectiveness in utilization of subsidy (MOE, 2008).

1.6 Methodology and Study Paradigm

This study used descriptive survey design and Correlation research design. Descriptive survey research designs and correlation research designs used were informed by the type of data collected in this study that drew both descriptive and inferential data required for descriptive and inferential analysis. As Shield and Rangarjan (2013) indicates that descriptive survey designs are used to describe characteristics of a population being studied. Correlation research design was used to measure relationships that existed between the two identifiable variables and the extent to which predictor variable enhances variation in dependent variables Creswell (2012). The paradigm that this study adopted was pragmatism even though many paradigms exist. The use of pragmatism paradigm was informed by the fact that pragmatist's idea about research was the use of a method which works best to address research problem. Pragmatic researchers grant themselves the freedom to use any of the methods

and procedures associated with quantitative and qualitative research (Johnson & Anthony, 2004).

1.7. Discussion of Study Findings

In order to establish the influence of school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures on effective utilization of educational subsidy, the study first determined the relationship that existed between the two variables and secondly tested the hypothesis to establish the significance of the relationships. The hypothesis statement was that there was no significant relationship between school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures and effective utilization of education subsidy.

1.7.1 Relationship between School Administration's Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures and Effective Utilization of Education Subsidy

To test the relationship, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation coefficient was used and to test a null hypothesis that 'There is no significant relationship between school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures and effective utilization of education subsidy" 95% level of significance was used. The interpretation of Pearson's Product Moment Correlation coefficient was based on Shirley *et al.* (2005) interpretation that indicates that a weak correlation, "r" ranges from + 0.10 to + 0.29; a moderate correlation, "r" ranges between + 0.30 and + 0.49; while in strong correlation, "r" ranges from + 0.5 and + 1.0. Correlation results were given in Table 1.2

Table1.2. Detailed Correlation Results

Model 1			EUES
School Administration's Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures	Pearson Correlation	1	.541**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	**333**	**333**

From Table 1.2, it indicates that 'r' value was = 0.541 while P = 0.000 (P < 0.05) indicating that there is a significant positive correlation between school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures and effective utilization of education subsidy. School administration monitoring and evaluation procedures contributed up to 54.1% in the variance in effective utilization of education subsidy and that a unit increase in school administration M&E procedures, would create an improvement of 54.1% units in effective utilization of education subsidy. When hypothesis was tested at 95% confidence level given that 'r' value was r = 0.541 and P value was found to be P = 0.000 (P < 0.05). The null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that there was a significant positive relationship between school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures and effective utilization of education subsidy.

In order to establish the level of influence of school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures on effective utilization of education subsidy, multiple regression analysis was done. The regression model proposed was: $Y = \beta 0 + \beta 1\ X_1 + \varepsilon$ where y means effective utilization of educational subsidy and X_1 means school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures. The summary of the regression model results indicates that R^2 value was = .293 indicating that up to 29.3% of the variance in effective utilization of education subsidy was explained by the school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures.

To test whether data was of good fit, ANOVA analysis was done and results indicates that P = .000 which was less than 0.05 (P < 0.05) indicating that regression model statistically predicted the outcome variable and therefore was a good fit for the data F (1, 331) = 137.032. The regression coefficient Model was developed and the result was that a linear regression equation existed between the two variables where effective utilization of education subsidy was the dependent variable ($\hat{Y}$) and school administration's monitoring and evaluation Procedures was the independent variable (x). The regression model equation that was given as $\hat{Y} = B + Ax$, became; $\hat{Y} = 14.113 + 0.570x$.

1.7.2. Analysis of Indicators under School Administration's M&E Procedures on Effective Utilization of Education Subsidy

When three indicators under school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures were regressed against effective utilization of education subsidy to establish their level of influence on the variance in dependent variable, the results were given in Table 1.5.

Table1.5. Analysis of Regression Results for Indicators of School Administration's M&EP on EUES

Model 1	Value
1. R	.465[a]
2. R Square	.216
3. Adjusted R Square	.209
4. Std. Error of the estimate	7.717

From Table 1.5, it indicates that the three indicators of school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures contributed up to 21.6% of the variance in effective utilization of education subsidy. The regression equation was therefore developed from the Table 1.6.

