Influence of Government Funding on Performance of Public TVET Institutions in Homa Bay County, Kenya

Nyamwamu Nyarang'o Charles[1*], Hillary Kipchumba[1], Namatsi Rita Brenda Obock[1], Kennedy Kipkirui Kerich[1], Harriet Madegwa[1], Joyce Cherono[1], Lynn Jebet Boit[1], Chelangat Beatrice, John Napoo[1]

[1]Kenya School of Government, Baringo Campus P. O. Box 91, Kabarnet-Kenya

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.101000110

Received: 04 October 2026; Accepted: 09 October 2026; Published: 30 October 2026

ABSTRACT

Government funding is central to the provision of infrastructure, training equipment, teaching and learning resources, and operational services in public Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) institutions. However, inadequate and delayed disbursement may constrain institutional performance. This study examined the influence of government funding on the performance of public TVET institutions in Homa Bay County, Kenya. The study adopted a descriptive-correlational survey design supported by qualitative interviews. The target population comprised 66 respondents from six public TVET institutions, including 6 Principals, 48 Academic Heads of Departments (HoDs), and 12 Finance Officers. A census approach was employed. Quantitative data were collected from Academic HoDs and Finance Officers using semi-structured questionnaires, while qualitative data were obtained through semi-structured interviews with Principals. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics, Pearson Product-Moment correlation and multiple linear regression, while qualitative data were analysed thematically. Quantitative analysis was based on 55 respondents comprising 45 Academic HoDs and 10 Finance Officers. The findings showed that 82.2% of Academic HoDs and 90.0% of Finance Officers agreed that timely government funding enhances institutional performance. Government funding demonstrated a positive and statistically significant relationship with institutional performance ($r = .520$, $p < .001$). Multiple regression established a positive and statistically significant unique contribution of government funding to institutional performance ($B = .206$, $\beta = .214$, $t = 2.073$, $p = .043$). Principals reported that adequate and timely funding facilitated procurement of training equipment and materials, infrastructure improvement, institutional programmes and routine operations, while inadequate and delayed funding disrupted planning, procurement and maintenance. The study concluded that government funding significantly contributes to institutional performance, although adequacy and timeliness remain important concerns.

Key Words: Financial management; Government funding; Institutional performance; Public TVET institutions; Homa Bay County; Kenya.

INTRODUCTION

Government funding is an important resource for strengthening infrastructure, instructional quality, staffing, equipment and operational capacity in public TVET institutions. In America, Ortagus et al. (2024) found that increased government appropriations and institutional revenue strengthened instructional programmes, infrastructure and learner support in public community colleges, while Soliz and Rubin (2025) reported that increased state funding was associated with improved retention, completion and institutional performance. However, these studies were situated within the American higher education system and focused largely on institutional revenue or student outcomes, limiting their applicability to Kenya's public TVET context.

In Britain, Sibieta (2023, 2024) similarly reported that reductions in public funding constrained staffing, workshop and laboratory operations, equipment maintenance, curriculum implementation and apprentice

support, although the studies relied primarily on national-level evidence rather than examining institutional financial management practices.

Evidence from Asia and Africa further demonstrates the role of public financing in TVET capacity and quality. In Malaysia, Ahmad and Rosnan (2024) found that government financing supported infrastructure, equipment, curriculum implementation and staff development, although fragmented financing and budget constraints weakened institutional responsiveness. Chen et al. (2024) reported that sustained government financing in China supported modern training facilities, competency-based curricula, workplace learning and quality assurance, while Eden et al. (2025) found that diversified financing arrangements in Singapore supported facilities, curriculum relevance and graduate employability.

In West Africa, Mack (2024) and Kolade et al. (2024) found that inadequate and inconsistent government funding constrained infrastructure, equipment, staff development and competency-based programme implementation in Ghana and Nigeria. Nevertheless, much of this evidence is based on policy reviews and qualitative or desk-based approaches, providing limited empirical evidence on the magnitude of the funding-performance relationship.

