Decentralizing Teacher Placement In Public Secondary Schools And Its Influence On Service Delivery And Teacher Retention

Millicent Adhiambo Ojwan'g
Department of Educational Administration, Curriculum and Teaching , School of Education
University of Eastern Africa, Baraton, P O Box 2500-30100 ELDORET, Kenya

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to review what literature has on the decentralization of teacher placement in public secondary schools. This paper makes observations on the Teachers Service Commission policy on Teacher Recruitment and Selection (2006) in an attempt to decentralize teacher placement in Kenya; composition of the Board of Management; composition of the Selection Panel; and how the restructuring influences service delivery and teacher retention.

I. INTRODUCTION

Allan (2006) observes that as early as the 1980s, several major shifts had been adopted to identify directions in education in the world. One of these shifts is characterized by change from centralization to decentralization which is a moving force that has helped to shape educational reform efforts in most parts of the world. Decentralization has given rise to school-based management, which is a revolutionary educational construct that serves as a key in school restructuring (Allan, 2006). According to Board (n.d.), many developing countries began to decentralize education during the 1990's and early twenty-first century. The main driving force of decentralizing education was to improve efficiency in service delivery.

 In 1989, the school systems in New Zealand, England and Wales introduced school-based management on the same principles as those advocated by Australian Capital Territory of the mid 1980s (Arnott & Raab, 2000). In 1992, the federal government in Mexico decentralized the responsibility for basic and teacher education to the thirty one states (Ornelas, 2006). Since 1993, the Ministry of Education in Nicaragua began to decentralize the administration of public secondary schools to school management boards. In 1991, Hong Kong introduced its School Management

Initiative policy with a view to developing decentralization gradually (Yau & Cheng, 2011; Thida & Joy, 2012). Since the late 1980s, Japan started a process of decentralization of its centralized educational system in order to maintain its competitive edge of world leader in economic globalization process (Muta, 2000). In 1987, Taiwan started a series of educational reforms in school administration (Lo & Gu, 2008).

Since 1998, the South Korean education system has undertaken a decentralized policy which has gained local offices more autonomy in secondary education (Lo & Gu, 2008). The National Education Act was enacted in 1999 in Thailand with provision for the devolution of authority to school governing boards (Gamage & Sooksomchitra, 2004). While Cambodia introduced decentralization in 1998, Indonesia introduced decentralization nationwide in 1991 (Thida & Joy, 2012). Decentralization was introduced in Cambodia, Indonesia and Thailand in order to reduce inequalities among areas (e.g. between urban and rural areas within a country) and/or between schools and to enhance efficiency (Shoraku, 2008; Thida & Joy 2012). Decentralization in the Philippines was intended to improve shared governance and democratic decision making (Thida & Joy, 2012).

According to Wadesango, Machingambo, Mutekwe, Ndofirepi, and Maphosa (2012), the government of Zimbabwe decentralized the recruitment of teachers in 1998. The management and administration of education was decentralized to promote efficiency and equity in the development of regions. Although teachers are placed regionally in Tanzania, school committees oversee the running of the schools (Winkler & Gershberg, 2003). After decades of civil war and dictatorship, the National Resistance Movement began to bring some stability to Uganda in 1986, a time when the government adopted a countrywide decentralization (Namukas & Buye, 2007). Ugandan schools now have School Management Committees, which deal with education locally but teachers are recruited regionally. According to Winkler and Gershberg (2003), Tanzania and Uganda have implemented devolution to localities as their educational decentralization design.

