

# Funding Public Day Secondary School Education: Implications on Quality Learning in Kisii County, Kenya

Kennedy Nyambeche Getange

Faculty of Education, Kisii University, P.O. BOX 408-40200, KISII

**Abstract:-** In Kenya, the envisaged goal of education is the attainment of quality, equity and relevance. The attainment of this depends on the availability of adequate and reliable sources of funding. However, the major challenge is to ensure that education provided meets high standards against steady increase in enrolment rates. This study examined the funding of public secondary schools and its implication on quality of learning in Kisii County, Kenya. The study adopted descriptive research design; the target population was 102 public secondary schools. Purposive sampling was used to select 36 principals, 36 bursars, 36 boards of management (BOM) members and 4 quality assurance officers. Data was collected using questionnaires and interview schedule. Validity was established by experts' opinion and reliability was determined by test-retest technique. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics. The study established that funding in secondary schools was not adequate and reliable to enhance quality learning. The study recommended that to enhance quality learning in secondary schools, several sources should be harnessed and the existing ones be enhanced.

**Keywords:-** Funding, Secondary Education, Quality and Learning.

## ❖ Research Objective

To find out the methods used in funding day secondary school education and the implications on quality of learning.

## ❖ Research Questions

- This study was guided by the research questions;
- What are the methods used in financing day secondary school education?
  - How adequate and reliable are the funding methods?
  - What are the implications of the methods used in financing day secondary school education on the quality of learning?

## I. INTRODUCTION

In developed countries the major source of financing Public Institutions is through income from government taxes. For example in Britain, education is a Public and Private Investment where the central government gives grants to local authorities to finance education through vouchers (Atkinson, 1987). In Africa public schools are funded

through partnership between the government and the beneficiaries of education (UNESCO, 1997).

A study by the World Bank (1989) established that in Malaysia in some areas, communities financing arise from demand for alternative forms of education. The Chinese communities have formed schools that teach basic curriculum required by the National Government but also provide a firm grounding in Chinese language, history and culture. In Indonesia schools with religious bias are run and financed by Islamic communities and by mid 1980s they formed 21% of the lower and upper secondary schools levels (World Bank, 1989).

Bray (1996) argues that in South East Asia, existing payment for schooling are the most obvious indicators that many parents are willing to pay for schooling. This willingness is particularly evident in countries where governments do not make satisfactory quantitative provision. He further established that in addition to demonstrated demand, in some countries, some households are willing to spend even more for secondary education. In Peru for example the views of parents whose children live close to secondary schools have been compared with views of parents whose children have to travel two or more hours each day to attend school and found out that households in the second group were willing to pay fees that would more than cover the costs of opening new schools in their village.

Bray (1996) citing further examples of community financing of education, in South East Asia, parents or other family members within the Public education system pay official fees demanded by secondary schools besides paying for uniforms, transport and other items. In addition to the already mentioned fees, parents in many third world countries pay levies to Parents Teachers Association (PTA) and in rural areas households contribute labour and materials in lieu of cash. In addition to direct costs, families must bear opportunity costs, which is the time their children devote to school.

Oluyele and Kunene(2001), in a case study of Swaziland on education financing and budgetary reforms in Africa, observed that despite the government provision of almost all expenditure, other sources are utilized to finance education. These included:

- Local communities in the form of school construction and land donations.
- Foreign aid mainly in the form of scholarships and capital investment.
- Families and individuals in the form of grants, donations, fees and PTA contributions.
- Enterprises, corporations and estates.
- Non-governmental organizations and missionary institutions.

According to the report on the state of education in Africa (UNESCO, 1997) in a majority of African countries, secondary education is organized in partnership with voluntary agencies, religious groups, NGO's and communities or individuals. The degree of partnership varies from one country to another. For example in Seychelles over 60% of schools are privately owned while in Nigeria 90% of schools are state owned. Even in countries where in principle all schools are state owned, all schools cost are borne by the state. The local communities and local NGO's through community boards, PTAs and other voluntary associations make direct or indirect contribution to the cost of education. The report went further to indicate that in Africa and partly sub-Saharan Africa, the economic difficulties have resulted in the inability of a majority of the countries to finance education.