Table 1.6. Analysis of Regression Equation for Indicators under School Administration M&E procedures

Model 1	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	12.562	2.703		4.647	.000
1. Supervision.	3.588	.589	.319	6.092	.000
2. Using staff meetings	2.566	.628	.290	4.085	.000
3. Disseminating information	-.451	.634	-.051	-.711	.478

a. Dependent Variable: Effective Utilization of Education Subsidy

From Table 1.6, it indicates that the linear regression equation for the indicators became; $\hat{Y} = 12.562 + 3.588x_1 + 2.566x_2$. Where X_1 was 'Supervision and X_2 was staff meetings. In conclusion, it is clear that the 21.6% of variance in effective utilization of education subsidy was contributed by supervision by school administration and staff meetings, other indicator dissemination of information behaved as constant rather than a variable in determining variance in effective utilization of education subsidy.

1.9. Conclusions

For this study, one hypothesis was formulated and tested. In testing this hypothesis, the existence of a regression model that included the variable under investigation was considered. The result was that 'r' value was r = 0.541, P value was P = 0.000 (P < 0.05) indicating that there was a positive correlation between school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures and effective utilization of education subsidy. Null hypothesis was rejected as P value was less than 0.05 (P < 0.05), it was concluded that there was a strong positive significant relationship between school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures and effective utilization of education subsidy. When school administration's monitoring and evaluation procedures was regressed against effective utilization of education subsidy, it was noted that independent variable could explain up to 29.3% of variance in effective utilization of education subsidy(dependent variable). This was indicating that for any unit change in independent variable a total of 29.3 units' improvement would be registered on dependent variable.

1.10. Recommendations

The study firstly recommends that the government of Kenya should carry out enactment of laws governing the use of school administration in monitoring and evaluating effective utilization of education subsidy for change to be realized in accessibility and availability of instructional materials in public secondary schools in Kenya.

Secondly the study is recommending that supervision by school administrators should be enhanced to facilitate effective utilization of education subsidy.

Thirdly the study is recommending that such indicators of school administration like staff meetings and supervision should be given priority in schools so that effective utilization of education subsidy is realized for contuinity.

References

Abdo, M. & Semela, T. (2010). Teachers of poor communities: The tale of instructional media in primary schools of Gedeo zone, Southern Ethiopia. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education,* 35 (7), 78-92.

Achoka, J. S., Odebero, S. O., Maiyo, J. K. & Mualuko, N. J. (2007). Access to Basic Education in Kenya. Inherent concerns. *Educational Research and Review* Vol. 2 (10). Pp 275-284.

Achoka, J.S.K. (2005). Female Gender Vulnerability and Challenges of HIV/AIDS to Health, Education and Development in Kenya. *International Journal of Disaster Management and Risk Reduction.* 1:29-33. June 2007. ISSN: 1992-2744 CDMHA, Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology.

Achoka, J.S.K. (2007). *Kenya's Management of Secondary School Education in the 21st Century*: New Model for Excekebce. J-STEM, 1:2.

Ananga, E., (2011). *Typology of School Dropout;* the Dimensions and Dynamics of Dropout in Ghana, 374-381

Asayo, O. (2011). *Abolition of secondary school fees in Kenya:* Responses by the poor, 402-408.

Asayo, O. (2012). Are Efficiency and Equity in School Finance Substitutes or Complements, *Journal of EconomicPerspectives* 10 (4): 51-72.

Attanasio, Orazio, Kugler, A. & Meghir, C. (2009). Subsidizing Vocational Training for Disadvantaged Youth in Developing Countries: Evidence from a Randomized Trial. *NBER Working Paper No. 13931.*

Ayoo, S.J. (2009). *An Investigation of the Factors influencing K.C.S.E. Performance in Kisumu District*. Unpublished M.E.d Thesis. University of Nairobi. Education Research and Publication.