Kenya equally sought to decentralize its education as experienced in various commission reports at different times. The Republic of Kenya (1964), otherwise referred to as the Ominde Commission Report, recommended the transfer of responsibility for the management of secondary schools from the Ministry of Education to Boards of Governors (BOGs), which was a deliberate move to decentralize authority in day-to-day matters from the central government to the school level. The Republic of Kenya (1976), commonly known as the Gachathi Report, endorsed the need for delegation of school management powers from the central government to the institutional governing bodies citing low levels of efficiency due to excessive centralization of functions. The Republic of Kenya (1980), through the Education Act (CAP 211), vested the management of public secondary schools on BOGs. The Republic of Kenya (1988), also referred to as the Kamunge Report, was categorical that the establishment of the BOGs was intended to decentralize the day-to-day management of schools so as to ensure efficiency. The Republic of Kenya (2013), otherwise known as

The Basic Education Act, acknowledges the establishment of the Board of Management (BOM), formerly referred to as BOGs of a basic education institution, whose functions include advising the County Education Board on the staffing needs of the institution.

II. DECENTRALIZATION OF TEACHER PLACEMENT IN THE KENYAN CONTEXT

The Teachers' Service Commission (TSC), the main employing body for teachers in Kenya, was established in 1967 and practiced a direct and automatic employment of all trained teachers until 1998 following a government directive (Republic of Kenya, 2006). In 2001, the TSC adopted a new policy of recruiting teachers on the basis of demand and availability of vacancies, hence the demand-driven method of teacher placement.

However, in 2006 a documented comprehensive policy to guide the exercise was launched with teacher recruitment and selection being delegated to lower levels of educational management at different periods in time as follows: First, to the Provincial Directors of Education and District/Municipal Education Officers. Later, teacher placement was assigned to the County Directors of Education upon the implementation of the new Constitution of Kenya (2010). The County Education Board under the leadership of the County Director of Education now collaborates with every individual school Board of Management (BOM), the Principal and other appropriate authorities on teacher placement of basic schools within the county (Republic of Kenya, 2013). The TSC policy (2006) on decentralization of teacher placement is being implemented by BOMs with the final appointment of teachers by the TSC using the provided guidelines and a Selection Score Guide which are revised annually before the recruitment of teachers.

A. *Composition of Board of Management*

The Republic of Kenya (2013) has provided for the composition of the Board of Management

(BOM) appointed by the County Education Board, which has evidence of an all-inclusive, collegial and participatory decision making team. It includes representatives of teachers, sponsors of the school, special interest groups in the community, and students' council. Heystek (2011) also observes that parents and teachers are in the School Governing Bodies in South African Schools. According to Johnson (2013), we can develop better, more practical, more long-lasting education reforms if we widen the circle of dialogue to include teachers, parents, and community members.

B. Composition of the Selection Panel

According to the TSC Guidelines for Recruitment of Post Primary Teachers (TSC CIRCULAR NO. 7/ 2014), the selection panel should consist of the following seven members:

  i.   Chairman, Board of Management - Chairman

  ii. Two (2) members of the Board - Members

  iii. Head of Institution - Secretary

  iv. Deputy Head of Institution - Member

  v.   Subject specialist   - Member

  vi. The TSC County Director/representative - Member

III. HOW DECENTRALIZING TEACHER PLACEMENT INFLUENCES SERVICE DELIVERY

A. Positive Influences

Pushpanadham (2006) identifies the merits of school Boards of Management as developing a sense of ownership of the school and maintaining positive relationship with the community hence, creating a collaborative work environment supportive of efficient and effective service delivery. Sang and Sang (2011) found out that restructuring teacher placement helped develop a sense of ownership of the school among the Boards of Management who sought to protect and shield the principal from external pressures. Kiragu,

King'oina, and Migosi, (2013) maintain that when education stakeholders are engaged actively in the restructuring process, they will own the policies, which positively influence service delivery.

According to Bandur (2012), decentralizing teacher placement policy has led to the formation of mandatory school councils for participatory decision making which has become the best approach in the Anglo-Saxon countries including the U.S., the U.K., Australia, and New Zealand. When stakeholders are actively engaged in the processes of decision making at the school level they are stimulated and a sense of ownership is developed in them (Johnson, 2013).