Munyae (2002) seemed to agree with the UNESCO report and attributed Africa's economic woes to the implementation of the structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs), which had a major impact on the provision of basic social services like education, health and nutrition among others. Since 1990s many African governments have had pressure from the World Bank/ International Monetary Fund (IMF) and their supporters to cut spending as part of reforms towards economic revival. These institutions have pushed for cuts in government expenditure (or subsidies) on social welfare programmes such as education, housing, health and food coupled with reductions in the public sector. For the educational sector, this is happening at a time when more resources are needed to make it effective.

Bray (1996) cites examples from African countries where communities were involved in financing education and explained that this occurred where demand for schooling is strong but government inputs are inadequate. He cited the following examples; first, in Uganda the government provision of education for all collapsed during the 1970s and remained deficient during the 1980s and 1990s. The gap was partly bridged by parents and broader communities who at the primary level met 65 – 90% of the total cost while at secondary level household inputs were estimated at 70%. Second, Togo also experienced a major crisis in governmental funding hence parents and communities have had to provide one-to-two thirds of the resources needed to operate Public Sector schools while in Malawi, community

ran schools unassisted by government made up to 20.5% of all primary schools.

A study carried out by Ogeta (2004) in South Nyanza on the contribution of parents to the cost of upper primary and its implications for free primary education in Kenya established that parents had low financial abilities in meeting the costs of upper primary education because of their low income. However he observed that despite the low income and inability to meet the cost of upper primary their contributions were necessary due to inability of the government to meet the primary schools financial needs. He recommended for soliciting of funds from community members, foundation bodies, and through cost sharing activities

Ogachi (2002) carried out a case study in Kajiado and South Kisii Districts on community financing of primary schooling in Kenya and its implications on quality. The study established that community financing of primary schooling led to the deterioration in quality of both the physical facilities and learning process. He further observed that the socio-economic backgrounds of committees affected household demands and ability to pay the required schooling level. He recommended that the government should institute various affirmative strategies to ensure quality primary schooling. Though this study was for primary schools level, the findings benefited the present study, as communities are involved in financing secondary education.

In Kenya, the history of cost sharing between the government and the public dates back to early colonial period. Since 1963, the role of the community in initiating and financing development has greatly expanded. In the past the government used to shoulder the equipping schools with materials for learning and buildings. Individuals and communities also are aware that higher education enhances prospects for wage employment in the modern sector and therefore a great demand at all levels hence they contribute to meet the cost of education.

Republic of Kenya (1999) pointed that the Government under the structural Adjustment Programme, implemented the cost sharing policy in the provision of Social services including Education. The policy, though meant to revitalize planning and management of education created the following problems:

- All controls on amounts of fees to be charged were removed and currently head teachers charge any amounts of fees.
- The significant expansion of education at all levels has been complemented by increase in teaching force, and high salary bill. The government's role has consequently become increasingly limited to provision of teachers salaries.

- Parents have been left to meet the rest of the recurrent costs, which include maintenance, physical facilities development, vehicles, electricity, water and other services as well as employments for all support staff.
- Lowered enrollment rates and increased dropout rates.
- The policy has increased inequalities, as regions with nothing to share have been unable to contribute to educational development.

Odongo (1996) in a study on the effects of cost sharing at Olare and Ligisa secondary schools in Homabay District established that cost sharing had affected the performance of students in KCSE examinations due to consistent lack of facilities and equipment. He further argued that parents met the bulk of the costs of developing the school besides payment of the costly school fees. The quality of facilities put up by parents does not facilitate learning as they are poor. Students spend much time at home after being sent away from school.

