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ABSTRACT

The central problem of this study was to analyze the roles of public and private partners in financing and provision of public secondary education in Migwani District, Kitui County. Financing education in Kenya has impacted negatively on the school enrollment as the parents shoulder an increasing large proportion of the cost. The user charges in Kenyan Secondary school are too high to be afforded by 56% of Kenyans who according the Millennium Development Goals 2005 Report, are living below the poverty line. This has specifically affected the participation of children from poor and vulnerable households in secondary education in Migwani District. Financing have not been adequately investigated especially in the newly created districts. The purpose of this study was to analyze the roles played by public and private partners in financing and providing secondary education in public secondary schools in Migwani District. The objectives of the study were to determine the direct costs that parents incur, the efforts played by public and private partners in financing secondary education and also to suggest policy recommendations on financing of secondary education to education policy formulators. The study is significant in that it may assist educational planners and education policy makers in planning and making appropriate decisions concerning the provision and financing of public secondary schools. It will also add to a body of knowledge in the area of educational financing by contributing literature on financing in secondary education. The study was conducted using a survey design. From a population of 38 Secondary schools with 6396 students in Migwani District, 10 schools were sampled using purposive sampling techniques considering gender and nature of the school i.e boys and girls’ schools, boarding and day schools, mixed boarding and day. In the mixed boarding and day schools cluster sampling was used to ensure that both boys and girls get equal representation. The study utilized questionnaires and observation checklist as research instruments to collect data. 211 individuals in 10 sampled secondary schools were respondents. They included 10 Head teachers, 1 D.E.O, 160 students and 40 teachers. The data collected was analyzed using quantitative methods. Quantitative data analysis procedures included frequencies and percentages. The result of data analysis was presented in frequency tables, bar graphs and pie chart. Findings indicated that parents were the main contributors of secondary education; the government financed public secondary schools by paying teachers’ salaries and giving bursaries to bright and needy students though not adequate. Community contributed to school Harambee. NGO's, sponsors and developmental partners also contributed. The researcher also noted that some schools engaged in income generating activities such as hiring of school bus to generate income to cater for facilities lacking in the school. The study recommended that the government should reflect on available options and strategies of sourcing for funds to support secondary education, it should encourage private and public partnerships in all regions of the country to achieve effective education, it should also monitor and evaluate all projects sponsored by private partners (NGOs), and it should also encourage local communities to fully participate in supporting their schools by helping in manual work.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background to the study, purpose of the study, basic assumptions of the study, limitations, theoretical framework, conceptual framework and operational definition of terms.

1.1. Background to the study

Education is considered as key element in the social and economic development and transformation of societies. Indeed, available research data indicate that no country has experienced social and economic development without investing heavily in human resource development. Quality education is also regarded as key to poverty reduction. The World Bank (1995) observed that education – especially basic (primary and secondary) education helps reduce poverty by increasing the productivity of the poor and by equipping people with the skills they need to participate fully in the economy and society.

The ever-increasing demand for education has subsequently led to increased cost. Kenya’s finance minister Njeru Githai in 2012/2013 financial year tabled 1.45 trillion estimated budgets in the parliament. The Kenyan government allocated Ksh 233.1 billion to the ministry of education. 3.8 billion (1.6%) for Free Primary Education. 17.7 billion for the Free Day Secondary Programme. 1.1 billion for bursary to cater for bright, needy students. 300 million towards provision of sanitary towels to girls from poor families and
480 million for computers. In the Kenyan system of education, the secondary level forms an important cycle of the system and builds on the foundation laid at primary school level. Secondary level seeks to strengthen the general intellectual skills that are more relevant to many occupations and subsequent education (Achola, 1988).

Education reforms that are aimed at increasing access to and participation in any level of education carry significant financial demands. In an effort to increase access to education the government has increased its spending in education and training from 7% of the GDP in 2004 to 20%, in 2010/2011 financial year (Republic of Kenya, 2010) as a result, the country has witnessed considerable expansion of education opportunities during the decade for both boys and girls. Besides, the government has initiated several programmes such as: Free Primary Education (FPE), Free Secondary Education (FSE), Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP), Constituency Bursary Funds (CBF), all these in a bid to improve education in Kenya. Having successfully initiated the implementation of these policies, the government for instance bears an enormous cost burden through the tuition waiver arranged under the auspices of FSE, with the programme support 1.2 million children in more than 5000 secondary schools each student getting Kshs. 10,625 annually.

The FSE programme alone consumed Kshs.12.75 Billion in 2008/09 financial year, Kshs.14.9Billion in 2009/10 and it has consumed Kshs. 16.9 Billion in 2010/11 financial year (Republic of Kenya 2011). However, in Light of the above, government’s commitment, the country faces constraints in mobilizing additional public and private resources to meet the high cost of expanding access to quality secondary education. Resource constraints are compounded by inequalities in participation across regions
social class and gender. Any attempt, therefore, to expand access to secondary education must take into account the existing disparities within the society, failure to which such expansion will be a tool for propagation of social – economic inequalities. The goals of expanding levels of schooling and maintaining equitable access to education are inextricably linked to issues of education costs and finance.

In Kenya, education financing for all levels is based on the cost – sharing policy introduced 1988, which requires most costs in education to be met through partnerships between public sector and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’S), Religious organizations, development partners, communities/individuals and private sector (Government of Kenya, 1988). Within this funding policy framework, overall government role includes professional development, teachers’ remuneration in public institutions, provision of infrastructure, administration and management, and provision of bursaries and scholarships for needy students. Responsibilities for other players include physical infrastructure development and maintenance, payment of fees for tuition, public examinations, catering and accommodation in boarding schools, school/college amenities (transport, water energy and communication), student’s personal expenses and remuneration of school non-teaching staff. Coupled with rapid education expansion, the policy has led to escalation of costs of schooling especially at secondary level of school system and increased pressure on the government budget over time (Government of Kenya, 2003a)

As the country moves towards achieving universal primary schooling, demand for education is shifting to secondary education. The global trends demand that more skills, values, and attitudes are necessary to exploit any global opportunity. Therefore, as it has
been noted by the World Bank (2005) provision of good quality secondary education is a
critical tool in generating the opportunities and benefits of social and economic
development. Educating people means putting opportunities into their hands, and is
recognized as one of the best anti-poverty strategies. It is also one of the best ways of
ensuring a country’s economic prosperity and competitiveness. Secondary education
trains future professionals such as doctors, lawyers, policy makers, among others..
Secondary education provides a vital link between basic education and the world of work,
on one hand, and further training on the other. It is therefore an important sub-sector of
education in the preparation of human capital for development and provision of life
opportunities. However, despite its importance in the process of development, the costs
of provision and expansion of quality secondary education have been escalating while
resources for secondary education have been dwindling. (Republic of Kenya, 2005)
The current status of education in Kenya suggests that the scenario is likely to remain the
same, if not worsen, unless urgent interventions are put in place to address the problem.
Various observations support this proposition. First, with the introduction of FPE, the
number of pupils completing primary school is bound to increase in the near future.
Second, doing nothing on transition rates into and access to secondary education may
have adverse consequences for primary completion rates, as students lose hope of joining
secondary school. Third, failure to expand secondary education will compromise human
capital accumulation and therefore jeopardize economic recovery and development.
Fourth, it should be realized that a more meaningful way of achieving gender equity in
school is to expand enrolments. Fifth, gender, social class and regional inequalities in
education will worsen as secondary schooling replaces primary education as the main
determinant of life opportunities and subsequent employment and income in the absence of reforms that allow vulnerable groups to participate. Sixth, in Kenya, economic recovery and growth will prove elusive with small proportions of labour force completing secondary education, and this will undermine financial sustainability of Education For All (EFA) as envisaged in the National Development goals (Republic of Kenya, 2005).

It is also noted that since independence one significant source of finance for Kenya’s school system are Harambee contributions (self-help drivers) from the community. Leaders are arranged for systematic collections of donations from farmers, cooperative societies and other organizations through fund-raising meetings held at all levels in most Districts (Anderson, 1973). There is strong evidence, that the objectives of cost-sharing strategy are not being met because schools lack essential facilities, kamunge report (Republic of Kenya, 1988) and materials inspite of the relatively larger levels of government, parents, community, private sectors, NGO’s and religious organizations expenditures on education. It is widely accepted that a significant factor is the inability of parents, government, and community among others to meet the charges of them by schools. Particularly in view of the fact that educational costs are not the only costs they have to meet in daily life, they also meet food and health costs among others. In Migwani District of Kitui county, there lacks empirical information on the adequacy of the contribution of public and private partners in financing secondary education hence the current study is necessary.

1.2. Statement of the problem

The provision of widely spread education and training opportunities has been a long-standing objective of the government of Kenya (GOK, 2002). Since independence, the
government has sought to address the challenges facing the education sector through a range of policy initiatives, often with mixed results, i.e. through partnership in financing education. Nevertheless, a major focus has been the attainment of universal primary education (UPE) and the key concern of achieving greater access, participation, equity, quality and relevance. However, at the outset of the 21st century, the country is faced with new challenges for educational policy, which marry both the right to universal access to education, and the need to enhance rapidly the development of skilled human resources (Kenya, 2005). Over the last 30 years, the education sector has undergone major transformations with more than ten reviews by special commissions and working parties established by the government. This increased public demands has stretched the government budget, and in response partnerships have been intensified with parents and communities, individual investors, civil societies and donors. On 11/2/2008 president Mwai Kibaki said the government will pay tuition fees for students in public secondary schools, while parents will meet boarding cost and buy uniforms.

