

**THE IMPACT OF THE POLICY OF COST SHARING:
A CASE STUDY OF SELECTED KENYAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS**

by

WAMBUGU JEDIDAH WANJIRU

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

in the subject

EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: DR SP MOKOENA

MARCH 2012

(i)

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the impact of the policy of cost sharing: a case study of selected Kenyan secondary schools represents my own work and has not been presented in any other university for the award of any Degree. All the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.



26th February, 2012

(JW Wambugu)

Date

(ii)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to first and foremost thank my supervisor Dr. SP Mokoena, for his continuous support and guidance during the development and completion of this research project report. My appreciation goes to the school principals, teachers, parents and students who willingly agreed to participate in this research study. I wish to appreciate the invaluable support, encouragement and prayers from the following people; Medad Githaiga, Norah Wambua, Mary Parsaloi, my beloved daughter Julianne Wacuka as well as my brothers and sisters for believing in me.

To God be the glory and honor.

(iii)

SUMMARY

Convinced of the role of education in promoting and accelerating economic and social development, the Government of Kenya devoted the early years of independence to the expansion of the education sector. The Government, however, could not shoulder the whole burden of financing education for long and, therefore, introduced the cost sharing policy in 1988. Demand for education has considerably increased in Kenya, yet, the sources of education finances are experiencing constraints even with the cost sharing strategy. With increased poverty levels, many parents are not able to meet the cost requirements under the cost sharing policy. This study, therefore, intended to investigate the impact of the cost sharing policy in secondary education in Kenya. In particular, the study sought to find out the views of teachers, parents and students on the cost sharing policy, the costs of secondary education, the main participants of the cost sharing policy and the proportion of dropouts and absenteeism attributed to the costs of education. This study established that there was an escalation of school fees at secondary school level as a result of the introduction of cost sharing policy in Kenya as well as in the other countries cited in this study. Most parents viewed cost sharing as a burden because not all of them were able to educate their children beyond the primary school level. The study recommends that the Government should introduce better methods of financing secondary education that would enable poor but bright students to join secondary schools of their choice, establish policies of identifying needy students among others.

Key Concepts:

Cost sharing
Education financing
Cost effectiveness
Financing options
Needy students
Secondary education
Students
Policy makers
School fees

Educators

(iv)

ACRONYMS

CDF	Constituency Development Fund
EFA	Education for All
FPE	Free Primary Education
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GER	Gross Enrolment Ratio
GLSS	Ghana Living Standards Survey
GNP	Gross National Product
GOK	Government of Kenya
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPAR	Institute of Policy Analysis & Research
JSS	Junior Secondary School
KCPE	Kenya Certificate of Primary Education
KCSE	Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOE & C	Ministry of Education and Culture
MOEST	Ministry of Education, Science & Technology
NARC	National Rainbow Coalition
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD	Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development
PTA	Parents/Teachers Association
SAPs	Structural Adjustment Programs
SMC	School Management Committee
TIVET	Technical and Industrial Education and Training
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE NUMBER
DECLARATION	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
SUMMARY	iii
ACRONYMS	iv
 CHAPTER 1 – BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM	
1.1 Background to the study	1
1.2 Statement of the problem	4
1.3 Research questions	4
1.4 Aims and objectives of the study	5
1.5 Significance of the study	6
1.6 Theoretical framework	7
1.7 Research methods	8
1.7.1 Research design	9
1.7.2 Sampling	9
1.7.3 Data collection	9
1.7.4 Data analysis	10
1.8 Limitations and delimitations of the study	10
1.9 Organization of the study	11
1.10 Definition of terms	12

1.11	Conclusion	14
------	------------	----

(vi)

CHAPTER 2 - LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Introduction	15
2.2	Definition of cost sharing	16
2.3	Cost sharing policy in Kenya	16
2.4	The influence of cost sharing policy on access and enrolment in secondary education in Kenya	21
2.5	Cost sharing policy from other countries	24
2.5.1	Ghana	24
2.5.2	Jamaica	25
2.5.3	Eritrea	27
2.6	Commonalities pertaining to cost sharing policy in these countries	29
2.7	Implications of these commonalities in these countries	30
2.8	Efficient options for funding secondary education	31
2.9	Conclusion	36

CHAPTER 3 – RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	37
3.2	Research design	37
3.3.	Qualitative approach	38
3.4	Data collection	39
3.4.1	Pilot testing	39
3.4.2	Interviews	39
3. 4.2.1	Individual interviews	40
3.4.2.2	Focus group interviews	40
3.5	Data management and analysis	41
3.6	Ethics in qualitative research	42
3.6.1	Informed consent	42
3.6.2	Deception of respondents	43
3.6.3	Violation of privacy	43
3.6.4	Actions and competence of researchers	44
3.7	Methodological principles	45
3.7.1	Validity	45
3.7.2	Reliability	45
3.7.3	Generalizability	46
3.8	Conclusion	47

CHAPTER 4 - ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS

4.1	Introduction	48
4.2	Respondents rate	49
4.3	The profile of the respondents	48
4.3.1	How long teachers had taught in the same school	49
4.3.2	Parents –How many other children they had in school	49
4.3.3	Student respondents	49
4.4	The meaning of the cost sharing policy	50
4.4.1	The Principals	50
4.4.2	Parents	51
4.4.3	Teachers	52
4.4.4	Students view of cost sharing policy	52
4.5	Effects of the cost sharing policy	53
4.5.1	Principals/Teachers	53
4.5.2	Parents	54
4.5.3	Students	55
4.5.3.1	Year of joining the school	55
4.5.3.2	Why the student left their former school	55
4.5.3.3	Whether the respondents had ever been sent home due to lack of school fees	56
4.5.3.4	How funds were raised for students to go back to school	57
4.5.3.5	How students made for lost time	57

4.5.3.6 Identification of needy students	58
--	----

(ix)

4.5.3.7 Whether the parents benefited from any bursary fund	59
4.6 The impact of the cost sharing policy on enrolment of students	59
4.7 Effect on completion	60
4.7.1 Principals/Teachers	60
4.7.2 Parents	60
4.8 Reflection	61
4.9 Participants of the cost sharing policy	62
4.9.1 Principals/Teachers	62
4.9.2 Findings from students	62
4.10 What the government, community and parents can do to ensure that all students have access to secondary education	63
4.10.1 Principals/Teachers	63
4.10.2 Parents	64
4.11 Conclusion	66

CHAPTER 5 –SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1	Introduction	67
5.2	Summaries	67
5.2.1	Chapter one	67
5.2.2	Chapter two	68
5.2.3	Chapter three	70
5.2.4	Chapter four	70
5.3	Conclusions	71
5.4	Limitations	72
5.5	Recommendations	72
5.6	Suggestions for further studies	73
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	74

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Letter seeking permission to conduct research in Limuru District	78
Appendix 2 - Introduction letter to school principals	79
Appendix 3 - Participants' information sheet	80
Appendix 4 - Consent Form	81
Appendix 5 - Individual Interview schedule for principal	82
Appendix 6 - Focus group interviews for teachers	83
Appendix 7 - Focus group interview for parents	84
Appendix 8 - Questionnaire for students	85
Appendix 9 - Proposed fee structure for a national school	86

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Proposed fee structure for boarding and day school	3
Table 2.1	Role of education stakeholders in Kenya	18
Table 2.2	Public and household financing ratios- 2003/4	19
Table 2.3	Financing option for education	33
Table 4.1	Class of students	50
Table 4.2	Students view of cost sharing policy	52
Table 4.3	Year of joining school	55
Table 4.4	Number of students sent and those not sent home for school fees	56
Table 4.5	Period students stayed at home	56
Table 4.6	How students made for the lost time	57
Table 4.7	Findings from the students	62

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

In Kenya, one of the documents that were instrumental in the launching of cost sharing in education was the Report of the Presidential working party on Education and Manpower Training for the next decade and beyond, otherwise known as the Kamunge Report (Government of Kenya, 1988) as noted by Elimu Yetu Coalition (2002:23). The government accepted the recommendations of the working party in the *Sessional Paper no 6* on Education and Training for the next decade and beyond (Government of Kenya, 1988). The introduction of cost sharing in 1988 officially marked the government's abandonment of 'free' and highly subsidized education. Like in most African countries, for example Nigeria, Ruanda and Tanzania, higher education in Kenya was historically offered free, with the public purse covering both tuition and living expenses (Weidman, 1993:56).

Education needs for secondary education in Kenya are on the increase since the introduction of Free Primary Education (FPE) in 2003 by the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) government. Financing of education continues to be a challenge to the government, parents, and communities at large (Ngware, Onsomu and Muthaka, 2007:15-24). Identifying sustainable financing options that maximize on cost effectiveness in resource utilization is, therefore, critical. Education financing also encompasses all financial outlays to educational institutions and sections, as well as the Ministry, made by central and local governments, the private sector, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), households, communities and external donors, towards investment in the education sector (MOEST, 2007: 18). It includes resources

from parents, families and communities in form of tuition fees, “harambees” (voluntary community fundraising) and other levies.

Over the last decade, the Ministry of Education science and Technology (MOEST) recurrent expenditure constituted more than a third and between 3-6% of Government of Kenya’s (GOK) recurrent and development budgets respectively (MOEST draft Education Sector strategic plan, 2003:16). In 2003, Kenya introduced the Free Primary Education Policy with a view to meeting the goal of Universal Primary Education (UPE). Having successfully initiated this policy, the country is now gearing to widening access to and improving the quality of secondary and tertiary education. However, the country faces constraints in mobilizing additional public and private resources to meet the high cost of expanding access to quality secondary education (Onsomu, Muthaka, Ngware & Kosimbei, 2006:1)

As noted by Eshiwani (1993: 130), the ever growing demand for education and the resultant expansion of education because of the world wide inflation have led to massive increases in spending on education all over the world. To address the issue of high costs of secondary education, the Government of Kenya introduced the concept of cost sharing as is evidenced by the self-help movement (Harambee). Through this movement, the community has shared costs with the government in the provision of a variety of basic human services and needs, education being one of them. Odada and Odhiambo, 1989:12a, commenting on the impact of cost sharing in Kenya, noted that too high fees have been charged to a level prohibitively costly for the poor, causing enrolment rate to fall due to rising drops. The decline in secondary school enrolment over the last decade has been caused by the following factors: high cost of education (the average annual unit cost of education is 5 times higher than primary education)

and poverty, with an estimated 30 per cent dropout rate due to this factor alone. Other factors include; high cost of learning and teaching materials, school uniforms, transport and development levies. In addition, the cost of secondary education in boarding schools is higher than that of day schools by more than 50 percent (MOEST, 2005:44).

Below is a table showing the proposed fee structure by the Ministry of Education.