Abagi and Wasunna(2000) in a study on cost sharing in education and health in Kenya acknowledged that the education sub sector is at crossroads due to low enrollment, poor retention and low transition rates and poor quality education. The study established that cost sharing in education lacks policy guidelines from the Ministry of Education on implementation, which has led to wide divergence in costs applied by schools across and within the region. The study declared the figures from the ministry as unrealistic, arbitrary and unresponsive to needs and conditions of individual schools. This view is supported by the Chairman of the Kenya Secondary Schools Head teachers Association who dismissed the fees guidelines set by the government as unworkable, outdated having been formulated in 1998.

To provide quality education, there is need to allocate more resources to public schools. Due to the limitation of the amount of fees collected, and economic hardships of parents, schools are compelled to initiate institutional strategies to secure additional funds for education. Gravenir (1991), while assessing the trends of public financing of education in Kenya, suggested that a combination of alternative methods of financing education including cost sharing and the generation of extra funds by institutions of learning seemed unavoidable, particularly in secondary schools. He did not identify the activities that could generate funds and what the contribution of such sources could be. The emphasis of Gravenir(1991) is crucial in pointing out the need for institutions to seek more funds.

A study done by Olembo (1986) investigated the methods by which schools are financed. The study revealed that a larger amount of money needed to run a school come from the Ministry of Education, at central and or local level, and is raised through taxation. The study regretted that there

was not always enough funds for school requirement. It also found that head teachers of schools were involved in fundraisings to supplement money from government sources. Sifuna (1990) and Bogonko (1992) made similar observations. The generation of supplemental funds is of interest to this study.

Kiogora (1990) studied the initiatives that primary schools engaged in to generate income in South Mmenti. The study revealed that primary schools that utilized their farms well generated an average of Ksh 29,742 annually. The activities undertaken included growing of coffee, napier grass, tobacco, tea and rearing of livestock. The study further revealed that head teachers were willing to undertake diversified income generating projects.

Wesonga (1996) studied supplementary sources of funds for secondary education in Kakamega District. The purpose was to identify school based economic activities, and to find out the uses of the money accruing from the sources. The study revealed that many schools had made an effort and were generating funds from school based economic activities to supplement existing sources.

Free secondary education was launched in 2008 to increase transition rate from primary to secondary schools. The government made a commitment through Sessional paper NO. 1 of 2005 to increase transition to 70%.

Kippra(2007) points out that to provide FSE the government should have to increase the program's administrative costs which will be covered under operations and maintenance. Schools could benefit from this allocation to meet the general purpose expenses while the office of the DEO and DQASO could use some funds to monitor implementation of FSE in schools.

In Kenya, the CDF act allows the use of CDF funds to improve schools infrastructure. However, availability of these funds is largely influenced by political considerations. Specifically 3% of the government's revenue is earmarked for CDF and the act allows upto 50% of these funds to be spent for education(Government of Kenya, 2001)Free secondary education was launched in 2008 to increase transition rate from primary to secondary schools. The government made a commitment through Sessional paper NO. 1 of 2005 to increase transition to 70%.

According to a circular by Ministry of Education (2008) on guidelines for the implementation of FSE, every child is entitled to free day secondary education from the government at a cost of Ksh.10, 265 per year.)

In Latin America, a study that included 50,000 students in grade 3 and 4, found out that the children whose classrooms lacked classroom materials and had inadequate library were significantly more likely to show low test scores

and higher grade repetition than those whose schools were well equipped(Willms D. 2000). Other studies carried out in Botswana, Nigeria and Papua Guinea concurs with these findings (Pennycluick, 1993).

Lillis (1988) seemed to agree with Nevo on the quality of student intakes and in reference to Kenya established that Harambee schools which are mainly day schools, admit students who have failed to get places in government schools. Apart from the factors of quality, he concluded that when community support supplements the existing government system, it may be assumed to improve quality. Communities which construct good teachers houses and which are able to make staff feel valued and productive by giving them a higher level of support are more likely to be able to attract and retain well qualified staff than other communities. In rural Kisii, teachers commute from long distances to schools, and this is likely to affect the quality of teaching.