Despite tuition fee waiver in secondary schools, children from poor backgrounds have continued to be marginalized as some Provincial Schools in the District charges are in excess of Kshs.30,000 annually.

Although public and private partners have tried to finance secondary education for many children, high poverty levels in the households are very pervasive. This situation might be the root cause of increased dropout, absenteeism and repetition in secondary schools in Migwani District, Kitui County. Hence, the researcher sought to establish the roles of public and private partners in financing and provision of secondary education in Migwani District, Kitui County.
1.3. Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to analyze the roles of public and private partners in financing and provision of public secondary education in Migwani District, Kitui County.

1.4. Objectives of the study

The specific objectives of this study were:

i. To determine the contributions of public sector (government and community) in financing, and provision of public secondary education in Migwani District.

ii. To determine the direct costs that parents incur as part of the cost sharing policy in financing secondary school education in Migwani District.

iii. To determine the contributions of private sector (parents, developmental partners, religious organizations, Non-Governmental Organizations) in financing and provision of public secondary education in Migwani District.

iv. To suggest policy recommendations on financing of secondary education to education policy formulators.

1.5. Research questions

The study was guided by the following questions:

i. To what extent had the government and community contribute to the financing and provision for the secondary school in Migwani District?

ii. What are the direct parental cost burdens from public secondary education?
iii. To what extent did the parents, developmental partners, NGO’s, religious organizations contribute to the financing and provision for the secondary schools in Migwani District?

iv. What policy recommendations can be suggested to education policy formulators to help in financing of secondary education?

1.6. Significance of the study

The study was significant since it was hoped that the findings and recommendations of the study would assist educational planners and educational policy makers in planning and making appropriate decisions concerning the provision and financing of public secondary schools. The study would also help future researchers regarding similar studies to be carried out elsewhere. It may also add to the body of knowledge in the area of educational financing by contributing literature on financing in secondary education.

1.7. Assumptions of the study

This study assumed that;

i. Parents and community had accepted cost sharing as a reality in the education system and were therefore actively engaged in providing for all that is required to achieve quality education.

ii. Public secondary schools in Migwani District had used the contributions from public-private partners to finance and provide for educational facilities and resources.
iii. Public secondary schools in Migwani District had received contributions from the above sources and had used them for the provision of adequate educational resources and facilities.

iv. Data on financing in Migwani District was accurate.

1.8. Limitations of the study

The following were limitations of the study;

- The study limited itself to only public secondary schools in Migwani District; Kitui County. For a more conclusive result all schools i.e. primary and secondary should have been studied. However, this was not possible due to logistic constraints such as inaccessibility.

- It was not possible to cover the opinions of parents and other stakeholders like B.O.G members in this District because tracing them required considerable time and resources.

1.9. Delimitations of the study

The study confined itself to students, teachers, Headteachers in public secondary schools and D.E.O in Migwani District of Kitui County, as they are the direct users of education provided in Kenya.

Second, the students, teachers and Head teachers included in the sample were those in session in the respective institutions by the time of the study. Those absent were not included in the study though they would have interesting input.
Finally, there are several other partners contributing in financing and provision of education but this study only focused on the contributions of parents, community, government, developmental partners, religious organizations and NGO’s and not the private individuals in the area of study.

1.10. Theoretical framework

This study was based on the theory developed by United States corps of army engineers in 1936 known as cost-benefit analysis (Alfred Marshall, 1936). They used it to recommend only projects whose benefits were at least equal to cost (Eckstein, 1958). By 1960s cost-benefit analysis was used widely by economists to assist in the search for efficiency in government spending. At the same time it begun to be used to scrutinize educational investments. The theoretical framework took the rate of return to investment approach (Hansen, 1963). According to this approach the costs in any investments should equal returns hence investment decisions are based on expected returns. This method of relating costs and benefits was chosen because the rate of return to education investment is comparable to rates of return on alternative kinds of investment.

1.11. Conceptual framework

The study was conceptualized whereby the parents, community and government, NGO’s among other private partners incur costs in education as an investment due to expected returns of increased quality and quantity of educational outputs including nature of graduates.
Fig. 1.1. Conceptual framework

**EDUCATION INVESTMENTS**

**Private investors**
- Parents
- Developmental partners
- NGO’s
- Religious organizations

**Social investors**
- Government
- Community

**Private cost**
- School fee
- Uniform
- Forgone earnings

**Social cost**
- School fees
- Uniforms
- Harambee
- Teachers salary
- Bursaries
- Forgone productivity

**Education cost**
- Quantity and quality of educational resources
- Nature of school students graduates

**Private returns**
- Social returns

Source: researcher.
The model comprises education as an investment. It referred to private investors as parents, NGO’s, religious organizations and developmental partners and social investors as government and community. Under private and social costs we have both direct and indirect costs. The study established the direct and indirect costs from the stakeholders in Migwani District.

The model comprises both private and social educational costs, which refers to uniforms, desks, classrooms, transport, activity fee, meals, and salaries among others.

Private and social returns referred to the quantity and quality of educational resources; facilities and nature of student graduates. The model shows contributions of public-private partners, which provide and finance various teaching/learning resources and facilities.

The contributions are utilized to provide and finance different learning and teaching resources and facilities required by the school. It is these contributions and utilizations which determined the amount of educational resources and facilities that have been provided and financed by the government, parents, community, developmental partners, non-governmental organizations and religious organizations.

The returns of utilization of contributions made by public and private partners are determined by quantifying the educational resources and facilities that the school required and are inadequately available through cost-sharing mechanism. It is these contributions that determine the education resources and facilities that are provided and financed in secondary schools.
1.12. Operational definition of terms

Cost sharing: Refers to the share of household contributions to supplement state effort in financing education.

Capital: Refers to expenditure on permanent features like new buildings, desks, textbooks.

Community: All the other people who live in a particular area excluding the parents and are responsible for financing a child’s education.

Direct cost: This refers to the expenses incurred by households in education for example fees, uniforms and textbooks.

Educational cost: These are costs of input (resources), which are allocated to education, for example cost for building materials, desks, equipments, teachers houses, workshops e.t.c.

Enrollment: Refers to the number of students who get admitted and registered in a school system.

Financing: Meeting the cost of education, capital (development) and recurrent expenditures.

Harambee: A meeting that is held in order to collect money for school projects (fund raising activities).

Indirect Cost: Refers to the earning forgone for example labour due to engagement in education.

Per capita Income: Average income per person in a given country

Parents: These include the natural mothers and fathers, the foster mothers and fathers, guardians and any other person who are responsible for financing a child’s education.
Rates of return of education: These refer to the net benefits accruing to an individual (private rate of return) or society as a whole (social rate of return) upon successful completion of education.

Recurrent expenditure: Refers to expenditure which is incurred and which covers one financial year only e.g. consumables such as exercise books, chalk, salaries for the year in question.

Recurrent cost: Are those costs incurred for goods and services consumed in the course of a budget year, and which must be regularly replaced.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This study was aimed at finding out the contributions made by public (community and government) and private (parents, developmental partners, religious organizations, non-governmental organizations) partners in providing and financing public secondary schools in Migwani District. This chapter examines the literature related to financing public secondary school in developed and developing countries of the world. The chapter covers the following: cost of education, global studies on financing, financing from African countries, financing regime in Kenya and summary.

The review of literature for this study was drawn from books, journals, news papers, government publications and documents, reports and works that have a bearing wholly or partially on the field of education finance.

2.2. Cost of education.

According to Martha (2007), education involves use of human material, and financial resources and as such it is never “free” in the real sense of the world. Someone must pay for education. The term “free” in the “Free Primary Education” means that parents are relieved from direct financial responsibility which is taken up by the government. The government uses taxes and other revenues to fund education which parents are required to surrender their children to the educational institutions which is a cost on their part.
Nations, societies and individuals in the world invest heavily in education for economic developments and social status. According to Olembo and Ross (1992), Education is a non material good which cannot be free because to provide it; money is required for training of personnel’s, employment of professionals, land, buildings, teaching and learning materials etc. As a durable good, education is costly. However, it has a multiplier effect in that it benefits the government, the society at large and individuals. It is a provider as well as a consumer good. It is a commodity to sell in order to be bought for the learner benefit.

Education is one of the basic rights, as in article 28 and 29 of the United Nations convention on the rights of the children (1989). According to Nyaga (2005), it is the right of every child to have access to education. In the constitution of Kenya (Republic of Kenya, 2010), Chapter 5 section 72, all Kenyans have a right to education, which is one of the fundamental human rights under protection of freedoms of the individuals. In its efforts to provide education for all citizens, the government’s expenditure on education in Kenya continues to rise (Eshiwani, 1994) and requires both the parents and beneficiaries to contribute towards it. This has previously been done to some extend through community efforts like Harambee (Fund raising activities) that helped lower the government development expenditure on education.

Kamunge report (Republic of Kenya 1988) recommended that parents and community supplement the government efforts by providing educational institutions with equipment and funds to procure teaching and learning materials in the spirit of cost sharing policy. Parents have also to provide their children with other requirements of the school which include books, prescribed items, uniforms and boarding requirements among others. The
cost sharing policy was to be continued and strengthened as one of the strategies to help the government achieve the stated objectives in the financing of education and training. The government finances education by providing administration and professional services while the parents meet all other costs through payment of school fees. This study was concerned with finding out if parents, community, government among others are effectively playing their roles as expected in order to enhance teaching and learning process in Kenya Public Secondary Schools.