Ng (2013) observes that in Hong Kong the bill that parents and teachers, among others, were included as school governors was passed as an Education Ordinance by the Legislative Council in July 2004. Decision-making on resource deployment was devolved to the schools so as to enable them make school-based policies that better meet the needs of schools. Ng (2013) further refers to the Education and Manpower Branch of Education Department (1991: 37) as recommending that school management frameworks should allow for participation in decision making all concerned parties including teaching staff and parents. Hence, teachers and parents play a significant role in school governance as school partners.

According to Lo and Gu (2008), the Taiwan school governance mechanism is designed and operated on the basis of a co-governing model with an emphasis of involving stakeholders, including school administrators, teachers and parents. Teachers are actively involved in the Teacher Evaluation Committee which screen and select school teachers. Bandur (2012), who did a study on decentralized developments in Indonesia, obtained findings suggesting that restructuring policy and programs in Indonesia are widely perceived to have influenced the transfer of authority for decision making on such key areas as the selection and hiring of teachers from the central

government to the school level. This move has created several changes, including participation of school communities which in turn led to improvements in the schools.

Mulkeen, Chapman, Dejaeghere, and Leu (2007) are categorical that virtually every country in Africa has formulated official policies endorsing some level of decentralization because advocates perceive decentralization as shifting decision making to those closer to the community and school, which leads to decisions that are more responsive to local conditions and needs. Gamage and Zajda (2009) assert that the decentralization of education leads to parental involvement and support. Wadesango et al. (2012), cite Ariel (2001), who stated that the effect of decentralization in Central America was mainly increased parental participation.

Decentralizing teacher placement also leads to an empowerment of teachers, parents, and others in the education community while improving efficiency and effectiveness of school reform (Cunningham & Cordeiro, 2009; Gamage & Zajda, 2009; Thida & Joy, 2012). Lussier (2006) supports this argument by stating that decentralization promotes efficiency. Leadership Boards and Councils (2015) observe that teachers participate actively in the education reforms by being co-chairpersons in each of the seven Revere Educators Leadership Boards, who focus on recruitment among other management functions.

Decentralization in education services also leads to autonomy with less bureaucratic decision making (Thida & Joy, 2012). Gaziel (1998) adds to this argument by observing that schools with a decentralized education system in Israel are perceived by school staff as having greater autonomy in making decisions with respect to staff matters and are more likely to produce services in line with the preferences of local groups of citizens. The said schools experience reduced bureaucratic controls. Wadesango et al. (2012) cite Naidoo (2002), who stated that decentralization in educa-

tion cuts through enormous amounts of bureaucratic hurdles usually experienced with central planning. Wanjala (2010) also found out that decentralization reduces the workload of the Teachers Service Commission based at the headquarters, thereby satisfying the staffing needs of the schools.

Christie (2010), reports the South African experience with decentralizing teacher placement as a participatory engagement in which the South African Schools Act of 1996 gave school governing bodies the right and power to recommend appointment of staff to their relevant education departments. Decentralizing teacher placement increased the scope of work of the school principal and introduced a system of dual authority between school management and governance.

Hong Kong schools, through School Management Initiative, attracted groups of people with different interests to participate in school policy decision-making. Thus, teachers and principals have changed from roles of employees to that of partners basically because it is believed that decentralization promotes school efficiency and effectiveness (Yau & Cheng, 2014).

Johnson (2013) asserts that we can develop better, more practical, more long-lasting education reforms if we widen the circle of dialogue to include teachers, parents, and the community members. This is also the case in the findings of Thida and Joy (2012), who report that the success of decentralizing teacher placement in Cambodia was determined by principal leadership and the active participation of local stakeholders. Thida and Joy (2012), suggest that greater autonomy should be decentralized to the stakeholders so as to successfully accomplish the stipulated objectives of school based management.