Baird, S., Craig, M. & Ozler, B. (2010). *Cash or Condition: Evidence from a Randomized Cash Transfer Program,* World Bank Working Paper

Behrman, J. R., Sengupta, P. & Todd, P. (2005). Progressing through PROGRESSA: An Impact Assessment of a

School Subsidy Experiment in Rural Mexico, *Economic Development and Cultural Change 54*(1): 237-275.

Benveniste, L. (2008). Education in Thailand: Improving Secondary Education. In Fredriksen, B. & Tan, J, P. (Eds.), *An African exploration of the East Asian education experiences* (pp. 218-286). Washington D. C.: World Bank.

Boon, G. C. & Gopinathan, S. (2008). Education in Singapore: Developments since 1965. In Fredriksen, B. & Tan, J.P. (Eds.), *An African exploration of the East Asian Education experiences* (pp. 80-108). Washington D. C.: World Bank

Brown, G. K. (2007). Making ethnic citizens: The politics and practice of education in Malaysia. *International Journal of Educational Development, 27,* 318–330. ..

Buckland, S. (2011). Uncovering South Africa's New Apartheid': *The challenges to Educational Accessfor Non-nationals in South Africa*, 367-373.

Bullock, C. (2007). *The relationship between school building conditions and student achievement at the middle school level in Commonwealth of Virginia.* RetrievedJuly 4, 2008from http://scholar.lib.vt.ed/theses/available/etd 08212007-163313

Chabari, E.B. (2010). *Challenges facing effective Implementation of Free Secondary Education in Kenya.* Thesis, Chuka University College.

Cloete, F. (2009). *Evidence based policy analysis: critical assessment of the emerging government wide monitoring and evaluation system*. Journal of public administration 44(2):293, June.

Colclough, C. & Otieno, J. (2009). Under-enrolment and Low Quality in African Primary Schooling: Towards a Gender-Sensitive Solution.*IDS Working Paper No. 7.*

Colgan, C. (2008). Building boom. *American School Board Journal, 190*(6), 26-29.

Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research Design:* Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches, 3rd Ed., Sage Publications,Thousand Oaks, California.

Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Earthman, G. I. (2002). *School facility conditions and student academic achievement.* Retrieved February 9, 2009, fromhttp://www.idea.gseis.ucla.edu/publications/williams/reports/pdfs/wws08.

Edwards, N. C. (2006). *School facilities and student achievement*: Student perspectives on connection between the urban learning environment and student motivation and performance.*Ph.D. dissertation,* The Ohio State University, United States - Ohio.Retrieved February 20, 2009, from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/send-pdf.cgi/Edwards%20Nicole%20C.pdf?osu1164663224

Gogo, K. S. (2002). *Input of cost sharing on access, equity and quality of secondary education* in Rachuonyo District. Unpublished ME.d, Kenyatta University.

Hale, O. (2002). *Improving performance.*American School and University, 75, 32-35

Hines, E. (2006). *Building condition and student achievement and behavior. Ph. D. dissertation*, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and State University, UnitedStates-Virginia. Retrieved November 8, 2008, from Dissertation & Theses*:* FullText. (Publication No. AAT 9712733).

Johnson, R. B. and Anthony J. O. (2004). *Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come*

Jotia, A. L. & Matlale, O. J. (2011). Use of instructional materials in social studies: Impact on students' performance in primary school leaving certificate examinations in Botswana. *European Journal of EducationalStudies,* 3(1), 111-122.

Khan, S. & Hussein, H., (2004). The impact of School facilities on quality education. *An Educational Management Journal Vol.* 3 (7) Page 134-204, Inc. Press.

Kibaki, M. (2008). Speech by his Excellency Hon. Mwai Kibaki, C.G.H., M.P., President and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Kenya during *the Launch Free Secondary Education, Jamhuri High School, Nairobi*, 11th February, 2008. [Accessed February 2008, from: http://statehouseKenya.go.ke/].

Kremer, M., Jessica L. Miguel, E. & Peterson, A. Z. (2010). Improving Education in Developing World: What have we Learned from Randomized Evaluations? *International Journal of Educational Development* 27: 347-56

Lewin, K. & Little, K. (2011). *Access to education revisited: Equity, drop out and transitions to secondary school in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa,* 333-337.