**II. METHODOLOGY**

A descriptive survey design was adopted in this study. This design was used because it is more accurate to collect data from a wider area. It is useful because it can study a large population and would discover relative incidences, distribution and interrelations of sociological and psychological variables (Kerlinger 1964). The target population was all the 102 public day secondary schools in the district. The sample of the study comprised of 36 day secondary schools chosen through stratified random sampling. Purposive sampling was used to select 36 principals, 36 Bursars, 36 Board of Governors (BOG), 36 Parents Teachers Association (PTA) chair persons and 4 district quality assurance officers (DQAS). Data was collected through questionnaires for principals and bursars and interview schedule for PTA, BOG chairpersons and DQASOs. The validity of the instruments was established through scrutiny by expertS. Test-retest method was used to establish reliability of the instruments. The qualitative data from interview schedule was analyzed thematically and reported in narrative and direct quotes.

**III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Source of income	Responses	
	Frequency	Percentage
Government	36	33.3
PTA/Parents	35	32.4
Donors	3	2.8
School income generating activities	2	1.9
Sponsor	1	.9
CDF	28	25.9
LATF	3	2.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 1:- Frequency of response on sources of income to schools

Data from Table 3.1 revealed that 33.3% of funding came from the government, 32.4% from PTA/Parents, 2.8% from donors, 1.9% from school income generating activities, 25.9% from CDF, 2.8% from LATF and sponsor gave 0.9%. The data contained in Table 4.6 indicates that a majority of the respondents cited the sources of income for the PDSS as Government, PTA/Parents and CDF consisting 33.3%, 32.4% and 25.9%, respectively.

➤ *The Reliability and Adequacy of the Income Sources*

The researcher under the same objective sought to ascertain whether the various income sources were reliable and adequate to sustain the quality of learning in PDSS.

To determine the reliability and adequacy of income sources, a four point Likert scale was developed for this purpose. Table 4.11 presents information on the reliability of income sources. In the Likert scale, 1 represents ‘extremely reliable’, 2 represents ‘very reliable’, 3 represents ‘reliable’, and 4 represents ‘not reliable’.

Source of income	Extremely reliable.		Very reliable		Reliable		Unreliable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Parents	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	41.2	21	58.8
Donors	0	0.0	3	8.0	4	12.0	29	80.0
IGAS	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	10.0	32	90.0
Sponsors	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	25.0	27	75.0
CDF	0	0.0	2	5.9	13	35.3	21	58.8
PTA	0	0.0	1	2.9	17	48.6	17	48.6

Table 2:- Reliability of income sources to PDSS in Percentage

From Table 3.2 shows that 58.8% of the respondents indicated that income from parents were unreliable while 41.2% indicated that income from parents was reliable. The researcher found that parents were to pay levies like lunch, development fee and even extra fees. The head teachers indicated from the interview schedule that parents were to pay in cash or any kind in day secondary schools. 41.2% of the respondents reported that school funds from parents were reliable, while 58.8% said that funds from parents were unreliable. 80% of the respondents agreed that funds from donors were very reliable, 12.0% said that they were reliable while 80.0% said that they were unreliable. 10.0% of the respondents reported that funds from school income generating activities / sources were reliable, while 90.0% said that they were unreliable. 25.0% of the respondents reported that school funds from sponsor were reliable while 75.0% reported that they were unreliable. 5.9% of respondents reported that funds from CDF were very reliable, 35.3% said that they were reliable while 58.8% responded that they were unreliable. 2.9% of the respondents reported that funds from PTA were very reliable, 48.6% said that funds were reliable while 48.6% reported that funds from PTA were unreliable. From the interview schedule, and the PTA chairpersons reported that 11.4% of respondents agreed that they were adequate while 88.6% disagreed.

Overall Reliability of sources	Responses	
	Frequency	Percentage
Extremely reliable	1	.5
Very reliable	13	6.4
Reliable	74	36.3
Unreliable	116	56.8
<b>Total</b>	204	100.0

Table 3:- Overall Reliability of income sources

On the question of reliability of sources, 0.5% of the respondents reported that the overall reliability of income sources were extremely reliable, 6.4% reported that they were very reliable, 36.3% were reliable while 56.8% were unreliable.