Table 1.1 Proposed fee structure for day and boarding schools

	Vote Head	Day Schools(Kshs)	Boarding Schools Kshs)		
		GoK Subsidy	GoK Subsidy	Parent Fee	Total
T1	Tuition	3,600	3,600	0	3,600
h 2	Boarding, equipment & Stores	0	0	13,034	13,034
e 3	Repair, Maintenance and Improvement	400	400	400	800
t 4	Local Travel and Transport	400	400	500	900
a 5	Administrative Costs	500	500	350	850
b 6	Electricity Water and Conservancy	500	500	1,500	2,000
l 7	Co-curricular Activity	600	600	0	600
e 8	Personal Emoluments	3,965	3,965	2,743	6,708
9	Medical	300	300	100	400
S	Total School Fees	10,265	10,265	18,635	28,892

0

Source: Ministry of Education (2009)

The table above shows the proposed fee structure for day and boarding schools. The government pays a total of Kshs 10,265 per student regardless of their school category. Parents and guardians are expected to meet the balance amounting to Kshs

18,635. This is way above what most parents can afford. It is important to note that this is not the fee charged in most schools. Some schools charge two to three times this amount and some fee structure has been included in this document (Appendix 9).

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Cost sharing, which was introduced in Kenya in 1988, has led to an increase in school fees in secondary school level. In 1988, the Presidential working party on Education emphasized the need for cost sharing in education between the Government, parents and communities due to the decline in government funding. The implementation of cost sharing in education, against of rising poverty, led to adverse effects on access, retention and quality of education (Daily Nation, 2003:23).

Cost sharing officially marked the Government abandonment of 'free' and highly subsidized education. The Government was to carry on with the task of paying teachers and education administrators as well as fund some limited school facilities. It has not been clear, even to the policy makers, how the increasing demand for the limited number of secondary school places could be increased to enhance access to, and participation in secondary schools against the background of the cost sharing strategy in education (Orodho, 2002:10). Therefore, this study attempts to investigate the impact of the policy of cost sharing on education in selected Kenyan secondary schools.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The problem to be investigated in this study is the impact of the policy of cost sharing in Kenyan secondary schools. *The main research question guiding this study is: how has the policy of cost sharing affected secondary education in Kenya?*

The following sub-questions were formulated based on the main research question:

1. What does the policy of cost sharing in Kenyan schools entail?
2. What is the impact of this policy on the enrolment of students?
3. What is your opinion on cost sharing policy in terms of completion rates of students in secondary schools?
4. What can the Government, community and parents do to ensure that all students have access to secondary education?

1.4 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Based on the research problem and sub-problems stated above, the purpose of this study was to analyze the trends of learners' enrolment, participation and completion rates in secondary education in public schools in Kenya. The study focused on the following objectives.

1. To identify the main participants in cost sharing in secondary education.
2. To find out the impact of the cost sharing policy on the enrolment of students.
3. To analyze completion rates of students enrolled into public secondary schools with regard to cost sharing.
4. To suggest strategies in the context of cost sharing that ensure that all students have access to secondary education.

The study aimed at providing information on the impact of the cost-sharing policy with regard to allocation of education resources. It is hoped that the findings of this study could enlighten planners and educators on possible strategies to help improve enrolment and retention rates in secondary schools. It could also rekindle further research in financing secondary education in general and cost sharing in education in particular.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

There have been three types of secondary schools in Kenya; private, government-aided and “harambee” schools. The latter have since been changed to district day secondary schools with partial government aid. The Government aided schools are more selective and only one out of four learners are accepted into one. The district day schools are less selective and make up to 75% of all secondary schools in the country (<http://www.devdata.worldbank.org>). Facilities in these schools are not as good as those in the fully Government-aided ones and often lack books, qualified teachers and infrastructure to name but a few challenges.

A report by UNESCO reveals that several developing countries will face acute problems in financing their secondary education expansion if present conditions and cost structures continue to prevail. As pupils leave primary schools, it is always their hope that they will join one of the fully Government-aided secondary schools. While the Government-aided schools cannot accommodate everyone who applies, great concern is of those who qualify but end up in the district day (“harambee”) schools simply because they cannot afford the fees charged in the schools of their choice.

As much as the Government of Kenya wants to push on with the policy of cost-sharing, and given the massive continued poverty amongst the majority of Kenyan families, it should ensure all the children of Kenya get equal chances in the available schools regardless of their social backgrounds. The findings of this study will have several implications for the future of secondary education in Kenya such as:

- i. helping the government through the Ministry of Education to re-evaluate the policy of cost sharing and possibly come up with better methods of financing secondary education;

- ii. revealing the role played by parents in financing education and challenge the government to review the Education Act and give the Parents Teachers Association (PTA) legal status, thus more powers to manage the schools especially in financial management.

1.6 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The classical Liberal Theory of Equal opportunity and the Social Darwinism assert that each person is born with a given amount of capacity which to a large extent is inherited and cannot be substantially changed. Thus, educational systems should be designed so as to remove barriers of any nature (economic, gender, geographic) that prevents bright students from lower economic backgrounds from taking advantage of inborn talents, which accelerate them to social promotion. The classical Liberal Theory states that social mobility will be promoted by equal opportunity of education. The roots of this theory can be traced to writers such as Rousseau (1712-1778), who claimed that the “natural” statesmen were born equal and personal qualities should not jeopardize social equity so long as society rewards people according to their status.

Social institutions such as education should in some sense attempt to treat people equally. American educator Horace Mann (1796-1889) could call education the great equalizer. In Kenya, the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) government made primary education free and highly subsidized secondary education in a bid to enhance access to education. However, with the introduction of cost-sharing in education against the background of poverty levels in the country, many parents may not be able to enroll and sustain their children in primary and secondary schools, given the rising hidden and actual cost of education. Therefore, for equity consideration, it practically becomes impossible to ignore the fact that unequal participation in education will in

the long run worsen the status of the poor and the vulnerable groups. (Njeru & Orodho, 2003).

The classical liberal theory was found to be relevant for this study because cost sharing discriminates poor families who cannot afford to keep their children in school hence withdrawing them prematurely. This impacts on education negatively.

1.7 RESEARCH METHOD

Research method refers to a plan of selecting subjects, research sites and data collection to answer the research questions. It shows which individual will be studied and when, where and under what circumstances they will be studied (Macmillan & Schumacher, 2006:166). The appropriate methods should be those that are reliable and valid procedures of collecting and analyzing data particular to research. The general research question for this study was: *how has the policy of cost sharing affected secondary education in Kenya?* Due to the nature of this research, an interactive qualitative research method was the most appropriate for this study. This is because the researcher wished to understand the situation from the participants' perspective. As defined by Macmillan and Schumacher (2006:395), interactive qualitative research is inquiry in which researchers collect data in face-to-face situations by interacting with selected persons in their setting (field research). This is further supported by Best and Kahn in Patton (1990) where they noted that qualitative methods consist of three kinds of data collection; 1) In depth, open ended interviews; 2) direct observation; and 3) written documents. The data from the interviews consisted of direct quotations from people about their experiences, feelings and knowledge. The data from observation consist of detailed descriptions of people's activities, actions and the full range of inter-personal interactions and organizations processes (Best and Kahn,

2009:247). Details about the research method used in this study are provided in Chapter Three.

1.7.1 Research Design.

Research design essentially refers to the plan or strategy of shaping the research (Matt, Henn, Mark, Weinstein & Nick Foard, 2009:49). This is further supported by Creswell, 2009:3 who defines it as the plans and procedures for research that span the decisions from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection and analysis. This study has adopted a qualitative research design.

1.7.2 Sampling

This research used purposeful sampling. MacMillan and Schumacher (2006:401) indicate that, to achieve authenticity in research reports, one has to focus on purposeful sampling as this reduces any chances of invalidity. In contrast to probabilities sampling, purposeful sampling is selecting information rich cases for study in depth. The researcher in this case purposefully targeted a group of people believed to be reliable for the study (Kombo & Tromp, 2006:82). The research was carried out on only two schools (one national and boarding and the other was a district day school) that were picked from Limuru District. The participants were teachers, parents and students from the selected schools. The participants were picked according to their willingness to participate and supply needed information.

1.7.3 Data Collection

The main data collection tool was an interview schedule for the school principal, teachers, parents and a questionnaire for the students. As earlier noted, qualitative in-depth interviews are noted more for their probes and pauses than their particular question format (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006:446). Topics are outlined in

advance. Structured questions are asked together with some open-ended ones. In a bid to enhance validity of the data collected, interviews have been recorded on audiotape and the tapes later transcribed.

Piloting was done to help the researcher discover any weaknesses in the research design/instrument and get any useful suggestion to improve the research question. The data collection was carried out in two schools which were not part of the final study.

1.7.4 Data Analysis

Since the primary data was verbatim accounts of what transpired in the interview session, the researcher later transcribed the tape and typed any handwritten records of the interview. As suggested by Macmillan and Schumacher (2006:450), Best and Kahn (2009:270), interviewer-recording forces the interviewer to be attentive, can help pace the interview, and legitimizes the writing of research insights (beginning data analysis) during the interview. Neither note-taking nor tape recording, however, should interfere with the researcher's full attention on the person. The typed drafts needed to be edited for transcriber/typist error and put into a final form. A detailed account on data collection and analysis is provided in Chapter Three.

1.8 LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.

The scope of the study was limited to the cost sharing policy as a means of financing education in Kenya. The scope was limited to two schools selected in Limuru District. As a result the findings cannot be generalized. Private schools were however left out as they are not funded by the government.

1.9 ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY.

The research study has five chapters explaining what the study was all about, why the study was worth doing, how it was conducted and the major findings, discussions, conclusions and recommendations emanating from the findings.

It is structured as follows:-

Chapter 1: This chapter gives the introduction to the study and has several sub-sections such as; Background to the study, statement of the problems, purpose/objectives of the study, significance of the study, theoretical framework, research methods, limitations and delimitations of the study, organization of the study, definition of terms and the conclusion.

Chapter 2: This contains Literature Review relevant for the study. This was based on the research problem and contains relevant pieces of literature on the cost-sharing policy that have been written and published.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology. This chapter provided basis for appreciating how the study was done. It has a separate section describing the research design and locale, target population and sampling procedures, data collection and the analytical techniques used.

Chapter 4: Research Findings

This chapter contains the research findings.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

The last chapter of the thesis contains summary of findings, discussions, interpretations of each result in the form of conclusions and the implication of the findings.

1.10 DEFINITION OF TERMS

1.10.1 Community

All people living within a geographical catchment area of a school whether or not they have children in that school.

1.10.2 Cost-Sharing

Partnership and shared responsibility among the government, parents and communities in the provision of Education

1.10.3 Harambee

A kiswahili word meaning pulling together.

1.10.4 Harambee School

A school built by the effort of the community and well-wishers pooling resources.

1.10.5 P.T.A

An organization comprising parents and teachers of a particular school. They look into the welfare and issues affecting the school and solicit for funds for its development.

10.6 Pupils

Learners from kindergarten to primary school level.

1.10.7 Purposeful sampling

A sampling method that involves selecting samples using set criteria such as type of school (National, Provincial, and Public/Private).

1.10.8 Respondents

The people to be interviewed.

1.10.9 Students

Learners from secondary school level onwards.

1.10.10 Access

This refers to making education available to those whom it was formerly denied or giving opportunities to those who have been denied education.

1.10.11 District Secondary School

This refers to a school that admits learners from primary schools located within the same district (a small administrative area).