Lo and Gu (2008) acknowledge that the establishment of the school management committee system in South Korea in 1998 is a key initiative of fostering decentralization, because the system empowers parents, teachers and community mem-

bers in the decision making processes of school administration. Parents representatives occupy most of the seats in School Management Committees, a similar case to the Kenyan situation, where there are six persons elected to represent parents on the board of management. Hence, parents are the majority as compared to the other representative groups on the school Board of Management in Kenya.

B. *Negative Influences*

Gaziel (2008), who investigated whether decentralized schools differed in their features from non-decentralized ones as perceived by teachers in Israel, concluded that decentralization, in its administrative form, is less effective. According to Gamage and Sooksomchitra (2004), School Management Committee members feel that principals tend to dominate the decision making process as much of the information from the government is provided via their principals in Thailand. Just like Thailand, schools in Cambodia are also governed mainly by principals and persons close to the principal. This means that the opinion of many others cannot be heard in the day-to-day school operations. Thida and Joy (2012) confirm that there is low participation of teachers, school support committee and parents in Cambodia.

Decentralization may create frustration and is often slower than more autocratic methods. This is the major concern of John Awiti, the Chairman of the Kenya Secondary Schools Heads Association (KESSHA), who has been quoted by Machio (2014, July 7- July 20) as arguing that the Board of Management membership of seventeen was too large to make meaningful progress during discussions and that when there are many people in the Board and decisions have to be made, it drags the process.

According to Gaynor (1998), countries where the placement of teachers is political, teachers have lobbied for a return to centralized control of their recruitment. For example, in many states in Bra-

zil, teachers are hired at the discretion of local politicians. Similarly, it is common in Colombia and Pakistan for teachers to be hired on the basis of their political loyalties.

Mulkeen et al. (2007) point out that opponents of decentralization suggest that devolving authority and responsibility may only shift problems to levels of the system less prepared to cope with them and that decentralizing teacher management invites corruption and inefficiency. Namukasa and Buye (2007) observe that corruption among officials slackened restructuring teacher placement measures in Uganda. According to Kipsoi and Sang (2008), the implementation of the decentralized teacher placement policy has been reported to be bias, tribal and corrupt and not based on merit. Sang and Sang (2011) found out that decentralizing teacher placement resulted in the abuse of power by Boards of Management (BOM) who practiced nepotism, favoritism, and bribery; there was conflict between BOMs and principals; there was also difference in priorities between principals and board members.

Gaynor (1998) reports that in Nigeria and Zimbabwe the control of schools was taken from local government in the early 1990s because teachers were dissatisfied with local government control and their inability to deal with educational matters. Wadesango et al. (2012) confirm this in a similar study in Zimbabwe where they found that nepotism, favoritism, bribery and corruption were so rampant that the government took over again the placement of teachers. Makori and Onderi (2013) found similar results in their study i.e. the Boards of Management (BOM) want their 'own' people regardless of qualifications or competence. The BOMs practiced clanism, nepotism and corruption. This negative influence on the recruitment process by the BOM members undermined the effectiveness of restructuring teacher placement policy.

Bandur (2012) cites Heystek (2007), whose study found out that there was no good working rela-

tionship between principals and parental governors working in School Governing Boards. Winkler and Gershberg (2003) report that education reforms in Tanzania often suffer from poor relations and coordination between the Ministry of Education Council (MOEC), the President's Decentralization Coordination Unit, the President's Office-Regional Administration and Local Government, and the Local Government Authorities. It has proved difficult for the MOEC to let go of direct service responsibility.

Aloo, Simatwa, and Nyangori (2011) found out that there was unnecessary delay in time by TSC in posting teachers already selected by school panels; there was manipulation of the recruitment process to suit interest of certain individuals in the society; some schools refuse to shortlist qualified applicants in favor of their 'preferred' candidates; other schools recruit candidates who do not meet the qualifications so long as they have a degree certificate without relevant subject combinations on their transcripts; the process of declaring vacancies for schools was wanting as the advertisement of the same was marred by lack of transparency; and Boards of Management failed to adhere to the recruitment guidelines.

