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ABSTRACT

Education is perceived as a cornerstone of economic, social and political advancement of a society. Thus, financing an educational programme is an important aspect of national development. However, the government of Kenya has found it increasingly difficult to finance the entire provision of education. Over the last couple of years, the emphases have been on cost-sharing and looking for alternative source of funds.

This study to examines the viability of the alternative sources of funds initiated by secondary schools and the problems experienced in using them as alternative sources of funds for supplementing forthcoming funds from the government, the parents and the community.

The study adopted an exploratory approach using a descriptive survey design. It was based on a random sample of 10 secondary schools in Gichugu division. A descriptive analysis of the data from questionnaires supplied to principals, Board of Governors (BoG) members and observation checklist found out the problems the schools experienced in soliciting funds from various sources. The study also examined the viability of such sources.

It was found out that fees paid by students formed the main source of revenue for schools’ recurrent expenditure. Late payments of fees, parents’ inability to pay and poverty within the community were the
main limitations to effective funds acquisition. The problems with the alternative sources of funds rendered them unreliable and non-viable for effective running of the schools.

The researcher concluded that for there to be effectively run schools, there had to be financial back up. Alternative sources therefore became a chief concern to educators. All schools' activities were to some degree influenced by the amount of funds a school was able to muster.

There were a few recommendations that were made. The researcher recommended that schools diversify their sources of funds and the need for all stakeholders in education coming together in formulating policies to stream line funding and revenue correction in all schools. The researcher also recommended that there should be further research carried out on issues relating to funding of education through the Constituency Development Fund (C.D.F) and bursaries.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is an introduction to the study. It contains the objectives of the study, background to the problem and what the research questions were. Assumptions and limitations of the study are also stated in this chapter. Finally, the purpose and significance of the study is also stated.

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The Human capital theory of development, developed by Schultz in 1961 proves that formal education is highly instrumental in economic development, i.e. education has a direct link to economic productivity. Many studies of economic growth in developed countries confirm the importance of investing in education. Meir (1976), confirms this by saying:

Education is now the craze and one cannot open a journal or read a speech concerned with development without being told of the high returns “investment in human beings” yields (Meir, 1976).

This being the case, there is needed to finance an educational programme especially secondary education. The most critical manpower requirement tends to be for people with secondary education who can be managers, administrators, professional technicians, or sub-professional
technical personnel. Different countries finance their education in different ways. In America, the need for funds has risen greatly, and increasing enrolments, accelerating costs, coupled with lagging income have created serious financial problems (Henderson and Henderson, 1997). Owing to these financial problems, Kintzes (1987) reveals that financial assistance from business and industry is a growing scheme in the United States. Money saving plans for managing education, including inspired systems for mass delivery of course materials via satellites, and other labour-saving devices are emerging.

In Britain, owing to the prevailing economic recession, public education which had been solely financed by the British government is now a joint concern of the government, industry, parents and the educational institutions themselves. These experiences show that financing education is a problem everywhere in the world which calls for a careful planning and use of existing resources, and creativity in obtaining new sources of funds.

In Mauritius, Education is free from primary to university level. The education sector gets funds from government through the national budget within the Ministry of Education. The budget for primary and secondary education sector is prepared by the office of the Chief Finance Officer of the Ministry of Education.
In Zimbabwe, the government schools are funded by the Ministry of Education. Aided schools receive income essentially on the basis of the number of students, the proportion of boarders and other special features that they may have. These schools may receive income from other sources and generally maintain their own financial accounting and auditing system.

Financial education in Kenya is on the basis of cost–sharing between the government, parents and communities. This is according to the recommendation of the “Presidential working party on Education and manpower Training for the next Decade and Beyond” (The Kamunge Report), (GoK 1988). The education sector is already getting a 136 percent much larger share of national resources than most other sectors. Education accounts for 38 percent of total government recurrent expenditures and over 6 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP) in Kenya. These shares are significantly higher than in other countries with income levels comparable to Kenya. The challenge to address the problems of poor access, inequity, low quality and heavy household financial burdens calls for all possible ways to look for other alternative sources of finance (GoK 2003).
In Kenya, as in many less industrialized countries, the funding of social service such as education is increasingly outstripping available government revenue. At the same time local government institutions seem to lack the capability and the capacity to generate adequate additional funds. This has been ascertained by the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST) report of the sector review and development.

The priorities and commitment of the Government in the provision of education is reflected in the relatively large and consisted resource allocations and expenditure since independence. Even with the country’s depressed economic performance and resource constraints, education remains one of the country’s highest development priority. During the period 1996/97 to 2000/01, the Ministry’s budget ranged between 30-39 per cent of the total Government recurrent expenditure. Table one(1) below shows the recurrent expenditure by level, 1996/97-2000/01 in Ksh Million
## Table I. Recurrent Expenditure by level, 1996/97-2000/01 in Ksh. Million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ksh.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Ksh</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Ksh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Adm</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>123.1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>16,719</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>24,742</td>
<td>58.31</td>
<td>24,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>6,766</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>10,170</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>11,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Education</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>446.6</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>613.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Education</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1,400.30</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1,418.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic Education</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>4,474</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>5,149.40</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>5,094.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>124.8</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ksh. Millions</td>
<td>30,070.20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>42,434.80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44,334.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provisional
As shown in Table, the overall expenditure of the Ministry expanded by 60.8 per cent from Ksh.30.1 billion in 1996/97 to Ksh.48.4 billion in 2000/2001. It is evident that the secondary sub-sector has continued to consume the second largest share of the overall recurrent expenditure with an expenditure amounting to Ksh.12.6 billion during the same period.

In Kenya, there are a number of factors that have contributed to the growth of recurrent expenditure on education. High enrolments at all levels have been a major factor. Education enrolment has expanded rapidly since independence. Table two (2) below shows a projected demand for education, 1997-2001.

**TABLE II. PROJECTED DEMAND FOR EDUCATION 1997-2001 (MN)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Age Years</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>6-13</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary School</td>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6-22</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(National Development Plan 1997-2001)
In the meantime, the average teachers' salaries have been increasing. Following the 1997 teachers salary review, the expenditure on teachers salary for both primary and secondary levels rose by 49.4 per cent from Kshs. 23.5 billion in 1996/97 to Kshs. 35.1 billion in 1997/98; and continued to rise gradually up to Kshs. 48.5 billion in 2002/2003 (GoK, 2003). These increases in average teachers salaries have caused the total salary bill to increase faster than the number of teachers. Provision of administration and professional services is another item which has led to high government expenditure on education. Until 2002, teacher salaries accounted for more than 95 percent of the recurrent expenditure at the primary and secondary levels. This meant there were almost no public resources remaining for other school inputs such as learning materials and textbooks (World Bank report 2003).

Similarly, the cost of education tends to be beyond the economic means of the citizens. At the secondary level, households are expected to pay fees which are often relatively high in relation to the household income. At this level, households are required to pay for all non-salary cost items. At this level therefore, secondary schooling expenditure per pupil are considerably high at Ksh.9,744 per year (GoK, 2003). This represents 65.4 per cent of the average per capital consumption expenditure of the households. As shown in the Table 3 below, fees represented about 67
percent of the total cost to households. Non-tuition items comprising uniforms, transport, boarding fees, and school development levies account for about 23 percent of the total cost. The relative burden of secondary schooling expenses is even greater on the poor considering the poorest quintile have to pay more than two times as much as their per capital consumption expenditure which amounts to Ksh.3346 (GoK, 2003).

In the light of the fact that 56 per cent of the Kenyan population live below the poverty line, it is obvious that the cost of sending a child to secondary school is clearly out of reach for the majority of Kenyans. This burden is compounded where households have to support more than one child in school. Table 3 below shows the average annual household expenditure on schooling per pupil, by expenditure category, schooling level, and percent capital expenditure quintile.
Table III. Average annual household expenditure (Ksh.) on schooling per pupil, by expenditure category, schooling level, and per capital expenditure quintile, Kenya, 1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Expenditure Category</th>
<th>Poorest</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Richest</th>
<th>All quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Fees</td>
<td>4760</td>
<td>5883</td>
<td>6137</td>
<td>6507</td>
<td>7671</td>
<td>6534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harambee</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,855</td>
<td>8,903</td>
<td>9,947</td>
<td>11,838</td>
<td>9,744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Annual household per capita expenditure per capita

| Per cap.Cons.Exp. | 3346 | 7036 | 10634 | 16396 | 41117 | 14897 |

Source: WMS 11, 1994
What all these amount to is an urgent need to think of additional ways of funding education. The World Bank reports:

There is need to put in place clear and transparent mechanisms for exempting the poorest students from paying fees in secondary schools and make available to them bursaries and scholarships that help their families to pay the other costs of schooling (World Bank 2003).