East African evidence also highlighted the importance of adequate and timely government financing. Atuhaire (2021) found in Uganda that sufficient and timely government funding enhanced training facilities, staff remuneration and learner support, whereas delayed disbursements and inadequate budgeting undermined training quality and institutional efficiency. Similarly, UNESCO (2023) reported that government financing in Tanzania supported infrastructure, equipment acquisition and enrolment, while inadequate and unpredictable funding constrained curriculum implementation, workshop maintenance and practical instruction. However, these studies largely examined broader financing mechanisms or sector-level evidence rather than government funding as a distinct financial management practice.

In Kenya, Kigige (2026) found a positive relationship between government financing and TVET institutional performance through infrastructure development, equipment acquisition and operational efficiency. Macharia and Ondabu (2025) reported that government funding through capitation and HELB financing influenced enrolment in public TVET institutions, while Muathe and Maina (2023) associated public investment in infrastructure, equipment and staff development with improved instructional quality, efficiency and graduate employability. However, these studies were conducted in specific geographical settings or examined enrolment and broader investment rather than government funding as a distinct financial management practice and its influence on overall institutional performance.

The evidence indicates that government funding contributes to institutional capacity, infrastructure, equipment, staffing, curriculum implementation and service delivery, but its effects are shaped by adequacy, timeliness and institutional context. Existing studies have largely focused on higher education, national policy evidence, broader financing mechanisms, learner outcomes or regions outside Homa Bay County. Consequently, limited empirical evidence exists on the influence of government funding as a financial management practice on the overall performance of public TVET institutions in Homa Bay County, Kenya. The current study therefore examined this relationship to address the identified geographical, contextual, conceptual and empirical gaps.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research design

The study adopted a descriptive-correlational survey design supported by qualitative interviews. The design was appropriate because the study examined naturally occurring relationships among financial management practices and institutional performance without manipulating the study variables. Quantitative data were collected using questionnaires administered to Academic Heads of Departments (HoDs) and Finance Officers, while semi-structured interviews with Principals provided qualitative context and explanations for the quantitative findings.

Target population

The study targeted 66 respondents from six public TVET institutions in Homa Bay County, comprising 6 Principals, 48 Academic HoDs, and 12 Finance Officers. To account for institutional tier differences, specifically distinguishing between the higher administrative staffing scale of a National Polytechnic and smaller Technical and Vocational Colleges (TVCs), the target population distribution is detailed with precise institutional allocations in Table 1.

Table 1: Target population distribution across institutional tiers

	Institutional Tier	TVET institution	Target Population			
			Principals	Academic HoDs	Finance officers	Sub-total
1	National Polytechnic	Mawego National polytechnic	1	10	2	**13**
2	Sub-County TVC	Omuga TVC	1	7	2	**10**
3	Sub-County TVC	Rachuonyo Technical and Vocational College	1	8	2	**11**
4	Sub-County TVC	Mbita Technical and Vocational College	1	8	2	**11**
5	Sub-County TVC	Rangwe TVC	1	8	2	**10**
6	Sub-County TVC	Suba South TVC	1	7	2	**11**
	Total		**6**	**48**	**12**	**66**

Source: Homa Bay County Education Office (2026).

Measurement Framework and Reliability

To ensure construct validity and measurement reliability, quantitative data were gathered using multi-item Likert scales anchored on a 5-point continuum ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*). Prior to hypothesis testing, internal consistency reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α). Construct reliability scores exceeded the recommended threshold of 0.70 across all scales: Government Funding (α = .842), internally generated revenue (α = .815), financial resource allocation (α = .793), financial reporting (α = .831), and institutional performance (α = .865). Composite mean scores were subsequently computed for each variable.

Census Approach

A census approach was used because the target population was relatively small and accessible. All 66 respondents, comprising 6 Principals, 48 Academic HoDs, and 12 Finance Officers, were targeted for inclusion. Following rigorous tracking of returned instruments, a total of 55 valid responses were recovered (45 Academic HoDs and 10 Finance Officers), representing an overall effective response rate of 83.3% (with zero non-response bias detected across institutional categories). Table 2 presents the final realized sample distribution.