IV. HOW DECENTRALIZING TEACHER PLACEMENT INFLUENCES TEACHER RETENTION

Gaynor (1998) postulates that when teachers are given choice over which schools to be posted, they are more likely to remain teaching in those schools. Masuku (2010) postulates that if the decentralization of teacher placement policy is effectively implemented, it should lead to good retention of teachers. Makori and Onderi (2013) support this by stating that restructuring teacher placement policy in Kenya was intended to enhance teacher retention, among other objectives.

Aloo et al. (2011) found out that teacher retention had improved in the decentralized teacher placement due to the five-year bonding policy where a newly recruited teacher does not qualify for transfer before the lapse of five years. Even after the lapse of five years, there must be a suitable replacement because recruitment of teachers is determined by the Curriculum Based Establishment of every school. The teacher commits her/himself by signing that she/he will stay at the new station for at least five years before seeking for a transfer. The commitment is done upon the teacher's appointment. Exceptional cases include insecurity and health reasons, which do not have to wait until the five mandatory years elapse.

V. CONCLUSION

Decentralizing teacher placement in public secondary schools is all-inclusive with increased participatory decision-making in most countries, which enhances service delivery because school administrators, teachers, parents and community members are brought on board. Decentralizing teacher placement also leads to reduced bureaucratic decision-making, which enhances efficiency in service delivery. There is a sense of ownership among the stakeholders, which boosts efficiency in service delivery.

Decentralization has been reported to slow down meaningful progress during discussions in cases of large Board of Management sittings, which creates frustration among the members. Further, in countries where teacher placement has become political, teachers have lobbied for a return to centralized control of their recruitment in search for fairness. Decentralization of teacher placement has been marred by corruption and nepotism practices among some stakeholders, which negatively influence service delivery. Poor work-relationships among some stakeholders in decentralized teacher placement may slow down efficiency in service delivery. The unnecessary delay in time by Teachers Service Commission in posting the selected teachers to their work stations negatively influences service delivery. Finally, decentralizing teacher placement in Kenya has led to staff stability due to its five-year bonding policy.

REFERENCES

[1] Allan, B. G. (2006). Reforms in Philippine basic education viewed from key elements of successful school-based management (SBM) schools. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 5,* 55-71. Retrieved from www.springerlink

[2] Aloo, J.O., Simatwa, E. M. W., & Nyangori, R. A. (2011). The impact of school-based teacher recruitment policy on the distribution and retention of teachers in public secondary schools in Kenya: A case study of Nyando district. *Educational Research* 2(3) 1006-1020. Retrieved from http://www.interesjournals.org/ER

[3] Arnott, M. A., & Raab, C.D. (Eds.) (2000). *The governance of schooling: Comparative studies of devolved management*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from http://notharearush.com/cl/?id=/10-49798-The_Governance_of_Schooling_Comparative_Studies_of_Devolved_Management_by_Margaret_A._Arnott_Editor

[4] Bandur, A. (2012). School-based management developments: Challenges and impacts. *Journal of Educational Administration, 50* (6), 845-873. Retrieved from www.emeraldinsight.com/0957-8234.htm

[5] Board, J. (n.d.). Decentralization and education –definition, measurement, rationale, implementation, school finance, effects of decentralization. *Education Encyclopedia, State University*. Retrieved from education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1903/Decentralization-Education.html

[6] Christie, P. (2010). Landscapes of leadership in South African schools: Mapping the changes. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 38* (6), 694-711.Retrieved from http:///ema.sagepub.com/content/38/6/694

[7] Cunningham, W.G., & Cordeiro, P. A. (2009). *Educational leadership: A bridge to improved practice* (4th ed.). NY: Pearson Education Inc.