These additional sources will include parents, community members and schools' initiated sources of funds. The Report of Presidential Working Party on Education and Manpower Training for the Next Decade and Beyond (1988) notes that already parents provide a great amount of finances on the education budget. The report maintains that building classrooms and teachers' houses has been the responsibility of parents for a long period. World Bank (1983) has also found that sources other than government already account for a big share of money for running educational institutions. The bank notes that in secondary education 69 percent of the total cost was catered for by these sources. These sources include fund raising, farming activities, donations, sponsors and the local government institutions.

According to the report on the presidential working party, the government will continue to finance the provision of educational administration and professional services while communities, parents and
sponsors provide physical facilities, books and supplementary readings, stationery and consumable materials.

What all these amount to is an urgent need to think of additional ways of funding education and finding out the problems with the existing sources. There is, therefore, a need to examine some possible strategies of raising more funds for secondary education or else many children may be forced to drop out because of fees as had been highlighted by the permanent secretary in the ministry of education Prof. Karega Mutahi addressing parents, teachers and students at Kisima Girls high school in Samburu District.

... Priority on teachers distribution will be given to arid and semi arid areas ... while the increase of secondary school student was inevitable, the numbers may not be as dramatic as expected as many children may be forced to drop out because of fees. (Daily Nation Monday September 27th 2004).

This calls for every strategy possible to examine the problems with other alternative sources of funds for secondary schools. Schools in Gichugu Division, Kirinyaga district have employed a number of ways to look for alternative source of funds. Sources of school funds can be classified into three major categories namely: Parent, government, and community groups. The contributions by parents become necessary due to the inability of the government to meet the recurrent expenditure of the
school. This is so in all schools in Gichugu division, Kirinyaga District. There is a problem with the parents’ contributions because not all parents are able to make the same contributions, whether financial, or in kind on time to the school. Income levels vary considerably within the division and the entire district. Difficulties with payment do not only cause the students affected to drop out of school but also constrain the schools’ ability to provide the necessary learning facilities.

A number of schools in the division have also engaged in several money generating programmes to raise funds to help them run more effectively. Such programmes include: Farming, workshops, such as craft work or carpentry and creative activities such as concerts. The problem with this source is that there is always a danger of trying to undertake too many money generating activities at the same time and deviating from the main goal of a school, that is providing academic excellence. The schools in the division have also tried to generate funds through school facilities. Ways of doing this include, hiring schooling facilities to the community, for example halls, vehicles, and playgrounds. However, there are no ready customers throughout the year.

Other sources of funds include the community, donations from foundation bodies and the students. The students have been involved in generating funds through such activities as agriculture, poultry keeping,
pigs and cattle, making crafts and bee keeping. They may also be engaged in fund raising activities like music, dance, drama and jumble sales.

Though effort to generate supplementary funds for schools in Gichugu Division, Kirinyaga district are evident they still suffer inadequate funds and severe lack of necessary learning facilities is evident. On the other hand, many students drop out of school due to lack of funds. This calls for every strategy possible to look for alternative sources of funds and examining the problems with such sources in view of making them more viable and reliable.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

As evident in the background, there is shortage of funds to run secondary schools. The funds coming from the parents in form of fees are inadequate. The schools have been forced to look for other alternative sources of funds. Therefore, from the preceding realization there was every need to explore other alternative sources of funds for schools to supplement the parents in their endeavors to providing access to secondary education. However, this has not solved the problem of inadequate funds for schools because such sources are coupled with many problems. It is for this reason that the study was set to explore the
viability and the problem with these other alternative sources of funds for secondary schools.

1.3 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to investigate the viability and problems with other alternative sources of funds for secondary schools in Gichugu Division, Kirinyaga District.

1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study was guided by the following objectives:

i. To determine the viability of other alternative sources of funds for secondary schools in Gichugu Division in Kirinyaga District.

ii. To determine the problems with other alternative source of funds for secondary school in Gichugu Division in Kirinyaga District.

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

i. What are the other alternative sources of funds for secondary schools?

ii. How viable are these other alternative sources of funds for secondary schools in Gichugu Division, Kirinyaga District.
iii. What are the problems with these other alternative sources of funds for Secondary schools.

1.6 ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

It was the assumption of the study that:

1. There are financial problems that hinder the running of secondary schools, and

2. Secondary schools that have other alternative sources of funds have better learning/teaching resources.

1.7 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

- The study was demarcated to only a selected sample of schools in Kirinyaga District.

- It was not possible to cover the opinion of parents and other stakeholders in these schools because tracing them would require considerable time, resources and other logistics.

- In respect to the instruments used to collect data, the study only used questionnaires and an observation schedule.
1.8 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The study was limited to only one division in Kirinyaga District, which is a rural setting. For a more conclusive results, urban areas should also be studied. However, this was not possible due to time and financial constraints.

1.9 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study was based on Classical Liberal Theory of Equal Opportunity that asserts that each person is born with a given amount of capacity, which to a large extent is inherited and cannot be substantially changed. Thus educational system should be designed so as to remove barriers of any nature (economic, gender, geographic) that prevent bright students from lower economic backgrounds from taking advantage of inborn talents which accelerate them to social promotion. Liberal progressivists like Horance Mann termed education as "the great Equalizers" main instrument, which would enhance life chances of those born into humble circumstances. The theory demands for further going through education at primary and secondary level to which access would be determined on the basis of individuals' merit and not on social backgrounds.

There is spread belief that by removing economic barriers and making more places available in upper primary and secondary education, and by
increasing the high length of attendance in the common school, ideal conditions could be created to implement the vision of equal opportunity, where everybody has access to the kind and amount of education that suits his/her inherited capacity. In the past, a great deal of weight has been attached to education as a vehicle of equalization and it has generally been assumed that increased public spending on education, which contributes to this end reduces dropout, repetition and absenteeism of poor children.

In developing countries where inequalities of educational provisions are severe, it may be desirable, on equity and efficiency grounds, to pursue the goal of equal distribution of educational opportunities. Inequality of participation means that the upper income families whose children are far more likely to complete the primary and secondary school cycle or enroll in higher education, disproportionately enjoy the benefits of education. Psacharopoulos and Woodhall, (1985) assert that increased dropouts, absenteeism and repetition occasioned by the financial inability of poor families to sustain their children in schools undoubtedly affect the internal efficiency of the public schools.

For example, in Kenya, the introduction of “Free” education (education without user charges) in January 2003 by the National Alliance Rainbow Coalition (NARC) government has raised the total primary school
enrolment from 5.8 million to about 7.1 million children. Before the introduction of the "free" programme, excessive fees, exorbitant user charges and other school related costs had locked over 3.2 million children of school-going age out of primary school.

In Kenya, the (NARC) government has made secondary education highly subsidized in a bid to enhance access to education. However, with the introduction of cost sharing in education against the background of high poverty levels in the country, many parents may not be able to enroll and sustain their children in secondary schools given the rising costs of education. Therefore, for the equity consideration, it practically becomes impossible to ignore the fact that unequal participation in education will, in the long run, worsen the status of the poor and the vulnerable groups (Njeru and Orodho 2003).

This theory was found relevant for this study because cost-sharing puts more burden on poor families who cannot afford to keep their children in school, hence withdrawing them prematurely. This impacts negatively on education.

1.10 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework was adapted from the 'cost effectiveness model' developed by Alkin (1970). Alkin had used the model to discuss
how to evaluate instructional programme in schools. The model consists of systems, students' inputs, financial and manipulatable characteristics and their outcomes. The external systems in this case refer to numerous social systems within which the school is placed. Students' input refer to the nature of students entering the programme from the social system to be evaluated. Financial inputs refer to financial resources that have been made available for carrying out the programme. Manipulatable characteristics are the way in which financial inputs have been utilized within the combination with the student input. Lastly, the outcomes means changes that have been with the necessary instructional facilities and the impact brought to systems external to the school.

