MANAGEMENT OF THE CHANGE OCCASIONED BY FREE PRIMARY EDUCATION IN KAKAMEGA AND KAJIADO DISTRICTS, KENYA

BY

OGOLA, MARTIN O.

E83/15172/2004

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

OCTOBER, 2010
DECLARATION

This thesis is my original work and has not been submitted for a degree in any other university

--------------------------------
Signature
Martin Ogola Odongo

This thesis has been submitted with our approval as university supervisors.

--------------------------------
Signature
Prof. Jotham Olembo
Kenyatta University

--------------------------------
Signature
Prof. Godfrey S. Mse,
Kenyatta University
DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to Chad Buyanzi, and his grandparents.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this thesis has been challenging, but at the same time, immensely rewarding. I have gained a great deal personally and professionally, and benefited invaluably from the support of others. I thank God for granting me the means and perseverance to come this far.

The assistance I got from my supervisors and their commitment is greatly appreciated. I must thank Prof. Jotham Olembo for providing outstanding academic counsel and encouragement to me right from the stage when this study was conceived. I benefited immensely from his vast experience in educational management and research, and his tireless capacity to provide feedback on the numerous proposal and thesis drafts that he reviewed.

I am also greatly indebted to my other supervisor, Prof. Godfrey Mse, who always made time for me and my work despite his very busy schedule. I thank him for his valuable comments and advice, for spending hours on my drafts and for ceaselessly providing me with feedback. I profited from his wealth of knowledge and incisive criticism.

Very special thanks go to Dr. Lucy Njoki Kathuri-Ogola who stood by me through this long academic journey. I will always remember with gratitude her resourcefulness and insights- these greatly enriched my study. I also must appreciate my ‘virtual classmate’, Dr. JP Oyore, whose scholarly and moral support made a difference. I am grateful to him for giving time and ideas towards this thesis.

I would also like to recognise the contribution of Dr. Onyango Adino, who enabled me to sharpen my understanding of this work. Then, I must extend my sincere gratitude to the Ministry of Education Officials, head teachers, teachers, parents and pupils who participated in the study.

I wish to acknowledge the support of my family over the years of study and work that this project has taken.
ABSTRACT
The purposes of this study was to conduct an in-depth investigation into how primary schools are managing change with regard to Free Primary Education (FPE) in Kenya and from this, develop a framework for effective change management of FPE. The study was conducted in Kakamega and Kajiado districts. From the 59 schools sampled, 59 headteachers and 177 teachers were included in the study. Fourteen Area Education Officers (AEOs), 118 parents, 118 School Management Committee (SMC) members, 2 District Education Officers and 7 senior officers from the Ministry of Education headquarters were also interviewed. The study used questionnaires, interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) for data collection. Some of the key findings from the study were as follows. Most primary schools were found to be inadequately resourced for FPE. There was an inequitable distribution of teachers among schools and teachers had heavy workloads. In terms of infrastructure, there existed considerable discrepancy among schools. As managers under FPE, headteachers cited accounting and management of financial resources as main areas of perceived inadequacy. Teachers evaluated headteachers lowly with regard to the following: involving staff in decision-making for procurement, interacting cordially with staff, identifying in-service training needs for FPE, supervising teaching and supporting teachers to try out new teaching techniques. Headteachers exhibited a high level of compliance with regard to maintaining most key financial documents but some weaknesses were observed in maintenance of analytical documents. Headteachers and teachers indicated that no preparation for FPE had been given to them prior to implementation. However, the training given after FPE was inadequate and too rushed. Headteachers and teachers revealed that most parents were not actively involved in school management affairs and had misinterpreted the FPE policy. Members of SMC were seen as lacking the necessary capacity to contribute effectively in financial management, budgeting and curriculum support in schools. Still, SMCs were more supportive than PTAs. Five concerns emerged as fundamental to the sustainability of FPE in Kenya: budgetary provisions and constraints, Kenya’s economic performance, donor support, political commitment and community support. The sustainability of FPE is threatened by high cost of funding, the shortage of teachers, reliance on donor support, uncertainty over continued political goodwill, slowed growth of the Kenyan economy and the apathy from parents. There are policy gaps relating to early childhood education, admission of pupils into primary schools and allocation of FPE grants. Based on the findings and on theory, a model for systemic management of the change to FPE is proposed as an output of the study. It is argued that for there to be effective management of the change process, a systemic approach should be adopted, such that all the relevant and interconnected components of the education system move in synchrony towards sustainable and effective change.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Problem

Education plays an invaluably pivotal role in the economic growth and social development of a country. Sustainable economic development for any country can only be achieved when substantial investment in human capital is made (Ozturk, 2001). Primary school education is the foundation for this; it not only provides literacy and numeracy, but also, the preparatory basis upon which higher level education is dependent and shaped.

Unfortunately, many countries in the developing world have not provided all school-age children with the opportunity to attend school (UNICEF & World Bank, 2006). Whereas children are entitled to a free, quality basic education, as recognized by world leaders when they made the achievement of universal primary education by the year 2015 one of the Millennium Development Goals, progress towards this goal has been out of reach for many poor countries (Hillman & Jenkner, 2004). By the year 2005 for example, there were 72 million primary school-age children who were out of school worldwide, and school attendance, especially for girls, was still far from universal. Worse still, in many of the developing countries, children who attended school received an inadequate education because of poorly trained and underpaid teachers, overcrowded classrooms, and a lack of basic teaching tools such as textbooks, blackboards, pens and paper (UNESCO, 2007a).

Kenya’s primary education system is also characterised by several of the challenges that face other developing countries as highlighted above. For example, at the primary school level, whereas the GER peaked to 105.4 percent during the 1990s, it declined to 88.2 percent in 2002. During the same period, the cumulative dropout rates in primary education recorded a high of 37 percent
and the repetition rates between standards 1 and 7 reached 14 percent (ROK, 2004a). The Primary Completion Rate (PCR) was only 62.8 percent in 2002. This high drop-out rates and low completion rates were mostly attributed to poverty (Wainaina, 2006). The Kenya Government Economic Recovery Strategy of 2003 acknowledges that it was in recognition of the challenges affecting primary schooling and the importance of a literate population for the country’s development prospects that the government of Kenya re-introduced ‘Free Primary Education’ (Republic of Kenya, 2003a). The National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) Party, which formed a new government after winning the general election in December 2002, immediately fulfilled its election promise to provide, ‘Free’ primary education to all children in Kenya’s public primary schools (Njoroge, 2003).

The introduction of FPE was also tied to the fact that Kenya is a signatory to the recommendations of the Jomtien World Conference on Education For All held in 1990 and the World Education Forum held in Dakar in 2000. In conforming to these agreements, the government abolished levies and tuition fees met by parents in all public primary schools to increase access to education. Parents and communities on their part were expected to meet the cost of pupil’s school uniform, food and healthcare (Republic of Kenya, 2003b).

The Kenya Government Economic Recovery Strategy (2003) indicated that at the time of the introduction of FPE, the country had high levels of inequality; the poor were disproportionately less schooled and less skilled than the rich (Republic of Kenya, 2003a). Thus, with the introduction of FPE, the government had to invest colossal amounts of money to finance primary school education. The Government of Kenya disbursed Kshs. 5.6 billion to public primary schools in the year 2003, and by the end of the year 2004, Kshs.16 billion had been released. An additional Kshs. 300 million was allocated in the year 2004 for monitoring the progress made in the FPE effort (Sawamura & Sifuna, 2008). Attendant challenges of FPE for the government included
increasing the availability of textbooks to facilitate learning and teaching and providing adequate teaching staff. The ideal pupil: teacher ratio prescribed for Kenya’s primary schools is 40:1 (Republic of Kenya, 2003c)

**Implementation of FPE: Initial Experiences**

Given a background of high dropout and low enrolment rates in primary level schooling in Kenya, the re-introduction of Free Primary Education (FPE) at the beginning of 2003 was received with euphoria and relief by Kenyans. At the time of the re-introduction of FPE, Kenya’s economic performance was experiencing a decline, and the economically disadvantaged children who had hitherto been unable to attend school, took advantage of the new educational opportunity.

On the heels of the inauguration of the new Kenyan government and its announcement it would immediately abolish fees at all government {primary} schools, some 1.3 million previously out of school children turned up to enrol (UNICEF, 2003a, p. 1).

As a consequence of the sudden upsurge in enrolment numbers, considerable pressure was exerted on the facilities in public primary schools. When schools re-opened for the new year in 2003, stakeholders in education struggled to come to terms with what could be criticized as a hastily implemented promise to abolish the payment of fees in public primary schools. Children, some of whom had never been to school before, turned up in large numbers seeking admission (Wainaina, 2006). The thousands of pupils who moved from private schools to public schools aggravated the situation (United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative, 2006). The reality of delivering on a pledge made before politicians had time to ponder the costs and logistical challenges increasingly became apparent.
The introduction of FPE put pressure on teachers as some class sizes increased to over 100 pupils. All these happened without a corresponding increase in number of teachers and facilities. In many schools, teachers were forced to teach different shifts of separate groups of children in the morning and afternoons. These problems were further complicated by the fact that many of the new pupils who enrolled country-wide were much older than the primary school-going age, leading to confusion on how to handle them alongside others (UN OCHA Integrated Regional Information Network, 2003). The official age of entry into primary school is six years (Republic of Kenya, 2002a). This state of affairs demonstrated the fact that many Kenyans who desired to access basic education had been constrained by the inability to afford the costs associated with it.

By March 2003, the government had released Kshs.519 million for FPE to primary schools, but at the same time, it appealed to donors and well-wishers to top-up the allocations. UNICEF had already responded by donating learning materials worth Ksh.195 million (UNICEF, 2003a). This initial funding from the government worked out to Ksh.28, 000 per school to cover for activity, maintenance, tuition, quality assurance, local travel, support staff wages, recurrent expenditure and contingency costs (United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative, 2006). Considering the numerous expenditure items covered by this money, the allocation was inadequate.

From the foregoing, it can be observed that the free primary education programme has enabled more children to attend school. However, the hasty implementation meant that schools were never well prepared in terms of facilities and skills. Thus, the process was fraught with funding, administrative and logistical difficulties. Even as the government continues to commit more finances to ensure the success of free primary education, planning strategies will have to focus more on sustainability. Donor support, impressive so far, and welcome as it may be, cannot provide a guaranteed source of funding. Of
pertinent concern too, will be the challenge of providing adequate facilities and increasing the number of qualified teachers to handle the increased number of pupils. It will also be necessary to direct efforts towards the retention of the enrolled pupils till completion of primary school for the programme to be meaningful.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
Soon after primary schools re-opened for the first term in January 2003 following the introduction of FPE, many head-teachers and observers began to complain that the government ought to have put in place proper arrangements before implementing the new policy (Avenstrp, Xiaoyan & Soren, 2004). Due to the abrupt introduction of FPE, there was inadequate preparation for the new policy, and there was concern that the introduction FPE was more of a political strategy to fulfil the NARC party pre-election promise (Chuck, 2009). The financial implications and the attendant logistical considerations related to FPE were profound, yet there was no clearly articulated mechanism for sustainably funding FPE. Did public primary schools initiate and work to maintain an efficient system for the management of resources in this challenging FPE environment? How then, did headteachers apply the management functions they are charged with in coping with these changes? What systemic structures should have been put in place, both in schools and at a system-wide level to ensure smooth implementation of FPE in Kenya? Such were the concerns that inspired this study, which sought to conduct an in-depth investigation into the management of the implementation of FPE in schools.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study was to conduct an in-depth investigation into how primary schools were managing change with regard to Free Primary Education in Kenya, and develop a framework for effective change management of FPE in Kenya.
1.4 Objectives of the Study

More specifically, this study aimed at meeting the following objectives;

i. To assess the management of the change process occasioned by FPE and evaluate the adequacy of coping strategies adopted in response to the introduction of FPE.

ii. To examine the sustainability of the FPE initiative.

iii. To analyze the gaps in the FPE policy.

iv. To recommend a modular framework for effective change management of FPE in Kenya.

1.5 Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions.

(i) What is the condition and adequacy of human, financial and material resourcing in primary schools?

(ii) How proficient have the management practices in primary schools been in responding to the implementation of FPE?

(iii) How adequate was the preparation/training given to teachers, headteachers and education officers to enhance their ability to implement the FPE policy?

(iv) What contribution have parents and School Management Committees made towards ensuring successful implementation of FPE?

(v) How was FPE funded and what are the prospects of FPE’s sustainability?

(vi) What gaps exist in the Free Primary Education policy?

(vii) How can the different experiences of managing the change occasioned by FPE be applied towards recommending a modular framework for managing change in primary schools in Kenya?
1.6 **Significance of the Study**

The studies that have been conducted on Free Primary Education in Kenya have generally concentrated on highlighting the challenges that were experienced by schools at implementation. Such studies tended to give prominence to concerns such as congestion in classrooms, shortage of desks and the inadequate number of teachers, while overlooking the management of the change process at the school level. This study presents findings on the management of the change process and recommends a framework through which the implementation of FPE can be viewed holistically to enhance the sustainability of the initiative. The study also provides information on the specific in-service training needs of teachers, headteachers and School Management Committees. Such information could be utilised for designing in-service training curricula relating to FPE for headteachers, teachers and School Management Committees.

1.7 **Limitations of the Study**

Owing to resource constraints, the study covered only two districts in Kenya: Kakamega and Kajiado. Therefore, whereas the findings to some extent apply to primary schools in districts other Kakamega and Kajiado, they might not be fully generalized to such schools beyond the study areas of Kakamega and Kajiado.

1.8 **Assumptions of the Study**

i) In this study, it was assumed that all public primary schools have been affected in their operations by the change of policy to Free Primary Education.

ii) It was assumed that all the education personnel who were involved in the study were fully aware of FPE policy and thus gave informed and honest responses that relate to the context of the policy.
1.9 Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by the Sociotechnical Systems Theory originally developed by Harold J. Leavitt (1965). The theory defines an organization as existing for the purpose of achieving something; reaching some goal or set of goals. The organization seeks to do this by accomplishing certain tasks. The organization is structured, equipped, and staffed appropriately to accomplish its mission. In order to achieve an assigned task, we build an organization; that is we give it structure. It is structure that gives an organization order, system and its characteristics. It establishes a pattern of authority communication and defines role.

The organization must have technological resources (the tools of trade). Technology, here, does not only include the typical equipment such as computers, microscopes and machines, but also textbooks, chalk, and programme inventions; systematic procedures, sequencing of activities, or other procedural activities to solve problems that stand in the way of task achievement. Thus, daily lesson plans, class schedules, curriculum guides are illustrative of technology in educational organizations (Owens, 1998). Finally, the organization must have people, who contribute to task achievement in the organization. Their behaviour selects, directs, communicates and decides. These four internal organizational factors: - Task, Structure, Technology and People (presented in Figure 1.1) are variables that differ from time to time and with different organizations (Owen and Steinhoff, 1976).

---

Within a given organization, these four factors are highly interactive, each tending to shape and mould others. “The interdependence of the variable factors means that a significant change in one will result in some adaptation on the part of the other factors,” (Owen, 1998 p.61). Also, the nature and interrelationship of these internal organizational arrangements in a school (organization) is determined greatly by the school’s response to changes occurring in the larger system in which it exists.

The school is a socio-technical system of larger systems such as the community and the education district in which it operates. This socio-technical view of school organization advocates for an effective approach to management that stresses a more functional administrative structure; organizational structures that
enhance and facilitate development of more adaptive decision-making styles. What is sought, administratively, is a more functional basis for task analysis, structural arrangements, selection and use of technology and the selection and professional development of people and groups on staff. The function of the educational administrator, then, is to develop organizational structures that assure the development of more adaptive ways of integrating people, technology and structure, in a dynamic problem-solving fashion (Owen, 1998).

For effective leadership and management of the school, the primary school head teacher performs various functions or tasks. Approaches to categorization of the task areas of school administrators differ, but the common role tasks include areas such as general school management, curriculum and instruction, pupil, staff and community relations and material and physical resources management. Whatever the categorization, effectiveness of the school manager (headteacher) will be determined by how s/he guides the school towards goal achievement through the execution of the key management functions; Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Coordinating, Directing (leading) and Controlling (Campbell, 1983; Kochhar, 1993).

1.10 Conceptual Framework
The conceptual framework for this study is based on the Sociotechnical Systems Theory perspective. The conceptualization of the theory is illustrative of the interdependence of factors; that a significant change in one will result in some adaptation on the part of the other factors. The framework conceptualizes the school as a system where the change to FPE has engendered other effects. For example, personnel at the Ministry of Education had to initiate and coordinate in-service training related to FPE, and headteachers had to find strategies for coping with the large enrolments that resulted from FPE. Technological changes such as multi-shift teaching, facilities for Special Needs Education, revised teachers guides, the creation of school clusters for resource-sharing and use of low-cost teaching/learning materials are responses to FPE
that were adopted variously in schools. These affected other factors in the school system; there could have been a need to create in some schools, a unit for special education, or a coordinator for the school cluster resource sharing arrangements, which are elements in the structure sub-system. Thus, structural changes would flow out of the technical change originally initiated. To illustrate further, the FPE policy abolished fees and levies in schools. This had an effect on the “people” sub-system, as workers and even non-Teachers’ Service Commission employed teachers had to be relieved of their duties. Some of the “tasks” that were previously done by the dismissed workers had to be re-structured and redistributed among the teachers, pupils and the remaining employees.

The framework thus provides the basis for exploring the variables of interest in this study. From the people, structure, technology and task components of the primary school education system, the following variables that form the basis for analysing the management of the change to FPE were extracted: the human, material and financial resources in schools; the management practices of headteachers; preparation and training of education personnel; parental and community support toward FPE; the funding for FPE; and the government policy relating to FPE. These variables represent the dynamic interaction that is pertinent for understanding the management of the change of policy to FPE.
Effective Management of the change to FPE

Figure 1.2: Conceptual framework showing the enabling inputs for effective management of FPE

Source: Researcher
As conceptualised in figure 1.2, the effective management of change is the independent variable. When FPE was introduced, headteachers found themselves in the position of principal change management agents in schools. Thus, through the management functions (planning, organising, staffing, leading, coordinating and controlling), headteachers, assisted by the other actors who contribute to school management such as the School Management Committees and deputy headteachers, had the responsibility of overseeing the operations of the institution and steering the management of the change process. While headteachers were the principal managers of the change process that resulted from the introduction of FPE, the Government, by virtue of the Ministry of Education’s status as the policy organ, similarly had a major role to play in the change management process. This role is expressed in functions of planning, policy formulation and implementation and exercising general oversight in management of schools.

A key determinant to the successful implementation of FPE, and thus to the management of the change process is resources. The extent to which teaching and learning resources are available in schools in light of the increase in the number of pupils occasioned by FPE is arguably the most critical variable of concern in the primary school education system. In addition, for successful implementation of FPE, such resources not only have to be availed in sufficient amounts, they also have to be managed efficiently. In this study, the term resources’ is seen as encompassing financial resources, physical and material resources, and personnel. Considering the abrupt change to FPE and the inadequate preparedness that was evident at the time of this shift in policy, it was important for this study to investigate the extent to which the resources necessary for teaching and learning were available in schools. The provision of resources is itself an indicator of the effectiveness or otherwise of the management of change.
Resources on their own, cannot lead to the achievement of organisational goals; they must be managed efficiently. The effective change management therefore requires that headteachers provide leadership in the FPE implementation process. This study therefore also sought to examine the management practices in schools in the context of FPE with regard to the key management functions of planning, leading, organizing, motivating, and controlling. The focus was to assess whether the management practices in primary schools were proficient in responding to the implementation of FPE. It was necessary to make an evaluation to determine whether the management practices of headteachers reflected competent execution of their duties as chief executives in the school organisation. Management practices of headteachers are seen through leadership behaviors displayed by headteachers as they engaged in managing the school in the changed environment that resulted from the introduction of FPE. This evaluation is premised on the assumption that school management is an integrated process; it integrates the people, finances and material resources to carry out the operations of the school enterprise efficiently and successfully. The process of implementing FPE in schools requires headteachers to provide leadership that can positively influence successful change implementation.

Effective management of change also entails creating readiness on the part of personnel who will be involved in the implementation process. The level of preparation given to teachers, headteachers and education officers for the implementation of FPE in Kenya is thus considered a key determinant for the success of FPE. Considering that the FPE policy was implemented in haste, and educational stakeholders received little preparation prior to its implementation, it was necessary to assess the adequacy of the orientation or training measures that were subsequently introduced for the purpose of resourcing personnel for FPE implementation. Preparation is related to management practices of headteachers, in the sense that for headteachers to act with proficiency, they require adequate training and preparation in management. Preparation and training, in turn, to a great extent, depend on the availability of resources. Such
relationships emphasize the interdependence of the various variables of change management outlined herein.

Also key in the implementation of FPE and therefore its sustainability and success are the level of parental and community support given to primary schools. Indeed, the government emphasizes that to ensure effectiveness of FPE, community support for infrastructure development must be encouraged as a key strategy (Republic of Kenya, 2005). Support from parents and the community as a whole not only impacts on headteachers’ management practices, but also enhances schools’ ability to initiate development programmes and increases their resource base. Parental and community support also entail involvement in school management affairs.

In addition to actual financial resources required for FPE, the sources of funding and the issues and concerns related to funding also have an impact on the sustainability of the FPE initiative. Effective management of change such as the introduction of FPE requires that mechanisms for sustainable funding be put in place, and that the challenges that face funding should inform policy making. In this study therefore, an analysis was made of the funding mechanisms for FPE and the implications that this had on the sustainability of FPE.

Lastly, the policy environment is conceptualised as a key variable that impacts FPE and its management. Interrogating policy concerns necessitates identifying areas in which existing policy is inadequate or where there is lack of policy to address certain concerns related to FPE in Kenya. Embedded in this analysis is the need to also highlight any notable gap between the policy and its implementation. In the conceptual framework, government policy is seen as affecting all other variables of concern. The Ministry of Education policy provides the guidelines for the management of schools, and therefore directly impacts on the change management efforts and activities of school administrators. Education policy also directly determines the provision of
resources for primary schools, impacts on the provision of resources, guides the training activity given to personnel, and illuminates the provisions for parental and community participation in school management. Government policy also outlines the strategies geared towards enhancing equity, increasing participation in schooling, ensuring achievement of literacy and numeracy, improving access to education and enhancing completion rates.

As conceptualised in the framework, effective management of FPE that pays attention to the various enabling inputs and processes should lead to the short term outcomes of reduced inequalities in education, increased participation and retention in schooling, achievement of literacy and numeracy, improved access to education and better completion rates. This in turn would lead to the achievement of Universal Primary Education (UPE), and ultimately, to the attainment of the overall goal of Education for All (EFA).

1.11 Definition of Terms

(i) Management of resources

Refers to the process by which the headteacher applies the functions of planning, organizing, staffing, leading coordinating and controlling to effectively utilize the human, physical and financial inputs of the school organization. Under the overall supervision of the headteacher, other members of staff also contribute variously towards resource management.

(ii) Management of change

Refers to those organized efforts, broadly but not exclusively, under the direction of the headteacher, aimed at enhancing the school’s ability to respond and adapt effectively to changes in the school occasioned by the implementation of FPE.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction
This chapter presents a review of literature on education for all, which is the philosophy underpinning effort to universalize primary education in Kenya. Government financing of education in Kenya since independence is also briefly outlined and two landmark concerns in financing education; the 8-4-4 system of education and the cost-sharing policy are analyzed. Lastly, effective school management, which is a central concern in this study, is reviewed.

2.2 Change management
The management of change in education has continued to attract academic interest. Morrison (2006) explains that, in education, as well as in business, a major common concern is to manage change effectively, to identify the pressures for change, to plan the direction of change and to implement it for everyone’s benefit. They make the important observation that the world of educational management is underpinned by business management, and so much of the strategy in education management, such as change management in education, derives from the world of business. Thus, many change management issues reflect business pedigree.

Change management is a strategic activity aimed at getting the best outcomes from the change process (Australian National Training Authority, 2003). Change cannot be avoided by educational systems and individual schools within the educational systems; they are subject to change over time. Stanley (2006) observes that because education is seen as being at the forefront of social and
economic planning, it is constantly subject to pressure for change. Due to this, leaders in education are required to address the imperative for change that comes from these extrinsic sources. The Australian National Training Authority (2003) offers some specific reasons why it is important to manage change as follows;

- To maximise the opportunities presented by the proposed change
- To identify and overcome impediments
- To minimise disruption to programs and services
- To ensure staff are engaged with the change process to achieve the best possible outcomes
- To prepare and support students and staff, to ensure effective change and to achieve strategic goals and vision.

Change, and especially if great in magnitude, can be weighed down by challenges and even opposition. Such was the case with the introduction of FPE in Kenya. The initial implementation stage was fraught with serious challenges that were attributable to lack of proper planning. The events that unfolded in the education system revealed a lack of readiness for the change to FPE, as the government focused most of its attention on ensuring that the election pledge that was made to provide FPE was fulfilled. Due consideration was not given to the full system-wide ramifications that would result from the change in policy.

The scenario observed with the introduction of FPE in Kenya, which represents a flaw in the management of the change process, brings to mind the observations of Banathy (1996) on management of change in educational systems (and institutions). He asserts that there is a distinction between systemic change management, which is contemplated with a view to the whole system, and its environment, and the piecemeal change efforts in educational organisations. The latter, he observes, have not produced desired outcomes in educational systems. Educational scholars such as Fullan (1993) and Sparks (1993), draw attention to the fact that when changes are introduced in schools
and education systems, leaders ought to fully comprehend the change process so as to lead and manage change and improvement efforts effectively. Fullan & Miles (1992) add that education leaders have to learn to overcome barriers and deal with the disorder that more often than not exists during the complex process of change.

2.2.1 Barriers to change

The barriers to educational change in schools and in other organizations is an area of research that has attracted much interest over the years. Several major barriers have been identified from research. Some authors such as Ertmer (1999) divide these barriers into ‘first order’ and ‘second order’ barriers to change. ‘First order’ barriers (or external barriers) refer to the challenges to adoption of new practices that result from the environment in which the change is introduced. These include a lack of access to resources; a lack of time; a lack of effective training; or technical problems. The internal or ‘second order’ barriers on the other hand are based more upon the perceptions and attitudes of the people involved. They include resistances borne from a lack of confidence; of negative attitudes to the change; and a lack of perceived benefits of the change introduced.

Several research studies (Dawes, 2000; Jones, 2004; Cox et al., 1999) propose that both the internal and external barriers need to be dealt with at the same time, with an emphasis upon the internal barriers (Mumtaz 2000; Ertmer, 1999) if changes to practice are to be enabled. Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, Roth and Smith (1999) also emphasize that deep changes in how people perceive the world and how they think are the most difficult to make happen. Due to the fact that such changes are deep and touch on values, they can not be enforced.

The barriers to change efforts lead to resistance and differences among those involved with the change process. Such resistance and conflict is aggravated if
the group involved with the change process is heterogeneous and diverse. Minimizing any resistance to change therefore becomes an important task for change managers, such as headteachers and education officers, who must convince teachers of the gains that the planned changes will bring them. Indeed, Fullan (1993, 1996) acknowledges the necessity of properly and adroitly managing resistance and conflict as part of the change process. He asserts that when conflict is recognized as healthy and manageable, it contains the seeds of growth and change.

Several research articles suggest that schools and teachers are inherently resistant to change (Albaugh 1997; Jones 2004; Ertmer 1999; Mumtaz 2000). Albaugh (1997) for example, argues that teachers are often suspicious of new claims and the implementation of new ideas where there is no proof yet of effectiveness. Crego and Schiffrin (1995) also posit that individuals, just like nature, have an innate mechanism that resists change so as to maintain a relatively state of equilibrium or homeostasis. However, they are also quick to point out that some individuals naturally embrace change in order to grow. Such individuals could be seen as the change initiators. Crego and Schiffrin also outline the levels at which change in organisation threatens individuals as follows:

- Loss of Status
- Loss of job
- Loss of security
- Loss of structure
- Social disruption
- Group transformation

According to the list of threats that Crego and Schiffrin (1995) present, individuals may feel threatened by the likelihood that change could lead to loss of the status within which they already feel comfortable, or even more discomforting, that it could render them jobless. They could feel their security is threatened. Loss of structure refers to the chaos that ensues with change. This threatens the order and comfort zones of individuals. Social disruption refers to
the fact that a social hierarchy exists in most organisations, and this is usually linked to authority. A change can alter the social order and cause disassociation pain in those affected. Lastly, group transformation relates to groups that are closely knit and who have usually worked together for a long period of time. Such groups are likely to resist change much more than individuals, or more loosely structured groups. The authors assert that the threats discussed above could cause individuals or groups to consciously undermine or sabotage change.

Senge et al. (1999) point out that inadequate participation and poor implementation are the two common reasons why organisations fail to redesign themselves successfully in the wake of change. They add that the capacity of people to absorb disruption—both in terms of time available as well personality characteristics such as resilience also affect the organisations’ ability to redesign successfully. Also, when the demands of change on people are too high, this causes dysfunctional behaviour, and in turn, loss of productivity. To this, Conner (1998) adds that some of the common symptoms that result from distressing change include confusion, anxiety, fear, defensiveness and withdrawal; people need to feel they are in control or at least feel they have some indirect control or influence. When change continues despite the symptoms of dysfunctional behaviour, this results in the three things:

- Morale deteriorates
- The initiatives that are attempted result in only short term application of the intended goals
- People stop listening to leaders and could even attempt to undermine the change process

The literature on barriers to change demonstrates the fact that changes in educational systems can have adverse effects if proper mechanisms are not instituted as a counteraction. The change management effort is therefore about managing the changes that are part of or a consequence of change introduced in the system, as well a conscious effort to neutralize the undesirable obstacles that
may hamper effective implementation of change. Change management is a means through which an endeavour is made to decrease and manage resistance to change.

2.2.2 Change Management Approaches

The study of change has a long history, and dates back to the theoretical studies of Kurt Lewin, who in the 1950s studied change inside organizations (Kleiner, 1996). Lewin portrays change as involving an unfreezing process, learning or changing process and a refreezing process. Several practitioners then pursued Lewin's approach to change and attempted to gain an understanding of the driving and restraining forces for change.

In the 1980s and 1990s, William Bridges (Bridges, 1980, 1991; Bridges & Mitchell, 2002) developed and extended the understanding of change management by differentiating between organizational change and transition. Change, he says, concerns what will be altered; transition relates to how the change will feel for those required to make it. Since then, numerous scholars have illustrated the steps involved in planning and managing change. Kotter (1996) describes eight steps to transforming an organization, including establishing a sense of urgency; forming a powerful guiding coalition; creating a vision; communicating the vision; empowering others to act on the vision; planning for and creating short-term wins; consolidating improvements and producing still more change; and institutionalizing new approaches. Ackerman-Anderson and Anderson (2001) describe a "conscious change leadership" process that is continuous and non-linear and incorporates an evaluation component. Their steps comprise preparing to lead the change; creating vision, commitment and capacity; assessing the situation and determining design requirements; designing the desired state; analyzing the impact; planning and organizing for implementation; implementing the change; celebrating and integrating the new state; and learning and course-correcting.
Skelton-Green, Simpson and Scott (2007) note that many leaders tend to emphasize one approach to change management over another. Some leaders favour the *strategy-driven* approaches which focus on the need for change and the desired outcome; they are inclined toward providing minimal specifications or rules, and work towards defining a shared purpose or outcome. Leaders who favour the *organizational development or people-driven* approaches tend to emphasize on stakeholder engagement, facilitation and capacity building. Finally, those who prefer more *project management-type* approaches tend to stress the definition of the tasks, deliverables and accountabilities that are requisite for implementing the change processes.

A Review of selected Models of Change

Several change management theories have been proposed as well as employed to better understand and implement management of change. These theories and how well they are implemented can be a useful driving factor of success in change management. There are numerous models and theories, each with its potential benefits or weaknesses for different types of organization. The following few are commonly employed in change management and have demonstrated success in organizations.

2.2.2.1 Lewin’s Three-step Model of change

Amongst the earliest fundamental approaches of change management is derived from Kurt Lewin’s seminal work. He conceived change as a modification of those forces keeping a system’s behaviour stable (Cummings & Worley, 1993). According to Lewin (1951), change is a process of identifying the status quo, then determining its relationship to a new and hopefully better state. Moving to the new state requires identifying the resisting forces (the factors that obstruct change) and the driving forces (those factors that support the change). Planning the change therefore, requires working to reduce the impeding factors while enhancing the driving forces. After the change has been put into operation, a
process of consolidation (refreezing) becomes necessary. Lewin thus proposes that successful change comprises three main stages:

1. Unfreezing: This means removing the deadlock, or abandoning the status quo prevailing in the organisation, in order to change.
2. Moving: This means transition to a new level required.
3. Refreezing: this means re-establishment of the new situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unfreezing</th>
<th>Moving</th>
<th>Refreezing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current organisational structure and roles.</td>
<td>Abandon the old methods of work. Change the tasks, routines and relationships. Change the organisational structure, operations and technologies. Change individuals and groups</td>
<td>- New roles and new organisational structure. - New work methods and new routines. - Taking risks - Evaluate the results. - Constructive amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a need for change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of resistance to change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-education and team-building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1: The Kurt-Lewin Model


Figure 2.1 shows that before the adoption of new behaviour, we must successfully eliminate the old behaviour, and then the new behaviour becomes acceptable. It is important to create the feeling of the need for change and the means needed to conduct it for change to be truly successful.

**Step One- Unfreezing the present level:** The unfreezing process is intended to increase awareness of individuals that the current circumstances are no longer suitable and meaningful on one hand, and to reduce resistance to change in order to get to the desired situation on the other (Grandstaff & Sorenson, 2009).
This step involves reduction of resistant forces such as those groups of people who attempt to maintain the organisation in its current status. It also involves assisting people to appreciate that change is necessary and that the current situation of the organisation is inadequate in meeting the changes occurring in the field. Unfreezing may be accomplished through some form of confrontation or re-education for participants. It can also be attained through team-building. The significance of these activities is to make it possible the change agents to become more convinced of the need for change (Cook, Hunsaker & Coffey, 1997).

**Step Two-Moving to the new level:** The moving process eliminates the old ways of doing things and embraces new behaviours or methods. At this stage, it becomes necessary to develop new personnel, change attitudes and values, and alter trends through changes in the organisational structure and operations of the organisation. The implementation at this stage should be effective so as to ensure individuals do not abandon the new practices introduced and revert to old work methods after a short while (Burnes, 2000).

**Step Three-Refreezing the new level:** In this stage the organization is stabilized in the new state in order to ensure that the new ways of working are relatively safe from regression. This can be achieved through giving careful attention to support strategies and mechanisms that positively reinforce the new ways of working. Such methods include rewards and the development of the organizational culture, norms, policies and structure (Cummings & Worley, 1993). If individuals perceive these methods as yielding positive results, they will work positively to support the new methods, but if individuals do not feel that they are working for them, it might be useful for the leader or manager to support the new system through using external methods (Burnes, 2000).

In the three-step approach, before a new change happens, the old behaviour has to be discarded. Only then can the new practices enjoy acceptance.
step approach emphasizes the significance of felt-need. It also clearly outlines the role of change agents, both in unfreezing and moving to the new state. The three-step approach provides a general framework for understanding change management. A useful contribution of this approach is that it enables change managers and implementers in general to think about creating a staged framework to changing the environment in which change is introduced. Studying the current situation before moving is a prudent change management practice. This has application for the implementation of FPE in Kenya. As shown by findings from several studies on FPE in Kenya (UNESCO, 2005; Chuck, 2009; Sifuna, 2008), there was no detailed planning before FPE was implemented, neither did the government carry out a situation analysis before implementing FPE in Kenya. Thus, such studies have shown that because of the abrupt introduction of FPE in Kenya, the education system was caught off-guard, resulting in confusion amongst teachers, parents, as well ministry of education personnel.

However, the three-step model of change is a start-stop process that views the refreezing process as stabilising new practices. The model fails to consider that change is a continual process, especially where the emphasis is on ongoing improvement such as is the case with the role of the MOE and school managers in managing the FPE implementation.

2.2.2.2 The ADKAR Model for Change

The ADKAR model for change management was developed by Hiatt (2006). Hiatt’s fundamental theory is that the main reason for project or programme failure is resistance to change and that effective change management greatly boosts the chances of success. The model is based on several change management techniques, but then is articulated as a single lucid model with one chief underlying message: the key to successful change is in an understanding of how to facilitate change with one person. The model is split up into 5 parts
which Hiatt explains are crucial to success in steering effective change management.

ADKAR is an acronym for the five elements of the model:

- **A** – *Awareness* of the need for change
- **D** – *Desire* to support and participate in the change
- **K** – *Knowledge* of how to change
- **A** – *Ability* to implement the required skills and behaviours
- **R** – *Reinforcement* to sustain the change. Are there incentives in place to reinforce the change and make it stick?

The ADKAR model tracks the natural order of how an individual experiences change. Hiatt defines each element of the model and analyses the factors that influence the success of each of these elements. The model is intended to focus teams on specific activities that will impact results. According to Prosci (2006), the benefits of this model include; it evaluates employee resistance, helps employees’ transition through the process, creates employee specific action plans, and develops a change management plan with employees. Because the ADKAR model focuses on employees, it offers high chances of success as the staff feels involved and has interest in the process.

The change managers in Kenya’s education system could apply this model to identify gaps in the FPE implementation change management process and to provide effective training for headteachers, teachers and ministry of education personnel. The ADKAR model can be used to;

- Diagnose school and staff resistance to change
- Help teachers and other personnel in the transition through the change process
- Create a successful action plan for personal and professional advancement during change
• Develop a change management plan for the school system in the country.

Thus, the ADKAR model provides the mechanism for identifying why change may not be working. Once this is possible, it assists in the development of the necessary steps to construct successful change. It facilitates the collapsing of the change into parts, an understanding of where the change is failing and tackles that impact point.

The change in policy to FPE could be seen in the context of the ADKAR model. A critical step in change management of the FPE initiative was to create awareness of the reasons for change. Desire to change at the employee level should have been addressed because resistance is seen as a natural reaction to change. As the change moved into implementation, an application of the ADKAR model suggests that there was need to develop knowledge about the change and the ability to implement new skills and behaviours. Once the change was in place, the need to reinforce the change to avoid moving backwards to old behaviours, such as the fee creep that has been observed, became necessary. This results-oriented model helps to guide change management activities for both system-wide and individual change management.

2.2.2.3 The ‘Six Change Approaches’ Kotter model

The Kotter model is based on research which shows that there are critical steps an organisation or service needs to go through to ensure that change happens and sticks. The ‘Six Change Approaches’ developed by Kotter and Schlesinger (1979) is a model designed to prevent or minimize employee resistance to change. This model can be useful as it covers many possible issues, some an organization may never even face. The approaches in the model react to the four main resistance factors which are: self-interest, misunderstanding, low tolerance for change, and employee disagreement with the reasons for change.
Kotter and Schlesinger set out the following six (6) change approaches to deal with this resistance to change:

1. **Education and Communication** – Where there is a lack of information or inaccurate information and analysis, one of the best ways to overcome resistance to change is to educate people about the change effort beforehand. Up-front communication and education helps employees see the logic in the change effort. This reduces unfounded and incorrect rumours concerning the effects of change in the organization.

2. **Participation and Involvement** – When employees are involved in the change effort, they are more likely to buy into change rather than resist it. This approach is likely to lower resistance and those who merely acquiesce to change.

3. **Facilitation and Support** – Where people are resisting change due to adjustment problems, managers can head-off potential resistance by being supportive of employees during difficult times. Managerial support helps employees to deal with fear and anxiety during a transition period. The basis of resistance to change is likely to be the perception that there is some form of detrimental effect occasioned by the change in the organization. This approach is concerned with provision of special training, counselling, and time off work.

4. **Negotiation and Agreement** – Where someone or some group may lose out in a change and where that individual or group has considerable power to resist, managers can combat resistance by offering incentives to employees not to resist change, for example, by allowing change resistors to veto elements of change that are threatening, or change resistors can be offered incentives to leave the organisation through early buyouts or retirements in order to avoid having to experience the change effort. This approach is appropriate where those resisting change are in a position of power.

5. **Manipulation and Co-option** – Where other tactics will not work or are too expensive, Kotter and Schlesinger (1979) suggest that an effective manipulation technique is to co-opt with resisters. Co-option involves the
patronizing gesture in bringing a person into a change management planning group for the sake of appearances rather than their substantive contribution. This often involves selecting leaders of the resisters to participate in the change effort. These leaders can be given a symbolic role in decision making without threatening the change effort.

6. **Explicit and Implicit Coercion** - Where speed is essential and to be used only as last resort, managers can explicitly or implicitly force employees into accepting change by making it clear that resisting change can lead to lose of jobs, being fired or transferred or not getting promoted.

2.2.2.4 **Fullan’s theories of managing change**
Michael Fullan, an educational change specialist, examines several fundamentals of educational change. Fullan (1993) explores the complexity of education and focuses on the school as a learning organization with a relationship to its environment. Fullan argues that effecting change in education is not confined to introducing innovations or reforms into the educational system; it also entails introduction of a new mindset about educational change. Therefore, a change of mind is critical in implementing change successfully. He adds that the main difficulty in changing education is to transform the educational system as a learning organization. This requires the educators, administrators and teachers to be experts in the dynamics of change and to become skilled change agents.

Fullan explains four moral imperatives for change; facilitating critical enculturation, providing access to knowledge, building an effective teacher-student connection and practicing good stewardship. He defines change agency as “being self conscious about the nature of change and the change process” (P.12). He also mentions four core capacities required as a generative foundation for building greater change capacities: personal vision, inquiry, mastery and collaboration.
Fullan views change as being complex and identifies eight lessons for understanding change. These are:

- You can not mandate what matters (the more complex the change the less you can force it).
- Change is a journey not a blueprint (change is non-linear, loaded with uncertainty and excitement and sometimes perverse).
- Problems are our friends (problems are inevitable and it is impossible to learn without having faced problems).
- Vision and strategic planning come later (premature vision and planning causes problems)
- Individualism and collectivism must have equal power (both individual and groupthink are important).
- Neither centralization nor decentralization works (top-down and bottom-up strategies are necessary).
- Connection with the wider environment is critical for success (the best organizations learn externally as well as internally).
- Every person is a change agent (change is too important to leave to experts, personal mind set and mastery is the ultimate protection).

Fullan’s change process is unusual in the way in which apparently contradictory pairs like failure and success, personal mastery and collective action, and pressure and support should move in tandem towards a successful change process. This process is very complex as one must be careful not to over control nor to leave it to disorder.

Fullan focuses on the idea of the school as a learning organization. He argues that most change efforts are misconceived because of their failure to understand the concept of the learning organization, and adds that the vision and strategic planning have blind spots and the educators must work in new ways. In discussing the relationship between education and its environment, he says that a learning organization will not find the solutions for its existing needs by
searching the environment (although it is helpful), but needs to look holistically at the complex view of its own existence. This means that the learning organization must use its own innovative capacities and connect with the wider environment.

The learning organization is seen by Fullan as part of a great holistic system that requires a holistic interactive view to improve and develop. In the case of Kenya, the Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP) 2005 - 2010 represents such an attempt to view education management holistically. The Kenya Education Sector Support Programme represents a planning effort whose intent is to ensure a clear long-term sector-wide development strategy for education in the country (Republic of Kenya, 2005b). The issue of concern however, is whether KESSP’s holistic view has effectively shaped practice in schools. Several Investment Programmes have been formed under KESSP to cover the needs of primary education, and especially in the context of FPE. Unfortunately, the implementation of FPE has continued to suffer serious challenges that threaten its very sustainability.

Also relevant to management of the change to FPE is the emphasis that Fullan places on teacher education. He argues that the best solution and the worst problem in education today is teacher education. He asserts that teacher education is such an important tool for improvement that the problem of productive change cannot be addressed unless continuous teacher education - pre-service and in-service- is treated as the major vehicle for producing teachers as moral change agents.

Fullan also notes that the role of the individual is to shape and check the organizations they work in. Although focusing on the individual is not a substitute for system change, it is the most effective strategy for accomplishing it. Whereas Fullan’s theories of change management have great benefit in schools as educational organizations, they might not be as successful in the
MOE Headquarters. This is because the MOE Headquarters is the centralized top level of a hierarchical administration where decisions are made and plans are formed. At the headquarters, bureaucratic rather than educational activities per se are performed.

The models presented focus on the process and the mechanism of change management, in terms of how and what to do. They also emphasize the role of the leader of change. Therefore, consideration must be given to the culture surrounding the leader: are they preventing or encouraging a culture for change. These models are mostly based on private sector results, but have found application in many fields for their competitive nature which encourages change and evolution.

2.3 Education For All

The persistence of both poverty and inequality in many parts of the world even after several decades of ‘development’ has made education an issue of critical importance. Efforts such as the Declaration of the World Conference on Education For All (WCEFA) in 1990 underscore the hope placed in education by society. Yet, education has continued to become less, rather than more available, accessible and its quality eroded (Little, Hoppers & Gardner, 1994). Such a trend is worrying, given the significance of education in development. Evidence from research shows that minimum educational attainment among the majority of a country’s population is critical for development. Education is a key determinant of earnings and therefore an important exit route from poverty. It is the key to creating, applying and spreading knowledge. Primary education develops the capacity to learn, to read, to use Mathematics, to acquire information and to think critically about information. It is also the gateway to higher education that trains the professionals. It serves as the basis for life-long learning (Bruns, Mingat & Rakotomalala, 2003; Republic of Kenya, 2003a; World Bank, 1990). Hence, the need to provide a basic education to everyone will continue to be a central concern in development planning.
In March 1990, delegates representing governments and other stakeholders worldwide met in Jomtien, Thailand at the World Conference on Education For All (WCEFA) to discuss the basic learning needs of children, youth and adults. Here, the World Declaration on Education For All (EFA) was adopted. Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 had enshrined the right of all to education, the educational realities were that more than 100 million children had no access to education. Millions of children satisfied attendance requirements but did not acquire essential knowledge and skills before dropping out (WCEFA, 1990). The WCEFA (1990) declaration advocated an expanded vision and renewed commitment to education that included universalizing access to education by removing disparities; focusing on learning acquisition rather than mere enrolment; and strengthening stakeholder partnerships and international solidarity (Little et al., 1990). After Jomtien, several governments undertook initiatives to promote EFA. Donor agencies increased spending on basic education, reinforcing a trend in flow of aid to education that had emerged gradually in the 1980s (Carr-Hill & King, 1992). The Jomtien conference, however, should not be seen as the genesis in EFA effort. The fact that the conference laid emphasis on re-affirmation, renewal and restrengthening attests to this.

In the Millennium Declaration of September 2000, members of the United Nations (UN) made a commitment to address the crippling poverty and misery afflicting parts of the globe. Governments set a date for 2015 by which they would meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) one of which was to achieve UPE by 2015. The ultimate goal here is for all boys and girls to have access to and complete a good quality primary education. It is also made explicit in the MDG that all gender disparity in primary and secondary education be eliminated by 2005.
EFA is not merely an end in itself, but a first step along the continuum of life-long learning for children to maximize their potential as individuals and members of a productive society. Achieving EFA will take strong government commitment through ensuring sound micro-economic climate, resource mobilization and adequate spending on primary education. This must not be divorced from the focus or access and quality of learning and the promotion of efficiency in the education system (World Bank, 2000). No one individual or government can ensure that all children enjoy their right to quality primary education. The right can only be fully realized when barriers to access, attendance, attainment and achievement are removed and the disparities in the four areas eliminated.

2.3.1 EFA: Global Overview and Trends

The international community’s commitment to universal education was first set down in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and later reiterated in the 1989 convention on the Rights of the child. In the 1990 World Summit for children leaders not only reaffirmed their commitment that children should have quality basic education, but also, pledged to place emphasis on reducing disparities that existed in rates of school enrolment for decades. Despite these commitments, the ideal of universal education remains unfulfilled and gender gaps persist to date. For more than a decade, the EFA campaign, led by UNESCO, has embraced a mission that includes both advocacy and a sense of accountability towards commitments. In its 2002 report, EFA campaign noted that although 86 countries have already achieved gender parity in primary enrolment, and another 36 appear close to meeting the goals, 31 countries, mostly located in sub-Saharan Africa are at high risk of not achieving the goal by 2015 (UNICEF, 2003b). One hundred and eighty nine (189) countries have committed to the 8 Millennium Development Goals of eradicating extreme poverty and improving the welfare of their people by 2015. The second of these Goals, “to achieve UPE’, echoes the Jomtien commitment to achieve UPE by 2000, which was reaffirmed and extended by the World Education Forum in
Dakar, 2000. As the Dakar forum acknowledged, the Jomtien goal was not met. Many countries still remain below target (Bruns et al., 2003).

Improvements could be noted from some of the previously left-behind regions. In Eastern Europe and Central Asia, nine to ten years of schooling is now the norm. Latin America, East Asia and the Caribbean region are moving towards an almost universal status for primary education. Every year, an increasing number of children have been accommodated within primary education, but available places are not sufficient enough to keep pace with the annual growth in school age population. The global number of children out of school therefore remains undiminished at 121 million (majority being girls). Sub-Saharan Africa accounts for a proportionately larger number of the world’s non-enrolled primary school age children – 41 million in 1990 and 45 million in the year 2003. Whereas net enrolment ratios may have increased considerably in all regions in 1990s (world average of 81% enrolment in 2002), the regional variations are enormous. Enrolment rates in Latin America and Caribbean are close to those in industrialized countries, at 94% and 97% respectively. South Asia lags much further behind at 74%, while sub-Saharan Africa languishes at 59%. In Sub-Saharan Africa, completion rate has improved but stands at just around 50%. At this rate, it will barely reach 60% in 2015 (UNICEF, 2003b).
Education policy has been slow in the path to realizing that girls’ schooling is fundamental to a country’s success in achieving education for all. In the days of newly independent nations, there was general enthusiasm for education as vital in advancement. However, the task of educating all children was colossal. In 1960, less than half of children in developing world aged 6 to 11 were enrolled in primary school, and in sub-Saharan Africa, only one in twenty attended secondary school. Overall primary enrolment had doubled in Asia and Latin America and tripled in Africa (Colclough & Lewin, 1993). Millions, majority of them girls, remained out of school as the rapid population growth consistently frustrated progress. In the 1980s, structural adjustment aggravated the situation. In sub-Saharan Africa, countries that underwent adjustment between 1980 and 1993 experienced an average reduction in real per capita spending of 14% (Jayarajah, Branson & Biyanak, 1996).

The conclusion to be drawn from this discussion is that whereas progress has been made towards universal primary education, in the developing world it is
still a challenge. Yet, scores of countries are without the talent, energy and creativity that these millions of children could bring to develop their societies.

2.3.2 Universal Primary Education: The Kenyan Scene

At independence in 1963, the Kenya government identified the fight against ignorance and the enhancement of economic growth as major priorities. The Sessional Paper No. 10 of 1965 on African Socialism and Its Application to Planning in Kenya set a policy and pace for fighting illiteracy, ignorance and poverty (Government of Kenya, 1965). The current government’s attempt at providing Free Primary Education is not an entirely new initiative. In fact, at independence the government proclaimed its commitment to the provision of free and universal primary education.

However, unlike the NARC government, which embarked on a full and immediate implementation in 2003, the government at independence followed a more gradual and progressive path to actualize the commitment to FPE. The first decree in this direction was passed in 1971 when the government abolished tuition fees for primary schools in Arid and Semi-Arid land (ASAL) districts. This measure was calculated to address the inequality in access to primary education suffered by these regions due to their low levels of socio-economic development and harsh geographical conditions (Kinyanjui, 1974). Soon after, in December 1973, another presidential decree was passed abolishing school fees for all children attending standard 1 to standard 4 (Eshiwani, 1993). It is important to note that many schools were established and others extended by communities with support from the government. The “Harambee” philosophy of pooling resources led to the rapid growth of primary education. Thus, the abolition of school fees in primary schools and the introduction of the school milk in 1979, spurred on by the stable economic growth of the 1970s led to a significant increase in access to primary education and improved retention rates. Primary enrolment shot up by 115 percent in 1980.
These gains were unfortunately reversed soon after. By 1985, the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) had dropped to 98.1%. When fees was abolished for standards 1 to 4 in 1974, for the remaining three grades (standards 5 to 7) the fees was standardized at Kshs.60, with a plan to reduce this figure annually before ultimately arriving at free 7-year primary schooling by 1980 (Nkinyangi, 1982). The immediate benefit of the above policies was an upsurge in enrolment in primary schools. For example the 1974 abolition of fees saw the figure in primary schools rise from 1,816,617 pupils in 1973 to 2,734,398 in 1974. This was an impressive 51% (Somerset, 2007). There was however, another angle to this phenomenon. There was an inevitable expansion in classroom facilities launched to respond to increase in number of pupils (Sifuna, 1990). As a result, school committees begun to charge a fee for each child to meet the cost of equipment, materials and construction. The cost of primary schooling started to rise as parents and communities had to bear this extra cost (Muhorro, 1975). The ironical consequence was that the new levies rose and eventually become higher than the school fees prior to free primary education. The high costs of education discouraged many parents from enrolling their children in primary school. Enrolment in Kenya declined from 95% in 1989 to 75% in 1995 (Republic of Kenya, 1996). By the year 2000, N.E.R. in primary schools had improved slightly to 87.6%. Completion and transition rates however, remained below 50% during the 1990s decade (Republic of Kenya, 2002b).

