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ABSTRACT

The CDF Act is one of the most credible and critical legislation passed by the Kenyan parliament in the recent past. It is one of the indigenous innovations of the national rainbow coalition (NARC) of the government of Kenya. The CDF was established by an act of parliament in the year 2003. It was passed into law in 2003 by the national Assembly. The CDF act was gazetted in Kenya Gazette supplement no.107 (Act No. 11) dated January 9th, 2004. The act compels the Minister for finance to allocate not less than 2.5 percent of all government ordinary revenue collected in every financial year and the money paid to the fund is distributed to the constituencies. One of the development sectors that CDF has been directed to is educational service delivery. There are various education sectors to which CDF can be directed. Such sectors include infrastructural development (classrooms, offices, laboratories, office blocks, libraries), enrollment, performance (examination, extracullicular activities), staffing (academic and non-teaching staff) student and staff satisfaction. However, CDF in education has not ensured high quality of service, equity in access or adequate efficiencies. There are many gaps that need to be filled in terms of education service delivery.

The purpose of this study was to assess the impact of CDF on education service delivery in Manyatta constituency. A descriptive survey was used in this study. The target population for the study consisted of 27 day secondary school principals however interviews were done for 26 day public secondary schools since one of the schools has since been elevated to a boarding secondary school making it ineligible for the study. A researcher-filled interview schedule was used to gather data from the sampled school heads and document analysis. Observation schedule was used to gather information from the physical projects funded by CDF in the day secondary schools. Data collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics, that is, percentages, mean and frequencies. Statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) was used for data analysis. Data is presented in the form of frequency distributions, tables, bar graphs and pie charts.

In this study 25 (96.2 %) day secondary schools are CDF funded. Most of the school had received the least amount of the CDF amount most which seemed to be used in infrastructural development. All the Principals reported that CDF fund has a great impact on the performance of the students this was confirmed by document analysis. Enrollments rate has also been increasing. Majority of the principals are not satisfied with amount allocated in their schools. The study revealed that there are numerous problems encountered in management of CDF funds by the principals in their schools e.g political inteference, inadequate amount allocation, poor management and lack of transparency.

There are still daunting challenges with regard to CDF funds availability, accessibility, allocation and utilization in schools. The results suggest key improvement would be fairness in the funds distribution, transparency, lack of political interference and putting good management committee in place.
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DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Impact:** Refers to the either positive or negative influence or effect of the CDF to education service delivery.

**Secondary school:** Refers to an educational institution where the final stage of compulsory schooling, known as secondary education, takes place. It follows on from elementary or primary education.

**Day secondary school:** Refers to a non-boarding post primary institution in which students receive regular instruction for four years from form one to form four.

**Constituency:** Refers to an electoral area. In this study it is an area under an MP where CDF money is allocated.

**Headteacher:** Refers to male or female school administrator in charge of running a school

**Education Service Delivery:** Educational delivery system is programs that serve students in order for the school system to meet its mission
### ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BoG</td>
<td>Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDF</td>
<td>Constituency Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFB</td>
<td>Constituencies Development Fund Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Education Service Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>Free Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoK</td>
<td>Government of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE</td>
<td>Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEA</td>
<td>Institute of Economic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATF</td>
<td>Local Authority Transfer Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARC</td>
<td>National Rainbow Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMC</td>
<td>National management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMLF</td>
<td>Road Maintenance Levy Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Kenya’s CDF is one of the indigenous innovations of the national rainbow coalition (NARC) of the government of Kenya (Kimenyi, 2005). The CDF was established by an act of parliament in the year 2003. It was passed into law in 2003 by national Assembly. The CDF act was gazetted in Kenya Gazette supplement no.107 (Act No. 11) dated January 9th, 2004. The act compels the Minister for finance to allocate not less than 2.5 percent of all government ordinary revenue collected in every financial year and the money paid to the fund is distributed under the direction of the National Management Committee (NMC) to the 210 constituencies for development programmes (Gok, 2003, Sambili, 2008).

Manyatta constituency is located in Eastern province of Kenya. It covers an area of 265.5 square kilometers with a population of 165368. The constituency comprises of three divisions and seven sub-locations. Over the years Manyatta constituency has continued to grow becoming one of the most developed constituencies in the country (Manyatta CDF Newsletter, 2007).

According to the latest Government records nearly all children of school going age in the constituency are already enrolled in various primary schools while the primary secondary school transition rate is one of the highest in the country. This has been made possible by the constituency development fund which has enabled the financing of education in many secondary and primary schools in the area (Ndwiga, 2006). The CDF is mainly used for constructing social infrastructures predominantly schools (IEA, 2006). The CDF came in hardy right from the inception of the fund with an ambitious programme to expand educational facilities with a special focus on day secondary schools being undertaken. This decision was driven by the high demand for affordable and accessible secondary schools within the constituency since then 75 educational projects have been funded to the tune of 35 million shillings (Ndwiga, 2006).
Public Day secondary schools have been the greatest beneficiary of this undertaking; seven ultra modern laboratories have been put up in day secondary schools which are now fully operational. More laboratories are under way in 8 day secondary schools making a total of 15 laboratories. A total of 14.6 million shillings has been spent on this project alone. Seventeen primary and secondary schools spread all over the constituency has received 14.7 million for construction of classrooms while 3 youth polytechnics have been funded to the tune of Sh 5 million. A total of 1,048 students pursuing education in post secondary institutions have benefited from 4 million CDF bursary kitty. Twelve other education institutions have received emergency funds totaling to Sh. 1.3 million (KNUT Executive Secretary, Embu branch, 2006). The CDF has helped communities initiate cross-cutting development projects in their respective constituencies. However, this study seeks to dwell on CDF in educational projects in Manyatta constituency. The CDF in education has not ensured high quality of service, equity in access or adequate efficiencies. There are many gaps that need to be filled in terms of education. Therefore, this study seeks to assess the impact of CDF on education service delivery in Manyatta constituency.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The initiation of the CDF in Kenya has created a desire for empirical studies, generation of new insights and innovations to inform CDF in development strategies. Most of the studies that have been done earlier on CDF have basically focused on CDF in general for instance a study by Kimenyi (2005) on the Efficiency and Efficacy of Kenya’s CDF; Nzwili, (2006), on the Impact of CDF on development and IEA, (2006) A citizens report card on the CDF. Whereas such studies provide very vital information on CDF in development, they do not necessarily provide a good indicator of CDF in a particular development project, for instance education projects.