![Diagram]

**Figure I**

The cost-effectiveness model has been modified slightly to suit this study as follows: Finances from without the school and those from within forms
the financial inputs of the school. The schools' financial inputs at the manipulation characteristics stage get utilized to provide teaching-learning facilities. The quantity and quality of educational facilities so provided in return get utilized by both pupils and teachers in the school to improve the quality of graduates emanating from the school.

1.11 DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Financial allocation:** Refers to the amount of money assigned for each item of expenditure. Thus, financial allocation to education is the amount of money assigned to education expenditure.

**Recurrent expenditure:** Refers to the expenditure, which occurs every year in the budget such as staff salaries, general administration, stationery repairs, etc.

**Principal:** Refers to either a man or woman head of a secondary school. He/she is the secondary school chief executive with administrative, instructive, supervisory, financial management and other leadership roles.

**Facilities:** Refers to the school plant and equipment such as buildings, instructional materials, etc.
Secondary education: Applies to the post primary education or instruction which covers form one to form four.

1.12 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

It was hoped that the findings of the study would have both theoretical and practical implications for the future of secondary education in Gichugu division, Kirinyaga District and the country at large. Theoretically, the study is expected to contribute to the advancement of knowledge about financing secondary education in Kenya. It is also expected to highlight possible solutions to the financial problems, which interfere with effective teaching learning process.

The study would also have practical significance because it offers recommendations for effective financing of secondary education in order to achieve qualitative and quantitative aspect of education. The study is hoped to have immediate benefits to the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST) in the formulation of future policies aimed at financing education and reducing public expenditure on education. In a similar vein, results of this study would enlighten educationalists on additional sources of funds to ensure effective learning and teaching. The study would also form a base on which others can develop their studies.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The literature review for this study is derived from books, journals, Kenya newspaper, government publications and documents. The review highlights the need for finances in an educational programme. If an educational programme is to meet its envisaged goals, then there is need for sufficient provision of finances. The literature reviewed also examines different strategies applied by different countries to finance education.

Education financing encompasses all financial outlays made by the central and local governments, the private sector (including NGOs), households, communities and external donors towards the services and investments in the education sector. This includes the public sector financial outlays to educational institutions that are used to meet personal emoluments, operations and maintenance expenses and developments expenditure. It includes financing by parents, families, and communities for tuition fees and other levies.

2.1 THE NEED FOR ADEQUATE FINANCING OF EDUCATION

Finance is considered, as a significant element in the provision of education and consequently its provision to finance education is
It is a prevailing fact, that because of inflationary and recessionary as well as population pressures, Kenya like many other less industrialized countries has been faced with dwindling revenues earmarked for educational services. Campbell (1997), states that money is an important element for the success of any organizations like the school.

Money is useful only as it is used to purchase a programme of teaching and learning. This money enable the services of personnel, building, the equipments the supplies and other items necessary to the operations of a school or a school to be paid (Campbell 1997:124).

This shows that every citizen should recognize that if children are to be satisfactorily educated; it is necessary to provide schools and other appropriate educational institutions with necessary funds. There must be a plan for providing a sound programme of education. For the schools and other educational institutions to operate desirably, they require financial support. If support provided is too limited, the school will operate unsatisfactorily and the children will be handicapped in achieving the desired goals. In the long run, not only the national economy, but also even the country’s democratic ways of life will be jeopardized. Whereas the purpose of the school should be to provide adequate educational programme to meet the needs of an individual and of the society, the purpose of school finance should be to provide
whatever funds are necessary to ensure a programme designed to meet these needs.

The need for adequate financing of educational investment arises from the fact that education fulfils very important goals. The World Bank enumerates these objectives as follows:

It satisfies a basic human need for knowledge, provides a means of helping to meet basic needs and helps sustain and accelerate overall development. It provides essential skilled manpower .... It helps to determine not only the income of the present generation but also the future distribution of income and employment. Finally, it influences social welfare through indirect effects on health, fertility and life expectancy and helps to increase the profitability of other forms of social and physical investment (Psacharapoulous and Woodhall, 1985).

If we are then convinced by the Bank's experience of the major objectives fulfilled by educational investment then, the provision or need for adequate funds becomes paramount.

2.2 EDUCATION IN NATIONAL BUDGET VERSUS COST SHARING IN KENYA

The ever-growing demand for education, the resultant expansion of educational systems, rising costs in education because of inflation and the need for more and more sophisticated equipment have all led to massive increases in spending on education all over the world. In 1960, the world spending on education by public bodies used up to 3.2 percent
of world GNP and by 1974, it had increased to 4.8 percent. We can see from this that the rate of increase of public expenditure on education was greater than the actual increase of the GNP. In other words, education was consuming a bigger and bigger share of the total wealth available. This was especially true of the less developed countries. Another feature of the less-developed world has been that the rate of this increase has been greater than the increase in total public expenditure.

In spite of the need for adequate financing of education, the Kenya government indicated in the Republic of Kenya (1997-2001) development plan, financing education from the public budget is one of the major critical strategic issues facing the education sector. The government argues that although the cost of education is currently borne both by the public and private sector, the share of public expenditure on education has become an issue of concern.

The Kenya government has shown priorities and commitment in the provision of education as reflected in the relatively large and consistent resource allocations and expenditure since independence. Even with the Kenya’s depressed economic performance and resource constraints, education remains one of the country’s highest development priority. As illustrated in Table 1, the overall recurrent expenditure of the ministry expanded by 60.8 per cent from Kshs. 30.1 billion 1996/97 to Kshs. 48.4
billion in 2000/2001. This represents a range of between 30-39 per cent of the total government recurrent expenditure (GoK, 2003).

The government cautions that this increasing share of education system on national resources, if allowed to continue along the same trend, would seriously reduce the resources available to meet the growth targets of the economy. To forestall this situation, the government has decided to reduce the recurrent expenditure on formal education to about 30 percent (GoK, 1997-2001). This hopefully would be achieved through the cost-sharing policy between the government, parents and communities, which has been in place since 1988. This has been ascertained in the 1997-2001. National Development Plan.

Financing education, and especially public financing of education, is of crucial importance. This policy of cost sharing between the Government, parents, and communities, which has been in place since 1988, will be maintained in financing education (GoK, 1997-2001).

The issue at hand is to assess how their beneficiaries, especially schools, are contributing to the education cost. The cost sharing strategy has fallen victim of criticisms from the members of the public. The present world recession with its accompanying inflation has reinforced the determination to cut government spending on education and in many countries, attempts have been made to make the individual recipient of the benefits of education pay a bigger share of the costs (Ayot and Briggs
1992). When this happens, this cost-sharing is passed to the parents in the form of increased fees, development funds etc, it becomes inequitable in that it limits access to children who come from wealthy families. Equating education to a commodity, then less will be demanded if cost to consumer increases. This would result to restricted enrolment hence inequity in terms of future distribution of income and access to schooling. Poor students are likely to drop out due to increased fees and be replaced by a greater number of students who can afford to pay high fees.

Muya (1989), argues that the cost sharing policy is a convenient way of shedding off the bloated education budget for the exchequer; it inevitably leads to social inequity. He reckons that areas, which are endowed with better resources, may end up sharing better school facilities. Since the income per capita in Kenya is below the average cost of maintaining a child in a public secondary school for a year, then an ordinary Kenyan has to spend all his annual earnings to educate a child in public secondary schools. The consequences of this are that many children from poor homes cannot afford to pay fees. Parents have been quoted commenting on the exorbitant cost of education.

School fees consume a big portion of my earning such that, as a parent, I'm unable to cater for other needs. (East African Standard, Monday, January 6, 2003).
Therefore, cost sharing measures advocated by the world bank and adopted by the government of Kenya may end up denying the poor an opportunity for secondary education.

This brief critique of the cost sharing strategy points out the extent to which it is impracticable as a sole method of financing education. Thus, it calls for a need to explore other alternatives, basically schools' initiated sources which can generate supplementary funds.

2.3 PRIVATE EXPENDITURE ON EDUCATION

Non-Governmental Organizations, religious organizations, households and communities have substantially contributed towards the expansion of education in Kenya at all levels. At the secondary level, households are expected to pay fees which are often relatively high in relation to the household's income. Households are required to pay for all non-salary cost items. At this level therefore, secondary schooling expenditures per student are considerably high. In the light of the fact that 56 per cent of the Kenya's population live below the poverty line, it is obvious that the cost of sending the child to secondary school is clearly out of reach for the majority of Kenyans. This burden is compounded where households have to support more than one child in school; and some households having children in different levels of schooling. This aspect may partly
explain why the transition rate from primary to secondary is currently very low. In the light of the country’s determination to attain the Education for All goal by 2015, it is imperative that deliberate strategies are employed to reduce cost at the household level. Such strategies must start by targeting ways in which schools can generate their own funds and solving problems with the existing sources.