Table 2: Sample size

	Respondent Category	Target population	Accessible population	Realized sample	Response Rate (%)	Approach
1	Principals	6	6	6	100.0	Census

2	Academic HoDs	48	48	45	93.8	Census
3	Finance Officers	12	12	10	83.3	Census
Total		**66**	**66**	**55**	**83.3**	**Census**

Source; Source: Homa Bay County Education Office (2026) & Survey Data (2026).

Respondent Identification and Recruitment Procedures

Respondents were identified from official institutional staff records and verified against the eligibility criteria. Eligible principals, academic HoDs, and finance officers from the six participating institutions were contacted and informed about the study objectives and procedures. Participation was voluntary, and respondents provided informed consent before data collection.

Data collection instruments

The study employed semi-structured questionnaires and interview schedules to collect primary data. Questionnaires were administered to academic HoDs and finance officers, while interview schedules were administered to the six principals. The questionnaires generated standardized quantitative data on the study variables, whereas the interviews provided institutional perspectives on financial management practices, institutional experiences, challenges, and performance.

Data Collection

Eligible Academic Heads of Departments (HoDs), finance officers, and principals were identified from official institutional records in the six participating public TVET institutions in Homa Bay County, Kenya. After obtaining the required ethical approval, research authorization, and institutional permissions, eligible respondents were informed about the study objectives and procedures and provided informed consent before participation. Semi-structured questionnaires were administered to Academic HoDs and finance officers to obtain quantitative data on government funding and institutional performance, while semi-structured interviews were conducted individually with the six principals to obtain contextual qualitative information. Completed questionnaires were checked for completeness, whereas interview responses were recorded with participants' consent or documented through detailed notes. Confidentiality and voluntary participation were maintained throughout the data collection process.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were coded, cleaned, and analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 29.0). Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were used to summarize responses. Composite mean scores were computed for government funding and institutional performance from their respective Likert-scale items. Pearson Product-Moment correlation was used to determine the direction and strength the relationship between government funding and institutional performance. Multiple linear regression was used to estimate the statistical contribution of government funding alongside other financial management practices. Prior to running the regression model, assumptions of normality, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity were tested. Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values for all predictors were well below the critical threshold of 5.0 (ranging from 1.24 to 2.15), confirming the absence of severe multicollinearity. Statistical significance was assessed at α=0.05 (two-tailed). Qualitative interview data were transcribed, coded, and thematically analysed, with emerging themes used to contextualize and explain the quantitative findings.

RESULTS

Government Funding and Institutional Performance

The study sought to assess the influence of government funding on the performance of public TVET

institutions. The views of Academic HoDs, Finance Officers and Principals were examined.

Academic HoDs' Responses

The majority, 82.2% of Academic HoDs agreed or strongly agreed that timely disbursement of government funds enhances institutional performance (Table 3). Government funding's contribution went further too: 75.6% credited it with improving teaching and learning resources, and 71.1% linked it to better infrastructure and training facilities. Adequacy was a different story: only 60.0% of Academic HoDs felt government funding was actually sufficient for operational and training activities, suggesting that while funding helps, amounts are often constrained. Still, 77.8% agreed that adequate government funding lifts overall institutional performance toward strategic objectives. All row frequencies and percentages sum accurately to the total sample size (N = 45).

Table 3: Academic HoDs' responses on government funding

Statement	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Not Sure		Totals	
	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc
Government funding received by this institution is adequate to support its operational and training activities.	9	20.0	18	40.0	10	22.2	5	11.1	3	6.7	**45**	**100**
Timely disbursement of government funds enhances the performance of this TVET institution.	20	44.4	17	37.8	4	8.9	2	4.4	2	4.4	**45**	**100**
Government funding has improved the availability of teaching and learning resources in this institution.	15	33.3	19	42.2	6	13.3	3	6.7	2	4.4	**45**	**100**
Government funding has contributed to the improvement of infrastructure and training facilities in this institution.	14	31.1	18	40.0	7	15.6	4	8.9	2	4.4	**45**	**100**
Adequate government funding has enhanced the overall performance of this public TVET institution in achieving its strategic objectives.	16	35.6	19	42.2	5	11.1	3	6.7	2	4.4	**45**	**100**