1.10.12 Intra-sectoral

This refers to a department inside or within the same sector.

1.10.13 National Secondary Schools

These are schools that admit the top/best learners from all over the country.

1.10.14 Provincial Secondary Schools

These schools admit learners from primary schools within the province (several districts within a given location form a province).

1.10.15 Public School

Refers to a school that offers basic education and is managed by the government. In Kenya, the government provides most of the facilities in public schools and also pays the teachers.

1.10.16 Quality Assurance

This refers to all the actions taken to ensure that all standards and procedures are adhered to and that delivered products or services meet performance requirements' (Bamboo web Dictionary, 2004).

1.10.17 Structure

This refers to how a teaching program is designed. It often reveals its flexibility or rigidity and the extent to which learners will benefit from it.

1.11 CONCLUSION

Issues about costs and financing lie at the very heart of initiatives to make secondary education more accessible. Lewin and Colloids (2001) observe that little attention has been paid to the consequences of enrolment expansion at primary school level on future educational demand above that level. Yet the number of children who graduate from primary education is expanding rapidly and putting pressure on Governments to open up educational opportunities at higher levels.

This introductory section of the research project gives details on background information on the cost sharing policy in Kenya, statement of the problem, aims and objectives of the study, significance of the study research design, and organization of the study, conclusion and definition of terms used.

The next chapter explores published literature on cost sharing in Kenya and in a few other selected countries and how it has affected secondary education.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter does not only provide a background to financing secondary education in Kenya per-se, it also focuses on other countries such as Jamaica, Ghana and Eritrea. Such a study is necessary for one to understand the challenges, if there are any, faced by these countries. 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. The current status of education in Kenya suggests that the scenario is likely to remain the same, if not worse, unless urgent interventions are put in place to address the problems (Onsomu, Muthaka, Ngware & Kosimbei, 2006:2).

Various countries that are on track in achieving UPE(Universal Primary Education) are now looking for innovative strategies and financing options for expanding secondary education, consistent with national human capital development goals. However, fiscal constraints prevent many, especially low income countries, from relying solely on government revenue for financing desired education expansion. The World Bank (1988) urged African countries to consider the idea of cost sharing instead of fully relying on public expenditures. Research carried out by Kiveu and Maiyo (2009:1) indicates that the adoption of the cost sharing policy in education has witnessed the return, to communities and parents, a substantial proportion of financial

responsibility for schooling. With increased poverty levels, many parents and communities have not been able to meet the requirements under this policy.

2.2 DEFINITION OF COST SHARING.

Cost sharing can be defined as an arrangement under which costs of the programme or project are shared by the involved parties, according to an agreed upon formula (Businessdictionary.com). Johnson (2003:35) defines cost sharing in education as a shift in the burden of higher education costs from being borne exclusively or predominantly by the government or tax payers to being shared with parents and students. Cost sharing or matching can also be defined as that portion of project or programme costs not borne by the funding agency. It includes all contributions, including cash and in kind, that a recipient makes to an award (accounting.ucdavis.edu). Kiveu and Mayo (2009:273) have defined the cost sharing policy as a situation where the government on one hand, and the households and communities on the other hand, share the responsibilities of financing education.

2.3 COST SHARING POLICY IN KENYA

A report by Reform Agenda for Education Sector in Kenya (2003: 23) notes that cost sharing in education and other sectors had always been a feature of educational development in Kenya even before independence. This continued even in the post-independence period through the “Harambee” system. The decision to introduce cost sharing was occasioned by the shift in the national economic policy which had so far seen visible government contribution in financing social services. In Kenya, education financing is based on the cost sharing policy introduced in 1988, which requires most costs in education to be met through partnerships between public sector (government), non-governmental organizations (NGO’s), religious organizations, development

partners and communities (Government of Kenya 1988). Within this funding policy framework, overall government role includes financing professional development, teachers' remuneration in public institutions, and provision of infrastructure, administration and management of bursary 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 and post-schools institutions, school/college amenities (transport, water, energy and communication), students' personal expenses and remuneration of school/college non-teaching staff (Onsomu, Muthaka, Ngware and Kosimbei, 2006:1)

Njeru and Orodho (2008:5) have also noted that, having accepted the rationality of cost sharing, the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST) Bursary scheme was introduced as one of the safety measures to cushion the poor and the vulnerable groups against the adverse effects of cost sharing. The bursary scheme, however, remains inefficient and ineffective. Other characteristics that contribute to bottlenecks in the implementation of the bursary scheme at the secondary school education level include poor access and participation due to poor quality of service, bad governance and management weaknesses. It is, therefore, arguable that against this background of more than half of Kenya's population living below the poverty line, and rising cost of education, majority of households especially among the poor and vulnerable groups would not be able to invest in the development of quality education at the secondary school level (Njeru and Orodho, 2008:1)

The then Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education, Prof. Karega Mutahi, in his contribution to the second issue of the Ministry of Education newsletter

emphasizes on the need to sustain partnerships, especially bearing in mind the difficult roles and the responsibilities of different actors e.g. the Board of Governors (BOGs) and School Management Committees (SMCs) in relation to institutions under their watch. In this case, the Government provides capitation grants whose management is delegated to BOGs. It also pays salaries of teachers among other expenses. This approach to institutional management is geared to harnessing partnership strength and stakeholder participation, pool resources and facilitate local level prioritization (Ministry of Education, 2007:5).

The main aim of the cost sharing policy was to reduce education cost burden on the government while ensuring cost effectiveness in the utilization of education facilities, equipment, materials and personnel, hopefully with a view to maintaining growth, quality and relevance of education and training. Thus, the government and other stakeholders have been having specific financing responsibilities as dictated by the cost-sharing policy. These roles are listed in the table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1: Role of Education Stakeholders in Kenya

Government Responsibility	Responsibilities for Government partners
1.Provision of grants for specialized equipment(for science and practical subjects) in marginalized secondary schools	1.Provision and maintenance of facilities, equipment and instructional materials in public and private secondary schools
2. Professional support: Curriculum development, teacher education, inspection and public examinations.	2.Fees for public examinations
3. Administration and management of bursary and scholarships for needy students.	3. Catering and accommodation in boarding schools and post-school institutions.
4. Teacher remuneration in public institutions.	4.School amenities (transport, water, energy and communication), and student personal expenses
5.In-service Training e.g. Strengthening of Mathematics and Science Subjects (SMASSE)	5. Remuneration of school/college non-teaching staff and temporary teachers.

Source: Ministry of Education (2005)

Table 2.2: Public and household financing ratios- 2003/4

Sub-sector	Public schools		Private Schools	
	Government	Households %	Government %	Households %
ECDE	5	95	0	100
Primary	80	20	0	100
Secondary	40	60	0	100
TIVET	25	75	0	100
University	92	8	0	100

Source: Ministry of Education (2005).

In addition to cost sharing in the financing of public sector, partners, especially NGO's, communities and the private sector are expected to continue providing private education services at all levels including pre-primary education, technical education and informal and tertiary education. On average, household funding of secondary education takes 60% while government financing constitutes 40% of the aggregate secondary financing as shown in table 2.2. To a large extent, the implementation of the cost-sharing policy at secondary level gives a leeway for schools to charge higher fees compared to the fees guidelines provided by the Ministry of Education.

Thus, secondary education has continued to increase the cost burden for households in spite of the levels of public funding (Onsomu, Muthaka, Ngware and Kosimbei, 2006:29). A study carried out by Njeru and Orodho (2008:27) reveals that the patterns and trends of education financing in Kenya incorporated a partnership between state, household and communities long before the formal introduction of the cost-sharing policy. The same study further notes that the government's financing of secondary education has largely been directed towards recurrent expenditure, mainly to meet teachers' salaries and allowances, at the expense of development expenditures, which

would be essential to provide and improve the physical and instructional facilities. This has resulted in poor quality education as most schools are inadequately provided with basic learning resources.

The financing of secondary education, i.e. cost sharing strategy, has, however, become problematic as parents have to shoulder an increasingly large portion of the costs thus creating a negative impact on the poor and vulnerable households (Njeru and Orodho, 2008:2). Elimu Yetu Coalition (2003) had made the same observation by indicating that the implementation of the cost sharing policy was taunted with several problems. Understandably, the manner in which the program was introduced had a lot to do with the cajoling by the World Bank and IMF as part of the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs). While the poor performance of the economy put strains on government resources, the transfer of costs to parents, at a time when they were still struggling to meet increased education costs brought about by the implementation of a new education system (8-4-4), was ill advised. Worse still, there were no clear guidelines as to the extent to which parents and communities were expected to cost share.

Johnstone Bruce (1986, 1992, 1993b, 2002, 2003) made the same observation where he noted that recent years have seen a dramatic, albeit uneven and still contested, shift in the burden of education costs from being borne predominantly by the government, or taxpayers, to being shared with parents and students. This cost sharing, as articulated by Johnstone may take the form of tuition either being introduced when it did not hitherto exist or being rapidly increased where it already does exist. It may take the form of public institutions sharing more near break-even or full cost fees for

room, boarding, books and other costs of students living that may formerly have been covered by the government (Marcucci, Johnstone and Ngolovoi, 2008:1).

A shift of the cost burden from government to student and family may also come in the form of a reduction, sometimes a freezing (especially in inflammatory times) of student grants (www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/intHigherEducFinance).

2.4 THE INFLUENCE OF COST SHARING POLICY ON ACCESS AND ENROLMENT IN SECONDARY EDUCATION IN KENYA.

Njeru and Orodho (2008:21) observed that the cost sharing policy has a negative impact on the poor and vulnerable households. This is because parents have to shoulder an increasingly large portion of the cost. Kiveu and Mayo (2009:1) seem to agree with this observation because a study they carried out found out that cost sharing has mainly affected the poor because they cannot afford the cost of the secondary education which is beyond the reach of not only the poor but also the middle income families.

Apparently dropouts and repetition as a phenomenon in Kenyan Secondary Schools as a whole has significantly contributed not only to unequal access to education, decreased quality of education but has also manifested an alarming aspect of wastage within the education system (Republic of Kenya, 1998, 1999 as well as Pontefract and Hardman 2005, and Martim 2008). As noted elsewhere, household funding of secondary education takes, on average, 60 percent while government financing constitutes 40 percent of the aggregates financing. To a large extent, the implementation of the cost sharing policy at secondary school level gives a leeway for schools to charge higher fees compared to the fees guidelines provided by the Ministry of Education Science and Technology. Further various categories of schools

charge different amounts of school fees which are unmanageable to some parents especially the poor.

Odada and Odhiambo (1989:129) commenting on the impact of cost sharing in Kenya noted that fees charged were at a level prohibitively high for the poor, causing enrolment rates to fall as well as too many dropouts. As earlier noted, Kenyan secondary schools fall into three categories: fully government funded, district day (“harambee”) and private. Further, government funded schools are divided into national, provincial and district levels. Government funded schools select student in order of scores achieved. Students with the highest scores gain admission into national schools while those with average scores are selected into provincial and district schools. District day schools accept students with lower scores. Pupils work hard in primary schools with a hope of attaining high marks to get them a place in one of the eighteen national schools in the country. School fees charged in these national schools is sometimes two or three times that charged in district schools and, therefore, those pupils from poor backgrounds admitted into national schools are left out as they cannot afford the fees charged in these schools.(District Education personnel).