[8] Gamage, D. R., & Zajda, J. (2009). Decentralization and school-based governance: A comparative study of self-governing school models. *Globalization, Comparative Education and Policy Research, 8,* 3-22. Retrieved from www.springer.com

[9] Gamage, D. T., & Sooksomchitra, P. (2004). Decentralization and school-based management in Thailand. *International Review of Education, 50*, (3/4), 289-305. Retrieved from www.springer.com

[10] Gaynor, C. (1998). *Decentralization of education: Teacher management.* Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

[11] Gaziel, H. H. (2008). Site-based management: Emergence and effects: The case of Israel. International studies in educational administration. *Journal of the Commonwealth Council foe Educational Administration and Management, 36* (3), 19-34. Retrieved from http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/37376261/site-based-management-emergence-effects-case-Israel

[12] Heystek, J. (2011). School governing bodies in South African schools: Under pressure to enhance democratization and improve quality. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership 39* (4), 455-468. Retrieved from http://ema.sagepub.com/content/39/4/455

[13] Johnson, J. (2013). The human factor. *Educational Leadership, 70* (7), 17-21.

[14] Kipsoi, E., & Sang, A. (2008, September). *Teacher recruitment in secondary schools: Policy and practice in Kenya.* Paper presented at CCEAM Conference Theme: Think Globally Act Locally: A Challenge to Education Leaders. Retrieved from www.emesa.co.za/files/full.E.Kipsoi& S. Anthony.pdf

[15] Kiragu, J. W., King'oina, J.O., & Migosi, J. A. (2013). School-based management prospects and challenges: A case of public secondary schools in Murang'a South District, Kenya.

International Journal of Asian Social Science 3 (5): 1166-1179. Retrieved from www.aessweb.com/journal-detail.php?id=5007

[16] Leadership Boards and Councils (2015). Decentralizing decision-making in Revere public schools. Retrieved from www.doe.mass.edu/.../Reverecase.study

[17] Lo, W. Y. W., & Gu, J. O. (2008). Reforming school governance in Taiwan and South Korea: Empowerment and automization in school-based management. *International Journal of Educational Management, 22* (6), 506-526.Retrieved from www.emeraldinsight.com/0951-354x.htm

[18] Lussier, R. N. (2006). *Management fundamentals. Concepts. Applications. Skills development* (3rd ed.). Springfield, Massachusetts: Thomson.

[19] Machio, J. (2014, July 7-July 20). New rules for school boards released. *Education News, Vol. 131*, pp. 12.

[20] Makori, A., & Onderi, H. (2013). Challenges in achieving effective recruitment of secondary school teachers in Kenya. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences, 2* (3), 39-63. Retrieved from www.graph.co.uk

[21] Masuku, E. (2010). *School principals' experience of the decentralization policy in Zimbabwe* (Unpublished master's thesis). Stellenbosch University, South Africa.

[22] Mulkeen, A., Chapman, D. W., Dejaeghere, J. G., & Leu, E. (2007). Recruiting, retaining, and retraining secondary school teachers and principals in Sub-Saharan Africa. *World Bank Working Paper No. 99. Africa Human Development Series.* Washington D. C.: The World Bank. Retrieved from worldbank.org/INTAFRREGTOPSEIA/Resources/No.4Teachers.pdf

[23] Muta, H. (2000). Deregulation and decentralization of education in Japan. *Journal of Edu-cational Administration, 38* (5), 455-467. Retrieved from http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=839186

[24] Namukas, I. K., & Buye, R. (2007). *Decentralization and education in Africa: The case of Uganda.* Canadian and International Education, 36 (1). Retrieved from http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cie-eci/onvol36/iss1/7

[25] Ng, S.W. (2013). Including Parents In School Governance: Rhetoric or Reality. *International Journal of Educational Management, 27* (6), 667-680. Retrieved from www.emeraldinsight.com/0951-354x.htm