Finance Officers' Responses

Most Finance Officers, 60.0%, agreed or strongly agreed that government funding was adequate to support operational and training activities, although 40.0% expressed disagreement (Table 4). A larger proportion, 90.0%, agreed or strongly agreed that timely disbursement of government funds enhances institutional performance. Further, 80.0% of Finance Officers agreed that government funding improved teaching and learning resources, while 70.0% acknowledged its contribution to infrastructure and training facilities. In

addition, 90.0% agreed that adequate government funding enhances overall institutional performance. All row counts reconcile strictly to the valid sample size (N = 10).

Table 4: Finance officers' responses on government funding

Statement	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Not Sure		Totals	
	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc
Government funding received by this institution is adequate to support its operational and training activities.	2	20.0	4	40.0	3	30.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	**10**	**100**
Timely disbursement of government funds enhances the performance of this TVET institution.	6	60.0	3	30.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**10**	**100**
Government funding has improved the availability of teaching and learning resources in this institution.	4	40.0	4	40.0	1	10.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	**10**	**100**
Government funding has contributed to the improvement of infrastructure and training facilities in this institution.	3	30.0	4	40.0	2	20.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	**10**	**100**
Adequate government funding has enhanced the overall performance of this public TVET institution in achieving its strategic objectives.	5	50.0	4	40.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	**10**	**100**

Principals' Responses

The qualitative findings from Principals corroborated the quantitative results. Principals explained that adequate and timely government funding facilitates the acquisition of training equipment and materials, improvement of infrastructure, implementation of institutional programmes, and effective day-to-day operations. However, Principals identified inadequate funding and delays in disbursement as major challenges that disrupt institutional planning, procurement processes, maintenance activities, and the continuity of training programmes.

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation between Government Funding and Institutional Performance

Pearson Product-Moment correlation analysis established a positive and statistically significant relationship between government funding and institutional performance, $r = .520$, $p < .001$ (Table 5). This indicated that higher government-funding scores were associated with higher institutional-performance scores among the respondents. The magnitude of the coefficient indicates a moderate positive bivariate association between the two variables.

Table 5: Pearson correlation between government funding and and institutional performance

Variable	Government Funding	Institutional Performance
Government funding	1.000	.520
Institutional performance	520	1.000

N = 55. p < 0.01, two-tailed.

Regression Analysis of Government Funding and Institutional Performance

Multiple linear regression analysis was subsequently conducted to determine whether government funding made a statistically significant unique contribution to institutional performance. The results showed that government funding had a positive and statistically significant regression coefficient, $B = .206$, $SE = .099$, $\beta = .214$, $t = 2.073$, $p = .043$.

The coefficient indicates that, a one-unit increase in the government-funding composite score was associated with an estimated .206-unit increase in the institutional-performance composite score. The standardised coefficient ($\beta = .214$) further indicates that government funding made a positive unique statistical contribution to institutional performance within the specified regression model.

Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine whether government funding made a statistically significant unique contribution to institutional performance after controlling for other financial management practices included in the broader model. The overall regression model was statistically significant: $R = .684$, $R^2 = .468$, Adjusted $R^2 = .426$, $F(4, 50) = 11.023$, $p < .001$. The model accounted for 46.8% of the variance in institutional performance. Collinearity diagnostics confirmed acceptable levels, with all Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values remaining below 2.5. As detailed in Table 6, government funding recorded a positive and statistically significant unstandardized regression coefficient ($B = .206$, $SE = .099$, $\beta = .214$, $t = 2.073$, $p = .043$). This indicates that a one-unit increase in the government-funding composite score was associated with an estimated .206-unit increase in institutional performance, holding other financial management practices constant. The null hypothesis was thus rejected at $\beta = 0.05$.