With regard to the contributions of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), their key activities in the sector include: infrastructure development, supply of instructional materials, teacher training, capacity building of Parents Teachers Association (PTAs) and school management committees and support to communities and parents educational initiatives. However, the contribution of NGOs in the sector in quantifiable terms is not possible since no information is available on their participation in the sector.

2.4 FINANCING BY HOUSEHOLDS

Several studies have attempted to measure the unit cost at various levels of the education system. (Makau, 1997; Mithu et al 1995; Karuga, 1995 and Karani, et al 1995), as a basis of evaluating access, equality, quality, effectiveness and efficiency. In a 1977 study by Makau, it is observed that tuition fees constitute the highest expenditure followed by the provision of uniforms. Expenditures on books and harambee are also
very significant for government and community schools. Similarly, a study on the cost of financing of secondary education (Karani et al 1995) based on a sample of 94 schools indicates that education in private schools cost twice as much as in public schools and that education in boarding schools costs about twice as much as in day schools.

In all studies, there is conclusive evidence that parents and communities are concerned about the escalating cost of school levies such as examinations fees, activity fees and textbook charges. Indeed, the negative impact on cost-sharing is particularly evident among the poor especially in the low endowed regions where poverty is most acute; and where survival concerns override the relevance of sending children to school.

Findings from the second Welfare Monitoring Survey (WMS-11) of 1994 reveals that households spent about Kshs. 9,744 at the secondary level per student, these constitute about 55 per cent of total per student expenditure. About 67 percent of the cost is meant to cover tuition fees. In addition, these average per student expenditure by households amount to about 200 per cent of the total per capita income measured by consumption of the 20 per cent of Kenyan households. This explains the recorded low participation rates by the poor in secondary education. This high cost of secondary education calls for alternative ways of funding
secondary education and a thorough examination of the problem with the existing sources.

2.5 ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF REVENUE FOR SCHOOLS IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), a strong arm of UNESCO has launched research projects into financing educational systems in various parts of the world. It notes that research into financing educational system has a broader aim not only looking at the real possibility of the developing countries financing their educational objectives, but rather to study the various financing methods likely to augment resources, and to define a strategy of educational financing more closely adopted to social and economic realities. Coupled with this, research into financing the educational system needs to analyze certain alternative solutions capable of supplementing educational costs.

This strongly felt belief by United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is equally expresses by World Bank (1980), which appreciates the need for additional sources of financing education. The bank notes that the increasing demand for education on public finance is not easily resolved and calls for two possible courses of action. Finding additional sources of financing and reducing costs by improving the efficiency of the education system. As for finding additional
resources, the bank notes that the first course of action calls for the tapping of non budgetary sources such as, loans, fees, external aid, and local communities. Although the Bank does not cite school-based initiatives as an aspect of raising additional revenues, it points out at the role of local communities, which if mobilized can assist schools in their cost-sharing strategies by providing them with land, labour, building, materials etc. The funds so saved can be used to acquire other necessities, which hitherto have been missing.

In Britain's education system, Knight (1983) notes that in addition to finances from the state, charitable organizations, parents associations and teaching staff operate activities such as fairs, concerts and other minor events whereby they charge a small fare. Pupils also contribute to swimming sessions, use of facilities and to watch matches. There are also commercially promoted schemes to raise funds by collecting labels and coupons. He observes that a few schools have also experimented with large lotteries and that most schools have a draw from time to time. This way, schools manage to supplement the schools budget.

Kutakov et al (1978) note that, in the Barrio High School of Phillipines, production is made part of the broader curriculum and a mechanism through which pupils could pay their fees. Similar projects have been launched in parts of China, Shao (1983) and in other countries. Similar
projects can yield better results in secondary schools in Kenya thus relieving parents from regular payment of unnecessary levies. However, all the schools' productive activities should be seen as only a supplementary activity to the schools' main purpose of imparting skills, and knowledge.

Una et al (1986) note that, funds for the smooth running of the educational programme are raised through the organization of events such as fairs, food sales and craft sales. Some schools sell items from their agriculture, home economics, industrial arts and craft departments.

Friendman's proposals for educational support in Garvue (1969) provides that schools be conducted under a variety of auspices including private enterprises operated for profit. This will allow schools to devise ways through which they can generate enough finances and even make reasonable profits to enhance their learning facilities. In this endeavor, schools can put up or rent business premises to conduct business and thus generate more finances. Friendman advocates a situation where schools are viewed as business for profit motives. However, although his proposals may shed some light in the study, it is dreaded that if schools were allowed to operate businesses, they are likely to deviate from being centres for imparting skills, attitudes and knowledge necessary for steady and sustainable economic development. This argument, however,
need not dismiss Friendman’s proposals, as schools could employ managers and other professionals to run the initiated business enterprises.

Mahatma Gandhi’s famous experiment in India showed that if children worked for three hours a day, a class of thirty children could raise enough money to pay for their teachers’ salary and still have something over for contingencies. If this could be done in Kenya, then the government and the public would be relieved a big burden. However, such ideas may not work because communities want their schools to be places of learning rather than production.

In ancient India, Misra (1967) contends that, it was part of the students study to go about begging for the teachers’ salaries. In Kenya, pupils are seen along the streets, in bars, hotels, etc begging for donations from the members of the public. These donations are used to develop schools.

Ozigi (1977), discusses the sources of revenue for schools in Nigeria. He identifies various sources such as grants from state, school fees, grants from philanthropic organizations or individuals and other school-based sources. These sources of revenue, include proceeds from sale of school magazines or from learners’ activities such as drama performance.
Bray and Lillis (1988), contend that, many schools raise money through their own productive activities. The schools undertake contracts in carpentry and metalwork, grow produce and rear animals for sale. Other schools run stores, which serve the neighbourhood and others. In urban areas some supplement their incomes by collecting empty bottles for return to drinks manufacturers. In addition, children usually organize dances, drama and other fund raising events. They give an example of one school in Rwanda where the use of organic fertilizers on a small plot enables eight and nine years old pupils to grow potatoes, worth the equivalent of US $120 and makes profit six times what the school receives from the government for equipment.

Olembo and Omoke (1982) in their study of financing primary schools in Kenya, discovered that in some schools in Central and Western provinces, the parents’ contribution to development funds was in form of labour in school farms. This was observed in schools, which had sizeable acreage of tea, sugar cane, or coffee. Parents were not paid but the crop raised was sold and the money used in the development of the school. They recommended that schools with farmland should follow the example aforementioned. From this recommendation, schools need not rely entirely on the government and parental contribution for the financing of secondary education; instead, they should initiate and run
economic activities, which generate supplementary income. Olembo concludes by saying that:

Financial demand, as a result of the new education system and economic austerity, have forced school authorities to rely less on the traditional methods of raising funds. Farming, and activities such as sponsored walks are providing additional alternative sources of financing educational programmes (Olembo 1986).

The above findings show that secondary schools in Kenya can generate supplementary funds for school purposes.

The government of Kenya in an attempt to enhance participation an retention in schools, introduced the School Feeding Programme (SFP) with collaboration with the World Food Programme (WFP). The potential of the SFP as a strategy for enhancing retention has been demonstrated over the years. The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology on its Report on the Sector Review and Development Technical Working Group (2003) gave a warning that for the programme’s sustainability, school management have to identify development micro projects to sustain the SFP when the WFP finally pulls out. The report also noted that activities such as development of school kitchen and school gardens are taking shape. What this highlights is that within the school itself there are economic activities that can be undertaken to supplement the inadequate finances.
2.6 SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE REVIEWED

Literature reviewed has indicated that the cost of education is increasing to unbearable levels. That being the case, there is need to diversify means of financing education so that both the households and governments do not strain too much in this regard. Many of the researchers in this area have more indulged in the identifying various ways of raising finances without assessing the problems which the schools face in using them.