On the adequacy of FSE, 8.8% of the headteachers agreed that FSE is adequate while 91.2% disagreed from the interview schedule administered to them. On the reasons of the inadequacy of FSE, 2.9% of respondents cited that the government does not provide for inflation hence incomplete projects, while 97.1% pointed out that high prices of goods is the reason for inadequacy of FSE. Table 3.4 shows the responses on the adequacy of income sources.

Source of income	Very adequate		Adequate		Fairly adequate		Not adequate	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
<b>Gok</b>	1	2.8	7	19.4	20	55.6	8	22.2
<b>Parents</b>	0	0.0	3	8.4	16	44.4	17	47.2
<b>Donors</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	38.9	22	61.1
<b>Harambees</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	21.4	28	78.6
<b>PTA</b>	0	0.0	2	6.5	14	38.7	20	54.8
<b>IGAS</b>	0	0.0	1	3.5	9	24.1	26	72.4
<b>CDF</b>	0	0.0	1	3.8	17	46.2	18	50.0

Table 4:- Adequacy of income sources

Data on Table 3.4 shows that 2.8% of respondents reported that government sources of income to schools were very adequate, 19.4% said the source was adequate, 55.6% reported that the source was fairly adequate while 22.2% of respondents said that the government source was not adequate. 8.4% of respondents reported that parents sources of income were adequate, 44.4% said that the source was fairly adequate and 47.2% of respondents said that parents source of income was not adequate. 21.4% of respondents reported that Harambee source of income to schools is fairly adequate while 78.6% of them said that the source is not adequate. 6.5% of respondents said that PTA source of income to schools is adequate, 38.7% reported that the source is fairly adequate while 54.8% of respondents reported that the source is not adequate. 3.5% of the respondents said that IGAS source for income was adequate, 24.1% said IGAS sources were fairly adequate while 72.4% said IGAS sources

were not adequate. 3.8% of respondents reported that CDF source of income was adequate, 46.2% said CDF source of income was fairly adequate while 50% of respondents said CDF source of income was not adequate. 0.5% of respondents agreed that school income sources were very adequate, 6.6% said that the sources were adequate, 36.6% said that the sources were fairly adequate while 56.3% reported that the sources of income were not adequate.

Financing of education underlies the themes of the current education policy of quality access and efficiency. However, the spending on education is notably low at 16% (233.1billion) of the spending in the years 2012-2013. The ambitious plan of free primary education (FPE) increased the number of the pupils completing primary education and failure to expand secondary education will compromise

quality and consequently jeopardize economic recovery and development.

In the present study, the government and parents are the main sources of revenue to public day secondary schools, while donors, IGAS, Sponsors, CDF/LATF indicate insignificant and highly fluctuating revenue. Data from the present study gave an accurate contribution of each source of revenue. In the present study, the revenue from the income sources is inadequate and unreliable to meet the corresponding financial needs at secondary school level. The income trend indicated quantitative increase of the government revenue from 2008 and declining trend by parents. Prior to 2008, parent's contribution was higher than the other sources of income.

The findings concur with KIPPRA (2006) that the costs of provision and expansion of quality secondary education have been escalating while resources for secondary education have been dwindling. The report projected the enrollment in secondary education to rise from 0.92 million in 2004 to 2 million and 2.7 million students by 2010 and 2015 respectively. The report further concurs with the present study that the main sources of secondary school funding are households and the government while the other sources of funds include private sector, religious organizations, NGOs and development partners. Public sources mainly fund teachers' personal emoluments and bursary to students, while household meet cost for provision of supplies and equipment, operations, maintenance, repair and physical infrastructure. Whereas earlier studies indicate projections of enrolment and costs the present study is a representative accurate sample of educators (principals) reporting on their individual schools. All the principals reported that the income sources were inadequate and unreliable.

Resources for schools can be raised in a variety of ways but the major sources of funding should be based on sources that generate stable and growing revenue to schools. Sources that generate small and highly fluctuating revenues are not desirable for supporting the major operational expenses of schools. With the increasing demand for secondary school as a result of FPE programme, it is becoming increasingly important to improve programs of income sources that reduce the financial barriers to secondary schooling.