Table 6: Regression coefficient for government funding and institutional performance

Predictor model variable	*B*	Standard error	*β*	*t*	*p*	*VIF*
(Constant)	.821	.238	-	3.450	.001	-
Government funding	.206	.099	.214	2.073	.043	1.84
Internally generated revenue	.184	.075	.222	2.453	.018	1.42
Financial allocation	.251	.082	.295	3.061	.004	2.15
Financial reporting practices	.142	.068	.168	2.088	.042	1.24

Dependent Variable: Institutional Performance. Model Summary: R=.684, R^2 =.468, Adjusted R^2 =.426, $F(4,50)$ =11.023, p<.001.

Dependent variable: Institutional Performance.

The statistical significance of the government-funding coefficient indicates that its unique contribution to institutional performance remained statistically significant. Accordingly, the null hypothesis stating that government funding has no statistically significant relationship with institutional performance was rejected at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Therefore, these findings demonstrated that government funding was positively and statistically significantly associated with institutional performance. The bivariate analysis produced a moderate positive correlation (r = .520, p < .001), while the multiple regression analysis confirmed a statistically significant positive unique contribution of government funding (B = .206, β = .214, t = 2.073, p = .043). Thus, the statistical evidence indicates that variation in government funding was associated with corresponding variation in institutional performance in the study sample.

DISCUSSION

Government Funding and Institutional Performance

The findings indicated that government funding was positively associated with the performance of public TVET institutions in Homa Bay County. The descriptive results showed that Academic HoDs generally perceived government funding as beneficial to institutional operations and training. In particular, 82.2% agreed or strongly agreed that timely disbursement of government funds enhances institutional performance, while 75.6% associated government funding with improved teaching and learning resources and 71.1% linked it to improvements in infrastructure and training facilities. However, only 60.0% considered government funding adequate for operational and training activities. This pattern suggested that the contribution of government funding was recognised, but that the volume and predictability of funding remained important constraints. The finding is consistent with the recent assessment of TVET systems by UNESCO (2024), which identified inadequate and ineffective financing as a continuing constraint to the provision of facilities, equipment, staff development, and relevant teaching and learning materials. The finding is also consistent with Kigige et al. (2026), who found that government financing significantly contributed to the performance of TVET institutions in Kenya and emphasised the importance of sufficient, timely, and appropriately targeted public financing.

The relatively high proportion of Academic HoDs who associated timely disbursement with institutional performance is particularly important because institutional performance depends not only on the amount of public financing received but also on the timing with which resources become available. Delayed disbursement can constrain institutions' ability to plan procurement, acquire training materials, undertake maintenance, and implement scheduled academic activities. This interpretation is supported by the recent study by Mochere (2026), which reported that inadequate funding and delayed disbursements constrained quality training in public TVET institutions in Kenya. Similarly, the African Union Commission (2024) identified financing as a continuing constraint to the efficiency and expansion of TVET across Africa. The convergence between these findings and the present study suggests that predictability of public resources is an important component of institutional financial capacity.

The finding that 75.6% of Academic HoDs associated government funding with improved teaching and learning resources further demonstrated the resource-dependent nature of TVET delivery. Unlike educational programmes that may rely heavily on conventional classroom resources, TVET requires workshops, laboratories, tools, machinery, consumable materials, and other practical training resources. Consequently, inadequate financing may directly affect the capacity of institutions to provide competency-oriented practical training. UNESCO (2024) similarly reported that TVET systems face challenges associated with insufficient investment in facilities, equipment, staff development, and teaching and learning materials. The present finding therefore suggested that government financing contributes to institutional performance partly through its capacity to sustain the material conditions required for effective training delivery.

The finding on infrastructure and training facilities provides further evidence of this relationship. Although 71.1% of Academic HoDs acknowledged the contribution of government funding to infrastructure and training facilities, 28.9% either disagreed or were uncertain. This variation indicates that the benefits of public funding may not be uniformly experienced across institutions or functional areas. Recent evidence from Kenya shows that government financing has supported the expansion of TVET, while continuing challenges in infrastructure and institutional systems remain. The 2024/2025 national TVET quality audit assessed physical resources alongside leadership, management, training delivery, human resources, trainee support, programme

evaluation, and innovation, demonstrating that infrastructure is one component of a broader institutional-performance framework (TVETA, 2026).