There are various education sectors to which CDF can be directed. Such sectors include infrastructural development (classrooms, offices, laboratories, office blocks, libraries), enrollment, performance (examination, extracullicular activities), staffing (academic and non-teaching staff) student and staff satisfaction. However, a study by (IEA, 2006)
indicated that CDF is not well managed, planning and selection of the projects is poor. A bigger portion of the fund has been embezzled and that it has been entrusted with unqualified personnel most of whom are relatives and friends of the area MP to manage the fund. Considering the above it was therefore imperative to examine the impact of the CDF on education service delivery in Manyatta constituency.

1.3 Overall objective

The purpose of this paper was to assess the impact of constituency development fund (CDF) on education service delivery in public day secondary schools in Manyatta constituency.

1.4 The specific objectives of the study were:

i. To assess the impact of CDF on infrastructural development in the CDF funded day secondary schools and non CDF funded schools.

ii. Establish the impact of CDF on student’s performance in the public day secondary schools in Manyatta constituency.

iii. Determine whether CDF has any impact on the enrollment rate in day secondary schools in Manyatta constituency.

iv. Find out whether the School Principals are satisfied with the CDF fund allocated to their schools.

1.5 Research questions

The research questions of the study were:

i. What is the impact of CDF fund on infrastructural development in the public day secondary schools?

ii. Is there performance increase due to CDF fund allocated in the schools?

iii. Is the enrollment rate increasing in day secondary schools funded by CDF?

iv. What is the satisfaction level of the School principal regarding the CDF allocated in the school?
1.6 **Significance of the study**

The study findings will be useful to various recipients. First, it will guide the policy makers on formulation of viable policies on CDF in education service delivery. The policies will for instance lead to increased percentage allocation of CDF to education development at the constituency level.

The findings will guide CDF management committees both at the national and constituency levels in developing a guide to CDF allocation to various development sectors in Kenya.

Being a challenging and a new area of study, the findings will constitute and contribute to the important knowledge on CDF in education service delivery. The findings will also replenish the data bank on CDF and development which is relatively scarce.

1.7 **Limitations of the study**

It was not possible to control the attitudes of the respondents; this is because the issue of finances is a very sensitive issue.

1.8 **Delimitations of the study**

This study was done in Manyatta constituency. This constituency might be different from the other constituencies in the country in terms of in development, population size among others. Therefore, the findings of the study can only be generalized to other constituencies with caution.

1.9 **Study assumptions**

The day secondary school heads would give truthful and honest responses to the instrument items. The questionnaire and observation schedule would be adequate instruments in gathering sufficient information regarding the impact of CDF in education service delivery in Manyatta constituency.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

Review of the literature for this study is discussed under the following themes: CDF in Kenya; Educational delivery system, Constituency Development Fund and the Community, Constituency Development Fund in Development, and General challenges about Constituency Development Fund.

2.1 Constituency Development Fund in Kenya

The Constituency Development Fund (‘CDF’) essentially provides additional resources for development at the local level by channeling money to constituencies under the management of Members of Parliament. Kenya’s CDF is one of the indigenous innovations of the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) of the government of Kenya (Kimenyi, 2005). The Constituency Development Fund (CDF) was established in 2003 through the CDF Act in The Kenya Gazette Supplement No. 107 (Act No. 11) of 9th January 2004. The fund is distributed under the direction of the National Management Committee (NMC) to the 210 constituencies for development programmes (Gok, 2003; CDF national Newsletter, 2006). The CDF is allocated in the budget of every financial year and after parliamentary approval, the funds are disbursed to the constituencies to be spent on development projects as identified and prioritized by local citizens. Every constituency receives funds whose exact amount is based on a formula that includes factors like population and size of the constituency. CDFs are typically managed by committees comprised of the area Member of Parliament (MP) and members nominated and elected by the residents of that constituency. In some instances, the MP is the chairperson of the committee. The MP may also be the chief accounting officer of the CDF, although this is not always the case. At any rate it is to be expected that the MP will want to have some influence over how these funds are used (Ongoya and Lumallas 2005).

The fund aims to control imbalances in regional development brought about by partisan politics. It targets all constituency-level development projects, particularly those aiming to combat poverty at the grassroots. The fund comprises an annual budgetary allocation...
equivalent to 2.5% of the government's ordinary revenue. A motion seeking to increase this allocation to 7.5% of government’s revenue was recently passed in parliament. 75% of the fund is allocated equally amongst all 210 constituencies. The remaining 25% is allocated as per constituency poverty levels. A maximum 10% of each constituency’s annual allocation may be used for an education bursary scheme. CDF is managed through 4 committees 2 of which are at the national level and 2 at the grassroots level (Gok, 2003). The NMC disburses funds on a quarterly basis. For a constituency to get funding, a project proposal must be submitted to the NMC. As of now the CDF amendment Act 2007, the CDF fund is managed by a Constituencies Development Fund Board (CDFB) a body corporate with perpetual succession which has replaced NMC (Kinyua, 2008).

CDF initiative is intended to uplift the living standards of the Kenyan people at the grass root level. The fund was designed to enable balanced development across the country (IEA, 2006). Therefore, the Act provides that in order to ensure fair distribution of the resources, 75 percent of the fund is shared equally among all constituencies and 25 percent is shared according to the constituencies’ poverty index (Gok, 2007). So far the government has disbursed 34.4 billion shillings, the period in which a large number of social and physical infrastructural projects have been initiated and completed.