2.3. Global studies on financing.

Existing payments for schooling are most obvious indications that many parents and communities are willing and able to pay for schooling (Bray, 1996). In Peru, the views of parents whose children live close to secondary school have been compared with the views of parents’ whose children have to travel two or more hours each day (Bray, 1996). The research found that households in the second group were willing to pay fees that would more than cover the costs of opening new secondary schools in their villages (Bray, 1996).

In Vietnam, the government used to provide free education throughout the system including post-primary schooling. This, however, was stopped in 1989 owing to economic stringency (Bray, 1996).

The willingness to support schooling is evident among Indonesia’s rural dwellers and poor households who contribute labour and materials in lieu of cash. The same kind of practice whereby parents contribute labour and materials in lieu of cash takes place in Kenya. This practice is common in most parts of East Asia and in other parts of the world (Bray, 1996).
In Sri-lanka, education is characterized by low costs and its education organizational structure allows for integrated primary and secondary schools, and sustainability of secondary enrolment at affordable rates (6 percent of GNP). Sri-lanka, though a low income country, had high school participation rates estimated at 104 percent primary GER, 66 percent secondary GER, and 4 percent tertiary GER in Mid-1980’s and low population growth rate of 1.2 percent between 1980 – 1994. By 1993, the participation rate for 5-14 age population had reached 93 percent rural and 96 percent urban. This, as Lewin and caillods (2001) notes, is attributed to rapid secondary, school expansion and sustainable financing, including decentralization of management to principals, free primary education, widely distributed school facilities, free text book scheme, free uniforms, adequate provision of infrastructure for teacher training and in-service programmes, and high internal efficiency reflected by low repetition rates and drop out rates.

Countries like the Czech Republic have made financing of secondary education more affordable by increasing the teacher load, increasing the teacher intensity in terms of the pupil – teacher ratio and merging of schools with low enrolment. Other cost reduction measurers include individual teacher innovations such as the use of computers in teaching (OECD 1999)

Sweden on the other hand has transformed the steering system based on regulations to a decentralized system based on goals and result oriented steering. OECD (1998) notes that steering goals, results and financing are now a joint responsibility for the state and municipalities. Independent schools are responsible for their own activities, but their costs are covered either by municipalities or by state. Each school and municipality, in
the same way as the state, formulate goals for their area of responsibility, evaluate result and make the changes required to maintained quality. The task given by the state to the central school authority the National Agency For Education, now focuses on monitoring results achieved the evaluation and follow-up procedures carried out by the National Agency For Education aim to provide a broad and sound basis for use by all interested parties needing up to date information and facts. However, the follow-up on how the school systems use resources, its conditions and qualitative results needed to be developed and made more efficient. The quality of education is subject to specific scrutiny by national education inspectors in accordance with special government directive.

According to Samah (1991) in Malaysia the role of the parent – teacher associations (PTA’S) is primarily that of material support; for example they contribute to the building of school halls canteens and providing teaching aids. According to the Australian National Commission for UNESCO on compulsory education, Australian states that, who got interested in local schools formed parent’s and citizens associations which performed functions such as, i). Raising the local funds for specific school projects, ii). Mobilizing and allowing local opinion in regard to particular education and administrative issues e.t.c Bangladesh introduced selective scholarships for female students while Colombia introduced targeted vouchers of learners from socio-economically disadvantaged groups. All the above could be applicable to Kenya, however it would need to be evaluated as regards the extent to which they have achieved their roles in their respective countries.
2.4. Secondary education financing from African countries.

African countries have been showing willingness to pay for schooling. This willingness seems to be particularly evident in countries where governments did not make satisfactory quantitative provision (World Bank, 1997). Subsequently; the sale of non-government resources even in public system of education is both larger and growing (World Bank, 1977). In 2007, the Uganda government went one step further and made secondary education free phasing it in so that, across Uganda every one in the first two years of secondary education is no longer paying fees. Uganda is likely to achieve the millennium development goals for education in 2015 (World bank, 2008). In 2011/2012 financial year budget ministry of finance ear marked sh 1.502 Trillion for the education sector, yet sh 1.816 trillion was budgeted for by the education ministry. By may 2013, education minister Jessica Alupo, announced a funding deficit of 314 billion sh for universal primary education.

Nigeria and Tanzania have identified three main sources of financing, namely: government sources, local sources including local authority funds, private financing. This is equally happening in Kenya and more so to secondary education whereby the villagers’ collections and parents’ fees finance the secondary education though the extent is yet to be established.

In Burkina Faso, where the government could not sustain the recurrent costs of significant expansion in secondary school enrolment, partnerships are being nurtured with the private sector through distance learning and provision of good quality secondary education. This initiative involves construction of at least three low cost secondary
schools in under served areas and delegation of their management to non-public organizations at no recurrent cost to government. Other initiatives included providing lease financing for construction of 10 private schools to be operated and paid for on easy terms by private sector operators or self-financed municipalities, with transfers of ownership to the non-public operator after full payment, and joint construction of 160 additional classrooms at existing private schools (Gueye and Gauci, 2003).

Lewin and Caillods (2001) brings out the case of Malawi as one of low participation rates at primary, 65 (percent) and secondary, 6 (percent) levels in 1995 and nominal transition rate from primary to secondary of 10 percent. The low secondary enrolment rates were associated with low levels of participation at primary and low performance at final grade of primary level leading to minimal number of the pupils meeting the minimum requirement for transition to secondary. Repetition and drop out rates were estimated at 15 - 20 percent and 18 percent in primary education and secondary respectively, during the same period. This implementation of FPE in 1994 placed severe budgetary constraints on financing of secondary education estimated at seven or more times higher than that of primary education (1:7).

Towards expanding secondary education in Malawi; the major policy and investment commitments included increasing transition rates from primary to secondary to 30 percent through building of more secondary schools, encouraging the development of private secondary schools, reduction in double shift system, curriculum review and rationalization to ensure quality, deliberate efforts towards increasing girls enrolment in secondary schools, and improved in-service and pre-service training and establishment of textbook fund to improve textbook provision in secondary schools.
Fiske and Ladd (2003), found that, in South Africa a governing body of public schools must make reasonable measure within its means to supplement the resources supplied by the state. The setting of fees is optional in the sense that a school can impose such fees only when authorized to do so by a majority of parents attending a budget meeting at the school. Children cannot be denied admission for failure to pay the fees but the school can sue the parents for non-payment. However, some parents with extreme low income are exempted from paying such fees.

Rwanda abolished lower secondary education in 2006 followed by Uganda in 2007. The two governments were concerned of low transition rate from primary schools to secondary schools due to limited places and high fees resulting to many qualified pupils to drop out after completing primary education (ohba, 2009).

Despite these initiatives by governments in sub-saharan continent, education systems are facing increasing problems of financial nature. Various countries that are on track in achieving FSE are now looking for innovative strategies and financing options for expanding secondary education, consistence with national human capital development goals. However, fiscal constraints prevent many, especially low-income counties, from relying solely on government revenue to finance desired educational expansion. To solve these problems, most countries have adopted policies to a) change tuition fees to recoup part of the coast of providing public education services; and / or b) encourage development of private schools to handle at least part of the expansion.

2.5. Financing regime in Kenya

In financing education, the Kenya government has experienced a very cooperative gesture from the public. Public financing of education in Kenya started in 1909 when
financial grants were made to mission schools conducting industrial training (Mutua, 1975). Hence, cost sharing between the parents, community and government goes back into the early years of colonial rule in Kenya (Achola, 1988). Full institutionalization of cost-sharing policy that is a common feature in the Kenyan education system is a worldwide phenomenon that can be traced way back to 1973, world oil crisis. As a reaction to this crisis, cost sharing was put in place to make good the deficit in education budget, Kenya was not exceptional. The trend in the 1970’s and 1980’s has therefore, been to cut down on the education budget in order to finance other essential services (Otiende et al, 1992: 107) hence the recommendation established.

Without this type of support from community financially many schools would fold because the state and the local government cannot cope with the financial requirement for the school upkeep and expansion. (Nwagwa and Olembo et al 1992) highlights potential benefits from collaboration of government with parents and community. He argues that the relationship not only increases the resources available for education they also improve the relevance, appropriateness, and sustainability of reform and innovation. This essentially provides clear message to policy makers in Kenya and elsewhere that the number one priority in education is to strengthen the relationship of government, parents, community, developmental partners and NGO’s regarding financing of education.

Local financing increases the legitimacy of communities to exercise control over their school. This strengthened accountability for parents and communities regarding their financing of education, and led to improvement in home – school liaison and in the local relevance of education (ibid). Parents and communities feel responsible for the well being of schools especially in relation to contribution in financing the education programmes,
which gives them a personal attachment to their schools thus strengthening the cost-sharing spirit. Cost sharing in education is supported by the international monetary fund (IMF) and the World Bank Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPS). The government agrees that cost-sharing is the right way in which the country can achieve its objectives of expanding its educational facilities and financing the education programme as a whole without adversely affecting the quality of education. (Rono, 1988:3)

In applying the cost-sharing strategy, the government is to meet administrative and professional services costs whereas parents and beneficiaries of education meet the costs related to the development and provision of educational facilities like textbooks uniforms, equipments and personal services, among others (Mackay report, 1989); Kamunge report, 1988; Republic of Kenya 1983. The community has also contributed to financing of public secondary schools in Kenya. As it is noted that since independence one significant sources of finance for Kenya’s school system is Harambee (self-drive), (Olembo, 1985). Leaders arranged for systematic collections of donations from farmers, co-operative societies, land buying companies and other organizations through fund-raising meetings held at all levels in most Districts (Anderson, 1973).