As noted earlier, in the cost sharing strategy, the government finances education administration and professional services, while the communities, parents and sponsors, provide physical facilities, books and supplementary readers, stationery and other consumables. Poor students who are not identified by any sponsor end up losing their places in secondary schools, or would join and later on drop out of school due to lack of school fees. Students who fail examinations or those whose parents cannot afford secondary school fees either repeat the final school year or pursue

technical training opportunities. A number of students also drop out of school by choice due to poor scores (en.wikipedia.org).

A study carried out by Kiveu and Mayo (2009:278) reveals that the fees and other related direct costs have become too high for parents to afford given their low average incomes. Therefore, some may not afford to keep their children in school especially at secondary level. According to Miruka, Akinyi and Manga (2009), five students from Nyanza Province who were admitted to national school could not report because of lack of school fees. Access to public secondary schools and universities by the poor has remained elusive despite government efforts to ensure equity in provision of education (Martim, 2008). He argues that despite tuition waiver in secondary school, children from poor backgrounds have continued to be marginalized as some national school charges are in excess of Kshs 60,000 annually(appendix 9).

Many children from poor families perform well in KCPE and are admitted to national schools but are locked out due to their inability to pay the high fees. Although cost sharing policy was introduced on the basis of economically genuine reasons, high poverty levels in the households are very pervasive. Therefore, financing education through cost sharing policy could be one of the major problems facing secondary education in Kenya (Kiveu and Mayo, 2009:274). This situation might be the root cause of increased dropouts, absenteeism and repetition in secondary schools. On the same study it was reported by some teachers that absenteeism leads to poor performance which in turn leads to repetition that overburden the parents who are made to incur extra costs. These costs lead to inefficiency in the sense that the students take more than the required minimum number of years to graduate.

2.5 COST SHARING POLICY FROM OTHER COUNTRIES.

2.5.1 GHANA

Africa Recovery special report by Ernest Harsh in Accra has this as the opening statement: “There are several ideas but the main theme that went through is that everybody has come to accept there is need for cost sharing, which means that all stakeholders - government, students, parents and the private sector all need to take some part of the burden for cost sharing. What is left is how much.” The government of Ghana faces difficult choices. Since 1992, the constitution mandates free and compulsory basic education for all. With about 30 percent of Ghanaian children still unable to attend primary school, this means that more of the education budget must shift to lower-level schools. This was noted by Mohammed IbnChabass, Deputy Minister of Education (citifmonline.com/Ghana).

Ghana is unusual in that children take responsibility for the payment of fees. This derives from the structure of the Ghanaian family. Children fostering in Ghana is widespread. Sibling data from GLSS (Ghana Living Standard Survey) 3 has not been published but evidence is available from earlier rounds. (GLSS -1987/88) data indicates that school aged children average 4.1 ‘same mother siblings and 5.9 ‘same father siblings, a difference of 1.8, which is an indication of the level of fostering. Children living away from their mothers or fathers have more siblings on average than those living with them (Penrose, 1998:54). Children thus collect money from both parents as well as relatives to pay fees, and there appears to be less direct financial relationships between parents and schools as in other countries. Penrose further notes that children also receive money from several sources. In a research he

carried out, he found out that 44% reported receiving money from parents, 28% from father only and 14% from mother only and 9% from other relatives.

It is likely that one parent will not be aware of the full amount collected by the child. It is, therefore, possible that total private contributions to junior secondary schools (JSS) are more than those reported by parents only. Parents and children in Ghana perceive that there is relatively little return in terms of access to jobs from just a basic education and, therefore, recognize the need to stay on at school. Primary school is, therefore, essentially a route through to secondary education. However, if secondary education costs are perceived to be beyond the ability of parents and children to pay, they may choose to forego the expenses of basic education in the anticipation of not being able to continue beyond it. Costs rise sharply at senior secondary school. The overall average expenditure in 1992 reported by GLSS was a little under 17,500 Cedis, 10,000 Cedis more than primary expenditure. There is a large other category of costs which is not explained, and the main expenditures are tuition, food and lodging. The current financial situation was not available online at the time of this study.

2.5.2 JAMAICA

The educational system was slow to reach most Jamaicans until the early 1970s. Even after the abolition of slavery, education remained uncommon; early efforts were conducted mostly by Christian churches. From the establishment of the Ministry of Education in 1953 to independence 1962, a national education policy was developed that expanded the scope of education and redefined educational priorities. Until the 1970s, however, the education system continued to provide insufficient opportunities at the post primary levels because many of the features inherited from the British educational system remained (country.studies.us/caribbean.islands). The reforms of

Secondary education by the PNP government elected in 1972 had positive but limited effects. Greater access to education was the main accomplishment of the reform process, but limited funding may also have lowered the quality of education for the increased number of students attending secondary schools.

Nevertheless, the introduction of universally free secondary education was a major step in removing the institutional barriers confronting poor Jamaicans who were otherwise unable to afford tuition. Although education was free in the public schools and school attendance was compulsory to the age of sixteen, costs of books, uniforms, lunch and transport deterred some families from sending their children to school.

The Ministry of Education and Culture (MOE&C) has developed and distributed textbooks for use in secondary schools, but it does not have the resources to dispense them free of charge as it does in primary schools. A textbook rental program does operate in secondary schools; however education at this level is not free.

The government has introduced “cost sharing” at this level and most students and/or their parents are expected to contribute at least a nominal amount towards the cost of education. Fees are set by each school, but all fees must be approved by the MOE & C. The ministry’s funding for secondary schools covers teachers’ salaries and related expenses but little else. The cost sharing policy program has resulted in a significant increase in the amount of money that schools have for instructional materials and Equipment (Jamaica SECONDARY-EDUCATION.HTML#i x 221ZeZe x c/7). Official cost sharing was introduced at the secondary level in 1994-95 as a measure to achieve social equity as well as a budgetary and economic goal. However, *actual* rather than *official* cost sharing was evident in the system for a long time.

Prior to the 1994-95 academic years, the Ministry of Education was responsible for funding the daily operations within secondary schools through a per capita grant. This proved inadequate to cover the operating costs of schools (World Bank, 1999). Since the government is the main supplier of schooling and education services, one critical issue concerns is its ability to finance the supply process either on recurrent budget or through user charges (cost sharing) charged to the private sector by educational institutions. The government budget over the last decade reflects the high priority given to secondary education reform, financed with significant inputs from international financial institutions such as World Bank and IDB (25). Cost sharing fees are legally the property of the government and are set and collected in secondary schools after approval by the Ministry of Education following its consideration of past expenditures and justification of present budget (James and Williams, 2002:25-28).

2.5.3 ERITREA.

Educational financing is an engine of economic development in Eritrea and thus financing education is like blood to human body. Education investment is one of the important economic activities that can play a major role in boosting a countries economy (Ravinder Rena 2004:3). It is a vital input in modernization where the developing countries particularly in African began their drive for social and economic development as a means not only of raising political and social consciousness but also of increasing the number of skilled workers and raising the level of trained man power (Rena, 2004).

Education in Eritrea has seen several challenges before attaining its present status. The Italians, the British and the Ethiopians have left their respective marks. The extensive educational reforms taking place at all levels were aimed at structuring

education to respond to the development needs of the country and enable Eritrea to participate appropriately in this 21st Century characterized by globalization and widespread knowledge based activities (MOE, 2006). The Eritrea education system faces challenges that are fairly common in other education system in sub Saharan Africa. These are limited access; low quality, doubtful relevance, inefficiencies, inadequate financial and non-financial resources, and poor delivery capacity. The government's vision for addressing these pressing challenges was well articulated across key policy documents (Government of Eritrea, 2003:8). Like most African countries, higher education in Eritrea was free, with the government supporting both tuition and living allowances for students (Rena: 2005). The performance of higher education in Eritrea is contestable both on equity and efficiency grounds. Austerity in the public budget for higher education, coupled with poor performance of the sector in promoting access and equity has led the Government of Eritrea to intensify the mechanism for cost sharing and user charges in higher education (Rena, 2008:10).

Substantial resources especially finance will be required to create greater access and higher quality of education in the next decade. Thus two types of investment will be required - for the expansion of the school system and for improving quality education. Two major issues arise here, which need to be considered in the next millennium. The first policy dimension is diversification of education finance. This would require increased cost sharing in education. One of the important measures in cost sharing would be to encourage privately owned and financed institutions especially at higher levels. In addition the involvement of communities to construct, finance and manage schools at basic education level should be encouraged (www.unesco.org).

Ravinder Rena (2004) in his report notes that donor support for pre-tertiary education and training amounted to about 85 percent of capital and 26 percent of overall spending. Ravinder concludes his 2004 report by noting that the emphasis on “Education for All” has increased the flow of students into secondary level. But the shortage of resources and expensive efforts has forced interested students off the school and to finally drop out of the education system. Education in Eritrea is, therefore, funded by the government with the help of donors and nongovernmental organizations.

2.6 COMMONALITIES PERTAINING TO COST SHARING POLICY IN THESE COUNTRIES.

One of the greatest functional demands of the present educational development in these countries is the development and implementation of an effective educational planning system geared towards successful economic growth and development. Education at some point in all these countries was offered free. The costs later became too high for the governments to shoulder alone and they introduced the cost sharing policy where the government pays a certain percentage and the rest is paid by parents, communities and donors. Eritrea for instance has not fully embraced the cost sharing policy per se but the Eritrean government is in partnership with some donor communities and, as Ravinder Rena, 2004-5 indicates, donor support for pre-tertiary education and training amounted to about 85 percent of capital and 26 percent of overall spending in education.

The escalation of school fees in secondary level has been the immediate consequence of the cost sharing policy. The fees and other related direct costs have become too high for parents to afford given their low incomes. In all these countries, inequalities

of education provision are severe. Inequality of participation means that the benefits of education are disproportionately enjoyed by the upper income families whose children are far more likely to complete secondary education or enroll in higher education while poor families may not afford to sustain their children in schools hence increased drop-outs, absenteeism and repetition.

Unfortunately in all these countries, placement of secondary education, enrolment and participation are all determined by the ability of the parent to pay school fees and not the child's ability. Bright but poor students who qualify to join good and prestigious high schools may be locked out of secondary schooling due to the inability of their parents to raise the required school fees. Even where education is said to be free, there is still a substantial amount of money that parents and communities are expected to pay and this may be too high for some to afford.

2.7 IMPLICATIONS OF THESE COMMUNALITIES IN THESE COUNTRIES.

In the formal education system, secondary education is strategically placed in such a way that it connects primary schooling, tertiary education and the labor market. It can be regarded as the transitional level that connects those in the education system from low to higher echelons of educations. It plays a key role as a transitional level of education that links basic education with skills and professional development, without which one cannot cross to or from poor families achieve them. Most of the students in the countries discussed in this study are locked out at this crucial stage due to the cost sharing policy. Financing of secondary education requires both feasible policy reforms and sustainable financing options.