Considering the situation at the time of independence, Kenya has had an impressive record in expanding access over the years. In 1960, just before independence, the primary school G.E.R was a measly 47%. Three decades later, in 1980, this had nearly doubled to 90%. However, the gains made in the earlier decades were reversed in 1989. After peaking at 106% in 1989, the primary school G.E.R fell to 101.4% in 1999. In 1999, the overall average drop-out rate in each of the classes of primary school was 3.2%. It increased
from 2.7% in standard 1 to a high of 5.2% in standard 7, the year before Kenya Certificate of Primary Education is done (Republic of Kenya, 2002b).

An important feature of enrolment in Kenya over the years is that it has been characterized by gender, region and income-level disparities. In 2000, the National G.E.R in primary education was 87.6%, but only 17.8% in North Eastern Province, as compared to 106% in Central Province. Female representation was 49.4% at primary school level. Access has been low and staffing problems have been experienced (Republic of Kenya, 2002a).

Whereas the objective of UPE has been embraced over the years, the target has remained elusive in Kenya. Right from independence, the Kenya Education Commission of 1964/65 supported the objective of UPE. This report envisioned UPE by 1971, which failed. The five-year development plans between 1966 and 1983 stressed the same sentiments, noting that achievement of UPE would remain a high priority as a means of promoting equal opportunity for all (Oketch & Rolleston, 2007). Kenya has also been a signatory to the global commitments on UPE such as Dakar, 2000 and the Jomtien Conference of 1990.

The death knell was sounded on “free primary schooling”, with the coming of the 8-4-4 system of education that placed heavy financial demands on parents and the introduction of the cost-sharing policy.

2.4 Government Financing of Primary Education in Kenya
Over the years preceding the introduction of FPE, the government’s financial resources to support primary schooling had been on a decline. The decrease in this support tended to shift the burden to parents and communities. During the colonial era, development of primary schools was almost entirely left to communities and churches (Cowan, 1970). Parents, pupils and communities contributed labour and funds for buildings, purchase of teaching materials and furniture (Olembo, 1985).
This state of affairs was changed after independence in 1963. The government, faced with the challenge and desire to Africanize the country’s economy, assumed greater responsibility in the establishment and running of primary schools. The government channelled its financing of primary schools through the District Education Boards (DEB) (Eshiwani, 1993). The central government had the direct responsibility in the administration and supervision of primary education to have control over the quality. To enhance this, the Kenya Schools Equipment Scheme (KSES) was established to supply schools with equipment for learning (Sifuna, 1989). The whole government subsidy package in primary education catered for the provision of teaching and learning materials, shouldered the burden of operational costs and paid teachers’ salaries. Parents and communities when required provided land and labour. Parents also had to buy school uniform for their children and pay some nominal fee. This fee was however gradually phased out when the government embarked on the course to abolish fees at primary school level beginning 1971.

As earlier noted, the first of the government decrees issued to actualize the commitment to provide UPE materialized in 1971. Tuition fees were abolished in the ASAL districts, and in 1973, another presidential decree was passed abolishing fees for all children in standards one to four. The vision then was to ultimately achieve free 7-year primary schooling by January 1980. The abolition of fees engendered massive enrolments; in 1973, there was a 51% increase in number of enrolled pupils (Government of Kenya, 1977). Parents, with time, had to contribute towards expansion and buying of equipment. But beside the issue of cost, there was a negative impact on quality. Not all communities could afford to provide adequate learning facilities. Thus, pupils in many areas had to contend with overcrowded classrooms and little in the way of learning materials (Nkinyangi, 1982). There was also the issue of teachers; in 1973, about 78% of the primary school teaching cadre was professionally trained. This figure dropped to 67% in 1974, to 64% in 1975 and by 1976, it
stood at 63% (Government of Kenya, 1977). The government was forced to increasingly rely on untrained teachers to counter the upsurge in enrolment.

Indeed, as earlier envisioned, in 1979, the government issued another directive abolishing all forms of school levies in public primary schools. Still, parents and communities had to contribute some amount of money towards development expenditure. The abolition of fees in the 1979 directive came along with advice to schools to establish Parent Teacher Association (PTA) that were supposed to coordinate the collection of funds through voluntary contributions. (Lillis & Ayot, 1988; Olombo, 1982). This, arguably, is what provided the loophole for the proliferation of levies imposed upon parents. Therefore, whereas there was government effort to move in the direction of free primary schooling, education at this level became expensive and quality was compromised by parents’ inability to guarantee provision of adequate facilities. It could be argued therefore that government policy did not direct as much attention on quality of infrastructure as it did on increasing the enrolment of children in schools.

2.4.1 Introduction of 8.4.4. System

Just as the education system was settling into the “free primary education policy” and still grappling with its shortcomings, the Kenya government announced its intention to change the structure of education from the 7-4-2-3 to 8-4-4. The system, implemented in 1985, comprises of 8 years of primary education, 4 years of secondary education and a minimum of 4 years at university, was introduced to respond to the growing needs and challenges of economic development of the country. Its rationale was that it would include youth’s participation in national development, provide a practical oriented curriculum that offers wide employment opportunities and promote equitable distribution of education resources (Republic of Kenya, 2002b).

The introduction of the 8-4-4 system had very significant implications for the financing of primary (and even secondary) education in Kenya. The policy of
free primary education was seriously challenged by the demands of the system, for it required huge financial resources for its implementation. An extra financial burden was placed upon the government and also the parents and communities. About 13,370 standard 8 classrooms needed to be urgently constructed and each of the 12,493 primary schools required home-science rooms and workshops for vocational subjects (Lillis & Ayot, 1988). The 8-4-4 system also came with an expanded curriculum that required 14 different textbooks. Parents inevitably, had to contribute more towards the education of their children, thus slowly eroding the thinking behind “free primary education”.

A study on the financial implications of 8-4-4 found that teaching and learning materials had become an expensive expenditure for primary schooling. From the study findings, it was found that parents paid an average Ksh.1,259 to retain a child in primary school per year, while the government spent Ksh.3,777 per child per year (an average cost of about Kshs.5,036 per child per year) (Okore, 1986). Parents therefore, were straining to meet the cost of education, and this was worst in the economically disadvantaged parts of the country. The product of this in the long-term would be the emergence of regional inequalities in access to primary schooling.

2.4.2 The Cost-sharing policy

The cost-sharing policy also marked an important stage in the history of educational financing in Kenya. The cost-sharing policy was introduced in Kenya at a time when the 8-4-4 system had begun to gain momentum. This is in itself, significant. The 8-4-4 system required huge financial resources for its implementation and this implied extra financial demands on the government, parents and communities. Yet, in the wake of the global economic recession of the 1980s, and fuelled by the economic mismanagement in Kenya, the country was made to implement the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs). In Kenya, as it was in other developing nations, the government had to implement
donor-developed structural adjustments that led to reduction in real capita
spending (Jayarajah, et al. (1996). A major requirement of the SAPs was that
the cost of financing social services be shared between the government and the
beneficiaries (Gibbon & Olukoshi, 1996). This arrangement became popularly
referred to as cost-sharing. In education, it meant that parents and communities
had to bear some of the costs to complement the government’s input.

The cost-sharing policy in Kenya was expressed in Sessional Paper No. 6 of
1988. The policy required that parents and communities shoulder the
responsibility of financing capital development and to a large extent, the
recurrent expenditure of primary and secondary education. The government
was thus left with the responsibility of paying teachers’ salaries and other
administrative issues (UNICEF, 1998). The resulting high cost of education
discouraged many parents from enrolling their children in primary schools.
Primary school enrolment in Kenya declined from 95% in 1989 to 75% in 1995
(Republic of Kenya, 1996). By the year 2000, the G.E.R had only slightly
improved to 87.6%. Completion and transition rates however remained below
50% during the 1990s decade (Republic of Kenya, 2002b). These trends showed
that gains that had been made in education so far were quickly being eroded.

The above scenario was exacerbated by the level of poverty in Kenya which
continued to escalate, recording at about 46.8% of families in the country living
below the poverty line at the turn of the century (Republic of Kenya, 2003a).
The 1997 Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) indicated that while primary
schools were generally available and physically accessible, most poor people
had limited access because of the various financial requirements, such as,
uniform fees, levies for workers’ pay, learning and teaching materials levy and
activity fees at school. It also reported that many of the poor pointed with
nostalgia to those days when books were provided for children at school by the
government. Due to cost-sharing, many children had been forced out of school
(Government of Kenya, 2002).
The National Development Plan (2002) in its summary of education paints a gloomy picture of primary education as it was then. It concedes that quality of education had declined while its relevance had not been systematically adapted to market needs. The quality of facilities and materials in schools had declined, and this was attributed to the cost-sharing strategy which is blamed in the report as having failed to fill the financing gap, leading to stagnation in enrolment (Republic of Kenya, 2002b).

It is against such a background that the government introduced Free Primary Education in its broad sector interventions aimed at achieving 100% net primary school enrolment and reducing disparity in access and quality of education. Included in these reforms was a revision of curriculum to reduce the financial burden of education. For the disadvantaged ASAL areas, it was proposed to expand and strengthen the school feeding programme and out of school (non-formal) education programmes (Republic of Kenya, 2003a).

2.5: **Offsetting Fees: FPE Experiences from Elsewhere in Africa**

The immediate post - independence years of the 1960s saw many African countries guarantee their citizens free primary and sometimes, secondary education; but by the 1980s and 1990s fees were imposed to help balance national budgets and cut state expenses. This resulted in millions dropping out of education. Not many countries in Sub-Saharan Africa had specific initiatives towards Education for All going into the 1990s. Understably, the resources for such ventures were limited, and most educational systems experienced gender, regional and social inequalities. Then, as noted by Avenstrup, Xiaoyan and Soren (2004), during the 1990s, a few countries abolished primary school fees. The results were dramatic, as this led to increased enrolments by significant margins.
Many countries now increasingly recognize that the cost of education is not affordable for the poor and may negatively impact enrolments and learning. To counter this, a variety of measures have been put in place in different countries to mitigate the hurtful effects of fees. These measures include reducing or eliminating tuition fees for the poor, offering scholarships to attend school, providing free textbooks and other learning materials, and providing free uniforms. In addition, some countries provide targeted subsidies to help offset some of the other costs of attending school, such as transport costs, bursaries and stipends. These are designed to enable poor families to overcome the indirect opportunity costs of attending school, in terms of lost contributions to the household economy (Kattan, 2006).

In recent years, fees have been dropped in most countries, resulting in an impressive growth in the numbers of pupils enrolled. In Sub-Saharan Africa, the countries that pioneered elimination of fees include Malawi (1994), Uganda (1997), Cameroon (1999), Lesotho (2000) Tanzania (2001), Zambia (2002), Kenya (2003), Madagascar (2003), Benin (2004), Mozambique (2004) and Burundi (2005). According to UNICEF, after measures were taken guaranteeing free primary education, school enrolment grew in Tanzania by 50% – from 4.4 million in 2002 to 6.6 million in 2003. In Kenya, it grew from 6 million to 7.2 million in a matter of weeks in 2003; in Uganda and Malawi, enrolment grew by over one half after fees were dropped. Other countries that now offer free primary education include Ethiopia, Ghana, and Burundi (UNICEF, 2006). This is encouraging, considering that whereas most out-of-school children live in Asia, it is in sub-Saharan Africa that the relative size and complexity of the challenge has been greatest. Poverty, conflict, the HIV/AIDS pandemic, gender discrimination and social exclusion are all barriers to achieving education for all.
2.5.1 Overview of UPE in the Middle East and North Africa

Northern Africa finds itself easily lumped together with the Middle East countries in many analyses. The Middle East and Northern Africa (MENA) region is as vast as it is diverse in socio-economic terms. Generalizations about this region therefore may sometimes conceal specific situations of particular countries. Never the less, a certain cultural and geographical commonality binds these countries and numerous similarities exist that define the region as homogenous.

Most MENA countries were under European colonization during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Though the European colonialists introduced compulsory basic education in the colonies, the strategy was to provide limited education to the many and restrict modern schooling and especially European-language education to a controlled number of learners who would be used to strengthen the colonial administration and weaken nationalist tendencies (Abdeljalil, 2004). Thus, upon gaining independence, free basic education became and has continued to be central to education policy in MENA countries.

Post-independence governments significantly expanded their education systems, and promoted free education as a critical aspect of nation-building. FPE was also used as a tool for gaining popular support for new regimes. Due to this, education systems in the region, with few exceptions, now provide basic education to most children. Most countries have achieved universal primary enrolment (MENA Region's Human Development Group/ The World Bank, 1999). Between 1965 and 1990, the percentage of pupils enrolled in primary education increased from 61% to 98% (The World Bank, 1995). By the year 2003, the commitment to free education was expressed as a legal guarantee in all Middle East and North Africa countries, with the exception of Djibouti. This guarantee has been translated into practice in the majority of countries (Tomasevski, 2003).
MENA countries, in expanding access to education faced several common problems, one being that because of the population boom, affordable education did not necessarily reduce the number of uneducated children. Then, educational systems proved inadequate as classrooms were crowded and taught by overworked and often under-qualified teachers (The New York Times, 2007). By 1999, other than in Lebanon, tuition was free for nearly all levels of the educational sector. However, some little school fees were often collected to provide additional resources for public education. For example, in Yemen, school fees provided virtually all resources available for school maintenance and various non-salary recurrent costs (MENA Region’s Human Development Group/ The World Bank, 1999).

While basic education is provided as a right in MENA, participation and completion of the basic cycle has not been accomplished everywhere. Some discrepancy exists between the different countries in the region. Countries such as Tunisia invested more than six per cent of GNP in free public education, and so more than 1.4 million pupils could enjoy a free and compulsory education by 1991. (Institut national d’études statistiques 1999). Others such as Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Qatar, did not improve their basic education as much despite their resources endowment (Walkins, 1999). At the end the 1990s, in Tunisia and Morocco where the first nine years of education were not compulsory, GERs were 52 percent and 45 respectively, and in Yemen, where the opportunity cost of child schooling is significant, decreasing upper basic enrolments were observed (MENA Region’s Human Development Group/ The World Bank, 1999).

Region wide, close to 5 million children aged 6-10 and another 4 million 11-15 year olds were out of school in 1995. Over 70 percent of this group was in Egypt, Morocco and Yemen. Many children dropped out before completing compulsory education. The situation was particularly alarming in Tunisia where close to a third of those who joined first grade dropped out before completing
the 7-year basic cycle in the early 1990s (ibid, 1999). Such statistics are worrying for a region that is relatively well endowed with financial resources from the petroleum industry. Investment in basic education in this region is also considerable.

Several obstacles were observed to have led to this scenario. Direct and indirect costs of education such transport, the opportunity costs of child labour as well as the reluctance to expose girls to the public world contributed to dampening demand for education. These factors were more profound in rural areas where distances to school can be longer, child agricultural labour more important, social attitudes more conservative and people, in general, poorer. The various mechanisms used to ration limited spaces and to maintain quality, such as repetition and age calibrated promotion, also impose supply obstacles to participation (ibid, 1999).

Closer home, Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia and Sudan comprise the group of six North African countries which is somewhat homogeneous in terms of use of the Arabic. These countries are a contrast to Sub-Saharan Africa with regard to socio-economic indicators. The average GDP per capita in North Africa is estimated at 1,415 US$, compared to a Sub-Saharan average (excluding southern Africa) of below 500 US$ by year 2006. Sudan stands out at the extreme, with a GDP per capita of 510 US$ while the other five have an average wealth per capita of between 1,157 US$ and 4,169 US$(UNESCO, 2006).

Schooling supply and internal efficiency in North Africa has grown and is commendable: the primary education GER was 94% in 2006. The average repetition rate was two times lower than the average in Africa. The internal efficiency ratio was 85%, the highest on the continent. Sudan with 80% and Morocco with 72% were the low performers in the group. Algeria, Egypt and Tunisia have primary school first year access rates of close to 100% and have a
primary completion rate (PCR) of 95%. These three may be considered as having fulfilled the UPE objective. Morocco has now reached universal access to primary level of education but has a PCR of only 75%. Sudan stands out clearly from the other countries in the region with an access rate of 68% and a PCR of under 50% (UNESCO, 2006).

In summary, Middle East and North Africa countries have widened access to basic education. However, demographic pressure has led to intensive use of school facilities, so much that double and sometimes triple shifts are not uncommon. The quality of education is additionally compromised by a lack of qualified teachers, and rural schoolchildren sometimes walk for hours to reach schools (Abdeljalil, 2004). The scarcity of schools, poverty and the use of children as workers are some of the key factors of low schooling achievement in the region.

2.5.2 The Sub-Saharan Africa Experience with FPE

The current wave of fee elimination in Sub-Saharan Africa is not an entirely new phenomenon. This had been tried out to varying degrees after independence from colonialism. Schools fees were introduced in the 1980s in countries which had previously been committed to free primary education, resulting in decreased enrolments, reduced access to primary schooling and increasing illiteracy (Tomasevski, 2003). To achieve UPE, much of sub-Saharan Africa has now removed school fees at the primary level of schooling. An overview of selected countries from the West, East, Central and Southern Africa aptly portrays the free primary education and UPE efforts in Sub-Saharan Africa. These countries provide a range of experience dating back to 1994, when Malawi introduced free primary education, up to when in 2003, Kenya followed suit. The profiles presented are intended to portray a snapshot of the experiences of countries in developing and implementing free primary education for purposes of a comparative perspective.
It was in 2000 at Dakar, Senegal, that 164 governments pledged to transform the lives of tens of millions of children across the world with no access to education. Nowhere was the need more acute than in Sub-Saharan Africa where four out of ten children were not even enrolled in primary school. In the Eastern Africa region, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi have all embraced free primary education. In 2006, Rwanda launched a nine-year free schooling, which comprises six years of primary education and three years of junior secondary or vocational and entrepreneurship training.

2.5.2.1 Uganda

Uganda was one of the first African countries to announce free primary education with the introduction of Universal Primary Education (UPE) in January 1997 in the form of abolition of tuition fees for 6-12 year-olds. This was intended to apply to a maximum of four children per family. In families that had boys and girls, at least two of the four children had to be girls (Avenstrup et al., 2004). In addition, disabled and orphaned children were to be given special consideration. In practice, however, it was applied virtually to all children in this age group. With the elimination of school fees, the primary school enrolment rate climbed from 50% to 90%. Primary school enrolment in 1996 was 2.7 million. By 2002, this had surged to 7.2 million pupils. Gross enrolment in 1995 was 74.3% (Government of the Republic of Uganda, 2002), and it rose to 123% in 1997 (Murphy, Bertoncino, & Wang, 2002). By 2000/1, gross enrolment had reached 135.8%, indicative of the considerable number of over- and under-age pupils enrolled (Government of the Republic of Uganda, 2002). Smaller annual increases followed until, in 2004, total enrolment in government schools stabilized at about 6.7 million (Uganda Bureau of Statistics, 2004a).

After the introduction of UPE, growth in enrolment rates was faster among the poor than the non-poor, thus narrowing the enrolment gap between the two groups (Kattan, 2006). Enrolment rates for girls also increased significantly.
Primary attendance among girls 6 to 12 years old grew from 59.7 percent in 1992 to an estimated 83.2 and 91 percent in 1999. Urban-rural disparities in access to primary education also declined. In addition, dropouts due to cost-related issues decreased (Uganda Ministry of Education n.d.).

The UPE effort in Uganda was seen as an important foundation of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan, and this commitment to UPE is reflected in the budget hikes given to education. Education comprised 12% of the Government’s budget in 1992 and had reached 25%, by 1998 (Government of the Republic of Uganda, 2002). An econometric analysis of the impacts of Uganda’s Universal Primary Education (UPE) policy showed that parental income became a less important determinant of enrolment after school fees were eliminated (Deininger, 2003). In the Ugandan model, 50% of educational spending was to go towards instructional materials, 15% to maintenance and utilities and 5% to administration. Over 50% of the education sector budget was covered by external agencies through grants, loans, technical assistance, and sectoral budget support (Pfaff, 2003). In 2003, the government expanded the free primary education policy to include all children and made school uniforms optional (Avenstrup et al., 2004). The Government of Uganda did not adopt an all-out introduction of free primary education in the first instance. Most of its resources went to school construction, instructional materials, and teacher recruitment and recurrent expenditure. “Free education”, still carried a number of costs despite the abolition of fees. Thus, family household expenditure on education remained on clothing, exercise books and school fund contributions. The decision to make school uniform optional therefore, represents an innovative way to further reduce the cost of education for parents while at the same time containing government expenditure on the education.

Uganda’s Ministry of Education and Sports formulated the Education Sector Investment Plan (ESIP) in 1998 for the period of 1998–2003. Through a Sector-Wide Approach (SWAP) in which the donors pooled their resources for
education, Uganda was able to attract a sizeable amount of donor support (Kattan, 2006). In 2004, Uganda was selected as one of the eligible countries for the EFA Fast Track Initiative (FTI) and its education plan obtained high reputation for its relevance to EFA. Having successfully implemented expansion of educational opportunities at the primary school level, the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) 2004-2015 shifted its focuses in emphasis from one of implementing UPE to a more balanced concern for post-primary and other sub-sectors as well (Byamugisha & Nishimura, 2007).

Just as was the case for Kenya, the scrapping of fees in Uganda was implemented in haste. This was despite the fact that Uganda had a universal primary education policy in place early as 1987. As noted by Avenstrup et al. (2004), the question of how to implement UPE remained open for many years. Unrest, lack of resources and focus on primary education, and political constraints on how far policy implementation could go stifled the progress in translating policy into reality. The Ugandan president only wrote the programme into a government manifesto in December of 1996, and within a short period, a template for UPE was developed, culminating in the emergency introduction of the UPE programme in early 1997.

The successes of the introduction of UPE in Uganda were however not without serious challenges. Whereas the government increased education expenditures, the quality (measured by input per pupil) declined in government schools. The pupil: teacher ratio input ratios for textbooks, teachers, and classrooms suffered with the introduction of UPE. Pupil-teacher ratios increased from 40:1, pre-UPE, to 80:1 in 1997 then improved to 60:1 in 1999 (Murphy et al., 2002). In rural areas, the pupil to teacher ratio was 70:1 (Deininger, 2003). The pupil: classroom ratio rose from 68:1 in 1996 to 105:1 in 1997, and was down to 84:1 in 2004 (Education Management Information System Reports).

On a brighter note however, community based construction of classrooms proved successful and achieved much higher classroom numbers than
centralized construction methods had (Murphy et al., 2002). Sadly, examination scores also suggested a drop in quality of learning as nearly 25 percent of pupils who took the final examination for primary school in 1999 did not pass. Furthermore, 27 percent of pupils in rural areas failed the examination, compared to only 17 percent in urban areas (Deininger, 2003). In a value for money audit on the UPE programme conducted by Uganda’s Ministry of Education and Sports, several constraints were identified. These included delayed disbursement of grants to schools such that schools at times went for a whole term without any funds; unclear guidelines on the mode of transfer of funds to schools, and as a result some districts issued cheques which lengthened the time taken for the schools to access funds; and ineffective monitoring, leading to schools providing inflated enrolments and thus receiving funds for non-existent pupils (Government of the Republic of Uganda, 2003.)

There also arose concerns about inadequate and poor quality education infrastructure such as classrooms, latrines and other structures. This resulted in tree classrooms, overcrowding and dusty learning (UDN, 2004). Further, the money given to schools was said by many head teachers to be inadequate for providing basic education. School Management Committees, particularly in rural areas were weak and easily controlled by headteachers. This opened room for corruption (Mushemeza & Dickens, 2005).

**Lessons from Uganda’s FPE Experience**

Uganda’s experience proves that the big bang approach can be a very powerful policy strategy for enabling all the children to get into school. However, in the implementation of UPE, it is important to accompany the increases in enrolment with an expansion of physical facilities. In the Ugandan case, an aggressive campaign to expand physical facilities was launched to counter the phenomenal increase in enrolment figures. For example, by the end of 1999, 4000 additional primary school classrooms had been constructed and by 2001, a total of 6321 had been completed (Government of the Republic of Uganda Ministry of Education and Sports, 2001). At the inception of UPE, a double-shift system for
grades 1 and 2 was introduced. Efforts were also made to increase the number of teachers through training, retraining and upgrading. This, though part of the UPE effort, had started earlier as a component of the Primary Education Teacher Development Project. Between 1995 and 1999, 7800 in-service teachers were trained or upgraded in addition to the 3,023 candidates trained through the regular pre-service teacher training programme (Ministry of Education and Sports, 1999). However, this still fell short of the deficit in teaching staff brought about by the massive enrolment of pupils in schools (Aguti, 2002).

The Government of Uganda also made improvement in management of teacher payroll and expedited clearance of all salary arrears of teachers; revised primary school curriculum; provided instructional materials and; initiated sensitization of key stakeholders – communities and local government leaders. It was envisaged that such interventions would provide an enabling environment (structural, logistical and human resource) for better utilization of UPE block grants (Mushemeza & Dickens, 2005). While the ratio of trained to total teachers rose from 73 percent in 1995 to 83 percent in 2000 and teacher recruitment and management improved, the improvement in teaching methods remained questionable (Murphy et al., 2002). An important lesson learnt from these initiatives is the fact that for poor countries, it may not be necessary to have everything in place to start implementing UPE; some innovations are best introduced in phases, as long as continuous effort is made to move forward.

To streamline the financing of education reform, Uganda developed budget support modalities that helped to eliminate some of the problems related to donor co-ordination. The SWAP has been successful, mainly because decision-making was devolved to the Ministry of Education and Sport (MoES), and also because the Government developed a more comprehensive and coherent approach to aid management. Uganda’s story exemplifies the fact that timely,
flexible donor support is a critical factor for success of UPE effort in poor countries.

The Ugandan experience attests to the need to have widespread consultation and participation of all stakeholders at all stages of decision-making. The establishment of inclusive, effective partnerships, both domestic and international, helped build a strong constituency for education that was facilitated through government-led semi-annual education reviews. In addition, decentralization led to greater efficiency in administration and management of the education system.

In Uganda the overwhelming response to the “big bang” approach that sharply increased public spending and made primary education free confirmed that, for Uganda, financial constraints on the demand side had been by far the most important reason for low primary enrolment. A downside of the big bang approach however is that it may lead to a dramatic decline in quality.

Management of UPE funds was initially fraught with the challenge of corruption. Measures to improve transparency and accountability of spending at the school level remarkably enhanced efficiency in the use of sector resources. As noted by the World Bank, the share of funds reaching schools rose to about 90 percent, from 28 percent in 1996 (Murphy et al., 2002).

### 2.5.2.2 Zambia

In February of 2002, the Government of Zambia declared and immediately introduced Free Basic Education (FBE) for all pupils from grades 1 – 7. All user fees were abolished, and uniforms were no longer compulsory. Schools would still be able to raise funds, but no child could be denied access to school on account of costs. Zambia’s 2002 Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) outlined the elimination of user fees for basic education as a way to reduce poverty. The call for the abolition of schools fees was similarly echoed in the
2003-2007 Strategic Plan for education. As was the case in many other countries such as Malawi, Kenya and Uganda, FBE was a political decision, yet the Ministry of Education was expected to implement the policy immediately. Little time was made available to adequately plan for the transformation (Mwansa, Zulu, Kalokoni & Nyirongo, 2004). In fact, there was a lack of clear guidelines for the implementation of FBE. For instance, due to lack of specific guidelines on applications, one-third of applicants to government schools were turned away, possibly due to inadequate school infrastructure and the New Breakthrough to Literacy Policy (NBLP), which limited class size to 40 pupils (Riddell, 2003). Whereas the policy eliminated the requirement of school uniforms, many urban schools and a few rural schools still required pupils to wear uniforms. This could be the result of ambiguity in FBE guidelines that allowed schools to use uniforms as long as they did not make a profit from them (Mwansa et al., 2004).

Earlier, in 1999, the Basic Education Sub-Sector Investment Programme (BESSIP), a sub-sectoral SWAP which guided development agencies’ contributions to basic education began. This served to integrate and coordinate a variety of efforts and programmes and focused on school infrastructure, educational materials, teacher education, curriculum development, capacity building, HIV/AIDS prevention, equity and gender, and school health and nutrition (Riddell, 2003). Thus, as FBE was introduced, there already was a cost-sharing framework in place under the Basic Education Sub-Sector Investment Program (BESSIP) through which communities were required to support the construction and rehabilitation of schools. Under FBE, communities ceased their contribution to infrastructure improvements because they interpreted the policy as meaning that the government would pay for all education costs (Mwansa et al., 2004). A strategic plan to facilitate the appropriate integration of the whole education sector was finalized in 2003 (Riddell, 2003).
Compared to other countries that introduced FPE at the time, the impact of FBE in Zambia was somewhat limited, with enrolment only rising by 8.5 percent between 2002 and 2003 (Global Campaign for Education, 2004). In the first year of FPE, the gross enrolment which had in prior years hovered between 78% and 79%, increased to 81% (Riddell, 2003). This suggests that factors other than costs still constituted a significant barrier to education. Dropout rates declined slightly from 3.88% to 2.42 percent but largely persisted due to early marriages, pregnancy, the rising incidence of AIDS orphans, and lack of parental support. Teacher and pupil absenteeism due to HIV/AIDS remained a significant obstacle to education (Global Campaign for Education, 2004)

Whereas the government increased the amount of grants paid to schools in an effort replace the loss of school fees, it was unable to carry out a school census, or needs-assessments due to the rushed implementation of the policy. The result was that each school, regardless of size or location received the same amount of grant money. There is some evidence that the grants proved to be inadequate and that the quality of education suffered. Increased enrolments and teacher shortages forced most schools to implement multiple shifts. Some schools conducted classes under trees or in tents, while others held multiple sessions. The pupil to teacher ratio increased from 46:1 to 52:1 between 2001 and 2003, partially due to a teacher strike, as well as hiring freezes that had left about 9,000 trained teachers out of work (Mwansa et al. 2004). In some rural areas, pupil-teacher ratios reached as much as 100:1 (Global Campaign for Education, 2004). Needless to say, such teacher shortage negatively impacts quality. According to an IMF study, some pupils received barely two hours of education a day (International Monetary Fund, 2004; Global Campaign for Education 2004).

The spirit of FBE was soon contradicted, ostensibly because government grants were seen to be inadequate. The fees collected by government schools began to increase between 2002 and 2003 (Mwansa et al., 2004) and some schools begun
to charge PTA fees again due to inadequate government funding (Global Campaign for Education, 2004).

The shortcomings of the FBE implementation in Zambia however do not imply the government made no effort at all to address challenges. Response to the problem of inadequate learning materials came through an endeavour to decentralize the procurement process. It was hoped that this would reduce the cost of transporting materials, as well as free up funds for more materials. To increase access, one hundred and six (106) new primary schools were constructed in 2002 (International Monetary Fund, 2004). The Programme for the Advancement of Girls Education and a re-entry policy for pregnant girls improved access to education for girls, while the bursary schemes and the School Health and Nutrition Programme improved access for the poor (Mwansa et al., 2004). By 2005, public education expenditures accounted for 24.1 percent of total government expenditure and teacher salaries were improved to a level above the household poverty line. The government also mandated that 100 percent of new teachers be posted to rural areas (Kattan, 2006).

Zambia has relied largely on donor funding to support FPE, and is likely to require external assistance for a considerable period to bridge the resource gap needed to finance basic education. Several international development agencies have funded BESSIP, overall, contributing to about half its budget. In 2000, 27% of total education expenditure was externally financed (Riddel, 2003). In 2003, the Dutch government gave Zambia a grant of US$11.3 million to pay arrears owed to almost 8,000 retired and retrenched teachers (Global Campaign for Education, 2004).

**Lessons from Zambia**
Official aggregate data obscures large inequities between schools and regions. Whereas official data show that the pupil to classroom ratio improved slightly, one study of 352 basic schools (Mwansa et al., 2004) found that 31.5 percent of
schools conducted class under trees, 14.2 percent held multiple sessions, and some schools used tents (3.9 percent).

HIV/AIDS should be considered as an integral concern within UPE effort. This is because HIV/AIDS is a serious threat to education that can lead to teacher and administrator attrition. Teacher absenteeism due to HIV/AIDS remains a significant obstacle to education in many countries. For example, in Zambia, infection rates are 25 to 30 percent in urban areas and 10 to 15 percent in rural areas. About 1,000 teachers die from AIDS every year (ADF, 1999; Global Campaign for Education, 2004).

The elimination of primary school user fees has undoubtedly increased enrolments in Zambia as it has in other countries. However, FPE alone should not be seen as the guarantee towards achievement of UPE. Other supportive policy interventions must be put in place to complement FPE. In the case of Zambia, the Programme for the Advancement of Girls Education (PAGE) and a re-entry policy for pregnant girls improved access to education for girls, while the bursary schemes and the School Health and Nutrition Programme improved access for the poor (Mwansa et al., 2004).

2.5.2.3 Malawi

Malawi was one of the very first countries to take the bold move to abolish school fees at primary school level, first using a phased approach immediately after the Jomtien Conference in 1990 and later opting for a “big bang” approach from 1994 after the first multi-party elections. It thus represents another of the pioneers of free primary education in sub-Saharan Africa. In 1994, to improve access to schooling for the poor, the newly elected government in Malawi (in the first ever multi-party elections) eliminated primary school fees. Mandatory school uniforms were also abolished, although parents were still expected to pay the costs of school supplies, as well as contribute labour and materials for school infrastructure improvements. The elimination of school fees led to a
significant increase in primary school enrolment (Ogawa, Chimombo, & Kunje, 2007). In Malawi, historically, the net enrolment rate (NER) before FPE was implemented was low at approximately 60%. The NER rapidly increased to 96% by the 1994/95 school year. While the GER remained constant around 130% from the 1994/95 school year until 2000, NER remained at around 80% (Kadzamira & Khwimam, 2004). This data implies that 20% of school-aged children were still not enrolled in schools.

In the first year of FPE, enrolments increased by over 50% from 1.9m in 1993/4 to about 3.2m in 1994/5. Net enrolments prior to FPE had been 58% for girls, and 58% for boys. The number of pupils per classroom went from 102 in 1992/3 to 422 in 1994/5, but fell to a level similar to 1992/3 by 1996. Prior to the announcement of FPE, the Government had brought in tuition waivers, in phases, from standard 1, but parents were still been expected to pay book fees and to contribute to school funds (Riddell, 2003). Whereas in 2002 the gross enrolment rate (GER) was recorded at around 137%, by 2004, it had decreased to 106%. These decreasing statistics suggest that after FPE implementation, a problem of low efficiency surfaced (Ogawa et al., 2007).

Inevitably, the expenditure on education rose from 13 percent of total government spending (3.5 percent of GDP) in 1994/95 to 20 percent (4.7% of GDP) in 1997/98. An immediate benefit of this policy was a narrowing of the gap in gross primary enrolment between the rich and the poor. Gross primary enrolment for the poorest 20 percent of the population rose by 101 percent between 1990 and 1997, from 58 to 117 percent, while that for the richest 20 percent only rose by 48 percent during the same years, from 81 to 120 percent. There was also experienced an improvement in the gender gap. Between 1990 and 1997, gross primary enrolment for girls in the poorest quintile rose by 113 percent (from 51 to 109 percent), while gross primary enrolment for boys in the same quintile rose by 92 percent (from 65 to 125 percent). Gross primary
enrolment for girls and boys in the top quintile rose by 48 and 50 percent, respectively (World Bank, 2002).

No doubt, Malawi made significant gains with regard to enrolment. These gains were however frustrated by some challenges, the most worrying of them being a decline in the quality of education. Because of many years of under-funding for infrastructure and supplies, Malawi’s public primary schools were among the most poorly equipped in Africa. Riddell (2003) observes that the rapid enrolment increases challenged an already weak system that even before expansion had a pupil-teacher ratio of 70:1, with 13% of teachers being unqualified and an average of 100 pupils crowding existing classrooms. Since a commensurate rise in trained teachers and teaching and learning materials was lacking to match growth in enrolment, quality was compromised. With a pupil to permanent classroom ratio of 119:1, a student to textbook ratio of 24:1 and a pupil to teacher ratio soaring to 62:1 at the inception of FPE, the scenario looked unsustainable (World Bank, 2004a; Kattan & Burnett, 2004). Rural areas suffered most, as the pupil per qualified teacher ratio in rural areas deteriorated from 84:1 in 1993/94 to 117:1 in 1994/95. By 2007, there was still about 30% disparity between rural and urban areas (Ogawa et al., 2007). Over 18,000 untrained teachers were deployed to public schools without any form of training (Kattan, 2006) yet parents felt less compelled to monitor teachers due to reduced personal financial involvement in the education system (Hillman & Jenkner 2002). Many pupils were forced to attend classes outside of classrooms. Efforts were made to construct temporary classes and such classes were estimated to be around 30% of total classes in 1995/96. The pupil per permanent classroom ratio fell to 1:106 and temporary classrooms as a percentage of total classes fell to 20% in 2005 (Kadzamira & Khwimam, 2004).

Even after the introduction of FPE, the internal efficiency of education in Malawi was very low. This was mainly due to high dropout and repetition rates. In 2005, it was estimated that it took on average, thirteen years for a child to
complete an eight year cycle of primary school and that almost half of the children who entered primary school dropped out before standard 5, and were not functionally literate or numerate (Kattan, 2006). By the year 2000, the average primary repetition rate was between 15.5 and 28.4 percent (Kattan & Burnett, 2004; Hillman & Jenkner, 2002; World Bank, 2002a; World Bank, 2004a). The average primary drop-out rate was between 4.8% and 10.4% in the same year (World Bank, 2004b). Such wastages definitely proved to be costly for Malawi, as this meant that the government was paying for more school years to send one child through 8 years of the primary school system and was wasting public resources on the many children who dropped out before finishing primary school. The fact that households continued to pay a considerable share of the costs of education despite official elimination of fees could be a possible explanation for the high primary drop-out rates. According to a World Bank survey, up to 83 percent of households that sent their children to primary school paid for one or more school supplies in 2001, mainly textbooks and uniforms. About 50 percent households contributed to school maintenance funds, and 72 percent of rural households and 25 percent of urban households contributed labour to primary schools (World Bank, 2004a).

To cater for the serious shortfalls, the government established the Malawi Integrated In-Service Teacher Education Project (MIITEP), designed to produce 18,000 teachers at a lower cost and in a much shorter time than conventional full-time teacher training programmes (Riddell, 2003). It also undertook an evaluation of its training and hiring of untrained teachers and created a remuneration package and career development for primary school teachers (World Bank, 2004b). The government had hired close to 18,000 untrained primary school teachers by 1997, resulting in a pupil to unqualified teacher ratio of 120:1 (World Bank, 2002a). Teachers’ resource centres were built and communities were engaged in school and teachers’ housing construction. Malawi Social Action Fund (MASAF) requires each community to contribute 20 percent of the value of the project in materials or labour in kind. Within five
years of the implementation of FPE, communities had constructed 41 percent of all new classrooms through this project (Kadzamira & Khwimam, 2004). The administrative and management capacities of the Ministry of Education were developed to cope with such undertakings. To complement these reforms, school uniforms were dispensed with, corporal punishment was prohibited, parent-teacher associations were revitalized, decentralization to the district level was initiated and curriculum changes were introduced (Riddell, 2003).

Malawi depends heavily on the donor to fund the FPE programmes. For example, in 2000/2001, about 97% of the total development budget was provided by donors. Because donors have provided much needed financial and administrative support, they have been able to exert considerable influence on policies in Malawi (Ogawa, et al., 2007). Since the inception of FPE, aid to Malawi has increased considerably over the years in the forms of program/budget support and project grants as well as reduced debt (UN, 2006). Malawi is a beneficiary of the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) debt relief. Most of Malawi’s capital expenditure in education has been provided by donors (Government of Malawi / MoE, 2004).

After the introduction of FPE, coordination of donor support began to pose a challenge. It was difficult for the Ministry to coordinate and direct efforts by development partners towards priority areas. Ogawa et al. (2007) report that poor coordination of support from donors led to uneven geographical distribution of the support. Therefore, while some districts benefited from several donor funded projects and activities, some received little, if any, support. This necessitated the development of a SWAP through which donor funding could be pooled for centralized management. However, due to different funding policy arrangements, some development partners were still unwilling to pool their resources into one basket. The SWAP is therefore being implemented in a phased approach with a pilot arrangement involving pooling funds from a few donors for specific programmes.
Lessons from Malawi
Girls may need targeted interventions to offset cultural norms and opportunity costs. In Malawi, the drop-out for girls continued into the post FPE period due to other factors such lack of interest, family responsibilities, early marriage and pregnancy. These social aspects require targeted interventions beyond the elimination of school fees to encourage retention.

The presence of donor funds in itself does not guarantee equitable distribution of or access to resources. Problems associated with poor coordination of support from partner organizations can lead to uneven geographical distribution of the support. Therefore, overall figures of expenditure may present a false picture that conceals regional disparities.

The declaration of FPE does not always lead to full implementation. Issues of sustainability over the long term are sometimes overlooked. In Malawi, as in many other countries, despite fee abolition, some form of contribution from parents still exists. Some fees that were abolished have returned. Avenstrup et al. (2004) report that from a survey of 2002, fee creep was observed to have occurred in Malawi: 80% of parents still paid for materials, 70% for uniforms, 60% for school development funds, and 33% for school meals. Such other indirect costs and education expenses can be greater barriers and must be addressed.

Successful implementation of FPE requires detailed planning. Ample time should also be given for those concerned to comprehensively work out the necessary logistics that accompany such profound policy changes. In Malawi’s case, the decision to implement school fees abolition did not allow for planning. According to UNICEF (UNICEF & World Bank, 2006) some 22,000 teachers had to be identified and sent out to schools with limited training or orientation, sometimes lasting just two weeks. There was neither time nor capacity available for procurement of additional books nor for launching school construction. In
fact, abolishment of fees forced the country into crisis mode planning in terms of supply of teachers, books and material. The situation that obtained therefore was one of overcrowded classrooms, inadequately prepared teachers and the lack of instructional materials, leading to a lowering of the quality of education (UNICEF & World Bank, 2006).

The Malawi example reveals that immediate overwhelming responses in enrolment to the introduction of FPE cannot always be interpreted as indications of successful UPE effort. In Malawi, despite the improvements in enrolment, completion and progression rates remained dismally low. As Kattan (2006) reports, over one million pupils enrolled in grade 2 in 1994, but the numbers dropped by 41% to 590,167 in Grade Two the following year. Of this group, only 289,251 pupils made it to Grade Five in 1999 – a 71% drop. It was further observed that by 2004, only 18% of all children enrolled in primary school completed the full eight years of primary education.

Malawi’s experience shows that while Free Primary Education results in achieving increase in access to education, it can at the same time adversely affect quality. In Malawi, the financial resources were simply not adequate to maintain the same quality of education. This was complicated further by the fact that even before introduction of FPE, there had been an increasing public concern about the deterioration in quality of education. The government increased spending on education after introduction of FPE, but there continued to be a shortage of even the essential teaching materials and human resources to educate children.

2.5.2.4 Lesotho

Lesotho, located in Southern Africa, introduced the Free Primary Education (FPE) programme in January 2000 to enable children to enter and complete the primary education cycle. The country adopted a phased approach, beginning with standard 1 in 2000, standard 2 in 2001, and so on until 2006. Schools that
opted to join the programme enjoyed government assistance in the form of teachers’ salaries and provision of textbooks, classrooms, equipment, and meals. The Ministry of Education created an additional 460 teaching positions and distributed grants to schools (World Bank and Lesotho’s Ministry of Education and Training, 2005). Some private schools, owned by communities and individuals, opted out of the programme and were thus considered not eligible for government support. The argument advanced by such institutions was that they needed to exercise control over the quality of education and resources in their schools (Lerotholi, 2001).

Beginning in 2000, the government has gradually taken over the cost of textbooks and stationery in primary schools, and has implemented a centralized procurement process. In addition, through existing programs such as the World Food Program, or through local catering contracts, food services are provided to schools and the payment made directly by the ministry. School maintenance is also managed at the central level (World Bank and Lesotho’s Ministry of Education and Training, 2005). The food program is especially important in Lesotho’s context because the country is considered to be a food-deficit country and is ranked 149th out of 177 in the United Nations Development Programme Human Development Index. The majority of its citizens are considered poor. The WFP baseline survey (2004) provides evidence that the rations provided at the schools are often the only full meals children have during the day, especially during the lean periods.

Unlike most African countries which adopted a hasty implementation of FPE, Lesotho made some preparations for implementation soon after the programme was announced. This preparation included visits by government officials to Malawi and Uganda to learn from their experiences. These visits informed the Lesotho government’s decision to phase in the elimination of user fees (Kattan, 2006). A visit to Asia enlightened the government on the possibility of outsourcing school catering for the school feeding programme to the community
instead of contracting from commercial outfits (Avenstrup, 2006).) The Government of Lesotho invests heavily on education, with an expenditure on education amounting to about 12 percent of the Gross Domestic Product in 2005. This amount, compared to a world average of 4 percent, is considered high by international and regional standards (World Bank, 2005a). Unfortunately, the weighting for this expenditure greatly favours tertiary and secondary education.

The elimination of fees positively impacted enrolment rates. The gross primary enrolment rate increased from 109 percent in 1996 to 127 percent in 2003. Net primary enrolment rose by 33 percent in the year following implementation of FPE, from 60 percent in 1999 to 80 percent in 2000 (Lerotholi, 2001). Total primary enrolment increased from about 350,000 in 1990 to 430,000 in 2003/04, a more than 20% increase. An encouraging trend from data is that, the increases in enrolment have been sustained. Gross entry rate into Standard 1 increased from 105% in 1998–99 to 120% in 2003/04. A higher proportion of 6 year-olds are now entering grade 1 on time (World Bank and Lesotho’s Ministry of Education and Training, 2005). FPE was also observed to have enhanced access to education for thousands of AIDS orphans (Lerotholi, 2001).

Underneath the relatively rosy picture of Lesotho’s FPE experience, lie a few challenges. Some schools’ financial needs exceeded the government allocations, yet most transactions were handled by the central government. Such schools had to struggle to raise funds. Furthermore, the maintenance expenditure guidelines were not flexible enough to account for individual school needs. Schools are not given direct cash for expenditures and thus they still must raise funds in order to generate spendable cash (Lerotholi, 2001). The UNESCO “Education for All Global Monitoring Report” (2007) also reports some inefficiency in the education system. There was a repetition rate of 18.2 percent in all grades for the school year ending in 2004, while the dropout rate was 43.1 percent in 2003; completion rates to grade 5 were 63.4 percent in total. In addition, a review of the education sector by the World Bank reveals that some 15 percent of primary
school-age children still remain outside the formal school system. The Lesotho “Fast Track Initiative Assessment Report” indicates that enrolment is lower in mountain areas, where poverty is deeper and access to school more difficult. Children have to walk long distances to school and thus arrive at school already hungry due to the high degree of food insecurity. These leads to irregular class attendance as many are too hungry to learn. A World Bank/ Government of Lesotho study also revealed serious regional and social disparities in education that lingered into the post FPE era. Schools in mountain areas and the Senqu River Valley tended to be more crowded, had higher pupil to teacher ratios and higher proportions of unqualified and less experienced teachers, compared to those in the lowlands and foothills. Multigrade schools, primarily located in rural mountain areas tend to be less endowed in terms of facilities and teachers, and perform worse in the Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE). A unique scenario from Lesotho is that boys are less likely to attend school, and are more likely to repeat and drop-out than girls (World Bank & Lesotho MoET, 2005).

It was estimated that in year 2003, on average, 20% of primary school pupils were repeaters. But most worrying were the concerns about the low quality of education as international comparisons rated Lesotho very unfavourably. Between 2000 and 2003, the Southern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ) conducted a study in 14 English-speaking African countries. In this study, Standard 6 pupils in Lesotho achieved very poor results compared to their counterparts. With scores of 451 on reading, and 447 on Mathematics, their performance fell well below the average score of 500 (World Bank & Lesotho’s MoET, 2005).

The experience of Lesotho reveals the problems with the stepped approach. To take advantage of free education, some parents enrolled children in primary school early (since preschool is not free). Others held children back to avoid paying fees in the next grade. In addition, dropouts returned to school and adults
enrolled in large numbers. These inflated enrolments caused bulges in the system in the fee-free grades (Avenstrup, 2006). Despite government’s efforts to construct additional classrooms, physical facilities have continued to pose a serious challenge. It was found that by 2004, the average class size was about 71 and 32% of the pupils lacked desks (World Bank & Lesotho’s MoET 2005). It became necessary to undertake additional measures to deal with pupil numbers. This forced the government of Lesotho to purchase tents for use as classrooms to counter the enrolment surges that were experienced with the introduction of FPE. Military helicopters were used to transport the tents and other educational equipment to the remote mountainous regions (Avenstrup, 2006).

**Lessons Learned From Lesotho**

School feeding has proved to be an incentive to parents and caregivers to send their children to school throughout the school year. At the same time, it supplements the children’s diet. Therefore, school meals are a considerable income transfer to families who often suffer from poverty. For orphans and other vulnerable children (OVC) school feeding may very well be the only source of a regular meal as well as the only chance for them to obtain primary education. School feeding programme increases retention of children in the hard to reach areas (schools) of the country and improves children’s capacity to concentrate and learn.

The school feeding programme can be used to achieve other benefits. In Lesotho, regular communications have been established between the cooperating partners and the school authorities. Several partners have built on these achievements and use the school feeding programme as a platform and a suitable environment to carry out complementary important activities such as health, nutrition, hygiene, sanitation and HIV prevention.
Efforts towards achieving UPE should make equity considerations an integral concern of the system. Whereas Lesotho spends highly on the education, this is heavily skewed in favour of tertiary education. The richer segment of society, with much greater chances of progressing to higher education thus benefit much more than the poor. In addition, regional disparities exist. Whereas the national pupil to teacher average is reasonable at about 47:1, the poorer remote regions have few trained teachers and much higher pupil to teacher ratios. These areas also suffer from classroom shortage.

Community awareness and sensitization are important aspects that must go along with the introduction of FPE. For dissemination of information, policy documents alone may not achieve wide coverage. Lesotho’s experience provides a good example of community sensitization. In addition to the mass media, Lesotho used the traditional form of community consultation, called pitsos to negotiate the Free Primary Education policy before introduction (Avenstrup, 2006)

The phased-in approach has helped the government to more effectively develop an implementation strategy. The country avoided the big bang approach, and this allowed time for better thought out forecasting. One of the innovative approaches that has been tried in Lesotho to counter the rapid expansion in school enrolment is the “Breakthrough to Literacy” programme which trains teachers to handle large class numbers. Through this programme, pupils are broken into smaller groups in line with their learning level until they are able to join the larger class.

2.5.2.5 Cameroon

After coming close to universal primary education in the late 1980’s (95.6% in 1989/1990), the primary school Gross Enrolment Ratios in Cameroon fell to 81.8% in 1998/1999 (United Nations Country Team Cameroon, 2001).
Cameroon took the decision to eliminate school fees for primary education in 1999. This was done against a backdrop of more than 10 years of economic crisis, increased teacher and administration corruption, and declining school enrolments. In the 1990s, the quality of education had deteriorated, with substandard achievement scores and record repetition rates of about 28% each year. The decline could have been triggered by the fiscal constraints of the early 1990s, which led to lower salaries for teachers, reduced allocations for materials, and neglected infrastructure (United Nations Country Team, Cameroon, 2001). The implementation of FPE was followed by an action plan, the *Stratégie du Secteur de l’Education, 2000*, to improve the education sector at all levels. The primary gross enrolment rate (GER) increased from 87.7 percent in 2000 to 105.4 percent in 2002, and the number of non-repeating pupils in primary school increased by 59 percent in the first year following the elimination of user fees. The government undertook an aggressive programme to recruit part-time teachers (4836 for the year 2003 alone), and to construct and rehabilitate classrooms (4278 in primary education and 385 in general secondary education). Primary per pupil government expenditures rose from CFAF 21,000 in 1995 to CFAF 45,000 in 2001 (World Bank, 2005b).

Cameroon’s action plan set out to improve quality by revising curricula, providing textbooks and teacher materials, improving school infrastructure, and improving career opportunities for teachers. The teacher component included training of existing teachers and hiring new teachers. The strategy also aimed to overhaul the school system’s management and governance activities by creating school councils that had supervisory responsibilities such as monitoring and evaluation. The government abolished the monopoly of production and distribution of textbooks in May 2000, and eliminated schools fees starting in September 2000. In addition, it also distributed free textbooks to priority areas (International Monetary Fund, 2000). A unique feature of the FPE initiative in Cameroon is that the government also subsidizes private primary schools, albeit to a smaller extent.
Enrolment remained high and near universal after FPE was introduced, but repetition rates were also high. In 2003, it was estimated that almost 30 percent of education sector resources were wasted due to repetition. Wide gender and socio-economic disparities still existed. There was also a big gap in enrolment between the poorest 40 percent of the population and the richest 60 percent, between urban and rural areas and between the northern provinces and the rest of the country (World Bank, 2005b). In 2006, the government established procedures for pupil promotions as part of the effort to reduce repetition rate from 30% to 10% (IMF, 2007).

In Cameroon, whereas school fees were officially eliminated in year 2000, low public funding has resulted in high private cost of education. About of 25% of public primary school teachers were paid by parents in 2002. These teachers are mainly in rural areas. Considering that 23% of the total number of primary teachers was in private schools, almost half of the total number of primary school teachers were paid by parents (World Bank, 2005c).