It was also evident that there was enough potential in the school resources as the literature reviewed in this area has revealed. This study has therefore identified problems with other alternative sources of funds for secondary schools in Gichugu division. It has also investigated the viability of such sources of funds.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 INTRODUCTION
This chapter explains the methodology that was used in the study. It explains how the study was carried out and what the basic design was. It also explains the sampling procedures, data collection and data analysis procedures.

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN
The study adopted an exploratory approach using a descriptive survey design. The purpose of survey research is to explore and describe. Survey research usually uses questionnaire and interview in order to determine the opinions, attitudes, preferences, and perceptions of a group of people of interest to the researcher (Kathuri and Pals, 1993). In this study, questionnaires and observation schedules were used. The facts that this study sought to survey were problems and viability with other alternative sources of school funds to ensure that education becomes affordable.

3.2 LOCATION OF THE STUDY
The location of the study was Gichugu Division of Kirinyaga District. The criterion that determined the choice was purely practical, due to the
close proximity to the researcher. This meant that the cost of travel was minimized.

3.3 TARGET POPULATION

The target population was 20 public secondary schools in Gichugu division of Kirinyaga District. However, due to enormous amount of money, time and human resources that would have been required to survey all of the 20 schools, only a sample of the population was studied.

3.4 SAMPLE SELECTION

Simple random sampling was used to select 10 schools. This comprised 50 per cent of the population. The schools were listed in an alphabetical order and numbered from 1 to 20. Papers numbered 1 to 20 were folded and randomly selected from a box and the numbers picked represented the schools to be surveyed. Simple random sampling enabled every school in the population to have an equal chance of inclusion in the sample (Orodho 2003). Sampling was useful in this study because it was possible to learn something about the schools in Gichugu division by studying a few of its members, thus saving time and money.

3.5 PILOTING

The purpose of piloting is to determine the reliability and the validity of the instruments. In the piloting, two schools were included. The
principals of these schools and one member of BoG from each school were included in the piloting.

3.5.1 VALIDITY OF THE INSTRUMENTS

The validity of the instruments involved getting expert judgment, consultation and discussion of the instruments. This was done to ensure that there is no ambiguity in the instruments to be used for data collection.

3.5.2 RELIABILITY OF THE INSTRUMENTS

To test the reliability of the instrument of the study the following steps were followed.

1. The developed questionnaire was given to the two principals of the school in the piloting sample and two BoG members from the same schools,
2. The answered questionnaires were scored manually,
3. The same questionnaires were administered to the same group of subject after a period of two (2) weeks,
4. The questionnaires were score manually
5. A comparison between answers obtained in 2 and 4 above was made.
A Pearson's product moment formula of the test-retest was employed to compute the correlation coefficient in order to establish the extent to which contents of the questionnaire are consisted in eliciting the same responses every time the instrument was administered. A correlation coefficient of about 0.8 was considered high enough to judge high installment as reliable for the study (Orodho 2003).

3.6 DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

In undertaking this study, a questionnaire was designed to collect the responses of the principals. The questionnaire entitled: "Principals' questionnaire" was given to the principals of selected secondary schools to solicit answers and opinions on various items. The items of the questionnaire were in structured and non-structured forms. A sample of the principals' questionnaire that was used appears in the appendices.

Another questionnaire entitled "The BoG. members' questionnaire" was also used and a sample of the same appears in the appendices. This questionnaire helped to solicit answers and opinions on ways in which the individual schools generate their own funds and the problems associated with the generation of such funds.

The second instrument was an observation guideline. This instrument helped the researcher to observe and record the number and condition of
the physical facilities in the school. The researcher was mostly interested in observing whether available school assets were used to generate funds. The observation guideline also appears in the appendices.

3.7 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

To be able to collect the desired data for this study, the researcher personally visited and delivered the questionnaires to all the principals of the secondary schools in the sample. To be able to collect data from the BoG members, the principals were consulted on how one of his/her BoG member could be reached. With the help of the principal, where the BoG member was not accessible, the questionnaire was sent to him/her through the principal and was returned to the principal after they had responded. The researcher provided the questionnaire and made arrangements on a convenient time thereafter when the completed questionnaire would be collected.

Questionnaire was considered ideal for collecting data from the principals and the BoG members because they would individually record and interpret this instrument. Observation data were collected at the time of delivering the questionnaire. The observation schedule was found important in obtaining information that might not have been easily obtained through the questionnaire.

3.8 DATA ANALYSIS

For quantitative data, information was written down and inferences made in terms of discussions and tabulations using methods of descriptive statistics. Quantitative data were analyzed and recorded on a
tally table from which frequencies, percentages and arithmetic means were manually computed.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

4.0 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, an analysis of the data collected is presented. The information analysed was obtained by administering questionnaires to principals and BoG members in the sampled schools of Gichugu Division, Kirinyaga District. Supplementary information was solicited through observation.

The main method of analysis was descriptive statistics such as percentages and means. In this study, percentages and means are tabulated and thus they form the basis of descriptive statistics which supplement the qualitative analysis. Since the study was mainly descriptive, an attempt was made to discuss in details the various problems with other alternative sources of funds for secondary schools and the viability of such sources of funds.

4.1 SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS

On being asked the sources of funds for schools, the principals identified the following:

(i) School fees including development funds,
(ii) Government grants through the District Education Board (D.E.B).

(iii) Harambee

(iv) Farming activities

(v) Constituency development funds (C.D.F)

(vi) Donations from individuals and organizations

(vii) Rents from school assets

(viii) The county council and

(ix) Sponsors

School fees

On being asked the main source of school funds, all the principals and the BoG members indicated that school fees formed the main source of funds. Three principals (30%) believed that schools can run smoothly with the school fees only. Seven (70%) of the principals felt that with fees only, the schools would not run smoothly. 90% of the BoG believed that the fees were inadequate for the schools to run smoothly and a 10% of them felt that fees charged were adequate for the schools to run smoothly. This information is tabulated in table I.
Table IV

Principals’ response on whether schools can run smoothly with funds from school fees only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether schools can run smoothly with school fees only</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoG</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that schools cannot run smoothly from funds forthcoming from fees only. The principals indicated that although school fees were the main source of funds for school, there were many problems associated with the collection of these funds. They lamented that the parents feel overburdened by the fees contributions.

**Farming activities**

A significant proportion of the principals as well as the BoG members identified school farm as a source of school funds. This was also evident through observation by the researcher. In majority of the schools, farming of some kind was noticed. A convincing 90% principals and BoG members indicated farming as being a potential source of school funds. The funds were however limited or negligible owing to some problems associated with farming and other factors within the individual schools.
Fund raising (Harambee)

The importance of harambee funds in the funding of secondary schools cannot be underrated or over-emphasized. Table II shows the number of schools that organised harambees to solicit for funds.

**Table V**

Principals and BoG response to whether they organize fund raising (Harambee).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether Harambees are organised in your school</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.O.G</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine (90%) of the schools organised harambees and only one (10%) did not make use of harambees. Due to the different financial needs of these schools, the frequency at which they organized harambees was different. Table III below shows how recent the schools had organized harambees.
Table VI

When the most recent harambee was held as indicated by the principals and BoG members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This year</th>
<th>Last year</th>
<th>Two years ago</th>
<th>Three years ago</th>
<th>Four years ago</th>
<th>More than five years ago</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five schools (50%) whose response was to the effect that no harambee has been held in their school in recent times did not imply their total absence.

The schools held harambees when necessary. Funds realised from harambees were used for various projects, such projects included construction of staff houses, buying school bus and putting up administration complex. Some of the schools did not get involved in major harambees but collected money that would have been raised through harambees during special occasions like prize giving days.

The absence of harambees in recent past in some of the schools was attributed to the poverty levels of the communities. In some cases, leaders in the community had shown indifference, lack of support. Government policies, like that of preventing civil servants and members...
of parliament to be actively involved in organizing harambees was also a factor.

**Government grants**

Although the role of the government in funding secondary education was in the provision of educational administration and professional services, schools with special needs receive some grants through the District Education Boards (D.E.Bs). The criteria used to determine which schools received grants are entirely on the hands of the D.E.Bs. The principals and the BoG members felt that receiving of grants from the government was entirely the discretion of the D.E.B. The principals, responses on whether their schools had received such grants in the past two years revealed that only one (10%) of the schools had received such grants to equip the science laboratory. This being the situation, the principals felt that the government had no role in funding the recurrent expenditure of the secondary schools.

