This study was primarily concerned with the question of who pays for primary education in government (council) Maintained primary education in Government (Council) Maintained primary schools in the Kisumu Municipality. The main purposes of the study were: to find out all the techniques which have been used to finance school facilities in Government (Council) maintained primary schools in the municipality since 1974; to identify financing methods more closely adapted to the social and economic realities of Kenya and capable of augmenting the current municipal school revenue sources; to identify the problems that have been involved in financing the council maintained primary schools since 1974.

The sample for this study consisted of eight head teachers who were administering the council's "old town schools," eight chairmen of the school committees, the Municipal Education Officer (MEO) and fifty-two randomly selected parents of school pupils.

Four sets of questionnaires were utilized in this study. In addition to the questionnaires, some participants involved in the study were interviewed. Secondary materials mainly involving library literature, Annual Revenue Estimates of the Kisumu Municipal Council and the Kisumu Municipal Education Monthly reports were also used to gather further information.

Data obtained from the above sources were systematically presented in a descriptive form, and supported by tables, frequency distributions and percentages. No inferential statistics were made since there was no hypothesis testing. The analyses were mainly directed towards answering specific research questions and recommending tentative guidelines that could be used to generate additional financial resources for municipal primary schools.

The findings of this study revealed that: (a) Parents’ contributions, Harambee fund-raising contributions and the Municipal Council grants have been the main sources of funds for the Council maintained primary schools. Other sources included Central Government grants, in the form of salaries for teachers and minor donations from a very small number of religious organizations. (b) The Urban community's contribution was found to be minimal. (c) There was increasing awareness that schools’ agricultural produce, along with art and crafts and home science products could form a substantial part of each individual school's income if these schools had easy access to the raw materials and a market for the products. (d) Shortage of school equipment and supplies; inadequate school finance; the rising cost of school funds by parents were the major problems facing the Council maintained primary schools.

It was concluded that: (a) Parents whose children go to school, are and will remain the main supporters of the primary schools' capital development programmes. (b) Collective Harambee fund-raising for all the schools within the town, a possible way of tapping contributions from most of the urban workers and organizations, and Harambee for individual schools will also continue to serve as a vital supplementary source of school funds.

Based on the findings, the study made various recommendations. Among these recommendations were: (a) The collection of development funds as well as the provision of other school facility requirements must be channeled through the entire community served by the schools if primary education is to be considered free in an objective sense. However, if schools still have to be built and learning facilities to be provided, as the situation implies, then the
parents with children in the schools have to play a leading role by committing more of their resources towards this need instead of shifting the responsibility entirely to the whole community. (b) This study also acknowledged the need to make decisions with regard to benefits of past and current experiences. In this regard, there should be a consensus of decisions made by Parents' Associations and the Government of the collection of school funds in order to avoid a contradiction of policies by either group.