Hence the contributions of government, parents, communities, developmental partners, religious organizations, and NGO’s have been impressive but scholars feel that the six sources of funds have been over -burdened by school related requirements and hence need supplementary from other sources such as, charitable organizations, sponsored walks, school’s own income generating activities among others (Olembo, 1985, Ter , 1973, Rono 1988, Achola 1988, Abongo 1987, Wesonga 1996).
2.6. Summary

In summary, this chapter looked at secondary schools theories and practices of financing in various countries including Kenya.

It has also managed to point out that cost-sharing strategy is not adequately meeting its objectives as it is evident that many schools still lack essential teaching/learning facilities and pointed out a need to further explore the adequacy of parents, government, community, religious organizations, developmental partners and NGO’s contributions in financing and providing secondary education through cost-sharing policy.

The public secondary schools in Migwani District should engage in some of the financing options like income generating projects such as rearing of livestock for use in school and sale to the market, bee keeping for sale of honey and hiring of school facilities e.g. halls for private functions. Besides, the government must play its central role in policy directions and encourage strong partnership among all stakeholders including communities, NGOs, private sectors and external support, among others. Main financial policy reforms related to improved primary and secondary school internal efficiencies, improved efficiency in use of resources, improved school management and decentralization of some management functions, quality improvement through curriculum reforms relevant to labour market and livelihoods and teacher provisional development. Some of the financial options that may
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This study was designed to analyze the roles of government, parents, community, NGO’s, developmental partners, Religious organizations in provision and financing of public secondary schools in Migwani District. This chapter includes, research design and location of study, population targeted, sampling technique and sample size, research instruments, pilot study, data collection procedure and data analysis procedure.

3.2. Research design

Since this study was geared towards analyzing the roles of public and private partners in providing and financing public secondary schools in Migwani District, a survey design utilizing quantitative approach was used. Survey design was appropriate because it involved collecting data in order to test questions concerning the current status of subjects of the study. It was used to test attitudes and opinions about events, individuals or procedure (Gay, 1993). Kothari (1995) notes that descriptive survey design is concerned with describing, recording, analyzing and reporting conditions that exist or existed. Engelhart (1972) argues that descriptive methods are widely used to obtain data useful in evaluating present practices and in providing the basis for decision – making. The study therefore employed the survey design since the researcher wanted to get clear information on the prevailing state of financing of public secondary school education.
3.3. Location of the study.

The study was carried out in Migwani District, Kitui County. The District covers some 619.9 square kilometers with a population of 70,128 people and 14,769 households. It shares common boundaries with Mwingi Central District to the East, Kitui West to the South, Kitui central to the south east, Yatta to the west and Mbeere east to the North. The Criterion that determined the choice of area of study was the fact that the researcher knows the area well and also the fact that most studies of this nature have been done in productive areas and not in arid and semi-arid land as it is the case of Migwani District.

3.4. Target population

The target population was thirty eight (38) public secondary schools in Migwani District with a population of 3120 boys and 3276 girls, which totals to 6396. Among the public secondary schools there are 4 boys’ schools, 4 girls’ schools, 26 mixed day schools, 3 mixed boarding and day schools, and 1 mixed boarding school. The Headteachers of the 38 schools, their 245 teachers and students were included in the target population. The D.E.O. in Migwani District was also be part of the target population.

3.5. Sample and sampling procedure.

Purposive sampling was used to select ten (10) schools so as to consider gender and nature. The researcher relied on her expert judgement to select units that are representative or typical of the population. The subjects were chosen according to a
certain specific criteria; girls and boys, mixed day and boarding public secondary schools which provided a representative sample. This formed about 26% of the public secondary schools in the District. A sample of ten percent (10%) of the population is considered minimum for a descriptive study (Gay, 1976). For smaller population twenty percent (20%) of the population may be required (Gay, 1976). Therefore 26% is justified for a descriptive study of this nature.

Ten (10) Headteachers one from each of the selected schools was included in the study. Fourty (40) teachers, four from each school, a total of one hundred and sixty students (160) were purposefully sampled from the selected schools, sixteen (16) students from each school and the District Education officer (D.E.O) from the District.

In selecting the students’ gender, their class and nature of the school was considered. Purposive sample was chosen so as to ensure when selecting teachers gender and their duration of stay in their respective schools was considered, those who have served for more than three years were sampled because the researcher believe that long stay have earned them enough knowledge on the issue that was under investigation. The D.E.O was included in the study because he was the closest to the Ministry of education hence government representative who was in a better position to know government contributions to financing of public secondary schools. He was also in charge of inspecting of the school funds and educational facilities (A manual for Headteachers 1975). The Headteachers on the other hand, were the chief financial controllers of the schools. They also ensure their schools had adequate educational facilities and resources for effective teaching/learning.
Students were included in the study because financing of the educational programmes affects them directly. The students, through experience were in the best position to explain the effects of the school finance on their education.

Table 3.1. Students’ enrolment by gender in sampled schools in Migwani District (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>NUMBER OF BOYS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GIRLS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIGWANI BOYS</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYOME BOYS</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THITANI GIRLS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITOLONI GIRLS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYAMBOO SEC</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSUANI MIXED</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILALAMBYU</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDALUNI</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOKOA</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZAUNI</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1643</strong></td>
<td><strong>1365</strong></td>
<td><strong>3008</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6. Research instruments

The research instruments for the study were questionnaires and observation checklist. The researcher mainly used questionnaires in data collection as they were appropriate in
descriptive survey (Orodho, 2009). There were questionnaires for headteachers and teachers, students and D.E.O.

The questionnaires were designed to gather information on personal background and school nature. The questionnaires also solicited information on the following; the contributions that have been made by parents, community, government, NGO’s, developmental partners and religious organizations. The opinions of the headteachers, teachers, D.E.O regarding the cost-sharing policy and its effectiveness. According to Kane (1995), questionnaires are widely used in research to obtain information about current conditions and practices and to make inquiries concerning attitudes and opinions in a precise form. The use of questionnaires was preferred because they save time and allow collection of data easily. They are also less costly, easy to quantify and appropriate in summarizing the results (Kane 1995; World Bank 2000; Sommer and Sommer 1991). Both open ended and closed ended items were included in the questionnaires.

3.7. Pilot study.

One public secondary school in Migwani District not in the list of the sampled schools for study was selected by the researcher for piloting the study. The school was randomly selected. The questionnaires were administered to the Headteacher, teachers, and students. The purpose of piloting the research instrument was to find out the reliability and validity and its suitability for the study.

3.7.1. Validity of instruments

The researcher in this study had to consult the experts in planning of education in the department of educational management, policy and curriculum studies of Kenyatta University, in order to seek relevant expert judgement in measuring the content validity
of the questionnaires developed. Their recommendations were incorporated in the final questionnaires.

3.7.2. Reliability of instruments

Mugenda M.O and Mugenda A.G (1999) note that, reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trial. According to Orodho (2002) reliability of measurement concerns the degree to which a particular measuring procedure gives similar results over number of repeated trials. Test-retest technique of assessing the reliability was employed, whereby the questionnaires were administered twice to the same group of subject. There was a two week time lapse between the first test and the second one. Then a correlation coefficient for the two tests was calculated using Pearson’s product-moment formula.

\[
R = \frac{N\sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][N\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}
\]

Where R=Correlation co-efficient

\[N=\text{Total number of scores}\]

\[\sum = \text{summation of scores}\]

\[X=\text{scores in the first test}\]

\[Y=\text{scores in the second test}\]

A correlation co-efficient (r) of about 0.75 was considered high enough to judge the reliability of the instrument as recommended by Orodho (2002).
3.8. Data collection procedure

The researcher obtained an introduction letter from Kenyatta University and a research permit from the National Council for Science and Technology. The researcher also sought for permission from the District Commissioner, District Education Officer and the Headteachers of the individual schools before the actual day. After this, the researcher booked an appointment with the sampled schools through the Headteachers to visit and administer the questionnaires. The researcher then visited and administered the questionnaires herself. The respondents were given instructions and assured of confidentiality then they were given enough time to fill in the questionnaires, after which the researcher collected the filled in questionnaires.

3.9. Data analysis and presentation

Items from the questionnaires were arranged and grouped according to particular research questions. Responses received from the above instrument were organized, tabulated and analyzed using simple frequencies and percentages. Bell (1993) maintains that when making the results known to a variety of readers, simple descriptive statistics such as percentages have a considerable advantage over more complex statistics, since they are easily understood. Borg and Gall (1983) also hold that the most widely used and understood standard proportion is the percentage.