Wide gender and socio-economic disparities still exist in Cameroon, where completion rates for boys were 14 percentage points higher than those for girls in 2003. There was a 25 percentage point gap in enrolment between the poorest 40 percent of the population and the richest 60 percent, and a 40 percentage point differential in enrolment between urban and rural areas. Regional disparity was also observed between the north and south; there was a 60 point differential between the Northern provinces and the rest of the country (World Bank, 2005b).

The government of Cameroon has enjoyed considerable donor support to fund the FPE programme. For example, in 2005, the World Bank approved a US$18.1 million loan to Cameroon to help the country to achieve universal primary education by 2015. The Education Development Capacity Building
Project aimed to reinforce administrative management, reinforce pedagogic management; reduce repetition rates, improve the health of schoolchildren; increase HIV/AIDS awareness among teachers and pupils; and increase the demand for primary education by reducing gender inequities. (World Bank, 2005b). In September 2006, Cameroon became eligible for financing under the fast track Initiative for Achieving EFA. The funding for education sector, recorded at 280.4 billion CFAF in 2006, represented 15.1% of government budget, 17.5 billion CFAF of which was funded from HIPC resources. 103.2 billion CFAF was dedicated to basic education. HIPC finances were utilized to construct 429 classrooms and equip them with desks (IMF, 2007).

### 2.6 A Synthesis from Experiences and Lessons Learned

The trend in Sub-Saharan Africa in the recent past has been to move away from primary school fees. This is most pronounced for tuition fees and for textbook fees, while some countries have also ceased to require compulsory uniforms. Momentum for declaring and implementing an outright abolition of fees gathered after year 2000. Whereas between 1994 and 1999, only three countries (Malawi, Uganda, and Cameroon) took this position, between 2001 and 2005, 13 countries abolished fees.

It is instructive that several African countries had already made significant progress towards UPE soon after independence with the initial programme to eradicate school fees. These gains were reversed in the 1980s as result of change of policy and the gradual reintroduction of levies. This observation is instructive in the sense that it offers an important lesson for the UPE initiative; unless a conscious effort is made to sustain the push towards UPE, a relapse could again be experienced. The priority for basic education that permeated much of SSA in the 1960s and 1970s, failed to survive into the early 1980s when economic problems started to afflict the continent. Kenya, Zambia and Cameroon, among other SSA countries, for example, had reached 100% GER in
the early 1980s, but they all experienced a big decline during the 1990s. Then of
course, 100% GER does not always result in universal completion.

As African countries abolished fees beginning from the 1990s, several Sub-
Saharan countries such as Kenya, Zambia and Malawi followed a “big bang”
approach whereby fee abolition was announced with little prior planning.
Malawi had a four month period for planning, but this is hardly ample time to
plan for a policy shift of such magnitude. As noted by (Avenstrup et al., 2004),
these countries that adopted FPE accompanied it with curriculum reform,
convergent pedagogy, provision of resources, and numerous other reforms
which overburdened the drive to change. Worse still, Malawi, Uganda, Lesotho
and Kenya began the implementation of FPE in the middle of financial years or
with fresh government after elections. These countries started on a difficult
foundation financially and FPE placed a budgetary strain on their systems.

An analysis of the contrast between the big bang and the phased –in approaches
offers useful lessons and brings to light the tradeoffs inherent in the differing
models. The two approaches used by the countries present lessons on the
difficult trade-offs between the “big bang” approach and various ways of
phasing in the fee abolition. With the “big bang”, anybody who has not
benefited from primary education is in principle given the opportunity to
enrol. Therefore, even the over-aged are allowed to immediately benefit. Kenya and
Malawi did not in any way employ phasing-in of the fee abolition policy.
Phasing in can be done by age, grade or over time. In Kenya and Malawi, a
second chance was accorded to those who had dropped out from primary school
to re-enter and sit for the primary school leaving certificate (which was
prominent in Kenya and Malawi). Allowing re-entry to the last grade of primary
education also immediately affects the demand for secondary education.

A phased-in approach can help to reduce the challenges associated the big bang
approach. Phasing in is easier than introducing FPE all-out. Lesotho and
Uganda phased in their fee abolition in different ways. Phasing in has several advantages; it permits the system to limit the “access shock”, gives more time to mobilize the financial, human and material resources required, allows for experimentation with different procedures for channelling fee-replacement funds to schools, allows systems to put in place effective mechanisms for managing funds, and reduces the wide age ranges in each grade. However, phasing in denies later stage drop-outs from gaining re-entry into the school system and in effect leads to wastage. In addition, parents may decide to enrol drop-out children at much lower levels, or retain them at the phase-in stages so as to take advantage of the model. Hence, both the big bang and phase-in approaches have to content with serious trade-offs.

The sudden large entry of pupils at the inception of FPE in all the countries caused an “access shock”: double and triple shifts, congested classrooms, teacher and textbook shortages, and large numbers of over-age pupils. Gross enrolment invariably rose beyond 100% in the first year of free primary education. Teachers had to grapple with larger numbers than they were prepared to handle, while pupils had to make do with conditions that were unfavourable for effective learning. There is no evidence of the availability of special programmes to incorporate over-age learners into the education system other than the existing adult education programmes.

Despite the rushed implementation of FPE, the experience in Uganda, Lesotho, Malawi, Zambia and Kenya shows that the provision of free primary education is within the capability of even poor countries, provided strong political leadership backs the drive. In all these countries, free primary education dominated the political debates that preceded multiparty elections or the transition to multiparty democracy. In Kenya, Lesotho and Malawi, free primary education was the key election issue on which the new governments came into power. In Uganda, presidential elections gave prominence to the promise of free primary education. Understandably, given that in all the countries discussed
above there existed high poverty and illiteracy rates as well as low enrolment and completion rates prior to the introduction of FPE, the issue easily found appeal among the electorate.

One immediate consequence of the introduction of free primary education is that the policy often deprived schools of essential resources. With government promises to provide free education, it was assumed by many parents that the government would meet all needs and parents soon withheld their contributions. Even in a country like Malawi where there was a successful cost sharing mechanism in place through which communities contributed labour and materials for school infrastructure improvements, parents withdrew such support with the expectation that the government would now take over the burden of providing all inputs. In the FPE countries therefore, parental and community inputs began to trickle back only when it becomes obvious that their governments could not provide a 100% free of cost education. Even then, the magnitude of parental inputs generally reduced to less than it would have been in the absence of official policies of fee-free provision. The lesson to be learnt is that school fee abolition should be presented and implemented in a way that maintains the communities’ engagement in supporting their local school, but without exerting obligatory financial payment requirements from pupils.

Analysis of the situation in the countries discussed reveals that Education for All requires a new paradigm; that learning should be the goal, rather than just mere attendance. A review of FPE in Malawi, Zambia, Uganda, Lesotho, Cameroon and Kenya shows that there have been concerns regarding the quality of education provided. The inadequacy of infrastructure in the face of rising enrolments has inevitably compromised standards as countries grapple with the need to admit and retain all school age children in schools. Good quality education is also an important factor that helps to keep pupils in schools. Unless quality is attended to from the beginning, high enrolment rates will not necessarily lead to an educated population. Therefore, the introduction of FPE
must be accompanied by policies that maintain and improve the quality of instruction. Ensuring conducive class sizes through school and classroom expansion, the provision of well trained teachers and the provision of textbooks may attract and retain children into school. An environment that reassures parents and pupils alike that children will learn something while in school increases the expected benefits of attending school and enhances completion and retention.

In several countries, the initial surge in enrolment rates began to decline soon after the introduction of FPE. Malawi, Kenya, and Cameroon are such cases. According to the World Bank, enrolment rates fell off after the initial increase partly as a result of a perceived decline in educational quality due to a combination of increased enrolments, inadequate funding, and overall lack of preparation. Malawi’s case is cited as being particularly acute; in year 2000, the Standard 1 average pupil to teacher ratio was 100:1, with many classrooms surpassing this ratio. The average primary repetition rate was estimated at between 16 and 28 percent, and the average primary drop-out rate was between 5 and 10 percent in the same year (World Bank, 2004b)

Evidently, the abolition of fees made education available to millions of poor children who could not previously afford it. However, this alone cannot guarantee their retention in the school system. Several of the Sub-Saharan countries that abolished fees and recorded overwhelming enrolments soon experienced drop-out rates that were alarming. The lesson to be learnt is that other complementary strategies such as targeted interventions, school feeding programmes, building schools closer to pupils, strong macroeconomic policies that support increases in access and increases in funding must be integrated into the UPE effort to ensure a comprehensive approach to the management of free primary education.
Free primary education in sub-Saharan Africa is not entirely free. Abolition of school fees reduced the direct cost of schooling, but other related costs such as transportation to and from school, pens and exercise books and contributions for school construction and maintenance still exist in varying degrees. Whereas in many countries school uniform is no longer compulsory, some pupils may keep away to avoid stigmatization if they cannot afford uniforms. Many poor and vulnerable children will still face serious barriers to getting an education.

Teachers form a central component of the schooling process and their capacity has direct impact on the success of any UPE programme. Upon introduction of FPE, different countries approached the teaching force component differently. Malawi appointed untrained teachers, orientated them briefly, and only subsequently created MIITEP to provide the professional development they lacked. Zambia and Kenya avoided hiring untrained teachers upon implementation of FPE. Zambia developed a new teacher education programme, in preparation for FPE while Kenya decided to map its teacher requirements before deploying new teachers. Uganda recruited teachers then began to upgrade them through comprehensive, professional teacher training. Thus, apart from Zambia, teacher development plans in the other countries discussed were only fully worked out after FPE was announced.

Success in the FPE implementation was and continues to be dependent upon external donor support in all the countries. This arrangement accords great policy leverage to donor agencies, as well as raises the question of sustainability over the long term. It would be more prudent for Sub-Saharan countries to develop home grown solutions to funding that would guarantee a more predictable funding mechanism. Without discounting the importance of external donor support, the realities of donor dynamics can result in unstable financing or biased donor-driven development agenda. Care must be taken to ensure that the reliance on external donor support does not in the long term weaken local ownership and leadership of education sectors in African countries. The donor
effort should however be commended for instigating development of structures for overall coordination of hitherto disjointed programmes that were given different support by different development agencies. This coordinated effort is manifested in the Sector wide Approach (SWAp) models that have been adopted.

FPE in general has enhanced equity in the education systems of African countries. The gender gap appears to have narrowed considerably, especially where there are targeted programs for girls. However, analysis shows that even in spite of fees abolition, some disparities persist. The equity gap between urban and rural areas has often not closed and in some countries, has deepened. As observed in Zambia, a significant gender gap remains, especially in rural areas. In Malawi, urban pupils are 20 to 30 percentage points more likely to stay in school than their rural counterparts. There is generally a higher degree of poverty in rural areas and teacher deployment to rural areas is not as strong as deployment to urban areas (World Bank, 2004b). Wide gender and socio-economic disparities still exist in Cameroon, where completion rates for boys were 14 percentage points higher than those for girls in 2003. There is a big gap in enrolment between the poorest of the population and the richest, and a wide point differential in enrolment between urban and rural areas. Such disparities are inconsistent with the push for UPE and are suggestive of gaps that call for policy adjustments and intervention.

Fee creep has been observed to have occurred in several countries even in spite of the official abolition of user fees. For example, despite official fee elimination in Malawi, parents continue to contribute to both the recurrent and capital costs of primary education through paying for school supply, for textbooks and uniforms, and contributing to the school development fund, which finances infrastructure maintenance. Boyle et al. (2002) also reported that in Uganda, official government policy states that parents are responsible for paying costs for exercise books and pencils, meals, clothing, transportation and
assistance with school construction, yet a study undertaken by the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development (DFID) found that unofficial fees that was charged included end-of-year parties, classroom construction, telecommunication infrastructure, and even teachers’ funerals. The same study noted that 48 percent of parents cited inability to pay expenses as the reason that their children left primary school. In Zambia, Mwansa et al. (2004) observed that despite the Free Basic Education (FBE) mandate to eliminate obligatory uniforms, 46 percent of urban and 14 percent of rural schools still required pupils to wear uniforms, while some schools begun to charge PTA fees again due to inadequate government funding. In Kenya, schools have been found to discretely charge unofficial fees to cover costs (Mukudi, 2004). The same situation obtains in Lesotho. Care ought to be taken to avoid a relapse to the pre FPE era when millions of school age children were locked out of schools by prohibitive costs. African countries could learn a valuable lesson from history; the immediate post independence era saw many countries work towards FPE, but the gains made were soon reversed by a gradual re-introduction of levies.

Through the HIPC-II (the Enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Debt Relief Initiative), several poor countries in sub Saharan Africa have received debt relief. It is apparent that the cancellation of unsustainable debt servicing increased funding for education to these countries. Tomaveski (2003) observes that Malawi, Uganda and Zambia among others, have usefully taken advantage of the process of debt relief to abolish school fees. The HIPC initiative is a means to free up additional resources to help these countries to achieve UPE as well as other MDGs. Other beneficiary countries in SSA should therefore be encouraged to ensure that the resources saved as a result of the HIPC debt relief initiative are directed towards the UPE effort.

It is instructive that several African countries had already made significant progress towards UPE soon after independence with the initial programme to
eradicate school fees. These gains were reversed in the 1980s as result of change of policy and the gradual reintroduction of levies. This observation is instructive and offers an important lesson for the UPE initiative; unless a conscious effort is made to sustain the push towards UPE, a relapse could again be experienced. The priority for basic education that permeated much of SSA in the 1960s and 1970s, failed to survive into the early 1980s when economic problems started to afflict the continent. Kenya, Zambia and Cameroon, among other SSA countries, for example, had reached 100% GER in the early 1980s, but experienced a big decline during the 1990s. Then of course, 100% GER does not always result in universal completion.

Overall, Sub-Saharan countries that have implemented FPE seem to face, in varying degrees, some common challenges. These include the provision of adequate physical facilities such as classrooms, furniture, safe water source, accommodation, latrines and libraries as well as instructional materials. Quality concerns seem to pervade these educational systems, and these could be addressed through monitoring quality learning and teaching, training and recruitment of teachers to achieve appropriate teacher-pupil ratio and decreasing drop-out rates. The gains in enrolment observed after fee abolition will only be sustainable if there is careful planning of appropriate accompanying measures. The overarching lesson in implementing school fee abolition initiatives is that FPE (Free Primary Education) is no quick fix, neither is it an end in itself. It requires adequate financing, resources, planning, community mobilization and government commitment.

2.7 Implementation of FPE in Kenya

The introduction of FPE in Kenya in the year 2003, which was welcomed by many Kenyans at inception, significantly increased access to primary education for many of the previously out of school children. The FPE policy was especially significant because it allowed children from the poorer segment of
society the chance to attend primary school. However, the sudden increase in enrolment of 1.3 million new pupils at the same time, occasioned significant problems in the primary school education system (Mathooko, 2009; Tooley, Dixon & Stanfield, 2008). The rapid expansion of enrolment led to overcrowded classrooms and increased the ratio of pupils to teachers to such a high rate that it resulted in a decline in the quality of education (Centre for the Study of African Economies, 2008; Avenstrup, Xiaoyan, & Soren, 2004; Mukudi, 2004).

The complications that arose as a result of the introduction of FPE in Kenya have over the years attracted a lot of research interest. Several studies have been conducted to gain insights into the attendant challenges of FPE, one of the earliest and most noteworthy being the assessment of the implementation of FPE that was conducted by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Nairobi Office. The FPE assessment study was carried out in 162 primary schools in February 2004, and covered 9 sampled districts in five provinces of Kenya. The study assessed the FPE programme with the aim of documenting the experiences of schools as they implemented the FPE. The study exposed the immediate resultant challenges faced by schools such as increased enrolments that many times could not be accommodated by schools; shortage of teachers; lack of clear guidelines on admission; and the delay by the government in disbursement of FPE funds to schools. According to the study, as a result of the indiscriminate admissions of pupils that followed the introduction of FPE, 44% of the pupils attending primary school were over-age for their class grade by two or more years. The study further found that there was no consultation with teachers and parents before the implementation of FPE. Headteachers who were interviewed during this UNESCO study complained that FPE led to an expanded role for them, making it difficult for them to teach effectively and provide instructional leadership in schools (UNESCO, 2005).
As a way of addressing the quality concerns, the UNESCO report recommended that there should be frequent assessments of the education process in primary schools as well as an increase in the number of inspections conducted by Ministry of Education quality assurance officers. The report further recommended the hiring of more teachers and improvement of salaries to motivate primary school teachers in Kenya. Coming soon after the introduction of FPE, the report was significant because it documented the experiences that were faced by schools in the implementation of FPE, and outlined both the detriments and benefits of the FPE policy. However, the study did not analytically address the effectiveness of the change management practices in schools.

Avenstrup, et al. (2004), in a study that employed interviews with teachers, parents, SMCs, Ministry of Education executives and representatives of donor agencies in Kenya in 2004, observed FPE implementation challenges similar to those revealed by UNESCO (2005), and noted that there was no time to negotiate with stakeholders, neither was there detailed planning before FPE was started. They thus concluded from their findings that in Kenya, the education system was not geared up for the logistical implications of FPE. Chuck (2009) supports this view, noting that with the abrupt introduction of FPE in Kenya, the education system was caught completely off-guard and failed to enact adequate preparation for the new policy. He argues that the FPE policy was more of a political strategy to fulfil the NARC party promise to provide FPE, and so necessary preparations such as prior consultations with the Ministry of Education and proper communication with stakeholders were overlooked. Sifuna (2008) also observes that the government failed to carry out a situation analysis before implementing FPE, resulting in confusion amongst teachers, parents, School Management Committees, sponsors and local donors.

As a result of the apprehension expressed by research activity that accompanied the introduction of FPE in Kenya, many subsequent studies on FPE
implementation have focussed on the quality imperative. Several studies have identified conditions that threatened quality. Mikiko, Keiichi, Sifuna, Chimombo, Kunje, Ampiah, Byamugisha, Sawamura, & Yamada (2009) call attention to the fact that due to the challenge of overcrowded classrooms, many teachers in primary schools suffered low morale. This was especially considering that fact there was a shortage of teachers in primary schools. As Sifuna (2008) observes, whereas 6,000 new teachers were hired in 2003 to replace those who had left through natural attrition, this number was inadequate and did not match the increase in number of pupils who had joined primary schools. Teaching and learning was thus compromised by the large classes, with the consequence that teacher–learner interaction became minimal and pupils failed to get adequate personalized attention. He adds that due to the heavy workload, some subjects and classes were left untaught as teachers found it difficult to attend to more than one class at a time. Such challenging conditions reduced teachers’ morale and negatively affected their willingness and ability to implement FPE to the best of their ability. Chuck (2009) and Roschanski (2007) express the concern that the amount of homework given by teachers reduced because teachers could not cope with large amount of pupils’ homework that required marking. These observations are consistent with those of UNESCO’s study which found that because teachers were unable to give individual attention to the learners, it was difficult for teachers not only to offer quality education, but to take full control of classes. Indiscipline was therefore rampant in schools (UNESCO, 2005).

Whereas research has shown that after FPE was introduced, more of the poor pupils could access primary education (Glewwe & Kremer, 2005; Avenstrup et al., 2004; Oketch & Rollestone, 2007), there has been concern that FPE probably benefits those from wealthier families more than it does the poor. Ngware, Oketch, Ezeh and Mudege (2009), in a study conducted in two slum and two non-slum communities in Nairobi, came to the unexpected conclusion that families living outside informal settlements were more likely to send their
children to public schools where free primary education is offered than families living in informal settlements. This was surprising because the free primary education policy was principally implemented to ensure that the poorest children were not kept out of school due to lack of school fees. The study revealed that 74% of families living in the relatively low-income formal settlements had their children enrolled in public primary schools compared to 52% of families living in the informal settlements. In addition, even within the informal settlements, the better-off families were more likely to have their children in public schools. The findings suggested that the very poor children were still not sufficiently catered for by the Free Primary Education policy. This raises the concern that equity in primary education might continue to be elusive despite the provision of Free Primary Education.

Data collected in a longitudinal study by the African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC) in two major informal settlements in Nairobi - Korogocho and Viwandani-and in two non-slum sites of Jericho and Harambee between 2005 and 2007 revealed that due to limited public investment in education in the slums (there are fewer public schools in the slums), room was created for the ‘mushrooming’ of private informal schools. Such schools usually operated in structures with unacceptable conditions for education. Evidence from data collected also showed that an unacceptably large number of pupils in the informal settlements of Nairobi, where 60% of the city’s population lived, had no access to free public primary schools. They thus instead, relied immensely on private informal schools. The data revealed that in the study sample, 44% of school going children in informal settlements were enrolled in private informal schools. The study therefore recommended that the government ought to find ways of improving supply of state schools of acceptable standard in the slums first, if it wished to reduce inequity at the primary school level of education (Ezeh, Oketch, Mutisya & Ngware, 2008a). The findings were significant as they revealed that there was inadequate public spending on education in slums. The poor were, as a result, pushed to using ‘private schools
for the poor’. What was evident from the data in this study was that an unacceptable proportion of the poor still utilized private schools, not necessarily because they preferred to do so, but because they had not been included in the public school system due to a shortage of supply of government schools.

Ngware and Oketch (2010) add that although the FPE policy allowed universal coverage, it ought to benefit the poor most since they were the ones who were excluded from the education sector before the policy was introduced. They explain in their analysis that findings from household-survey data collected in Nairobi to assess the impact of the FPE policy on schooling outcomes of the poor revealed that the FPE policy in Kenya still excluded the poorest of the poor. Tooley et al. (2008) also emphasize that even with Kenya’s success in widening participation in primary schooling through FPE, the country must not ignore the reality of a fee-paying private education sector that charges low fees and sets out to meet the needs of the poor. This, they contend, is an indication of inadequacies of state education.

In addition, a number of surveys conducted on FPE in Kenya have indicated that for the poor children, numerous costs still exist that hinder access to schooling (Avenstrup, et al., 2004; Alubisia, 2005). Despite the fact that the government has waived the tuition fee and provides textbooks, some other schooling-related costs are still the parent's responsibility. Parents still have to meet other direct costs, such as uniforms, supplementary tutoring, additional exercise books lunch and transportation to school. Chuck (2009) notes that whereas exercise books are provided under the FPE policy, teachers had complained that this provision was inadequate for the whole year. According to Avenstrup et al. (2004), even though uniforms are no longer compulsory, some parents kept their children at home to avoid the stigma of not being able to afford school uniform. Parents are still expected to provide their children with exercise books and pens, and schools still raise funds for social, cultural, and sporting activities. Schools have also been found to demand for monetary
contributions. Avenstrup et al. (2004) argue that the very poor—such as dispossessed AIDS orphans in urban slums or rural areas, who are unable to contribute anything toward their education—are therefore often excluded from the system, and hence, only completely free education provided in a supportive environment can reach such marginalized groups. Vos et al. (2004), in addition, aver that even with the abolition of school fees, there remain other obstacles to enrolment among the poor such as the need for children to work and earn a living for their families and the poor perception of the utility of the education on offer.

Somerset (2009), in a school-level survey of the impact of FPE carried out in 2007, also found that primary school education in Kenya after introduction of FPE could not really be said to be cost-free for pupils. During the survey, pupils frequently mentioned that charges of various kinds, such computer fees, charges for examinations and charges for school trips were demanded by schools. Most public primary schools were found to be charging tutorial fees especially for the standard 8 pupils. In some cases, even pupils in lower classes were expected to attend tutorial lessons outside regular school hours. The fees charged ranged from a few hundred shillings up to about Kshs.1500 per term. It was found that poor pupils who were unable to pay such fees were often harassed and placed under pressure to pay by the school administration. From the study findings, it was concluded that tutorial fees were a major burden that could well contribute—along with KCPE ‘sifting’, where only the high performing prospective examination candidates were allowed to register for national examinations—to the high dropout rate from the final primary grade.

While the very poor in urban slums are forced by circumstances to rely on deprived private schools, research has also shown that some of wealthier parents, fearing that overcrowded classrooms had led to decline in the quality of education in public schools, transferred their children to privately—owned primary schools (Mikiko & Takashi, 2008; Tooley et al., 2008; Chuck, 2009;
This was probably exacerbated by the fact that most of the primary schools that experienced the high increases in enrolment were also the schools that lacked adequate infrastructure (Kenya Ministry of Education, 2008). In response to the concerns about decline in quality of education in public primary schools after FPE was introduced, Bold, Kimenyi, Mwabu and Sandefur (2010) conducted a research study on enrolment and achievement in Kenya. The study found that the introduction of FPE had caused many of the more affluent parents in Kenya to move their children into the private schools. Their study established that the number of private schools had tripled after FPE, with a concomitant doubling of the cost of private education. They therefore concluded that since these were the parents who previously gave a lot of financial support to schools, the introduction of FPE may well have denied schools parental support and supervision.

Data from official Government of Kenya’s statistics give credence to the findings of (Bold et al., 2010) on the increase in the number of parents seeking private school education for their children after FPE. According to the Central Bureau of Statistics, the number of private primary schools increased by approximately 38 percent in the first three years of FPE implementation, from 1,441 in 2002 to 1,985 in 2005, while that of public schools rose only by 1.6 percent from 17,589 in 2002 to 17,864 in 2005 (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2006).

Although several studies, as discussed, have highlighted the concerns on quality of teaching and learning, few studies have explored the actual differences in impact that FPE has had on different types of schools. In attempt to fill this gap, Chuck (2009), in a study on the effects FPE on the quality of education in Nairobi primary schools, sought to examine if the FPE policy had benefited certain kinds of schools more than others. The study thus aimed at determining whether educational inequalities in primary schools had been exacerbated, sustained or eliminated. The uniqueness of this study was that it sought to gain
insights on how FPE had affected schools with different socio-economic characteristics. It was found in this study that schools in the wealthier regions had more and better facilities, and so could have accommodated a larger number of new enrolments. Yet, these are the schools that experienced a smaller number of newly enrolled students after FPE because the children living in the surrounding areas could already afford an education. The consequence of this was that the poorer schools faced greater challenges, leading to a disparity between schools. The study concluded that FPE had affected the learning circumstances of schools in different ways. Primary schools in slum areas that had prior to FPE performed very well were the most adversely affected by FPE because they experienced the largest surges in enrolment. Schools that were previously almost dysfunctional because they had very minimal resources and very poor students, on the other hand, benefited most from FPE because they were now properly operating under FPE.

From the research conducted on FPE in Kenya, a few major points may be noted. Firstly, there was a rapid expansion in access to primary education which led to problems of resourcing and overcrowding. These threaten educational quality in public schools. Secondly, even with the elimination of school fees, there still exist some other impediments to enrolment especially among the economically underprivileged in Kenya. This raises the concern that equity in primary education might continue to be elusive despite the provision of Free Primary Education. Lastly, there have been perceptions that the quality of education in public primary schools has declined as result of the challenges that emerged after the introduction of FPE in 2003. This perceived decline in quality is unsettling as it could lead to a decline in enrolment due to dropouts. Studies conducted on Free Primary Education in Kenya have focused broadly on the challenges that were faced by schools at implementation. However, these studies have not illuminated particular focus on the management of the change process to Free Primary Education. There is also absence of research literature
that evaluates the preparation and training that was given to education personnel with regard to FPE, as part of the change management process.

2.8 Summary

The review of literature in this chapter has presented the concept of Education for All, which explains the philosophy behind providing Universal Primary Education and minimum basic education to all people. It is the thinking upon which the FPE policy in Kenya is based. The literature also presents the global perspectives and trends in EFA. The literature is then narrowed down to the Universal Primary Education scenario in Kenya. This is traced historically, from the time of independence to recent times to provide a background to the introduction of FPE. The historical view of government financing of primary education in Kenya clearly shows that the concept of ‘Free Primary Education’ is not an entirely new phenomenon in Kenya. Thus, a brief analysis is made of the circumstances that worked against the attempts to bring the policy to fruition in the early years of Kenya’s political independence. The overview of government financing that is presented in this chapter is punctuated by the significant milestones of cost sharing and the introduction of the 8-4-4 system. These two phenomena are highlighted for the reason that they impacted significantly on the financing of primary education in Kenya. In fact, from the analysis presented, their net effect, arguably, necessitated the re-introduction of Free Primary Education. This chapter also presents ‘free primary schooling’ experiences from other parts of Africa. Case studies from the different regions of Africa are discussed and a synthesis of the lessons learnt is given.

Studies conducted on Free Primary Education in Kenya have focused broadly on the challenges that were faced by schools at implementation. However, these studies have not illuminated particular focus on the management of the change process to Free Primary Education. It is with regard to this that the present study sought to fill the gap by conducting an analysis of management practices in schools as they relate to the change to FPE. There is also absence of research
literature that evaluates the preparation and training that was given to education personnel with regard to FPE, as part of the change management process. The present study addresses this gap and goes further to analyze the existence of gaps in the FPE policy. Based on the findings, a modular framework for effective change management of Free Primary Education in Kenya is proposed.
CHAPTER THREE

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
In this chapter, the procedures and strategies that were used in the study are presented. The research design adopted for the study and the locations of the study are described. The population and sample for the study and the sampling procedure used for the study are then defined. The three instruments that were utilized for collecting data are also explained before the procedure that was used for data collection is presented. The methodology section concludes with an overview of the data analysis process.

3.2 Research Design
The design adopted for the study was the cross-sectional survey. Cross-sectional surveys are employed to gather information on a population at a single point in time, as opposed to longitudinal surveys which gather data over a period of time so as to analyze changes in the population. Surveys are used to collect information from or about people to describe, compare or explain their knowledge, feelings, values or behaviour (Fink, 2006). Julian and Burstein (1985) add that survey research concerns itself with describing practices that prevail, beliefs, views, attitudes or perceptions that are held. Surveys, in their simplest form, are commonly conducted to establish the nature of existing conditions (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000). Survey research seeks to obtain information that describes existing phenomena by asking individuals about their attitudes, perceptions or behaviour, but apart from describing, it can be used to explore existing status. It is perhaps the best method available to social scientists and educators interested in collecting original data for describing a population that is too large to observe directly (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).
This study was aimed at gathering facts, knowledge, experiences, views and judgment from headteachers, teachers and education officers on the implementation of FPE. It was a survey because it sought to explore and establish conditions relating to the implementation process in schools, then, mostly from qualitative data collected, report the situation as it existed. The information gathered on implementation of FPE was then used to design a model for systemic change management.

3.3 Study Locale
The study was conducted in Kakamega and Kajiado districts of Kenya.

3.3.1 Kakamega District
Kakamega, as constituted at the inception of the study, was one of the eight districts that made up Western province. It had seven administrative divisions and covered an area of 1,394.8 square kilometres. It has a climate that is suitable for growing various cash crops, but much of the farming is done on small scale basis (Republic of Kenya, 2002d). Much of the population tends to settle around and within the small towns and trading centres where physical infrastructure such as schools, health centres, electricity and roads are found. The district’s population stood at 603,422 in 2001, which is a population density of 481 persons per sq. km. There is a high rate of poverty in the district, with a rural and urban absolute poverty of 57.47% (i.e. 369,599 people). This poverty manifests itself in forms such as high disease rates, high infant mortality rates (63.9/1000), high under-5 years mortality rates (122.5/1000) and high school drop-out rates (28%). There is also high incidence of un-employment and under-employment. The district had 344 primary schools (District Education Office data, 2005), with enrolment rates of 82.1% for boys and 81.3% of girls as of the year 2002. During the same year, the dropout rates for boys and girls were 28% and 24% respectively. The district has a mix of boys’, girls’, mixed, day and boarding primary schools (Republic of Kenya, 2002d).
The combination of factors presented here made the district a suitable choice of location for conducting the study. The rationale for selecting Kakamega, specifically stated, was as follows;

(a) The district had a high poverty rate that has over the years affected school enrolment/attendance.

(b) The district had both a rural and urban setting, which provided for the researcher, the benefit of a broader insight into the problem under study.

(c) There was a readily available mix of day, boarding, mixed, girls’ and boys’ schools. Such diversity enriched the data collected.

(d) The fairly well developed network of roads facilitated access to schools for the study.

The conditions described above may not be unique to Kakamega district. However, owing to challenges of limited time and scarce financial resources, a district that embodied such characteristics of relevance to the study was selected. The researcher’s familiarity with the district also made for easy access to the respondents.

3.3.2 **Kajiado District**

The other district used for the study –Kajiado, is home to the mainly nomadic and pastoralist Maasai community. In contrast to Kakamega, which has a high potential for agricultural activity, 90% of Kajiado is arid and sparsely populated. The vast district is prone to frequent and prolonged droughts. Because of the nomadic nature of the Maasai people and the harsh climatic conditions in this ASAL area, provision of and access to education has remained challenging. Gorham (1980) observes that many people in Maasai community have over the years been unable to finance quality schooling due to the unstable nature of pastoral economy.

Kajiado district covers an area of 21,902.9sq.km and has seven administrative divisions with a total population of 470,000 people. The district has a total of 198 primary schools. Many of the people in the rural areas, especially women,
are illiterate (Republic of Kenya, 2002c). The historically difficult educational circumstances and the high rates of illiteracy in this district provided for the researcher the interest to include the district in the research. In addition, the district’s geographical and socio-economic nature described above, that contrast sharply with those of Kakamega, served to enrich the study by capturing the diversity. Kajiado was selected over other districts that may have similar characteristics for its proximity to Nairobi, the fact that it provided both remote-rural and very urban settings and its relatively well-developed road network compared to other ASAL areas. In addition, compared to most other ASAL areas, it enjoys good security. It thus provided for the researcher, better prospects for access to the research respondents.

### 3.4 The Study Population

In this study, the target population comprised all the public primary schools in Kenya. However, for the purpose of this research, the accessible population, or study population, was all public primary schools in Kakamega and Kajiado districts. Kakamega district had 344 public primary schools while Kajiado had 198 public primary schools. Schools in Kakamega and Kajiado formed the sampling frame for this study, hence, it was from this population that a sample of headteachers, teachers, parents and pupils were selected for the study. Kakamega district had a total of 344 primary school headteachers, 4041 teachers and a pupil enrolment of 187,802 pupils in 2007 (Kakamega District Education Office records, 2007). Kajiado district had a total of 198 headteachers, 2024 teachers and a pupil enrolment of 89,810 pupils in the year 2007 (Kajiado District Education Office records).

At the Ministry of Education level, the target population comprised all the Area Education Officers (AEOs), District Education Officers and Team Leaders of Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP) Investment Programmes in Kenya. However, since the study was confined to Kakamega and Kajiado
districts, the study population comprised the 14 Area Education Officers (AEOs) and 2 District Education Officers in Kakamega and Kajiado districts, and the 23 KESSP IP Team Leaders at the Ministry of Education headquarters (all IP team Leaders are based at the Ministry of Education headquarters in Nairobi.

3.5 Sampling Design

3.5.1 Primary Schools

Primary schools constituting the sample totalled 59 schools (representing 11% of the population of 542 schools in Kakamega and Kajiado districts). Therefore, from the 344 (three-hundred and forty-four) public primary schools in Kakamega district, a sample of 37 schools was selected, representing 11% of the district population. From the population of 198 primary schools in Kajiado, 22 schools, also representing 11% of the district population, were selected for the study. Gay (1981: 98) avers, ‘for survey research, a sample size of 10% of the population is considered minimum’.

The disproportionate stratified sampling technique was then used to select schools that constituted the sample. However, since the boarding schools formed a very small grouping, the disproportionate stratified sampling procedure was employed. Rubin and Babbie (2009) explain that in some studies, it may be advisable and is permissible to take a larger proportion of the very small homogenous groupings. This process, referred to as disproportionate stratified sampling, gives cases from specified small sub- groups a disproportionately better chance of inclusion in the sample. Crucially, the sampling fraction is not the same within all strata: some strata are over-sampled relative to others. The technique was selected for this study to ensure that both the categories of boarding and day schools were represented in the study. This way, any uniqueness in their experiences relating to the implementation of FPE was captured. Thus, from the 7 boarding schools in Kajiado district, 4 were
selected for the study, while from the five boarding schools in Kakamega district, 4 were selected from within the strata into the study sample (See Appendix xii). The reason for selecting four boarding schools from each district was simply to have two girls’ and two boys’ boarding schools in the sample. Even in stratified sampling (both proportionate and disproportionate), after dividing the population into homogeneous subgroups, a simple random sample, especially in the proportionately larger subgroup, is then selected. Thus, after selecting the boarding schools, 33 day schools were randomly selected from Kakamega district and 18 day schools were randomly selected from Kajiado district to complete the sample for the study.

3.5.2 Teachers, Headteachers and Area Education Officers
Teachers and headteachers included in the sample were those from the schools randomly selected for the sample. From each school, three teachers, representing Standard 1, 4 and 8 respectively were selected alongside the headteacher. The three classes were chosen purposively for the study to represent the lower, middle and upper sections of the school respectively. In cases where there was more than one stream for the targeted classes, teachers were selected using the simple random sampling method (the lottery method). The total number of teachers included in the study sample therefore, was 177 (one hundred and seventy-seven).

Area Education Officers (AEOs) heading the educational divisions in Kakamega and Kajiado districts were included in the study. Kakamega and Kajiado districts (as constituted at the time of the study) each had seven divisions headed by AEOs, who doubled up as the principal Quality Assurance and Standards officers. Therefore, a total of 14 AEOs were targeted for the study. Headteachers were selected for this study because they are the managers of the education process on the ground. For this reason, they were best placed to provide insights on the management of the FPE change process. However, to get an objective judgment on the management practices of headteachers in
schools, teachers and AEOs were also included in the study. Area Education Officers oversee the implementation of education at the divisional administrative level. They serve as the principal Quality Assurance and Standards officers at the divisional level. It was therefore important to interview them to gain insights on the management of the implementation of FPE vis a vis government policy.

3.5.3   Parents

Two parents were selected from each of the sampled schools in the study for interviewing. Using two lists of all parents availed by school administration, one for the lower primary section and the other for the upper primary section, two parents of pupils per school were randomly selected. Therefore, a total of 118 parents were selected for the study sample. The selected parents were then contacted and invited for the interview. Where a parent indicated inability to attend the interview, a fresh random selection for a replacement was conducted. Parents were included in the sample to gather information on their role in FPE, and to provide recommendations that could be used to improve the management of FPE.

3.5.4.   School Management Committee (SMC) Members

From each of the selected schools, two randomly selected members of the School Management Committee were included in the study for interviewing, making a total of 118. With the introduction of FPE, the role of School Management Committee became more critical; it is SMC’s responsibility to manage FPE funds and oversee procurements. It was therefore necessary to interview SMC members on the role they played in school management, the challenges they faced and their views on the management of FPE. This information was useful for designing the model for systemic change management in Kenya and for making recommendations for the improvement of FPE management.
3.5.5 District Education Officers and senior Ministry of Education Officers

The two District Education Officers heading Kajiado and Kakamega districts respectively were included in the study. The DEOs were selected for the study to provide information on the level of preparedness for FPE at the district level. In addition to these two, the Director of Policy and Planning in the Ministry of Education and six Heads of Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP) Investment Programmes (IP) were selected for the study to provide a national and policy perspective to FPE in Kenya. Such information was useful for identifying policy gaps and clarifying government policy on FPE. The officers were also included in the sample to provide information on implementation strategies and challenges relating to FPE.

3.5.6 Pupils

With the permission of the headteacher and the assistance of class teachers, eight pupils representing the different class levels, were randomly selected in each school. From the list of all pupils provided in each school, one pupil per class level was randomly selected. This worked to a total of 472 pupils in the sample. Based on the Pupils’ Discussion Guide, these pupils were engaged in a short discussion on their experiences relating to FPE, and on what could be done to improve the provision of FPE.

3.6 Research Instruments

Data for this study were collected using questionnaires, interview schedules, focus group discussion guide and an observation checklist.

3.6.1 Questionnaires

The researcher personally gave the questionnaires to the respondents to complete. These ensured a 100% response rate. There were two sets of questionnaires; one for teachers and the other for headteachers. A questionnaire
has inherent advantages. As indicated by Achola and Bless (1987), it is suitable
as a method of data collection in a survey study for several reasons;

(a) Large coverage of the population can be realized with little time,
personnel or cost.

(b) Anonymity of the respondents filling the questionnaire may help them to
be honest in their answers

(c) Avoids bias that may be introduced by the interviewer, that is,
respondents record their answers in their own words. This enhances
objectivity.

(d) Allows respondents time on questions that would require reflection or
consultation before answering to avoid hasty responses.

The advantages presented above were beneficial to the research study. The
process of collecting data from several respondents simultaneously was fast and
economical, and the respondents had the opportunity to provide honest and well
thought out responses. The questionnaires were designed to address the issues
that formed the basis of the study. They consisted of closed-ended questions that
provided for structured responses, which were easy to tabulate and analyze. The
questionnaires had open-ended items to allow for in-depth information.
 Respondents were therefore able to expound their responses. The headteachers
and teachers’ questionnaire items sought to obtain information that assisted the
researcher;

- To assess the level of human, material and financial resources in primary
  schools.
- To determine the suitability of management practices in schools as they
  relate to the change to FPE.
- To evaluate the adequacy of preparation/training, if any, that was given
to education personnel with regard to FPE.
- To examine the role played by parents and School Management
  Committees in the implementation of FPE.
- To assess the funding mechanisms for FPE and examine the
  sustainability of the FPE initiative.
• To analyze the gaps in the FPE policy.
• To recommend a modular framework for effective change management of FPE in Kenya.

3.6.2 Interview Guides
The study used a total of 7 interview guides for the different categories of respondents; headteachers, parents, School Management Committee members, Area Education Officers, District Education Officers, Investment Programme Team Leaders and the Director of Policy and Planning respectively. The interviews provided in-depth data that could not have been generated through questionnaires. They also allowed the researcher to clarify questions and probe for answers, hence were more flexible than questionnaires. In addition, interviews enabled the researcher to create rapport with respondents and therefore extract sensitive information from them. The interview instrument for this study consisted of a topical agenda that guided the researcher to cover broad concerns of the study in depth. For headteachers, the interview complemented the Headteachers’ Questionnaire and enabled the researcher to seek insight and clarification on concerns that arose during observation. This instrument also enabled the researcher to better comprehend the respondents’ viewpoints and emphasized the spirit of discussion in an informal and cordial atmosphere.

3.6.3 The Observation Guide
Observation technique in research provides rich, objective and relatively accurate descriptive data on a situation as it exists in a research setting (Williamson, Karp, Dalphin, & Gray, 1982). For this study, the researcher also utilized direct observation to describe the conditions existing within the schools. Using an observation guide as a checklist, the researcher conducted direct observation of the schools’ physical conditions, classroom learning environments and teaching facilities in general. Particular attention was given to the quality of school buildings; the adequacy of school facilities (convenience of classroom space, adequacy of desks, tables); provision of facilities for
inclusive education; and the availability of classroom learning resources in classes (charts, globes, maps, and innovative use of locally available materials).

3.6.4 Focus Group Discussion Guide
Focus Group Discussions (FGD) were conducted with groups of 8 selected class teachers in a total of 14 schools. From the sample, 7 schools were randomly selected from each district for the Focus Group Discussions. Krueger (1994) advocates the use of FGD in research to provide insights into opinions of participants through open-ended questions. The Focus Group Discussion Guide was used to generate information from the wider spectrum of teachers to supplement the questionnaire and interview schedule responses. The value of using FGDs was to enable the wider group of teachers to discuss issues in the larger school community context. It also enabled the researcher to draw supplementary information from class teachers.

3.7 Pre-testing
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*Figure 3: 1 The Pre-field Instrument Development Process Used*

Source: Developed by researcher

A pre-test study was conducted for the purpose of trying out the questionnaires using a small sample of four teachers and four headteachers from schools in
Nairobi. In preparation for this pre-testing, the questionnaires had been given to lecturers in the School of Education to both fill and provide comments for improvement. Teachers who completed the questionnaires were encouraged to evaluate the questionnaire for completeness, clarity of questions and for acceptability of the questions asked among other things. Based on the comments made by the respondents, some amendments were made to the questionnaire. Some of the questions were re-worded, some which were close ended were changed to open ended and vice versa. A few questions were found to require more space for answers, and so the space was increased. Some questions that were too broad were also broken down into additional subsections to elicit more accurate and focused responses.

The refined questionnaires were then given to a different group of five teachers and headteachers from schools in Nairobi for purposes of testing reliability. The same questionnaires were re-administered after four weeks to the same respondents to determine whether the instruments were consistent enough to elicit the same response from subjects over time. The process of determining such reliability is described below.

### 3.8 Validity and Reliability of the Research Instruments

#### 3.8.1 Reliability

According to Cohen, Manion, & Morrison (2000), issues of validity are applicable both to quantitative and qualitative research. However, the relevant constructs for reliability and validity cannot always be forced together; care must be taken to balance reliability and validity concerns in mixed approach studies.

Bless, Higson-Smith, & Kagee (2006) describe reliability as being concerned with the consistency of measures; an instrument that produces dissimilar scores every time it is used to measure the same value is considered to have low
reliability. In simple terms therefore, reliability refers to the "consistency" or "repeatability" of measures employed for the study. In this study, the test, re-test (stability reliability) technique was found most suited and was utilised to determine the reliability of the questionnaire instrument. The questionnaire was given to five teachers and five headteachers from different schools in Nairobi. To determine instrument stability, the questionnaire was administered to the same subjects after four weeks. The results from the second test were correlated with the initial test results to give a measure of stability. This was meant to establish the extent to which the questionnaires were consistent in yielding the same response every time they were administered. The Spearman’s Product Moment formula for test-retest was used to compute the correlation between the two sets of scores. The headteachers’ and teachers’ questionnaires were found to be reliable in eliciting similar response from the respondents over time with a correlation coefficient of 0.89 for the headteachers’ questionnaire and a correlation coefficient of 0.78 for teachers. According to Golombok and Rust (1999), a reliability co-efficient of at least 0.7 is considered sufficient for person-based questionnaires (reliability coefficient lies between zero and one, where one is a perfect correlation).

According to Cohen et al. (2000:119), the elements of reliability for quantitative research are (a) stability over time (i.e. consistency) (b) equivalence (e.g. pre-post measures) and (c) internal consistency (split half method). For qualitative research, they propose that reliability implies a “fit between what researchers record as data and what actually occurs in the natural setting that is being researched, i.e. a degree of accuracy and comprehensiveness of coverage”. This study endeavoured to enhance the reliability of the qualitative data by requesting the respondents to validate what the researcher had recorded from the interviews and discussions. This member check technique ensured that responses were reliably documented. In addition, to minimize and control interpretive biases, data were gathered from multiple perspectives: from pupils, teachers, and headteachers, school management committee members and
Ministry of Education officials. The study also employed questionnaires, interviews, focus group discussion and a detailed observation checklist.

3.8.2 Validity

The approach to validity may be slightly different in qualitative and quantitative research paradigms. However, generally speaking, validity refers to the extent to which an instrument measures what it is intended to measure. While reliability is concerned with the accuracy of the actual measuring instrument or procedure, validity is concerned with the study's success at measuring what it seeks to measure. Two types of validity that were found applicable to this study were content validity and face validity. Bless et al. (2006) explain that in order to properly measure the complex topics presented by social science research, the researcher must ensure that information is provided on all the different components. This means that if one component is ignored, the researcher cannot claim to measure whatever it is that they want to measure in the study or test. Bless et al. advise that in most cases, content validity of an original instrument is achieved by referring to literature and theory. The more the instrument measures all the various components of the variable, the greater the confidence in its content validity. They concur with Fraenkel and Warren’s (2000) assertion that content validity can in addition be determined through expert judgment.

To ensure content validity, the research instruments in this study were developed from reference to theory and literature on systems theory, effective school management and change management. To enhance the content validity, expert opinion from the researcher’s thesis supervisors and other education experts within the School of Education was sought. The comments received from such evaluation were incorporated in the improvement of the instruments. This review of the instruments also enhanced their face validity. According to Bless et al. (2006), face validity is concerned with the way the instrument appears to the participant. They explain that an instrument may appear
insultingly simplistic, far too difficult, or too repetitive, and so on. Such flaws affect the respondent’s willingness to complete the questionnaire. In evaluating face validity, the researcher would need to ask questions such as, “Does it seem like a reasonable way to gain the information the researchers are attempting to obtain? Does it seem well designed? Does it seem as though it will work reliably? These concerns were addressed during the pre-testing of the instruments. Respondents were requested to provide judgment on the appearance of the questionnaires. Suggestions for improvement were then incorporated into the refined instrument.

3.9 Piloting

Following the pre-testing and revision of questionnaires, a pilot study of all the research instruments was conducted. A pilot study is the process of carrying out a preliminary study, and it entails going through the entire research procedure with a small sample. The researcher found it necessary to conduct a comprehensive pilot study because the pre-testing of questionnaires, which had been done earlier, was simply a trial of the questionnaire instrument that assisted in refining the questionnaires and determining the reliability of the instrument.

The pilot study was conducted in six primary schools; three from Kakamega district and three from Kajiado district. The schools that were involved in the pilot study were automatically disqualified from the subsequent sample selected for the main study. Kaifeng, & Miller (2008) note that a pilot study should preferably be done using subjects that will not be recruited for the main study. This is so because experience gained by subjects in the pilot study may bias the results of the main study if the same subjects are included.

Four education officers from Kakamega and Kajiado (two from each district) were also taken through interviews to test the education officers’ interview
guides. The education officers were requested to analyze the interview guide and propose any amendments in the structuring of questions. This exercise was meant to rid the interview guide of ambiguities and repetitions, to improve on the clarity of questions and to ensure completeness. In this way, the validity of the instrument was enhanced. With regard to piloting of the questionnaires, subjects were asked to complete the questionnaire, to give their comments on the clarity of instructions and question items and to suggest any additions or rectifications that could be made to improve the instruments. Interviews and focus group discussions were also conducted. The major purpose of the pilot exercise was to ascertain whether the instruments would yield the required data, and to further improve on the data collection instruments.

To make the pilot study as comprehensive as possible, the observation schedule was also applied to check the state of facilities in schools. This exercise enabled the researcher to improve on the observation checklist to ensure all items of interest to the study were integrated into the checklist.

The pilot study was aimed at addressing several key concerns. With regard to instruments, the pilot study helped the researcher to check whether:

- The instruments adequately generated the required information.
- The instruments contained proper wording of questions
- The items were logically arranged to facilitate response
- There were any redundancies and repetitions that called for elimination of some questions
- The data collected was quantifiable, analyzable and useful
- The questions asked were acceptable to respondents

The pilot study also addressed other broad concerns. The key points addressed were;

- Availability of the study population and how respondents’ daily work schedules could best be respected.
- The acceptability of the methods used to collect data
• The willingness of the respondents to answer the questions
• How much time was needed to administer the interview guide/questionnaire, focus group discussion, and to conduct observations
• How to best sequence the data collection process in each school

Based on what was learnt from the pilot study, alterations were made to the data collection instruments. For example, a few questions from the interview schedule were found to elicit more or less the same response and were thus merged. The order of the questions in the interview guide was also altered to make the questions more logically sequenced. These helped to reduce the amount of time spent per interview. It was noted that the headteacher and education officers’ interviews took an unacceptably long duration of time – between 90 minutes and two hours. With the re-sequencing of questions and merging of others, unnecessary time lost in interviews was considerably reduced.

The checklist for assessing physical facilities and equipment in schools was also redesigned to make it more comprehensive and compact at the same time. After the various changes were made to the research instruments, the researcher embarked on the actual data collection

3.10 Data Collection Procedures

In conformity with government policy, the researcher acquired a permit sanctioning the research from the Ministry of Education. The researcher then proceeded to the field, where research in the selected schools was conducted one school at a time. The first phase of the research involved familiarization on arriving at each of the schools selected in the sample, the researcher sought audience with the headteacher and spent some time in creating rapport. After a relaxed discussion with the headteacher, a detailed observation of each school followed. From the observation process, which was guided by an observation checklist, all the data relevant for the study was recorded. This involved
observing physical environment of the school, nature and state of facilities and the teaching/learning conditions. The second phase of data collection involved administering the questionnaire to the respondents and as much as possible, waiting for the respondents to complete filling them. This way, the researcher was available incase there was need for guidance and clarification.

The final phase involved face-to-face interviews and focus group discussions. The researcher promoted a relaxed atmosphere to encourage complete, honest and spontaneous responses. The interview and focus group discussion techniques were calculated to provide in-depth insights and the opportunity to address any concerns that arose in the course of the study, which bore relevance to the problem of study. Information gathered during the interview and focus group discussion was recorded in a note book during the sessions to avoid distortion. The recorded information was counter-checked by the respondents to ensure accuracy. In cases where respondents consented, a tape recorder was used to record and store data.

Interviews with district–level education officers were conducted in-between visits to different schools whenever the proximity of their offices to schools presented itself conveniently for the researcher.

The last phase of data collection involved conducting interviews at the Ministry of Education headquarters. These interviews involved selected Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP) Investment Programme Team Leaders and the Director of Policy and Planning in the Ministry of Education.

Several official government documents relevant for answering research questions were also used as a source of secondary data. This were especially important in enabling the researcher to identify areas in which existing policy is inadequate or where there was lack of policy to address certain concerns related to FPE in Kenya. Interrogating policy concerns inevitably involves making
reference to relevant secondary sources such as policy documents. This study also sought to examine the sources of funding for FPE, and the issues and concerns related to funding. From the data obtained on funding, an analysis was made of the sustainability of FPE. Whereas the data that helped to answer this research question was mainly gathered from interviews with Ministry of Education officials at the headquarters, documents from the Ministry of Education such as the Kenya Education Sector Support Programme Financial Monitoring Reports were inevitably, also used to obtain statistical data.