Mbelle (2008) reporting on a research on educational quality postulates that increasing access to education is only one aspect of addressing human resources capacity. It is importance to ensure high quality cognitive achievement, skills, values are attained. Quality aspects in education cover such issues as adequacy of having and teaching resources, which is a function of finances.

In this study, the contribution of parents towards meeting the costs of public day secondary schools were fairly adequate shown by 44.4% and not adequate by 47.2% hence

cannot be sufficient to run the costs of having at this level. The finding agreed with that of Ogeta (2004) who found out that in South Nyanza, Kenya parents contributions towards meeting the costs of upper primary education were below what each of them expected to pay, the study attributed this to low average annual income per parent from their occupations. Similarly, in this study poor home background has contributed as a cause of parents' inability to pay for learning.

It was also found in this study that Donors as a source of funding PDSS was 100% inadequate. Most schools did not seek donor support due to level of information by principals on donors who can support the education programme.

In this study, "Harambee" as a source of funding was found to be inadequate. This concurred with a study findings of Ogachi(2002) on community financing of primary schooling in Kenya and its implications on quality in Kajiado and south Kisii Districts. The study established that community financing led to deterioration in quality of both physical facilities and learning. This was attributed to poor social economic background. The harambee though is being initiated by the schools, not one schools has used it to raise money for education. The current government policy of providing funds to schools has discouraged this model of financing education.

In this study, the IGAS as a source of income was also found to be inadequate. This finding agrees with the findings of HomingNg'(2000) who in his study pointed out that: the ability of schools to create income positively correlates to the schools status. It was established that high status schools engaged in agricultural based IGAS. The study further pointed out that high status schools normally make profits because they are supported by alumni, influential parents and large enterprises. In this study it was established that most PDSS in Kisii Central have a the land size of between 1-2 acres which is not enough to engage in large scale agricultural production. The social economic status of the parents and community is low hence the contribution to schools income is low. The study established that schools initiative supplement finances of secondary education.

These findings also concurred with that of Getange (2005) who found out that in Kisii Central District secondary schools cultivated beans, coffee, Napier grass besides dairy farming and poultry keeping. It is evident from this study that none of the schools have modern facilities like swimming pools, halls and school buses for hire; hence the income from IGAS is insufficient and fluctuating.

The study also found PTA as a source of income to be inadequate. This was attributed to poverty of the households. The overall adequacy and reliability of the income sources was found from this study to be inadequate.

In this study, the trend of income-sources over the years shows a gradual increase of the government contribution and decrease of the parent's contributions. The introduction of FSE in 2008 saw withdrawal of parents' support with the excuse that education is free. However, this is not the reality on financial demands. The income from other sources is minimal and shows a fluctuating trend.

The income and expenditure trends show a deficit over the years. However, there is significant difference between income and expenditure. KIPPRA (2003) coheres with the study that the patterns and trends of education financing in Kenya is based on partnership between the state, household and communities. The FDSE is a new dimension on the depth and volume of government, community and household expenditure on education services.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

- The main sources of income to PDSS are the government and the parents; the other possible income sources were irregular, fluctuating and had minimal contributions.
- The income sources to PDSS are unreliable and inadequate to meet the learning needs.
- The FSE introduced by the government is inadequate to finance education due to inflation and escalating prices of commodities and has remained constant since it was introduced.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

The financial sources in public day secondary schools are unable to meet the required facilities for enhancing quality education. The government needs to increase the amount disbursed to schools due to inflation and the high cost of living. The government contribution should be disbursed in time preferably before the start of the term to avoid delayance which led to financial strains which hinder quality achievement in PDSS. Also provide enough funds for quality assurance officers.

#### REFERENCES

[1]. Abagi, O. & Wasunna, O. (2000). *Cost sharing in Education and Health in Kenya*. Institute of Policy Analysis and Research, Nairobi

[2]. Atkinson, G, B, J. (1987). *The Economics of Education*: Hodder Stoughton, London.