Before coding and entering the data in the computer for analysis there was editing to check on internal consistency of the recorded data. Care was taken by the researcher to know the number of times views are expressed and the number of respondents that expressed the views. This formed the basis for drawing conclusion. Hence data collected
has been presented systematically in a descriptive form supported by, frequency
distribution and percentages. Data was summarized using tables, bar graphs and pie
charts.
4.0. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. Introduction

The purpose of this study was to analyze the roles of public and private partners in financing and provision of public secondary education in Migwani District, Kitui County, as perceived by Headteacher, teachers, students and D.E.O. An observation checklist was used by the researcher to get supplementary information on availability and condition of significant facilities in the school. The findings of the study are presented in this chapter based on the research objectives. Data received from the respondents was analyzed and presented in form of tables, graphs and percentages. The statistical data in the tables are supplemented with some explanation.

The sample size under this study was 211 respondents comprising 10 Headteachers, 40 teachers, 160 students and 1 D.E.O. Out of 211 questionnaires given out to the sampled respondents, 205 (97.2%) questionnaires were completed accurately and returned. The breakdown of the complete and accurate questionnaires that were used in the analysis was as follows; From Headteachers, 8 questionnaires, out of the 10 distributed were received, all the 40 distributed to teachers were received in their complete and accurate form and 156 out of 160 distributed to students were received for analysis. The D.E.O’s questionnaire was also received. This high rate of 97.2% was considered adequate enough for analysis. The analysis was done under the following themes.

- Background information
- Contributions of public sectors – government and community
• Contributions of private sectors – parents, Non – Governmental Organization, religious organizations (sponsor), developmental partners

• Policy recommendations that can help in financing.

4.2. Background information

For better understanding of the findings of this study, it was important to have some background information about the schools where the study was done and respondents who gave the data that was analyzed. The background information collected in the study included: gender, age, professional qualifications, position in the school and teaching load of the respondents. Data on school category, nature and size of the schools which participated in the study was also collected.

4.2.1. Gender of the respondents

The study sought to find out the gender of the respondents. The results obtained are summarized in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>D.E.O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Most of the respondents were males as shown in Table 4.1. Female respondents were only 37% at Headteachers and teachers category.

4.2.2. Ages of the respondents

The researcher determined the age of respondents and the findings are in table 4.2.

| Age     | Teachers |  | Headteachers |  | Students |  | D.E.O |  | Total |  |
|---------|----------|  |--------------|  |-----------|  |-------|  |-------|  |
|         | n        | % | n            | % | n        | % | n    | % | n     | % |
| 10 – 19 | 0        | 0 | 0            | 0 | 120      | 76.9 | 0    | 0 | 120    | 58.5 |
| 20 – 29 | 10       | 25 | 0           | 0 | 36       | 23.1 | 0    | 0 | 46     | 22.4 |
| 30 – 39 | 20       | 50 | 0           | 0 | 0        | 0   | 0    | 0 | 20     | 9.8 |
| 40 – 49 | 9        | 22.5 | 5         | 75 | 0       | 0   | 0    | 0 | 14     | 6.9 |
| Above 50| 1        | 2.5 | 3           | 25 | 0       | 0 | 1    | 100 | 5     | 2.4 |
| Total   | 40       | 100 | 8           | 100 | 156      | 100 | 1   | 100 | 205    | 100 |

Majority (76.9%) of the respondents were between ages of (10 – 19). Majority (75%) of the Headteachers were above 40 years of age, only 2.5% of the total respondents were above the age of 50 years. This implies that those teachers entrusted with the management of schools were senior in age.

4.2.3. Professional qualifications of respondents

Information was also obtained about the professional qualifications of the respondents. The findings are summarized in table 4.3.
The study revealed that majority (55%) of the respondents possessed a B. ED degree while those with M. ED and Diploma qualifications were 25% and 20% respectively. This indicates that all respondents were professionally qualified as teachers.

4.2.4. Teaching load of the respondents

The average teaching load per week was also sought by the researcher for different subject categories. The data obtained is presented in table 4.4.
### Table 4.4. Average teaching load per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Humanity</th>
<th>Technical &amp; applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study found out that only 3 (30%) of the teachers of languages and 1 (10%) of teachers of Mathematics had a teaching load of above 29 lessons per week. However, all humanities and technical and applied teachers had a teaching load of below 24 lessons per week. This shows that the work load in different subject categories is reasonable considering (DSES 2007) suggestion on increasing the number of lessons taught per week (i.e. 27 lessons). The researcher felt that schools could still do with less of BOG teachers and utilize the available TSC teachers to cut down on cost.
4.2.5. School category and nature

Information about categories of schools which participated in the study was also received. This information is indicated in fig. 4.1.

**Fig. 4.1 school category and nature.**

The study revealed that most (70%) of the schools which participated in the study were mixed day with only 5% being single sex schools. This shows that both single sex and mixed schools participated in the study even though majority were mixed schools.

4.2.6. Size of schools (number of streams)

Data obtained the size of schools in terms of streams which participated in the study is presented in fig. 4.2.
Fig 4.2. Indicates that all sizes of schools were used in the study even though majority (50%) of them were single streamed. There was no school with above four streams.

4.3 Public sector contributions in financing and provision of public secondary education

Public sectors included government and community.

4.3.1. Governments contribution in financing and provision of public secondary education.

4.3.1.0. Provision of funds for free secondary education

The head teachers and D.E.O. said that the role played by the government included provision of free secondary education through tuition waiver. The government introduced a free secondary schooling education programme with a target of raising students’
enrolment to 1.4 million by the end of each year. President Mwai Kibaki formally launched the programme and indicated that the Kenyan government was to pay tuition fee for students amounting to 10,265 Kshs. Per annum. The government in 2008 released more than $ 41 million to pay for the different phases of the programme which has proved to be a success to relieve the poor and marginalized communities from accessing education equally. This government contribution has led to increased enrollment in public secondary schools for both girls and boys as shown in table 4.5 below. However, this contribution has not been adequate as indicated by D.E.O.; this was due to poverty, drought and ignorance.

**Table 4.5 students population in public secondary schools in Migwani District from 2008 – 2012 by gender.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Rate of growth of students population in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2422</td>
<td>2429</td>
<td>2776</td>
<td>3044</td>
<td>3276</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2296</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>2953</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4718</td>
<td>5160</td>
<td>5506</td>
<td>5997</td>
<td>6424</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students’ population has been increasing since the year 2008 to 2012 for both boys and girls. This is attributed to the governments’ involvement in free secondary education and the additional secondary schools which were being built from the CDF Kitty. considering that many are day schools and the school fees charged was affordable by many parents and again parents could make arrangements to pay fees in kind under very lenient conditions such as fetching water for the school, providing firewood, availing themselves for manual labour in the school. This was made possible owing to the fact that
these CDF schools are highly localized and with an objective of boosting access to education to the local natives. Girls population is higher than boys with an exception of the year 2009. This is an indication that the community prefers enrolling girls in secondary schools at the expense of boys. Female students population has increased by 35.3% while male students by 35.9%. The total increase for both female and male has been 36.2%.

Fig 4.3 below shows the trend in schools enrolment from the year 2008 to 2012 in Migwani district by gender. It clearly shows that female population increases year by year more than the male population.
Fig. 4.3 Students population from 2008 – 2012 by gender.
4.3.1.1. Teacher’s establishment in public secondary schools

As a way of determining the curriculum based establishments (CBE) and the cost incurred on teachers, the Head teachers were asked to indicate the total number of teachers in their schools specifying those under T.S.C and B.O.G respectively. They also gave reasons for employing or not employing B.O.G teachers. The results are as shown in fig. 4.4 below.

**Figure 4.4 The number of teachers in the sampled public secondary schools.**

The results showed that the majority i.e. 34(85%) of the teachers in the sampled schools were employed by T.S.C while 6 (15%) were under B.O.G. Reasons advanced for hiring B.O.G teachers were; share excess workload and enhance effectiveness in service delivery, increase in students enrolment thus poor teacher student ratio, replacement of TSC teachers redeployed in administrative positions.

4.3.1.2. Provision of physical facilities, equipment and resources.

The researcher inquired whether the schools had enough teaching and learning facilities. The responses are as shown in table 4.6.
### Table 4.6 Availability and adequacy of teaching – learning facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Availability n = 10</th>
<th>Adequacy n = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitories</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets/latrines</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff houses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer room</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopiers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School van/bus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped water</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinning hall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/Science room</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Others specify     | This information was sought as a means of determining the level of need as a consequence for educational costs. The Head teachers and teachers were asked to indicate
whether various physical facilities were available and whether they were adequate for the smooth running of the school. Table 4.6 above provides the details.

From table 4.6 it is clear that most schools do not have enough facilities and equipment. In the whole District there are only three schools that has well equipped library and laboratory. These are Provincial schools. 10 schools had laboratories and 4 had libraries, but they were not well equipped, finally 6 schools did not have libraries and had overcrowded classes. There were day mixed schools. 70% had dormitories for boarding while 8 (80%) were connected to the electricity. Only 5 (50%) of the sampled schools had a school bus. The study also revealed that of the sampled schools, 7 (70%) didn’t have staff houses while only 5 (50%) of the schools didn’t have either a dining hall or computers.

On adequacy, 6 (60%) schools connected with electricity said that it was adequate, while 2 (20%) of the schools having piped water said it was sufficient. Although all the sampled schools had classrooms, toilets and latrines, 6 (60%) of the Headteachers indicated that they were not adequate. With the apparent shortage of facilities, there was a possibility of competition by schools to acquire more in order to improve on quality; a factor that will contribute to higher costs of education.