**Sponsor**

The sampled schools are sponsored by the Anglican Church of Kenya, the Catholic Church or the District Education Board. The distribution of the schools by sponsor is shown in table VII.
Table VII
Distribution of secondary schools by sponsor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic church</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican church</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.E.B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was noted that the sponsors of secondary schools do not have financial obligation in the schools they sponsor. Eight (80%) of the respondents indicated that they do not receive any financial support from the sponsors. Two (20%) of the respondents indicated that they receive some financial support from the sponsors during district and constituency education days. However, they felt that whatever they received was less than the amount they are supposed to subscribe to these sponsors.

Rents from school assets
Schools with assets such as halls, buses, vans or school houses were rented and generated some funds. Relatively young schools without such assets were not able to generate funds using this method. The table below shows the numbers of schools that generated some funds by renting school assets.
Table VIII

Principals' and BoG's responses on whether they generate any funds by renting school assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether the school generate funds by renting school assets</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.O.G</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, it is evident that schools are capable of generating funds from the assets they have. However, there are limitations associated with this as discussed later in this chapter.

Old students organizations

In response to school alumni, two of the schools (20%) have old students’ organizations but only one was functional. This one which was active had raised funds for specific projects that did not require much funds and also participated in organising and making contributions towards harambees. The remaining 80% had not mobilized the old students for various reasons.

Donations from individuals and organizations

From the sampled schools, all the principals' responses showed that their schools received donations of some kind from individuals or
organizations. They however dismissed these donations as negligible. Some of the non-governmental organizations identified were: The Green Belt Movement, Forum for Women Educationalists (FAWE) and Cradle International organisation for the child. Donations were also received from churches, cooperatives and the county council. The table below shows the distribution of the donations from the various donors.

**Table IX**

Number of schools receiving donations from various donors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether the school received donations from</th>
<th>Charges</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>N.G.O's</th>
<th>County Council &amp; Local cooperatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table four schools (40%) of the schools got funds from churches and private individuals. Five school (50%) of the schools also got donations from N.G.O’s. Three schools (30%) of the schools also got donations from the Kirinyaga county council and local co-operatives.

**The Constituency Development Fund**

The Constituency Development Fund (C.D.F) is a new provision of the NARC government. These funds are given by the central government to all constituencies in the country to cater for various development
projects including education. These funds are administered by a constituency development fund committee under the stewardship of the Member of Parliament for that constituency. Needy schools benefit from the C.D.F. The C.D.F committee have the discretion to determine which schools benefit.

On being asked whether their schools received any funds from the C.D.F, the principals and the BoG gave the responses as shown in table X below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table (X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals’ and BoG’s response to whether they receive any funds from the C.D.F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether the school received funds from C.D.F funds</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoG’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, three (30%) of the schools received funds from the C.D.F. Seven (70%) of the schools did not receive any funds from CDF and lamented on credibility of the C.D.F committee and the criteria used to allocate the funds.
Bursaries

An overwhelming 100% of the schools received bursaries from the MoEST and the Kirinyaga county council. These bursaries are however not allocated to individual schools but to specific students who are unable to pay school fees. All the principals concurred that these bursaries were not enough to cater for all needy cases and sometimes undeserving students received them at the expense of the deserving ones.

There was no school getting funds from sponsored walks or competitions in all the sampled schools. There was no school also generating any funds from collection and sale of used bottles or plastics.

4.2 VIABILITY AND PROBLEMS WITH THESE SOURCES OF FUNDS

Problems with fees collection

The delay in the payment of school fees had been a problem experienced by all the principals. All the BoG's and principals (100%) responses was that they never received school fees on time. The failure to pay fees on time and not paying at all had several consequences to the students and the school as well.

In some cases, students dropped out of school due to inability to pay up the school fees. Others were frequently sent home to collect fees and could only manage to pay in instalments. Some of the bright but needy
students were kept in school without paying and left school with huge debts. In such instances, the schools withheld the certificates of the student as a way of compelling them to pay. Some of the very needy students were recommended for bursaries from the MoEST and the Kirinyaga county council. This did not help much since bursaries have been overstretched by the high number of needy cases. The bursaries also cover a very small portion of the total fees paid by students. In some cases, the parents were asked to deliver their produce like maize and beans or even work on school farms as a form of payment. This was not common and was evident in two (20%) of the sampled schools.

The principals contacted donor organizations, individuals and agents in some cases to meet the expenses of the needy children. Some of the organizations contacted included churches, FAWE, The Green Belt Movement, Kirinyaga county council, Cradle and individual well-wishers.

If assistance was not secured, the students dropped out of school.

**Problems in securing grants**

As it was evidenced earlier, grants from the MoEST benefit a few schools and are disbursed through the D.E.B. Only public schools with special needs receive these grants. The schools that had received the funds expressed dissatisfaction at the delay in sending these grants and also
they considered these grants inadequate. Those schools that had not received these grants felt discriminated and questioned the criteria used in selecting the schools that benefit from the grants.

As a result, schools suffered many problems like delaying financial commitments and obligations. It also hindered the smooth running of the school as they limited the provision of necessary facilities. One of the consequences of the unavailability of grants is the slow growth of the schools’ physical facilities which often necessitated colossal sums of money for putting them up. This situation prevailed in the newly established schools.

**Problems with Harambee**

There are several factors that hindered the principals in their attempt to raise funds through harambee. These included lack of money by the school community, community indifference, community ignorance, organizational problems, political factors and government policies. This information is tabulated in Table XI.
Table XI

Ratings of the problems in the use of harambees to raise funds in schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Lack of money by community</th>
<th>Community Indifference</th>
<th>Organizational Problems</th>
<th>Political factors</th>
<th>Community Ignorance</th>
<th>Government policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rating ranged from (1) the most limiting to (5) the least limiting. Government policies were the most limiting factors in the use of harambee. This was due to the new government policy hindering civil servants and members of parliament to be actively involved in organization of harambee. This made the organization difficult because most community members are poor. Next was lack of money by the community. Community ignorance, political factors and community
indifference were rated the least limiting respectively and were not considered to pose much limitation.

**Problems with farming activities**

Although a convincing 90% principals and BoG members indicated farming as being a potential source of school funds, they however dismissed funds forthcoming from this source as negligible owing to some problems associated with farming. On being asked the problems associated with farming, the respondents gave the following: unreliable weather conditions, high cost of inputs and labour, low prices of the produce and the realization that money generated from farming was very little.

**The sponsors**

As was noted earlier, secondary school sponsors have no financial obligation in the schools they sponsor. However, during educational days organized by the sponsors, schools received some money from them. This money comes from the contributions the schools subscribe to the sponsors. The respondents felt that such funds received were negligible.

**Rents from school assets**

Rents accrue from assets such as halls, buses, vans or school houses. Although 80% of the schools used this method to generate funds, there
were several problems associated with it. The problems included the following: First, the charges on these assets were minimal. This is because of the community’s notion that school properties are public property and should be used for free. For this reason, the charges were below the commercial rates and sometimes those rents were not forthcoming. Second, the purpose for which the renting was made was also a limitation. Any renting that interfered with school programs was not allowed. The other reason which limited the renting of the school assets was time of the year. Renting of assets like halls was not possible during the school sessions. It could only be done when the schools are on holiday. Relatively young schools were not able to generate funds using this method because they did not have assets to rent.

**Old students organizations**

Among the two schools (20%) that had old students organization their financial contribution was very little. They only made contributions rarely when there was a specific project to be funded. The remaining 80% of the schools had various reasons for not having formed an old student association. Among them, they felt poor performance of the school was a major factor. The old students did not feel proud of the school they attended. Others felt that their school was young and for this reason they were unable to form an old student organization.
All the respondents felt that such an organization was a potential source of funds. They were however reluctant in forming such organization with no apparent reasons.

Bursaries, donations and the constituency development funds

Concerning the bursaries, the principals and BoG members raised concern over the increasing number of needy cases which result to overstretching of the available bursary funds. They attributed the rise in the number of needy cases to increased poverty and the HIV/AIDS pandemic. The principals also lamented that the allocation criteria sometimes disadvantaged some needy cases. There was assumption that non-orphaned children are capable of paying. This resulted to some needy cases not benefiting from the bursaries. The problem of the bursary funds not getting to the schools on time was also evident.