2.2 Characteristics of Service Delivery

A service is the action of doing something for someone or something. It is largely intangible (i.e. not material). A product is tangible (i.e. material) since you can touch it and own it. A service tends to be an experience that is consumed at the point where it is purchased, and cannot be owned since is quickly perishes. According to Kotler a service is any activity or benefit that one party can offer to another which is essentially intangible and does not result in the ownership of anything. A service can also be defined as the production of an essentially intangible product which through some form of exchanges satisfies an identified need. There are five characteristics of service delivery.
Lack of ownership
You cannot own and store a service like you can a product. Services are used or hired for a period of time. Consumers want and expect excellent service for that time. Because you can measure the duration of the service consumers become more demanding of it.

Intangibility
You cannot hold or touch a service unlike a product. In saying that although services are intangible the experience consumers obtain from the service has an impact on how they will perceive it. What do consumers perceive from customer service? The location and the inner presentation of where they are purchasing the service.

Inseparability
Services cannot be separated from the service providers. A product when produced can be taken away from the producer. However, a service is produced at or near the point of purchase.

Perishibility
Services last a specific time and cannot be stored like a product for later use. The service is developed and used almost simultaneously. Again because of this time constraint consumers demand more.

Heterogeneity
It is very difficult to make each service experience identical. Generally systems and procedures are put into place to make sure the service provided is consistent all the time, training in service organizations is essential for this, however in saying this there will always be subtle differences.

2.3 Determinants of quality service
According to V. A. Zeithaml et.al (1985) there are ten determinants of quality service.

Reliability: Consistency of performance and dependability. Many of the factors promoting reliability are common to overall success. We employ backup systems and personnel to insure that an adequate supply of workers are available to complete the job.

Responsiveness: Willingness and readiness to perform services. All the workers (service providers) are encouraged to work under a “spirit of service”. Customers would not need
services, if they never had problems. Personnel are tough to understand and appreciate the term “job security”.

**Competence**: Possession of skills and knowledge to perform and deliver a given service.

**Understanding**: Knowing the customer's needs and requirements knowing how listen.

**Access**: Approachability and ease of access to management. Service provider should be accessible.

**Communication**: Providing the customer with effective information. Ability to retrieve and effectively passing this information on to the customers (students)

**Courtesy**: Friendliness of personnel and ownership. Knowledge of how to handle complaints, striving to be “peacemakers not troublemakers” finding answers, not excuses.

**Credibility**: Trust and personal characteristics of personnel. We have experienced recruiters who ask pertinent questions, check references and conduct background checks on all new hires.

**Security**: Safety, financial security, and confidentiality.

**Tangibles**: This is the physical evidence of service. Enables the customers to know what is being done for them examples could be very elaborate communications system for example number of dormitories in a school, classrooms, laboratories among others

### 2.4 Dimensions of Service Quality

Sureshchandar et al. (2002) suggested that service quality is based essentially on five dimensions/factors critical from the customers’ point of view. These dimensions/factors are:

**Tangibles**: Appearance of physical facilities, equipment, personnel, and communication materials.

**Reliability**: Ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately.

**Responsiveness**: Willingness to help customers and provide prompt service.

**Assurance**: Knowledge and courtesy of employees and their ability to convey trust and confidence.

**Empathy**: Caring, individualized attention to the customers.
2.5 Model of Service Quality Gaps

Perceived service quality can be defined as, according to the model of Parasuraman et al (1985), the difference between consumers’ expectation and perceptions which eventually depends on the size and the direction of the four gaps concerning the delivery of service quality on the company’s side. Consumers’ perception towards a service quality depends on the four gaps existing in organization – consumer environments.

Customer Gap = f (Gap 1, Gap 2, Gap 3, Gap 4)

The magnitude and the direction of each gap will affect the service quality. For instance, Gap 3 will be favorable if the delivery of a service exceeds the standards of service required by the organization, and it will be unfavorable when the specifications of the service delivered are not met.

There are seven major gaps in the service quality concept, which are shown.

- **Gap1:** Customers’ expectations versus management perceptions: as a result of the lack of a marketing research orientation, inadequate upward communication and too many layers of management.

- **Gap2:** Management perceptions versus service specifications: as a result of inadequate commitment to service quality, a perception of unfeasibility, inadequate task standardization and an absence of goal setting.

- **Gap3:** Service specifications versus service delivery: as a result of role ambiguity and conflict, poor employee-job fit and poor technology-job fit, inappropriate supervisory control systems, lack of perceived control and lack of teamwork.

- **Gap4:** Service delivery versus external communication: as a result of inadequate horizontal communications and propensity to over-promise.

- **Gap5:** The discrepancy between customer expectations and their perceptions of the service delivered: as a result of the influences exerted from the customer side and the shortfalls (gaps) on the part of the service provider. In this case, customer expectations are influenced by the extent of personal needs, word of mouth recommendation and past service experiences.

- **Gap6:** The discrepancy between customer expectations and employees’ perceptions: as a result of the differences in the understanding of customer expectations by front-line service providers.
The discrepancy between employee’s perceptions and management perceptions: as a result of the differences in the understanding of customer expectations between managers and service providers.

2.6 Educational delivery system

Educational delivery system is programs that serve students. This is an efficient and effective way, for the school system to meet its mission. Education Service delivery provides all students with an equitable opportunity to develop their abilities to their full potential and to obtain the knowledge, skills, and values needed to succeed in a global society (Management of American Inc. 2003). Kenya upholds education as a fundamental human right and recognizes it as pivotal for the attainment of self fulfillment and national development (GoK 2007).

2.7 Constituency Development Fund and the Community

In a country where 56 percent of the population lives below poverty line, the CDF has been billed as one of the best tools in creation of wealth and poverty reduction among the Kenyan communities (Kimenyi, 2005). The mission of the CDF is to ensure that a specific proportion of the annual government ordinary revenue is devoted to the constituencies for development and in particular poverty reduction. The CDF has provided Kenyans with an opportunity to make investment choices that address their needs (NMC, 2006). It has empowered the community through direct involvement in projects selection implementation and procurement (Sambili, 2008). The idea of CDF was conceived to give consumers (you & me) of the development projects a chance to participate in identifying and implementing projects based first and foremost on community felt needs and priorities (Muraya, 2007). The programme has created employment for local populace because local artisans are awarded contracts and materials are sourced locally (Sambili, 2008).