Besides, the government must play its central role in policy direction and encourage strong partnerships among all stakeholders including communities, NGOs, private sector and external support among others. Main financing policy reforms relate to improved primary and secondary school internal efficiencies, efficiency in use of resources, improved school management and decentralization of some management functions, commitment to improved access to basic education- primary and secondary, quality improvement through curriculum reforms relevant to labor market and livelihoods and teacher professional development.

Manda, Mwabu and Kimenyi (2002:505) noted that the government should always be the principal investor in education. Such a role cannot be left entirely to the private sector because of the long term objectives of human resource development. On the other hand, education, particularly post – primary, can be treated as a profitable investment for individual graduates, who earn more than they would otherwise, and for the society, which is enriched not only by the knowledge of the educated people, but also by the higher taxes paid by educated individuals. These benefits extend from the students present household, future households and the economy as a whole.

2.8 EFFICIENT OPTIONS FOR FUNDING SECONDARY EDUCATION.

Identification of feasible and sustainable financing options varies from country to country, depending on the level of development and existing financing system. Some of the financing options that may work for developing countries like Kenya, Ghana, Eritrea and many others are, reducing schooling costs, public (government and external) financing of physical infrastructure, introduction of targeted vouchers accessible by both private and public schools household subsidies and provision of incentives (Onsomu, Muthaka, Ngware & Kosimbei, 2006: 20). Some countries like

Kenya have introduced a bursary scheme to cater for the needy students. However, major concerns are in regard to the MOES&T bursary schemes' inadequate finances to cater for all eligible needy students, weak administrative systems as evidenced by delays in communicating the bursary awards to beneficiaries and questionable bursary eligibility criteria (IPAR 2003:1). Schools can also start income generating projects in schools so that the money generated can be used to cater for needy students, repair and maintenance of the school infrastructure and could also be used in starting other projects and this would reduce the cost burden of parents and the communities.

Table 2.3 below presents selected options for financing lifelong learning in selected countries. These options include grants, scholarships, traditional loans, human capital contracts, income contingent loans, graduate tax vouchers, entitlements and learning tax credit among others from these options, bursaries and scholarships are the most commonly used in secondary education. Income-contingent loans (allocation of loans to students to cover tuition and maintenance costs) are offered. Management of such schemes varies across countries. For instance, in Latin American countries, the governments are the main source of educational credit programmes, while in some countries; private donations are significant and are encouraged through fiscal incentives.

Table 2.3: Financing options for Education

Instrument	Details	Major variables	Strengths	Weaknesses	Examples
Cost-sharing	Public pays for teachers' remuneration while other partners pay for facilities and equipment.	Public contributions; Private Sector contributions; Community contributions; Household/parents contributions; other stakeholders' contribution.	Complement one another; Make all partners responsible	Poor households unable to pay so they may not access education services; Schools are dominated by non-poor groups.	Kenya
Traditional loan	Fixed payments; specific period of time.	Amount borrowed, Interest paid, repayment period.	Implementation relatively easy, instrument easy to understand.	Requires collateral, thus benefits wealthier more; Not attractive to students as the terms of repayment do not adjust to capacity to pay; Poor collection record.	Benin, Brazil, Korea, Liberia, Malaysia, Mexico.
Human Capital contract	Students commit part of future earnings for fixed period in exchange for capital for financing education.	Percentage of future income to be paid, repayment period, collection of payments.	Creates a market for investing in skills; Decreases risks of defaulter; Offers measure of expected value of education; Adjust payments to earning capacity; equitable.	Information on individual difficult to obtain; Requires developed tax collection (or similar) agency; Adverse selection; Could create disincentive to work.	United States
Income-contingent loan.	Collects percentage of income until value of loan repaid or maximum repayment period reached.	Percentage of future income to be repaid, repayment period.	Decreases risk to individuals; Eliminates default risk; Equitable: Promotes incentive to study.	Requires developed tax collection (or similar) agency but does not fully reflect expected value of education.	Australia, Ghana, Hungary, Namibia, New Zealand, Sweden, United Kingdom, Latin America.
Graduate Tax	Tax on learner's future earnings.	Tax Rate	Universal flexible, payments through lifetime individuals.	Payment throughout lifetime; Requires developed tax collection (or similar)	Proposed in UK

				agency; All earnings treated equally, could create disincentive to study, no private initiates	
		Subsidized	Mechanisms		
Voucher and other demand-side financing mechanisms	Channel public funds for public and private education individuals or their families.	Cost of schooling, target population/schooling level, demand-side financing.	Funding-based on demand/enrolments efficient; Equitable quality of schooling.	Need to market; Funds could be misused; May not be sustainable capacity to pay; Poor collection record.	Bangladesh, Chile, Guatemala, Netherlands, Pakistan, Sweden
Entitlement	Voucher and loan combination.	Amount of entitlement (Voucher and loan), co-finance amount, repayment terms.	Target individuals based on income and motivation; Helps build individual's assets; sustainable.	Need to market; Funds could be missed.	Brazil
Individual learning account.	Incentives for investing in education and training.	Individual subsidy, co-finance amount, type of training.	Individual responsibility; Private Sector participation.	Funds could be misused; need to market; May not be sustainable.	Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland.
Education Savings Account	Incentives for savings for education and training.	Individual subsidy, co-finance amount, tax discount.	Individual responsibility, builds assets targeted.	Need to market, may not be sustainable.	Canada
Learning tax credit	Taxes reduced in proportion to spending on approved education and training.	Tax discount; spending maximum.	Individual responsibility, private sector participation.	Lack of equity; May not be sustainable.	UK

Source: World Bank (2003: 88)

Education vouchers, on the other hand, are commonly used to target vulnerable groups in post-primary education. Vouchers take various forms, including student entitlement, mixture of grants and loans, and allocation of higher grant element than loan.

In summary, various lessons can be learnt from the various countries. Sustainable financing of secondary education requires both feasible policy reforms and sustainable financing options. Besides, the government must play its central role in policy direction and encourage strong partnerships among all stakeholders including communities, NGOs, private sector and external support, among others. Main financing policy reforms relate to improved primary and secondary school internal efficiencies, improved efficiency in use of resources, improved school management and decentralization of some management functions, commitment to improved access to basic education (primary and secondary education), quality improvement through curriculum reforms relevant to labour market and livelihoods and teacher professional development.

However, identification of feasible and sustainable financing options varies from one country to another, depending on the level of development and existing financing system. Some of the financing options that may work for developing countries, Kenya included, are: reducing schooling costs, public (government and external) financing of physical infrastructure, introduction of targeted vouchers accessible by both private and public schools, household subsidies and provision of incentives.

2.9 CONCLUSION

Educational investment has long been considered as a stimulant for economic development. It is one of the important economic activities that can play a major role in boosting a country's economy. According to EFA 2001, secondary education is part of basic education in Kenya. Failure to provide basic education seriously compromises a country's effort in reducing poverty

A study carried out by Kiveu and Mayio (2009 278) found out that teachers and parents viewed cost sharing both positively and negatively. Positive in the sense that it had made parents actively participate in the running and management of schools.

On the negative side, it was reported that cost sharing has discriminated the poor who could not afford the costs of education. Financing of secondary education will continue to face major challenges unless and until efficient resource utilization measures are put in place.

In addition to budgetary constraints, the negative impact of inequitable resource allocation and spending on inputs has been accentuated by intra-sectoral misallocation of resources in secondary education (Onsomu, Muthaka, Ngware and Kosimbei, 2006:58). For sustainable financing of expansion in secondary education therefore, the governments in most countries will have to adopt several financing options as suggested above.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a description of the research design of this study. It also gives a detailed explanation of the research approach and the data collection strategies used.

The study aimed at answering the following questions.

1. What does the policy of cost sharing in Kenyan Schools entail?
2. What is the impact of this policy on the enrolment of students?
3. Does this cost sharing policy affect completion rates of secondary school students?
4. What can the Government community and parents do to ensure that all students have access to secondary education?

The study aimed at providing information on the impact of the cost sharing policy with regard to allocation of education resources in selected schools in Kenya. Interviews were conducted with the relevant stakeholders, i.e. school principals, parents, teachers and the students and were recorded and transcribed. Relevant documents such as admission registers, class registers and progression reports were analyzed in order to get objective view of the problem

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

Best and Kahn (2009: 249-251) and Creswell (2009:3) define research designs as the plans and procedures for research that span the decisions from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection and analysis. De Vos (1998:77), on the other hand, claims that research design is the overall plan of conducting the whole research study in the world. De Vos argues that a research design is the blue print according to which

data are collected to investigate the research hypothesis or question in the most economic way. The researcher in this case selected the qualitative approach to collect data. The rationale for selecting qualitative approach is discussed in the following section.

3.3 QUALITATIVE APPROACH

Research can be divided into two broad categories, quantitative research and qualitative research. To achieve the aims and objectives identified in chapter one of this study, a qualitative research approach was used. Qualitative research is a means of exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem. The process of research involves emerging quotations and procedures, data typically collected in the participants setting, data analysis inductively building from particular to general themes and the researcher making interpretations of the meaning of data. (Creswell, 2009:4). Qualitative research uses several methods of inquiry which include one-to-one; in-depth interviews focus groups and qualitative observation based studies (Henn, Weinstein & Foard 2009:177). Often researchers use the participants' own words in the report as the participants' narration can best explain the meaning that they ascribe to their world, feelings, beliefs, thoughts, actions and ideas. (Henn et al, 2009: 178).

Data was collected by conducting interviews (individual and focus group) and analyzing documents relevant for this study. What makes qualitative approach relevant for this particular study is that, the researcher spent some time in the field (schools in this case) collecting documents and conducting interviews. However, the researcher also used quantitative analysis on a very small scale to calculate the percentages. The aim of the researcher was not to generalize the findings to all other

similar schools in Limuru District but to provide objective information peculiar to these schools.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION

3.4.1 Pilot testing.

Piloting is necessary in order to test both the instructions and survey before distributing to the identified sample. It should be done with respondents similar to those in the sample. The pilot test gives an estimate of the amount of time it takes to complete the survey and also provides an initial idea of the pattern of responses that are likely and whether revisions need to be done. Pilot testing was done in two neighboring public schools two weeks before the actual data collection began in order to test for validity and reliability of the research instruments. The researcher conducted focused group interviews with a small group of parents, teachers, administered a questionnaire to twenty students from each school and had interviews with the two school principals. This aided the researcher in redesigning and revising the interview schedules and rephrasing the questions that were not very clear to the interviewees. It also helped in estimating the time needed for each interview session.

3.4.2 Interviews

Best and Kahn (2009:268) describe interviews as oral questionnaires. The purpose of interviewing is to find out what is in or on someone else's mind. Qualitative research uses interviews as one of the data collection techniques. The interviewer must understand his/her own role. She/he should not express any opinions and should advise the participants that he/she is not going to be judgmental in any way.