[3]. Bogonko, S, N. (1992). *Reflections on Education in East Africa*.: Oxford University

[4]. Bray, M. (1996). *Decentralization of Education*. World Bank, Washington.

[5]. Getange, K (2005). *Institutional Initiatives in Supplementing the Financing of Secondary Education in Kisii District*. Unpublished M.ED Thesis, Maseno University, Kisumu, Kenya

[6]. Ho Ming Ng (2000). Creation of Income by school in China: a survey of selected Schools in Gvangzhou. *Educational Management Administration and leadership*, vol.29(4)

[7]. *Implications of Quality: case studies from Kajiado and South Gusii* Unpublished Ph.D thesis Kenyatta University, Nairobi

[8]. Keppra. (2006). *Improving Public Policy Making for Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction*. Nairobi: Kenya.

[9]. Kiogora, R, K. (1990). *Primary School Based Initiatives for Supplementing Educational*

[10]. Kippira. (2007). Draft Report on "Financing Sources for Achieving MDGs in Kenya: Domestic Resources, Dept and ODA". KIPPRA, Nairobi.

[11]. Lillis, K. (1988). *Issues of Quality; in: Financing of Education*, Bray M. and Lillis K (Eds ) Pergamon Press: Oxford.

[12]. Lovell, K. & Lawson, K, S. (1970). *Understanding Research in Education*, Britain: University of London Press.

[13]. Mbelle, A. (2008). The Impact of Reforms on the Quality of Primary Education in Tanzania, Research Report, Daer-esalaam.

[14]. Ministry of Education. (2008). Guidelines for the implementation of Free Secondary Education, Nairobi

[15]. Munyae, M, M. (2002). *A seminar Paper Presented During the 10<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of CODESRIA*, Kampala, Uganda.

[16]. Odongo, J. (1996). *Investigation into the Effects of Cost sharing at Olale and Ligisa Office*". Country Department, Washington DC

[17]. Ogachi, I, O (2002). *Community Financing of Primary Schooling in Kenya and its* Olembo, J, O. (1986). *Financing Primary School Buildings in Kenya*, London.

[18]. Oluyele, A, K. & Kunene, V. (2001). *Education Financing and Budgetary Reforms in Africa, the Swaziland Case Study*, Paris.

[19]. Omukoba, H., Simatwa, E, M., & Ayodo, T, M, O. (2011) *contribution of income generating activities to financing secondary school education in Kenya: A case study of Eldoret Municipality*. Retrieved from <http://www.interestjournals.org/er>

[20]. Pennycluck, D. (1993). *School Effectiveness in Developing Countries: A Summary of the Research Evidence*. Serial No.1. London: Department for International Development Education District. *Performances in Kisii and Nyamira Districts*.

[21]. Riechi, A. (2003) *Revenue Diversification in Kenya's Public Universities and Implications for Efficiency and Equity: An Analysis of Education Finance in the African Context*. Unpublished Ph.D thesis, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

[22]. Sifuna, D, N. (1990). *Development of Education in Africa: The Kenyan Experience*: Initiative publishers, Nairobi.

- [23]. UNESCO. (1997). *Report on State of Education in Africa challenges and Changes*, Paris: UNESCO. Paris, (2000). *With Africa For Africa, Towards Quality Education for All*, Paris, UNESCO, Paris, (2002). *With Africa, for Africa, Towards Quality Education for All*, Paris: UNESCO. Paris, (2010). *National Education Support strategy for the Republic of Kenya 2010-2011*, Nairobi Publishing Services section.
- [24]. Wesonga M,D. (1996). *Supplementary Sources of Funds for Secondary Education in Kenya: A Survey of Kakamega District*, unpublished M. ed. ThesisKenyattaUniversity, Nairobi.
- [25]. Willms,J,D.(2000). *Standards of care: investments to Improve Childrens Educational Outcomes in Latin America*. A paper presented at the “Year 2000 conference of early childhood Development” Sponsored by the World Bank, Washington D.C, April 2001.