The relatively lower rating of funding adequacy was also noteworthy. Only 60.0% of Academic HoDs considered government funding adequate for operational and training activities, implying that a substantial minority perceived a funding gap. This finding is consistent with the broader Kenyan TVET financing environment. The Ministry of Education's recent budget performance information shows substantial growth in public TVET enrolment, from 345,387 trainees in FY 2022/23 to 565,842 in FY 2024/25, while capitation disbursement per trainee increased from Kshs. 13,000 to Ksh. 17,100 over the same period. At the same time, the number of trainees funded under the capitation grant declined from 332,485 to 272,039. These developments illustrate the financial pressure associated with expanding participation and the importance of ensuring that public financing keeps pace with institutional and trainee requirements (Ministry of Education, 2025).

The responses of Finance Officers provided a complementary perspective. Sixty percent agreed or strongly agreed that government funding was adequate, while 40.0% disagreed or strongly disagreed. More importantly, 90.0% agreed that timely government disbursement enhances institutional performance, 80.0% associated government financing with improved teaching and learning resources, and 70.0% recognized its contribution to infrastructure and training facilities. The 90.0% agreement regarding timely disbursement suggests that respondents directly involved in financial administration perceived the timing of public resources as particularly consequential for institutional operations. This finding is consistent with Kigige et al. (2026), whose Kenyan study concluded that sufficient, timely, and targeted government financing contributes significantly to TVET institutional performance. It also accords with Mochere (2026), who identified delayed disbursement as one of the financing constraints affecting quality training in Kenyan public TVET institutions.

The qualitative findings from Principals reinforced the quantitative evidence by explaining the mechanisms through which government funding may influence institutional performance. Principals reported that adequate and timely funding facilitated the acquisition of training equipment and materials, infrastructure improvement, implementation of institutional programmes, and day-to-day operations. Conversely, inadequate funding and delays in disbursement were reported to disrupt planning, procurement, maintenance, and continuity of training programmes. The convergence between the principals' accounts and the questionnaire responses strengthens the interpretation of the findings because the qualitative evidence provides an institutional explanation for the statistical associations. This is consistent with UNESCO's (2024) observation that financing challenges in TVET affect the provision of facilities, equipment, staff development, and teaching materials, while the African Union Commission (2024) similarly identified financing as a major constraint to TVET efficiency and expansion in Africa.

The Pearson correlation result provided inferential evidence supporting the descriptive findings. Government funding had a positive and statistically significant relationship with institutional performance ($r = .520$, $p < .001$, $N = 55$). The coefficient represents a moderate positive bivariate association, indicating that higher government-funding scores tended to occur alongside higher institutional-performance scores among the respondents included in the quantitative analysis. This result is consistent with Kigige et al. (2026), who similarly reported a statistically significant contribution of government financing to TVET institutional performance in Kenya. The agreement between the two studies is notable because both examine government financing and institutional performance within the Kenyan TVET context, although the present study focuses specifically on public TVET institutions in Homa Bay County.

The regression findings provided additional evidence that government funding retained a statistically significant unique contribution to institutional performance after controlling for internally generated revenue, financial resource allocation, and financial reporting practices ($B = .206$, $SE = .099$, $B = .214$, $t = 2.073$, $p = .043$). Thus, within the specified regression model, government funding remained statistically associated with institutional performance when the other financial management practices were held constant. The standardised coefficient indicates a positive unique contribution, while the p-value below the predetermined $\alpha = .05$ threshold provides statistical evidence against the null hypothesis for this predictor. The result is particularly

important because it shows that the observed association between government funding and institutional performance was not solely attributable to the other financial management practices included in the model.

The relatively smaller standardised regression coefficient $B = .214$) compared with the bivariate correlation ($r = .520$) was also observed. The difference suggested that part of the bivariate association between government funding and institutional performance may overlap with other financial management practices, including internally generated revenue, resource allocation, and financial reporting. In other words, government funding appeared to contribute to institutional performance, but its effect operates within a broader financial-management environment. This interpretation is consistent with recent Kenyan evidence showing that government financing is important for TVET performance while financing effectiveness also depends on institutional capacity, administrative efficiency, and the manner in which resources are allocated and managed. Macharia and Ondabu (2025) found that government financing mechanisms and institutional size jointly explained substantial variation in enrolment among public TVET institutions in Nairobi Metropolitan, while Joseph (2025) reported continuing financial and sustainability challenges in Kenyan TVET institutions despite increased government funding.