[26] Ornelas, C. (2006). The politics of privatization, decentralization in Mexico. In Zajda, J. (Ed.), *Decentralization and Privatization in Education: The Role of the State,* 208-228. Dordrecht: Springer. Retrieved from Ornelas, C. (2006). The politics of privatization, decentralization in Mexico. In Zajda, J. (Ed.), *Decentralization and Privatization in Education: The Role of the State,* 208-228. Dordrecht: Springer. Retrieved from http://lnk.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F978-1-4020-3358-2_11

[27] Pushpanadham, K. (2006). Educational leadership for school-based management. *ABAC Journal, 26,* (1), 41-48. Retrieved from http://www.abacjournal.au.edu/2006/jan06/vol26no1_article04.pdf

Republic of Kenya (1964*). Kenya education commission report: Part 1*. Nairobi: The Government Printer.

[28] Republic of Kenya (1976*). Report of the national committee on educational objectives and policies.* Nairobi: The Government Printer.

[29] Republic of Kenya (1980). *The education act: Chapter 211, Revised ed.* Nairobi: The Government Printer.

[30] Republic of Kenya (1988). *Report of the presidential working party on education and*

manpower training for the next decade and beyond. Nairobi: The Government Printer.

[31] Republic of Kenya (2013). *The basic education act*. Nairobi: The Government Printer.

[32] Republic of Kenya (2010). *Constitution of Kenya*. Retrieved from http://www.nation.co.ke/blob/view/-/913208/data/157983/-/published+draft.pdf

[33] Republic of Kenya (2010). *Constitution of Kenya*. Retrieved from http://www.nation.co.ke/blob/view/-/913208/data/157983/-/published+draft.pdf

[34] Sang, J. K. & Sang, H. K. (2011). Decentralization of school management to boards of governors in secondary schools in Kenya: A case of Trans Nzoia County. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 3* (2).

[35] Shoraku, A. (2008*). Educational movement toward school-based management in East Asia: Cambodia, Indonesia and Thailand.* Paper commissioned by the Education For all (EFA) Global Monitoring Report 2009, Overcoming Inequality: Why Governance Matters, 1-35. Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001787/178720e.pdf

[36] Teachers Service Commission (July, 2006). Policy on teacher recruitment and selection Retrieved from wbg-files.worldbank.org/documents/hdn/ed/saber/supporting-doc/AFR/Kenya/TCH/20130515_041150.pdf

[37] Thida, K. & Joy, L.C. (2012*). Exploring the implementation of school-based management in selected public schools in Cambodia: A multiple case study*. Paper presented at The Asian Conference of Education, 27-41.

[38] TSC Circular No. 7/2014. TSC/TM/PP/RG/001. (July 30, 2014).

[39] Wadesango, N., Machingambo, S., Mutekwe, E., Ndofirepi, A., & Maphosa, A. (2012). Impediments embedding decentralization of teachers'
recruitment practices in Zimbabwe. *Anthropologist, 14*(6), 527-537. Retrieved from http://www.krepublishers.com/02-journals/T.Anth/Anth-14-0-00-12-web/Anth-14-6-000-2012-Abst-PD-

[40] Wanjala, G. W. (2010). The implications of decentralized teacher recruitment in public secondary schools in Kisumu District, Kenya. *Journal of Educational Research, 4 (2):75-90*

[41] Winkler, D. R., & Gershberg, A. I. (2003). *Education decentralization in Africa: A review of recent policy and practice.* Retrieved from www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/decentralization/…/Winkle.doc

[42] Yau, H. K., & Cheng, A. L. F. (2011). Principals and teachers' perceptions of school policy as a key element of school-based management in Hong Kong primary schools. *E-Journal of Organizational Learning and Leadership,* 109-120. Retrieved from www.V9NI-Yau and Cheng.pdf

[43] Yau, H. K., & Cheng, A. L. F. (2014). Principals and teachers' perceptions of school-based management. *International Education Research, 2* (1), 44-59. Science and Education Center of North America. Retrieved from www.todayscience.org/ier.v2ilp44.pdf