**4.3.2. Community contribution**

The community have financed and provided for schools in the District through Harambees, donations and provision of land. However, the D.E.O, Head teacher and teachers said that the community contribution was not adequate. The communities in the District include parents and well wishers. Some Head teachers said the community
provides bursary to needy students. Others said the community initiated fully projects like construction of classrooms, buying of school vehicle, pumping of water from river to school, construction of dormitory, laboratories and also construction of administration block through Harambee. According to Head teachers, teachers and D.E.O, the cost-sharing strategy between public and private sectors was not adequate to meet the teaching/learning needs. The reasons for this being poverty, and small scale farming for their income. Harambees on the other hand in the area were poorly attended hence not much was contributed (Report from Ilalambyu Secondary school, Harambee contribution on 7/7/2012)

4.4. Private sector contribution in financing and provision of public secondary education

4.4.1. Direct costs incurred by parents in education at secondary school level.

Data were gathered concerning the direct costs incurred by parents in public secondary schools in Migwani District. These data were required in order to establish the total private direct costs that parents are supposed to pay as their share of cost sharing policy. Table 4.7 Shows the direct cost incurred by parents in secondary school education in Migwani District per year, and other requirements met by parents.
Table 4.7 Fees charged in boarding and day schools in Migwani District per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTE HEAD</th>
<th>BOARDING</th>
<th>DAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount (Ksh)</td>
<td>Amount (Ksh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding</td>
<td>13034</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMI</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTT</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>2740</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration cost</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caution</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games kit</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School I.D</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed cover</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outings</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35424</strong></td>
<td><strong>17050</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table 4.7, it is clear that parents meet various costs of secondary education, for example uniform fees, boarding fees, PTA, Medical and caution. In total, table 4.6 reveals that for boarding school parents pay between 31,200 to 35,500 Kshs while in day schools parents pay directly between 15,500 to 17,500 Kshs per annum. Under cost sharing policy, parents are supposed to shoulder 60% of the total expenditure of secondary school education while the government shoulders 40% (MOEST, 2001). Perhaps the amount reflected in the table 4.8. Shouldered by parents was higher than what is recommended by the Ministry of education. The recommended annual fee guidelines for public secondary schools were only lunch money for day schools and Kshs. 18,250 for the boarding schools in District and Provincial category. These guidelines are largely ignored by large number of Headteachers, Boards Of Governors and Parents Teachers Associations who go ahead and charge what they feel is realistic. Be-side the vote heads recommended by the MOEST, schools have introduced other items such as remedial teaching fees, motivation fee, welfare fees that have contributed to increased costs of education, these findings conform to the Orodho (2002) and UNICEF (1999) that found out that the schools charge more than what the Ministry of Education has recommended. Similarly, Martim (2008) found out that most schools especially National schools charge over kshs.60, 000 per year. This high cost is prohibitive to not only poor but also middle class families. Akinyi et al. (2009) states that five students who were admitted to National schools from Nyanza Province could not report because of lack of school fees. This is a clear indication that despite tuition fee waiver many parents are still unable to educate their children in secondary schools. It was pointed out by a hundred percent (100%) of Headteachers in the schools visited by the researcher that it
was the responsibility of parents to finance all the above requirements in table 4.7 for their children.

The researcher was further interested in knowing the financial position of secondary schools. Headteachers were therefore used to rate the financial position of their schools. Table 4.8 below, depicts their rating.

**Table 4.8 Rating of schools financial position.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Head teachers (87.5%) rated their schools financial position as satisfactory while only one school (12.5%) was rated to be in good financial position.

Despite the fact that parents are key contributors in the financing of public secondary schools, a hundred percent (100%) of the Head teachers and teachers in the District stated that parents formed most problematic source of funds. This is because of most parents’ inability to raise the amount of money agreed upon by the B.O.G and P.T.A. This means parent’s contribution is inadequate. Parents are forced to finance and provide for schools by paying fees through installments or in kind for example in form of firewood, food or labour instead of cash. Migwani District is an arid and semi-arid region, which is often
hit by drought. This means that there is little income generating activity being carried out in the region. Parents in the area therefore have very little income to contribute to the schools.

Table 4.9. Response to rate of payment of school fees by parents within a given year in public secondary schools in Migwani District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% payment of fees within a given year</th>
<th>Responses (n)</th>
<th>% responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 – 90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to 62.5% of the respondents of the schools visited 50 – 80% of the school parents paid the whole amount of fees within a given year. 37.5% said that parents paid fees less than fifty percent (50%) within a given year and no parents paid fees between eighty one percent (81%) and hundred percent (100%) hence depicting a deficit on amount of fees paid and that required by the schools. Hundred percent (100%) of Head teachers indicated a huge amount of fee arrears by 31st Dec 2011 for example 2.1 Million shillings.

From the data collected, it is clear that parents play a central role in financing and providing for public secondary schools. Their contribution seems to touch on every
aspect of school requirement. Though it should be noted that parents’ contribution in the schools visited was not used in isolation but alongside other sources of funds as shown in table 4.10 below.

**Table 4.10. Contributions by various sources of finance.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Head teacher responses</th>
<th>% responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government bursaries (CDF, LTF)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Harambee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations – Sponsors, NGO’s, Churches,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income generating activities (school house rent, school bus hire)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above it can be deduced that government do a lot in terms of financing. It provides teachers, funds for construction of schools infrastructure through tuition fee, LATF, and provides bursaries for needy students in the school. The community which encompasses well wishers, churches, NGO’s in the area, charitable organizations are also contributing immensely to the well being of the schools in the District for example community give the land on which the school stands, Churches give funds to needy students. Head teachers also were of the opinion that economic activities were an important source of finance for their schools. The Head teachers and teachers were also asked to state whether or not their current sources of finance were sufficient for the proper running of the education programme in their schools. Forty respondents (83.3%) answered ‘No’ while only 16.7% answered ‘Yes’.
An inquiry from the students on how direct costs are paid and whether their parents are able to afford revealed that payments are made in installments and not all parents complete paying fees by the end of the year. However, it was reported that some do not pay promptly. In some schools, it was revealed that very few parents pay promptly. The reasons for delayed payment of fees were given in table 4.11 below.

**Table 4.11. Reasons for delayed payments.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many dependants</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor market</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/Aids</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 percent of the students felt that poverty was the main cause of delayed payments. Many parents are poor and therefore cannot pay promptly. Another factor that affects prompt payment is the situation where parents have many dependants to cater for, this constituted 64.1%. Many dependants, coupled with poverty have made it difficult for the parents to pay promptly. Some students 32.1% stated that some parents who are farmers do not have ready market for their produce thus they could not pay promptly. Others about 38.5% identified HIV/Aids and orphanage as a factor affecting payment of fees. They indicated that Aids has made some parents unable to pay for their children because they spent a lot of money on medication. This condition had also left some children
orphans without somebody to pay for their fees. At the same time 25.7% of the students reported that some parents are unemployed and therefore they do not have regular income and so cannot pay promptly.

The researcher also sought to know from Head teachers how the fees payment pattern affected school operations. It was revealed that the greatest impact of unprompted payment of school fees is absenteeism. Students are regularly sent home for fees. This impact on the internal operations of the school institutions in the following ways; first, there was delayed coverage of syllabus because students were not attending classes regularly. This made teachers to repeat what they had already taught when those students who had been sent home for fees resumed, second project in schools were delayed and payments of non-teaching staff were delayed leading to lack of motivation hence poor performance. Physical development in school slowed down and it was revealed that some projects, which were supposed to have been completed some years back, were still under construction. Third, acquisition of necessary teaching learning materials and equipment had become difficult. This demotivated teachers and students leading to poor performance. Fourth, when students are sent away from classrooms to collect fees, there were underutilization of available resources such as classes, books libraries and laboratories and when all were present these resources were shared among many students. This is not cost effective. If resources are over utilized at times and underutilized at other times, the operations of the schools are not cost effective hence resulting into inefficiency. Other roles played by parents include provision of labour in Lieu of cash among others.
4.4.2. Contributions made by NGO’s, religious organizations (sponsor) and Developmental partners.

The results revealed that all schools 10 (100%) had fees as the main source of finance whiles others 8 (80%) received CDF, LATF and Bursaries from government. On the other hand only few of the schools had donors (NGO’s) as the source of finance for their schools. However, only 2 (20%) of the schools indicated sponsor like church as a source of finance. Developmental partners such as Equity Bank sponsor the bright students in the District. Another organization like Twana Twitu helps in paying school fees for the needy students in the District especially the orphan. The sponsor in some schools for example African Brotherhood Church drilled borehole for the school and community (Report from Ilalambyu secondary school) to get enough water. Headteachers and teachers in Migwani District also indicated that their schools do receive grants from NGO’s. The NGOs were Christian Children’s Fund (CCF) and Compassion International. They assist students in paying school fees, medical costs and buying of school uniforms. Although they contribute to the schools, Headteachers and teachers said they do not meet all the cost required for the students. About (30%) said many schools engage in income generating activities so as to run the school programmes smoothly. This is shown in fig. 4.5 below.
Fig. 4.5 The Headteachers and teachers response on whether schools engage in income generating activities.