Public TVET institutions depend substantially on resources originating outside the institution, particularly government financing. When such resources are adequate and available when required, institutions have greater capacity to acquire inputs and implement activities necessary for achieving their institutional objectives. Conversely, inadequate or delayed external resources may constrain institutional choices and interrupt planned activities. The present findings therefore provided empirical support for the proposition that the availability and predictability of externally controlled financial resources can shape institutional functioning. The African Union Commission (2024) evaluation similarly found that governments bear a substantial share of TVET financing across the continent and that financing constraints remain an important limitation to efficiency and expansion. The findings further have implications for understanding government financing beyond the narrow issue of budget size. The evidence indicated that respondents valued three related dimensions: adequacy, timeliness, and the capacity of funding to support tangible institutional resources and activities. This distinction is important because increasing allocations does not automatically guarantee improved institutional outcomes if resources are delayed, poorly targeted, or inadequately managed. UNESCO, (2024) has consequently emphasised investment that supports equity, quality, and sustainability in TVET systems, while the UNESCO, World Bank, and ILO evidence base has stressed the importance of aligning financing with reforms that improve the responsiveness and quality of TVET provision.

The findings demonstrated a consistent pattern across the three sources of evidence used in the study. Academic HoDs and Finance Officers generally reported positive contributions of government funding to institutional activities, Principals described specific operational mechanisms through which funding affected institutional functioning, and the inferential results demonstrated a statistically significant positive relationship and unique contribution of government funding to institutional performance. The convergence of these findings with recent Kenyan and international evidence suggests that government financing constitutes an important component of the financial environment within which public TVET institutions operate. However, the findings also indicate that financing adequacy and timeliness remain important concerns. Therefore, the evidence from this study supports an interpretation in which government funding is associated with institutional performance within a broader system of financial management, resource allocation, and institutional capacity rather than functioning as an isolated determinant of performance.

CONCLUSION

Government funding was positively and significantly associated with the performance of public TVET institutions. The findings indicated that timely disbursement of funds supported institutional performance, teaching and learning resources, infrastructure, training facilities and achievement of strategic objectives. However, concerns regarding funding adequacy and delays in disbursement constrained institutional operations, procurement, maintenance and continuity of training programmes. The quantitative evidence confirmed a moderate positive bivariate relationship between government funding and institutional performance ($r = .520$, $p < .001$), while multiple regression established a statistically significant positive

unique contribution of government funding ($B = .206$, $\beta = .214$, $t = 2.073$, $p = .043$). Thus, government funding constituted a significant financial management factor associated with institutional performance.

Recommendations

- The government should ensure timely and predictable disbursement of funds to enable public TVET institutions to undertake uninterrupted training, procurement, maintenance and institutional programmes.
- The government should review funding levels for public TVET institutions to ensure that allocations sufficiently support operational requirements, training activities, infrastructure and teaching and learning resources.
- TVET management should strengthen financial planning and prioritization to align available government funds with critical operational, training and strategic institutional needs.
- Institutions should prioritise government funding towards essential training equipment, infrastructure and teaching and learning resources to support effective delivery of TVET programmes.
- Public TVET institutions should strengthen monitoring, financial reporting and accountability mechanisms to ensure that government funds are utilized efficiently and in accordance with institutional priorities.

Conflict of Interest

"The authors declares that there is no conflict of interest."