In this study, the interviewer used the interview guide approach. The topics and issues covered were specified in advance in outline form and the interviewer decided the sequence and working of questions in the course of the interview. This technique,

although time consuming, provided the opportunity to obtain qualitative data in a manner that has the benefit of providing an overall question frame work and focus for the interviewer yet also providing the opportunity for the interviewees to express their views.

3.4.2.1 Individual Interviews

These are interviews that target one person or participant to provide the needed information. Individual interviews can take different forms i.e. face-to-face, one-on-one, in person interview or telephone conversations (Creswell, 2009:178). The interview identifies one individual referred to as key informant who has special knowledge, status or communication skills that they are willing to share with the researcher. In this study individual interviews were carried out with the school principals, the identified teachers and parents of the identified schools. The researcher, as much as possible, tried to establish trust, be genuine, maintain eye contact and convey, through phrasing, cadence and voice so as to connect with the participants as this would elicit more valid data.

3.4.2.2 Focus Group Interviews

These are qualitative interviews that are held with a group of participants as opposed to those with only one respondent. The intention of focus group interviews is to stimulate discussion among people and bring to the surface responses that otherwise might lay dormant. McMillan and Schumacher (2006:455) describe focus group interviews as a strategy of obtaining a better understanding of a problem or an assessment of a problem, concerning an idea by interviewing a purposefully sampled group of people rather than each person individually.

Focus group interviews were held with students, teachers, and parents in the two schools. The research chose the focus group interviews because the people interviewed were many and it was not possible to interview them individually as this would take a lot of their time. The researcher requested the help of a colleague so as to control the group and also to help in recording of data. It was also hoped that the assistant would be able to pick some of the responses that the researcher might not have been able to get.

3.5 DATA MANAGEMENT AND ANALYSIS

Since the primary data was verbatim accounts of what transpired in the interview sessions, researcher later transcribed the tapes and typed any handwritten records of the interview. The typed draft was edited for transcriber/typist error and put into a final form. Since qualitative data analysis is a very personal process with few rigid rules and procedures, the researcher needed to go through content analysis. This (content analysis) means analysis of the content of an interview in order to identify the main themes that emerge from the responses given by the respondents.

Step 1: Identifying the main themes. The researcher carefully went through the descriptive responses given by respondents to each question in order to understand the meaning they communicate. From these responses the researcher developed broad themes that reflected these meanings.

Step 2: Assigning codes to the main themes. The researcher counted the number of times a theme had occurred in the interview. This was done by selecting a few responses to an open ended question and identifying the main theme. She continued to identify these themes from the same question till a saturation point was reached. She wrote these themes and assigned a code to each of them.

Step 3: Classifying responses under the themes.

Having identified the themes, the next step was to go through the transcripts of all the interviews and classify the responses under the different themes.

Step 4: Integrate themes and responses into the list of the report.

Having identified the responses that fall within different themes, the next step was to integrate the themes into the text of the report.

3.6 ETHICS IN QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Before obtaining any information from the respondents, the researcher first obtained the respondents informed consent in every discipline. It is considered unethical to collect information without the knowledge of the participants and their expressed willingness and informed consent.

3.6.1 Informed Consent

Most studies require the investigator to secure informed consent from the subjects before they participate in the research. Informed consent was achieved by providing subjects with an explanation of the research, an opportunity to terminate their participation at any time with no penalty, and full disclosure of any risks associated with the study. This implied that the subjects had a choice about whether to participate. In this case the researcher asked the subjects to sign a consent form that indicated understanding of the research and consent to participate.

The researcher made sure that the participants were made adequately aware of the type of information she wanted from them, why the information was being sought , what purpose it was to be put to and how they were expected to participate in the

study and how it would directly or indirectly affect them. The researcher, as much as possible, refrained from gathering any information regarded as sensitive or confidential so as not to upset or embarrass a respondent.

3.6.2 Deception of subjects/respondents

The investigator should be as open and honest with the subjects as possible. This usually involves a full disclosure of the purpose of the research but there are circumstances in which either withholding information about the research or deceiving the subjects may be justified.

This may be done in studies where full disclosure would seriously affect the validity of the results. (McMillan and Schumacher 2006, 197). The study being carried out in this case did not involve any risks and, therefore, there was no need for deception of subjects/respondents. The researcher tried to be as open and straight forward as possible.

3.6.3 Violation of privacy

Creswell (2009:91) argues that researchers need to anticipate the possibility of harmful, intimate information being disclosed during the data collection process. It is difficult to anticipate and try to plan for the impact of this information during or after an interview. For example, a student may discuss parental abuse or a prisoner may talk about an escape. Typically in these situations, the ethical code for researchers is to protect the privacy of the participant and to convey this protection to all individuals involved in a study.

Most of the legal constraints placed on researchers since 1974 have focused on protecting the rights and welfare of the subjects (McMillan Schumacher, 2006:199).

All information obtained about the subjects was held confidential unless otherwise agreed on, in advance, through informed consent. This means that no one had access to individual data or the names of the participants except the researcher and the participants were informed of the same before they participated. Confidentiality was ensured by making certain that the data cannot be linked to individual subjects by name.

3.6.4 Actions and competence of researchers.

Since qualitative research is interpretative, where the research is typically involved in the sustained and intensive experience with participants, the researcher has to explicitly identify reflexively his/her biases, values and personal background, such as gender, history, culture and social economic status, that may shape their interpretations formed during a study (Creswell, 2009:177).

McMillan Schumacher (2006:414) goes on to say that reflexivity requires the researcher to do more than self-monitoring and keeping a decision record. Critical reflexivity is the researcher constantly assessing own actions and roles in the entire research process. The researcher in this case constantly reflected and questioned her own assumptions pertaining to what the respondents know as well as their values which are likely to be influenced by the researcher's experiences as a long serving teacher in the area under study.

3.7 METHODOLOGY PRINCIPLES

3.7.1 Validity

Best and Kahn (2009:289) defines validity as that quality of a data-gathering instrument or procedure that enables it to measure what it is supposed to measure; while Henn, Weinstein and Foard (2009:208) indicate that validity concerns the extent to which observations and/or in depth interviews achieve a close approximation to the 'truth' of a particular matter, whether that be respondents view or their actions and whether or not the researcher is calling what is measured by the right name. To enhance validity, the researcher used the following methods as suggested by McMillan and Schumacher (2006:410).

- Member checking within the interviews: questions were rephrased and probing used to obtain complete meanings and understanding of the responses.
- Use of mechanically recorded data: the researcher used a tape recorder to tape the interviews to ensure accurate and relatively complete data.
- Participant review: since the researcher intended to interview only two school principals, the researcher asked them to review the transcripts or synthesis of data obtained from him to her. The participants were asked to modify any information or interpretation of the interview data.

3.7.2 Reliability

Reliability refers to whether scores to items on an instrument are internally consistent, stable overtime (test-retest correlations) and whether there was consistency in test administration and scoring (Creswell, 2009:233). Best and Kahn (2009:297) say that a test is reliable to the extent that it measures whatever it is measuring consistently. Reliable tests are stable in whatever they measure and yield comparable scores on

repeated administration. To test reliability the test retest method was applied, i.e. where the same questionnaires and interviews were given to the same respondents after a period of two weeks and the relationship between the two tests determined using Pearson's correlation coefficient.

3.7.3 Generalizability.

Generalizability is the extent to which the findings of one study can be used as knowledge about other populations and situations –that is to predict (McMillan and Schumacher, 2006:17). Best and Kahn (2009:88) argues that most historians would agree that some generalizations are possible, but they disagree on the validity of applying them to different times and places.

Most qualitative studies employ a case study design in which the single case is not treated as a probability sample of the larger universe. The researcher in this case did not aim at generalization of the results since the research was carried out in only two schools. The results thus were not generalized to the wide population. The intention was to provide for the extension of the findings which enables others to understand similar situations and apply these findings in subsequent researcher or practical situations. McMillan and Schumacher (2006:414) assert that qualitative researchers produce authentic analytical descriptions of phenomena which are informative and useful to research communities, readers and participants.

3.8 CONCLUSION

This chapter gives a report on the research design and research methods used in this study. Ethical measures and data collection and data management and analysis used are also discussed. The next chapter provides the findings of the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the presentation and interpretation of the findings of the study. The study aimed at providing information on the impact of the cost-sharing policy with regard to allocation of education resources. The study also sought to analyze the trends of learners' enrolment, participation and completion rates in secondary education in public schools in Kenya. Data analysis technique adopted in analyzing qualitative data was through content analysis and presented in prose forms. It was also presented in frequency table and in percentages.

Data for the study was collected by conducting individual interviews with school principals and focus groups interviews from the teachers and parents and a questionnaire for the students and analyzing documents relevant for this study. The qualitative data checklist was developed and the checklist clustered along main themes of the research to ease consolidation of information and interpretation and then analyzed through content analysis. Content analysis is the process of analyzing verbal or written communications in a systematic way to measure variables qualitatively (Norusis, 2007).

Analysis was done according to the following sub- questions;

- i. What does the policy of cost sharing in Kenyan schools entail?
- ii. What is the impact of this policy on the enrolment of students?
- iii. Does this cost sharing policy affect completion rates of secondary school students?

- iv. What can the Government, community and parents do to ensure that all students have access to secondary education?

The study also sought to achieve the following objectives;

- i. To identify the main participants in cost sharing in secondary education.
- ii. To find out the impact of the cost sharing policy on the enrolment of students.
- iii. To analyze completion rates of students enrolled into public secondary schools with regard to cost sharing.
- iv. To find out the patterns and trends in financing secondary school education in Kenya.

4.2 RESPONDENT RATES

Data was collected using interview guides. The respondents who participated in the study were two principals, 58 students, 10 teachers and 25 parents. These are the only ones who were contacted after filling the consent forms out of 80 students, 10 teachers and 40 parents. A total of 93 respondents equate to 72 percent.

4.3 THE PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS.

Several questions were asked in order to understand the profile of the respondents as follows.

4.3.1 How long teachers had taught in the same school?

The teachers were requested to indicate the period of time they had taught in the school they were stationed. From the findings, majority (51%) of the respondents indicated that they had taught for three years, 21 % indicated that they had taught for five years, 15% indicated that they had taught for two years, 8% indicated that they

had taught for one year, while 5% indicated that they had taught for thirteen years. It was clear that most teachers had taught in the school for more than two years. This implied that they were aware of the issues concerning their students and were in a position to offer valid information on the subject under investigation.

4.3.2 Parents- How many other children they had in school?

Fifteen of the parents indicated that they had three children in school, seventeen had two while two others said they had one and one parent said that hers had dropped out due to lack of school fees which she could not afford.

4.3.3 Student respondents:

Table 4.1- class of students

Class	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Form 1	16	27.5
Form 2	18	31.0
Form 3	24	41.5
Total	58	100

The respondents were requested to indicate the class they were in. From the findings, majority 24 (41.5%) were in Form three, 18 (31.0%) were in Form two while 16 (27.5%) were student in Form one. The Form four students were sitting for their final exam Kenya Certificate of Secondary Examinations (KCSE) and could not participate in the study.