![Pie chart showing the response of schools on income generating activities]

Table 4.12. Income generating activities present in public secondary schools’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>N = 10</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dairy farming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry farming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop farming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring school bus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental houses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish pond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study found out that 9 (90%) of the schools were noted as being engaged in income generating. Out of these 1 (10%) of the schools participate in dairy farming while none were engaged in poultry farming, and only 1 (10%) engaged in fish pond. House rents, crops farming were mentioned by 3 (30%) and 2 (20%) respectively.
Hiring school bus mentioned by 3 schools (30%). This is inline with DSES (2007) suggestion on income generating activity as a strategy for lowering costs though there was need to diversify the activities.

Table 4.13. Headteacher response on the total income generated by school from income generating activities annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Ksh</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 10)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41,000 – 50,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51,000 – 60,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61,000 – 70,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71,000 – 80,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81,000 – 90,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91,000 and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 Shows that 1 school (10%) rose between (51,000 – 60,000 Kshs) from economic activities annually. One school admitted that their school rose over 91,000 Ksh every year. On the basis of this data, the researcher calculated & established that secondary schools surveyed generated a total of 751,000 kshs from economic activities each year and an average of Kshs 75,100 per school which is not adequate to support the schools financially.
Table 4.14. The total score for all the 21 items considered in the observation checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Adequacy (%)</th>
<th>Quality (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Kyome</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Migwani</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Ilalambyu</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Thitani</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Itoloni</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Kyamboo</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Musuani</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ndaluni</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Thokoa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Nzauni</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>534</strong></td>
<td><strong>472</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The district experiences difficulties in achieving the objectives of secondary education because the interventions to provide all the learning needs cannot be immediate. It implies that disparities in educational outcomes caused by lack of schooling facilities will continue to exist, there is therefore need to reduce the observed differences in school facilities by making efforts to equip all schools. This will improve equity and quality in learning achievements in secondary schools. In Migwani District pupil teacher ratio was
about 50:1. Classroom space was observed to be generally adequate, this shows well established school infrastructure.

4.5. Measures taken by public secondary schools to cater for the facilities lacking in schools.

The Head teacher and teachers were asked to give the alternatives preferred in case of lack of facilities within their schools and their opinions in terms of costs. The responses were as shown in table 4.15.

Table 4.15. Suggestions on alternatives preferred in case of lack of facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dormitories</td>
<td>Use classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use the available in shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Plan to expand in future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>Limit the number of students taking computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hire a ‘Matatu’ incase of need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School bus</td>
<td>Hire from other schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Use pressure lamps /generators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinning hall</td>
<td>Take meals in open field or in the classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organize practical’s to be done in shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td>Use classrooms for practical work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Borrow equipment from neighbouring schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversification and improvisation as indicated in table 4.15 are cost effective alternatives incase facilities lack in schools. Heyneman (1994) suggested that sharing common facilities across different institutions is one way of efficient use of current resources. Similarly Headteachers had embraced this. However, some of the alternatives given such as hiring ‘Matatu’ incase of need were found to be costly. This shows that the government did not provide the additional physical facilities and equipments required and these costs were too passed to the parents. Most parents were poor and therefore would not meet these costs. Therefore schools were not in a position to purchase necessary teaching and learning materials, construct facilities and also equipment. Lack of textbooks, enough teachers and teaching-learning materials led to drop out and repetition which are indicators of internal inefficiency (psacharopoulos and woodhall, 1985). Instructional materials are key ingredients in learning. They provide information, organize presentation of information, offer students opportunities to use what they had learned, and are known to enhance student achievement (World Bank, 1990). In the eighties researchers found that the availability of textbooks and other learning materials had a consistently positive effect on students achievement. However, in schools the researcher visited, students either lacked books altogether or were required to share books and other facilities with other students.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction

This chapter gives a summary of the findings of the study, conclusions that have been drawn and recommendation on the way forward based on the findings of the study. Finally the gaps that have been left by the research inform of suggestions for further research have been in this chapter.

5.2. Summary of the study findings.

The purpose of the study was to analyze the roles of public and private partners in financing and provision of public secondary education in Migwani District as perceived by Headteachers, teachers, students and D.EO. The study adopted survey design and data collected was largely descriptive in nature. Data was collected using questionnaires and observation checklist. The questionnaire used had three sections which solicited information on personal and school data, roles of public partners and roles of private partners, the findings of the study indicated that the number of female respondents were generally low. Out of the total number of respondents, female were 37% teachers and Headteachers, 41% students. On the age of the respondents it was found out that 50% of Headteachers were young ranging from 30 – 39 years. All Headteachers were above 40 years of age. This indicated that the leadership of the schools in the District was in the hands of older and experienced Headteachers. The study established that most respondents were well qualified as teachers (83.3%) had at least a B.ED degree. On
school category and nature, the study found out that (70%) of the schools which participated in study were Mixed day schools. On the size it was found out that (50%) of them were single streamed and none had five streams. It was also found that parents are the main contributors to financing of public secondary education. School administrators did not follow the fee guidelines provided by the Ministry of Education and they regarded them as unrealistic hence charged what they felt was realistic. The high charges resulted to absenteeism of students and even some dropping out of schools because were regularly sent home for school fees. Similarly parents did not pay the school fees required to enable schools operate efficiently. As a result, many schools did not have basic facilities and equipment and this compromised the quality of education. At the same time, it was revealed that the government did not provide the whole of its share, that is, did not provide enough teachers and additional texts and materials that it was supposed to provide. This negatively affected the internal operations of the schools. The community, NGO’s, sponsors and developmental partners contribute to financing of education although their financing is inadequate.

5.3. Conclusions

From the findings of this study, the following conclusions were made. First, enrolment had been increasing every year due to increase in school going age population in the District, and governments effort to provide free day secondary education. While the government is fully committed to ensuring that the education system is internally efficient, majority of the parents in the District of study are low income earners that is seen by their inability to pay the required user charges required to keep their children in school. Secondly, government should intervene in ensuring that income disparities in an
education system are lowered, this is because it may create a selective system where children from poor areas are disadvantaged, thus limiting their opportunities to climb to socio-economic ladder. This may result in a vicious cycle in which their potential to learn is lowered because of their more difficult social position. They, therefore, remain the same or even deteriorate to worse economic conditions. Therefore, they do not have a good chance to develop intellectually because they are not given adequate opportunity to acquire knowledge, which may remain a privilege of the rich. Third, partnership in education is not well established and this results to poor performance in educations. Apart from government funding the following alternative sources were identified; income generating projects e.g livestock farming, bus hire, and rental housing. Other sources included individual sponsors and donors, Harambee/ fund raising, CDF, churches, equity bank, Local Authority Transfer Fund.(LATF) and Christian Children Fund (CCF).

Financing of public secondary education will be faced with major challenges if no efficient resource utilization measures are put in place. In addition to budgetary constraints, the negative impact of inequitable resources allocation and spending on inputs has been accentuated by intra-sectoral misallocation of resources in secondary education. It is evident that non-salary expenditures at secondary education level are generally under-funded to enable provision of supplies and equipment, operations, maintenance, and repairs, which are considered as prerequisites for quality service delivery. The tendency of persistent inequalities in distributions has resulted into low growth in the number of secondary schools, particularly where household cannot afford. The study establishes that lack of adequate fund and resources was the biggest challenge affecting effective implementation of public secondary education.
5.4. Recommendations

Based on the research findings of this study the following are recommendations;

i. Since the cost sharing policy is already causing problems, the government should now reflect on available options and strategies of sourcing for funds to support secondary education. A likely option will be to approach development partners like the British department of foreign and international development.

ii. The government and other stakeholders should allocate funds in time and resources in to schools to ensure that secondary school education runs smoothly without compromising quality of education.

iii. Government should encourage private and public partnerships in all regions of the country. This is because effective education can best be achieved when government collaborates with a range of other actors- private sectors, civil society, independent experts, communities and families. This will entail the pooling of recourses, competencies, and capacities from the public and private sectors to achieve outcomes that add value beyond what either party could achieve acting alone.

iv. The local administration should encourage the local communities to fully participate in supporting their schools, by helping in manual work since such activities contribute to the reduction of cost the schools incur.

v. The ministry of education should review the free secondary education policy to reflect the current inflation trend in Kenya. The review should be in consultation with
the school managers and parents. The review should encompass the formula used to allocate the funds as well as the time of releasing the funds.

5.5. Recommendations for further research

- A similar study should be carried out in a different geographical region, especially in urban setting, to investigate the economic activates unique in the public secondary schools.

- A study similar to this should be carried out at provincial level or the whole country so as to get the state or providing and financing or education facilities under the 8.4.4 system. This will provide wider information on public secondary school education facilities.

- A study on how to peg disbursement of free learning funds on regional poverty index could also add to this body of knowledge and mitigate educational wastage due to poverty.
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APPENDIX I: STUDENT'S QUESTIONNAIRE

Roles of public – private partners in financing and provision of public secondary education

Instructions

This questionnaire is for collecting data for research concerning financing of public secondary schools in Migwani District. You are kindly requested to give information by filling this questionnaire. It is hoped that the information you give will be useful in this education research. You are assured that all the information you give will be strictly in confidence and will only be used for the purpose of research.

Please respond to all questions by filling in the space provided or use a tick in the indicated brackets [   ] as is appropriate. For confidentiality purposes, do not write your name.