3.11 Data Analysis

The research yielded both qualitative and quantitative data, though the study’s basic design was qualitative. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for data analysis. Responses to the open-ended items in the questionnaires were analysed qualitatively. Such data were organised into themes pertinent to the study and presented using descriptions. This is so because qualitative data is based on the ideal of looseness and flexibility (Cohen et al., 2000). Analyzing data qualitatively involved developing coding categories as a way of organizing it. Developing a coding system involved searching through the data for regularities and patterns based on the topics of interest. This exercise was a means of sorting the descriptive data (Robson, 2002). Qualitative data were used for analytical discussion of responses to the research questions.

Coding categories were created through the process of combing the data for themes, ideas and categories and then marking similar portions of data text with a code label so that they could easily be retrieved at a later stage for further comparison and analysis. Coding the data made it easier to search the data and to identify any patterns that were relevant for analysis. The codes were based on themes, topics and keywords found in the data. All portions of data that were coded the same way – that is, given the same label – were judged (by the
researcher) to be about the same topic, theme, keyword and so on. The codes were then given meaningful names that indicated the idea or concept that underpinned the category. Any parts of the data that related to a code topic were coded with the appropriate label. This process of associating labels with the text involved close reading of the text. If a theme was identified from the data that did not quite fit the codes already existing, then a new code was created.

Some of the respondents consented to tape recording during the interviews while others declined. Qualitative data from interviews and discussions which were tape-recorded was first transcribed. This was then combined with the data that was recorded manually. The transcribed data were carefully read line by line and segmented into meaningful analytical units (codes). Consistent with Dillman’s (2000) explanation, coding simply entailed marking the segments of data with symbols, descriptive words, or category names.

Quantitative data was directly coded into the SPSS programme for analysis. For the quantitative data, descriptive statistics such as mean, mode, standard deviation and frequency were used to analyse and summarize the collected data. Presentation of data was done through tables, pie charts and bar charts.

Krueger (1994) observes that, increasingly, researchers are recognizing the benefits of combining qualitative and quantitative procedures to strengthen the research design. Qualitative procedures such as interviews and focus group discussions enable the researcher to get deeper insights from the respondents. These insights can be used to develop efficient quantitative procedures that enable the researcher to make inferences about the larger population. A researcher may also combine quantitative and qualitative methods to obtain breadth and depth of information, and to confirm findings. All the data from questionnaires, interviews and observation were thematically synchronized in concordance with the objectives of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the data that were collected are presented, analyzed and interpreted through a discussion of the findings. The discussion is structured along the research questions that guided the study. The overall purpose of this study was to conduct an in-depth investigation into how primary schools were managing change with regard to Free Primary Education in Kenya. This overall purpose was brought to fulfilment by answering several research questions.

(i) What is the condition and adequacy of human, financial and material resourcing in primary schools?

(ii) How proficient have the management practices in primary schools been in responding to the implementation of FPE?

(iii) How adequate was the preparation/training given to teachers, headteachers and education officers to enhance their ability to implement the FPE policy?

(iv) What contribution have parents and School Management Committees made towards ensuring the successful implementation of FPE?

(v) How was FPE funded and what are the prospects of FPE’s sustainability?

(vi) What gaps exist in the Free Primary Education policy?

(vii) How can the different experiences of managing the change occasioned by FPE be applied towards recommending a modular framework for managing change in primary schools in Kenya?
Whereas the data in this study is mostly qualitative, some of the data yielded is quantitative and is treated as such. Hence, a rich mix of both qualitative and quantitative approaches was employed in data analysis. The data were obtained through questionnaires that were administered to 177 teachers and 59 head teachers. Interviews were also conducted with the head teachers, 118 parents, 118 School Management Committee (SMC) members, 14 Area Education Officers, 2 District Education Officers, 6 KESSP IP Team Leaders and the Director of Policy and Planning in the Ministry of Education. The interviews were further supplemented by focus group discussions with teachers from selected schools. The findings discussed in this chapter are structured in line with the research questions.

4.2 Characteristics of Schools and the Sample

4.2.1 Characteristics of Schools

Table 4.1: Number of Schools per District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Day schools</th>
<th>Boarding schools</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kakamega</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajiado</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the total 59 schools selected for the study, 37(62.7%) were drawn from Kakamega district while 22(37.3%) were drawn from Kajiado district. The selection of schools from the two districts was done proportionate to their representation in the combined population of 542 schools in the two districts. Kakamega had a population of 344(63%) public primary schools, while Kajiado had population of 198(37%) public primary schools.
Table 4.2: *Type of Schools by Sex*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kakamega</td>
<td>Kajiado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within type of school</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within district</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within type of school</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within district</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within type of school</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within district</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within type of school</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-three (89.9%) of the schools selected for the sample were mixed-sex schools. All the single-sex schools were boarding schools, while the mixed schools, with the exception of a few in Kajiado, were day schools. Table 4.3 provides a summary of the study sample’s schools’ pupil populations.

Table 4.3: *Pupil Population in Schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil population</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 400</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-700</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701-800</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901-1000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas some of the schools had a normal population of less than 500 pupils, 37 (62.7%) of the schools in the sample had a pupil population of more than 500 pupils. Eight (13.7%) schools had very large populations of more than 900 pupils.
pupils. The school with the highest population had 1,350 pupils, followed closely by 3 other schools that each had more than 1,260 pupils. Such large populations pose serious challenges to teachers and head teachers. In each of these densely populated schools, teachers complained that the pupil population had overstretched facilities such as desks, toilets, classroom capacity and playgrounds.

Large populations within schools tend to negatively impact on educational quality. Research has revealed that in large schools, wider gaps are experienced in academic achievement between disadvantaged pupils and their peers (Arnold, 2000; UNESCO, 2005; Achilles, Finn & Pate-Bain, 2002; Blatchford, 2009). It has been observed that this is because large pupil populations result in less communication, interaction, and coordination throughout the school. Arnold, Gaddy and Dean (2004) argue that in small schools, the curriculum is more limited and directed to the average pupil rather than the full range of pupils with varied learning needs.

4.2.2 Characteristics of Headteachers

From each of the schools in the study sample, the head teacher was selected to respond to the questionnaire and provide pertinent insights into the provision of resources in primary schools and the management challenges related to FPE during the interview. A total of 59 headteachers participated in the study. Of these, 37(62.7%) were drawn from schools in Kakamega while 22 were drawn from schools in Kajiado district. Forty–one (69.5%) of the headteachers selected were male while 18(30.5%) were female.
Table 4.4: Number of Years Served as Headteacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 15 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-six (44.1 %) of the headteachers involved in the study had served as headteacher for a period of less than five years. Thirty-three (55.9%) had served as headteachers for over six years. Analysis of the data also showed that all the head teachers had worked in the teaching profession for between 8 and 32 years.

4.2.3 Characteristics of Teachers

There were a total of one hundred and seventy-seven (177) teachers in the sample for this study. From each of the 59 schools that participated in this study, 3 teachers, representing the lower, middle and upper primary levels were selected. The study sought to establish these teachers’ years of experience, and the information ids outlined in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Teachers’ years of teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years and above</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers in the sample had had between 3 years to 30 years of teaching experience in primary schools. However, it is worth noting that 127(71%) of the
teachers had been teaching in primary school for more than 11 years. Thus, a considerable majority of teachers had sufficient experience in primary school teaching to make informed judgment on issues relating to this level of education.

4.2.4 Teachers’ Workload

The workload that teachers have affects their effectiveness in teaching. When teachers teach one lesson after the other all day without rest periods in between, they may not be able to prepare adequately for teaching. At the same time, if burdened with a big workload, they are rendered unable to perform optimally due to fatigue. Table 4.6 summarizes teachers’ workload in terms of the lessons they teach per week.

Table 4.6: Number of Lessons Taught by Teachers per Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of lessons per week</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>177</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the teachers in the sample reported teaching at least 20 lessons per week. However, 7 (4%) teachers taught between 20 and 24 lessons per week. The average number of lessons taught by teachers was 34 lessons. Eighty seven (49.2 %) of the teachers had a heavy load of between 35 and 39 lessons per week. Eighteen (10.2%) of the teachers had an extremely heavy load of between 40 and 54 lessons a week. This translates into an average of over 8 lessons per day. Infact, this group of teachers confessed that they were unable to teach all the lessons assigned to them on the timetable and had to skip as many as ten in a week. Some of the subjects were therefore never taught at all, especially if they
are categorized as non-examinable in KCPE. In addition, it is practically impossible to work out a way in the timetable for a teacher to be available for more than more than 40 lessons a week; collisions in timetabled lessons would be inevitable. The schools where this heavy loading for teachers was observed were seriously understaffed, such that the few available teachers had to be shared around all the classes. Some of these schools had adopted coping mechanisms such as group work and learner-led discussions to engage pupils in the teacher’s absence.

The teaching workload explains teachers’ response to (question 3) that asked them if they felt they had an unmanageable load. One hundred and forty-two (80.2 %) of the teachers either agreed or strongly agreed that they had an unmanageable load of teaching hours. These sentiments were further expounded during the focus group discussion with teachers, where it emerged that they were no longer able to frequently give homework to pupils. Even when homework was given, many teachers were forced by circumstances to keep it simple and short enough to enable brisk marking. English composition and Mathematics were observed to suffer most because they required copious practice on the part of pupils, and keen marking and revision on the part of teachers.

Evidence of heavy teacher workload was also apparent from the number of pupils that were accommodated in the classrooms. In the schools sampled for the study, the smallest number of pupils in a stream was 24. However, on the other extreme end, there was found a single classroom with a population of 98 pupils; all crammed into one room, some without desks or chairs at all. The average class size was 51 pupils.

Similar findings have been found in studies conducted in other districts of Kenya. Chuck (2009), in a study conducted in primary schools within Nairobi, observed that teachers were unable to provide special tuition for the slow
learners due to the heavy workload that the teachers had. In addition, the amount of homework given to pupils after introduction of FPE had been reduced by teachers because they were unable to regularly mark exercise done by the large number of pupils. Makori (2009) also revealed that in Kisii district, after the introduction of FPE, most schools experienced a high student: teacher ratio which affected teachers’ ability to provide individual attention to pupils. From the study, he concluded that there was an urgent need to reduce classroom sizes as well increase the number of teachers in schools. These findings suggest that analyses on staffing norms conducted by the Ministry of Education should go beyond focussing on the number of lessons that teachers have in a week. Focusing merely on the number of lessons taught per week tends to obscure an important aspect of workload; the total number of pupils teachers handle in the classroom.

4.3 The Condition and Adequacy of Human, Material and Financial Resources in Schools

The first research question sought to assess the extent to which teaching and learning resources are available in schools in light of the sudden increase in the number of pupils occasioned by FPE. Depending on context, ‘resources’ can be interpreted in a variety of ways. In this study, ‘resources’ is seen as encompassing finance, materials, staff and time. The quality and availability of teaching and learning resources significantly impact teachers’ ability to provide meaningful instruction. Put another way, even a ‘good teacher” and effective teaching can only flourish when the teacher and the learners are provided with the appropriate resource support. The provision of ample resources also allows teachers to dedicate more of their time to support pupils in their pursuit of knowledge. Once schools have satisfactory level of textbooks and other teaching-learning materials, then teacher practice can make the difference.
Considering the abrupt change to FPE and the attendant limited preparedness that accompanied this shift in policy, it was important for this study to investigate the extent to which resources were available for teaching and learning in schools. To examine the status of resources and facilities, the study explored a range of factors within schools, firstly, from questionnaires that were given to head teachers and teachers. Secondly, additional in-depth information was acquired from interviews among head teachers, teachers and pupils. Lastly, a comprehensive checklist and observation guide were also employed to elicit information about the state of various infrastructure, and the availability of teaching and learning resources.

4.3.1 The Adequacy of Human Resources

Personnel comprise the most critical resource in any organization. Any analysis of the resource situation in an organization must therefore give due consideration to the work force that puts into utilization the material aspects. An analysis of the availability of teachers in primary schools revealed that there is an inequitable distribution of teaching staff among schools. While some schools, especially those in the urban areas, had a relatively adequate number of teachers, others were so desperately short of staff that learners missed lessons. In principle, staffing establishment is worked out in line with the number of streams a school has. However, some schools have such a small number of teachers that even if they all went to class at the same time, some classes would have to stay without a teacher.

An analysis of the ratio of total number of streams to the total number of teachers in each school reveals the inadequacies and inequalities that exist with regard to staffing in primary schools. A Stream to Teacher Ratio (STR) of 1:1, that is, one stream per teacher would represent the maximum load that teachers in a school can possibly handle. In other words, at any one time, all teachers would be in class and all the classes would be having a teacher. In the study sample, some schools were found to have a big STR, such as one that had a total...
of 15 streams against a total of 11 teachers. This is a STR of 1.4:1, which implies that at any one time, even if all the teachers were in class teaching, 4 streams would be without a teacher. Table 4.7 summarises the Streams to Teacher Ratios in the sampled schools.

Table 4.7: The Ratio of Class Streams to Teachers in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Streams to Teacher Ratio (STR)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.6:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9:1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7:1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8:1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1:1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2:1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3:1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4:1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5:1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to staffing, the two most understaffed schools in the sample had a STR of 1.5:1. In actual figures, these two schools each had 16 streams against a total of 11 teachers each. They thus required a minimum of 5 more teachers each to ensure there were enough teachers to teach all the classes. On the other extreme, one school had a Stream to Teacher Ratio of 0.6:1. This was a single stream school with a total of 8 streams, yet it had 12 teachers. Thirty-eight (64.4%) of the schools had a STR of more than 1:1, meaning that the number of streams was more than the number of teachers in these schools. The implication of this is that teachers have to skip some lessons, as there cannot be a teacher in all the classes at all times. This analysis exposed the fact that there was a
shortage of teachers in many of the schools. Secondly, it revealed the fact there was an inequitable distribution of teachers in the primary schools. One school, which had only five teachers and three schools, which had six teachers, demonstrate the staffing inequalities and inadequacies that exist among the primary schools. All of these schools were full primary schools with Standard 1 to Standard 8. Even though these four schools that are described above had only one stream per class, it is practically impossible for teachers to teach all the classes and subjects in the school. Improvisations such as teaching different classes at the same time had to be made to cope with the serious shortage. Teachers in these schools had heavy workload, and this made them emphasize on covering the syllabus rather than emphasizing quality of teaching and learning. These findings concur with those of Roschanski (2007), who from findings of a study conducted in Nyanza and Coast provinces, similarly observed that due to a large influx of students after FPE was introduced, it was impossible to for teachers to assist weaker students and to check and correct assignments. Most respondents in the study area agreed that the quality of education had been compromised. He also observed that pupils in 75% of the schools in the research area received far fewer hours of instruction because scheduled classes were often not taught.

Such a situation has potentially harmful impact on quality and as well as on retention rates. Evidence from research shows that how well pupils are taught and how much they learn have an impact on the kind of interest they will have in schooling (Fehrler, Michaelowa & Wechtler, 2007; Sustainable Development Division of Human Resources and Democracy, 2001; Lloyd & Hewett, 2003).

More insight onto the availability of human resources can be seen in the analysis of Pupil to Teacher ratios (PTR) found in the sampled schools. Table 4.8 presents a summary of the overall PTR of the sample by district.
Table 4.8: Pupils to Teacher Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Mean Pupil to Teacher Ratio (PTR)</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kakamega</td>
<td>47.69 : 1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajiado</td>
<td>48.09 : 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.84 : 1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10.640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kajiado had a higher PTR of 48.09 than Kakamega which had PTR of 47.69. However, these figures represent mean ratios that conceal the disparities between individual schools. For example, in Kakamega, the lowest individual school PTR observed was 28:1, while the highest was 80:1. On the other hand, in Kajiado, one school had a PTR of 33:1 while another had 68:1. This scenario exemplifies the large discrepancies that are a reality in Kenya’s primary schools. Official statistics show that the national average pupil-teacher ratio in Kenya’s public primary schools was 43 in 2005 and 50 in 2007 (Republic of Kenya, 2008d). These figures and those observed for Kajiado and Kakamega during the study, are above the recommended pupil-teacher ratio of 40 for public primary schools (Teachers Service Commission, 2005), and is an indication that the number of pupils in primary schools has been expanding much faster than it has for teachers.

Response by headteachers to statement 3 of the questionnaire that stated ‘The school has an adequate number of teachers’ revealed that headteachers in general considered their schools to be understaffed. Five (8.5%) agreed with the statement, while the remaining 54 (91.5%) disagreed with the statement. This suggests that teacher numbers have not been adjusted upwards to match the increase in pupil numbers. The responses by headteachers are similar to those of headteachers in a study conducted in 192 schools from the 8 provinces in Kenya where 97% of headteachers surveyed reported having a shortage of teachers in their schools (Ngan’ga, 2010). At the national level, the number of teachers in primary schools went up only marginally from 178,037 in 2002 to 178,622 in
2003, with the pupil-teacher ratio (PTR) worsening from 34:1 in 2002 to 40:1 in 2003 (Republic of Kenya, 2004b)

Even with the difficulties relating to staffing levels mentioned above, very few schools reported having received additional teachers after the introduction of FPE. Thirty-one (52.5%) schools had not received a single additional teacher since the introduction of FPE. Sixteen (27.1%) schools had received one teacher; 9 (18.6%) schools had received two teachers each, while only 3 (5.1%) had received three teachers. The increase in pupil population that was occasioned by FPE has overwhelmed teachers, yet there has not been a corresponding increase in the number of teachers.

4.3.2 The Condition and Adequacy of Material Resources

As explained by UNESCO (2004) the material resources for schools are provided by both governments and households, and include firstly, textbooks and other learning materials and then, the availability of classrooms, libraries, school facilities and other infrastructure. Equipment and furniture are therefore an important part of the material resources. The essence of material management is selecting, procuring, purchasing, maintaining, storage and utilisation. This study sought to examine the availability and condition of material resources such as textbooks, learning materials, classrooms, furniture and other physical infrastructure in primary schools.

The provision of teaching and learning materials in public primary schools through FPE can be noted as one of the significant achievements in the education system. As noted by Ministry of Education officers, part of the success of this initiative is attributable to the support from Development Partners, and in particular the Department for International Development (DFID), World Bank, the multi-donor Fast Track Initiative (FTI), The Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), The United States Agency for
International Development (USAID), European Union, The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

The shortage of resources has persisted as an issue of concern surrounding free primary education in Kenya. Head teachers were asked if they thought their work was hampered by lack of resources. Fifty-one (86.4%) head teachers stated that their work was hampered by a lack of resources, while only 8 (13.6%) said it was not. Asked to explain why they thought their work was hampered by a lack of resources, head teachers gave the following reasons as presented in Table 4.9.

**Table 4.9: Headteachers’ Reason for Saying Their Work was hampered by Lack of Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headteachers’ Reason for saying their Work was Hampered by Lack of Resources **</th>
<th>N=51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 78.4%</td>
<td>School is unable to raise funds for additional physical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 76.5%</td>
<td>There is congestion in classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 76.5%</td>
<td>There is a shortage of physical facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 60.8%</td>
<td>It is difficult to give pupils individual attention in class and in administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 60.8%</td>
<td>Staff have heavy workload due to few teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 32.1%</td>
<td>School lacks water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 19.2%</td>
<td>School is unable to hire enough support staff and extra teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( **This was a multiple response question; the 51 head teachers who answered ‘YES’ could give more than one reason)**

Headteachers were also asked to provide information on the availability of resources in schools. The responses are reported in Table 4.10.
Headteachers expressed their dissatisfaction with regard to books and number of classrooms available for learning. Twenty-two (37.6%) indicated that the number of classrooms were sufficient to accommodate learners, while 37 (62.7%), representing a majority, indicated that there was an inadequate number of classrooms to accommodate learners. No doubt, some schools are better endowed than others and have better capacity to accommodate a large population. The response ratio above however suggests that the majority of schools are short of classrooms and therefore have to cope with congestion.

An almost similar response was elicited with regard to sufficiency of textbooks supplied by the government for FPE. As shown in Table 4.10, only 23(39%) headteachers agreed that the book supplies were sufficient. Thirty-six (61%) indicated that the number of books was insufficient. As noted by Chuck (2009) in a study conducted on the effect of FPE on quality of education in primary schools in Nairobi, due to the shortage of books in schools where parental subsidisation of government effort was minimal or absent, several pupils shared a book. This was found to have negatively impacted on quality, as many pupils had difficulty completing their homework or reading ahead for the next lesson.

Table 4.10: Headteachers’ Responses on the Situation of Resources in their Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School has sufficient no. of classrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials supplied for FPE are sufficient</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of books is sufficient</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the response with regard to the sufficiency of teaching materials supplied for FPE was more positive. Thirty-two (54.2%) head teachers agreed that teaching materials supplied for FPE were sufficient, while 27 (45.7%) did not agree with the statement. Therefore, most head teachers were satisfied with the level of supply of FPE teaching materials.

The responses given by headteachers regarding material resources concurred with those of teachers. Table 4.11 shows teachers’ responses on the situation of resources in their schools.

Table 4.11: Teachers’ Responses on the Situation of Resources in their Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School has adequate teaching resources</td>
<td>5, 2.8 %</td>
<td>69, 39 %</td>
<td>79, 44.6 %</td>
<td>24, 13.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adequate supply of books</td>
<td>10, 5.7 %</td>
<td>117, 66.4 %</td>
<td>40, 22.7 %</td>
<td>9, 5.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching materials for FPE have enhanced learning</td>
<td>12, 6.8 %</td>
<td>102, 58.2 %</td>
<td>56, 31.6 %</td>
<td>7, 4.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom has adequate space to accommodate all pupils</td>
<td>16, 9 %</td>
<td>69, 39 %</td>
<td>68, 38.6 %</td>
<td>24, 13.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fewer than half of teachers agreed with the statement “the school has adequate teaching resources”. Seventy-four (41.2%) agreed that schools had adequate teaching resources while the remaining 103 (58.25%) teachers disagreed with the statement. This points to the fact that most schools still suffer an inadequacy of teaching resources. Interestingly, however, the response by teachers with regard to the adequacy of book supply was more positive. One hundred and twenty-seven (72.2%) teachers agreed that the number of books issued by the government for the FPE programme was adequate for all learners. This was
expounded in the discussions with teachers; that whereas the books provided may not have been enough to ensure each pupil owned their own copy, all pupils had access to the books, even if that meant three pupils sharing a book at the same time. Table 4.12 shows the book-sharing ratio reported by teachers for the different class levels they represented.

Table 4.12: Book –Sharing Ratio among Pupils as Reported by Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BOOK-SHARING RATIO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakamega</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajiado</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the two districts, 49(27.6%) teachers reported an average book-sharing ratio (BSR) of 1:2 (that is, one book shared between two pupils). The most common book-sharing ratio was 1:3. Eighty-seven (49.2%) teachers reported a BSR of 1:3. However, in a few instances, a very high book-sharing ratio was reported. Thirty-two (18.1%) classes had an average BSR of 1:4, 4(2.3%) classes had a BSR of 1:4, while 5(2.8%) classes reported an extremely high BSR of 1:6. Overall therefore, it may be concluded that most of the pupils share textbooks at the ratio of 1:3 or below.

Teachers who reported the very high book ratios explained that this was due to erratic enrolment numbers that had not been anticipated in advance. They had submitted their requests for more books and were awaiting positive response from the head teachers in the subsequent purchase period. In addition, head teachers and teachers pointed out that they had as much as possible tried to ensure there was one book for every three children in the core subjects -
English, Mathematics and Science. However, there was generally a higher pupil to textbook ratio for Kiswahili, Geography, History and Civics and Religious Education. According to the government’s policy framework as outlined in KESSP report, the goal is to provide one textbook per child for every subject by the end of 2010 (Republic of Kenya, 2005b). Whereas significant strides have been made towards this target, the year 2010 may prove to be too soon for many schools to achieve the target.

Discussions held with pupils revealed that many of them lacked personal textbooks that they could use at home for revision. However, in boarding schools, it was found that most of the pupils had at least one textbook of their own, especially for Mathematics and English subjects. Pupils who did not own textbooks complained that whereas the school provided books, it was difficult for them to put them to use in their own free time because the books were shared. In addition, all the pupils in boarding schools who were interviewed had an extra exercise book for each subject, while about 60% in the day schools did not. The pupils who had extra exercise books explained that their parents bought them the books at the beginning of term, while their counterparts who did not have extra books claimed that their parents were convinced the school should and would provide enough books. Most pupils shared books in the ratio of 1:3, but it was frequently noted that science books were shared at a higher ratio of 1:4 and even 1:5.

Teachers also painted a positive picture of the role that the teaching materials supplied by the government to support FPE had played in enhancing teaching. One hundred and fourteen (64.4%) teachers agreed that the teaching materials supplied had enhanced teaching. Discussions during the interviews and FGDs however indicated that the instructional materials were inadequate, and teachers had to improvise most of the time.
Not all schools lacked the capacity to accommodate all pupils in class. Eighty-five (48%) teachers agreed with the statement that classrooms had adequate space to accommodate all learners. Still, 92 (51.9%) of the teachers did not agree with the statement on adequacy of space. Whereas many schools could not sit all pupils in classrooms after the initial enrolment boom of 2003, some attrition and balancing among schools later allowed most schools to accommodate pupils. However, the inadequacy of space within the classrooms has meant that many of the pupils are unable to sit comfortably. Ngware, Oketch and Ezeh (2008) in a study of urban schools in Kenya, succinctly outline the main concerns relating to classroom physical space; safety and accessibility to learning; arrangement of furniture; and the teachers’ use of physical resources. They explain that adequate space allows the teacher and pupil, for example, to plan a display of work, and to shift furniture to facilitate group work and to improve pupil traffic flow. The lack of classroom space observed in many schools during the present study meant that learners operate under conditions of discomfort, and teachers find difficulty in accessing pupils for closer and individual interaction.

Many schools that had enrolled children with physical and cognitive/mental disabilities were inadequately resourced. Headteachers were asked if they had any learners with special needs in their school, and if so, what type of special needs category the pupils belonged to. This question was of pertinent concern because FPE opened the gates for all kinds of learners who were previously disadvantaged by circumstances from attending primary school. As shown in Table 4.13, all headteachers indicated that they had pupils with varying special needs in their school.
Table 4.13: Headteacher response on whether they had pupils with special needs in their school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of special need</th>
<th>Schools without such cases of pupils</th>
<th>Schools with such cases of pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overage learners</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally/intellectually challenged</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically challenged</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing impaired</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually impaired</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former street children</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.13 above, 58(98.3%) of headteachers indicated that they had pupils with special needs in their school. Eighteen (31.0%) reported they had pupils who were physically handicapped, 25(42.4%) had mentally handicapped pupils, 9(15.5%) had pupils with hearing impairment, and 5 (8.6%) had learners with visual impairment. The other children with special needs as reported by headteachers were former street children 5(8.6%) and overage learners (46 , which was 79%). Headteachers noted that the Government had directed all schools not to deny admission to any child because of his or her disability.

Former street children and overage learners were generally considered as learners with special needs. However, even while excluding them from the count, 48 (81%) head teachers reported that their schools had pupils with some form of disability. It was commendable that 28(47.5%) had a trained special needs education teacher. Still, not all schools had a special needs education teacher. However, an encouraging trend reported by 13(22%) head teachers was that they had (a) staff member(s) who was/were undertaking a self-sponsored
special needs education course at university level. It was hoped that such teachers would soon fill the gap that existed in Special Needs Education in primary schools. This is encouraging, as the fundamental principle of the 
Salamanka Statement and Framework for Action in Special Needs Education, 1994, of inclusive schooling is that all children should team together wherever possible regardless of any difficulties or differences they may have (UNESCO, 1994). Mainstream schools must recognise and respond to the diverse needs of their learners, accommodating both different styles and rates of learning within them. Out of the 59 schools, 11 (18.6%) had special units, that comprised a dedicated classroom for the special needs education. Of these 11, only 5 (8.5%) schools had special units that were equipped to varying degrees of adequacy, while the remaining simply had a separate classroom with little or no facilities for teaching pupils with impairments. These 5 schools with some facilities were schools that were fortunate to have benefited from various donor agencies. Two of the schools even had a boarding section devoted to learners with special needs.

During the interviews with headteachers, it emerged that in schools that had no special units, many of the learners with special needs were simply integrated into mainstream classes. Such pupils formed a small minority within the school and were therefore easily neglected by the teachers and consequently disadvantaged. The study found that children with mental/cognitive disabilities were especially disadvantaged with regard to the prospects of acquiring meaningful education. One headteacher lamented that she had two mentally retarded pupils from very poor families who simply attended lessons with others and were promoted to the next class level despite scoring less than 5 % in all the subjects examined at the end of term. The school had neither a special needs education teacher nor any facilities to handle such learners. The headteacher had recommended that the pupils be taken to a special school, but the parents, being poor and illiterate, had made no effort to do so.
It was also noted by the headteachers that some of the over-age learners were in actual sense pupils with learning difficulties. Such were learners who had earlier dropped out of school because their parents considered them wasteful investment. Now that tuition fees had been abolished, parents had brought them back to school. Unfortunately, many schools lacked the capacity, both in terms of teachers with the necessary training and in terms of facilities, to accommodate such learners in an integrated setup. Taub, McLorg and Bartnick (2009) point out that these are the kind of hardships that confront the disabled. They note that what makes challenged people more disadvantaged are the obstacles that society puts on their path which could be social, economic, cultural, physical or political in structure and nature.

Headteachers’ were asked to report on the physical facilities that had been constructed in their school since the introduction of FPE and what physical facilities their school required as a result of the FPE. The physical facility cited most by head teachers as being required as a result of FPE was classrooms.

Table 4.14: Headteachers’ Response on Physical Facilities Required by their School due to FPE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical facilities required following introduction of FPE</th>
<th>No. of Headteachers who cited reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desks</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>latrines</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storage facility</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offices/staffroom</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fence, gate</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitchen</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-four (74.6%) headteachers reported that they required additional classrooms. Also frequently cited were latrines, which were indicated as required by 42 (71.2%) of headteachers, desks by 42 (72.4%) of head teachers and storage facility by 24 (40.7%) of the headteachers. Head teachers complained that they had difficulty in ensuring that the instructional materials that were supplied by the government were securely stored.

In most schools, there were just a few latrines to serve the hundreds of pupils, and this was evident during breaks. Long queues would be found outside the few available latrines. Surprisingly, 14 (23.7%) schools either did not have a spacious staffroom or lacked one altogether. In 6 (10.2%) of the schools, the teachers had surrendered the staffroom to be used as an additional classroom; they thus shared the head teachers’ and deputy headteachers’ offices when necessary, as staffrooms.

Some construction of physical facilities has been achieved by several schools since the introduction of FPE. Schools have given a lot of prominence to latrine construction. Table 4.15 shows the facilities that have been constructed by the sampled schools since the introduction of FPE.

Table 4.15: Headteachers’ Report on Facilities that had been Constructed Since the Introduction of FPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Constructed Since the Introduction of FPE</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>latrines</td>
<td>51 n (%) 86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classrooms</td>
<td>28 n (%) 47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fence</td>
<td>12 n (%) 20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storage facility</td>
<td>6 n (%) 10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library</td>
<td>3 n (%) 5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitchen</td>
<td>6 n (%) 10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water wells/tanks</td>
<td>4 n (%) 6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-eight schools had constructed at least one additional classroom since the introduction of FPE. The majority of these constructions were attributed to the Constituency Development Fund (CDF). However, considering that schools had to compete with other community interests such as boreholes, health facilities and cattle dips for CDF funds, not many classrooms could be built from this fund. In most schools therefore, the CDF had been used to construct just one additional classroom. Surprisingly, whereas most schools do not have a library, little attention had been given to their construction. The views of one head teacher may possibly explain this state of affairs.

We have to think about the basics. How do we construct a library when there are 80 pupils crammed into one classroom? Some of these pupils do not even have proper desks. When we finally have enough classrooms, we shall consider constructing a library.

The checklist and observation guide employed in the study brought forth additional information on infrastructure and resources. A striking observation made during the study was that there exists considerable discrepancy between urban and rural schools in terms of infrastructure. The schools in remote rural locations are more likely to lack electricity, running water and permanent building structures. Many of the rural school classrooms lacked windows, plastered walls and smooth floors. The state of disrepair that was found in many schools caused a lot of suffering to pupils during the cold or rainy seasons. Leaking roofs were particularly noted as a challenge, and the lack of ceiling boards in most rural schools meant that teaching had to be halted when rain pounded the roofs. Kajiado district had even greater disparities within the district. Schools that were located deeper into the countryside had dilapidated structures and classrooms. Many of these schools had mud-walled structures and lacked doors. In two schools, standard one lessons were conducted under trees.
Interviews conducted at the Ministry of Education headquarters revealed that the primary school infrastructure improvement programme had proved to be one of the most testing of the KESSP IPs because of the complexities of needs identification, the large number of schools requiring support and their diverse spread within the country.

From the classroom observations, it was evident that many learners did not have ample space to enable them to write and sit comfortably. This was especially evident at the lower primary level i.e standard 1, 2 and 3. Many pupils were forced by circumstances to sit on improvised contraptions or share desks in a way that made it impossible to write properly or maintain concentration for long. Fifty one percent of the classes observed had an inadequate number of desks and in 46% of the cases, the desks were in a poor state of repair. Even where present, they were not necessarily designed to suit the ages of learners or to ensure comfort.

In addition, many schools in both Kakamega and Kajiado districts had classrooms which were crowded with desks. One class teacher explained that “it is better to have 80 pupils gaining a little from school education than having only 45 comfortably accommodated in class while the others stay at home for lack of space”. Lack of space was also observed to be a hindrance to effective teaching. In the crowded classroom setting, teachers complained that they were unable to move around the classroom and provide more personalized attention to pupils. Only 47% of classes observed had ample space within classrooms, while 40% lacked sufficient ventilation to ensure comfort of pupils.
Table 4.16: The State of Facilities and Learning Environment in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHALKBOARD</th>
<th>WINDOWS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>good</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/glare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothness</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESKS</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(state of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLUMINATION</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electricity</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanen</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plastered</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>painted</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crumbling</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean walls</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regard to physical conditions, it was observed that 30 (50.8%) of schools looked obviously crowded and 18 (30.5%) of the schools lacked ample compound space for pupils to move around freely or play and to allow future expansion. There was also a big disparity in the quality of buildings in the schools. Whereas some had high quality permanent structures, others had semi–permanent or mud walled structures. The general observation was that boarding schools had the best buildings, followed by urban or peri-urban schools and lastly, the rural schools, whose quality of buildings ranged between good and very dismal. A total of 41 (69%) of the schools had permanent structures. However, not all schools with permanent structures had plastered and/or painted walls and some of the classroom walls were dirty or soiled with graffiti. A total of 18 schools had mud-walled classrooms. Of these 18 schools, 10 (17%) schools, all of which were rural, had mud-walled buildings that also lacked windows, doors and cemented floors. The remaining 8 (13.5%) schools had windows and doors. A complaint by some of the pupils was that they easily got common colds and were prone to jigger attacks from the fleas that thrive in such conditions.

It is worth noting that several other schools that had permanent structures still lacked windows and doors. This exposed pupils to the vagaries of weather as well as distraction during lessons. Forty percent of classrooms were observed to be poorly lit, and only 15 (25.4%) of the schools had electricity. Thirty–five (59.3%) of the schools had well covered roofs, while the rest either had leaking or crumbling roofs. Whereas there may have been no empirical studies that have directly examined the association between buildings and pupil achievement, findings from elsewhere in developed countries show that there exists close correlation between the quality of the buildings and a sense that education is important, hence increasing pupils’ interest in schooling (Earthman & Lemasters, 1996; PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2000). Research also shows that improvements in learner performance can be realised when building conditions...
are improved (Gary, Min, & Sipplea, 2010; Earthman & Lemasters, 1996; Matar, 2010).

Very few schools had any storage rooms for teaching aids. Teaching aids were mostly stored in staffroom cupboards or the head teacher’s office. The study found that the teaching aids, such as wall charts, maps and models were not always in good condition and in 12(20%) of the schools, they were altogether absent. Only in 10(17%) schools were charts for teaching displayed on classroom walls. Few schools had a library. Out of the 59 schools, just six had a library or reading room that pupils could utilize out of class. Incidentally, all of these six were boarding schools. Ten percent of the classrooms observed had a bookshelf, although a few more (33%) had some class library of some sort. The class libraries comprised carton boxes, wooden boxes or small lockable cupboards for storing books. This situation calls for urgent attention. In circumstances where schools do not have a central school library, the classroom library can be a useful alternative. Even where a central library exists, classroom libraries act as an addition to the reading resources and should encourage voluntary reading. As asserted by Dike (2000), classroom libraries bring books and reading very close to the children, especially younger children in primary schools, and so encourage reading. In addition, having resources in the classroom enhances the integration of the library with the curriculum and transforms teaching and learning.

Technology occupies an important role in modern industrial society. Therefore, integrating technology into schools assists to prepare pupils to thrive in a rapidly changing world. In a rapidly changing world, the school system, beginning from the primary school level, need to embrace technology, not just to facilitate administration and day to day operations, but also to support the curriculum through improving and transforming teaching and learning. Observations in the primary schools sampled for the study revealed a grim lack
of modern technological equipment. Most of the schools lacked equipment such as computers, photocopiers, television sets and tape recorders. The only technological equipment that was available in most schools was a radio. Table 4.17 summarizes the availability of such equipment in the primary schools.

Table 4.17: Number of Schools having Selected Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Number of Schools Owning Equipment</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewriter</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio cassette player</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>03.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead projector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video machine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3 The Provision and Adequacy of Financial Resources

Financial resources are critical for the success of the education system because they impact on the quality and availability of the other resources. After the introduction of FPE in Kenya, funding for public primary schools is predominantly derived from the State through direct transfer of funds from central government to the school. Allocation of funds is based on the enrolment levels in schools and the availability of funds at the time of disbursement. Therefore, besides meeting teachers’ salaries, the government provides teaching and learning materials. Funding for free primary education is divided into three allocations. The first allocation is reserved for the purchase of teaching and learning materials; the second allocation is for general-purpose, while the third is for operations and maintenance. All
schools in the study sample reported that the money for FPE had been disbursed to schools without fail, even though delays had perennially been experienced. The head teachers also confirmed that Kshs. 650 is disbursed annually per pupil towards teaching and learning materials and another Kshs. 370 per pupil is given to cover operational and other maintenance functions.

As a requirement, schools are expected to open two accounts. Account 1, dubbed the SIMBA account, is a Current Account meant for the following tuition related items; textbooks, exercise books, reference materials, pencils, dusters and chalk, wall maps and charts. Account 2, which must be a Savings Account, is regarded as the General Purpose/Operations Account. This account covers several items as shown in Table 4.18. According to the ministry guidelines, the breakdown for FPE funds per pupil is as follows;

Table 4.18: Allocation of FPE Funds per Pupil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost (vote)</th>
<th>Annual allocation(Kshs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text books</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise books</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary readers and reference materials</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pencils</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusters, chalk, registers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charts and wall maps</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>650</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, Water and Conservancy(EWC)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Travel and Transport(LT&amp;T),</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair, Maintenance and Improvement(RMI)</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff wages</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage/telephone/box rental</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>370</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,020</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was reported by head teachers of schools with special units that in addition to the regular FPE funds, every child with special needs in schools with special units and in special primary schools was allocated top up funds to cater for specific teaching/learning needs. The top up allocated in 2003/2004 financial year was Kshs. 2000/= per child. There was an improvement in affirmative action for pupils with special needs in 2004/2005 financial year; all public primary schools in Kenya were given Kshs.10,000 to modify their environment in readiness for Inclusive Education, and each primary school with a special unit with an enrolment of more than six pupils was allocated Kshs. 153,660/=, while those units with less than five pupils were each allocated Kshs. 17,400/=.

Interviews with senior officers at the ministry Headquarters confirmed that even full fledged special primary schools were allocated Kshs. 153,660/= each. Whereas this resource allocation is welcome, it was found to be insufficient given the special requirements of children with disabilities. Pupils with special needs require specialized facilities, equipment and teaching aids. Very few schools covered by the study had specialized facilities.

Headteachers were asked to state whether or not the funds disbursed to schools by the government were sufficient to cater for school expenditure. Fifty-five (93.2%) of the head teachers stated that the funds were insufficient while the remaining 4(6.8%) head teachers thought that they were sufficient. Thus, the general view of school administrators was that funds for FPE could not sufficiently cater for the schools’ needs. Headteachers were then asked to suggest how much more money should be allocated per student in a year. The headteachers’ responses were varied; the minimum amount suggested was 250kshs. per pupil per year, and the maximum amount proposed was 1,600kshs. per pupil per year. The average figure, computed from the suggested amounts was 768 Kshs. per pupil per year. Twenty-nine (49.2%) head teachers proposed amounts ranging from Kshs. 600 to Kshs. 1,000 per pupil. It emerged in the interviews conducted with head teachers that the proposed increments in funding were conservative. Several head teachers intimated that FPE could well
do with much higher increment in funding, but they were apprehensive that the ideal amount might prove to be unsustainable for country’s economy. It was felt by head teachers that whereas the abolition of school fees had enabled thousands of poor pupils to attend school, the loss of fees revenue arising from this policy had negatively affected some aspects of school programmes. Table 4.19 itemizes what head teachers saw as areas affected by the abolition of user fees in public primary schools.

Table 4.19: Headteachers’ Opinion on Aspects Most Affected by Loss of Fees and Levies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of operations most affected by loss of fee/levy revenue</th>
<th>Number citing aspect as having been affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal exams</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical development</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furniture</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-curricular activity</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local transport &amp; travel</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Generating Activity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support staff e.g. accountant</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mentioned most as having been affected by elimination of fees was internal examinations. Forty-four (74.6%) headteachers complained that their schools could no longer afford to administer printed examinations or mock exams as regularly as they did when parents paid fees. In most schools, before the introduction of FPE, parents paid an annual examination fee of between Kshs. 200 to Kshs. 500 that catered for internal exams as well as divisional, or district mock examinations. The Kshs. 29 per pupil for Quality Assurance that is disbursed by the government under FPE was seen as being too little to cater for printing of examinations. Physical development (cited by 72.9% of head teachers) and furniture (cited by 71.2% of head teachers) ranked second and
third respectively as the most frequently mentioned aspects that had been affected by elimination of fees. Headteachers lamented that their plans for construction of physical facilities had been jeopardized after the building fund that most schools charged before FPE was outlawed. This, coupled with their reported inability to buy enough desks or repair broken ones, made it difficult to cope with the ever increasing number of pupils. The FPE funds in the General-Purpose & Operations Account are given for repair and maintenance rather than for construction of new buildings. Though by a smaller percentage, co-curricular activities, Local Travel and Transport (LT&T), support staff wages and the capacity to initiate income generating activities were also mentioned as areas that had been negatively affected by the banning of school fees.

Headteachers complained that the need to attend to numerous meetings and seminars related to FPE, as well as the need to travel frequently to process procurements, forced them to spend a lot of money. Those in schools with smaller populations especially, complained that the money for LT&T was insufficient. Head teachers also noted that they had to cut down considerably on school participation in co-curricular activities to ensure that they spent within the limited amount disbursed. One complaint that was frequently mentioned by headteachers was that the vote for support staff was insufficient. It was therefore difficult for schools to get enough support staff because they could not guarantee their salaries for the whole year. Some head teachers had resorted to hiring support staff on a part-time basis such that they could use them for only a few months of the school year.

While all schools have a watchman, some of the schools with large compounds and more facilities expressed dissatisfaction with the amount disbursed for support staff, arguing that the money could not pay for reliable security given the level of fund provision for support staff and the fact that there were others such as cooks, secretaries and grounds men competing for the same kitty. Headteachers of boarding schools and those of large urban schools complained
that the votes for electricity and water did not sufficiently meet their needs. This forced the schools to adopt some form of rationing on power and water consumption.

When asked if parents of pupils in their schools had been actively involved in contributing financially in support of school activities after introduction of FPE, head teachers overwhelmingly responded in the negative; only 4(6.8%) headteachers agreed that parents had been supportive financially while the remaining 55(93.2%) thought otherwise. However, it was noted from the interviews with parents, teachers and pupils that whereas parents were largely unwilling to contribute financially to subsidize government funding, there was a noticeable incidence of fee creep camouflaged in parents’ contributions towards payment for extra teachers, support staff and ‘coaching’. It was observed that in 7 (11.9%) schools, parents were asked to pay an amount of between Kshs.200 to Kshs. 400 per annum to cater for the salaries of either privately employed non-TSC teachers or support staff such as cooks. Parents in 20(33.8%) of the sampled schools also revealed that they were charged some minimal fee of between 200kshs. and 500 Kshs. per year for extra tuition (popularly referred to as coaching). This was especially so in for standard 7 and standard 8 pupils. Whereas these fees were not declared official or compulsory, those who were unable to pay were silently excluded from the extra tuition sessions.

Several of the schools surveyed also have pre-primary units. However, many of the nursery schools are struggling to survive because the FPE funds do not encompass this critical level of education. Many parents opt to take their children straight into standard one which is free. Yet, head teachers can not turn away pupils who have not been prepared through pre-school education. The resultant difficulties for lower primary school teachers are obvious. One teacher commented:
We receive pupils in Standard One who cannot even write their names or utter a single word in English. Yet, the syllabus assumes that such basic skills should have been already acquired. We do not have any training, yet we have to do the work of nursery school teachers. What is more, this type of pupils unfairly make the others have to repeat what they have already covered in nursery school. It slows everyone down and makes our job frustrating. The patience demanded of us is extraordinary.

Unfortunately, few schools have income generating activities to subsidize funding received from the government. The only other source of funding that several schools have benefited from is the Constituency Development Fund (CDF). The CDF has been used to construct additional classrooms in more than half of the schools studied. As noted earlier, this fund is used for several competing community projects and cannot be relied upon to resolve the shortage of physical facilities in schools. As shown in Table 4.20, only 23(39%) schools indicated having an income generating activity (IGA). The majority did not have any income generating activity. Thirty-four (57.6%) schools therefore relied entirely on government funds to sustain their expenditure.

Table 4.20: Head teachers’ responses on whether their school had Income Generating Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Generating Activity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The few head teachers who indicated that their schools had income generating activity were asked to clarify. It emerged that there was little diversity in the range of activities that schools engaged in. Twenty (62.5%) schools had a commercial school garden, 5(16.1%) schools reared cattle, chicken or other
animals for commercial purposes and 10 (18.9%) schools charged rent on teachers’ houses.

None but one of the schools with income generating activities (IGA) operated them to a scale which provided profitable returns that were significant enough to impact schools’ capital base in a productive manner. Head teachers reported earnings of between Kshs. 4,000 and Kshs. 9,000 per month from their schools’ income generating ventures. Only one boarding school reported a significant profit of Kshs. 26,000 per month from their ventures. This school had a combination of school farm, dairy farming, chicken rearing and teachers’ houses in their IGA portfolio.

4.4 The Proficiency of Management Practices in Primary Schools in responding to the Implementation of FPE.

The study also sought to examine the management practices in schools. Different authors have defined management in a number of ways. Generally however, a common concept inherent in many of these definitions is the manager’s responsibility for establishing and accomplishing the goals and objectives of the organization, and this is achieved by getting things done through and with people in formally organized groups (Koontz et al., 1980).

The research data was used to examine head teacher’s management practices in schools in the context of FPE with regard to the key management functions of planning, leading, organizing, motivating, and controlling. The focus of this research objective was to assess whether the management practices in primary schools were proficient in responding to the implementation of FPE. Thus, from the data collected, an evaluation was made to determine whether the management practices of headteachers reflected competent execution of their duties as managers of the school organisation. Through this research question,
the study attempted to explain the type of leadership behaviors displayed by headteachers as they engaged in managing the school in the change environment that resulted from the introduction of FPE. This evaluation is premised on the assumption that school management is an integrated process; it integrates the people, finances and material resources to carry out the operations of the school enterprise efficiently and successfully. Thus, the process of implementing FPE in schools requires headteachers to provide leadership that can positively influence successful change implementation. The quality of leadership is expressed through the management practices of headteachers.

Data collected from teachers and head teachers questionnaires provided information on management practices in schools. Additional data was also drawn from interviews with head teachers, teachers and education officers as well as from observations conducted by the researcher. Head teachers were first asked to conduct a self-evaluation on several question items that were related to management. Table 4.21 presents their evaluation.
Table 4.21: *Head teachers’ Self-evaluation of their Management-related Practices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is possible to give pupils individual attention since introduction of FPE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting for school needs under FPE involves all staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, educational activities have been communicated in advance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since introduction of FPE, you are able to develop school routines, procedures for effective use of time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You plan and schedule work of teaching and support staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is delegation of responsibility and authority in the school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, you have difficulty in equitably distributing duties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since introduction of FPE, you are able to understand the needs and concerns of staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members feel free to interact with H/T</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since introduction of FPE, you discuss instructional problems with individual teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You identify the school's educational needs under FPE and set priorities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since introduction of FPE, the school plans for and organizes in-service training programmes for teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question statement</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since FPE, you regularly give direction to teachers on teaching methods</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
<td>50 84.7%</td>
<td>7 11.9%</td>
<td>2 3.4%</td>
<td>59 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since introduction of FPE, you work with teachers to identify in-service needs</td>
<td>3 5.1%</td>
<td>49 83.1%</td>
<td>7 11.9%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>59 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since introduction of FPE, you conduct actual classroom visits for supervision</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
<td>50 84.7%</td>
<td>9 15.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>59 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since introduction of FPE, you conduct induction for new and professionally young teachers to plan teaching</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
<td>53 89.8%</td>
<td>5 8.5%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>59 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since introduction of FPE, teachers are free to try out new teaching techniques and curriculum materials</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
<td>49 83.1%</td>
<td>10 16.9%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>59 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since introduction of FPE, you are unable to supervise effective utilization of resources</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
<td>17 28.8%</td>
<td>37 62.7%</td>
<td>4 6.8%</td>
<td>59 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since introduction of FPE, you solicit the involvement of parents in school affairs</td>
<td>5 8.5%</td>
<td>53 89.8%</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>59 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since introduction of FPE, you are able to communicate with parents regularly</td>
<td>3 5.1%</td>
<td>50 84.7%</td>
<td>5 8.5%</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
<td>59 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings between staff and head teacher are held regularly in the school</td>
<td>11 18.6%</td>
<td>48 81.4%</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
<td>59 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since introduction of FPE, there is a clearly understood, effective communication system between teachers and head teacher</td>
<td>9 15.3%</td>
<td>50 84.7%</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
<td>59 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since introduction of FPE, you are involved in motivating pupils in academic work</td>
<td>5 8.5%</td>
<td>53 89.8%</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>59 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regard to the performance of their roles as managers, head teachers generally evaluated themselves highly. Fifty-two (88.2%) headteachers said that they worked with teachers to identify in-service needs, although only 24 (40.7%) said that their school actually plans for and organizes in-service training programmes for teachers to better equip them for FPE.

The head teachers also evaluated themselves positively in response to queries relating to several other management related practices.

- Fifty-five (93.2%) headteachers indicated that they always communicated educational activities for the term to staff in advance
- Fifty-one (86.4%) headteachers said they involved all members of staff in the school’s budgeting process.
- Fifty-four (91.5%) headteachers indicated they were able to develop school routines and procedures to ensure more effective use of time.
- Fifty-five (93.2%) headteachers indicated that there was delegation of authority and responsibility to members of staff in their school
- Fifty-nine (100%) headteachers indicated that they usually identified the school’s educational needs and set priorities
- Forty-nine (83.1%) headteachers indicated that in their school, teachers were free to try out new teaching techniques and curriculum materials
- Fifty-eight (98.3%) headteachers indicated that they were personally involved in motivating pupils in their academic work.
- Forty-one (69.5%) headteachers indicated that even after the introduction of FPE, they were still able to personally supervise the effective utilization of resources in the school.

With regard to staff–related responsibilities, the head teachers returned a positive self-evaluation of their practices as follows:-

- Fifty-nine (100%) head teachers said they regularly held meetings with staff.
Fifty-nine (100%) head teachers said there was a clearly understood and effective communication system between them and the teachers.

Fifty-nine (100%) head teachers reported that staff members felt free to interact cordially with the head teacher.

Fifty-five (93.2%) head teachers said they were in a position to effectively understand the needs and concerns of members of staff.

Fifty-three (89.8%) reported that they usually planned and scheduled the work of both teaching and support staff.

Fifty-seven (96.6%) headteachers said that they discussed instructional problems with individual teachers.

Fifty (84.7%) headteachers indicated that since the introduction of FPE, they regularly gave direction to teachers on teaching methods.

Fifty (84.7%) headteachers reported that they conducted classroom visits for supervision.

Fifty-three (89.8%) headteachers reported that they conducted induction for new and professionally young teachers to plan their teaching.

However, with regard to their ability to give the pupils as much individual attention as was the case before the introduction of FPE, most headteachers gave a negative response. Eight (15.3%) head teachers only, agreed that they were still able to give pupils as much individual attention, while 50 (84.7%) indicated that they were unable. Thirty-seven (62.7%) headteachers also indicated that with the introduction of FPE, they had difficulty in equitably distributing duties among all members of staff.