Concerning donations from individual well wishes the principals felt that the funds forthcoming from them was unreliable and they had no means to compel the donors to make their contributions. Although the C.D.F funds ought to provide funds to deserving schools within a constituency, some principals considered their schools as deserving and had never received these funds. Most of them complain of the bureaucracy and the political interferences involved thus opting to forego the funds. There was no school getting funds from sponsored walks or completion in all
the sampled schools and the respondents attributed this to lack of individuals or organizations within the school community to sponsor such activities.

4.3 IMPLICATIONS OF INADEQUACY OF FUNDS TO SCHOOL

The respondents reported that funds were a major constraint in the school. On whether they encountered financial difficulties, all of the respondents indicated that they experienced financial difficulties. The principals were asked to indicate the type of problems they encounter with school funds. Some of the problems they cited are:

(i) Parents have low income thus they do not make fees contribution on time;
(ii) Vote head for paying support staff is inadequate;
(iii) Expenditure is higher than income forcing the school to incur debts;
(iv) Lack of learning teaching facilities;
(v) Students are frequently sent home to collect school fees, and
(vi) It is difficult to expand the school structures.

On whether the above problems could be minimized, 100% of the respondents felt that the cited problems could be minimized. On being
asked to suggest how the problems can be contained, the following suggestions were offered:

(i) Increasing bursary allocations;

(ii) Subsidising educational materials;

(iii) Organizing fundraising (Harambee);

(iv) By government to take the responsibility of paying the support staff;

(v) By government giving grants to schools, and

(vi) Parents paying school fees on time.

Having reported that finance is a critical issue, principals were asked to respond on how the issue of inadequate funds interferes with the smooth running of their schools. Their responses are as tabulated on Table XII.
Table XII

Principal's response on how inadequate fund interferes with the smooth running of secondary schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of interference</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Absenteeism of students</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Educational facilities are inadequately</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Students drop out of school</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Physical expansion of the school is slowed down</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Vote for support staff salaries is overstretched</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table, 90% of the principals indicated that fees contribution forms the main source of their finance. Those who default have their children frequently expelled from school. The students stay at home until and up to when their parents clear the payments. The children waste too much learning time. Some principals (30%) even indicated that some parents were unable to make fees contributions. A great interference was also recorded on lack of enough funds to pay salaries for the support staff. 90% of the principals encountered the interference. Another interference was on the provision of physical facilities and equipment. 70% respondents indicated that the little funds at their disposal are
inadequate to provide the required facilities. This interferes with the smooth running of schools.

**Summary**

From the analysis of data, the following is a summary of the findings. All public secondary schools are supposedly to meet their recurrent expenditure from fees charged and other levies. Since the funds from school fees are inadequate to cater for all the recurrent expenditure, schools solicited for extra funds from various sources. These other sources included: Harambee, farming activities, C.D.F, bursaries, rents from school assets and donations from individuals and organizations.

The above sources were coupled with many problems and were considered unreliable as a source of fund for schools. The inadequacy of funds interfered with the smooth running of the schools. Solutions on how the inadequacy of funds could be minimized were also recorded.
5.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a summary of the study findings, drawn conclusions from the findings and finally make appropriate recommendations.

5.1 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

Based on the following research questions:

a) What are the other alternative sources of funds for secondary schools?

b) What are the problems with these other alternative sources of funds for secondary schools?

c) How viable are these other alternative sources of funds for secondary schools?

The researcher was able to extract the following findings from the questionnaires administered to principals, BoG members and the observation checklist. The findings serve as a summary of the study.
• The major source of funds for public secondary school was school fees (including development fund) charged on students. From the fees, schools are supposedly to meet their recurrent expenditure.

• The government did not have any obligation in providing funds for recurrent expenditure for public secondary schools but schools with special needs got some grants from the government through the D.E.B.

• The schools solicited other alternative sources of funds through Harambee, farming activities, C.D.F., donations from individuals and organizations, rents from school assets, sponsors and the local authority.

• The failure to pay school fees on time and not paying at all posed the greatest problem for schools. The school levies were beyond the parents’ ability to pay.

• Criteria used by the D.E.B to determine which school benefits from the government grants were discriminative. The grants were also considered inadequate and did not reach the schools on time.

• Government policies, lack of money by the community, community indifference, community ignorance, organizational problems and political factors were the limiting factors in the use of harambee as a source of school funds.
Farming as an alternative source of funds was limited by unreliable weather conditions, high cost of inputs and labour, low prices of the produce, and the realization that money generated from farming was very little.

Although schools received some funds from the sponsors, they were also obliged to make some contributions to them. What they received in return was lower than the contributions they made to the sponsors.

Many schools did not have school alumni and such organizations were not considered a source of fund for schools.

Bursaries and donations from individuals and organizations were overstretched by the increasing number of needy cases resulting from many orphaned students by the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Criteria of bursary awarding were also considered discriminative. Donations from individuals were dismissed as negligible.

Owing to the little amounts from sources other than school fees and their high unreliability, such sources were considered non-viable as alternative sources of school funds.

As a result of inadequate funds, smooth running of a school was affected. Students absenteeism, dropout, lack of educational facilities, and lack of adequate funds for support staff salaries were the major implications of inadequate funds.
5.2 DISCUSSION

From the findings highlighted above, it is evident that the major source of funds for public secondary schools is school fees that are paid by the parents. The fees also include development funds. These are determined by the MoEST. Due to the inadequacy of the fees to cater for all the recurrent expenditure, schools solicit for alternative funds from various sources. These other sources include the following: Fund raising (Harambee), farming activities, rents (from school assets like buses, halls etc.), bursaries, C.D.F., sponsors, local authority and donations from individuals and organizations.

These other alternative sources of funds for secondary schools are coupled with a number of problems. The failure to pay fees on time and not paying at all posed the greatest problem for schools. The fees charged are beyond the parents’ ability to pay. Criteria for awarding grants and bursaries from the MoEST and the C.D.F. are discriminative and many deserving students and schools do not benefit from funds from these sources. As was evident in the findings, bursaries and donations from individuals and organizations are over stretched by the increasing number of needy cases resulting from many orphaned students by the H.I.V./AIDS pandemic. Donations from individuals are very minimal. As regards to farming activities, the schools encounter many problems. Unreliable
weather conditions, high cost of inputs and labour, low prices of the produce, and the realization that money generated from farming is very little are the greatest limitations. Although schools received some funds from the sponsors, they were also obliged to make some contributions to them. What they received in return was lower than the contributions they made to these sponsors.

Owing to the little amounts from sources other than school fees and their high and reliability, such sources were considered non-viable as an alternative sources of school funds. As a result of inadequate funds, smooth running of a school was affected. Students absenteeism, drop outs, lack of educational facilities and lack of adequate funds for support staff salaries are the major implications of inadequate funds.

5.3 CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are drawn from the findings of the study. From the study, it is clear that government’s role in financing secondary school education cannot be underrated. Payment of teacher’s salaries and administrative services is not enough. Government’s financial support should be broad based to cover both capital and recurrent expenditure of the schools. This will release the parents a heavy burden they are unable to shoulder. The present arrangement where the government is under no
obligation to provide recurrent expenditure to secondary schools need to be reversed if the majority students are to attain secondary education. If parents are to continue paying the entire cost of running schools through school fees, it is strongly feared that secondary education may end up being for only those who can afford, thus denying the majority an opportunity to education.

The principals of secondary schools in Gichugu Division experience difficulties in securing funds. However, there are varied options open to them in raising supplementary funds. These options include harambees, farming activities, C.D.F, donations from individuals and organizations, rents from school assets, sponsors and the local authority.

Due to the problems in securing enough funds, the provision of necessary facilities is inadequate. This interferes with the smooth running of schools. Students whose parents fail to make the fees contributions are sent home frequently and consequently waste a lot of their precious time. Some students even drop out of school simply because their parents fail to pay fees. All these aspects are not conducive to the smooth learning of the affected students.
Most of the principals and the BoG members are willing to diversify the sources of school funds but the sources are not viable because they are unreliable and the funds forthcoming from such sources are negligible.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

Drawing from the purpose of this study, viability and problems with other alternative sources of funds for secondary schools, the following recommendations are offered.

(a) Need for diversity in securing educational funds

Principals and BoG members indicated that fees contributed by parents formed the main source of educational funds. However, they felt that funds from fees were far from adequate. In this respect, the researcher recommends that principals should view other sources like charitable organizations, NGOs, sponsors and international donors as being potentially capable of supplementing parents' financial endeavour in secondary education.