The CDF Act is one of the most credible and critical legislation passed by the Kenyan parliament in the recent past (IEA, 2006). Over the years some communities have been receiving sufficient government services due to politics, that is, if a given community did
not support or vote overwhelmingly for the government of the day, it got sidelined by the government during the whole cycle of the electoral period of five years. The CDF however is allocated to every constituency no matter the political inclination (NMC, 2006). It has enabled Kenyans to experience the value of government money and the common man and woman can now directly take part in deciding on development matters for the area (IEA, 2006). This shows how important the fund is especially as a tool to enhance development in the country. The CDF implementation is decentralized through the community participation, the community does prioritization of the projects itself and the community also does implementation (NMC, 2006). A study done by IAE in 2006 found that communities were generally satisfied with projects being implemented by the CDF because they participated in their planning and implementation, the communities are also happy with the fund because the government has given them a chance to identify and prioritize projects hence a feeling of ownership of the projects at the grass root levels. CDF has led to high enrolment in secondary schools and higher institutions, improving the level of education in the area. Construction of schools such as Songot and Kaikor has given children from pastoral families a chance to get secondary school education. The constituents are grateful for the committee's work (Daily Nation 2010).

2.8 Constituency Development Fund in Development

Constituency Development Fund is one of the many development initiatives being undertaken by the government to address poverty in the country. Before the initiation of the CDF, there were other funds known as devolved funds which include 1993 Road maintenance (RMLF), 1993/4 bursary fund, 1998/99 Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF), the 1999 constituency HIV Fund, 2003 Free Primary Education (FPE), 1993 Rural Electrification Levy Fund and the 2006/07 youth enterprise fund (IEA, 2006). These development funds filter from the central government through larger and more layers of administrative organs and bureaucracies. Unlike the aforementioned funds earmarked as decentralized funds, CDF funds go directly to local levels and thus provide people at the grass root the opportunity to make expenditure decisions that maximize their welfare in line with their needs and preferences. In other words, individuals are given a chance to make investment choices that address their needs and maximize their
welfare in consistency with the theoretical prediction of decentralization theory. Choices made can be expected to be more aligned to their problems and circumstances (Kimenyi, 2005; National CDF Newsletter, 2006).

The current indication in regard to CDF is that it is helping to provide services to communities that for many years did not benefit substantially from government services. The CDF has had a major bearing on the development and rehabilitation of the socio-economic infrastructure in the entire country. Many major sectors have been seen to benefit from CDF funding. These include education, water and health with education receiving the lions share (Kinyua, 2006). The CDF initiative has been seen as one of the success stories in the country. This is evident from the visitors received by national assembly from Uganda, Tanzania, Namibia, Zambia, South Africa, Sudan, and Ghana among others (Marende, 2008). One of the major services offered by CDF is access to education. This paper therefore, seeks to find out the impact of CDF education development in Manyatta constituency.

2.9 General challenges about Constituency Development Fund
Efficiency and efficacy in CDF projects distribution continue to raise disquiet. On face value, spreading small projects across the constituency appears rational (Daily Nation 2010). A CDF is vulnerable to manipulation by the area MP, who may use his/her position to influence the selection of committee members and projects, turning the CDF into a personal project fund. In Uganda and Kenya, guidelines were clumsy and led to a lot of funds being misused. In Uganda in 2006, most MPs failed to account for CDF money, leading to suspension of the entire CDF. It was only reinstated in 2007 on condition that MPs establish a five-person committee in their constituency to assist in accounting for the money. Furthermore, the accounting structures of the CDF are not clear. Is the CDF Chairperson accountable to parliament, to the District Council Legislature, or to both? (Ongoya Z.E and Lumallas E. 2005). The present CDF structure and practices in Kenya do not lend itself to adequate participation. The CDF committees are hand-picked by MPs and do not necessarily represent residents' interests. They are ill-
prepared to speed up development, as is evident in the kinds of projects they select (Daily Nation 2010).

CDF continues to operate in very controversial, illegal and arguably unconstitutional circumstances. However, Parliamentarians have chosen to ignore these facts simply because the status quo benefits them. In most constituencies, CDF is rife with corruption and nepotism. Projects undertaken are sub standard and implemented selectively. At the moment, one or two unfinished classrooms schools are littered all over constituencies with most having no students since they do not have teachers. It seems like the CDF kitty is only meant for contractors who reap heavily from the shoddy work that they do. To the communities, they just see projects being implemented without their approval and in the long run, there has been no or very little to show for the billions of shillings utilized so far by CDF (Hussein Khalid, 2008)

2.10 Conceptual Framework
This study is based on the premise that education needs such as; Physical infrastructure, Laboratory equipments, Library books, Personnel, Bursaries and Renovations, will depend on the Head teachers’ political inclination and BoGs’ bargaining power for CDF funds, BoGs’ managerial skills. This will determine how the funds are distributed to the various sectors of education in the school considering the school needs.

CDF has some direct political implication for instance political inclination of the school Head teacher will determine whether the school gets funds and what amount. Political leaders (the MP) may view CDF as an investment in his/her political careers. A politician would prefer that the funds are distributed depending with the political inclination of the school head to ensure his/her survival in the electoral cycle or as a reward to those who voted him/her in.

CDF is subject to interest group competition and the fund is likely to benefit the well organized interest groups (BoGs of various schools). Therefore, the BoGs’ bargaining power will determine the amount of funds to be allocated to their school and also the school needs. BoGs bargaining power and the managerial skills will also determine the
school needs through CDF allocated in the school. The managerial skills of the BoGs will determine how the CDF funds allocated in the school will be prioritized to meet the school needs. CDF allocated in school will directly determine the school needs.