Fifty-eight (98.3%) of headteachers indicated that they solicited the involvement of parents in school affairs, and 53 (89.8%) indicated that they were able to communicate with parents regularly. However, as discussed later, the general impression created by head teachers was that most parents had become uncooperative.
Headteachers were asked to highlight the aspects/tasks in their management role where they had felt inadequately skilled to operate effectively as a head teacher in light of FPE. Figure 4.1 summarizes their responses.

**Figure 4.1  Head Teachers’ Perceived Own Management Weaknesses in the Context of Free Primary Education**

When queried on the areas where they perceived themselves as having weakness that affected their effectiveness in managing the FPE implementation, 56 (96.6%) head teachers cited bookkeeping or accounting as an area of difficulty. Forty-seven (81%) headteachers also pointed out management of financial resources as an area in which they had trouble. Bookkeeping was seen as the process of maintaining financial records through making entries, balancing accounts and so on, while the management of financial resources referred to aspects such as budgeting, costing.
and cost analyses, auditing, making investment decisions, expense management and procurement. Seventeen (29.3%) head teachers saw public relations as an area in which they had experienced inadequacy. Lastly, 15(25.8%) headteachers perceived guidance and counselling as an area of difficulty in their management role. It was observed during the interviews with head teachers that after the introduction of FPE, schools experienced an influx of pupils with innumerable special needs. There were many orphans, HIV/AIDS patients, destitute children, former street children, children from homes in distress and children with various types of disability. Several head teachers pointed out that such conditions tested their guidance and counselling abilities to the limit and brought their inadequacies to the fore.

Even though head teachers had generally expressed a high opinion of themselves as managers, when they were cross-examined on areas of skill or capacity that they lacked, 30% of schools heads admitted that they did not have a complete school development plan. What is more telling is that just 27(45.7%) of headteachers provided documentary evidence of the existence of an action plan. A closer examination of the available school development plans revealed that 30% of them addressed school issues holistically. A major shortcoming was that they failed to focus on pedagogical issues such as classroom supervision, materials development and acquisition, in-service training, teaching methods and quality assurance. They instead mostly featured the more generic issues and infrastructure. This prompted the researcher to inquire from the headteachers if they had sufficient skill in the construction of a logical framework matrix. Twenty-five (42.4%) responded that they lacked skills for construction of a logical framework matrix and actually desired training on the same. This scenario betrays an inadequacy in school planning skills. Also reported as an area of skills difficulty was computer skills. Seventy–five percent of headteachers admitted to not being able to use computers, especially for purposes of record keeping and data management. Many of those who had some computer skills could only use them for basic typing and writing emails. Considering the complexity of financial management and the demands of
general resource management that come with FPE, this gap in ability to apply IT skills is undesirable and calls for urgent resolution. The lack of computers in schools, as earlier noted, only works to exacerbate the problem. With respect to the quality of training they had received in management, financial planning received prominence as a weakness. Forty-five percent of head teachers cited it as an area in which they had received inadequate training and one that had proved particularly problematic for them as managers.

**Management Challenges that were faced by headteachers**

To complement the interrogation of management practices in schools, it was essential for the study to also establish the management challenges faced by headteachers. This was necessary so as to provide insights into conditions that impact on their performance. Headteachers noted several difficulties that impinged on their effectiveness as managers. A frequently mentioned difficulty was the increase in pupil numbers that was aggravated by the shortage of teachers. It was felt by head teachers that this amplified the pressure on their time as they were forced to take up more lessons than they could comfortably handle besides their administrative duties. It was also claimed by head teachers that the demands of FPE in themselves had expanded roles for school heads. Headteachers lamented that they acted as accounts clerk, purchasing officer, instructional leader and public relations officer at the same time.

The management of large numbers of pupils was said to have led to myriad management challenges: shortage of classrooms, furniture and toilets; escalation in cases of indiscipline; inability to give personalized attention to pupils; increase in number of orphans and needy pupils who required special attention and an increase in maintenance costs for schools. The erratic transfer by pupils from one school to another also caused logistical problems for head teachers in school management. Headteachers complained that since there were no clear admission guidelines, some pupils transferred from one school to the other, sometimes even during the school term. This practice, not only complicated and reduced the reliability of the record-
keeping for headteachers, but also encouraged indiscipline, as pupils knew they could at little cost, move on to other schools and avoid disciplinary action. Considering that funding for FPE is pegged on pupil enrolments per school, influx of pupils that were not anticipated by head teachers also served to strain school budgets and expenditure.

The lack of management skills among headteachers as well as School Management Committees (SMCs) was cited as a challenge by headteachers. Head teachers reported that there had been some effort, albeit insufficient so far, to expose them to management training after the introduction FPE. The major concern by head teachers was that on being appointed to become school managers, no additional training was given to them to serve as preparation for the challenging role. They therefore had to discover on the job, in a trial and error fashion. The situation was worse for the members of the SMCs, some of whom were semi-illiterate but were still expected to provide direction on management issues. Several of the head teachers, especially in the rural areas, expressed frustration at the inability of some of the School Management Committee members to deal with pedagogical, staffing and financial issues.

To get a more objective assessment of headteachers’ management practices in schools, teachers’ views were sought through the questionnaires and face-to-face discussions. Table 4.22 shows the level of agreement or disagreement with the statements relating to management practices in schools.
### Table 4.22: Teachers’ Evaluation of Headteachers’ Management-related Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Headteacher (H/T) fully outlines plans for school to achieve its goals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The budgeting process involves all staff</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational activities for the term are always communicated to staff in advance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T teacher manages time effectively</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School budgetary estimates reflect school priorities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T effectively plans and schedules work of teaching and support staff</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is delegation of authority and responsibility</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of authority is clear and works effectively</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is fair distribution of duties among staff</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is clarity of staff's responsibility</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T perceives needs and concerns of staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members are free to interact cordially with H/T</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T discusses instructional problems with teachers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T identifies the school's educational needs for FPE and sets priorities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T works with teachers to identify in-service needs for teaching challenges of FPE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school plans for and organizes in-service training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T oversees effective utilization of resources</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T has provided direction on teaching methods</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T conducts classroom visits for supervision</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T conducts induction for new teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T promotes a school environment that supports teachers to try new techniques</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T interprets relevant educational laws and policy to staff</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T personally motivates pupils in academics</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is cooperation between teachers and parents to promote teaching and learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T solicits involvement of parents in school affairs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T motivates teachers to work hard</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T communicates with parents regularly and effectively</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T promotes good working relationship among teachers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are regular staff–head teacher meetings</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a clearly understood and effective communication system between you and the H/T</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evaluation of headteachers’ management related practices by teachers was highly positive on several aspects. There was a high percentage of teachers who agreed that headteachers had performed well on the following:-

- One hundred and sixty-five (93.2%) teachers said their headteacher had ensured there was clarity of staff members’ responsibilities.
- One hundred and sixty-two (91.5%) teachers indicated that their headteacher interpreted relevant educational laws and policy to staff.
- One hundred and fifty-eight (89.2%) teachers said that the headteacher solicited the involvement of parents in school affairs.
- One hundred and fifty-seven (88.7%) teachers reported that their headteacher managed time effectively.
- One hundred and fifty-five (87.5%) teachers indicated that their headteacher promoted good working relationship among teachers.
- One hundred and fifty-five (87.5%) teachers indicated that their headteacher identified the school's educational needs for FPE and set priorities.
- One hundred and fifty-four (87.0%) teachers reported that their headteacher effectively planned and scheduled work of teaching and support staff.
- One hundred and fifty-three (86.40%) teachers said that the headteacher fully outlined plans for the school to achieve its goals.
- One hundred and fifty-two (85.90%) teachers indicated that the headteacher oversees effective utilization of resources.
- One hundred and fifty (84.80%) teachers reported that their headteacher personally motivated pupils in academics.
- One hundred and forty-six (82.3%) teachers indicated that the headteacher perceives needs and concerns of staff.
- One hundred and forty-four (81.4%) teachers indicated that the headteacher communicates with parents regularly and effectively.
- One hundred and forty-seven (83.1%) teachers indicated that there was a clearly understood and effective communication system between teachers and the headteacher.
• One hundred and thirty-seven (77.4%) teachers indicated that their Headteacher had ensured delegation of authority and responsibility
• One hundred and thirty-one (74%) teachers indicated that educational activities for the term were always communicated to staff in advance
• One hundred and twenty-eight (72.3%) teachers reported that there was fair distribution of duties among staff
• One hundred and twenty-eight (72.3%) teachers indicated that the head teacher discussed instructional problems with teachers.
• One hundred and twenty-four (70.1%) teachers indicated that their headteacher had facilitated delegation of authority that was clear and effective.

In some other aspects relating to school management, whereas a majority of teachers gave a positive assessment of the headteacher, the percentages were considerably low relative to those highlighted above. In these aspects therefore, the ratios in nature of responses were suggestive of notable displeasure, despite a majority responding in the affirmative. It was felt by 117 (66.1%) of teachers that school budgetary estimates reflect school priorities and that headteachers motivated teachers to work hard. One hundred and five teachers (59.3%) considered their headteacher as having provided direction on teaching methods, while an almost equal number of 104 (58.8%) agreed that the headteacher involved all staff members in the budgeting process. This could be interpreted to mean that whereas majority of head teachers recognize the value of incorporating all members of staff in the budgetary process, a large number of head teachers still do not. Yet, the importance of ensuring participation in the budgetary process can not be over-emphasized. This is especially so in the light of FPE where all stakeholders need to be assured of transparency and accountability in the utilization of public funds. This finding, coupled with that from a separate question that sought to find out the level of participation by teachers in decision-making reveal that there is a strong indication that level of staff participation in management decision-making is minimal. Only 61 (34%) of teachers indicated that they were involved in making decisions pertaining to the procurement of teaching and learning materials. In
addition 70(39.6%) indicated that they were all involved in decision-making regarding repairs and maintenance in their schools. Yet, as noted by Townsend (1997), an organisational culture that is characterised by collaborative decision–making is a feature of an effective school. Schools need to provide encouragement for teachers’ participation in decision-making. Clarke and Newman (1997) add that indeed, teachers need to take responsibility for and be involved in school planning and curriculum development.

Teachers’ responses with regard to staff members’ interaction with headteachers suggest an uncomfortable relationship between the two parties. Seventy-eight (44.1%) teachers only, agreed that teachers were free to interact cordially with the headteacher. Seventy-five (42.7%) teachers agreed that the headteacher worked with teachers to identify in-service training needs to address teaching challenges of FPE, while an even smaller number of 41(23.10%) teachers said that their school plans for and organizes in-service training. In addition, it is apparent that few headteachers conduct induction for new teachers, as 81(45.8%) teachers indicated that their headteachers inducted new teachers. Responses from teachers showed that headteachers did not conduct classroom visits to supervise teaching. Forty-two (23.7%) teachers indicated that such visits were made by headteachers. Similarly, very few schools provide an environment that supports teachers to try new techniques. Thirty-eight (21.5%) of teachers considered their headteachers as promoting an environment that supports teachers to try out new teaching techniques and curriculum materials.

Teachers were also asked to evaluate the headteachers on selected aspects on a scale of 1-3 points, where 1 stood for very good, 2 stood for satisfactory and 3 stood for poor or not at all. Their responses are summarized in Table. 4.23. Mean response scores were computed to assist in interpretation of the overall judgment.
Table 4.23: Teachers’ Evaluation of Headteachers on Selected management Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The head teacher has put in place active strategies for enhancing teamwork among teachers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The head teacher sets a very clear educational direction to the work of the school</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteacher sets challenging targets to raise academic standards</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The headteacher carries out monitoring by inspecting lesson plans and schemes of work</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The headteacher provides useful feedback on lesson plans, schemes of work</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school works in partnership with others to promote learners’ achievement</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The headteacher provides comprehensive feedback to staff on school inspection that is conducted by Ministry quality assurance officers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions on expenditure of schools' FPE funds involve all members of staff</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The head teacher treats all staff members equally and fairly</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to rating: 1: very good, 2: satisfactory, 3: poor/not at all

In Table 4.23, mean response of less than 2.0 was considered to be very good, mean response of between 2.0 and 2.3 was seen as satisfactory, while a response mean of more than 2.2 was seen as tending towards poor. Head teachers were ranked highly by teachers with regard to three aspects. One hundred and twenty (75%) teachers rated the displaying by head teachers of school expenditure for public scrutiny as very good. Fifty-four teachers (30.5%) said it was satisfactory while only 3 (1.7%) teachers felt it was poor. The head teachers were also seen as
setting a very clear educational direction to the work of the school by 155 (87.5%) teachers who rated their behaviour as very good or satisfactory. The mean response score of 1.78 confirms a high rating. Similarly, head teachers were seen by the majority of teachers (138 or 77.9%) as having done very well or satisfactorily in setting challenging targets to raise academic standards. One hundred and thirty-eight (77.9%) teachers said headteachers had done very well or satisfactorily in setting challenging targets to raise academic standards. The overall mean score of 1.83 reflects a high rating of “very good”. The overall rating of head teachers with regard to putting in place strategies for enhancing teamwork among teachers (mean score=2.27) and treating all staff members equally and fairly (mean score=2.02) could be summarized as satisfactory.

However, the overall rating of headteachers with regard to several other aspects was poor. Eighty-four (47.5 %) teachers felt the decisions on expenditure of schools’ FPE funds did not involve all members of staff (mean score=2.37); Ninety (50.8%) head teachers indicated a score of poor with regard to head teachers carrying out monitoring by inspecting teachers’ lesson plans and schemes of work (mean score of 2.42); and Ninety-nine (55.9%) teachers rated as poor, head teachers’ provision of useful feedback on lesson plans and schemes of work (mean score =2.47). With an overall mean score response of 2.59, the head teachers were rated poorly on the presence of partnerships with other schools to promote learners' achievement. One hundred and thirty teachers (74.6%) indicated that such partnerships were poor or missing. This may suggest that schools still operate in an outmoded competitive fashion that discourages interschool cooperation and collaborations that could be more beneficial to learners. Lastly, it may be concluded that many headteachers were unwilling to fully share the reports of inspection resulting from inspections. One hundred and twenty six (71.2%) of teachers said that Headteachers do not provide comprehensive feedback to staff on school inspection that is conducted by Ministry quality assurance officers. One teacher remarked during the interview:
Reports by the ministry inspectors (Quality Assurance and Standards Officers) are treated by many head teachers as sensitive and therefore guarded as secrets. This is especially so when comments that are made by inspectors are perceived by head teachers as an indictment on their abilities. They think this could expose them negatively in the eyes of their juniors.

Management of FPE funds

As mentioned earlier, the Ministry of Education disburses Kshs 1,020 per pupil per year to schools. The ministry headquarters confirms school account details with the District Education Officers (DEOs) from each district and sends the money by direct wire transfer to each school account. Head teachers confirmed that the Government had issued guidelines on the expenditure per child with regard to instructional materials and co-curriculum activities. The guidelines also include the recommended textbook prices.

School Management Committees (SMCs) are charged with the overall responsibility of managing funds after they are banked in the school accounts. Area Education Officers, acting on behalf of the District Education Officers, monitor the expenditure of funds by all the schools in their jurisdiction. The Area Education Officers (AEOs) reported that officers from Ministry of Education also sampled and visited schools for inspection on how they were utilizing the FPE funds. Interviews with the District Quality Assurance Unit officers also confirmed inspection on the usage of funds was conducted in schools to ascertain that they had adhered to procurement procedures. The unit also involved pupils to determine how books were issued to them.

The head teachers involved the School Management Committees in procurement. According to the Ministry of Education policy which is stipulated in the Primary School Instructional Materials Management Handbook (Government of Kenya, 2003), all public primary schools are required to establish a School Instructional Materials Selection Committee (SIMSC). The SIMSC is charged with the
responsibility of both selecting suppliers of instructional materials and the book titles from the Approved Booklist. The SIMSC is composed of the Head teacher, the Deputy Head teacher, the Senior Teacher, a teacher representative from each Standard, the chairperson of the Parents’ Association as well as representative of the Parents’ Association, and the chairperson of the SMC. Headteachers are also encouraged by the Ministry of Education to involve all teachers in making decisions regarding the choice of textbooks to include in the purchase list. Whereas SIMSC were found to have been actively involved in the selection of books and in making procurement decisions, there is need to widen the involvement of teachers in book selection. One hundred (56%) of the teachers interviewed felt left out of the process.

One flaw in the management practices of headteachers related to the SIMSC was the failure to record the deliberations of their SIMSCs. Ministry of Education regulations, as published in the Primary School Instructional Materials Management Handbook (Government of Kenya, 2003), require that the decisions on the selection of Instructional Materials and the selection of a supplier should be recorded in SIMSC Minute Book. Nine (41%) and 12 (32%) of the schools sampled in Kajiado district and Kakamega district respectively did not have complete records of all the SIMSC meetings for the term. Such omissions can provide loopholes for impropriety. Records of SIMSC deliberations act as proof that the procurement of Instructional Materials is backed by lawful process.

All the head teachers had complied with the Ministry of Education requirement to display the summary of purchases and accounts on the school notice boards. This enabled members of the community to inspect the financial records. The general impression from the study was that on the whole, head teachers conformed to the laid down guidelines. However, it was noted by District Education Officers that it was not unusual for some head teachers to meddle with different votes especially when the disbursement was done late.
Requests to the DEB for virement were said to be cumbersome and time-consuming to process. The delays in consideration and ultimate approval of virement were said to be so frustrating that some head teachers gave up altogether to avoid moving into the next disbursement period with pending expenditure. Head teachers however expressed satisfaction with new policy of decentralizing book procurement to schools. This, they said, was better than the former system in which funds were channelled to DEOs to procure books for schools within their district.

Headteachers’ rating of the financial skills of members of the SMC was low. According to 32 (54.2%) of head teachers, SMC members had no skills in school budgeting. Similarly, 49% of teachers reported that SMC members had no skills in school budgeting. This suggests that SMCs, who form an important component of the management of FPE funds, are drawn into preparing school budgets without the requisite competencies and skills.

School Management Committees are also mandated to fully participate in procurement under the FPE policy. Twenty-six (44.1%) head teachers reported that members of SMC did not fully participate in procurement, while 40% of members of SMCs who were interviewed complained that they were not always adequately involved in the process. This scenario is inimical to the effective management of school finances because it provides loopholes for manipulation and reduces accountability. What is worse, 17 (28%) head teachers reported that their books of accounts, which were due for auditing, had not been examined by the Ministry of Education personnel. It is praiseworthy however, that a majority of the books of accounts had been audited. The District Education Officer when queried about the pending audits of some schools explained that they had done well under the prevailing circumstances. The District Education Officer lamented that they were experiencing a shortage of auditing staff.

The District Education Officer pointed out that headteachers are expected to provide quarterly returns on the use of funds in their schools. In Kakamega district, the office reported that on average, 60% of headteachers satisfied this requirement
on time, while in Kajiado, it was reported that on average, 55% of the returns were submitted on time. It was further charged that in 30% and 25% of the cases in Kakamega and Kajiado district respectively, auditors who were sent to schools were presented with raw data rather than properly completed books of accounts. This state of affairs slowed down their work. The explanation given by headteachers for the failure to meet deadlines was that they were burdened with numerous other tasks and responsibilities such as tendering and procurement, meetings, teaching and public relations which took up much of their time. They also pointed out that they found the task of making financial statements tedious and challenging owing to the limited accounting background they had. An innovative solution to mitigate the encumbrance faced by headteachers of large schools has been worked out by the District Education Office in Kakamega. The office facilitates the appointment of two deputy head teachers to support the school head.

In 15(25%) of the schools surveyed, headteachers admitted to not having given receipts to Ministry of Education headquarters as required. In addition, 24 (40.6%) of the headteachers did not have an up to date contracts register. It was evident in such cases that whereas schools had entered into contracts for maintenance and construction of facilities, they had no documented literature to back the contractual bases of such works. While most schools had been audited, 24(40.6%) of the school heads did not have any records of the audited reports. In addition, an important aspect of school financial management, variance analysis, seems to have been overlooked by head teachers. Variance analysis in school management is an instrument used to analyze the variance between budget and actual expenditure. This not only enhances internal auditing, but also helps in future budgeting. The study revealed that only 26(44.1%) head teachers had prepared variance analyses for their schools.

Schools are expected by the Ministry of Education to maintain some important documents from which financial analyses can be generated. Such records include cash books, vouchers, receipt books and bank statements. During the visits to
schools, an assessment of the availability and maintenance of the key documents was made by the researcher. Table 4.24 presents the findings.

**Table 4.24: Summary of the Maintenance of Key Financial Records in Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents/record</th>
<th>No. of schools that maintained the document</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank statements</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank reconciliation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash book</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment voucher</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPO/LSO</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt books</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials receipts and Issue register</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts register</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Head teachers in the sampled schools exhibited a high level of compliance with regard to maintaining several key financial documents. In 56 (94.9%) schools, records of up to date Bank statements were available. In 57 (96.6%) schools, Cash books, Payment vouchers and Local Purchase Order/Local Supply Orders were available and up to date in their maintenance. Receipt books with up to date counterfoils were observed to be available in 54 (91.5%). The level of compliance observed with regard to the aforementioned is remarkable, and suggests that head teachers have made good effort to ensure most of the key documents that are used on a day to day basis are maintained. This is a big contrast to the performance of head teachers with regard to preparing analytical statements of account such as balance sheet and monthly trial balances. Thirty-two (54.2%) of schools had prepared bank reconciliations, while just 18 (30.5%) had a payroll. Head teachers explained that they saw no need for maintaining a payroll because they had very few workers. In addition, these workers were simply paid cash through a payment voucher system.
Ministry of Education guidelines for financial management also require that headteachers maintain stipulated financial records such as a monthly trial balance, an income and expenditure statement, and a balance sheet at the end of year. Findings from the study revealed that 38 (64.4%) schools only, had monthly trial balances; 35(59.3%) schools had completed income and expenditure statements, while 49(83.19%) head teachers had prepared financial statements for the previous year. Some headteachers explained that whereas day to day documents such as receipt books, cash books and bank statements were fairly straightforward to maintain, the secondary documents such as income and expenditure statements required time, concentration and skill. They were thus perceived as cumbersome, and this explains the tendency by head teachers to procrastinate in completing them.

Three key issues emerged from discussions with headteachers on management of school finances. Whereas most of the headteachers had been trained on the management of the funds, they unanimously complained that the training had been beneficial but inadequate. It was noted that they had little prior exposure to accounting. Thus, their capacity to fully comprehend and internalize financial matters was limited. Secondly, head teachers felt overburdened by the numerous responsibilities they were charged with in the context of FPE. It was suggested that the Ministry of Education should consider deploying accounts clerks to schools. Lastly, head teachers expressed dissatisfaction with the perennial delays in disbursement of FPE funds. This, in turn, causes delays in procurement and ultimately affects curricular activities in schools. In explaining the delays, Ministry of Education officials at the zonal, district and headquarter levels gave several reasons, some of which were an indictment on the efficiency of head teachers. One of the reasons given was the submission of incorrect data by head teachers, such as erroneous bank account numbers, to the Textbook Management Unit (TMU). In other instances, schools delayed in submitting updated data, while others changed accounts without notifying the Ministry of Education in advance.
A number of other reasons given were beyond the control of head teachers. Some
districts delayed in submitting updated data, and errors were also made by data
entry clerks at the Ministry of Education headquarters. Such errors led to delays.
An error in bank account number for instance, led to bank rejections. An interesting
observation made by Ministry of Education officers was the incidence of numerous
schools sharing the same name. When this happens, Ministry of Education
databases reject the requisitions as double or conflicting entry, thereby occasioning
delays in disbursements as the ministry sought to investigate the anomaly.

4.5 Preparation and Training Given to Teachers, Headteachers and Education Officers to Enhance Their Ability to Implement the FPE Policy

The study sought to assess the level of preparation given to teachers, headteachers
and education officers for the implementation of FPE in Kenya. Responses were
thus sought from teachers, headteachers and education officers. Considering that
the FPE policy was implemented in haste, educational stakeholders did not receive
anything significant in the form of preparation prior to its implementation. Some
measures were however taken after the introduction of FPE to enhance the ability
of officers and teachers to cope with the change. This study sought to identify and
assess the adequacy of such orientation or training measures taken for the purpose
of resourcing personnel for FPE implementation.

4.5.1 Preparation and Training given to Headteachers

Headteachers were first asked if they were given any training in preparation for
FPE prior to its introduction. None of the headteachers indicated that such
preparation had been given to them. This confirmed the concerns raised by other
studies which revealed that the implementation of FPE was rushed. Ayieke (2006)
and UNESCO (2005) observe that the policy was rushed without consulting or
training various key stakeholders such as teachers and parents. Headteachers were
then asked if they had ever attended any in-service training or orientation course
since FPE was introduced. All the 59 headteachers indicated that they had attended some training related to FPE since free schooling was introduced.

A large number of headteachers indicated that they had received training on financial management. Fifty-five (93.2%) headteachers had received financial training on budgeting, book-keeping and accounting. It was noted by headteachers and education officers that after the introduction of FPE in 2003, the MOEST had organized financial management training sessions for primary school headteachers. These training sessions comprised basic book-keeping to enable them to manage the FPE funds effectively and in accordance with the guidelines provided by the MOEST. Ironically, however, despite having been taken through such financial management courses, most headteachers reported experiencing difficulty in this aspect of their management role.

As discussed earlier, most headteachers have little background skills and knowledge in financial management, and were thus encountering financial training for the first time. The practice over the years has been for headteachers to grapple with financial management through trial and error. Many of the headteachers also noted that they had previously relied on the services of accounts clerks to manage bookkeeping. Accounts clerks, whose services were paid for by parents’ contributions, could no longer be retained by most schools after the abolition of fees. Three of the headteachers interviewed revealed that their predecessors had stepped down soon after the introduction of FPE, citing incompetence in financial management of FPE funds as the cause of their apprehension. It was felt by the resigning headteachers that FPE placed such great demand on financial management that they would find themselves rendered incompetent.

More than half of headteachers also indicated that they had received training under the School Empowerment Program (SEP). Thirty-eight (64.4%) headteachers had been trained through the SEP, a collaborative effort between the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MOEST) and Imfundo to support the implementation of Free Primary Education (FPE). “Imfundo” is a word derived
from the Nguni languages of Southern Africa, meaning 'the acquisition of knowledge, the process of being educated'. The School Empowerment Programme, established in September 2003, is a distance-learning course designed to develop capacity by training headteachers and Key Resource Teachers to deal with the challenges of Free Primary Education in Kenya. The programme is mainly delivered through print-based material supported by multi-media. The headteacher materials comprise a nine themed distance-learning module that focuses on helping them to reflect on the areas relevant to bringing about change in the school, working with the community, management and leadership, while the Key Resource Teacher material supports classroom practice and illustrates how to deliver this training on to the rest of the teachers (see http://www.dfid.gov.uk/research/imfundo.asp). Whereas the SEP has been rolled out, progress was found to be slow.

Ten (16.9%) headteachers indicated they had received training on curricular management in the context of FPE. Considering that the FPE brought challenges of curricular nature such as large classes, the small number of headteachers indicating they had received training in curricular matters is worrying. This suggests that the focus in provision of orientation relevant to FPE has been on financial management at the expense of other similarly important aspects relating to the implementation of FPE.

In addition to the training given on financial management, headteachers reported that they had been provided with a financial management handbook. Interviews with Ministry of Education Officials revealed that PriceWaterhouseCoopers were engaged by the World Bank as consultants to prepare a financial management handbook and provide training on financial procedures to Ministry of Education officers, headteachers and members of School Instructional Materials Selection Committees (SIMSCs). This was followed by the production and distribution of a Procurement Manual for Primary Schools. Another important document that that was produced for headteachers is the Primary Schools Instructional Materials Management Handbook that provides guidelines on maintenance of the School
Instructional Materials Bank Account (SIMBA), procurement of instructional materials, stock management, and conservation and repair. To ensure compliance with instructional materials guidelines, the Textbook Management Unit (TMU) of the Ministry of Education continues to provide training to headteachers through field officers.

Evidently, most of the headteachers had received some form of training or orientation to equip them for FPE. It was however, necessary to find out from headteachers whether they considered this training to have been adequate. Most of the headteachers were of the opinion that whereas the training they had received after the introduction of FPE was useful and necessary, it was inadequate. Fifty (84.7%) headteachers evaluated the training they had received as overall being inadequate to fully equip them for the challenges of FPE. When probed further, they gave several reasons. It was observed by headteachers that the training courses they were given were too short and rushed. The training given to headteachers in financial management was especially cited as being too brief. This explains why, as discussed earlier, 47(81%) head teachers pointed out management of financial resources as an area in which they had difficulty. Mikiko et al.(2009), in a study of FPE policy in Kenya and other African countries also found that the ad hoc training opportunities given to head teachers on accounting and school management under FPE were not adequate for head teachers to obtain confidence in daily school management.

Headteachers also observed that whereas they had been exposed to training in financial management, which is critical for their role as managers, other important aspects such as the teaching of a large number of pupils, quality assurance for large school populations, and teaching methodologies that could be used to mitigate the challenges brought about by FPE were given little attention.

It was observed during the interviews with headteachers that after the introduction of FPE, schools experienced an influx of pupils with innumerable special needs. There were many orphans, destitute children, former street children, children from
homes in distress and children with various types of disability. Headteachers pointed out that they felt inadequate in dealing with such conditions and proposed that INSET in guidance and counselling should have been given more prominence.

4.5.2 The Training Given to Teachers
Teachers were asked if they were given any preparatory orientation before the introduction of FPE in Kenya. All the teachers reported that no form of preparation for FPE was given to them before its implementation. Asked to explain in what way they felt unprepared at the inception of FPE, teachers prominently mentioned workload, handling large classes, multi-age teaching and multi-grade teaching. Thomas and Shaw (1992) explain multi-grading as a process of combining pupils of different ages and abilities in one classroom under the direction of one teacher. They add that whereas multi-grading is cost-effective, teachers who are involved in it should be in-serviced to enable them to adopt more responsive measures.

Most teachers interviewed in the present study explained that they were unprepared to teach over-age learners, or to handle classrooms with learners of disparate abilities. Neither were the teachers prepared for the workload that came with the phenomenally large number of pupils who enrolled into primary schools when FPE was introduced. For example, Mathematics and English language teachers who have to regularly give pupils homework and mark the assignments found it difficult to teach effectively. Yet, no preparation was given to them on how to handle such large classes. Some teachers complained that they had to introduce a double-shift system, and this placed a big strain on teachers where the same teacher handled both morning and afternoon shifts.

However, as the consequences of the implementation of FPE began to show, there was an effort by the Ministry of Education to provide some orientation and training for teachers. Teachers were queried on whether they had received any form of in-service training or orientation since FPE education was introduced. One hundred and thirty (73.4%) teachers had attended some form of in-service course after the introduction of FPE. Forty-three (24.3%) of the teachers had not attended any in-
service course since the introduction of FPE, while four teachers did not indicate whether or not they had ever attended an in-service course since FPE. These results are heartening, and signify an effort, albeit underprovided, to equip and update teachers with skills and knowledge relevant to their work.

Teachers were then asked to describe the nature of the in-service courses they had attended since the introduction of FPE. From their responses, presented in Table 4.25, it was observed that they had attended varying in-service training courses, with the biggest number of them indicating that they had been exposed to the School-based Teacher Development Programme (SbTD).

Table 4.25: Type of In-service Course/Training Attended by Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the Training Received by Teachers</th>
<th>N=130</th>
<th>% among those who had had in-service</th>
<th>N=177</th>
<th>% of total No. of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Empowerment Program</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SbTD programme</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIE in-service course on curriculum</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Materials management</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS awareness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counselling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-eight teachers (27.1%) said they had attended the School-based Teacher Development Programme (SbTD). This was a five-month in-service Distance Learning programme for primary school teachers that focused on key subjects: Maths, Science and English. As explained by the Ministry of Education officer in charge of the INSET Unit at the headquarters, the aim of the SbTD programme is
designed to encourage teachers to try out different teaching strategies that motivate and challenge pupils. The SbTD-trained teachers were then expected to lead school-based professional development in their subject area in their respective schools. The programme was used to develop 54,000 Key Resource Teachers (29% of teaching force) over 3 three years. As reported by the Ministry of Education Research Report 2 (Republic of Kenya, 2007), there is need for the Ministry of Education INSET unit to work with the District INSET support teams to ensure all teachers who want to undertake the SbTD do so by 2012, as there remained an additional 100,000 plus teachers in primary schools who had not been trained through the programme.

The SEP, from which 58 (32.8%) of the teachers in the study sample had benefited, is a programme that attempts to address the challenges of FPE implementation by offering skills in alternative learning approaches like multi-grade and multi-shift teaching, mobile classes and accelerated learning. During the interview conducted at the INSET Unit of the Ministry of Education Headquarters, it was clarified that the School Empowerment Programme (SEP) developed from the lessons learnt on the limitations of the SbTD programme. It was felt that the SbTD had not impacted enough change in teaching methodologies and that there was still an inadequacy of skills for effective use of school instructional materials. Teachers had not been sufficiently equipped to lead annual programmes of continuous school-focused inservice programmes.

Teachers who were interviewed during the study revealed that SEP’s pace had been slowed down by Key Resource Teachers (KRTs) who were reluctant to implement school empowerment and teacher development as expected. It was suggested that the selection criteria for KRTs should be revised. Some of the KRTs, in defending their lacklustre performance, complained that they did not fully understand the programme and contrary to their hopes, the TSC failed to recognise the SEP certification for teacher promotion.
Forty-eight (27.1%) teachers reported that they had undergone in-service training courses mounted by the Kenya Institute of Education (KIE), mainly for orientation courses to enhance their capacity in implementing the syllabus changes that were effected soon after the introduction of FPE. KIE provides general sensitization about the curriculum and enlightens teachers on proper interpretation of the primary school syllabus. KIE training also encompasses instruction on proper use of various curriculum support materials such as textbooks, charts and audio-visual materials.

The management of instructional materials (IM) became more critical with the introduction of FPE, as donors moved swiftly to provide support in the provision of IM. As would be expected, the need for schools to improve on IM management and accountability to the satisfaction of donors became imperative. Through a Kenya government and Royal Netherlands Embassy (RNE) project, training in IM provision was provided to teachers and headteachers. Twenty nine (16.4%) teachers indicated they had been trained on Instructional Materials management. This reflects the fact that a small percentage of the teacher population had benefited from his important exercise. A Ministry of Education research report (Republic of Kenya, 2007) admits that this exercise was not as effective as should have been owing to staffing and logistic difficulties such as transport facilities in the districts.

Twelve (6.8%) teachers also indicated having attended in-service training on financial management, AIDS awareness and guidance and counselling respectively. Those who had attended financial management training were mostly deputy headteachers or Senior Teachers. Twelve (6.8%) of the teachers said that they had attended a course on HIV/AIDS, a number similar to those who reported having attended guidance and counselling training. Both guidance and counselling and HIV/AIDS awareness were seen by teachers as being important and relevant concerns for FPE. The introduction of FPE brought with it a large number of pupils with varying special needs as well as many who were affected or infected by HIV/AIDS.
Two striking observations may be made from the responses provided by teachers. Firstly, not all teachers have had some form of in-service training since the introduction of FPE. Secondly, there seems to be disharmony in the provision of in-service training for teachers, and there is a lack of clear policy regarding the acquisition of in-service training by teachers. Whereas some teachers had attended as many as three in-service training courses, many others had attended only one or none at all. In-service training provision also seems to be fragmented; apart from the SbTD programme, which was designed to target the primary school teacher population during its lifespan, other in-service programmes reach only a few teachers. There also seem to be no structured programmes for in servicing of teachers over a defined period. One hundred and forty (79.1%) teachers felt that the in-service training courses were not regular enough, while 116 (65.5%) thought that the in-service training given to them was inadequate with regard to completeness or quality in meeting their needs as teachers. Teachers’ responses overall reveal that the duration of the in-service courses was too short and that some of the courses fell short on effectiveness. This suggests a gap between teachers’ expectations and what in-service courses provide.

From the findings in this study, it is evident that the development of a regular programme of schools-based INSET had not taken root in many schools across the country. Thus, SbTD’s aim was not fully achieved. One of the reasons given for this failure included teachers claiming that due to the pressure they faced under FPE, they lacked time. KRTs also pointed out that there was a lack of support from headteachers who had a relatively weak knowledge of the detail of the SbTD programme and its ongoing INSET potential. According to Ministry of Education officers interviewed at the headquarters, programme planners failed to sufficiently involve and engage headteachers with a distinct role in the SbTD that gave adequate recognition of the headteachers’ status as principal decision maker within the school. In addition, most School Development Plans did not include plans for INSET. To remedy some of these shortcomings, the subsequent INSET programme, SEP, was implemented as a school-based and school-focused
programme of collaborative INSET. The SEP utilized needs-led multi media training resources and employed a more individualised approach through distance learning. It also shifted the INSET paradigm from a largely reactive model, to a more proactive, problem-solving and school-focused orientation.

4.5.3 The Preparation and Training given to Education Officers

The two District Education Officers interviewed in the study conceded that there was little time for adequate preparation of education officers for the change to FPE. All that was given to education officers at this level at the inception of FPE were official circulars instructing them to ensure that no child was denied access to primary schools on account of fees. Regular briefings on the implementation were also given to officers as a way of mitigating the serious challenges that were experienced at the primary schooling level. Education officers disclosed that there was a lot of uncertainty among most Ministry of Education staff regarding what to do in providing support and guidance to schools. The MOEST failed to issue implementation guidelines on time, and many field officers were thus unable to offer any serious direction to schools.

When asked to highlight some of the areas in which they thought educational officers in the district were unprepared for at the inception of FPE, the DEOs pointed out the monitoring of education standards in schools, the management of large school populations, and the assessment of curriculum coverage under such conditions.

However, it was noted that soon after the introduction of FPE, training in financial management was conducted for District Education Officers and Quality Assurance Officers as part of the Free Primary Education Support Programme. The Textbook Monitoring Unit (TMU) also gave some training to the District Education Office personnel. This training on supervision of textbook procurement and utilization supervision is provided on a continuous basis. Later, in 2005, a Procurement
Procedures Manual for Ministry of Education provincial and district level officers who were involved with KESSP project accounting and reporting was produced.

Educational officers at the Zonal level of education concurred with the sentiments of DEOs that there was no preparation given to them to cope with the abrupt introduction of FPE in Kenya’s primary schools. Discussions held with them revealed areas in which they felt least prepared and therefore challenged when FPE was introduced. Most prominently mentioned were the lack of training in skills for monitoring teaching and learning in schools, monitoring of curriculum implementation, assessment of curriculum coverage, and provision of support to schools on effectively handling the large number of pupils.

The MOEST has trained various Ministry of Education officers in financial management of schools through the Financial Management Support Programme. This training targeted DEOs, District Quality Assurance and Standards personnel and FPE officers. The programme had also trained Zonal Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (ZQASOs). Training under this programme covered areas such as challenges encountered in FPE financial management, the FPE accounting system, government interventions in FPE provision, FPE guidelines and regulations, and school audit reporting.

Interviews conducted with officers at the Ministry of Education headquarters provided some insights into the challenges faced by the INSET unit of the Ministry of Education, one being that the funds for INSET were not always available on time. It was also noted that an INSET strategy had not been developed, and this led to a situation of lack of proper coordination and harmonisation. The need for harmonisation was seen as particularly necessary because many organizations conduct in-service activities in different parts of the country.

It was pointed out that the district level Teacher Advisory Centre had been scrapped and this had hampered the Ministry of Education’s INSET programme. With the abolition of District Teacher Advisory Centre (DTAC), key professional
staff at the district level who hitherto implemented and sustained the school based INSET programme were eliminated. In addition, it was reported by Ministry of Education officials at the headquarters that most of the experienced INSET staff had left the Ministry of Education’s INSET unit through external promotion, retirement or transfer. As of the time of interviews in early 2008, the unit was said to be understaffed by 50%.

This was further compounded by the level of resourcing at the lowest levels of the Ministry of Education’s quality assurance hierarchy. All the zonal level educational officers interviewed expressed dissatisfaction with resources and facilities available to them for carrying out their work in the field. The officers said that they lacked adequate funds to effectively cover their areas of jurisdiction. In addition, there was a serious shortage of government vehicles available for them to use in the field. These findings bear similarity to those of Makori (2009) whose study found that Ministry of Education personnel in Kisii district were constrained in their work by lean staffing which in turn affected effectiveness in the monitoring, evaluation and inspection of schools after FPE was introduced. Due to the small number of Quality Assurance Officers, and a shortage of official vehicles for transportation, the inspection in schools was slowed. Cheruto and Kyalo (2010) similarly found that in Keiyo district, Quality Assurance Officers were unable to visit schools regularly, and hence, when they did, their visits were mostly routine, rather than advisory. This was so because headteachers did not have regular contact with these education officers.

4.6 The Role Played by Parents and School Management Committees in the Implementation of FPE

The present study also queried the participation of parents and School Management Committees (SMCs) in the implementation of FPE. Data relevant for this research question were obtained mainly from head teachers, but also from teachers, parents and School Management Committee members (SMCs).
4.6.1 Role Played by Parents in the Implementation of FPE

With the introduction of FPE, the government abolished fees and tuition levies in primary education. Thus, the government and development partners undertook to meet the cost of basic teaching and learning materials as well as wages of critical non-teaching staff and co-curricular activities. Under FPE, the only costs for parents are school uniforms and examination fees. At the onset of FPE, parents and communities were not required to build new schools, but it was expected they would refurbish and use existing facilities such as community and religious buildings. School heads and committees, are required to obtain approval from the MoEST if they wish to charge additional levies. In the Sessional Paper No. I of 2005, the government emphasizes that to ensure effectiveness of FPE, it will encourage community support for infrastructure development as a strategy (Republic of Kenya, 2005). Indeed, the Ministry of Education in its KESSP programme, reiterates that community contributions, either in form of financial resources (depending on economic level) or in kind, will be required to support the government’s and other partners’ contributions (Republic of Kenya, 2005b).

Essentially, therefore, whereas primary education has been officially declared free, the Government did not bar parents from contributing towards education. The role of parents is outlined in the Free Primary Education Booklet that was released in 2003. Parents have the responsibility to ensure that all children go to school, provide children with school uniform and food, and encourage them to learn. Parents are also expected to help in building schools, equip them with facilities like desks and workshops and to maintain school facilities. They also have a responsibility to support and be involved in schools’ management to ensure accountability and transparency in resource management. It is stressed however in FPE policy that, no child should be denied access to or sent away from school for being unable to make material or financial contribution since public primary education is defined as being free.
Head teachers were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with regard to several statements related to parents’ involvement in the school affairs. Table 4.26 provides a summary of their responses.

**Table 4.26: Headteachers’ Responses on Parental Involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question item</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents are actively involved in school management affairs</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17 28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are involved in discipline within school</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14 23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are involved in contributing materially/financially</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has an active, supportive PTA</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20 33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since FPE, there is cooperation between teachers and parents to promote teaching/learning</td>
<td>n=0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24 40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are able to communicate with parents regularly</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5 8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You solicit the involvement of parents in school affairs</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall response by head teachers with regard to parents’ involvement in the implementation of FPE at the school level suggests laxity. Thirty-one (52.5%) head teachers considered parents of children in their school as not being actively involved in school management affairs. Therefore, it only in less than half of the schools studied that parents were seen as taking interest in management affairs of
the school. This finding suggests that parents have not fully taken the responsibility to support and be involved in schools’ management to ensure accountability and transparency in resource management as anticipated in the FPE policy. Communities are also expected to voluntarily make financial or other contributions to augment government contributions. Apparently, parents have not embraced this thought. The fact that 55 (93.2%) of the headteachers indicated that parents did not voluntarily contribute materially or financially to support school activities suggests that communities have left the burden of school development to the government.

Moreover, most Parents-Teacher Associations (PTAs) were reported by headteachers as being unsupportive and inactive. Twenty-nine (49.2%) of the headteachers indicated that the PTA was active and supportive to the school administration. Parents were also mostly seen as not cooperating with teachers in promoting teaching and learning since introduction of FPE. Thirty-nine (66.1%) head teachers regarded the parents as not cooperating on this account. These findings are similar to those of Cheruto & Kyalo (2010) who found that after the introduction of FPE, most parents in Keiyo district had perceived the provision of primary education as being the sole responsibility of the government. This had led them to mistakenly believe that they had no more role to play in the provision of primary education, a misconception that had caused conflict and antagonism between school administrators and the community. According to World Bank (2009), some parents even expected that the government would and should provide uniforms for all pupils in primary schools as part of the FPE package.

The scenario such as described above negatively impacts on learners’ performance; when parents take a keen interest in the academic affairs of their children, there is a greater chance for the learners to achieve their potential. It also enhances aspects such as discipline among pupils. Unfortunately, parents were also not rated highly with regard to their involvement in discipline within school. Thirty-six (61%) head teachers indicated that parents were not involved in discipline within school. This finding is especially worrying considering that teachers and headteachers in the study sample pointed out that an increase in indiscipline was one of the principal
challenges they had observed with the introduction of FPE. Headteachers also felt that teachers had lost a considerable amount control over pupils with the banning of corporal punishment in schools. Discussion with teachers revealed that many parents had simply left the schools to grapple with pupil problems, now that education was free. Yet, the success of education depends on the social, cultural, economic and psychological contributions from communities. This is so because people living together as a community largely share similar interests that can create a shared vision for the education of children. Headteachers expressed frustration that despite attempting to communicate regularly with parents, there was still such a high level of apathy on the part of parents. Fifty-three (89.8%) headteachers said they were able to communicate with parents regularly, and 58 (93.8%) of the head teachers said they solicited the involvement of parents in school affairs. Thus, according to head teachers, the problem is due to indifference on the part of parents, rather than a lack of information.

It would appear that teachers absolved headteachers from blame with regard to parents’ lack of involvement in school management and academic affairs of pupils. One hundred and fifty-eight (89.2%) teachers expressed agreement with the statement that headteachers made the effort to solicit the involvement of parents in school affairs. An almost equal number of teachers agreed that their headteacher communicates with parents regularly. The assessment by 144 (81.4%) teachers who indicated that their headteacher communicates regularly with parents concurs with the headteachers’ view that they (headteachers) solicit the involvement of parents and communicate with them regularly. It may be concluded therefore that most parents, despite receiving communication from headteachers, have decided to snub invitations for closer involvement with their children’s education.

Teachers were also asked to evaluate the involvement of parents in the education of their children on a scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Table 4.27 presents their responses to the various statements.
Table 4.27: Teachers’ Evaluation of Parents’ Involvement in Education of their Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents are actively involved in school management since FPE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>176*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are actively involved in discipline within the school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>176*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents contribute materially/financially to support school activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents work with you to follow up academic progress of pupils</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>176*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is cooperation between teachers and parents to promote teaching and learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T solicits involvement of parents in school affairs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The H/T communicates with parents regularly</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates there was a missing response

Teachers mostly saw parents as not being actively involved in school management since the introduction FPE. One hundred and nine (61.9%) teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, “After the implementation of FPE, parents of pupils in your school are actively involved in school management affairs.” This suggests that there are only a few parents who take an interest in the management affairs of schools while the majority have adopted an indifferent stance. The response by teachers is also in consonance with that of head teachers, majority of whom judged parents as being inactive in school management. Similarly, parents were viewed as not being actively involved in discipline matters of their children within the school by 154 (86.3%) of teachers. This is a worryingly high statistic.
Teachers can only do so much with regard to discipline of pupils. As observed by Melhuish, Sylva, Sammons, Siraj-Blatchford & Taggart (2001), the absence of parental involvement in the discipline of children at school denies teachers the advantages of reinforcement that come with parental involvement. In addition, parents should be seen by their children to be supporting good behaviour and positive habits.

One hundred and fifty-four (87%) teachers viewed parents as not contributing materially or financially to support the FPE programme in schools. Whereas parents are not required to contribute financially to schools, they also are not barred from doing so voluntarily. In any case, parental contribution, for as long as it is not made obligatory, is encouraged by the government.

Constant dialogue and interaction between parents and teachers is vital for effective monitoring of the learning that is taking place among pupils. Yet, from the data in this study, 143(80.8%) teachers felt that parents do not work with them in following up the academic progress of their children. Further, a small number of 45(25.4%) teachers indicated that there was cooperation between teachers and parents in promoting teaching and learning after the introduction of FPE. Such lack of involvement by parents in their children’s learning can be detrimental to their performance, because research shows that parental involvement in their children’s learning positively affects their academic performance (Fan & Chen, 2001), leading to higher academic achievement, greater cognitive competence, greater school enjoyment, better school attendance and fewer behavioural problems at school (Melhuish et al., 2001).

From discussions with head teachers, it was also revealed that many of the parents who were better off economically, and who used to be more cooperative and concerned with their children’s academic performance, transferred their children to private schools after the introduction of FPE. One head teacher’s remarks aptly capture this sentiment:-
In this school, before FPE, we had eight pupils whose parents are teachers in this school. Surprisingly, after FPE was introduced, these teachers immediately transferred their children to the ‘academy’ (private school) you see 1 km up the road as you come to this school. Several other parents did the same. That may tell you something about the calibre of parents we have been left with.

These sentiments concur with the findings of Ezeh, Oketch, Mutisya & Ngware (2008b) whose study of FPE in a sample of schools in Nairobi revealed that with the advent of FPE, many people from high income households began to perceive public schools as being of low quality. They argue that this encouraged the growth of private schools. This could be a pointer that the government might have to increase spending on public schools and focus on maintaining high quality of education provision in public schools.

It was also noted that whereas parents were swift to fault the school administration when they perceived school affairs to be going wrong, they ironically shied away from making practical contribution to school management. They are content to play the perfunctory roles of electing Parents Teachers Association (PTA) representatives and attending yearly general meetings. They therefore, lack a grasp of the goings-on in the very schools in whose management they are supposed to be involved as watchdogs for accountability and transparency. Head teachers and teachers alike, also blamed the media for publicizing FPE simplistically. It was felt that the message sent out to the public was easily misinterpreted to mean that parents should not in any way contribute to their children’s education.

An area that was cited frequently by head teachers as having suffered due to laxity by parents was examinations. Whereas schools would like to regularly give pupils printed examinations, this was no longer possible as many parents were unwilling to meet printing costs. Teachers were left with the option of reading out questions or writing examinations on the blackboard, alternatives which were cumbersome and time-wasting. Nevertheless, headteachers of boarding schools reported having difficulty with just a few parents in this regard. Parents in all the boarding schools
in the study had in principle agreed to contribute some money, ranging from between 500 to 1,000 Kshs. annually, as examination fees. Related to this was the issue of extra tuition. Head teachers complained that FPE had actually increased the need for extra tuition, since many of the learners who had joined schools after FPE was announced lagged behind others in academic performance. Parents who paid up for tuition willingly before FPE are now less enthusiastic about it. Whereas some parents were still willing to pay for tuition, most of them expressed reluctance. Teachers, in many schools had abandoned the exercise, preferring to do it at home on private arrangement with individual pupils. Headteachers were of the opinion that standards in performance would drop because of many pupils being unable to get extra tuition. Nonetheless, headteachers in urban schools reported that most of the parents had expressed an interest in maintaining extra tuition at a minimal cost. This could be an indicator that urban parents are more likely to be highly educated and thus more concerned with educational achievement.

Hot lunches for pupils who have to otherwise walk long distances to their homes or for pupils in standard 8 who need to save time, are organized in several schools. In fact, this is the one instance where a large number of schools had successfully mobilized parents to contribute financially or in kind. In Kajiado, many of the rural schools benefited from the school feeding programme- an initiative by the government and donor partners launched to enhance retention in hardship areas of Kenya. Parents in such areas are required to pay cooks and provide cooking fuel. Some parents were however, either unwilling or unable to contribute for this expense component of the programme. Headteachers had thus devised other means of ensuring a higher level of compliance. Parents who were unable to contribute financially were asked to bring charcoal, firewood, water or to volunteer cooking services on a rotational basis. In Kakamega district, most schools reported cooperation from parents in terms of providing food, firewood, water and money for the school-organized meals. Such meals were mainly prepared for class seven and class eight pupils to allow them more time in school for assignments, reading and remedial classes.
Headteachers complained that, largely, parents had misinterpreted the FPE policy. Many parents, and especially in the rural areas, were wont to think that the government would provide everything to satisfy the unique needs of each school. This attitude has complicated the management of facilities. Head teachers complained of having urgent needs such as classroom repairs, desks, latrines and water, which could not be catered for sufficiently by government grants. Some parents, when asked to contribute for such expenses, would retort that hundreds of thousands of shillings had been disbursed to schools. This shows that on the part of parents, there is a combination of ignorance and suspicion which has proved to be retrogressive for schools. These findings concur with those of Mikiko, Keiichi, Sifuna, Chimombo, Kunje, Ampiah, Byamugisha, Sawamura, and Yamada (2009) who, in a study of FPE policy in Kenya, found that whereas schools suffered from lack of funds after FPE was introduced, they were unable to ask parents for financial support because parents had become passive in school activities and decision making. Their study further revealed that parents and communities generally held the view that the government was responsible for providing everything to sustain schools, and that parents and communities had no stake in school governance. In a study conducted in nine districts of Kenya soon after the introduction of FPE, UNESCO (2005), also found that most parents and even pupils expressed the belief that ‘free’ education meant that everything related to education was free and therefore, they were not expected to make any contributions at all. According Mikiko et al. (2009), the low participation of parents seemed to have created mutual mistrust and poor relationships in schools, especially between teachers and the community.