(b) It is recommended that principals in consultation with the P.T.A. devise proper mechanisms through which parents can make their contributions without resulting to sending students away frequently.

(c) The government should reconsider taking the responsibility of paying the support personnel. By doing this, schools' financial
problems would be minimized because this takes a big proportion of the fees collected.

d) There should be a constant review of the awarding criteria of bursaries, grants and the constituency development funds.

e) Money accruing from bursaries, grants and the C.D.F. should be given to schools on time. This will minimize the problems and difficulties heads face in planning for funds.

f) Proper farming techniques and the need to diversify farming should be emphasized to make it more viable as a source of funds.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

a) The study was restricted to 10 public secondary schools in Gichugu division of Kirinyaga District. This could not be a true representative of all schools in Kenya. The socio-economic, the location and the nature of the schools have an influence on the methods they use to mobilize funds. Other studies of the same nature could be carried out in other locations.

b) A study could be carried out with a thorough analysis of the criteria of bursary allocations and disbursement to give a finer and in-depth picture of their problems and shortcomings.

c) The newly created constituency development fund is a potential source of funds for schools in various parts of the country. A study
could be carried with a view to finding out its impact in the funding of education.
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APPENDIX I

THE PRINCIPAL’S QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is name of your school?

2. Sources of funds for this school are (Tick where applicable)
   - Ministry of Education grants [ ]
   - Fees from students [ ]
   - School farm [ ]
   - Name others (i) ...........................................................................
     (ii) .........................................................................................
     (iii) .......................................................................................  

3. Usually, how reliable is projected revenue from other sources besides the school fees? (tick one)
   - Very reliable [ ]
   - Reliable [ ]
   - Fairly reliable [ ]
   - Not reliable [ ]

4. Do you think that the school can run smoothly with the funds from fees only? (Tick one).
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

5. Is your school capable of generating its own funds? (Tick one).
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
6. (a) Does your school have a Parents Teachers Association?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

   (b) What role does the Parents Teachers Association play in funding your school?
   Explain briefly.

7. How effective has the Parents Teachers Association been in arranging for additional funds for your school? (Tick one).
   Very effective [ ]
   Effective [ ]
   Less effective [ ]
   Not effective at all [ ]

8. If the Parents Teachers Association has been ineffective in arranging for additional funds, outline the reasons for this.

9. Do all students pay up their fees in good time? (Tick one)
   Yes [ ]
10. (a) How do you ensure that all pay up on good time? (Explain briefly).


(b) What happens if a student does not pay? (Explain briefly)


11. (a) List all sources of bursary funds received by students in your school.

(i)

(ii)

(iii)

(iv)

(b) Are bursaries enough to cater for all needy students? (Explain briefly)


(c) What other sources of finance (e.g.) agents or organizations do you contact to cater for these students who are unable to raise fees (explain briefly)
(b) For the activities identified in (a) above, what problems are encountered in raising funds using them? (Briefly explain).

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

12. (a) Have your school received any grants from the ministry of education in the last two years? (Tick one).

    Yes [ ]

    No [ ]

(b) If no, what problems does this cause your school? (Briefly explain)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(c) If yes, can these grants sustain in the running of the school without soliciting other funds from other sources? (Tick one)

    Yes [ ]

    No [ ]

13. When was the last fund raising (harambee) held in your school? (Tick one)

    This year [ ]

    One year ago [ ]

    Two years ago [ ]
Four years ago [ ]
More than five years ago [ ]
Never [ ]

14. Rate the following problems in order of limitation.

(1) As the most limiting problem and (5) the least limiting. The most limiting factors in the use of harambee in raising funds are?

Lack of money by the school community [ ]
Community indifference [ ]
Organizational problems [ ]
Community ignorance [ ]
Political factors [ ]

15. (a) Apart from school fees, do parents in your school subscribe to any other contributions? (Tick one).

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

(b) How much are parents willing to contribute towards other contributions? (Tick one)

Very willing [ ]
Willing [ ]
Somewhat willing [ ]
Unwilling [ ]

16. (a) What is the financial position of your school? (tick one)

Very good [ ]
(b) Does lack funds interfere with the smooth running of your school? (Tick one)

Yes [  ]
No [  ]

c) If the answer to (b) above is yes, what are these interferences? (Briefly explain).

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

d) How can shortage of funds be minimized in school? (Briefly explain).

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

17. (a) Do you rent out any of the school assets? (tick one)

Yes [  ]
No [  ]

b) If not, what are the reasons for this? (briefly explain)

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

c) If yes, do you have any restrictions in terms of who receives these services? (tick one)
18. (a) Do your school have an old student association?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

   (b) If yes, have you attempted to use them as an organization that can help raise funds for the school? (tick one)
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

   (c) If not, what factors would hinder you from approaching them? (briefly explain).

19. (a) Who is the school sponsor?

(b) Do you get any financial support from your sponsor? (tick one)
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

20. In the past two years, have your school received any grants/donations from: (tick where applicable)
   Government? [ ]
   Churches? [ ]
   Non-Governmental Organisations [ ]
   Local professional Organisations [ ]
21. (a) Does your school organize for the following activities as a way of raising funds?

- School fetes (Where goods and produce are donated then sold), social events e.g. school discos, selling raffle tickets
- Sponsored competitions e.g. sponsored walks
- Renting school facilities like halls and buses
- Farming activities
- Collecting empty bottles or plastics for sales

(b) For the activities identified in (a) above, what problems are encountered in raising funds using them? (Briefly explain)

____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________

22. (a) Do you rent out any of the school assets? (Tick one).

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

(b) If no, what are the reasons for this? (Briefly explain)

____________________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________________

(c) If yes, do you have any restrictions? (Tick one)

- Yes [ ]
(d) Incase of restriction on what are they based? (Tick where applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political affiliations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of activity for which renting is done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of the year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other (list them)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. (a) What physical facilities is your school lacking? Explain briefly.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(b) What problems is your school facing as a result of the lack of these facilities? (Explain briefly).

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX II

THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS' QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is the name of your school?

2. Does your school source for funds from the following sources? (tick where applicable)
   - Government grants [ ]
   - Fees from students [ ]
   - Harambee (fund raising) [ ]
   - School farm [ ]
   - Building fund [ ]
   - Old student organization [ ]
   - Rent of school assets [ ]
   - Donations from individuals and organizations [ ]

3. Among the sources identified in (2) above which is the major source of funds for your school?

4. Is the source identified in (3) above adequate for the school to run smoothly? (Tick one).
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

5. Is your school capable of generating its own funds? (tick one)
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
6. How effective has the Board of governors in your school been in arranging for additional funds? (tick one)

   Very effective [ ]
   Effective [ ]
   Less effective [ ]
   Not effective at all [ ]

7. Are there students who are unable to pay fees in your school?

   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

8. How would you rate the amount of fees charged by your school?

   Very high [ ]
   High [ ]
   Average [ ]
   Very low [ ]

9. Have your school held a fund raising (Harambee) meeting in the last three years?

   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

10. If your answer to (9) above is yes, do you experience any of the following limitation in organizing harambees? (Tick where applicable)

    Lack of money by the school community [ ]
    Community indifference [ ]
    Organizational problems among board members [ ]
    Community ignorance [ ]
11. Apart from school fees, how willing are parents to contributing towards other contributions? (tick one)

- Very Willing  
- Willing  
- Somewhat willing  
- Unwilling  

12. Does your school get any financial assistance from your sponsor? (tick one)

- Yes  
- No  

13. Does your school organize for the following activities as a way of raising funds? (tick where applicable)

- Renting school assets like buses and halls  
- Farming activities  
- Sponsored competitions e.g. sponsored walks  
- Social events like selling raffle tickets  

14. What problems do you encounter in using the above identified methods in raising funds? (tick where applicable)

- Lack of funds initiate them  
- Interference of the activities with the learning programmes  
- Government policies  
- Political interference  
- Indifference of the community and parenting  
- Realization that money forthcoming from them is very little  

# APPENDIX III

**OBSERVATION SCHEDULE FORM ON THE CONDITION AND USE OF SCHOOL ASSETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets Available</th>
<th>State/Condition</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home science rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitches/fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basket ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volley ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projectiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films and videos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicating machines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicating machines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopier and cameras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Automobiles</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tractors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lorries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School mean grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No of candidates</th>
<th>Mean grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>