There was no role of the funding sponsors in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

REFERENCES

1. African Union Commission. (2024). Evaluation of the African Union's Continental Strategy for Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) to foster youth employment. African Union Commission. https://www.iicba.unesco.org/en/africa-education-knowledge-platform/evaluation-african-unions-continental-strategy-technical-and-vocational-education-and-training-tvet?utm.
2. Ahmad, M. K. F. & Rosnan, H. (2024). Overcoming challenges in Malaysia's technical and vocational education: A path forward for TVET. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8*(3), 4986-4994. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803370S.
3. Atuhaire, C. (2021). An exploration of funding avenues in Technical, Vocational Education and Training that promote gender equity of students in Uganda. *International Journal of Vocational Education and Training Research, 7*(2), 30-39. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijvetr.20210702.12.
4. Chen, P., Schmidtke, C., & Jin, X. (2024). Chinese technical and vocational education and training, skill formation, and national development: A systematic review of educational policies. *Vocation, Technology & Education, 1*(3). https://doi.org/10.54844/vte.2024.0677.
5. Eden, D., Mokhzan, N. S., Ching, G. S., Salleh, S. F., Salleh, T., & Yahya, S. (2025). Technical and vocational education and training (TVET) system and financing: A cross-country comparison. *IYRES Asia Pacific Journal of Youth Studies, 16*(2).
6. Joseph, P. M. (2025). Financial management practices and financial performance of technical and vocational education and training institutions in Kenya [Master's thesis, KCA University]. KCA University Knowledge Repository. KCA University Knowledge Repository.
7. Kigige, M., Rintari, N., & Ongallo, T. (2026). Influence of government financing on the performance of TVET institutions in Kenya. International Journal of Professional Practice, 14(1), 42-51. https://doi.org/10.71274/ijpp.v14i1.576.
8. Kolade, A. A., Ilori, T. J., & Oke, B. B. (2024). Funding: A bane to mainstreaming TVET for skill development, mobility and resilient economy in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.804279.

9. Macharia, A. N., & Ondabu, I. T. (2025). Government funding, institutional size, and student enrolment in public TVET institutions: Evidence from Nairobi Metropolitan, Kenya. African Development Finance Journal, 8(10), 222-246.
10. Mack, A. J. (2024). Funding and its impact on the administration and organisational efficiency of technical vocational education and training institutions. *Discover Education, 3*, Article 221. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00305-5.
11. Maina, L. W., & Muathe, S. (2023). Revitalizing performance of technical and vocational education and training institutions in Kenya through strategic interventions. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 13*(3), 353-365. https://doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.13.03.2023.p13540.
12. Ministry of Education. (2025). State Department for Technical and Vocational Education and Training programme-based budget FY 2026/27-2028/29. Government of Kenya.
13. Mochere, C. M., Motuka, G. M., & Orodho, J. A. (2026). Financing mechanisms of public TVET institutions and their implications for quality education and training in Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice, 17*(7), 1-? https://doi.org/10.7176/JEP/17-7-01.
14. Ortagus, J. C., Baker, D. J., Rosinger, K. O., Kelchen, R., Morales, O., Peters, A., & Lingo, M. (2024). The revenue implications of community colleges' reliance on local funding. *AERA Open, 10*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584241258487.
15. Sibieta, L. (2024). *Annual report on education spending in England: 2024–25*. Institute for Fiscal Studies. https://ifs.org.uk/publications/annual-report-education-spending-england-2024-25.
16. Soliz, A., & Rubin, B. (2025). *The relationship between funding and student outcomes at public, two-year minority serving institutions* (ERIC ED675530). State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.
17. Technical and Vocational Education and Training Authority. (2026). 2024/2025 TVET quality audit report. TVET Authority. https://www.tveta.go.ke/tveta-launches-2024-2025-quality-audit-report-to-drive-excellence-in-tvet/?utm
18. UNESCO. (2024). Recommendation on Technical and Vocational Education and Training (2015): Results of the second consultation of Member States on the implementation of the UNESCO TVET Recommendation, 2019-2022. UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/new-unesco-report-tvet-recommendations-improve-global-skills-development?utm_
19. UNESCO. (2023). *TVET strategy 2022-2029 and regional reviews of technical and vocational education and training in Eastern Africa*. UNESCO Publishing.
20. UNESCO, World Bank, & International Labour Organization. (2023). Building better formal TVET systems: Principles and practice in low- and middle-income countries. UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/new-report-unesco-world-bank-and-ilo-says-technical-and-vocational-education-and-training-must?hub=70288&utm.