Teachers’ and headteachers’ gloomy opinion on parental involvement in school affairs seems to give credence to the views expressed by pupils. From discussions with pupils, it was observed that only a small number of parents took actual interest in what pupils learnt in school by inspecting their books or participating in their homework. Many pupils also indicated that parents were generally unwilling to buy supplementary textbooks for them. Most pupils therefore, had either very few textbooks or no textbooks of their own. Nonetheless, the majority of pupils said
that their parents showed concern about pupils finishing the homework they had been given at school. Parents were said by 75% of pupils to be cooperative in allowing pupils some time off from domestic chores to do their homework and studies. It was found necessary to gauge the level of parental involvement in the academic life of pupils at home. This is especially so considering that teachers are overwhelmed with workload under the FPE. While there was an indication of some interest by parents in pupils’ academic work at home, the level of involvement was low. Less than a third (31.8%) of pupils from Kakamega with whom discussions were held indicated that their parents inquired to ensure homework was done, while 34.7% of their counterparts in Kajiado district indicated their parents ensured homework was done. The results were even lower with regard to parents’ actual participation in assisting pupils to do homework. In Kakamega, 26.0% of the pupils indicated parents assisted them with homework, while in Kajiado, 18.8% reported that parents assisted with homework.

It is important for parents to interact academically with pupils at home and show an interest in their schoolwork or help them with schoolwork. This complements the input of teachers, whose capacity to provide individualized attention is limited, and especially in context of large numbers as experienced with FPE. It is therefore imperative that parents recognize education as a joint effort of the home and the school.

Parents generally expressed relief and happiness with the introduction of FPE in Kenya. The FPE policy was said to have greatly eased their burden, especially considering the harsh economic circumstances that many ordinary Kenyans are experiencing. It was however evident that most parents had misinterpreted the FPE policy. According to the majority of parents, the policy simply meant that all children could attend school at no cost whatsoever. Therefore, they did not expect to be asked for any form of contribution, not even for physical development and maintenance of facilities. This might explain the difficulties mentioned by school headteachers who had reported that parents had largely become uncooperative. When asked to explain why headteachers had complained about lack of
cooperation from parents, parents defended themselves by saying that they were not sure whether appeals made by headteachers were genuine. There was much indication that parents held suspicions about any pleas from headteachers for contribution. There is need for greater awareness among parents on their role in FPE and the benefits that would accrue from greater participation. For many parents, especially in the rural areas, the only source of information about FPE was politicians who made reference to FPE during the election campaigns. Political rhetoric can be unreliable and distorted, and so many parents could be operating from limited knowledge on FPE.

It is worth mentioning though, that some of the parents also appreciated the fact that it was impossible for the government to meet the full cost of education sufficiently. About 40% of the parents interviewed indicated their willingness to voluntarily augment government contribution to FPE, adding that success of FPE was only possible if parents also made some sacrifices. One such parent argued that the phrase ‘free’ had made some parents to abdicate their role in education. Thus, he suggested, this should be changed to read “affordable primary education”. Those who belonged to this school of thought intimated that when people are allowed to enjoy services without paying for them, they tend to become less responsible and this encourages a culture of dependency. This is a valuable observation because community participation in school management helps to foster a sense of ownership among members of the community.

With regard to allegations by headteachers that parents were not being helpful with the discipline of their children, some parents blamed the ban on caning as being the possible cause of indiscipline. In any case, parents insisted that such indiscipline did not manifest at home, and so the failure was seen as attributable to and confined mainly to the school environment. Parents also indicated that they were not keen on attending frequent meetings in schools because they suspected that such meetings would ultimately be used to convince them on the necessity to contribute money. This, they thought, was unnecessary, considering the fact the government meets the cost of everything in primary schools. Some parents also
intimated that teachers do not always take their views seriously because they (teachers) believe they are the educational experts. Parents are therefore seen as being ignorant in matters of education.

4.6.2 Role played by SMCs in the Implementation of FPE

With the introduction of FPE policy, the government made the decision to devolve funds to the local level as a way of speeding up service delivery and increasing community participation in decision-making. This resulted in a greater need for communities to have the capacity to plan and make decisions about education expenditure. The role of the School Management Committee (SMC) consequently became more prominent. It is the SMC’s responsibility to manage funds that have been wired into school accounts and to give tenders for the supply of the various learning materials. This leads to the question: have SMCs lived up to the expectations held of them?

The underlying principle behind establishing SMCs was to create mechanisms for effective management of school resources. The SMC membership comprises representatives of parents and a representative of the school administration, usually the headteacher. School Management Committees, whose existence predates FPE, are constituted through elections. Members may be re-elected to the SMC. From interviews held with Ministry of Education officials, the broad official functions of SMCs were outlined as follows;

- To prepare plans and budgets for the school and approve expenditure.
- To mobilize resources for schools
- To make investment decisions for the school
- To supervise expenditure and school development projects
- To organize parental education and reconcile school management and parents
- To enhance discipline in the school
Once decisions relating to finance have been made, the school administration implements the decisions and accounts for the funds utilized.

Headteachers were asked to state the contribution that School Management Committees had played in the management of their respective schools. Table 4.28 presents their responses.

**Table 4.28: Headteachers’ Views on the Role Played by the SMC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of School Management Committee in management</th>
<th>No. of H/T who cited role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting and planning</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of projects</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of expenditure</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling disciplinary cases</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilizing &amp; sensitizing parents on school programs</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining academic standards</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilizing resources</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-two (88.1%) headteachers indicated that the SMC played the role of budgeting and planning in management of school. This is an important role, and its significance is underscored in the Ministry of Education’s Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP). According to KESSP, schools are now required to generate a 5-year development plan that describes individual schools’ priority areas for investment. It is expected that such plans will be developed and agreed upon by the School Management Committees (SMCs) and the Parents-Teachers-Associations (PTAs) before being submitted to higher authorities. Some of the items that may be included in the plan are improvement of existing permanent classrooms, toilets, storage facilities, fences, water supply infrastructure, furniture and cooking facilities (Republic of Kenya, 2005b).

A similarly large response was made with regard to two other important functions; 46(78.0%) of headteachers reported that the SMC played the role of supervising
development projects and 42(71.2%) reported that the SMC played the role of supervising expenditure. The three functions above are critical to the success of FPE, because the modest resources provided by the government call for a high degree of prudent and transparent management. Then again, considering that headteachers overwhelmingly complained of being overburdened with school administration since the introduction of FPE, it is essential that effective support be given to them to ease their burden.

However, the role played by SMCs was found to be less significant with regard to several other functions. Twenty-eight (47.5%) headteachers indicated that the SMC participated in handling disciplinary cases in the school. Fourteen (23.7%) headteachers indicated the SMC played the role of maintaining academic standards, while 23 (39.0%), stated that the SMC played the role of mobilizing and sensitizing parents on school programmes. It appears that the SMCs have not only been inactive in mobilizing and sensitizing parents but also in mobilizing resources for the school. A small number of nine (15.3%) headteachers indicated the mobilization of resources as a role played by the SMC. As shown elsewhere in this report, the SMC mentioned their role in mobilizing resources as having been watered down and nearly neutralized by the FPE.

School Management Committees were generally regarded by headteachers as being much more supportive than Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs). Forty-seven (79.7%) headteachers indicated that SMCs had given support in school management, while 21(49.2%) headteachers viewed the PTA of their school as having been supportive to the school administration. Headteachers were then asked if they were satisfied with the performance of the SMC, and 40 (67.8%) of them stated that they were satisfied. The headteachers who had expressed satisfaction with the SMC of their schools gave reasons as summarized in Table 4.29.
Table 4.29: *Reasons for Headteachers being satisfied with the SMC*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for contentment with SMC</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMC is supportive of school policy and programmes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of SMC attend meetings and are committed</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of SMC assist in school planning activities</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of SMC help to mobilize resources</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-eight (95%) of the headteachers who expressed satisfaction with performance of their SMC explained that their School Management Committee was supportive of school policy and programmes. An equal number of headteachers also explained that they were satisfied with SMC because the members were committed to the school and availed themselves for meetings. Thirty-six headteachers (90.0%) were satisfied with the SMC because they saw the members as having assisted in the school planning activities. Only 8 (20%) of headteachers who were satisfied with their SMC felt that way because the SMC had helped to mobilize resources. This is not unexpected, as only 15.3% of all the headteachers had, as earlier discussed, indicated the mobilization of resources as a role that had been played by their SMC.

Even though they were in the minority, the 18 (30.5%) headteachers who expressed dissatisfaction with their SMC still constitute a considerable percentage of the headteachers. The reasons for their dissatisfaction were therefore sought and are presented to provide insights into some of the shortcomings of SMCs. The explanations given are summarized Table 4.30.
Table 4.30: Reasons for Headteachers’ Dissatisfaction with SMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for dissatisfaction with SMC</th>
<th>N=18</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMC members are ignorant of their roles</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC members are not committed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC members are lowly educated and thus incapable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC members interfere with smooth running of the school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC members are engaged in clanism, nepotism and partisan politics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*multiple responses were allowed

The most frequently mentioned reason for dissatisfaction with the SMC was what headteachers perceived as ignorance on the part of SMC members of their own roles. Thirteen (72.2%) of the discontented headteachers cited this as the reason for being dissatisfied with their schools’ SMC. This is probably related to another reason that was mentioned by 11(61.1%) of these headteachers: that their SMC had members whose low level of education rendered them incapable of serving efficiently as members of a SMC. Twelve (66.7%) of the discontented headteachers perceived their SMC members as lacking commitment to their work. Indeed, some members of SMCs were said by headteachers and teachers to have shown a very lacklustre attitude towards school affairs. Such individuals were said to be on the committee for their own selfish gains, such as to unduly influence tenders or to gain social clout.

Some members of SMCs were accused of unnecessarily interfering with the smooth running of school. Eleven (55.0%) of the discontented headteachers cited this as the reason for being dissatisfied with the SMC. The headteachers explained that some SMC were composed of individuals who had misinterpreted their role and used their position on school committees to frustrate school administration and oppose every other decision or proposal made. Such members behaved more as an opposition to school administration than as partners. In six schools, headteachers complained that the SMC had on several occasions incited parents against the
school administration and teachers. The antagonism was attributed to procurement issues by headteachers. It was also surprising that some SMC members had misused the school as a theatre for enacting clan rivalry as well partisan politics. Clan differences were mainly manifested in schools that were located in areas with a history of clan supremacy struggles. In such cases, SMC members make tendering, procurement and employment decisions that are in favour of their clansmen. Infact, two such schools were said to have been affected by a perennial conflict in which two protagonist clans had struggled to produce the head teacher and chairperson of the SMC. Five (26.3%) of the discontented headteachers cited clanism, nepotism and partisan politics as a reason for being unhappy with the performance of their SMC.

Headteachers were also asked to point out areas in which they thought SMCs had shown weakness in their role as managers of the school. Headteachers indicated that whereas most SMCs had overall taken an interest in school management affairs, there was an observable lack of the necessary capacities and skills in SMCs to provide management support in financial management, budgeting and curriculum support in schools. Most School Management Committees are composed of members who do not possess managerial skills. The results show that 28(47.5%) of headteachers reported that SMCs were not equipped to deal with financial management; 25(42.4%) reported that SMCs were not equipped to handle budgeting and 24(40.7%) reported that they were not capable of providing curriculum support in schools. These findings concur with those of Nyamute (2006) who found that one of the biggest challenges faced in the management of schools after the introduction of FPE was the lack of management skills among SMCs. He adds that a significant proportion of the SMC members in the rural areas were semi-illiterate.

Eighteen (30.5%) headteachers indicated that SMC had been weak in mobilizing community resources, and a similar number of headteachers reported that SMC had not had not made any impact in enhancing discipline among pupils. School management committees were seen as having failed to meet teachers on a regular
basis to discuss school related problems facing them by 22(37.3%) of the headteachers.

During the interviews, headteachers pointed out some important issues relating to School Management Committees. For instance, there is no set criteria specifying requisite skills a person should possess to qualify for appointment into a SMC. There is simply a requirement that such persons should have a minimum of O-level education. It is difficult to defend the position that anyone with an O-level certificate, and even regardless of his or her performance at form IV, has the ability to serve effectively as a member of a management committee. It was also revealed that service in SMCs is considered voluntary. Because there is no remuneration attached to this responsibility, schools find it difficult to attract professionals to serve on committees and thus end up with languid retirees or lowly educated businesspeople. The result has been a managerial gap in most rural public schools. Whilst elders may bring a wealth of wisdom with them, headteachers complained that such people lack the vigour and dynamism needed to cope with the rapid social, technological and cultural changes in our country.

Senior Ministry of Education officials, when asked to comment on the lack of clear criteria for identifying competent members to serve on SMCs, explained that the Ministry of Education is not directly involved in SMC appointments. Ministry of Education officials at the headquarters emphasized that the Ministry of Education only recommended individuals selected by the panel composed of the Provincial Director of Education, sponsor of the school and local leaders such as the area Member of Parliament. The Ministry of Education officials justified this position by pointing out that the government did not wish to go against the choice of schools’ stakeholders. The Ministry of Education’s role was that of ensuring that the individuals who were selected were people of integrity and who could avail themselves when needed.

Ministry of Education officials reiterated the importance attached to the role of SMCs in implementation of FPE and pointed out that under FPE and the KESSP
initiative, schools were now required to generate 5-year development plans that describe individual schools’ priority areas for investment. School Management Committees (SMCs) and the Parents-Teachers-Associations (PTAs) are expected to participate in developing and endorsing such plans before they are submitted to higher authorities.

School Management Committee members expressed the view that their role in financial management had actually diminished with the introduction of FPE. Whereas in the past they were actively involved in fundraising for schools, and in actual expenditure of funds, with the coming of FPE, actual procurements and financial transactions were left to the head teacher. They also said that they would be willing to play an active role in mobilizing financial support for schools, but their hands were tied by the FPE policy. Parents were said to be generally averse to any suggestions touching on fund raising, and SMC members were regarded more with suspicion and mistrust than as representatives of parents in the school management.

Nevertheless, SMC members said that headteachers generally involved them in the decision-making processes of the school. All the SMC members interviewed reported that they were called upon to assist in prioritizing school needs whenever FPE funds had been wired into school accounts. However, apart from acting as signatories to account withdrawals, they said that their involvement in actual procurement was minimal. Members of the SMCs therefore noted that they found little reason to go to schools frequently because after the meeting that was held upon release of funds, they received very few invitations from headteachers. Considering that funds for FPE are released bi-annually, SMCs are rendered inactive most of the year. Three SMC members resignedly pointed out that since the government now provided all the books and instructional materials, they found that they had no agenda. They felt that their participation prior to FPE was spirited because they had to mobilize parental contributions for several projects and needs. Their role then was perceived as critical to the very survival of schools.
School Management Committee members were asked to point out any aspects of their role as managers in which they felt inadequate to perform effectively. The results show that 56(47.5%) of SMC members reported that they were not adequately equipped to deal with financial management; 41(34.7 %) reported that they were not equipped to handle budgeting and 41(39.8 %) reported that since they were not educational experts, they were not adequately competent to provide curriculum support in schools. They expressed the opinion that they were expected to maintain high academic standards within schools, but could not competently advise on matters such as teaching methods, school examinations and teacher effectiveness.

To understand if SMC members required any training, they were queried on aspects related to their role in which they saw a need for training. Bookkeeping/accounting, budget preparation, guidance and counselling, school development planning and auditing were cited as areas in which there was a perceived need for training the responses are presented in Table 4.31.

**Table 4.31: SMC Members’ Perceived Areas of Training Need**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of training need</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeping/accounting</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget preparation</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School development planning</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of tender documents, contract deeds</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counselling</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*multiple responses were allowed*

Sixty-five (55.1%) members of SMCs interviewed indicated that they would desire some training in accounting. This area was found to be particularly challenging by many of the SMC members. They expressed the opinion that in order to be effective managers, they needed to be fully conversant with accounting processes. This is related to the need for training in auditing, which was cited by 39(33.1%) of SMC members interviewed. It was felt that some basic training in auditing would
enhance their capacity to review school financial management as required of them. Budget preparation, a process that requires the participation of the SMC, was cited by 50(42.4%) members as an area of training need. School development planning, mentioned by 48(40.7%) of SMC members as an area of training need, was seen as being highly technical. Members mentioned that comprehensive School Development Plans employed the use of tables and log frames, tools that, in their opinion, required some technical understanding to develop. Lastly, 45(38.1%) SMC members indicated they needed training in guidance and counselling. It was reported that the guidance and counselling needs in schools were diverse; teachers, pupils and parents alike present situations that call for guidance and counselling. SMC members felt that whereas guidance and counselling fitted well within their role, they were limited in their capacity by lack of skills to effectively conduct the same.

In summing up their role in school management, Schools Management Committees (SMCs) felt that they are seriously inhibited with regard to improving the state of learning facilities in schools. This, they explained, is due to the government's ban on any additional school levies. Whereas government policy gives provision for charging of nominal levies where there is a justifiable need, the process of applying for and being granted permission by the Ministry of Education was said to be very cumbersome and frustrating. In any case, parents are under no obligation to pay additional levies and success of any fundraising initiatives depends entirely on goodwill by the community. Such goodwill was said to be mostly absent. In fact, SMC members complained that with the introduction of FPE, many parents began to view the SMCs as irrelevant.

4.7 How FPE was funded and the Prospects of its Sustainability

The immediate and inevitable financial implication for the Kenya government after introduction of FPE was a phenomenal increase in expenditure on primary education of 3.2 billion shillings. Considering the huge enrolments that were experienced, the financing needs became even more substantial, such that in the
absence of adequate funding, there was a real risk of the freshly enrolled pupils failing to learn much in the public primary schools. This study therefore sought to examine the sources of funding for FPE, and the issues and concerns related to funding. At the same time, from the data obtained on funding, an analysis was made of the sustainability of FPE. The research question used to interrogate these concerns was ‘How has FPE been funded and what are the prospects of its sustainability?’ Pertinent data that answered this research question was mainly gathered from interviews with senior Ministry of Education of education officials at the headquarters. Secondary sources of data from the Ministry of Education were inevitably also used for statistical data. Information gathered from teachers and headteachers supplemented the major sources of information.

4.7.1 Funding of FPE

After Free Primary Education was introduced, the government was left with a greater role in the provision of primary education. The new role encompassed mobilization of resources, paying tuition fees, training, recruitment and paying teachers, and the provision of infrastructure and instructional materials. Parents on the other hand were required to provide basic needs for their children such as school uniforms, food and transport to school where necessary.

Ministry of Education officials who were interviewed in this study revealed that the hype that accompanied the introduction of FPE and the political investment in UPE that had been made by the incoming government which had used FPE as a campaign promise, made the necessity to invest heavily for the success of FPE a high-stakes matter. Urgent financial arrangements had to be made to enable the Government to deliver on its commitment to FPE. Unfortunately, all this was happening against a backdrop of poor economic performance by the country. As pointed out in the Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2004(Republic of Kenya, 2004b), the slow expansion of the economy during the 1990s had led to a situation where government expenditure needs continued to exceed available resources. The Director of Policy and Planning in the Ministry of Education explained that by
2004, as the country made effort to manage FPE and to restructure expenditure allocations across sectors to ensure the provision of basic services, the education sector had the largest share of social spending. The education sector at this point enjoyed an allocation of a quarter of the Government’s available resources. Table 4.32 presents the picture of the budgetary trends for education in general for the period immediately preceding and following the introduction of FPE.

Table 4.32: Overall Education Budget in Kenya (Kshs. Billions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Recurrent expenditure</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Development expenditure</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Total Kshs. (Billions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999/2000</td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td>98.63</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>48.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>48.71</td>
<td>97.81</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>49.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>53.74</td>
<td>95.39</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>56.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>61.60</td>
<td>92.76</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>66.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>71.80</td>
<td>89.49</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>80.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOEST (www.education.go.ke)

In the 2003/04 financial year, as the implementation of FPE began, there was a sharp increase of Kshs. 13.82 billion (20.8%) in the government’s overall education budget. This brought government allocation for education to Kshs. 80.23 billion. An explanation was sought from Ministry of Education officials on this allocation and it was clarified that other than expenditure on salaries, much of this money (over Kshs. 7.6 billion) was specifically allocated to the FPE programme. The donor community responded by supporting the FPE initiative. In June, 2003, for example, the World Bank gave a grant of Kshs. 3.7 billion, while the British government through the Department for International Development offered Kshs. 1.6 billion.

There were other significant donors such as the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) which provided Kshs. 1.2 billion, the Swedish government which gave Kshs. 430 million and UNICEF which gave Kshs. 250 million (Commonwealth Education Fund & Elimu Yetu Coalition, 2003). It thus
could be immediately noted that donor funds played a significant role in funding FPE. Then also, the funds awarded to Kenya in donor support, though welcome and impressive, pointed to the fact that the country was not fully prepared for the FPE that it had so boldly introduced. Much of the increase in educational expenditure is attributable to the implementation of FPE. Table 4.33 illustrates budgetary allocation towards primary education during the period immediately preceding and following the introduction of FPE.

Table 4.33: Primary Schools Education Budget (Kshs. Billions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Recurrent</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>As % of Total Education Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999/2000</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>62.97%</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>37.03%</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>77.57%</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>22.43%</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>83.18%</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>16.82%</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>80.66%</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>19.34%</td>
<td>4.116</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>50.67%</td>
<td><strong>5.813</strong></td>
<td>49.33%</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td><strong>14.69%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MOEST (www.education.go.ke)

Between FY 1999/2000 and 2002/2003, which is the period before FPE, the allocation to primary education as a percentage of the total education budget lay between 1.58% and 6.20%. During the same period, it was lowest (1.58%) as a percentage of the total education budget in FY 2001/2002. The allocation rose appreciably in 2002/2003 to a high of 6.2%, just before the introduction of FPE (FPE began in the second half of the 2002/03 financial year). During the financial year that started after introduction of FPE, the allocation to primary education as a percentage of the total education sector budget rose to 14.69%, reflecting both the importance attached by government to FPE, as well as the soaring demands of the programme. A colossal Kshs. 7.667 billion increase was made in the primary education budget from FY 2002/2003 to 2003/2004. Whereas in the four financial years preceding FPE development expenditure on primary education had never gone beyond the Kshs. 1 billion mark, it rose sharply to Kshs. 5.813 billion in
2003/2004. Evidently, the primary education sub-sector was beginning to consume unprecedented levels of exchequer funds.

It was reported by the Director of Policy and Planning that prior to FPE, towards the late 1990s, the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) was the only donor providing significant support to primary education. This support was stepped up upon the introduction of FPE. The World Bank Report No: 2565 shows that the DFID provided U$18 million of financial support for the purchase of learning materials for needy primary school pupils through the SPRED III programme and $3 million for distance learning, school-based teacher development programme during the year 2003. Whereas the procedures were said to have been working well, financial support was modest due to the country’s national budget limitations (World Bank, 2003). Urgent financial arrangements had to be made to enable the Government to deliver on its commitment to FPE.

According to Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2004, the average Government spending on education and training has ranged between 5 and 7 percent of the GDP and the recurrent Government spending on education has been higher than any other social sector spending. For example, education’s recurrent budget rose from 35 percent of public sector recurrent budget in 2000 to 39 percent in 2004. Fifty percent of the of the total allocation to the MOES&T went to primary education, with about 85 percent of the fiscal resources to primary schools being used to pay teachers’ salaries. Most notably however, as a result of the implementation of FPE, development expenditure has increased since 2003, resulting in little allocation being left for other sub-sectors (ROK, 2004b). Figure 4.1 below presents a comparison of Central Government Expenditure on Social Services for FY 2003/04. As can be observed in the figure, the expenditure by MOES&T by far outweighs that on other social services represented by the Ministry of Home Affairs, National Heritage and Sports (MOHANH&S), Ministry of Health( MOH) , and the Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development (MOL&HRD).
In FY 2003/2004, the expenditure by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOES&T) amounted to 73% of the total Government Expenditure on Social Services, followed by the Ministry of Health (MOH), which consumed 19% of the expenditure. The Ministry of Home Affairs, National Heritage and Sports (MOHANH&S) used up 6%, while the Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development (MOL&HRD) took up just 2% of the total government expenditure on social services.

The Director of Policy and Planning indicated that the heavy investment in education that was being borne by the Kenya Government called for strong collaboration and partnership with other stakeholders to mitigate the challenges. He noted that without a working partnership on financing, it would have been hard to address the problems of inadequate access, inequity, low quality and the heavy household financial burden. Thus, to address the challenges that relate to financing education, the government sought to work with partners to mobilize additional
resources to finance education. This led to the development of a sector-wide Strategic Plan that gave birth to the Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP). The KESSP provided mechanisms for collaboration by all stakeholders in programme implementation and financing.

Interviews with officials at the Ministry of Education headquarters explicated the justification for KESSP. It was noted that the KESSP provided an appropriate basis for coordinated external assistance to a SWAP. Through KESSP’s pooled-funding approach, the Ministry of Education is able to better coordinate funding as well as address monitoring and evaluation concerns. It was further explained that KESPP has enhanced the forging of productive relationship and close liaison between the donor community and the government. Indeed, KESSP was built through a partnership between the Kenya government and donors such as the World Bank and DFID to implement a long-term education sector development programme based on a sector-wide approach (SWAp) in 2005.

The KESSP is a five-year programme (2005-2010) that is structured into 23 Investment Programmes (IP), through which the recurrent costs relating to all levels of the education system in Kenya are outlined. The KESSP presents an overall picture of the resources required for its full implementation, and is seen as the vehicle through which the government intends to provide quality education and training. KESSP acts as the implementation framework for Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005. The cost scenario over the five-year period totals KSh. 543 billion (US$ 7.2 billion), with the bulk of the funding estimated at Kshs. 481 billion (89%) expected to come from the Government (Republic of Kenya, 2005b). Therefore, even with generous amounts proposed to come from donors, the greater financial burden for the programme rests with the government.

An examination of funding for the FPE programme is therefore best seen through the KESSP framework. The KESSP Investment Programmes (IPs) that are directly related to primary education (and thus FPE) are Primary School Infrastructure IP, Primary School Instructional Materials IP, School Health, Nutrition and Feeding
IP, Special Needs Education IP, Quality Assurance and Standards IP and the In-Service Primary Teacher Training IP. Several other IPs, touch on primary education, but either in a secondary or peripheral manner. These include Pre-Service Primary Teacher Education IP, Expanding Educational Opportunity in ASALs IP, Capacity Building IP, EMIS IP, ICT in Education IP, Guidance and Counselling IP, Teacher Management IP and the Monitoring and Evaluation IP.

The senior officer at the Ministry of Education’s Directorate of Policy and Planning was asked to indicate the major sources of funding for Free Primary Education. While a list of the major sources of finding was provided, it was noted that the several donors who had supported FPE did so through the KESSP pooled fund basket. As such, some of the KESSP funds were channelled to levels of education other than primary schooling. Overall, primary education enjoyed the bulk of the financial resources pooled under KESSP. It was noted that the different donors channel the funds for education through KESSP, but they did so at different times and in various independent tranches. It was further clarified that the different donors prescribed varying conditions before the release of funds. For example, some of the donors insisted on providing funds for specific components of the KESSP. The major sources of funds mentioned were as follows:

- The Government of Kenya (GoK)
- Department for International Development (DFID)
- International Development Association (IDA)
- Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA),
- United Nations Children’s Educational Fund (UNICEF)
- Organization of Oil Exporting Countries (OPEC)
- The Fast Track Initiative (FTI)
- World Food Programme (WFP)
- USAID.

As of mid 2008, the major donors towards KESSP had contributed a total of Kshs. 296,428,804,326 to the programme. Table 4.34 shows the amounts contributed by individual donors as well the government in support of KESSP.
Table 4.34: Support Given by Donors /GOK towards Education in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Financial Year 2008 contribution</th>
<th>Cumulative Contribution to KESSP upto June 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOK</td>
<td>97,131,597,010</td>
<td>279,070,116,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>1,423,013,760</td>
<td>3,926,531,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDA(FPESP)</td>
<td>1,241,000,000</td>
<td>2,999,736,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>450,000,000</td>
<td>1,330,660,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVOB-Belgium</td>
<td>2,869,493</td>
<td>3,699,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>80,553,018</td>
<td>412,373,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB/ADF</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>6,411,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC</td>
<td>223,000,000</td>
<td>411,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTI</td>
<td>3,093,970,000</td>
<td>6,430,870,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>403,345,862</td>
<td>1,627,005,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>210,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>104,055,349,143</strong></td>
<td><strong>296,428,804,326</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For the period starting from the year 2005 when KESSP was established, until the end of the 2007/2008 FY, the government of Kenya provided the bulk of the funding for the education sector. Still, a considerable amount of money, totalling Kshs. 17,358,687,940 was received from the donor community to help ease the gap in financing. The most outstanding contributions received from the donor community were from DFID, the Fast Track Initiative (FTI), World Food Programme (WFP), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and the International Development Association (IDA) through the Free Primary Education Support Programme (FPESP). All of these mentioned provided funding support in excess of Kshs.1 billion.

During the period 2005 to 2008 described above, free primary education used up Kshs. Kshs.16, 521,704, 993. Table 4.35 summarises the expenditure on education and training during this period vis a vis the expenditure on FPE alone.
Table 4.35: GOK Expenditure on Education under KESSP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure item</th>
<th>Financial Year 2008 (Kshs.)</th>
<th>Cumulative expenditure under KESSP upto June 2008 (Kshs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost of MOE-based IPs</td>
<td>17,376,695,677</td>
<td>37,884,583,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>16,521,704,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other MoE costs( administration, construction, equipment)</td>
<td>86,453,300,730</td>
<td>237,756,031,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign exchange loss/gain</td>
<td>1,015,974</td>
<td>2,510,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total MoE expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,828,980,433</strong></td>
<td><strong>292,164,830,350</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost of non MoE- based IPs</td>
<td>1,667,216,266</td>
<td>3,057,576,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure on education</strong></td>
<td><strong>105,496,196,699</strong></td>
<td><strong>295,222,406,476</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: KESSP Secretariat*

The total expenditure on Ministry of Education-based IPs for the KESSP period upto 2008 was Kshs. 37,884,583,193. Money that had been specifically channelled towards Free Primary Education over the same period amounted to Kshs. 16,521,704,993. Not all the IPs are Ministry of Education-Based. For example, the TIVET IP and the University Education belong to the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology. However, all funding for KESSP is channelled through the Ministry of Education account. The total expenditure on non MOE-based IPs was Kshs. 3,057,576,126. It is worth noting that a huge proportion of the expenditure by the Ministry of Education goes to ministry administration, operations, constructions and equipment. This area of expenditure gobbled up Kshs. 237,756,031,173, representing 80.5% of the total expenditure on education over the KESSP period upto year 2008. This is a colossal amount, and cost-cutting measures could explore this area to generate savings.

It was useful for this study to interrogate the distribution of FPE funds and therefore the prioritization of expenditure on primary education. The Director of Policy and Planning explained that the Ministry of Education had placed great emphasis on instructional materials followed by the construction of school infrastructure. For this reason, most of the FPE funds were allocated to the provision of instructional materials such as chalk, exercise books, textbooks, pencils, pens, charts and wall maps. The rationale for this is that without
instructional materials being provided first, no meaningful learning could be undertaken in schools. It is also argued by the Ministry of Education that prior to the introduction of FPE, many pupils were kept out of schools by the inability to afford books and other relevant scholastic materials. Many others attended school but were greatly disadvantaged by the fact that they lacked adequate books to enable them to perform as well as their more privileged counterparts. The need to invest highly in textbooks was made even more urgent by the change in curriculum that had been affected in primary schools. In addition, to improve the teaching of sciences in primary schools, science kits were provided to all primary schools. The provision of instructional materials, explained the Director, has had an equalizing effect on primary education, thereby increasing equity and access all at once. The Director revealed that as of mid-2008, the primary school Instructional Materials IP had expended slightly over Kshs. 17 billion since the establishment of KESSP. This is as compared to the next highest expenditure programme, the Primary School Infrastructure IP, which had consumed Ksh. 3 billion during the same period.

It was revealed that the attention given to primary school infrastructure was as a result of the Ministry of Education having identified this as one of the major barriers to improving access to primary education in the country. The director observed that whereas communities had invested considerable effort in developing primary school infrastructure over the years, over time, there accumulated a backlog in infrastructure provision in the poorer communities. Many schools also have poorly maintained or shoddily constructed buildings. This, added to the highly scattered dispersion of schools in remote areas of the country, made it necessary for the Ministry of Education to invest more in school infrastructure.

According to information gathered from the Directorate of Policy and Planning, additional funding for construction of school buildings had been secured from donors, namely the USAID, which focused on North Eastern province, OPEC which built over 1,000 classrooms countrywide, the World Bank and the European Union. The CDF and LATF were also cited as having been instrumental sources of funding for infrastructural development in primary schools in the country.
Other areas that had expended over Kshs. 1 billion during the same period were Special Needs Education IP and the School Health, Nutrition and Feeding and IP. Special needs was said to be receiving much attention from the Ministry of Education because FPE had attracted many previously excluded learners with special needs into primary schools. Furthermore, to provide free primary education without addressing the needs of such disadvantaged pupils would defeat the purpose of providing educational opportunity for all children. Many of the children with special needs would be unable to benefit from ‘Free Primary Education’ if arrangements were not made to meet their special requirements such as assessment tools, hearing aids, braille machines and other specialized equipment. For schools with integrated special units, it is also necessary for teachers to be given training in special needs education.

Other than identifying the sources of funding and the general allocation of funds for FPE, it was also important to examine the adequacy of funding as well as to identify any challenges at the ministry level related to funding. The Director of Policy and Planning and the selected IP team leaders were interviewed to shed light on these aspects of funding. These senior officers at the Ministry of Education headquarters unanimously expressed the opinion that whereas funding for the various FPE needs had been impressive so far, it nonetheless fell short of what was required. It was also reported that the level of funding from donors has improved over the years, enabling the government therefore to better cope with the demands of FPE. Luckily, in spite of the financial challenges, disbursement of the Kshs.1, 020 per capita grants to schools had been completed every year. It was noted nevertheless that the delays that had been perennially experienced in the disbursement of funds to schools were occasioned by delays in donor funding. Some of the donors in the KESSP pool were said to have held up disbursements by as long as five months into the financial year. This in turn led to delay in disbursement of per capita grants to schools. The Ministry of Education always gives priority to school per capita grants, hence other programmes such as capacity building, end up suffering postponement, some times being rescheduled by a year. A demonstration of the financial challenges facing the FPE was manifested recently.
in the first term of 2009 school year when funds had not been disbursed to schools as late as early March. This was more than ten weeks into the school term.

The IP leaders reported examples to demonstrate the inadequacy of funds. In 2008, for example, the disbursement of phase III funds to schools for infrastructure fell short of target due to inadequacy of financial resources. The planned procurement of equipment for Special Needs Education in regular schools could not be made as no funds for this were made available to the SNE IP. During the same year, only 60 out of the 1500 Teachers’ Advisory Centre (TAC) tutors were trained on effective management of TACs. While 1,050 TAC tutors were scheduled for training to enhance their capacity to support teachers in public primary schools, only 193 were trained due to insufficient funds.

The head of the Primary School Infrastructure IP complained that in 2007, not only did the funds arrive late in the financial year, they were also inadequate. This also meant that construction targets were not achieved by the Primary School Infrastructure IP. Further, funds for construction in the previous years had been less than anticipated and arrived in the last month of the financial year, which was too late. Due to the low levels of funding, rather than construct new schools in ASAL areas as planned, priority was given to the refurbishment of schools with dilapidated or semi-permanent structures.

The Special Needs Education IP leader also pointed out some challenges faced in funding the programme. During the year 2007, the planned special needs education survey that sought to assess equipment, education and training was shelved for lack of funds. The survey was initially planned for the year 2005, but was postponed twice. The Ministry of Education was also unable to sponsor teachers for in-service training in SNE as planned, hence, it could not guarantee the effective use of capitation grants that were disbursed to schools identified as having learners with special needs (SN). Since no funds were provided for the component, it was also not possible for the Ministry of Education to strengthen the capacity of educational assessment centers to enable them to carry out early assessment, placement and
rehabilitation of children with special needs. Whereas funds were disbursed to special schools and special units for purchase of SN teaching and learning materials, it was not possible to do the same for regular schools as planned in 2006. This, again, was attributed to a shortage of funds. The head of KESSP secretariat added that the Guidance and Counselling IP, which sometimes complements SNE and has become increasingly necessary with FPE, had received no funds from the time of KESSP’s inception till 2007.

As of June 2008 when the Ministry of Education conducted a Financial Monitoring Report (FMR) for its fourth quarter performance under KESSP, a financing gap of Kshs. 7,770.81 million was reported for the 6 months’ projections leading to December 2008 (Republic of Kenya, 2008). The FMR further reveals deficits in financing that have been suffered by the education sector since the inception of KESSP. Table 4.36 summarizes the deficit scenario as of year 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Total forecast for IPs expenditure (6 monhts upto Dec, 2008)</td>
<td>10,611.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Total balances available (GoK &amp; Development Partners)</td>
<td>141.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Total new funds required (a-b)</td>
<td>10,469.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. (Less) scheduled development partner payments</td>
<td>4,240.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required GOK financing for IPs (c-d)</td>
<td>6,229.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available GoK funding</td>
<td>16,727.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KESSP cumulative deficit</td>
<td>18,268.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financing gap</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,770.80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from: Republic of Kenya (2008a) KESSP FMR*

Table 4.36 summarizes the Financial Monitoring Report for KESSP for the period ended last quarter of 2007/2008 FY as at 30th June 2008. The total forecast for the 6 months up to December 2008 based on original KESSP costings was Kshs.
10,611.17 million. The total fund balances available in the MOE pooled KESSP Account, exchequer and Development Partner Foreign Currency Accounts was Kshs. 141.36 million, hence the government required Kshs. 10,469.81 million. The scheduled development partner payments (July to December, 2008) amounted to Kshs. 4,240.12 million, thus, the government was required to finance Kshs. 6,229.69 million. The available Government of Kenya funding for the projected period at this point was Kshs. 16,727.19, but the cumulative KESSP deficit was Kshs. 18,268.30 million. Therefore, as of the end of FY 2008, the government had a net KESSP deficit in the financing of the education sector of Kshs. 7,770.80 million. The KESSP deficit is illustrated below in Table 4.37 provided by the KESSP Secretariat.

**Table 4.37: KESSP Cumulative Deficit (Kshs. million)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005/06 KESSP costings</th>
<th>2006/07 KESSP costings</th>
<th>2007/08 KESSP costings</th>
<th>Total Costings</th>
<th>Cumulative expenditure totals(KESSP life up to end of last quarter 2007/2008)</th>
<th>Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D=A+B+C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F=D-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,208.01</td>
<td>19,929.22</td>
<td>21,073.23</td>
<td>59,210.46</td>
<td>40,942.16</td>
<td>18,268.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: KESSP Secretariat, 2008*

Whereas the total original costing for KESSP between 2005 and 2008 were Kshs. 59,210.46 million, the total expenditure from inception until June, 2008 was Kshs. 40,942.16 million. This indicates a huge deficit of Kshs. 18,268.3 million. The education sector therefore was unable to meet its targeted activities over this period owing to the deficit indicated. This implies also that government of Kenya, despite having made huge investments in education, was still struggling to secure adequate financing for the sector.

The Director of Policy and Planning explained that the financing gap for the KESSP has been growing because of several reasons. Some of the reasons given were: the cost of KESSP inputs and activities had escalated due to a higher than anticipated inflation rates; the unforeseen needs of Internally Displaced Persons
(IDPs) the 2007 post-election violence; the implementation of the Free Secondary Day Education (FSDE) policy in 2008; the imposition by government of austerity measures on all ministries to reduce expenditures by 10 percent in the 2008 and the increased cost of the school feeding programme due to growing food and fuel prices.

4.7.2 Sustainability of FPE
At the beginning of FPE, criticism was levelled against the government for not giving ample time for stakeholders to prepare for the change. The government maintained its resolve to provide FPE to all schoolchildren in public schools against all odds. Soon, the challenges became apparent, and this raised concern about the sustainability of the FPE programme. The challenges faced in financing FPE and the reliance on donor funding to supplement government resources give credence to concerns about the sustainability of FPE. The fact that Kenya has in the past experimented with the abolition of fees in public primary schools without success, further justifies some level of pessimism about the sustainability of FPE.

When asked if they thought FPE was sustainable, 87 (49.15%) teachers thought that FPE was not sustainable in the long-term, 80(45.19%) thought it was sustainable, while 10 (5.6%) teachers indicated they could not tell. The almost 50-50 response to this question suggests the kind of uncertainty that many people have regarding the sustainability of FPE. It was however more important to understand the reasons why some teachers thought the programme was sustainable and why the others thought it was not. The different reasons given by the 80 teachers for thinking that FPE was sustainable were:

- The drive towards UPE is a global phenomenon that cannot be resisted; the country has to keep to FPE. This reason was cited by 49(61.3 %)* teachers.
- Kenyans, having seen the benefits of giving access to primary children will not accept anything less from the government. This reason was cited by 45(56.3%)* teachers.
The current or any other government cannot want to take the blame for failing to provide universal access to primary education. This was cited by 36 (45%) teachers.

- The government is capable of paying for FPE. This was cited by 30 (37.5%) teachers.

(*NB: figures are as a percentage of the 80 teachers who said YES. Multiple responses were allowed)

The teachers who felt that FPE was not sustainable gave the following reasons:

- FPE is too expensive for the Kenya government to sustain over the long-term. The Kenya economy is not capable of financing FPE for long. This reason was cited by 80 (92%) teachers.
- FPE relies too heavily on donor support which may not be guaranteed in the long term. This reason was cited by 60 (70.1%) teachers.
- Fee creep is bound to occur after some time. This reason was cited by 44 (50.6%) teachers.
- Government capitation grants are too little to sustain schools over time. This reason was cited by 45 (51.7%) teachers.
- The lack of community support since introduction of FPE will lead to its collapse. This reason was cited by 35 (40.2%) teachers.
- The perennial delays in fund disbursement to schools are an indicator that the government is struggling to sustain FPE. This reason was cited by 30 (34.5%) teachers.
- FPE collapsed before, and will collapse again. This reason was cited by 30 (34.5%) teachers.

(*NB: figures are as a percentage of the 87 teachers who said NO. Multiple responses were allowed)

Headteachers gave a more guarded response to the question. When queried on whether they thought FPE was sustainable or not, 24 (40.7%) of the headteachers said it was difficult to tell, 21 (35.6%) thought it was sustainable, while 14 (23.7%) thought it was not sustainable. Headteachers gave more or less the same reasons as had been given by teachers. Headteachers and teachers who indicated that it was
difficult to tell, gave the explanations that it was still too early to tell, or that they were not sure of the measures taken by the government to ensure the sustainability of FPE.

Headteachers and teachers were then asked what, if anything, could be done to ensure the sustainability of FPE. Interestingly, virtually all the headteachers and teachers gave one or other explanation of what could be done to ensure sustainability of FPE. An important interpretation may be made from this; whereas some of the headteachers and teachers may have indicated that the FPE was not sustainable, they nevertheless were expressing the conviction that under certain circumstances, the sustainability of FPE could be guaranteed or enhanced.

From the responses by headteachers and teachers, several thoughts emerged as describing the most prominently proposed circumstances that would guarantee the sustainability of FPE. Firstly, it was proposed that the government should increase the per capita allocation to schools to ensure that there were sufficient funds to cater for infrastructural development and maintenance. Secondly, it was frequently mentioned that the reliance on donor funding to supplement government resources for FPE should be minimized. Thus, the government should find ways of bolstering its own revenue base to be able to fund FPE even without external assistance. Teachers expressed the opinion that it was only when the government could accumulate enough resources of its own to fund FPE that it could be said to be sustainable. Thirdly, it was felt that FPE could be sustainable if parents and communities were made to contribute more towards primary education. Teachers pointed out that many parents had misunderstood the FPE initiative and had thus abdicated their role as important stakeholders and contributors. It was felt that if this insidious indifference is left to go on for long, it will be difficult for the government to provide instructional materials as well as maintain and construct physical infrastructure in all the schools around the country. Concern about sustainability of the FPE initiative has continued to occupy the discourse on primary education in Kenya. Sawamura & Sifuna (2008) for example, note that it was becoming clear that UPE in Kenya was not going to be achieved using the
government’s resources alone and that more contribution from parents might be necessary, considering the government’s financial constraints.

Free Primary Education was introduced by the NARC government as a political selling point and has enjoyed immense goodwill from the government. There was pervasive apprehension among teachers however, that future governments may not extend as much goodwill to FPE. Fortunately, Kenya’s new constitution (endorsed by a referendum vote on August 4th, 2010) clearly asserts that right of every child to Free Basic Education. What remains, therefore, is explicit mechanisms to enforce this right to Free Basic Education by ensuring all children of school-going age attend school. Provisions that declare right to education do not in themselves guarantee compliance.

Teachers were also particularly perturbed by the heavy workload they had as result of large influx of pupils after FPE was introduced. This was seen by teachers as one of the major concerns that could place the sustainability of FPE in jeopardy. According to them, an important step in ensuring the sustainability of FPE would be to urgently employ more teachers in schools that had suffered massive enrolments. Unless this was done, teachers in the affected schools may soon succumb to fatigue and serious erosion of morale. Such an eventuality could spell doom for teaching and learning in primary schools, thereby lowering quality of schooling. Sawamura and Sifuna (2008) observe that due to the acute teacher shortages that were experienced in primary schools after the introduction of FPE, teachers became less motivated because they felt overworked. It became less possible for teachers to effectively manage the large classes, teacher-pupil interaction was minimised and therefore the slow learners were disadvantaged. They conclude that this led to a decline in the quality of education in many public primary schools. The observations made by Sawamura and Sifuna (2008) raise the concern that the government might have placed emphasis on attendance and enrolment at the expense of the quality of teaching and learning.
Teachers also proposed that examination fees should be waived for the very poor pupils. It was noted that when many of the poor pupils who had joined lower primary school reach standard 8, a crisis might emerge if they cannot pay examination fees. In addition, this could have a demoralizing effect on many others, with the risk that they could withdraw from school altogether. Also related to the issue of poverty were the inequalities that exist among different schools and regions of the country. It was proposed that poorer schools (and schools in poor settings) should receive preferential treatment in the disbursement of funds and allocation of other resources. This would help to attract and retain children from poor backgrounds in school, thereby enhancing the sustainability of the FPE endeavour. In addition, several teachers expressed that fact some pupils are kept away from school by hunger. Whereas effort has been made to feed children in the ASAL areas through the School Feeding Programme, teachers pointed out that there are many children in non-ASAL who were food-poor and who either failed to attend school or lacked concentration in the classroom. Providing a meal for such children would contribute to the sustainability of FPE.

Of the seven officers interviewed at the Ministry of Education headquarters, three categorically cast their doubts about the sustainability of the FPE. The rest preferred to take a more reflective position on the matter. They instead, chose to highlight the kind of conditions that would support the sustainability of FPE. It could be that being senior Ministry of Education officials, these officials felt it was their responsibility to have an optimistic stance towards FPE, or that they felt uncomfortable sounding critical of the government they served. It could also imply that these officers were optimistic that FPE was sustainable. What is more revealing nevertheless is that Ministry of Education officials conceded that the challenge of funding FPE was immense. The officers expressed the opinion that FPE was placing a heavy burden on the education sector, and that the Ministry of Education’s financial resources had been stretched to the limits.

The officers added that for FPE to succeed, it would be necessary for the government to invest more financial resources. For the government to be able to
invest more resources in primary education, it would be critical to build on the current improvements in revenue collection by widening and diversifying the government’s revenue base. It would also call for greater efficiency in resource utilisation across government ministries and departments. This implies that such structures should be put in place that ensure greater fiscal discipline and transparency. The sector-wide approach that was adopted after the introduction of FPE was said to have both improved the planning and implementation of sector programmes as well as consolidated funding. Ministry of Education officials expressed concern that KESSP, which has been instrumental in realizing the achievements in the education sector as a whole and FPE in particular, was scheduled to close in 2010. It was revealed however, that the Ministry of Education had initiated negotiations with stakeholders for an extension, and it was hoped that an additional phase would be introduced after 2010.

Lastly, Ministry of Education officials observed that the current arrangement where the government undertakes the provision of resources for both instructional materials and physical development was not sustainable. It was proposed that a more sustainable model would be to ensure more community participation in provision of some of the facilities, without necessarily disadvantaging the poor parents who cannot afford to pay money. It was suggested that if communities adopted greater sense of ownership of schools, the voluntary support they provide could have a significant affect on school resourcing. In the same vein, if schools initiated income-generating projects, the money raised could be used to subsidise government efforts in FPE.

Based on concerns expressed with regard to financing of FPE in Kenya, it can be observed that the issue of financial sustainability of fee abolition needs to be addressed seriously. Fee abolition in Kenya evidently occasioned cost complexities that resulted in major budget pressures. The government of Kenya will have to examine how it can better mobilize and manage financial resources and sustain the policy within the strained education and national budgetary provisions beyond the short term. The difficulties encountered in financing FPE demand that the country
rethinks and revises its budget strategies so as to balance financing needs firstly, from within its education budget, then from its national budget and finally from external donor funding.

By focusing scrutiny on a few principal concerns, the sustainability of FPE can be examined from an analytical perspective. Five concerns emerge as fundamental to any discourse on sustainability of FPE in Kenya: budgetary provisions and constraints, the country’s economic performance, donor support, the KESSP initiative, political commitment and community involvement and support. Firstly, the government has continued to invest heavily in education as a whole and FPE in particular. In Kenya, 28% of the national budget goes to education and this is hardly sustainable, given the competing demand for funding by others sectors of the economy. According to the National Report on the Development of Education in Kenya (Republic of Kenya, 2008b), about 40% of Kenya’s national recurrent expenditure goes to education, a figure that translates to 7% of the GDP. As shown earlier, the greater part of this financial resources are spent on primary schooling.

The Education Sector Report for 2008 concedes that the total resources available to the education sector for the 2008/2009 FY amount to Kshs.131,231 million. The report further explains that this amount is inadequate for the sector’s envisaged programmes and reflects a resource gap of Kshs.14, 374 million (Republic of Kenya, 2008c). The current cost of FPE is way beyond the normal education budget allocation. The percentage of total Government spending on education (both recurrent and development) shot up to 26.13 per cent on average between 2003 and 2008. In absolute terms the expenditure has steadily increased from Kshs. 72.29 billion in 2003/04 to Kshs. 114.36 billion in 2007/08 (United Nations- E SC / GoK. , 2008). Then, as explained earlier, the primary school education budget as a percentage of total education budget increased significantly from below 2.11% in the years preceding FPE to highs of 6.2% in 2002/2003 and then 14.69% in 2003/2004. This trend has been maintained.
From the interview conducted with the Director of Policy and Planning, it was revealed that since the launching of FPE in 2003, there has been a high demand for teachers. While the country has enough qualified teachers that could be employed, it does not have the resources to hire them. Ironically, the wage bill for teachers consumes 84% of the Ministry of Education budget. This has important implications for the sustainability of FPE. Teachers who were interviewed in the study lamented the shortage of teachers as an important challenge that faced the implementation of FPE and one which had a bearing on the sustainability of the programme.

With regard to performance of the economy, Kenya has had mixed results. After the major decline of the 1990s, recovery was reported in the years following the elections of 2002. According to the Vision 2030 Medium Term Plan [MTP] (Republic of Kenya, 2008d), real GDP expanded by 5.3 percent on average over the 2003-2007 period. Economic growth rose steadily from 0.5 percent in 2002 to an estimated 7.0 percent per annum in 2007. The MTP however, laments that that lack of fiscal discipline and the resultant increase in domestic borrowing, high interest rates and a return to high debt level experienced prior to the ERS could threaten macroeconomic stability. Under Vision 2030, the government ambitiously intends to scale up economic growth to 10 % per annum by 2012. The MTP however, cautions that further upscaling to 10 % per annum as envisaged under Vision 2030 will be a major challenge, considering the historical averages. It notes that few countries, other than those endowed with substantial natural resources or fast reformers like China, have been able to scale up growth to 10 % and to sustain it around there for a long period. Kenya scores weakly on the two ingredients. For the Kenyan economy to grow on such a sustained basis, the country would have to mobilize larger amounts of resources.

The other factor that will influence FPE’s prospects is the donor community. Even though donors contribute only about 10% of the support for the education sector, their contribution has immensely cushioned the finance gaps in Kenya’s funding for FPE. It can only be hoped that this donor assistance shall be sustained over the
long term to assist Kenya in the drive towards UPE. However, the major concern with regard to the sustainability of FPE in Kenya is reliability of donor funding. In the past, donor support for developing countries has not always been reliable, as donor interests and relationships with governments may change direction over time. The reliance on donors to support FPE in Kenya, places the prospects of FPE sustainability at risk. In addition, donors may not necessarily feel obligated to fill financing gaps, or may have their own criteria for disbursements that could be unfavourable to the country. In 2006, for example, The EFA-Fast Track Initiative’s (FTI) Catalytic Fund (CF) acknowledged that Kenya’s estimated funding needs for education in 2006 and 2007 amounted to 85.4 and 144.5 US $ millions respectively. However, the FTI Secretariat made the decision to provide US $24.2 million, leaving a huge financing gap (Fast Track Initiative, 2006). Ministry of Education officials confirmed that funding from FTI was scheduled to end in 2008 and it was feared that the absence of Education for All (EFA)-Fast Track Initiative (FTI) grants would grimly affect FPE financing.