Lewin, K. (2009). Access to Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Patterns, problems and possibilities, *Comparative Education Vol. 45* (2), 151-174.

Lewin, K. M. & Sayed, Y. (2005). *Non-government secondary schooling in sub-Saharan Africa*. Exploring the Evidence in South Africa and Malawi.Researching the Issues 59. London: The Department for International Development (DFID).

Mackay, K. (2009). *Evaluation capacity development*. Institutionalizing of monitoring and evaluation systems to improve public sector management: 15: 1-3, January

Ministry of Education, Science & Technology (2005). *Kenya Education Sector Support Program 2005-2010*.Nairobi: Government Printer.

MOE (2008). *Report of the Task Force on Implementation of FPE,* Nairobi, MOE Government Printer.

Moore, K. J. (2008). *Modern public school facilities: Investing in the future.* Retrieved May 6, 2010, from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/fa/sf/documents/congresstestimony.doc

Motala, S., Dieltiens, V. & Sayed Y. (2009). *Physical access to schooling in South Africa: Mapping dropout, repetition and age-grade progression in two districts*

Munavu, R. M., Ogutu, D. M. & Wasanga, P. M. (2008). Sustainable Articulation

Oladejo, M. A.; Olosunde, G. R.; Ojebisi, A. O. & Isola, O. M. (2011*). Instructional Materials and students achievement in physics*; Some Policy Implications. European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences. Vol. 2 (1). JournalBank Publishing Inc.

Olembo, J. O. & Ross (2008). *Financing Secondary Education in Kenya*. Nairobi: Bureau of Educational Research.

Osuga, B. and Mutayisa, D. (2010). '*Use of PRA in Programme Reviews and Evaluations*: Key Strengths, Weaknesses, and Lessons'.

Republic of Kenya (1988). Report on the Development of Education for the Next Decade and Beyond *(Kamunge Report).*Nairobi. Government Printer.

Republic of Kenya (2005), Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. *Sessional paper no.1 of 2005 on Policy Framework for Education, Training and Research*, Nairobi Government Printer

Schneider, M. (2003). *Linking school facility conditions to teacher satisfaction and success.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities

Sharma, S. R. (2011). *Encyclopaedia of Modern Educational Research*. New York.

Shield, Patricia and Rangarjan, N. (2013). *A Playbook for Research Methods: Integrating Conceptual Frameworks and Project Management*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Shirley Dowdy, Stanley Weardon, Daniel Chilko. (2005). *Statistics for Research.* Third Edition. Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. ISBN: 9780471267355

Ricks, D. (2006). *Monitoring and Evaluating NGO's Achievements in Arnold Companion to Development studies* edited by Potter, RB and Desald V. New York: Arnold: 107-130.

Riddel, R. C. (2009). *Searching for impact methods*: *NGO Evaluation synthesis study*: A report produced for the OECD/DAC expert group on evaluation. Department for international Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Helsinki.

Tashakkori, A., and Teddlie, C. (2011). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Taylor, F.W. (1911). *The principles of Scientific*

UNESCO (2005). *EFA. Global Monitoring Report: The Role of the Organization and Social Context of Schools*. http://portal.org/education

UNICEF(2008). *Basic education and gender equality* [http://www.unicef.org/girlseducation/index_bigpicture.html]. Last accessed on 13 November 2008

UPWARD (2007). '*Interfacing PM&E with the Research and Development Process*: An Introduction', pp. 7-12, in Self-assessment: Participatory Dimensions of Project Monitoring and Evaluation, Los Banos, Philippines: UPWARD

Von Bertalanffy, Ludwing. (1968). *General System theory: Foundations, Development, Applications.* New York: George Braziller, revised edition 1976: ISBN 0-8076-0453-4.

World Bank (2008). *Transitions in Secondary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Equity and Equality.* International Centre for Research on Women.anju@icrw.org *in rural India*, 394-401

World Bank (2005). *African Development Indicators*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

World Bank (2005). *World development report: Equity in development.* New York: Oxford University Press.

World Bank (2006). *Kenya Education Sector Support Program (KESSP) Project Appraisal Document.* Washington, D.C.: The World Bank