Source: Researcher (2010)
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the techniques and procedures that were used to collect data for this study. It includes the study design, study area, targeted population, Sample and sampling procedure, Data collection instruments and procedures, Data analysis and Data presentation.

3.1 Study Design

A descriptive Cross sectional study design was used in this study. This design was used because it is suitable in collection and description of the relevant data for the proposed study. It was chosen because of its flexibility in the field. It enabled the researcher to generate data in a standardized form for a specified population or sample in order to describe and explain certain phenomenon.

3.2 Study Area

Manyatta Constituency is an electoral constituency in Kenya located in Eastern Province. It is one of two constituencies of Embu District. The constituency was established for the 1997 elections. The constituency covers an area of 265.5 square kilometers with a population of 165368 and comprises of three divisions and seven sub-locations.

3.3 Target Population

According to the DEO office Embu district there are 27 public day secondary schools in Manyatta constituency. The target population for this study consisted 27 day secondary school Principals. However, data collection was done on 26 secondary schools since one was elevated to a boarding school making it ineligible for the study. The Principals of the schools that had received CDF funding and school Principals of the schools that had not received the CDF funding in their schools were the respondents.
3.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure
Census was used to collect data for this study. Complete enumeration was used because there only 27 day secondary schools in Manyatta constituency. All the principals of the day secondary schools in Manyatta constituency participated in the study.

3.5 Data Collection Instruments and Procedures
Interviews were done on the school principals. A researcher-filled interview schedule was used to gather data from the sampled school heads. It was divided into five sections. Section one was meant to gather demographic information. Section two gathered information on sectors that had benefited from the CDF in their schools. Section three consisted of open-ended items aimed at probing further into the matters being explored in section B.

Section four was to gather information from the school Principals who had not received CDF funding in their schools. Section five (E) is meant for document analysis. This section analyzed the K.C.S.E. results of the school since the year 2004 when CDF fund was initiated. The indicators of performance was the average KCSE performance from 2004-2009. The measurement of performance was the trend in average KCSE performance from 2004-2009. This was done by comparing the CDF funded and the CDF Non funded day Secondary Schools. Checklist was used to collect the data on performance rate.

Observation schedule was used to gather information from the physical projects funded by CDF in the day secondary schools of Manyatta constituency. The observation checklist consisted of 8 items. Document analysis was also used to gather performance and enrollment data.

3.6 Data Analysis
The broad-based review of educational service delivery included an analysis of documents to find out the school’s enrollment and performance rates. Data collected was
analyzed using descriptive statistics, that is, percentages, mean and frequencies. Statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) was used for data analysis. Data is presented in the form of frequency distributions, tables and bar graphs. Data is also thematically described to depict binding or conflicting information/responses.

3.7 Data Presentation

Data is presented using tables, graphs and pie charts
CHAPTER FOUR
4.0 DATA ANALYSIS

This section presents a synthesis of the study findings in relation to the study objectives and variables.

4.1 Socio Demographic Profile of the School Principals

4.1.1 Principals’ Age Distribution

The respondents were asked to indicate their age and the results are shown in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Age in years of the school principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.1 it is clear that half (50%) of the school principals age fall within between 41-50 age bracket. This is followed by those who fell within 31-40 age bracket and the least falling in the 51-60 age group and only 15.4% are in age group of 51-60. This could be explained by the fact that for as teacher to qualify to become a school principal he or she must have adequate experience.

4.1.2 Academic qualification of the school principals

The respondents were asked to indicate their academic qualifications and the results are shown in figure 4.1 below.
Figure 4.1: Education Level of the school principal

Figure 4.1 reveals that most principals were graduates. This can be attributed to the fact that upon acquisition of this degree, one qualifies for recruitment as a secondary school teacher. Holders of post graduate degree and diploma were the second largest at (15.4%) each. This indicates that the highest academic qualification among principals was a masters degree while the lowest holding a diploma in education. The smallest number of diploma holders could be attributed to the deployment of diploma teachers from secondary schools to primary schools and that of the post graduate being that many teachers are now furthering their education.

4.1.3. Duration of the Principal in the School
The respondents were asked to indicate the duration they had been in the school and the results are shown in figure 4.2 below.
It is evidently clear from figure 4.2 that majority (92%) (n=24) of the principals had been in school for 1-10 years. The other principals have been in the school for 11-20 years and 21-30 years bracket at 4% each. This could be attributed to the fact that most of the schools were recently established. Secondly, other school principals may have retired leading to the deployment of other principals.

4.2. School Data

4.2.1 CDF Funded Schools and Non CDF Funded Schools
The respondents were asked to indicate whether they had received CDF funding in their school and the results are shown in Table 4.2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of the school</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDF FUNDED</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON CDF FUNDED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The finding of the study revealed that majority (96.2%) of the public day secondary schools in Manyatta constituency are CDF funded as shown on table 4.2. This implies that there is no discrimination in terms of allocation of CDF funds. The study showed that it was only one public day secondary school that was not funded in Manyatta constituency and the reason they gave was that they apply for CDF fund but there has been no response.

4.2.2. Amount of the CDF Fund Allocate in the School
The respondents were asked to indicate the amount of CDF fund allocation they had received in their schools. The results are shown in Table 4.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Money Received from CDF</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 500,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,001 - 1,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,001 - 1,500,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500,001 - 2,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 4.3, most of the school (40%) receives a range of 1,000-500,000 thousand. Seven schools (28%) had received an average of 500,001 – 1,000,000 and other 7 schools (28%) received 1,000,001 – 1,500,000. The study revealed that it is only one school that is received 1,500,001 – 2,000,000. The disparity in CDF allocation could be attributed to the student population and also the bargaining power of the school BOG.

4.3 School Projects Funded by the CDF

4.3.1 Infrastructural Development

The respondents were asked to indicate whether their schools had received allocation for infrastructural development in their schools the results are shown in Table 4.4 below.
Table 4.4: School that have received funds for Infrastructural development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not funded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows that majority of the schools had received funds for infrastructural development with 22 schools (88%) schools reporting to have received funds for infrastructural development. Four schools reported that they had not received funds for infrastructural development. This depicts that the three schools that have not received funds for infrastructural development may have received funds for other projects. Given that majority of the schools had received funds for infrastructural development implies that infrastructure is a core component of the schools and that is the reason why most of the funds that are allocated in the schools were used for infrastructural development.