The FTI Secretariat decision was based on what it described as a lack of capacity in the country to absorb the increase. The FTI secretariat added that completely meeting the estimated annual financial gap would more than triple the prevailing yearly allocation of US$24.2 million, thus complicating implementation within the country. The argument advanced by the FTI may have its merits, or may be not, but the point belaboured by this illustration is that donor conditions may not always favour the country’s needs, however pressing they may be from the government’s perspective.

The SWAp process, through which the government and Development Partners fashioned KESSP, has enhanced the engagement of stakeholders in harmonizing procedures and achieving a coherent financing arrangement. As learnt from the Director of policy and Planning during the interview, the KESSP approach has facilitated strong coordination among donors, and between donors and the government. It was further revealed that KESSP helped to build donor confidence in the utilization of FPE funds and eased their concerns on transparency. The
KESSP lifetime is scheduled to come to an end in 2010. If the programme is not extended, and especially if a suitable progeny is not put in place, this could place the flow of donor funding in jeopardy. The implications of such an eventuality for FPE would be grave.

The government’s commitment to FPE has been widely acclaimed as contributing to the achievements of the programme so far. Having used the promise of free primary schooling as a campaign tool, the newly elected government had to deliver on its promise. Since then, the FPE has enjoyed immense political goodwill. However, as feared by respondents who were interviewed in this study, there is a danger that a future change in government might spell doom for the FPE. Continued political goodwill will therefore be important for the sustainability of FPE. To supplement such good will, greater community participation in the provision of primary education will also be an important contributing factor. This is more so considering the budgetary strain that FPE has placed on the government.

As noted by teachers and headteachers, many parents have simply stopped providing any support to primary schools. This is in the misguided belief that the government should and will provide for all the needs of schools. Yet, from the data collected in the present study, schools are inadequately resourced, and the grants provided by the government cannot satisfy the development needs of most schools. A study conducted by the Elimu Yetu Coalition found that primary education per child per year should cost KSh 6,154, yet the current government capitation grant is Kshs. 1,020, which is a shortfall of Kshs 5,134 (Commonwealth Education Fund & Elimu Yetu Coalition, 2003). Even though the government makes provision for parents to contribute towards physical development of schools, there is no requirement that binds parents to fulfil this role. Neither can schools prevail on parents to provide such support. If this state of apathy is left to take root, the prospects of FPE’s survival could be doubtful.

It is the researchers’ opinion that, taking into consideration several key factors, as presented above, the sustainability of FPE in Kenya is not guaranteed. That
considering the country’s socio-economic situation, the slowed growth of the economy, the financial constraints faced by the government and the fact that reliance on foreign support will be increasingly necessary to finance FPE, the sustainability of FPE needs to be addressed urgently. Add to this the fact that donor finance is many times temporary, and has been inadequate, the task of sustaining FPE will be daunting. Kenya is still a highly indebted country and a sizeable proportion of its income is diverted to debt repayment. The country’s financial outlay for investment in services and infrastructure is thus greatly undermined. As confirmed by Ministry of Education officials and school administrators, there has been inadequate funding for the sector. Therefore, whereas the government has committed huge fraction of its budgetary funds to education, the needs surpass the resources. The inclusion of anticipated donor funding is evidence of constraints faced by the government.

All indications are that the current cost of FPE is beyond the normal education budget allocation. For the country to achieve and sustain universal access to basic education there will have to be rapid and sustained economic growth to generate funds for education. If remarkable economic growth is not realised, FPE could eat into the resource provision for other sub-sectors of education as well as from the other sectors of the economy. As observed by Mukudi(2004), Kenya spends as high a percentage of GDP as most developed countries on education, yet the per capita GDP for Kenya is by far smaller.

Kenya has a good chance of building on what has been learnt and the achievements that have been made so far to ensure sustainability of FPE. However, whether the FPE is sustainable in Kenya will depend on continued political goodwill, improved economic performance, greater parental/community support and enhanced budgetary capacity.
4.8 Gaps in the FPE policy

This research question sought to identify areas in which existing policy is inadequate or where there is lack of policy to address certain concerns related to FPE in Kenya. Embedded in this analysis was the need to also highlight any notable gap between the policy and its implementation. Data relevant for answering this research question was firstly derived from interviews conducted with teachers, headteachers and Ministry of Education officers. Secondly, interrogating policy concerns inevitably involves making reference to relevant secondary sources such as policy documents.

As a consequence of the implementation of FPE policy in 2003, the net enrolment ratio in Kenya grew impressively. However, just as had happened in the 1970s, the implementation of free primary education was fraught with difficulties. The rapid expansion in enrolment complicated the problems of teaching and learning facilities, led to classroom congestion, and raised teacher-pupil ratios. This suggests therefore that the planning component of the re-introduction of FPE failed to incorporate the lessons learned from the difficulties of implementation earlier experienced in the 1970s. As observed by Muthwii (2004), these problems, just as they did in the 1970s, led to high dropout rates and affected the inflow of pupils in the second year of implementation. Districts that registered a 20% increase in enrolment in 2003 hardly recorded more than 5% in 2004. The weakness in policy formulation that translated into such flaws is echoed in the observations made at the Shanghai conference of 2004 on Primary Education for Poverty Reduction. At this conference, there was concurrence by the participants that most government policies in Africa on FPE at the time, were political initiatives implemented hastily without due regard for detailed planning. Kenya, Malawi and Lesotho were cited as budding multiparty democracies where FPE represented a key election issue that eased new governments into power.

Pre-primary education is important for building a foundation for lifelong learning. It ensures the holistic development of children and could be argued as representing
early primary school learning. Whereas FPE has been introduced in Kenya, there is no policy in place to ensure that children joining the primary school cycle have gone through proper early childhood education to adequately prepare them for the subsequent education level. The situation obtaining in Kenya is that there exists a large population of children who have not had pre–primary schooling, but whom all the same, turn up for admission into the ‘free’ primary school level. This policy gap causes a pedagogical complication for lower level primary school teachers; they have to grapple with the challenge of handling large numbers of pupils in an environment of inadequate facilities, while at the same time, try to make compensations for the many pupils without adequate pre-primary school preparation. Further more, owing to cost, not all children who enrol for pre-primary education necessarily complete the full curriculum duration. Interviews conducted with lower primary school teachers and education officers revealed that many parents adopt a shortcut tactic by presenting 5-year-olds for the first time to undergo pre-schooling. Essentially, the strategy is to take the children through a crash course just before they enter formal schooling, rather than ensure that they benefit from a gradual process of building a foundation for lifelong learning, focusing on children’s holistic development. It is argued in this thesis that for the free primary education policy to be effective, and to ensure that constructive learning occurs at the primary school level, there is need for complementary policy measures to ensure children’s attendance in the early childhood education.

There is a lack of policy guidelines relating to admission of pupils into primary schools. Pupils of all ages have been admitted into schools regardless of age considerations. Headteachers in the study expressed frustration at the haphazard manner in which over-age learners joined various levels of the primary school education. Whereas it would have been inhuman to send away pupils who were well over the age of attending primary schools, this type of learners have complicated management and teaching in primary schools. For example, over 50% of headteachers interviewed in this study complained that over-age learners had contributed to an increase in indiscipline in schools. Some of the over-age learners are even married and lack respect for the young teachers. According to
headteachers, more incidents of pregnancy have been observed among pupils and this is attributed to the many over-age learners who were admitted into schools after the introduction of FPE. The lack of clear policy relating to admission criteria has also led to a situation where learners joined primary school at whatever level regardless of their intellectual preparedness to fit into the level. In the words of one headteacher, schools have therefore become mere “conveyor belts to process pupils mechanically through the system”.

Respondents in this study also raised questions about the sustainability of the free primary education policy. It was observed that the government continues to enjoy and rely on donor support for the successful implementation of FPE. It is commendable that the Kenyan government has raised its education budget to accommodate the FPE. In 2003–2004 for example, the budget was raised by 17.4%. Strong donor support was also evident and greatly boosted the FPE initiative (Muthwii, 2004). The heavy reliance on donor support however, raises a policy concern: can donor funding be relied upon to always flow and in sufficient amounts to fill the perennial deficit suffered by the governments’ kitty? Past experience shows that donor finance tends to be temporary. While the international community has made a commitment to support poor countries in their bid to achieve UPE, such support has not been as timely as expected. Headteachers in this study complained of perennial delays in the disbursement of funds. When asked to provide an explanation for this, the Ministry of Education headquarters officials attributed the delays in the disbursement of FPE funds to the failure by donor community to release funds in good time. Considering that the Kenya’s economic performance has been erratic, it may be difficult to conclude that the country has the resource capacity to maintain educational quality if abandoned by the donor community.

It is argued by the researcher in this study therefore that, firstly, government policy needs to reflect a gradual and explicit endeavour towards self sustenance. Secondly, education policy needs to adopt more efficient resource allocation within the education sector. That more consideration for cost-effectiveness should guide
policy making to ensure that available resources can guarantee the sustainability of FPE, donor involvement notwithstanding.

It was observed from the study that FPE funding in Kenya is based on school enrolments, a policy that disadvantages schools with very low enrolments. Whereas this policy may derive its appeal from being straightforward, simple and logical, it at the same time may be argued to be simplistic in its assumptions. Schools with fewer pupils end up with little money as they are disadvantaged by the economies of scale. Under FPE, school’s Account II receives Ksh.370. (36.3% of total disbursed) per pupil. This is considered as the General Purpose Account that caters for the wages of support staff, repairs and maintenance, phone bills, electricity bills, garbage collection, postage and general expenses. Account I, which is reserved for instructional materials, receives 650 Ksh. per pupil enrolled. This is 63.7% of the total disbursed. To illustrate the simplicity of this formula, a school with 2000 pupils would receive a total of Kshs.740, 000 for staff wages, maintenance and other general expenses, while one with 500 pupils would only receive a total of Kshs.185, 000. Yet, the phone bills, staff wages and electricity bills for the two schools may not differ greatly. Therefore, the smaller school’s capacity to participate in extra curricular activity will be considerably inferior to that of larger schools. Headteachers and School Management Committees further complained that the FPE policy in Kenya does not provide adequate funding for school development (capital development), hence, schools that had poor infrastructure before introduction of FPE, had to accommodate more pupils without an improvement in physical facilities. This begs the question: is it fair for schools with adequate infrastructure to receive the same amount (per child) of funding as those without adequate infrastructure? Some schools have resorted to soliciting for building fund contributions from parents, while many others simply rely on the Constituency Development Funds (CDF) amidst stiff competition from other community projects like water and health. There is need therefore for equity-sensitive calculation of the FPE grants. Complaints from school managers suggest that there exists a policy conflict between the abolition of fees and the provision of inadequate funds for FPE to replace the fees.
The policy guidelines that are given to schools on how the FPE funds should be spent are inflexible. Whereas guidelines that show how FPE funds should be spent by schools are necessary for ensuring transparency and minimizing the opportunities for embezzlement, there should be ample provision for schools to spend money on items that directly address their particular needs. As it is now, School Management Committees and other stakeholders cannot decide on how to best use these funds to prioritize school needs. School Management Committee members who interviewed in this study complained that whereas special appeals may be made to the District Education Board, the board’s capacity is constrained. Therefore, the DEBs take a long time to make decisions, and the decisions made are not always in consonance with the unique needs of individual schools. Owing to the inflexibility of guidelines, schools in turn, are unable to provide timely response to needs that are specific to the schools. It was even suggested by headteachers and management committees that schools should be allowed to raise funds for specific projects or charge minimal levies for infrastructural development that is not funded by governments. Headteachers and SMCs of schools with poor infrastructure held the opinion that funding policy should be reviewed so as to ensure it was tailored to the needs of specific regions.

Whereas there is a Quality Assurance directorate that undertakes school inspection, the absence of a policy framework for continuous monitoring of learner achievements to enable improvements in primary schools is disquieting. There is no standardized test that appraises literacy, writing and basic critical thinking in lower and middle classes in Kenya. The government cannot therefore evaluate the quality of education that is received at various class levels of primary education. Schools generally give their own classroom tests and examinations, but comprehensive system-wide audits of educational achievement that could be used to analyze and understand variables such as regions, gender, cultural influences and socio-economic level are lacking.
Gaps between FPE Policy and its Implementation

It was found necessary to also analyze whether there is any gap between the FPE policy written in official documents and the actual implementation on the ground. The most striking and fundamental gap between policy and its implementation is that whereas FPE by its very definition and intent abolished user fees in all public primary schools, some schools were found to be collecting school fees and levies from parents. Forty percent (40%) of schools studied in Kakamega and 27% of the schools studied in Kajiado were found to be charging some form of levy. All the boarding schools included in the study charged some fees besides the officially allowed boarding fees. It was also observed that the schools with a tradition of good performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) were more likely to charge fees than the poor performers. The fees charged are mostly camouflaged as contributions for extra tuition, internal examination fees, cost of lunch for candidate pupils, school trip fund, contribution for privately-hired teachers’ salary, furniture replacement and money for school maintenance. Interestingly, most of the schools that charge such levy officially adopt a no-fee policy. These findings are similar to those of Somerset (2009) who, in a study conducted in Nairobi and Nyeri primary schools, found that charges of various kinds such as computer fees, tutorial fees, school trip levy and school examination fees were still being demanded from parents by schools even after the introduction of FPE. Such charges, if left to continue unchecked, could lead to drop-outs among the very poor pupils.

In many schools that were included in the study, the teacher-pupil ratio was observed to be much higher than prescribed by official government policy. The recommended pupil-teacher ratio benchmark in Kenya is 40:1 (Teachers’ Service Commission, 2005). This concern represents both a policy gap as well as a policy conflict. A policy conflict arises from the fact that schools are generally expected to admit as many pupils as can fit into the classroom. Yet, this requirement has not given schools the leeway to peg admissions on the number of teachers available in
the school. This has made it difficult for teachers to ensure quality teaching in the classroom.

Under the FPE policy, the government took over the responsibility of providing textbooks to pupils. The government’s regulations stipulate that textbooks in lower primary (grades 1-4) should be shared in the ratio of at most 3:1, while in upper primary, the ratio should be at most 2:1 in all main subjects. However, from data collected in the filed, it was found that in some schools, the pupil/book ratios still remained as high 1:5. This demonstrates a gap between policy and implementation. At one level, the government may be blamed for not providing enough books in all the schools. However, according to education officers interviewed in this study, some schools have a high pupil to book ratio at the lower primary school level because teachers give priority to the purchasing of books for the upper classes which are preparing for examinations. Good quality FPE and effective learning and teaching cannot be maintained if the distribution of books in some schools remains at such a dismal level.

Quality Assurance is also an aspect of the FPE where there is an observable gap between the government policy and the actual implementation of the policy. The Quality Assurance Officers, formerly referred to as Inspectors of Schools, complained of encountering serious difficulties in carrying out their duties. In the rural areas where roads are impassable, it was difficult for them scrutinize and regulate the implementation of free primary education. Even where roads are good, the large area of coverage, compounded by a shortage of official government vehicles for transportation makes it challenging for the officers to fulfil their duties. Area Education Officers (AEOs), Inspectors and Auditors who are supposed to visit schools regularly within their jurisdiction also lack assistants and adequate means of transport. Efforts have been made by the government to provide motorcycles to mitigate the transport constraint, but this has not sufficiently addressed. Women Quality Assurance Officers also complained that they found it indecent to ride motorcycles considering that they came to work in dresses rather than long trousers.
CHAPTER FIVE

A Proposed Model for Systemic Change Management of FPE

5.1 Introduction
The last objective of this study was to develop a model for systemic change management of the FPE in Kenya. In this section therefore, the implications of systems thinking for educational change are explored.

Contemporary management has continued to embrace an understanding of systems thinking to guide change in organizations; the educational enterprise could equally benefit from the application of systemic analysis. Therefore, a useful way to understand and guide change in education is through systems thinking (Banathy, 1996). In this section of the thesis, a conceptual underpinning to systems thinking and systemic change management is provided. Then, based on the findings of the study, and an application of systems thinking, a model for the systemic management of the change process occasioned by the implementation of FPE is proposed.

5.2. Rationale for Recommending a Model for Systemic Change

There have been several previous attempts to introduce FPE in Kenya. In fact, at independence the government proclaimed its commitment to the provision of free and universal primary education (Kinyanjui, 1974; Government of Kenya, 1965). Tuition fees were abolished in the ASAL districts in 1971, and in 1973, through another presidential decree, fees for all children in Standard 1 to Standard 4 were abolished. The abolition of fees engendered massive enrolments; in 1973, there was a 51% increase in number of enrolled pupils (Government of Kenya, 1977). To enable schools to cope with overwhelming enrolments, parents, with time, had to contribute towards school expansion and buying of equipment. Not all communities could afford to provide adequate learning facilities and this negatively impacted on quality. In many schools, pupils had to contend with overcrowded classrooms and little in the way of learning materials (Nkinyangi, 1982). There was
also an inadequate number of trained teachers to cope with the large number of pupils who enrolled (Government of Kenya, 1977). In 1979, the government issued another directive abolishing all forms of school levies in public primary schools, but soon, there was a proliferation of levies imposed upon parents, and education at this level became expensive and quality was compromised by parents’ inability to guarantee provision of adequate facilities (Lillis & Ayot, 1988; Olembo, 1982). It could be argued therefore that government policy did not direct as much attention on quality of infrastructure as it did on increasing the enrolment of children in schools. The FPE initiative did not fully materialise and by the mid 1980s, had collapsed altogether. This in itself suggests that there was flawed planning for the education system. The political decisions that were made to introduce FPE were not accompanied by well thought out strategies to manage the implementation of change.

Even with the previous experience that Kenya had with FPE, and which should have served to provide lessons for management of change, the implementation of FPE in 2003 still caught school managers off guard; they had not been prepared for the change and so they found it challenging (Kipkoech & Kyalo, 2010). Kenya followed a “big bang” approach whereby fee abolition was announced, but unfortunately, this was done with little prior planning (Avenstrup et al., 2004). Several other studies conducted on the implementation of FPE in Kenya have shown that the education system was not geared up for the logistical implications of FPE. Chuck (2009) for example notes that the education system failed to enact adequate preparation for the new policy. He argues that the FPE policy was more of a political strategy to fulfil the NARC party promise to provide FPE, and so necessary preparations such as prior consultations with the Ministry of Education and proper communication with stakeholders were overlooked. Sifuna (2008) also observes that the government failed to carry out a situation analysis before implementing FPE, resulting in confusion amongst teachers, parents, School Management Committees, sponsors and local donors. In addition, the number of teachers available in primary schools did not match the increase in number of pupils. Teaching and learning was thus compromised.
One of the earliest studies conducted to gain insights into the attendant challenges of FPE implementation in Kenya, carried out by UNESCO in 2004, exposed the immediate resultant challenges faced by schools such as inadequate classroom space; shortage of teachers; lack of clear guidelines on admission; and the delay by the government in disbursement of FPE funds to schools. The study further found that there was no consultation with teachers and parents before the implementation of FPE (UNESCO, 2005). Avenstrup, et al. (2004), also note that there was no time to negotiate with stakeholders, neither was there detailed planning before FPE was started. They thus concluded from their findings that in Kenya, the education system was not geared up for the logistical implications of FPE. Indeed, Simiyu and Chemwile (2006) assert that some of the major educational innovations in Kenya, such as adoption of the 8-4-4 system of education and introduction of FPE have been characterized by poor management of change. They contend that, in Kenya, changes in education have been ineffective due to several factors, the chief one being that the stakeholders are neither fully informed nor involved in formulating and initiating change.

Research findings from the several studies highlighted have shown that there was too much emphasis on the content of the change introduced and inadequate attention was given to the features and consequences of the change process. Implementing FPE in Kenya should not be seen simply as a singular change-that of elimination of school fees at the primary school level of education in public schools. This should rather be seen as a complexity of component changes of the system. This shortcoming in the change management process negatively impacted the implementation process.

As revealed by the data in this study, a well-designed systemic change infrastructure and strategies was not put in place as FPE was introduced. That is, there was lack of a well-conceived, well-designed, and subsequently well-implemented approach that holistically paid attention to the various and integrated facets of the primary education system that would be affected by the introduction of FPE. There was no formative evaluation to inform the implementation process and
personnel who had not even been given adequate training, set several ad hoc mechanisms in motion to deal with the continually emerging challenges of implementation.

Existing physical infrastructure was not modified in response to the new policy directions, there were no well-designed mechanisms to ensure local ownership of the new policy at school level, the change did not first ensure a critical mass of committed stakeholders, and there were no clear strategies to mobilize and maintain proactive effort so that changes could be implemented. Administrative structures (e.g. Education Officers and headteachers) operated without clear understanding of new functions because they had not been guided by a consideration of systemic changes that would inevitably result.

It is argued here that the change from fee payment by parents to FPE and the resultant complex implications that this had on the education system can only be managed more effectively through a systemic approach. That this change must be managed systemically to enhance FPE’s prospects for sustainability. Successful, enduring change in the education system must be systemic; that is, it must reflect the interrelationships among education’s stakeholders and subsystems. The findings of the present study, and those of other studies on FPE in Kenya, clearly reveal that such interrelationships were either lacking or were given inadequate attention.

Based on the findings of this study, and on the application of systems thinking, a model for the systemic management of the change to FPE is proposed. The model provokes reflection on what actually happened against what might have happened if organizational change had been managed systemically. It is anticipated that this model will assist educationists to build an improved understanding of change management, and that it will provide perspectives that can inform future change management practice in education.
5.3 Concept of System, Systemic Thinking and their Relevance to Education

A system is a set of elements where the behaviour of each element has an effect on the behaviour of the whole and the behaviour of the elements and their effects on the whole are interdependent (Skyttner, 1996). In other words, a system comprises of subsystems whose inter-relationships and interdependence move toward equilibrium within the larger system (Martinelli, 2001). More simply put, a system is an organized set of components (or subsystems) that are highly integrated to accomplish an overall goal. The system has a variety of inputs, which undergo processes to yield certain outputs, which together, realize the overall desired goal for the system. A key aspect in the definition of a system is "mutual interaction," - a relationship exists between and among the parts, which maintains the system.

In open systems, any change in an element of the system causes changes in other elements (Shafritz & Russell, 2005; Wang, 2004). Systems theorists such as Banathy (1991, 1992) call attention to the fact that to change any part of an educational system requires knowledge and understanding of how the parts of the educational system are interrelated. Basing on this view, the implementation of FPE in Kenya constitutes a fundamental change in the educational system. The change to FPE had far-reaching implications for other components of the primary school system, and by extension, the larger education system in the country. Therefore, the elimination of school fees in primary schools cannot be viewed in isolation, but rather, as the epicenter of system-wide ramifications that inevitably ensued. The financing aspect of primary education is a component in the educational system, a system within which all the elements are interdependent and interconnected. The change in this one element of the system had to affect the entire system, leading to a complex change process.

Glickman (1993) and Reigeluth (1994) in analyzing educational change assert that piecemeal change efforts commonly pursued in educational organizations have not produced desired outcomes, leading to the increasing call for systemic change.
Systemic change is an approach that involves players from throughout the system. It considers all parts of an organization or group, how change in one area affects another, and how to coordinate change in a system so that it furthers the shared goals and visions.

If one part of the school system is changed, the nature of the overall system often changes in response. Such, is a systemic relationship, meaning relating to, or affecting, the entire system. It is important to point out that systemic should not be confused with systematic. Systematic simply means that something is methodical. Thus, systemic change is a process in which the impact of change on all parts of the whole and their relationships to one another are taken into consideration. In the contexts of schools, it may be seen as a philosophy for improving education that advocates reflecting, rethinking, and restructuring.

Banathy (1996:83) comments that acquiring a "systems view of education" means that we learn to think about education as a system, so that we can put the systems view into practice and apply it in educational inquiry, and we can design education so that it will manifest systemic behaviour. Once we individually and collectively develop a systems view, then we become "systemic" in our approach to educational reform. Systemic change is change that pervades all aspects and levels of the educational process and that affects all of the people included in this process--pupils, teachers, parents, administrators, and community members. It is a dynamic process that necessitates continuous communication and evaluation and has implications for curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development. When we change parts of the system, interdependent components can buttress and perpetuate the results. When the system is overlooked, change efforts can be defused as other components retain the status quo. The effects of systemic change are more pervasive and sustainable those of individual changes in a few aspects.

Systemic change as discussed here is both a process and an outcome. As a process, it refers to how reformers can use strategies which are in consonance with systems theory to change the education system. Viewed as an outcome, systemic change
implies changes that occur in the system which alter how the Ministry of Education, schools and individuals operate and relate to each other. It also implies changes that will result in improved outcomes for the whole education system. It is thus assumed in this discussion that successful, enduring change must be systemic; that is, it must reflect the interrelationships among education's stakeholders and subsystems.

Amagoh (2008) observes that Systems Theory is a theory of organisational change since, organisations are dynamic systems of adaptation and evolution that contain multiple parts, which interact with one another and the environment. Yoon and Kuchinke (2005) expound this further with the view that an understanding of systems theory provides an enhanced appreciation of how each of the sub-systems of the organisation interconnects and interacts, and the nature of the interplay between the various components. Such an understanding, they assert, can help organizational leaders to plan how to better obtain resources and information, and transform resources by making use of the social and technological components for best results.

### 5.4 Systemic Change Management Model for FPE

Figure 5.1 illustrates elements that can be used to frame key concerns related to a systemic management of change, and each is intimately linked to the other. Four broad aspects that impact closely on the primary school education system in Kenya are taken to represent the key components of the education system. These are: the Government, People, Resources and Infrastructure, and finally, Tasks, Structure and Strategies. The categorization should be seen as one of convenience, rather than of discreet elements; overlaps may be noted between categories. These ‘four’ components are linked and interact intimately with each other within the education system. The continuous horizontal lines that link them represent this relationship. The vertical flow in the diagram represents four phases in the change process, viz. creation of awareness, initial implementation, institutionalization and continuous monitoring and evaluation.
Figure 5.1 Model for Systemic Change Management of FPE
The formulation of the phases is designed to guide thinking about systemic change. It is not meant as a rigid format for change process, but rather, a loosely defined logical representation of sequence. Although Figure 5.1 displays the four developmental stages (creation of awareness, initial implementation, institutionalization and continuous monitoring and evaluation) as distinct and assuming linear progression, change is unlikely to follow a linear path. An education system will rarely be clearly at one of these stages but will usually experience "Brownian motion," going back and forth from one stage to another on the path toward an ideal situation. The four stages proposed in the model (creation of awareness, initial implementation, institutionalization and continuous monitoring and evaluation) are therefore separated by dotted lines. This denotes the loose boundaries that separate them. It is worth noting that systemic change does not necessarily imply changing the entire system at once. This is often neither practical nor necessary; it implies more of universal transformation in ways that ensure that the old and new components buttress rather than counteract one another.

a) **The government**

The government is represented by the Ministry of Education, and is the most influential component of the system. The government’s centrality in the provision of education comes from the fact that it is responsible for formulation and implementation (and enforcement) of education policy in the country. The government also plays the role of principal financier for the education sector. It provides teaching and learning resources for primary schools, pays teachers and support staff, and provides money for physical development of schools. Through its layered hierarchy of administration, the Ministry of Education’s extensive network of officers reaches the grassroots level. The Ministry of Education is manned by personnel; these embody an overlap with the ‘people’ component of the system.

b) **People**

The people component of the education system is broadly seen as encompassing all the stakeholders. Thus, pupils, teachers, headteachers, parents, and education officers as well donors and sponsors fall within this broad category. The education
system is incomplete without this human aspect. Teachers, school administrators, pupils and education officers form the core of this ‘subsystem’. The activities of people are affected and determined by government policy on education. People translate policy into action, and any change in policy, such as the introduction of FPE, engenders changes and adjustments in the behaviour and relationships of people within the system.

c) **Resources and infrastructure**
Needless to say, no education system can operate efficiently and effectively without the requisite resources and infrastructure. The provision and availability of these resources is dependent most significantly on the government, then, on people-parents, sponsors and donors. Further interdependence between the interacting components of the system is seen in the fact the utilisation of resources is a function of people-their skills, competence and attitudes. Then again, people are also a resource. Debatably, human resources are the most important resource in any organisation or system because they shape and control the other resources for the achievement of defined goals.

Changes in government or in government policy, and factors that may impinge on the government’s budgetary capacity all impact significantly on the nature and availability of educational resources and infrastructure. The introduction of FPE by the government immediately affected the resources and infrastructure in the primary school education system. There was an upsurge in enrolments that exerted considerable pressure on teachers as a resource, physical infrastructure and on teaching and learning resources. The government had to significantly increase its expenditure on education to meet the demands of FPE. These sort of ramifications demonstrate the interdependent interaction of system components.

d) **Tasks, Structure & Strategies**
Tasks, as conceived in the model, refer to responsibilities of personnel who are charged with various roles within the primary education system. Structure refers to the way functions and people are arranged in specific areas and levels of
responsibility. Structure defines the key decision-making, communication and control relationships within an organisation or system. The various tasks and roles are allocated through structure, hence structure on the one hand and tasks and responsibilities, on the other, are intimately connected. The two are in turn connected to and dependent on people (personnel); without people, there can be no functional structure. In addition, without people, tasks can not be assigned or accomplished. Personnel, who are assigned specific formal responsibilities based on structure, accomplish tasks through strategies. Strategies may be described simply as plans which are designed to achieve some specific purposes. The introduction of FPE necessitated the creation of structures such as the School Instructional Materials Committees, a redefinition of the roles and hence tasks of School Management Committees (SMC), the creation of KESSP through a SWAp and so on. These responses which were designed to manage the change to FPE required the development of strategies that would ensure the successful implementation of FPE. Therefore, adjustments and innovations in tasks, structures and strategies can not be seen in isolation: they are dependent on and influenced by government policy, people, resources and infrastructure.

**Change Phases**

5.4.1 Creating Readiness

As noted by Adelman and Taylor (2007) any move toward substantive systemic change must commence with measures designed to create readiness by enhancing a climate for change. They add that the steps in creating readiness include articulation of shared vision for the changes, mobilizing interest, clarifying feasibility, and negotiating agreements with decision makers and implementers. It is crucial to ensure that stakeholders experience systemic change as valued associates who are contributing to a collective destiny and vision.

The change to FPE should have started with the articulation of a clear, shared vision. This stage of the process entails building interest and consensus among
prospective donors, Ministry of Education officials, teachers and the parents of pupils. A fine vision, generated at the top and transmitted to the rest of the system, may produce compliance, but it will not necessarily garner true commitment from the system’s members. To achieve genuine commitment and the resourceful energy that comes with it means that the vision must progress through a sequence of discourse at all levels of the system. Clarifying the basic concepts of the FPE programme to relevant groups of stakeholders would have worked to mobilize interest, consensus, and support among key stakeholders. Having realized the necessary consensus and support, representatives from the various interest groups such KNUT, TSC, donors SMC and PTA would then be identified to champion the changes attendant to the introduction of FPE through “social marketing” strategy. For example, the support from communities for physical development of schools would have been clearly defined and worked out that this stage. The situation as it is now is that the role of communities is not clearly spelt out, and the mechanisms for community support have not been outlined explicitly. This is so because there was no provision for the negotiation of agreements between decision-makers and implementers on role responsibilities.

Creating readiness also has implications at the school level. Sindelar et al. (2006) point out that schools with shared vision, cultures of communication, shared decision-making and schools that involve the teachers in shaping innovation are more likely to sustain it. When teachers as individuals view themselves as being responsible for change, then those changes are more likely to be maintained in their personal repertoire of behaviour.

Scholars such as Graczyk, Domitrovich, Small, and Zins (2006) have delineated factors that influence readiness for change. They cite the seven factors that affect systemic readiness for change as follows: the need for change, readiness for change, capacity to effect change, awareness of the need for change, commitment to engage in the change process, incentive for change, and a history of successful change. Graczyk et al. emphasize that implementer readiness is a critical factor in the implementation and sustainability of effective practices. Indicators of
implementer readiness include understanding of the programme’s causal theory and acquisition of the skills needed to implement the intervention. The implementer needs to feel positively about the programme, value what it contributes in their setting, be committed to its goals and believe their role in implementing the intervention will be effective. Findings from the present study on FPE suggest that there was little or no readiness at all on the part of the implementers of FPE. The skills required for teachers to effectively handle the realities of the change to FPE were lacking at the time of initial implementation. Findings from the study also indicate that many teachers do not feel positively about FPE, and this has led to demoralisation. Fortunately, teachers value the importance of FPE, but owing to the fact that they were neither adequately prepared for FPE nor consulted as important stakeholders, their commitment to the goals of FPE may be weak.

Barth (1990) and Anderson (1993) also advise that positive relationships at the school level are needed to build a sense of professional community. Principals, teachers, and staff need a strong foundation of goodwill, respect, and collaboration if they are to be successful in implementing a new programme. They suggest that participants need to share common goals, communicate openly and exchange ideas. Findings from the present study on FPE indicated that 79 (44.6 %) teachers only, agreed that teachers were free to interact cordially with the head teacher. This is inimical to the management ideals of goodwill, respect, and collaboration.

Creating readiness also entails conducting a survey of the state of infrastructure and resources in general to determine absorptive capacity for implementation the level. The survey of infrastructure provides an overview of what infrastructure needs to be put in place and the innovations/modifications that could be explored and pursued in readiness for implementation. The failure to conduct a proper survey of the physical infrastructure in schools before implementing FPE education led to the mayhem that was observed in year 2003. Schools had to grapple with phenomenal enrolments that led to congestion in classrooms, shortage of desks and use of makeshift structures to accommodate new pupils.
Creating readiness allows for the clarification of feasibility, that is, an explication of how the necessary changes can be accomplished, who will lead change efforts at the different levels and what mechanisms can be used to steer and support the change process. As revealed from the data in this study, such clarification of the feasibility of FPE was not made before implementation. Luckily, a demonstration of this is found in the KESSP initiative, which came three years after the introduction of FPE. To ensure readiness for the change to FPE, the government should have secured major policy commitment from all participating stakeholders.

Systemic change management would also require that readiness related changes in structure and strategies are addressed. This entails establishing mechanisms and procedures to guide the anticipated reforms, as well as mechanisms for long term planning. It is important to note that creating awareness should ideally be based on readiness assessment. Readiness assessment naturally involves asking several pertinent questions such as: How big is this change and is it gradual or radical? How many people are affected? What sort of resistance can be expected? What is the capacity of the change management team? and so forth.

5.4.2. Initial Implementation Phase

In any educational change, the initial implementation phase is critical, as it shapes the subsequent activity relating to the change process. It is also at this stage that ‘change shocks’ are likely to be most heavily experienced. As was the case with FPE, the initial implementation stage was fraught with serious challenges that were attributable to lack of proper planning. The experiences in the education system revealed a lack of readiness for the new venture.

The implementation phase of change management calls for well-designed mechanisms to ensure local ownership. It also calls for the leadership to design strategies that mobilize and maintain proactive effort so that changes are implemented. At the implementation stage, the Government, through Ministry of
Education staff, had the responsibility for building capacity, implementing strategic plans, maintaining daily oversight and resolving problems and challenges. The Ministry of Education’s role in the systemic arrangement was to ensure its personnel played an oversight role in implementation of FPE to ensure standards were maintained.

Effective administrative leadership at every level of the system is key to the success of any systemic change management. As FPE was implemented, different stakeholders should have been aware of who was responsible for leading various activity and who was accountable for the development of the unfolding changes. It was important therefore, that leaders (education officers, headteachers and School Management Committees) be trained to guide systemic change. Effective change management calls for leadership training for all who will be taking a lead in implementing the initiative. Such capacity building, as discussed in the findings, was attempted, but it remains incomplete and in some instances inadequate. In systemic change management, such leaders are seen as part of a systemic change infrastructure of “champions” who are enlisted to steer the process. To effectively steer the change process, the “champions” at school level must be highly motivated to ensure a sustained effort to manage change and provide support and guidance. As part of a systemic approach, the champions require appropriate incentives, adequate training and resources over time. Fullan (2005) stresses that effective systemic change requires leadership that “motivates people to take on the complexities and anxieties of difficult change.”

Other less obvious systemic changes resulting from FPE implementation should be noted. These affect people -teachers, pupils and parents. Teachers required training to improve their ability to cope with the large number of pupils. The changes that occurred called for interventions on the part of the teacher that relate to teaching methodology, coping with increased workload and managing a disparate composition of learners. For the pupils, there was also a need for support to ensure their sustained interest in the wake of stressful learning conditions that accompanied the introduction of FPE. A systemic view of learning and the learner
sees the learners’ full participation and engagement as being essential to transformative change. Considering that FPE opened up access to many pupils who were previously out of school, it is important that schools create an educational environment where pupils want to learn, rather than one in which they attend school with disinterest. This in turn calls for a shift in teaching style and content to ensure that pupils see relevance in the free primary education they receive. Parents and communities are also linked systemically to the adjustments accompanying FPE. With teachers having less opportunity to provide individual attention to pupils, parental and community involvement in the education of their children becomes more crucial. In addition, the shortage of facilities calls for collaborative arrangements between schools and communities to ameliorate the situation. Systemic thinking would in addition advocate for the development of a culture of ownership among parents and communities; essentially, this requires a shift in mindset from apathy to responsibility.

A systemic approach to analyzing the implementation phase of FPE would be incomplete without referring to the creation of structures and strategies for implementing change. For effective change management, it is imperative that mechanisms for steering the change process are established. This entails defining the mechanisms for governance, creating structures for resource management and leadership and integrating change management facilitators to enrich the change process. It is necessary to define the functions, key tasks to be accomplished, and the necessary systemic changes to be effected. Finally, a systemic transformation should be accomplished by rethinking and redeploying how existing resources are used. It is also necessary that transformational thinking is extended to funding mechanisms. To enhance sustainability in funding FPE, there is need to think beyond traditional sources and to look to creative funding options.

5.4.3 Institutionalization

This phase forms the later stage of implementation where changes are established as routine and become a part of the system’s everyday functions.
Institutionalization is accomplished by ensuring there is an infrastructure to maintain and enhance productive changes. The systemic change efforts are routinized and established as regular, ongoing practice. Cobern and Aikenhead (1998) explain that routinization involves social activities that constitute practice being continually re-created by agents who routinize day-to-day practices. This process of routinization leads to production of rules and resources that influence the production of social life. Thus, systemic changes are ratified by the government into policy and policies are developed to maintain the new functions and tasks and strategies. At the individual level, the mindset of stakeholders adopts the changes as routine and as the new way of doing things. Mechanisms are therefore developed to ensure the sustainability of resources and infrastructure to maintain the newly routinized changes. Systemic changes for improvement are only as good as the system’s ability to develop and institutionalize them equitably in all its schools. This is the only way to maintain high levels of commitment to accomplishing necessary systemic changes.

Policy needs to be aligned around the beliefs and practices of the positive changes in the system, particularly in areas related to curriculum frameworks, instructional methods and materials, student assessment practices, and resource allocation. An example of strategy for institutionalisation of change is to adopt a paradigm shift towards a personalized, learner-centred education. This way, fewer of the learners who have joined school after a long absence, or joined without proper foundation at earlier stages, will be left behind. A customised and personalized education to meet pupils’ individual needs, interests, and abilities, is consistent with systemic thinking as it represents a transformation in pedagogical approach; a shift from the dominant paradigm that lumps pupils together and leaves many behind.

5.4.4 Continuous Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation is important because it checks against regression. Change processes, if left unchecked, have the tendency for regression. Monitoring and evaluation reinforces institutionalization because it helps to determine the extent to which change has been embedded. The systemic change
management model proposed here may give the impression that evaluation comes as a last and terminal activity; this is far from the truth. Indeed, monitoring and evaluation could begin immediately after the initial implementation to ensure that everything moves on as per the plan. The main goal of monitoring and evaluation is to assess progress regularly and revise actions as needed. Monitoring and evaluation is an integral part of the systemic reform design and helps to establish measurable expectations for management and implementation.

For effective Monitoring and evaluation, the Ministry of Education needs to define benchmarks for standards and to establish mechanisms for accountability. People, especially headteachers and teachers also need to engage in self-evaluation to assess their achievement and their personal consonance with the systemic reforms. Self-evaluation will assist individuals to adjust their mindset to the new system’s way of operation, that is, ‘are they part of the change effort?’ Monitoring and evaluation naturally calls for continuous communication and evaluation of performance.

The leadership should establish mechanisms to facilitate necessary systemic analysis with regard to resources and infrastructure. Proper change management calls for gap analysis that provides workable recommendations. In addition, an evaluation of the structures and strategies that provide the driving force for change process is essential to determine their effectiveness and efficiency. Systemic evaluation also requires pertinent queries to be made with regard to outcomes of evaluation. Such questions include: What happens to the results of the evaluation? Are they gathering dust or are the recommendations put into practice? Are they used in the planning process?

5.5 Conclusion

Systems theory provides an approach for managing educational change, ensuring that a "critical mass" of coordinated adjustments for improvement is in place, and that stakeholders' needs are addressed. The model presented here illustrates that for meaningful systemic change to occur, all aspects of the school system must move
forward. There is need to nurture all aspects of the education system to be able to transform educational innovations and change. However, it is important to note that this does not necessarily mean that the only way to achieve sustainable change is to cast off the old system in its entirety and devise a new one to replace it. Some existing subsystems may continue to be a "good fit" with the new system's design.

For significant systemic change to occur, policy commitments must be demonstrated through effective allocation and redeployment of resources to facilitate institutional and operational changes. Finances, personnel, equipment, and other essential resources must be availed, organized, and used in ways that sufficiently operationalize policy.
CHAPTER SIX
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction
This chapter presents a summary of the main findings from the study and the conclusions that were made from the findings. Based on the findings, recommendations are made. Finally, the study offers some suggestions for further research.

6.2 Summary of the Study
The purpose of this study was to conduct an in-depth investigation into how primary schools were managing change with regard to Free Primary Education in Kenya, and develop a framework for effective change management of FPE. The study aimed at meeting the following specific objectives;

i. To assess the management of the change process occasioned by FPE and evaluate the adequacy of coping strategies adopted in response to the introduction of FPE.

ii. To assess the funding mechanisms for FPE and examine the sustainability of the FPE initiative.

iii. To analyze the gaps in the FPE policy.

iv. To recommend a modular framework for effective change management of FPE in Kenya.

This study was guided by the following research questions.

(i) What is the condition and adequacy of human, financial and material resourcing in primary schools?

(ii) How proficient have the management practices in primary schools been in responding to the implementation of FPE?
(iii) How adequate was the preparation/training given to teachers, headteachers and education officers to enhance their ability to implement the FPE policy?

(iv) What contribution have parents and School Management Committees made towards ensuring successful implementation of FPE?

(v) How was FPE funded and what are the prospects of FPE’s sustainability?

(vi) What gaps exist in the Free Primary Education policy?

(vii) How can the different experiences of managing the change occasioned by FPE be applied towards recommending a modular framework for managing change in primary schools in Kenya?

The design adopted for the study was the cross-sectional survey. The study was conducted in Kakamega and Kajiado districts. The disproportionate stratified sampling technique was used to select 59 primary schools for the study sample (representing 11% of the population of 542 schools in Kakamega and Kajiado districts). The sample of informants for the study included 59 headteachers, 177 teachers, 472 pupils, 118 parents, 14 AEOs, 118 members of School Management Committees, 2 District Education Officers, 6 KESSP IP Team Leaders and the Director of Policy and Planning in the Ministry of Education.

Data for this study were collected using questionnaires, interview schedules, a focus group discussion guide and an observation checklist. Several official government documents relevant for answering research questions were also used as a source of secondary data. The research yielded both qualitative and quantitative data, though the study’s basic design was qualitative. Quantitative data was directly coded into the SPSS programme for analysis. Responses to the open-ended items in the questionnaires were analysed qualitatively.
6.3 Summary of Findings

6.3.1 Characteristics of Schools and the Sample

Of the total 59 schools selected for the study, 37 (62.7%) were drawn from Kakamega district while 22 (37.3%) were drawn from Kajiado district. Fifty (84.7%) of these schools were day schools, while 9 (15.3%) were boarding schools. Fifty-three (89.9%) of schools selected for the sample were mixed-sex schools. This reflects the distribution of schools by sex in the population. Most of the primary schools in the two districts are mixed schools, while just a few single-sex schools. The single-sex schools happen to be boarding schools, while the mixed schools, with the exception of a few in Kajiado, are day schools.

Fifty-nine headteachers were selected for the study. Forty-one of the headteachers selected were male and 18 were female. There were 177 teachers selected in the sample for this study. Of these, 108 (61%) were female. All the teachers in the sample had between 3 to 30 years of teaching experience in primary schools, and 125 (71%) of them had been teaching in primary school for more than 11 years.

The data revealed that teachers generally had a heavy teaching workload. Eighty-seven (49.2%) teachers had a heavy load of between 35 and 39 lessons per week. The average number of lessons taught by teachers was 34 lessons. Eighteen (10.2%) of the teachers had an extremely heavy load of between 40 and 53 lessons a week. This translates into an average of at least 8 lessons per day. Teachers overwhelmingly expressed the judgment that they had a workload that was not manageable, and this had affected their ability to teach effectively. The average class size was 51 pupils.

6.3.2 The Level of Resources in Primary Schools.

The first research question sought to establish the extent to which teaching and learning resources are available in schools in light of the adversities occasioned by FPE. To examine the status of resources and facilities, the study explored a
range of factors within schools firstly, from questionnaires, then from interviews among headteachers, teachers and pupils. Lastly, a comprehensive check-list and observation guide were also employed to elicit information about the state of various infrastructure and the availability of teaching and learning resources

6.3.2.1 Adequacy of Human Resources in Schools

There is an inequitable distribution of teaching staff among schools. One school, which had only five teachers and three schools, which had six teachers, demonstrate the staffing inequalities and inadequacies that exist in some of the primary schools. Improvisations such as teaching different classes at the same time had to be made to cope with the serious shortage. Teachers in these schools had heavy workload, and this made them emphasize on coverage rather than quality. The lowest individual school Pupil to Teacher Ratio (PTR) observed was 28: 1, while the highest was 80:1. Headteachers in general reported their schools as being understaffed. Forty-seven (79.7%) headteachers cited teacher shortage as one of the main problems they had experienced since the introduction of FPE. Thirty-one (52.5%) of the schools had not received a single additional teacher since the introduction of FPE. Whereas 58(98.3%) headteachers indicated that they had pupils with special needs in their school, not all schools with pupils having challenging handicaps such as visual and mental impairment had a special needs education teacher.

6.3.2.2 Availability of Material Resources in Schools

Forty-six (78 %) headteachers cited congestion in classrooms, 55(93.2%) cited pressure on physical facilities such as toilets and 38(64.4%) cited shortage of desks as resource-related problems they were experiencing after FPE was introduced. However, 32(54.2%) headteachers agreed that teaching materials supplied for FPE were sufficient. Many schools that had enrolled children with physical and cognitive/ mental disabilities were inadequately resourced. Out of
the 59 schools, 11 (18.6%) had special units. Of these eleven, only 5 (8.5%) schools had adequately equipped special units.

In the two districts, 49 (27.6%) teachers reported an average book-sharing ratio (BSR) of 1:2 (that is, one book shared between two pupils). Eighty-seven (49.2%) teachers reported a book-sharing ratio of 1:3. However, in a few instances, a very high book-sharing ratio of up to 1:6 was reported. Book-sharing ratios were better for English, Mathematics and Science, than they were for Kiswahili, Geography, History and Civics and Religious Education.

Twenty-four (74.6%) headteachers indicated that they required additional classrooms, 42 (71.2%) headteachers indicated they needed latrines, 42 (71.4%) of headteachers indicated they needed additional desks, and 24 (40.7%) headteachers needed a storage facility mentioned.

Discussions held with pupils revealed that many of them lacked text books of their own that they could use at home for revision. However, those in boarding schools had at least one textbook of their own, especially for Mathematics and English, and an extra exercise book for each subject. There exists considerable discrepancy between urban and rural schools in terms of infrastructure.

From the classroom observations, it was found that many learners, especially at the lower primary level, did not have ample space to write and sit comfortably. Fifty-one percent of the classes observed had an inadequate number of desks and in 46% of the cases, the desks were in a poor state of repair. In addition, many schools in both Kakamega and Kajiado districts had classrooms which were crowded with desks.

In general, boarding schools had the best buildings, followed by urban or peri-urban schools and lastly, the rural schools. A total of 41 (69%) schools had permanent structures. However, not all schools with permanent structures had
plastered and/or painted walls. Ten (17%) schools, all of which were rural, had mud-walled buildings that also lacked windows, doors and cemented floors.

6.3.2.3 Adequacy of Financial Resources in Schools

All schools in the study sample reported that the money for FPE had been disbursed to schools without fail, even though delays had perennially been experienced. The headteachers also confirmed that Kshs. 650 is disbursed annually per pupil towards teaching and learning materials and another Kshs. 370 per pupil is given to cover operational and other maintenance functions.

It was reported by headteachers of schools with special units that in addition to the regular FPE funds, every child with special needs in their schools and in special primary schools was allocated top up funds to cater for specific teaching/learning needs. Whereas this resource allocation is welcome, it was found to be insufficient given the special requirements of children with disabilities.

Fifty-five (93.2%) of the headteachers stated that the capitation funds that are disbursed to schools were insufficient to cater for school expenditure. On average, headteachers proposed that an additional Kshs. 768 per pupil per year should be disbursed to schools.

It was felt by headteachers that the loss of fees revenue arising from FPE policy had negatively affected some aspects of school programmes, most notably, internal examinations, physical development and furniture. Co-curricular activities, support staff wages and Local Travel and Transport (LT&T) were also mentioned as areas that had been negatively affected by the banning of school fees. Headteachers of boarding schools and those of large urban schools complained that the votes for electricity and water did not sufficiently meet their needs.
Regrettably, few schools have income generating activities to subsidize funding received from the government. The only other source of funding that several schools have benefited from is the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) which cannot be relied upon to resolve the shortage of physical facilities in schools.

### 6.3.3 Proficiency of Management Practices in Primary Schools

With regard to the performance of their roles as managers under FPE, headteachers generally evaluated themselves highly. They reported that they were still able to personally supervise the effective utilization of resources and regularly give direction to teachers on teaching methods even after the introduction of FPE. However, most headteachers indicated that they were unable to give pupils as much individual attention as they did before FPE.

When queried on the areas where they perceived themselves as having weakness that affected their effectiveness as managers under FPE, 56 (96.6%) headteachers cited bookkeeping or accounting, 47 (81%) pointed out management of financial resources, 17 (29.3%) mentioned public relations and 15 (25.8%) cited guidance and counselling as areas of perceived inadequacy.

Most headteachers were found not to have made School Development Plans (SDP) and most of the SDPs did not address school issues holistically. Forty-two percent of headteachers responded that they lacked skills for construction of a logical framework matrix and actually desired training on the same. This scenario reveals an inadequacy in school planning skills. With respect to the quality of training they had received in management, forty-five percent of headteachers cited financial planning as an area in which they had received inadequate training and one that had proved particularly problematic for them as managers.
Evaluation of headteachers on several aspects of their management role was high. Thus, in management of the change process, headteachers had exhibited management proficiency in the following aspects since the introduction of FPE -;

- **Planning:** Identifying educational needs of the school, setting priorities for the school, planning the work of staff, and efficiently managing their time
- **Organising:** Clarifying responsibilities to staff, fairly distributing duties to staff, effectively facilitating delegation.
- **Staffing:** Promoting good relationship, perceiving staff needs / concerns
- **Directing/leading:** Motivating pupils / teachers towards achievement, discussing instructional problems with teachers, and setting challenging targets for members of the school raise academic standards.
- **Coordinating:** Ensuring smooth running of programmes, and soliciting for and coordinating parental involvement.
- **Reporting/Communicating:** Properly interpreting policy for staff, keeping contact with parents, establishing clear communication channels with staff, and communicating activities to staff in advance.
- **Budgeting:** Headteachers were able to budget in line with priorities of the school
- **Controlling:** Headteachers had ensured efficient resource utilization

It was felt by 117(66.1%) teachers that school budgetary estimates reflected school priorities and that headteachers motivated teachers to work hard. One hundred and five teachers (52.5%) considered their headteacher as having provided direction on teaching methods, while an almost equal number of 97 (54.8%) teachers agreed that the headteacher involved all staff members in the budgeting process. Only 34 % of teachers indicated that they were involved in making decisions pertaining to the procurement of teaching and learning materials.

Seventy-nine (44.6%) teachers indicated that teachers were free to interact cordially with the headteacher. Seventy-five (42.7%) of teachers agreed that the headteacher worked with teachers to identify in-service training needs to address
teaching challenges of FPE, while 41 (23.1 %) teachers said that their school plans for and organizes in-service training. In addition, it is apparent that few headteachers conduct induction for new teachers, as just 85(48%) teachers indicated that their headteachers inducted new teachers. Responses from teachers showed that headteachers did not conduct classroom visits to supervise teaching. About one quarter (23.7%) of teachers indicated that such visits were made by headteachers. A similarly small number of 38 (21.5 %) teachers considered their headteachers as promoting an environment that supports teachers to try out new teaching techniques and curriculum materials.