4.4 THE MEANING OF THE COST SHARING POLICY

4.4.1 The Principals

The principals indicated that the policy of cost sharing in education was a situation where the government catered for part of education cost such as paying of teachers and professional development of workforce in education while the other share of

education costs was catered for by government partners in education such as parents, church organizations, NGOs and the communities. The principals explained that cost sharing policy was adopted due to the high cost the government was experiencing in provision of education, due to the burden of misappropriation and funding of other social services in the economy.

“The government was having difficulties and there was a lot of education funds misappropriation leading to high cost of education and the government could only meet part of the education cost.” stated one of the principals.

4.4.2 Parents.

Asked whether they had heard of the cost sharing policy, the study found that parents were aware of the cost sharing system as they indicated that it was a policy where the government provided part of education costs such as provision of teachers’ remuneration while parents and guardians took part of the education cost such as provision of infrastructure in schools, maintenance cost and providing students with personal necessities.

The findings concurred with Onsomu, Muthaka, Ngware and Kosimbei (2006:1) who found that, through the cost sharing policy, the overall government role was to provide development of professionalism in education, teachers’ remuneration, provision of infrastructure, administration and management as well as provision of bursary and scholarships for needy students. The parents, guardian, CDF, NGOs, the churches and the communities, as well as well-wishers, responsibilities included physical infrastructure development and maintenance, payment of tuition fees, public examinations, catering and accommodation in boarding schools and post-school

institutions, school/college amenities (transport, water, energy and communication), students personal expenses and remuneration of school/college non-teaching staff.

4.4.3 Teachers

The study sought to investigate whether the respondents understood the cost sharing policy in education. From the findings after collection of information through focus interviews, all the teachers indicated that they were well aware of the policy in education. One respondent indicated that *“It was partial funding of the cost of education in school by parent and the government.”*

Another respondent indicated that *“It was a situation where the cost of education is shared between the government and the parents /guardians.”*

It was clear that the respondents understood the cost sharing policy in education. This agrees with Johnson’s (2003:35) definition that cost sharing in education is a shift in the burden of education costs being borne exclusively or predominantly by the government or tax payers to being shared with parents and students.

4.4.4 Student view on cost sharing policy

Table 4.2 Students view on cost sharing

Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	3	5
No	55	95
Total	58	100

On whether the students were aware of cost sharing policy, the study found that 55 (95%) of the student respondents were not aware of the cost sharing policy while 3 (5%) were aware of the cost sharing policy in education. This clearly indicated that students in secondary school are not aware of the cost sharing policy in funding

education. The 5% who knew what it meant indicated that it was a system of funding adopted by the government in catering for education costs. One of the students wrote; “This is the contribution of the government in funding of the education needs.”

4.5 EFFECTS OF COST SHARING POLICY

4.5.1 Principals/ Teachers’ on effects of cost sharing on student in school

The respondents indicated that the cost sharing policy in education had promoted community responsibility towards educating students to secondary school level and enabled many students’ access and participation in secondary education. Some respondents indicated that implementation of cost sharing policy at secondary schools had promoted absenteeism among students; created room for corruption where some schools requested for more school fees than was indicated in the guidelines provided by the government, thereby increasing the cost of secondary education. Martim (2008) observed that the implementation of the cost sharing policy at secondary school level created a leeway for schools to charge higher fees compared to the fees guidelines provided by the Ministry of Education Science and Technology while various categories of schools charged different amounts of school fees which are unmanageable to some parents especially the poor. More specifically, the respondents indicated the various amounts of school fees charged, which could not be afforded by some parents, especially the poor.

As indicated earlier by Miruka, Akinyi and Mangoa (2009), five students from Nyanza province who were admitted to national schools could not report because of lack of school fees. Martim, (2008) further indicated that access to public secondary schools and universities by the poor had remained elusive despite government efforts to ensure equity in provision of education as an effect of cost sharing policy and

argued that, despite tuition waiver in secondary schools, children from poor backgrounds had continued being marginalized in education accessibility and equity (Daily Nation, May 8th 2008: 14.5).

4.5.2 Parents

Some parents indicated that cost sharing policy had effects of ensuring parents or guardians had to participate in meeting the cost of their children education. Others could not specifically identify the effects of the policy but they indicated that so long as they were able to pay for their children school fees, they were happy with the policy. Others felt that the policy had the effect of ensuring parents and other parties responsible for educating student had to work extra hard in order to educate their children. One of the parents indicated that,

“It affects me in the sense that I have to work extra hard to get more money to maintain my children in school”

The respondent also indicated that dropouts and repetition cases were reported in the schools and this significantly contributed to unequal access to education.

Kiveu and Mayio (2009:1) had observed that cost sharing had mainly affected the poor because they could not afford the cost of the secondary education which is beyond the reach of not only the poor but also the middle income families.

4.5.3 Students

4.5.3.1 Year of joining the school

Table 4.3 Year of joining school

Year	Frequency	Percentage (%)
2011	14	24.1
2010	23	39.7
2009	21	36.2
Total	58	100

The study found that most, 23 (39.7%), of the respondents join the school in the year 2010, 21 (36.2%) indicated that they joined the school in the year 2009 while 14 (24.2%) indicated that they joined the school in the year 2011. From this group of respondents, at least five of them had transferred from other schools.

4.5.3.2 Why the students left their former school?

From the findings, two students who left their former school to join their current one indicated that their parents could not afford the school fees charged in their former school, while one indicated that his parents brought him to a school near their home to cut on travel expenses since he was in a day school. The last two could not quite tell why the parents decided to transfer them to their current school. This clearly indicated that the cost sharing policy influenced the placement of students in the type of school the learners were placed.

4.5.3.3 Whether the respondents had ever been sent home due to lack of school fees:

Table 4.4 Number of students sent home and those not sent home for school fees

Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	30	51
No	28	49
Total	58	100

On whether the students had ever been sent home due to school fees problems, 30 (51%) indicated that they had been sent home due to lack of school fees while 28 (49%) indicated that they had never been sent home due to lack of school fee. This was clear that majority of the parent were burdened by the cost sharing policy in catering for their children education as not all parents were able to pay school fees for their children. This concurred with Njeru and Orodho (2008:2).who indicated that cost sharing strategy had become problematic as parents had to shoulder an increasingly large portion of the costs thus creating a negative impact on the poor and vulnerable households.

Table 4.5: Period students stayed at home

Period of time Stayed at home	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Less than a week	12	40.0
1 Week	8	27.0
1-2 week	7	23.0
2-3 weeks	3	10.0
Total	30	100

On the period the students stayed at home after being sent home for lack of fees, 12 (40%) of the respondents indicated that they had stayed at home for less than a week i.e. three or four days, 8 (27%) of the students indicated that they stayed at home for 1 week, 7 (23.0%) of the respondents indicated that they stayed at home for 1-2 week, whilst 3 (10%) of the student respondent indicated that they stayed at home for 2-3

weeks. It was clear from the findings that most students had been sent home which then implies that raising enough money to educate students is still a great problem.

4.5.3.4 How funds were raised for student to go back to school.

There were different ways through which money to take the students back to school was raised. From the findings, some of the methods employed include; contribution by the family members, others said that their parents paid from their salaries and were able to go back to school after one, two or three days. The study found that others went to help their parent in picking tea to raise school fees while yet others indicated that they went back to school even though they were unable to get school fees. The School Principal for two of the respondents said the students had found some well-wishers to sponsor them. The findings concurred with Penrose (1998) who observed that children in Ghana collect money from both parents as well as relatives to pay fees, and there appears to be less direct financial relationships between parents and schools as in other countries. Penrose further noted those children also received money from several sources with 44% reported receiving money from parents, 28% from father only and 14% from mother only and 9% from other relatives. It was clear that fees charged in schools was at a level higher than could be afforded by many parents who were probably poor, causing enrolment rate to fall.

4.5.3.5 How the students made for the lost time:

Table 4.6 How students made for the lost time

Means of recovering for the lost time	Frequency	Percent
Extra tuition by teachers	7	23
Assistance from other student	20	67
Never made up	3	10

The students who had been sent home due to lack of school fees adopted different measures of recovering for the lost time. From the findings, 20 (67.0%) of the respondents indicated that they sought assistance from other students, 7 (23%) of the respondents indicated that they sought assistance from the teachers for extra tuition while 3 (10%) of the respondents indicated that they were unable to cover for the lost time they were out of school. The study revealed that school fees and other related direct costs had become too high for parents to afford given their low average incomes and hence some could not afford to keep their children in school especially at secondary level. The students who stayed out of school for a long period of time recorded a decline in performance and this resulted in despondency and low self-esteem.

4.5.3.6 Identification of needy students

The school principals and teachers were asked how they were able to identify the needy students in their schools and one principal indicated that the students, on joining the school, are made to fill a questionnaire that sought to collect as much background information about the learners as was possible. The teachers also made a follow-up as they interacted with the learners in and out of class.

Individual parents also made personal visits to school where they disclosed a lot of information about themselves and their children. In Kenya, bursary scheme was introduced to cater for needy students to ensure they get access to secondary education but the project was wrought with inadequate finances, weak administrative systems and questionable bursary eligibility.

4.5.3.7 Whether the parents benefitted from any Bursary Fund

The Government, through the Ministry of Education, introduced a bursary scheme as one of the safety measures to cushion the poor and the vulnerable groups against the adverse effects of cost sharing policy. From the findings, majority indicated that they had never benefitted from bursary schemes implying that the bursary schemes were neither adequate, efficient nor effective. This concurred with Njeru and Orodho (2008) who indicated that the bursary scheme, however, remains inefficient and ineffective due to poor access and participation as a result of poor quality of service, bad governance and management weaknesses.

One parent who indicated that she had benefitted from the bursary scheme said that the money she got was too little as it had to be shared by very many applicants. There was, however, one parent who was happy because the school where the daughter was operates a bursary scheme for the needy students and her daughter's school fees was paid in full from that fund.

4.6 THE IMPACT OF COST SHARING POLICY ON ENROLMENT OF STUDENTS.

According to the two principals interviewed, the cost sharing policy was found to have positive and negative effects on enrolment and student completion of education as most of the best students from needy families were sponsored by the CDF, Banks e.g. Equity Bank and NGOs as well as other government agencies such as Jomo Kenyatta Foundation. However, there were parents who chose to enroll their children in provincial and district schools even if they qualified to go to national schools because of the high school fees charged in the latter. Kiveu and Mayo (2009:274) had observed that the cost sharing policy might be the cause of increased dropouts,

absenteeism and repetition in secondary schools. The same study reported that some teachers had observed that absenteeism led to poor performance which in turn led to repetition that overburdened the parents who were made to incur extra costs.

4.7 EFFECTS ON COMPLETION

4.7.1 Principals/Teachers

One of the principals interviewed indicated that none of her students dropped out of school due to lack of school fees as the school operates a bursary scheme for the needy students. The other one who heads a district school confirmed that there were students who were completely unable to raise school fees and at least two of his students were unable to complete their secondary education. This was a clear indication that indeed the cost sharing policy did affect the completion rates of students in secondary schools.