4.3.2 Bursary Funds

The respondents were asked to indicate whether their schools had received CDF allocation for bursaries. The results are shown in Table 4.5 below.

Table 4.5: Schools that have received funds for Bursaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not funded</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 shows that 18 schools (72 %) had received funding for bursaries. This may be taken to mean that most of the CDF money is catering for the poor students who cannot afford to pay school fees.
The other projects that had received funding include; purchase of the laboratory chemicals with 4 schools reporting to have received funding for the recruitment of the personnel, purchase of furniture, construction of water tanks and power installation.

4.4 Completeness of the School CDF Funded Projects

4.4.1 Infrastructural Development Project Completed

The respondents were asked to indicate whether infrastructural development projects were complete. The results are shown in Table 4.6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not completed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Complete Infrastructural Developments

Table 4.6 shows that only 9 (40.9%) schools had their infrastructures completed. This implies that some of the schools had received funds recently and were in the process of infrastructural development. In addition, the funds may not have been adequate and therefore left some infrastructures incomplete.

4.4.2 Purchase of Laboratory Chemicals and Equipment Complete

The respondents were asked to indicate whether purchase of laboratory chemicals and equipment were complete. The results are shown in Table 4.7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not completed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Purchase of Laboratory Chemicals and Equipment Complete
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It is evident from table 4.7 that, three quarters of the schools (75%) that had received allocation for the purchase of the laboratory chemicals and equipment had their project completed.

4.4.3 Bursaries Complete

The respondents were asked to indicate whether bursaries complete projects were complete results are shown in table 4.8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not completed</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Bursaries complete

Table 4.8 Shows that a majority (55.6%) of the schools that had received funds for bursary had their project complete while 8 schools have their project incomplete. This implies that the students who had received bursaries had completed their high school education while the students of 8 schools had not completed high school education.

4.5 CDF Funded Ongoing projects

The respondents were asked to mention the CDF funded projects that are ongoing and the data reveals that among the funded projects it is only infrastructural development and bursary project that were ongoing. This implies that other projects were completed or had stalled due to lack of adequate funds. The other project that was reported to be ongoing was toilet construction.

4.6 School Principals Level of Satisfaction on Various CDF Funded Projects

The respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction regarding the amount of CDF allocated in their schools. The results are shown in Table 4.9 below.
Table 4.9: Level of satisfaction with CDF amount allocated to the projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 shows that 25% of the principals were satisfied with the amount of CDF fund allocated in their school projects. The other (75%) reported not to be satisfied with the CDF fund allocated to their schools. This means that CDF fund is not adequate to cater for the needs of the schools. This can also be as a result of the increased enrollment rate making the funds unable to cater for all the needs of the increasing population of the students.

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent of satisfaction regarding the amount of CDF allocated in their schools. The results are shown in Table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10: Extent of satisfaction with the amount allocated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of satisfaction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to no extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very much satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who reported not to be satisfied with the CDF amount allocated to their schools gave the following reasons. The amount allocated per project was not enough; the BOG in the school was not able to influence the allocation of the funds in the schools, BOG had no power in CDF allocation in the school; and that CDF amount allocated to the schools does not meet the direct expenses of the school.
4.7 Areas of education that had benefited most from the CDF fund.  
A majority (73.1%) (n= 19) of the school principals indicated that infrastructure is the area of education that had benefited most from CDF funding. This reveals that this area has benefited most to accommodate the number of the increasing students in the schools. The other areas that have benefited are bursaries and purchase of the laboratory chemicals.

4.8 Effects of the CDF fund allocated in performance and enrollment  
All the schools that had received CDF funding reported that CDF had an effect on the student performance. The study also revealed that CDF fund had an impact on the student enrollment with (96.2%) (n=24). High enrollment could also be attributed to the introduction of the free primary education. The introduction of the free primary education (FPE) in the year 2003, led to an increase in school enrollment creating the need to develop school infrastructures to accommodate the increasing numbers of the students. Improvement of the facilities is bound to increase the performance of the students.

4.9 CDF Fund Management in the Schools  
The respondents were asked to indicate who manages CDF fund, the results are shown in table 4.11 below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School CDF Fund Managers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BoG</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In most of the schools CDF kitty is managed by the BoG (88%) (n=22). In the other schools CDF fund is managed by by parents (8%) (n=2) and in one of the schools CDF is managed by the project management committee as shown in Table 4.11. It is evident that BoG is the management organ of the schools.
4.10 Problems Experienced in the Management of CDF Fund in the Schools

As asked to indicate the problems they encountered in management of CDF funds in their school, 5 (19.2%) principals reported political interference in the management of the CDF fund. This is because of the politicians' interest in CDF management. Others reported community interference and inadequate CDF fund that is allocated in the schools. CDF fund may not be enough because the schools have numerous competing needs so funds are bound not to be enough.

The reported solution to CDF management fund are making CDF management committee independent, empowering CDF committee and train CDF managers on accounting.

4.11 Presence of School BOG

The respondents were asked to indicate whether they are satisfied with the BOG bargaining power, the results are shown in table 4.12 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the schools reported that they have BoG in their schools however only (65.4%) (n=17) are satisfied with the BoG bargaining power. While the other (30.8%) (n=8) are not satisfied by the BoG bargaining power as shown in table 4.10 below. This may affect the CDF allocated in the school and how CDF is managed since BoG is a critical organ of every school.
4.12 OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

4.12.1 Condition of the Completed Infrastructures

The observation schedule was to show the condition of the completed infrastructures, in the schools, the results are shown in figure 4.3 below.