Headteachers were overall rated by teachers as having performed poorly with regard to inspecting teachers’ lesson plans and schemes of work, provision of useful feedback on lesson plans and schemes of work, and in developing academic partnerships with other schools. Most headteachers were also said to have failed to provide comprehensive feedback to staff on school inspection that was conducted by Ministry of Education quality assurance officers.

With regard to financial management, all the headteachers had complied with the Ministry of Education requirement to display the summary of purchases and accounts on school notice boards. Headteachers’ rating of the financial skills of members of the SMC was low. According to 32(54.2 %) of headteachers, SMC members have no skills in school budgeting. Twenty-six (44.1%) headteachers reported that members of SMC did not fully participate in procurement, while 48(40.7 %) members of SMCs who were interviewed complained that they were not always adequately involved in the process.

The District Education Offices reported that in 30% and 25 % of the cases in Kakamega and Kajiado district respectively, Ministry of Education auditors were presented with raw data rather properly completed books of account. While most schools had been audited, 40% of school heads did not have any records of the audited reports. Variance analysis, which is an important aspect of school
financial management, seems to have been overlooked by headteachers. The study revealed that only 26(44.06%) headteachers had prepared variance analyses for their schools. In 15(25.4%) of the schools studied, headteachers admitted to not having given receipts to Ministry of Education headquarters as required. In addition, 40% of the headteachers did not have an up to date contracts register.

An assessment of the availability and maintenance of the key documents revealed that headteachers exhibited a high level of compliance with regard to maintaining several key financial documents, such as records of up to date Bank statements, Cashbooks, Payment Vouchers and Local Purchase Order/Local Supply Orders and Receipt books. This is a big contrast to the performance of headteachers with regard to preparing analytical statements of account such as balance sheet, monthly trial balances, income and expenditure statements and bank reconciliations.

With regard to delays in disbursement of FPE funds, Ministry of Education officials at the zonal and district levels mentioned that headteachers also contributed to delays in disbursement by submitting incorrect data, such as erroneous bank account numbers to the Textbook Management Unit (TMU), delaying in submitting updated data and changing accounts without notifying the Ministry of Education in advance.

6.3.4 Adequacy of Preparation/Training, Given to Teachers, Headteachers and Education Officers to Enhance their Ability to Implement the FPE Policy

Headteachers indicated that no preparation for FPE had been given to them prior to implementation. However, all the 59 headteachers indicated that they had attended some training to equip them for FPE after free schooling was introduced. Fifty-five (93.2%) headteachers indicated that they had attended short financial management workshop sessions on budgeting, book-keeping and accounting. Ironically, however, most headteachers still reported having trouble in this aspect of their
management role. Thirty-eight (64.4%) headteachers also indicated that they had received training under the School Empowerment Program (SEP) and 10(16.9%) headteachers indicated they had received training on curricular management for FPE.

Most of the headteachers were of the opinion that whereas the training they had received after the introduction of FPE was useful and necessary, it was inadequate, too short and rushed. The training on financial management was especially cited as being too brief. Headteachers observed that other important aspects such as the teaching of large number of pupils, quality assurance for large school populations, and teaching methodologies that could be used to mitigate the challenges brought about by FPE were given little attention.

Teachers similarly reported that no form of preparation for FPE was given to them before implementation, and they felt unprepared to handle large classes, multi-age teaching, double-shift teaching and multi-grade teaching. They indicated that they were unprepared to teach over-age learners, learners with immensely disparate abilities and for the workload that accompanied the large classes.

However, after the introduction of FPE, 130(73.4%) teachers had attended some form of in-service or orientation course. Fifty-eight(32.8%) of the teachers in the study sample had attended the School Empowerment Programme (SEP) which addressed the challenges of FPE implementation by offering skills in alternative learning approaches like multi-grade and multi-shift teaching, mobile classes and accelerated learning. The SEP succeeded the SbTD, which had been attended by (27.1%) teachers. The five-month SEP in-service programme for primary school teachers focused on key subjects: Math, science and English.

One hundred and forty (79.1%) teachers felt that the in-service training courses were not regular enough, while 116 (65.5%) thought that the in-service training given to them was inadequate with regard to completeness or meeting their needs.
as teachers. Teachers’ responses overall reveal that the duration of the in-service courses was too short and ineffective.

The two District Education Officers interviewed in the study conceded that there was little time for adequate preparation of education officers for the change to FPE. Educational officers at the field level revealed areas in which they felt least prepared and therefore challenged when FPE was introduced.

After the introduction of FPE, training in financial management and training on supervision of textbook procurement and utilization was conducted for District Education Officers and Quality Assurance Officers. The MOEST has trained various Ministry of Education officers in financial management of schools. Zonal and national quality assurance officers were also trained to undertake the monitoring, evaluation and quality assurance aspects of the SbTD implementation.

The INSET unit of the Ministry of Education reported challenges of inadequate staffing and funds. As of the time of interviews in early 2008, the unit was said to be understaffed by 50%. In addition, the INSET Strategy had not been developed, leading to lack of proper coordination and harmonisation. Many different organizations conduct disjointed in-service activities in different parts of the country. It was also noted that the District Teacher Advisory Centres (DTACs) had been scrapped and this has hampered the Ministry of Education’s INSET programme.

6.3.5 Role Played by Parents and School Management Committees in the Implementation of FPE

6.3.5.1 Role played by Parents in the Implementation FPE

Headteachers rated parents’ involvement in the implementation of FPE at the school level as slack. Thirty-one (52.5%) headteachers considered parents as not being actively involved in school management affairs and 55 (93.2%) headteachers indicated that parents did not voluntarily contribute materially or financially to
support school activities. Twenty-nine (49.2%) headteachers indicated that the PTA was active and supportive to the school administration. Thirty-nine (66.1%) headteachers regarded the parents as not cooperating with teachers in promoting teaching and learning since introduction of FPE. Thirty-six (61%) headteachers indicated that parents were not involved in discipline within school.

Teachers, just like the headteachers, rated parents as not being actively involved in school management since the introduction FPE. One hundred and nine (61.9%) teachers said that after the implementation of FPE, parents were neither actively involved in school management affairs nor in the discipline matters of their children at school. Eighty seven percent of teachers said that parents did not contributing materially or financially to support the FPE programme in schools.

Most of the teachers felt that parents did not work with them in following up the academic progress of their children. One hundred and forty-one (79.7 %) teachers indicated that parents did not work with them by following up the academic progress of their children. Further, a small number of 45 (25.4%) teachers indicated that there was cooperation between teachers and parents in promoting teaching and learning after the introduction of FPE.

It was evident that most parents had misinterpreted the FPE policy. According to the majority of parents, the policy simply meant that all children could attend school at no cost whatsoever. Therefore, they did not expect to make any form of contribution, not even for physical development and maintenance of facilities.

6.3.5.2 Role played by SMCs in the Implementation of FPE

Fifty-two (88.1%) headteachers indicated that the SMC played the management roles of budgeting and planning in their schools. Forty-six (78.0%) headteachers reported that the SMC played the role of supervising development projects and 42 (71.2%) reported that the SMC played the role of supervising expenditure.
However, the role played by SMCs was found to be less significant with regard to participation in handling disciplinary cases in the school, maintaining academic standards, and mobilizing and sensitizing parents on school programmes. School Management Committees seem to be inactive in mobilizing resources. Still, School Management Committees were generally regarded by headteachers as being much more supportive than Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs) and 40(67.8%) headteachers stated that they were satisfied with the performance of their SMC.

However, eighteen (30.5%) headteachers expressed dissatisfaction with their SMC and gave reasons such as; SMC members were ignorant of their roles; SMC members are not committed; SMC members are lowly educated and thus incompetent; SMC members interfered with smooth running of the school and SMC members engaged in clanism, nepotism and partisan politics.

Headteachers indicated that whereas most SMCs had overall taken an interest in school management affairs, they lacked the necessary capacity to contribute effectively in financial management, budgeting and curriculum support in schools. Eighteen (30.5%) headteachers indicated that SMC had been weak in mobilizing community resources, and a similar number of headteachers reported that SMC had not had not made any impact in enhancing discipline among pupils. In addition, SMCs were seen by 22(37.3%) of headteachers as having failed to meet teachers on a regular basis to discuss school related problems facing them.

Nevertheless, SMC members said that headteachers generally involved them in the decision-making processes of the school such as in prioritizing school needs for FPE funds expenditure. However, apart from acting as signatories to account withdrawals, they said that their involvement in actual procurement was minimal.

The results show that 56 (47.5%) of SMC members reported that were not adequately knowledgeable to deal with financial management; 41(34.7 %) reported that they were not equipped to handle budgeting and 47(39.8 %) reported that since they were not educational experts, they were not competent to provide curriculum
support in schools. School Management Committee members cited bookkeeping/accounting, budget preparation, guidance and counselling, school development planning and auditing as areas in which they needed training.

In summing up their role in school management, SMCs felt that they are seriously inhibited with regard to improving the state of learning facilities in schools, and that their role in financial management had actually diminished with the introduction of FPE. This, they explained, was due to the government's ban on any additional school levies which made them inactive in fundraising for schools. In fact, SMC members complained that with the introduction of FPE, many parents began to view the SMCs as irrelevant.

6.3.6 Funding of FPE and the Prospects of FPE’s sustainability

6.3.6.1 Funding of FPE
The Director of Policy and Planning in the Ministry of Education explained that by 2004, education was using up a quarter of the Government’s available resources and had the largest share of social spending. In the 2003/04 financial year, as the implementation of FPE began, there was a sharp increase of 13.82 billion (20.8%) in the government’s overall education budget. Over Kshs. 7.6 billion was specifically allocated to the FPE programme.

The major donors who supported FPE at its inception in 2003 were the World Bank, Department for International Development, OPEC, the Swedish government and UNICEF. Donor finances played a critical role in funding FPE as the country was not fully prepared for the FPE that it had so boldly introduced.

However, even with generous amounts proposed to come from donors, the greater financial burden for the programme rests with the government. Over the years, the major sources of funds for funding FPE have been as follows:

- The Government of Kenya (GoK)
- Department for International Development (DFID)
- International Development Association (IDA)
- Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA),
- United Nations Children’s Educational Funds (UNICEF)
- Organization of Oil Exporting Countries (OPEC)
- The Fast Track Initiative (FTI)
- World Food Programme (WFP)
- USAID.

Since 2005 when KESSP was established, until the end of the 2007/2008 FY, the Government of Kenya provided the bulk of the funding for the education sector. During the same period, Free Primary Education used up Kshs. Kshs. 16,521,704,993, and a total of Kshs. 17,358,687,940 was received from the donor community to help ease the gap in financing.

Senior officers at the Ministry of Education headquarters unanimously expressed the opinion that whereas funding for the various FPE needs had been impressive, it nonetheless was inadequate. In addition, funding from donors had been perennially delayed, in turn causing delay in the disbursement of funds to schools.

Ministry of Education officials lamented that between 2005 and 2008, the education sector was unable to meet its targeted activities owing to a deficit. As of June 2008, data from the KESSP Secretariat showed an education sector-financing gap of Kshs. 7,770.81 million. The Investment Programme (IP) leaders reported that the inadequacy of funds had negatively affected many programmes under FPE.

**6.3.6.2 Sustainability of FPE**

When asked if they thought FPE was sustainable, teachers’ mixed response suggests the kind of uncertainty that many people have regarding the sustainability of FPE. Headteachers and teachers nevertheless expressed the conviction that the sustainability of FPE could be guaranteed or enhanced if the government increased the per capita allocation to schools for infrastructural development and maintenance, minimised the reliance on donor funding and made communities to contribute more towards primary education. Headteachers also suggested that FPE should be categorically entrenched in the law and constitution to ensure its survival. Teachers on their part emphasized that more teachers should be employed,
examination fees should be waived for the very poor pupils and that poorer schools should receive preferential treatment in the allocation of resources.

Officers interviewed at the Ministry of Education headquarters conceded that the challenge of funding FPE was immense. Ministry of Education officials expressed concern that KESSP, which has been instrumental in realizing the achievements in the education sector as a whole and FPE in particular, was scheduled to close in 2010. Lastly, Ministry of Education officials observed that the government’s undertaking to provide both instructional materials and physical development was not sustainable. More community participation in provision of some of the facilities was required.

Five concerns emerged as fundamental to the sustainability of FPE in Kenya: budgetary provisions and constraints, the country’s economic performance, donor support, the KESSP initiative, political commitment and community involvement and support.

The sustainability of FPE in Kenya is threatened by high cost of funding FPE, the shortage of teaching staff in schools, the reliance on donors support, the possibility of KESSP’s termination, the uncertainty over continued political goodwill, the slowed growth of the Kenyan economy, and the apathy from parents of pupils in primary schools.

6.3.7 Gaps in FPE Policy

There are several areas in which existing education policy is inadequate to address certain concerns related to FPE in Kenya. There are also, some notable gaps between policy relating to FPE and its implementation. Firstly, there is no policy in place to ensure that children joining the primary school cycle have gone through proper early childhood education. This policy gap causes a pedagogical complication for lower level primary school teachers.
There is a lack of policy guidelines relating to admission of pupils into primary schools. Pupils of all ages and regardless of their level of intellectual preparedness have been admitted into schools and into various class levels.

The heavy reliance on donor support to fill funding deficits raises a policy concern: can donor funding be relied upon to always flow and in sufficient amounts to fill the perennial deficit suffered by the governments’ kitty? It is argued by the researcher in this study that government policy needs to reflect a gradual and explicit endeavour towards self-sustenance.

It was observed from the study that allocation of FPE grants based on school enrolments, disadvantages schools with very low enrolments. This policy is simplistic in its assumptions.

The Government’s current funding policy does not allow for flexibility within the instructional materials and general-purpose accounts, and the process of approving virement is very slow. Owing to the inflexibility of guidelines, schools are unable to provide timely response to needs that are specific to the schools.

There is no policy framework for continuous monitoring of literacy and other skills attained in primary schools. There is a lack of comprehensive system-wide audits of educational achievement in the country.

FPE policy does not provide clear guidelines for parents and the community on how they could provide infrastructural support for schools. Lastly, the introduction of FPE came as a directive; but this did not entrench FPE programme in law to protect it from collapsing in future.

Gaps between policy and implementation
Some schools were found to be collecting school fees and levies from parents contrary to FPE policy. In addition, the teacher-pupil ratio in many schools is much higher than prescribed by official government policy, and the pupil/book ratios
remained as high 1:5 in some schools. These demonstrate a gap between policy and implementation.

6.4 Conclusions

6.4.1 Availability of resources for teaching and learning in schools

The introduction of FPE has negatively impacted on the adequacy of resources in schools. School administrators and teachers alike have difficulties in managing the attendant changes such as increased workload for teachers, shortage of teachers due to understaffing and the inequitable distribution of teaching staff among schools. Staff replenishment rates have been dismally low and have not matched the increase in pupil population. Such conditions have negatively impacted on quality, as teachers are forced to improvise by combining classes, skipping some classes and giving homework.

Managing the changes in the classroom environment has proved to be challenging for teachers. The number of textbooks in primary schools is still insufficient, many schools have congested classrooms and lack sufficient number of desks. Unfortunately, the construction of extra classrooms continues to be a difficult challenge to overcome for school managers.

Primary schools are inadequately resourced to handle Special Needs Education. Learners with Special Needs are therefore not receiving optimal attention in most schools and could continue to lag behind their counterparts.

While the book sharing ratio has improved considerably in schools, extreme cases of a 1:5 BSR still exist. It can be concluded that since many pupils lack textbooks of their own that they could use at home for revision, some pupils’ performance, especially in day schools, will be affected by book shortage.
There exists considerable discrepancy between urban and rural schools, and between, boarding and day schools in terms of infrastructure. Most rural schools have poor quality of buildings. It can be concluded therefore that due to the huge discrepancies among schools, not all children are guaranteed the same standard of education. Poor children receive an inferior education.

The capitation funds that are disbursed to schools are insufficient to cater for school expenditure. The loss of fees revenue arising from school fees abolition has affected school programmes such as internal examinations, physical development, co-curricular activities and provision of furniture.

### 6.4.2 Management Practices in Schools

With regard to the performance of their roles as managers, headteachers generally regard themselves highly. However, many headteachers still have inadequate competence in bookkeeping or accounting, management of financial resources, public relations and guidance and counselling.

Members of SMC, who form an important component of the management of FPE funds, lack the requisite competencies and skills for preparing school budgets.

A large number of headteachers do not provide instructional leadership in their schools, and while many headteachers recognize the value of incorporating members of staff in the budgetary process, many have failed to demonstrate such involvement. Few teachers are involved in the decision-making process in schools.

Headteachers have performed well in most of the management roles. However, in some aspects, their management practices have fallen short of expectation. To be in a position to better manage the change to FPE, some aspects where their performance has fallen short should be improved. These include interpersonal relationship with teachers, identification of training needs of teachers, induction
for new teachers and planning for in-service training. Most headteachers do not provide regular instructional leadership and supervision, as seen in their failure to evaluate lesson plans and schemes of work, conduct classroom supervision and provide an environment that supports teachers to try new techniques.

With regard to managing FPE finances, headteachers are up to date in the maintenance of key day-to-day financial records. This however, is a big contrast to their performance with regard to preparing analytical statements of account such as balance sheet and monthly trial balances. Few headteachers prepare bank reconciliations, monthly trial balances, annual financial statements and income and expenditure statements.

6.4.3 Level of Preparation for FPE

The implementation of FPE in Kenya was hasty and allowed no time for stakeholders to properly prepare for its implementation. A situational analysis was not done to prepare for the change to FPE. It can be concluded therefore that the management of the planning aspect of the change to FPE was poor. Whereas most of the headteachers have now received some useful and necessary form of training or orientation to equip them for FPE, it has been inadequate, too short and rushed.

It can also be concluded from the numerous complaints of inadequate training that there is a gap between teachers’ expectations and what in-service courses provide. The training given to headteachers in financial management is inadequate, and headteachers still experience difficulty in management of financial resources. Other important aspects such as pedagogy and quality assurance for large class populations, and teaching methodologies that could be used to mitigate the challenges brought about by FPE have received inadequate attention under in-service training.

Not all teachers have had some form of in-service training since the introduction of FPE and there is disharmony in the provision of in-service training for teachers. It
can be concluded therefore that there is a lack of clear policy regarding in-service training for teachers. Whereas some teachers had attended as many as three in-service training courses, many others had attended only one or none at all.

Lastly, management of the change to FPE has not made adequate provision for staffing and funding of the quality assurance and in-service training wings of the Ministry of Education.

6.4.4 Role of parents and SMCs

Whereas the role of parents and SMCs is critical to the successful implementation of FPE in Kenya, parents and communities in general, have not contributed adequately in managing the change process. Since the introduction of FPE, most communities have left the burden of school development to the government. Yet, most of the schools have urgent needs such as classroom repairs, desks, latrines and water, which cannot be catered for sufficiently by government grants.

Most Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs), which should be at the forefront in providing support for the change process, have been inactive and unsupportive to schools. The kind of support given by parents of pupils in boarding has however been more consistent with good practice in change management process.

School Management Committees have overall, provided better support for managing the change to FPE than PTAs. However, the role of School Management Committees in mobilizing resources has diminished since the introduction of FPE. The performance of School Management Committees in managing the change to FPE could nonetheless be enhanced if criteria specifying requisite skills for appointment to SMC is improved, and if schools attracted professionals to serve on committees. The fact that many of the SMC members are lowly educated, and lack the necessary capacity to contribute effectively in financial management, budgeting and curriculum support in schools has negatively impacted their ability to provide leadership in managing the change to FPE.
6.4.5 Funding and Sustainability of FPE

It can be concluded that the current cost of FPE is beyond the normal education budget allocation. It can also be concluded that despite having made huge investments in education, the Government of Kenya is still struggling to secure adequate financing for the sector. In Kenya, 28% of the national budget goes to education and this is hardly sustainable, given the competing demand for funding by other sectors of the economy. Deficits in the financing of FPE and education in general have persisted, and the trends suggest the situation shall obtain in the medium-term. The country's economy has not performed well enough to comfortably support FPE and the realisation of UPE goals without the dependence on foreign funding. Whereas donor support has been instrumental in reducing the financing the gap, the aid that that has been given by the donors is not sufficient to guarantee the financial sustainability of FPE.

The financial sustainability of FPE cannot be guaranteed. It hinges on four things; rapid and sustained economic growth, continued (and scaled up) donor support, greater budgetary capacity and more budgetary allocation to primary schooling, maintenance of political goodwill, more parental/community involvement in primary education and the KESSP initiative.

Based on concerns expressed with regard to financing of FPE in Kenya, it can be observed that the issue of financial sustainability of fee abolition needs to be addressed seriously. The government of Kenya will have to mobilize and manage financial resources to sustain the policy within the strained education and national budgetary provisions beyond the short term.

6.4.6 Policy gaps

The study established that there exist some policy gaps that have negatively affected the management of the change to FPE in Kenya. Due to this policy gaps, not all children who enrol for pre-primary education necessarily complete the full
curriculum duration. Furthermore, there is a large population of children who have not had pre–primary schooling but who all the same join primary schooling.

The flaw in policy has also led to substandard institutions being allowed to operate as schools, while at the same time, the inflexibility of FPE funding regime does not adequately address the unique needs of less endowed schools. Then, government policy has not explicitly outlined any measures to guarantee the financial sustainability of FPE without factoring donor assistance.

6.4.7 Systemic Management of the FPE Change Process
Management of the change process that resulted from the introduction of FPE in Kenya has mostly been ad hoc in nature. The change from fee payment by parents to a fee-free primary education and the resultant complex implications that this had on the education system can only be managed more effectively through a systemic approach. A systemic approach to managing the change process will enhance FPE’s prospects for sustainability. For meaningful systemic change to occur, all aspects of the primary school system should be transformed in such ways that support the changes that resulted from the introduction of Free Primary Education. There is need to nurture all aspects of the education system to be able to transform educational innovations and change.

6.5 Recommendations

Based on the main findings and conclusions that have been discussed above, a number of recommendations are made. The recommendations made are generally aimed at the improvement of the management of FPE in Kenya, and have policy implications. The recommendations are presented in line with the objectives and research questions of this study, rather than in order of importance.

a) Human, material and financial resourcing in schools
i. There is need for a staff right-sizing exercise to ensure a more equitable distribution of teachers. Rural and remotely located schools should have
staffing levels that compare favourably with those of urban and peri-urban schools. This should also go hand in hand with a teacher recruitment exercise to fill the big staffing gap in primary schools.

ii. The government should construct Special Units that are fully equipped with resources for special needs education in at least one primary school per location. This would ensure that all learners with special needs who are not enrolled in special schools have access to meaningful inclusive education as outlined in the government policy on mainstreaming special needs education in primary schools. Findings from Kakamega and Kajiado districts revealed that very few schools had Special Units, and so many of the learners with special needs only had access to schools that had neither Special Units nor the necessary the facilities to cater for the needs. The primary schools with Special Units were widely dispersed and were mostly poorly equipped.

iii. There is need for continued affirmative action to improve infrastructure in rural schools. The government should focus on providing electricity, clean water and access roads for schools in the rural areas. Other than enhancing their ability to provide better quality education, this would at the same time make rural schools more attractive for teachers.

iv. The Kshs. 1,020 per capita grants given for FPE is inadequate to cover all expenses. The government needs to revise the amount upwards to at least Kshs. 1,800. The allocation of funds to schools should also consider schools’ level of specific needs such as classrooms, furniture, water supply, electricity, and libraries rather than rely purely on the school enrolment numbers as the basis for calculating the amount of FPE funds to be allocated.

b) Management practices in schools as they relate to the change to FPE.

i. Headteachers should provide illustrious leadership by supervising and providing useful feedback on teaching methods and by establishing collaboration with other schools. Headteachers should also provide
comprehensive feedback to staff on school inspection that is conducted by Ministry of Education Quality Assurance Officers.

ii. Ministry of Education Quality Assurance & Standards Officers as well as Auditors should visit primary schools more often to give guidance to headteachers on financial management. In addition, the ministry should consider deploying accounts clerks to schools, even on a pooled basis, to ease the burden of bookkeeping and accounting faced by headteachers.

iii. The ministry of Education should ensure that all members of SMCs are trained comprehensively on effective school management.

c) Training for education personnel with regard to FPE.

i. There is need to streamline In-service Education provision. Many different organizations conduct in-service activities in different parts of the country as evidenced from findings from Kakamega and Kajiado districts. These in-service training activities are not streamlined to ensure that each teacher gets the opportunity to attend in-service education. There should be a mechanism to ensure that teachers who have not benefited from in-service education are given first priority when training opportunities arise.

ii. All primary school teachers should be given regular school-based professional development courses in SNE and in teaching methods that specifically address the challenges of FPE.

d) Role of parents and SMCs in the implementation of FPE.

The government should promote greater awareness among parents and communities in general on their role in FPE and the benefits that would accrue from greater participation by parents in management of school affairs. There is need for a lucid and responsive national sensitization campaign to educate the public about the FPE policy, including explaining clearly the roles of the various stakeholders in the implementation of the programme.

e) Funding and ensuring sustainability of the FPE initiative.
i. Whereas the government has instituted measures such as the school feeding programme to benefit marginalised regions, children who come from very poor families in the more generally economically endowed regions of the country may still not necessarily be able to attend school even with the fee abolition. This is because their parents still have to buy school uniform, feed them and provide medical care, or may find the opportunity cost of attending school to be high. The government should provide specific support, such as extending school feeding programme to the poor pupils in the more economically endowed regions, or greater per capita allocation to the poorer schools in the different parts of the country. It is important for government policy to strike a balance between targeted programs aimed at marginalised regions of the country and those that take into consideration other children who might be disadvantaged in other ways such as belonging to poverty stricken households. It is also a reality that the educational needs of children differ across the country, and the uniform application of grants to schools is unfair.

ii. More consideration for home-grown solutions should guide policy making to ensure that available resources can guarantee the sustainability of FPE into the future. There should be less reliance on external donor funding to sustain FPE. Long-term sustainability of the FPE requires that the government puts in place stringent measures for fiscal discipline in government expenditure. Savings made from such austerity measures can then be channelled towards more sustainable funding for the FPE programme. This also implies that the economic growth should be maintained at progressive levels, since the ability to finance FPE will largely depend on the economic health of the country.

f) Addressing gaps in the FPE policy

i. Free Primary Education should be re-labelled as “Affordable Primary Education for All”; the slogan “Free Primary Education’ has been misinterpreted by some parents. The cost-sharing relationship between communities and the government for school physical infrastructure
development should be explicitly defined. Communities can still provide some support to schools, but there seem to be no clear structures to facilitate this participation.

ii. Admission policy for schools should be made more stringent to ensure that where schools reach their full capacity for accommodating pupils, no more pupils are admitted and immediate measures to increase capacity are initiated (such as providing government grants for prefabricated classrooms and immediately deploying additional teachers).

iii. The FPE funding policy should be tailored to the needs of specific regions and schools. The expenditure guidelines for FPE funds should be so designed as to be responsive to the specific needs of schools in different regions of the country.

**g) Systemic change management of FPE in Kenya**

The implementation of FPE in Kenya failed to nurture all the aspects of the system to transform in response to the change in policy. In addition, implementation of FPE came too soon after the political pronouncement that declared primary education would be free. This therefore did not allow for proper advance planning, such that policy formulation has reflected ad hoc response to challenges. For meaningful systemic change to occur in the implementation of FPE, there is need to nurture all aspects of the education system to be able to transform by ensuring long-term planning, instituting complementary policy measures to guarantee children’s attendance in the early childhood education, continually anticipating barriers to the success of FPE and their solutions, mobilizing interest among stakeholders, establishing mechanisms for sustainability of FPE, rethinking and redeploying resources for equity and efficiency, exploring home-grown funding options and engaging in continuous personnel and system performance evaluation at all levels.
6.6 Suggestions for Further Research

i. There is need for research to empirically review the impact that the change of policy to FPE has had on the quality of education. Such an inquiry should also scrutinize the effectiveness of teaching methods used in schools and their suitability under the FPE.

ii. It would be useful to establish through research, just how much parents (or even different discernible categories of parents) are willing to contribute towards resourcing schools without feeling pressured. Understanding this would provide useful data that can be used to design a sustainable cost – sharing funding model for FPE in Kenya.
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INTRODUCTION

I am conducting a study on the management of Free Primary Education (FPE) in schools. The aim of the questions asked in this questionnaire is to seek information based on your experiences as a headteacher. The management matters addressed here are seen in the context of FPE in schools. This information is useful for studying the implementation of FPE in Kenya. Please give information relevant to your current school. Throughout this questionnaire, the abbreviation FPE is used to mean Free Primary Education.

There is no right or wrong answer; only your honest opinion is sought. The information you provide will be used strictly for academic purposes. YOUR IDENTITY AND THE INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE WILL BE TREATED IN CONFIDENCE. I will be grateful if you participate in this study by completing this questionnaire.

Instructions

The questionnaire is divided into sections A, B and C. Section A seeks background information about you and the school. Fill the blank space provided or tick the appropriate answer in the bracket “( )” space provided. In section B, tick the response that matches your opinion in the column on the right hand side of the table. For section C, provide brief answers to the questions in the space provided after the question.

SECTION A

Name of school…………………………………………
Number of pupils…………………………………………
Number of teachers……………………………………...
Number of streams per class……….. (Specify if the number is not uniform in the different class level e.g. Std 1- three streams, Std 2- two streams) ………………….
School type: Tick whether Boys’ ( ) Girls’ ( ) or Mixed ( )
The school is Day ( ) Boarding ( )
Number of years as Headteacher………………
Total number of years as a teacher………………
Your sex: Male ( ) Female ( )

SECTION B

Read each item carefully and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement by ticking (✔) in the column on the right side of the table. Your response should be a reflection of the situation in your school. The options given stand for;

SA - Strongly Agree  D - Disagree
A - Agree  SD - Strongly Disagree
U - Undecided
For Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The learners in the school lack enthusiasm in class</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** The tick (✔) in the second column for responses would indicate you agree with the statement. This implies therefore, in your school, you find the pupils to lack enthusiasm in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The school has sufficient number of classrooms to accommodate all learners admitted after introduction of FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The school has an adequate number of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The teachers have normal load of teaching hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The teaching materials supplied by the government for the FPE programme are sufficient for teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The number of books issued by the government under FPE program is adequate for all learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parents of pupils in your school have been actively involved in school management affairs after introduction of FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parents of pupils in your school have been actively involved in discipline of pupils within the school after introduction of FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. After introduction of FPE, parents of pupils in your school have been actively involved in contributing materially/financially in support of school activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is still possible to give the pupils as much individual attention as was the case before the introduction of FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The FPE programme was hastily implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The school’s Parents’ Association has been active and supportive since the introduction of FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Since the introduction of FPE the budgeting process for the school involves all members of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Since the introduction of FPE, the educational activities for the term are always communicated to staff in advance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Since the introduction of FPE, you are able develop school routines and procedures to ensure more effective use of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Since the introduction of FPE, the school has regularly received inspectors from the Ministry of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. You normally plan and schedule the work of teaching and support staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. In the school, there is delegation of authority and responsibility to members of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. With the introduction of FPE, you have difficulty in equitably distributing duties among all members of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Under the FPE programme all members of staff in your school clearly understand what their responsibilities in the school are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>As a school manager under the FPE programme, you are in a position to effectively understand the needs and concerns of members of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Staff members feel free to interact cordially with the headteacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE you are <strong>unable</strong> to personally supervise the effective utilization of resources in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, you discuss with individual teachers, their instructional problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>As the headteacher, you identify the school’s educational needs and set priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, there is an arrangement for teachers to work with you to identify in-service needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>To better equip them for FPE, the school plans for and organizes in-service training programmes for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, you regularly give direction to teachers on teaching methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, you have been conducting classroom visits for supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, you conduct <strong>induction</strong> for new and professionally young teachers to plan their teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, teachers are free to try out new teaching techniques and curriculum materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, you are personally involved in motivating pupils in their academic work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, there is cooperation between teachers and parents in promoting teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, you solicit the involvement of parents in school affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, you are able to communicate with parents regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>There is a good working relationship among teachers in your school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Meetings between staff and headteacher are held regularly in the school since the introduction of FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, there has been a clearly understood and effective communication system between the teachers and the headteacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>The school management committee has provided support by participating in school management since the introduction of FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>The quality of learning has been compromised by FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B
1(a) Have you ever attended any in-service or orientation course since FPE was introduced?
   Yes (    )           NO (   ).
(b) If the answer is yes, what was the content of this training?
                     .................................................................
                     .................................................................
                     .................................................................
c) If you have attended in-service or orientation course since FPE, has it been adequate for your needs as a headteacher under FPE?(Explain)
                     .................................................................
                     .................................................................
2. Since the inception of FPE, do you feel overworked? Yes (    ) NO (   ).
   Explain .................................................................
                     .................................................................
                     .................................................................
3.a) In what specific areas, if any, would you require training to better enable you to be effective in your job as a headteacher under the FPE programme?
                     .................................................................
                     .................................................................
                     .................................................................
                     .................................................................
b) In what aspects/ tasks of management do you feel inadequately skilled to operate effectively as a head teacher?
                     .................................................................
                     .................................................................
                     .................................................................
                     .................................................................
4. What has been the increase in number of pupils in this school since the introduction of FPE? ..........
5. What specific problems have you experienced with this increased number of pupils?
   i) .................................................................
      .................................................................
   ii) .................................................................
      .................................................................
   iii) .................................................................
      .................................................................
   iv) .................................................................
6. (a) Do you have any pupils with special needs (e.g. handicapped, street children, orphans, over-age learners)? Yes ( ) No ( )
(b) If yes, specify the type of special need..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................
(c) If you have such pupils with special needs, what arrangements do you have in place to cope with their unique requirements?

i)..............................................................................................................................................................................................
ii)..............................................................................................................................................................................................
iii)..............................................................................................................................................................................................
iv)..............................................................................................................................................................................................

7. Do you have any pupils who are unable to afford school uniform? How do you resolve this?

..............................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................

8. Have you had to make any innovations and improvisations to cope with teaching under FPE? Yes ( ) No ( )

Specify..............................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................

9. Do you think your work is hampered by lack of resources? Yes ( ) No ( )
(Explain your answer)

..............................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................................

10. As a result of the introduction of FPE, in what significant ways has your administration job changed?

i)..............................................................................................................................................................................................
ii)..............................................................................................................................................................................................
iii)..............................................................................................................................................................................................
iv)..............................................................................................................................................................................................

11. (a) Would you say the funds disbursed to schools by the government are sufficient to cater for school expenditure? NO....... YES....... (Tick the appropriate answer)
(b) If NO, approximately how much more per year would enable you to meet your expenditure?
Kshs.__________________________________________________________

(c) What aspects of school operations have been most affected by the loss of revenue from payment of fees and levies?
   i) ____________________________________________________________
   ii) __________________________________________________________
   iii) _________________________________________________________
   iv) _________________________________________________________
   v) _________________________________________________________

12. (a) What physical facilities have you constructed since the introduction of FPE?
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

(b) What physical facilities does the school require as a result of the FPE?
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

13. Does the school employ any (a) non-TSC teachers? If yes how many? ........
   (b) Support staff.......If yes how many? ........

14. How does the school pay for their services?
   i) ...................................................................................................
   ii) ...................................................................................................
   iii) ...................................................................................................
   iv) ...................................................................................................

15. Did you have to lay off any workers as a result of the implementation of FPE?
   Yes (....)   No (....)

16. If you laid off workers, how has the school reorganized to handle the work that was done by the laid –off employees?
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

17. In what areas of school operations (both teaching and non academic) are you short of personnel?
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

18. How many additional teachers have you received since the introduction of FPE? .........

19. If there are any income generating activities, list them and indicate who manages each
20. What role does the school committee play in management of the school?
i).................................................................................................
ii).................................................................................................
iii).................................................................................................
iv).................................................................................................
v).................................................................................................
vi).................................................................................................

21. a) Are you satisfied with performance of the school committee? Yes (  ) No (   )
(Explain your answer)
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................

b) In what areas, if any, has the SMC shown weakness in their role as managers?
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................

22. What specific recommendations would you give that could improve the management of FPE in Kenya?
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................

23. What if any are the flaws in educational policy that negatively impact on provision of FPE in Kenya?
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................

\
APPENDIX II

TEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION
I am conducting a study on the management of Free Primary Education (FPE) in schools. The aim of the questions asked in this questionnaire is to seek information on your experiences as a teacher and on matters pertaining to management in the context of FPE in schools. This information is useful for studying the implementation of FPE in Kenya. Please give information relevant to the class level that you represent (indicated above). Throughout this questionnaire, the abbreviation FPE is used to mean Free Primary Education.

There are no right or wrong answers; only your honest opinion is sought. The information you provide will be used strictly for academic purposes. YOUR IDENTITY AND THE INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE WILL BE TREATED IN CONFIDENCE. I will be grateful if you participate in this study by completing this questionnaire.

Instructions
The questionnaire is divided into sections A, B and C. Section A seeks background information about you and the school. Fill the blank space provided or tick the appropriate answer in the bracket “( )” space provided. In section B, tick the response that matches your opinion in the column on the right hand side of the table. For section C, provide brief answers to the questions in the space provided after the question.

SECTION A

Name of School..........................................................
School type: Boys’ ( ) Girls’ ( ) Mixed ( ) (Tick appropriate option)
The school is day ( ) boarding ( ) (tick the appropriate option)
Your Sex: Male ( ) Female ( )
Number of years as a teacher......................
The class you teach is..............................
Number of streams per class....................
Number of pupils in a stream..............
Total number lessons you teach per week...........

SECTION B

Read each item carefully and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement by ticking ( ✔ ) in the column on the right side of the table. Your response should reflect the situation in your school in relation to FPE. The options given stand for:
SA-Strongly Agree      D -Disagree
A -Agree               A-Strongly Agree
U - Undecided          D-Strongly Disagree
For Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The learners in the school lack enthusiasm in class</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** The tick (✓) in the second column for responses would indicate you agree with the statement. This implies therefore, in the class you teach, you find the pupils to lack enthusiasm in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The classroom has adequate space to accommodate all learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The school has an adequate number of teachers to effectively teach the increased number of pupils after introduction of FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. After the introduction of FPE, you have an <em>unmanageable</em> load of teaching hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Since the introduction of FPE, your school has had adequate teaching resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The number of books issued by the government for the FPE programme is adequate for all learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. After the implementation of FPE, parents of pupils in your school are actively involved in school management affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Since the introduction of FPE, parents of pupils in your school are actively involved in discipline of pupils within the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Parents of pupils in your school have been actively involved in contributing materially/financially in support of school activities after the introduction of FPE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is still possible to give the pupils as much individual attention as was the case before the introduction of FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The FPE programme was hastily implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Since the introduction of FPE, parents have worked with you in following up the academic progress of their children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The teaching materials supplied by the government to support FPE have enhanced teaching in your class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher has fully outlined the plans for the school to achieve its goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Since the introduction of FPE, the head teacher ensures that the budgeting process for the school involves all staff members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Since the introduction of FPE, the educational activities for the term have always been communicated to staff well in advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher manages time effectively by developing school routines, procedures and that ensure more effective use of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the school budgetary estimates reflect school priorities and are effective during implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Even after implementation of FPE, teachers in your school have a manageable load of teaching hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the head teacher effectively plans and schedules the work of teaching and support staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the head teacher delegates authority and responsibility to members of staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, delegation of authority is clear and works effectively in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, there is a fair distribution of duties among all members of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The head teacher makes it clear for each member of staff what their responsibilities in the school are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher effectively perceives the needs and concerns of members of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Staff members are free to interact cordially with the headteacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The FPE programme has been a complete success in your school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The headteacher discusses with individual teachers their instructional problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The headteacher identifies the school’s educational needs for FPE and sets priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The headteacher works with teachers to identify in-service needs to address the teaching challenges brought about by FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the school plans for and organizes in-service training programmes for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher oversees effective utilization of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher discusses with individual teachers their instructional problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>After introduction of FPE, the headteacher has provided direction to teachers on teaching methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The headteacher conducts classroom visits to directly supervise implementation of FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>QUESTION ITEM</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The headteacher conducts induction to help new teachers and professionally young teachers to plan their teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher promotes an environment that supports teachers to try out new teaching techniques and curriculum materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher interprets relevant education laws and policy to members of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher is personally involved in motivating pupils in their academic work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>There is cooperation between teachers and parents in promoting teaching and learning after the introduction of FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>The headteacher solicits the involvement of parents in school affairs after the introduction of FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher motivates teachers to work hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>The headteacher controls school performance under the FPE programme through establishing and maintaining standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>The headteacher communicates with parents regularly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher promotes a good working relationship among teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, meetings between staff and headteacher are held regularly in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, there is a clearly understood and effective communication system between you as a teacher and the headteacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate the performance of your head teacher on the following according to the scale provided. Grade them on a scale of 1-3 points, where 1 stands for very good, 2 stands for satisfactory and 3 stands for poor or missing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Very good</th>
<th>2 satisfactory</th>
<th>3 Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the head teacher has put in place active strategies for enhancing teamwork among teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The headteacher sets a very clear educational direction to the work of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher sets challenging targets to raise academic standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher carries out monitoring by inspecting teachers’ lesson plans and schemes of work.

Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher provides useful feedback on lesson plans and schemes of work.

Since the introduction of FPE, the school head works in partnership with other schools to promote learners’ achievement.

Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher provides feedback to staff on school inspection that is conducted by Ministry quality assurance officers.

Since the introduction of FPE, the expenditure of schools finances has been transparent.

Since the introduction of FPE, the headteacher has treated all staff members equally and fairly.

---

**PART B**

1(a) Have you ever attended any in-service or orientation course for teaching since FPE was introduced? Yes ( ) No ( ).

(b) If the answer is yes, what was the content of this training?

(c) If you have attended in-service or orientation course for teaching since FPE, has it been adequate for your needs as a teacher under FPE?

Explain………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Since the inception of FPE, do you feel overworked? Yes ( ) No ( ).

(Explain) …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. In what specific areas, if any, would you require training to better enable you to be effective in your job as teacher under the FPE programme?

i) ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

ii) …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

iii) …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
4. What has been the average increase in number of pupils at this class level since the introduction of FPE? .......... 

5. What specific problems have you experienced with this increased number of pupils?
   i) ..........................................................................................................
   ii) ..........................................................................................................
   iii) ..........................................................................................................
   iv) ..........................................................................................................
   v) ..........................................................................................................
   vi) ..........................................................................................................

6. (a) Do you have any pupils with special needs (e.g. handicapped, street children, orphans)? Yes ( ) No ( )
   (b) If you have such pupils with special needs, what arrangements do you have in place to cope with their unique requirements?
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................

7. Have you had to make any innovations and improvisations to cope with teaching under FPE? Yes ( ) No ( )
   (Explain) ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................

8. Are you able to mark pupils’ tests as regularly as you did before FPE was introduced?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
   (Explain) ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................
      ..........................................................................................................

9. Do you think your work is hampered by lack of resources? Yes ( ) No ( )
(Explain your answer).

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
10. Do you have all the recommended books? ........................
11. (a) Do the pupils have all the recommended books? .................
    (b) How are the books used by pupils; individually or shared?
    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    (c) If the books are shared, in what ratio is this done?
    ……………………………………………………………………………………

12(a) In your opinion, do you think FPE is sustainable? (Explain).
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

b) What, in your opinion, can be done to improve the FPE programme in Kenya?
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
APPENDIX III

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR HEADTEACHERS

The following instrument is meant to gather in-depth information on the experiences of headteachers in the implementation of FPE.

1. What has been the community’s role in mobilizing extra resources for the school?
2. What are the challenges that have been occasioned by FPE?
3. What special arrangements are made for coping with pupils with special needs?
4. a) What are the school’s plans, if any, for income generating activity?
   b) If the school has IGA, what does the school earn from this venture?
5. What cost-cutting measures have been employed by the school in adjusting to the loss of revenue from fees charged?
6. What role have parents played in FPE?
7. How competent are your SMC members in constructing budgets, costing, procurement processes and tendering procedures.
8. How competent are you in constructing budgets, accounting, financial reporting, costing, procurement processes and tendering procedures?
9. Does the Ministry of Education provide you with sufficient guidelines on the expenditure of FPE funds? Are sufficiently knowledgeable on the guidelines provided?
10. What are the shortcomings of FPE policy in Kenya?
11.) In your opinion, do you think FPE is sustainable? Explain.
12. Describe the changes in your management job and in the school’s operations and activities that have resulted from the introduction of FPE. How have you managed these changes?
13. Give suggestions for improvement of the management of FPE.
APPENDIX IV

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE OFFICERS (AEOs)

INTRODUCTION
The discussion we are going to have is meant to seek your opinions on the management of Free Primary Education (FPE) in your area of jurisdiction as an education officer. The opinions you express and the information you volunteer will be used for academic purposes. Your identity shall also be kept anonymous.

1. How effectively have headteachers been in managing resources provided by the government for Free Primary Education (FPE)?
2. What form of instructional and management support has been given to teachers and headteachers respectively by the Ministry of Education?
3. What challenges have been faced by the education office in management of FPE programme?
4. What has been the increase in number of pupils enrolled in the district since the introduction of FPE in the year 2003?
5. Have the headteachers followed the procurement guidelines set by the Ministry of Education in acquiring supplies for schools under the FPE programme?
6. What arrangements have been put in place to cater for learners with special needs (over-age learners, street children, orphans and the handicapped)?
7. What shortcomings in policy may have hampered the successful implementation of FPE in Kenya?
8. Were you adequately prepared for the implementation of FPE?
9. What can be done to improve the management of FPE in schools and at the Ministry of Education levels?
APPENDIX V

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PARENTS

1. What is your a) your level of formal education?
   b) Age?
   c) Profession?
   d) Source of income?
   e) Approximate annual income?

2. What is your average monthly income?

3. Are you an old or new parent in this school?

4. What are you expected to contribute towards your child’s education? What do you understand by FPE?

5. What can be done to improve FPE programme in Kenya?

6. Are you involved in management affairs of your child’s school?

7. How often do you visit your child’s school? (Now and before introduction of FPE)

8. Would you like to voluntarily contribute more to support the programmes of the school?

9. Are you satisfied with overall management of the FPE in your child’s school?
   If not, what aspects are you dissatisfied with?

10. Would you rate the FPE programme as successful so far?

11. What shortcomings in policy may have hampered the successful implementation of FPE in Kenya?
APPENDIX VI

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEMBERS

INTRODUCTION
I am conducting a research on the management of Free Primary Education in schools. The discussion we are going to have seeks to get information from you on your views and experiences as a member of the school committee on matters related to the implementation of Free Primary Education in your school.

1. What are the challenges you have faced as a member of the school committee with the introduction of Free Primary Education?
2. Would you say you are fully involved in management affairs of your school?
3. How often do you visit the school on official duty as a member of the school committee?
4. Has the school committee played any role in mobilizing extra resources for the school since the introduction of FPE?
5. Are you satisfied with overall management of the FPE in this school? If not, with what aspects are you dissatisfied.
6. In what aspects of school management do you feel inadequately skilled to be effective? In what aspects would you like to be trained?
7. Would you rate the FPE in your school programme as successful so far?
8. What strategies have you put in place as members of the school committee towards improvement of the implementation of FPE in this school?
9. What shortcomings in policy may have hampered the successful implementation of FPE in Kenya?
10. What can be done to improve FPE programme in Kenya?
APPENDIX VII

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE FOR TEACHERS

INTRODUCTION
I am conducting a research on the management of Free Primary Education in schools. The discussion we are going to have seeks to get information from you on your views and experiences on matters relating to the implementation of Free Primary Education in your school.

1. What are the challenges you have faced as teachers with the introduction of Free Primary Education?

2. Have you had any cases of dropouts from your school after the introduction of FPE? If so, what could these be attributed to?

3. What can you say about the level and adequacy of teaching and learning materials in the classrooms? (Probe for textbooks, writing materials, teaching aids, other educational support materials).

4. How supportive have the parents been in providing for; Teaching and learning materials, school facilities, and pupil discipline matters, and the academic performance of their children?

5. In what aspects of your teaching job would you recommend in-service training to better enable you to be effective in the context of FPE?

6. Suggest ways through which the management of FPE can be improved in your school and in the country as a whole.

7. Describe the changes in your teaching job and in the school’s operations and activities that have resulted from the introduction of FPE. How have you managed these changes?
APPENDIX VIII

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICER

1. What plans have been made at the district education headquarters for capacity building/training of education officers and teachers involved in FPE?

2. What strategies are employed for monitoring and evaluation of the FPE programme in your district?

3. How would you rate the success of the implementation of FPE in the district?

4. What are the financial and material resource gaps faced by the district education office for the effective implementation of FPE?

5. What partnerships have been forged between the government and donor agencies towards the FPE effort in your district?

6. How effective have headteachers been in managing resources provided by the government for Free Primary Education (FPE) in your district?

7. What form of instructional and management support has been given to teachers and headteachers respectively by the Ministry of Education in your district with reference to FPE?

8. What challenges have been faced by the district education office in management of FPE programme?

9. What has been the increase in number of pupils enrolled in the district since the introduction of FPE in the year 2003?

10. What shortcomings in policy may have hampered the successful implementation of FPE in Kenya?

11. What can be done in your district to improve the management of FPE in schools?
APPENDIX IX

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR DIRECTOR OF POLICY AND PLANNING

1. What plans have been made at the Ministry of Education headquarters for capacity building/training of education officers involved in FPE?
2. What strategies are employed for monitoring and evaluation of the FPE programme?
3. How would you rate the success of the implementation of FPE in the country?
4. What are the financial and material resource gaps faced by the Ministry of Education for the effective implementation of FPE?
5. What are the policy gaps that may negatively impact the effective implementation of FPE?
6. What partnerships have been forged between the government and donor agencies towards the FPE effort?
7. What arrangements have been made by the government in anticipation of increase in number of pupils who shall enter the secondary school cycle?
8. How much of the expenditure on education has gone to financing FPE?
9. What is your view on the sustainability of FPE?
APPENDIX X

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR KESSP IP TEAM LEADERS

1. What plans have been made at the Ministry of Education headquarters for capacity building/training of education officers involved in FPE under your IP?
2. What strategies are employed for monitoring and evaluation of the FPE related programmes in your IP?
3. How would you rate the success of the implementation of FPE in the country?
4. What are the financial and material resource gaps faced by your IP that may hamper the effective implementation of FPE?
5. What are the policy gaps that may negatively impact the effective implementation of FPE?
6. What partnerships have been forged between the government and donor agencies towards the FPE effort? Have they been successful?
7. How much of the expenditure in your IP goes directly towards FPE?
8. Has your IP been able to fully meet its objectives that are related FPE? If not, what factors have acted as impediments?
9. What is your view on the sustainability of FPE?
APPENDIX XI

DISCUSSION GUIDE FOR PUPILS

1. Are you happy with free primary education?
2. Are the exercise books you are given enough for your use?
3. Do you have any textbooks of your own?
4. Do your parents allow you enough time to do homework after school when get home?
5. Is the classroom environment conducive for you in terms of space and the availability of desks?
APPENDIX XII

OBSERVATION SCHEDULE FOR SCHOOLS

The researcher to utilize direct observation to describe the school and the conditions existing within the research setting. There will be direct observation and description of;

1. The schools’ physical conditions, classroom learning environments and teaching facilities in general. Particular attention will be given to the quality of school buildings. The adequacy and suitability of school facilities (convenience of classroom space, adequacy of desks, tables, proper blackboards, etc) will be observed

2. Provision of facilities for inclusive education

3. Availability of classroom learning equipment in classes (charts, globes, maps, and innovative use of locally available materials).

4. School physical environment (sanitation, playgrounds, maintenance)

5. Maintenance of material resources (books, equipment, desks etc)

a) Observation Guide For Assessing the Maintenance of Key Financial Records in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents/record</th>
<th>Document available and properly maintained</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank reconciliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment voucher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPO/LSO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials receipts and Issue register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Checklist for the availability and status of physical conditions in schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHALKBOARD</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>WINDOWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>visibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Window panes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of surface</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wooden windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESKS</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate for number of pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition (state of repair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILLUMINATION</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>WINDOWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walls</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>WINDOWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permanence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>painted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleanliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOFS</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>WINDOWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crumbling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING AIDS</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>WINDOWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**c) Additional Classroom observations:**

*Key points to observe*
- Bookshelf
- Classroom dictionary
- Wall charts
- Wall maps
- Class book corner
- Teacher’s chair
- Teacher’s table
- Cupboard
d) School technological equipment

**Checklist for availability of equipment in schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Not available</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewriter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio cassette player</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead projector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video machine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax machine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding machine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning machine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX XIII

SAMPLING PROCEDURE FOR SCHOOLS IN KAKAMEGA AND KAJIADO DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KAJIADO</th>
<th>KAKAMEGA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of schools (Population)</strong></td>
<td>198 (37 %)</td>
<td>344(63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of day schools</strong></td>
<td>191(97% of district total)</td>
<td>339 (99% of district total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of boarding schools</strong></td>
<td>7 (3.5% of district total)</td>
<td>5 (2% of district total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample size</strong></td>
<td>22(37%)</td>
<td>37(63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of day schools selected in sample</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of boarding schools selected in sample</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Ministry of Education, Planning Department. Nairobi