PART A: General information

1. Give your age 10 – 19 [   ] above 20 [   ]

2. School category and nature

Boys boarding [   ] Girls boarding [   ] Mixed day [   ]
Mixed boarding [   ] Mixed day and boarding [   ]

3. Sex: Male [   ] Female [   ]

4. Indicate your class:

Form I [   ] Form II [   ] Form III [   ] Form IV [   ]
5. Whom do you live with?

Both parents [   ] One parent [   ] Guardian [   ]

Others (specify) ____________________________________________________________

6. Occupation of your Parents or guardians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[   ] Business man</td>
<td>[   ] Business lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[   ] Employed</td>
<td>[   ] Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[   ] Farmer</td>
<td>[   ] Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[   ] Retired</td>
<td>[   ] Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[   ] No work</td>
<td>[   ] No work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others specify _____________________  Others specify _____________________

________________________________________________________________________

PART B :(i) Direct parental cost burden

6. a). What stationary item does the school require you to possess for learning:

   list them below:-

   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________

b). Which of the stationery item (s) do your parents provide you with?

________________________________________________________________________
Are your parents able to afford and how do they pay the direct cost? Explain giving reasons for delayed payments __________________________

(ii). Government contribution

7. (a). Which of the stationery item(s) does the government provide you with?

____________________________________________________________________

(b). What materials or equipments do you lack in the school?

____________________________________________________________________

c). what is being done to avail them?

____________________________________________________________________

d). who are the major providers of the materials or equipments in your school?

Government  □  Parents □  Community □  NGO’s □

Religious organizations □

Others (specify) _______________________________________________________

(iii). Extent to which private partners contribute to education

8. a). Do private partners i.e. NGO’S pay fee for you?

    Yes □  No □

If No who pays your fee (explain) _______________________________
b). Is your performance in academic and co-curricular activities affected by scarcity of funds?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Explanation for the answer above_____________________________________

Suggest what can be done to improve this problem of scarcity of funds.

______________________________________________________________

iv). Policy recommendations suggested to education policy formulators.

Suggest some policy recommendations that can help in financing of secondary education in your school.____________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

PART C:

9. i). Which sex is given preference to secondary education incase of insufficient income

Male ☐ Female ☐

ii). Have you ever received funds from the following?

a). C.D.F Bursary

b). Religious organizations

c). Government funds

Others (specify) _____________________________________________________

iii). Are the funds adequate to provide for your education?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If No. explain your answer; ________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Thank you for your cooperation
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HEADTEACHERS AND TEACHERS

Roles of public and private partners in financing and provision of public secondary education.

Instructions

This questionnaire is designed to gather information about financing of public secondary school in Migwani District. Kindly, respond by ticking the appropriate responses to the questions or information needed. All your responses and information in questionnaire will be confidential and will be used by researcher for the purpose of this study only. For confidentiality purposes, do not write your name.

PART A: General Information

1. a). School category and nature:

   Boys boarding []
   Girls boarding []
   Mixed day []

   Mixed boarding []
   Mixed day and boarding []

   b). Your position in the school, Headteacher [], D/Headteacher []
   H.O.D [], Teacher []

2. a). Number of schools within Migwani District you have served in the same position ________________________________

   b). Duration in the present position in this school ________________________________

   c). How many students are in your school?
Boys__________ Girls_____________

d). In to how many streams are they divided? 1 [   ] 2[   ] 3 [   ] 4 [   ] above 4 [   ]

3. a). Give your age: 20 – 29 [   ] 30 – 39 [   ] 40 – 49 [   ] Above 50 [   ]

b). Your gender: Male [   ] Female [   ]

c). Your highest professional qualification: Diploma [   ] B.E.D [   ] MED [   ]

Others specify______________________________

d). i). Your teaching load/lessons per week__________________________________

ii). Give the average teaching load per week for different subjects:

Language__________________________ Maths__________________________

Sciences__________________________ Humanities____________________

Technical/Applied__________________

PART B

Contributions of public and private sectors in financing secondary education

4. Direct parental cost burden
a). How much fee is paid under the following vote heads (for Headteachers only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTE HEAD</th>
<th>TERM I</th>
<th>TERM II</th>
<th>TERM III</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT And T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b). A part from the amount paid above, how much money is charged under the following (for Headteachers only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote head</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Caution                 | _______
| Uniform                 | _______
| P.T.A                   | _______
| Motivation              | _______
| Examination (mock)      | _______
| Games kit               | _______
| School I.D              | _______
| Lunch                   | _______
| Bed Cover               | _______
| Trip /outings           | _______
c). How does the fee payment pattern affect your school operations?

__________________________________________________________________

d). Are there any fee arrears? Yes  No

if yes, approximate the figure in Kshs. As at 31st Dec 2011.

e). i). What is the financial position of your school? (Tick where appropriate)

very good  good  satisfactory  

bad  very bad

ii). How is the rate of payment of school fees by parents?

Less than 50%  50 – 80%  81 – 90%  100%

f). What are the other sources of finance for your school?

Income generating activities (School house rent, school bus hire)

Harambee/community

Donations-sponsor, NGOs, charitable bodies

Government bursaries (CDF, LTF)

(Tick the appropriate answers)

i). Are the sources sufficient?  Yes  No
5. **Government contribution**

a). i). Does the government contribute in financing of the school?  Yes □  No □

   ii). If yes, explain briefly how it does this____________________________________

   _____________________________________________

   iii). List the amount provided in the following years: 2010 ________________

   2011__________________ 2012__________________

   iv). Is the government financing adequate to run the school?_____________________

b). Fill appropriately in the table below on physical facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes /No</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets/latrines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School van</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c). Incase of lacking facilities what other alternatives do you use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Alternative used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinning hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d). In your opinion, how are the alternatives in terms of costs.____________________

________________________________________________________

e). How many teachers are in your school? Female [   ] male [   ]

i). Indicate the number of teachers under T.S.C [   ] B.O.G [   ]

ii). Give reasons for employing B.O.G teachers ______________________________

___________________________________________________________________
6. **Community contributions**

a). In your school who constitute the community?

________________________________________________________________________

b). Does the community contribute to the financing of the school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tick one)

c). Is the community financing adequate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tick one)

7. a). Do you get any financial support from your sponsors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b). Do you receive any grants from any NGOs?

Please specify________________________________________________________

8. Suggest some policy recommendations that can help in financing of secondary education in your school

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________
PART C

9. Are the funds received from CDF Bursary, Religious organizations, Government funds, Community and Parents funds, NGOs adequate?

____________________________________________________________________

a). Does your school engage in any income generating activity?

b). Name the income generating projects which exist in your school.

   i).

   ii).

   iii).

   iv).

   v).

c). What is the average annual income generated by income generating projects above.

   i).

   ii).

   iii).

   iv).

Thank you for your cooperation
APPENDIX III: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICER (D.E.O.)

Roles of public-private partners in financing and provision of public secondary education.

Instructions This questionnaire is for collecting data for research concerning financing of public secondary schools in Migwani District. You are kindly requested to give information by filling this questionnaire. It is hoped that the information you give will be useful in this education research. You are assured that all the information you give will be strictly in confidence and will only be used for the purpose of the research.

Please respond to all questions by filling in the space provided or use a tick in the indicated box as is appropriate. For confidentiality purpose, do not write your name.

1. a). Duration spent in this position______________________________

b). Indicate your gender Male [ ] Female [ ]

c). Give your age: 20 – 29 [ ] 30 – 39 [ ] 40 – 49 [ ] Above 50 [ ]

d). Your highest professional qualification.

   Diploma [ ]

   Degree [ ]

   Masters [ ]

   Others specify __________________________________________________________

2. How many students have been enrolled in the public secondary schools in your District
In the following years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. List the methods the schools in your District use to raise finances?________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________

4. a). How does the government finance public secondary schools in Migwani District?
   ______________________________________________________________________

b). What is the government's policy as far as cost-sharing is concerned?
   ______________________________________________________________________

5. a). How does the community in your District respond to Harambee (self-drive) contribution for financing public secondary schools?________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________

b). What specific facilities does the community provide and finance in public secondary schools?________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
6. a). In your view, is the cost-sharing strategy among the government, parents, community, NGOs, religious organizations of financing the secondary education adequate?

____________________________________________________________________

Explanation.__________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

b). Please suggest ways of improving financing in public secondary schools in Migwani District._____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your cooperation
APPENDIX IV: OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

This instrument is a checklist aimed at rating school resources in terms of adequacy (A) and quality (Q). A five – point rating scale will be employed. The highest score will be 5 while the lowest score will be 1 in relation to school facilities adequacy and quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School facilities</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. H/Teachers office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. H/Teachers office furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Staff room furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Classroom furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chalkboard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Wall maps/wall charts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reference texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Music equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Pupils note books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pens &amp; pencils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. School uniforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Lighting systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Piped water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Income generating activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY

This key attempts to describe the implication of the scores as given in the observation checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>V.Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Poor or Not Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE

1. The teacher – pupil ratio will be observed in terms of:-
   
   a). Pupil number per teacher
   
   b). Classroom space in relation to number of pupils
   
   c). Sitting arrangement

2. Any other unique aspect will be observed.
# APPENDIX V: RESEARCH BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport to library</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of proposal</td>
<td>18000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of instruments</td>
<td>20000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project preparations</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopy</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 46000
### APENDIX IV: WORK PLAN (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Problem identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Concept paper writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Proposal draft writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Proposal refinement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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