Figure 4.3: Condition of the Completed Classes

Observation of the conditions of the infrastructures in the schools revealed that the completed classes in a very good condition (52%). However, (43%) are fairly good and (5%) are fairly poor. The high rating of the class conditions could be attributed to the fact that most of the CDF fund allocated in school is used for infrastructural development and mostly in construction of classes. The second high rating of the class conditions being fairly good could be because the funds allocated are insufficient as indicated earlier and that some infrastructural development projects are still ongoing.

The observation schedule was to show the condition of the completed office, in the schools, the results are shown in figure 4.4 below.
Figure 4.4 clearly shows that the condition of the complete office blocks is fairly good and equal to the ones that are good at the rating of 47.8% each. According to the observation the Office blocks were rated poor at 4.3%. This reveals that some of the office blocks were being constructed or the funds were insufficient to complete the office blocks.

The observation schedule was to show the condition of the completed library block in the schools, the results are shown in figure 4.5 below.
It is evident from Figure 4.5 that 43% of the completed library block was very poor and 43% was rated poor. It is only 14% of the completed library block that was fairly good according to the observation.

The observation schedule was to show the condition of the completed laboratories in the schools, the results are shown in figure 4.6 below.
Figure 4.6 shows the condition of the completed laboratories. According to the observation 47.1% of the completed laboratories are good followed by the proportion of the laboratories that are in a very poor condition at 23.5%. This implies that the CDF fund is used in development of other infrastructures but not laboratories which generally consume a lot of money and given the fact that CDF funding is limited.

The observation schedule was to show the condition of the classes being constructed, in the schools, the results are shown in figure 4.7 below

**Figure 4.7: Condition of Ongoing Classes**

Most of the classes that have been completed in the schools are either in very good condition or are in good condition. Figure 4.7 shows that among all the observed completed classes half (50%) are very good and half (50%) are good. This means that most of the CDF funds allocated in the schools is used in classes construction. This is to cater for the growing population of the students.

The observation schedule was to show the condition of the office block being constructed in the schools and the results are shown in figure 4.8 below
From figure 4.8 it is very clear that the condition of most of the office blocks being constructed is very poor (67%) and the rest are good (33%). This can also be linked to the previous data whereby none of the schools has received funds for office block. Secondly offices are not a priority in the CDF allocation by CDF management committees.

The observation schedule was to show the adequacy of laboratory equipments, in the schools, the results are shown in figure 4.8 below.
Figure 4.8 shows that in majority of the schools laboratory materials are inadequate (54.2%) while in a few schools they are Adequate. In other schools they are non-existence. This could be linked to the fact that none of the schools had received funding for laboratory equipments. Inadequacy of the laboratory materials could be linked to the fact that the student enrolment increasing and therefore the available equipments cannot cater for the need of all the students.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

5.1 Introduction
This chapter covers the summary, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further studies. The study population included all the principals of public day secondary schools of Manyatta constituency. Census was used to collect data for this study. Complete enumeration was used because there were only 27 day secondary schools in Manyatta constituency. However, data was collected from 26 day secondary school since one of the school had been elevated to a day and a boarding school and therefore was not eligible for inclusion in the study.

5.2 Major Findings of the Study

5.2.1 School information
The study findings revealed that 25 (96.2 %) all the days secondary schools are CDF funded and that it is only one of the schools which had not received CDF Fund. Most of the school that had received the least amount of the CDF (40%). This shows that there is disparity in the allocation of the CDF funds amongst the schools. Given the amount allocated to most of the school it shows that CDF fund is not sufficient.

5.2.2 What is the impact of CDF fund on infrastructural development in the schools
Most of the schools (88 %) have received funding for infrastructural development. Further the data showed that among the funded infrastructures, classrooms construction is the major project that has been funded with this being confirmed by the observation that showed that most (52%) of the completed classes are in very good condition. Moreover, some of the principals reported to have received CDF allocation for Bursaries (72 %) in their schools in which (55.6%) (N=18) are complete. This implies that CDF is playing a great role to facilitate education service delivery to the students from less fortunate
backgrounds. This is likely to increase school enrollment and also performance of the students who do not have to be expelled out of the school due to lack of funds.

5.2.3. Is there performance increase due to CDF fund allocated in the schools?
All the school principals reported that CDF fund has a great impact on the performance of the students. Document analysis confirmed that the performance of the students in most of the schools has been increasing. This means that CDF fund has a great impact in education service delivery by enhancing the performance.

5.2.4 Is the enrollment rate increasing in day secondary schools funded by CDF?
Almost all the school principals (96.2%) indicated that enrollment rate has increased due to CDF fund. This means that there are increased classrooms that can accommodate the increasing number of the students. Document analysis of the enrollment rate also confirmed this since the trend of the student enrollment seemed to be going up.

5.2.5. What is the satisfaction level of the School principal regarding the CDF allocated in the school?
Very few (25%) of the Principals reported to be satisfied with the amount of CDF fund allocated in their schools. This means that there is unfair distribution of the funds. In addition, given that the enrollment rate of the students is increasing on the yearly basis it means that the funds allocated are not enough to meet the increasing demand.

5.3 Problems and solution to management of the CDF fund in the schools
The study revealed that there are numerous problems encountered in management of CDF funds in the schools which included, political interference in the management of problems are community interference, inadequate CDF fund and the fact that some principles cannot tell the exact amount allocated in the school. This shows that there is no transparency in CDF allocation making it hard for proper management which may encourage corruption thus interfering with the main goal of the funds in Education service deliverly. The reported solution to CDF management fund were to make CDF management committee independent, empowering CDF committee and training CDF managers on accounting.
5.4 CONCLUSION
Overall, provisioning of CDF fund is a new initiative in the country. There are still daunting challenges with regard to CDF funds availability, accessibility, allocation and utilization and in schools.

The study concluded that CDF fund is an important initiative to enhancing performance and enrollment in schools given that all the teachers reported that CDF increased performance and enrolment. With fairness in the funds distribution, transparency, lack of political interference and availability of good management committee in place CDF can be a good initiative in education service delivery in the country.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS
The study came up with the following recommendations some of which may form foundation for further research.

Fairness in the allocation of the CDF fund: People mandated to allocate CDF funds in the school should ensure fair distribution; the school should get funds according to their needs and the level of development.

Ministry of Education involvement: Ministry of education has an organ that does quality control in schools therefore this organ should be involved in allocation of the CDF fund in the school and to ensure quality of the completed projects in the schools

Transparency in allocation of the CDF funds: The school managing committee should know the exact amount allocated in the schools for proper prioritization of the school projects

Fund other school projects: other school projects such as buying laboratory equipments should be funded to ensure that the science subjects that require practical are properly delivered.

Recommendation for further study
A study should be done in other areas to compare the school that have received CDF and the ones that have not received CDF to establish the differences in Education service delivery.
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APPENDIX 1. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THE HEAD TEACHERS
(RESEARCHER FILLED)

This interview is designed to gather more information on the impact of constituency development fund (CDF) on education service delivery in day secondary schools in Manyatta constituency. The information collected is expected to shed more light on how CDF is influencing education service delivery in the constituency. The findings and recommendation that will be obtained will be use to improve future CDF initiatives in the education development. Please feel relaxed as you answer the interview questions. Your responses will be treated confidentially. Answer all questions as truthfully and as honestly as possible.

SECTION A

Instructions

Kindly respond to all the items (Please tick where appropriate)

1. What is your age in years?
   21-30 ( )  31-40 ( )  41-50 ( )  51-60 ( )

2. What is your highest level of education?
   College ( ) Diploma ( ) Graduate ( ) Post graduate ( )
   Any other specify ____________________-

3. How long have you been in this school?
   1-10 yrs ( )  11-20yrs ( )  21-30 yrs ( )

SECTION B

This interview session is to relate CDF in your school.

1. Are you aware of the existence of the CDF?
   YES ( )
   NO ( )

2. Has CDF funded any project in your school?
   YES ( )
   NO ( )  

Skip to section D
3. How much money have you received for in your school each of the above mentioned project?
   1,000-500,000 ( ) 501,000- 1M ( ) 1.1M-1.5 ( ) 1.6M-2M ( )
   2.1M-2.5M ( ) 3 M + ( )

4. What projects in your school have been funded through CDF? (Please tick where appropriate)
   i. Infrastructural development
   ii. Purchase of laboratory chemicals and equipment
   iii. Bursaries,
   iv. Purchase of furniture
   v. Any other specify

5. How many of the above mentioned projects are complete?
   i. Infrastructural development
   ii. employment of personnel
   iii. purchase of laboratory chemicals and equipment
   iv. bursaries,
   v. purchase of furniture
   vi. Any other specify

6. How many of these projects are ongoing?
   i. Infrastructural development
   ii. employment of personnel
   iii. purchase of laboratory chemicals and equipment
   iv. purchase of furniture
   v. Any other specify

7. Are you satisfied with amount allocated to the projects?
   YES ( )
   NO ( )

8. To what extent are you satisfied with the amount allocated to you
   a. To no extent
   b. Moderately
   c. Much satisfied
d. Very much satisfied

9. If no explain

10. How many staffs do you have in your school?
   Academic ( )
   Non- academic ( )

11. How many of the above (9) are employed as a result of the CDF fund?
   Academic ( )
   Non- academic ( )

12. Do you think CDF has any effect on the student performance since your school started receiving the fund?
   YES ( )
   NO ( )

13. If no explain

14. Do you think the CDF has any effect on the student enrollment rate since your school started receiving the fund?
   YES ( )
   NO ( )

15. If no explain

16. Who manages the CDF in your school?
   Myself ( )  BoG ( )  Parents ( )  MP ( )

17. Is there BoG committee in your school?
   YES ( )
   NO ( )
18. Are you satisfied with BoG’s bargaining power for CDF?
   YES ( )
   NO ( )

19. If no please explain

SECTION C

20. What areas of education in your school would you say have benefited most from the CDF? (please tick where appropriate)
   a. Infrastructure
   b. Employment of personnel
   c. Purchase of laboratory
   d. Purchase of furniture
   e. Others ______________________

21. What problems do you encounter when trying to manage the CDF in your school?
   a. Political interference
   b. Lack of accounting knowledge
   c. Community interference
   d. Others ______________________

22. What do you think can be the solution to the challenges you have stated?
   a. Empowering CDF committee
   b. Independence of CDF management committee from political interference
   c. Training on accounting
   d. Others ______________________

(Skip to section E for performance analysis)

SECTION (D)

This section is for the school Principals who have not received CDF in their schools

23. Why haven’t you received CDF in your school
   a. Perceived not to support area MP
   b. Lack of bargaining power
c. Perception of lack of need of CDF money
   d. Others

(Probe for more answers)

24. Do you have any projects that are going on in you school?
   YES ( )
   NO ( )

25. If yes who finances these projects?
   Parents ( ) church ( ) community ( )
   Any other specify

26. Has student performance in your school improved since 2004?
   YES ( )
   NO ( )

27. Has there has been an increase in student enrollment rate since the year 2004?
   YES ( )
   NO ( )

28. Do you think this school would be better than it is if it was funded by the CDF?
   YES ( )
   NO ( )

SECTION E

This section is for document analysis. It is meant to analyze the K. C. S. E results and the enrollment records since the inception of the CDF fund. To find out whether there has been any performance and enrollment improvement in the schools that have received the CDF and also to find out whether there are any differences in terms of performance in the CDF funded schools and the ones not funded by the CDF.

29. Can I please KCSE results, number of classrooms, no of dormitories and number enrolled before and after CDF onset?
Checklist for the KCSE results, number of classrooms, no of dormitories and number enrolled before and after CDF onset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>KCSE performance</th>
<th>Number of classrooms</th>
<th>Number of dormitories</th>
<th>Number enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3. OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

**COMPLETED INFRASTRUCTURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fairly good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office blocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTRUCTION ONGOING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fairly good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office blocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER RENOVATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fairly good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office blocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LABORATORY AND LIBRARY MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory equipments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>