4.7.2 Parents

The parents all seemed to agree that it was a great struggle for most of them to keep their children in schools and ensure that they completed their secondary education. One openly said “I have to struggle to ensure that at least this one gets to complete her studies as my first two children dropped in form one and two as I was completely unable to pay for their education”. There were no documents in the two schools to show that any student had left school due to lack of school fees but there were indications of transfers from boarding to a day school which could be pegged on school fees.

4.8 REFLECTION

According to (EFA, 2001) secondary education is part of basic education in Kenya. Failure to provide basic education seriously compromises a country's effort to reduce poverty. This also implies that the millennium development goal of providing basic education to all by the year 2015 will not be realized. Basic education of acceptable quality is crucial in equipping disadvantaged individuals with the means to contribute to and benefit from economic growth. Education is one of the most powerful instruments societies have for reducing deprivation and vulnerability. It helps lift health of parents and children, reduce fertility and child mortality and affords the disadvantaged a voice in society and the political system (Psacharopolous & Woodhall, 1985).

Education investments are crucial for sustained economic growth, which low - income countries are seeking to stimulate and without which long - term poverty reduction is impossible. Education directly contributes to worker productivity and can promote better natural resources management and more rapid technological adaptation and innovation. It is fundamental to the creation of a competitive knowledge-based economy, not only for the direct production of the critical mass of scientists and skilled workers that every country requires but broad based education is associated with faster diffusion of information within the economy, which is crucial for enabling workers and citizens in both traditional and modern sectors to increase productivity (Psacharopoulos & Woodhall, 1985).

Research has shown that nations with most of the population literate and in which all children complete at least a basic education have higher quality institutions, stronger democratic process and as consequence, more equitable development policies. To

achieve these in Kenya, the government should come up with financing policies that will enable a good % of Kenyans to complete at least the basic level of education.

4.9 PARTICIPANTS OF THE COST SHARING POLICY

4.9.1 Principals/Teachers

On who were benefactors or sponsors, the respondents indicated that there were parties responsible in helping school fees payment and other needs which included the church, non-governmental organizations, CDF, parent and guardians. One of the schools operated a bursary fund for needy students that raised money through staging charity walks that were sponsored by several companies and individuals while the other school was located within a tea estate that helped in financing some of the school projects.

4.9.2 Findings from the students

Table 4.7 Findings from the students

Party Responsible for paying school fees	Frequency	Percent
Parent	45	77.6
NGO's	10	17.2
Community Development fund	2	3.4
Church	1	1.8
Total	58	100

On who paid student fees, 45 (77.6%) of the respondents indicated that it was their parents who paid the school fees, 10 (17.2%) indicated that some NGOs paid for their school fees, 2 (3.4%) indicated that the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) catered for their school fees while 1(1.8%) indicated that school fees was paid by their church. The findings were in line with Government of Kenya (1988) report which indicated that cost sharing policy required most costs in education to be met through

partnerships between public sector and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO's), religious organizations, development partners and communities .

As regards any other parties that helped in paying of school fees, the respondents indicated that Equity bank, through its scholarship schemes, helped in paying school fees for needy students from all over the country and there were also some individuals who identified needy students from their communities and offered to educate them.

4.10 WHAT CAN THE GOVERNMENT, COMMUNITY AND PARENTS DO TO ENSURE THAT ALL STUDENTS ACCESS TO SECONDARY EDUCATION?

4.10.1 Principals /Teachers

These respondents felt that the government still had a great role to play in ensuring that all students had access to secondary education. Some indicated that the government should increase the education budget to include boarding and uniform fees for needy students, make secondary education free and compulsory for needy and bright students, and enhance the Bursary Scheme to be more effective in helping the needy and vulnerable students. One school principal observed that the schools were managed by well-wishers (Board of Governors) who are not in touch with the day to day learning of the school and, since they are not paid for the services they offer to schools, may lack the commitment that is needed. She felt that, if the government employed professionals at district levels to be in charge of all the schools in their jurisdiction, this would not only improve the school academic performance but would ensure that all deserving children get access to education. They observed that if the government made secondary education free, this would be a better way of identifying

the needy and vulnerable and it would be easier to help them while in school other than allowing them to get wasted at home which in most cases leads to child labor.

4.10.2 Parents

On what the government could do to help in reducing the burden of fees, parents felt that the government should allocate more funds to the education sector to enable schools to have adequate learning facilities and to prevent misuse of the policy as some schools may use the policy to ask for exorbitant school fees that is not affordable by needy and vulnerable students. Parents also indicated that they would wish the government to subsidize the cost of education further by not only providing professional development, teachers' remuneration and provision of infrastructure, but also offering education free for needy students. One of the parents indicated "*The government should subsidize school fees as much as possible and provide schools with adequate facilities*"

This was clear that the government was not doing enough but could undertake to improve the cost sharing funding system to improve accessibility to secondary education for all the students irrespective of their social economic background. Asked how they raise money to educate their children, some parents said that they use their family resources to ensure that their children remain in school, most of those who are salaried often have to take bank and cooperative loans to sustain their children in school.

Others indicated that they had to operate more than one job to raise enough money to educate their children. They, therefore, felt that the government could approach more NGO's and Government agencies and persuade them to partner in ensuring that all Kenyan students access secondary education since, as was noted earlier by EFA

(2001), secondary education is part of basic education in Kenya and failure to provide basic education seriously compromises a country's effort in reducing poverty.

4.11 CONCLUSION

The chapter presents the analysis of the study giving findings and interpretations. The analysis was done as per given objective of the study. The information provided by the respondents enabled the study to answer the study research questions. The study established that cost sharing policy had negative effects on completion of education among the students and this was clearly demonstrated by the in-depth interview of the principal, parent and teacher respondents. The study also found that there are still more measures that could be adopted for improving the policy to make education more accessible. The next chapter gives the summary of the findings, conclusion and recommendations guided by the study objectives.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The final chapter of this study presents the summary, conclusion and recommendations for future study. The aim of this study was to provide information on the impact of the cost sharing policy with regard to allocation of education resources.

In Chapter 1, background to the study (1.1), statement of the problem (1.2), aims, significance and objectives of the study as well as the research design were discussed. Chapter 2 provided an overview of the impact of the cost sharing policy in Kenya and in other countries such as Ghana (2.5.1), Jamaica (2.5.2) and Eritrea (2.5.3).

In Chapter 3, the qualitative research design and methodology were described. Chapter 4 provided the findings of the research results which were presented in relation to the research question. The purpose of this chapter was to present a summary of the study, to depict conclusions and present recommendations in accordance with the research results.

5.2 SUMMARIES.

5.2.1 Chapter one

Chapter one dealt with the background to the impact of the policy of cost sharing, citing the documents that were instrumental in the launching of the cost sharing policy (the Kamunge report). The chapter was divided into several sub-sections as follows; background to the study (1.1) which highlighted the genesis and implementation of the cost sharing policy; statement of the problem (1.2); research questions (1.3). In this last sub section, the main research question was; *how the policy of the cost*

sharing policy has affected secondary education in Kenya? The sub section was further broken into four sub questions for ease of investigation. The aims and objectives (1.4) were well stipulated based on the research questions and the sub-questions. This was followed by the significance of the study (1.5) that can be found on page 7. It stated the significance and the implications of the study. The theoretical framework (i.e. the classical liberal theory) guiding this study was discussed in section 1.6 and the relationship between this theory and the problem under investigation brought out. This was followed by the research method (1.7) used in interactive qualitative research method and why it was picked as the most appropriate for this study. There is a small sub section on limitations and delimitations of the study (1.8) as well as organization of the study (1.9) from Chapter one to chapter five. A list of terms used and their definitions are found in sub section 1.10 and this is followed by a conclusion (1.11) of chapter one.

5.2.2 Chapter Two

This chapter sought to review literature on the impact of cost sharing policy in Kenya as well as in other countries. A brief background to the study was given in section 1.1 which tried to explore the launch and genesis of cost sharing in education. As noted by Ngware, 2007:15(24), financing of education had always been a challenge to the government, parents and communities at large and, therefore, identifying sustainable financing options that maximized on cost effectiveness in resource utilization was critical. Various countries that were on track in achieving Universal Primary Education (UPE) were looking for innovative strategies and financing options for expanding secondary education, consistent with national human capital development goals.

However, fiscal constraints prevent many, especially low income countries, from relying solely on government revenue for financing desired education expansion. The Government of Kenya introduced the cost sharing policy in 1988, which required that most costs in education be met through partnerships between public sector and NGOs, religious organizations, development partners and communities (Government of Kenya 1988). The main aim of the cost sharing policy was to reduce education cost burden on the government while ensuring cost effectiveness in the utilization of education facilities, equipment, materials and personnel, with a view to maintaining growth, quality and relevance of education and training. Onsomu, Muthaka, Ngware and Kosimbei, 2006:29 had noted that the implementation of cost sharing policy at secondary level had given a leeway for schools to charge higher fees compared to the fees guidelines provided by the Ministry of Education, thereby increasing the cost burden for households despite the levels of public funding. Njeru and Orodho (2008:31) had also noted that the cost sharing policy had a negative impact on the poor and vulnerable households as parents had to shoulder an increasingly large portion of the cost. This was further confirmed by Kiveu and Mayio (2009) in a study that revealed that cost sharing had mainly affected the poor because they could not afford the cost of secondary education which is beyond the reach of not only the poor but also the middle income families. This study found out from all the countries studied that secondary education is strategically placed in such a way that it connects primary, tertiary education and the labor market. Unfortunately most of the students from the poor countries were locked out at this crucial stage due to the cost sharing policy. This findings contradict the Classical liberal theory which states that social mobility will be promoted by equal opportunity in education as cost sharing clearly discriminates students from poor backgrounds who withdraw from school

prematurely. The governments in these countries, therefore, had a responsibility in identifying feasible and sustainable financing options to insure all their students had access to secondary education.

5.2.3 Chapter Three

This Chapter outlined the methodology and data collection methods employed to investigate the research question. It detailed how the study was undertaken, how the school principals, teachers, parents and students were selected for interviews, the data collection procedures and instruments and the methods of data analysis, with discourses being the unit of analysis. Attention was dedicated to the research questions and objectives of the study (sections 1.3 and 1.4), Qualitative research approach was discussed in section 3.3. Ethics in qualitative research (section 3.4), Methodology principles followed in section 3.5 and data management and analysis (section 3.7) detailing the content analysis and the steps followed.

5.2.4 Chapter Four

The transcribed individual and focus group interviews and the students' questionnaires were analyzed and the emerging and similar categories were clustered together under fitting descriptions in this chapter. The following descriptive categories emerged based on the objectives of the research study.

- The meaning of cost sharing policy
- Effects of the cost sharing policy
- The impact of the cost sharing policy on enrolment of students
- Effects on completion
- What the Government, community and parents can do to ensure that all students have secondary education.

Each of the categories above was discussed in accordance with the view of the participants who included the school principals, teachers, parents and students. Their views and feelings were summarized and discussed in sequence.

5.3 CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY.

From the literature reviewed, it was clear that, in the cost sharing policy, the government's role included professional development and remuneration of teachers in public institutions and provisions of infrastructure while the responsibilities of other key players included payment of tuition fees, public examinations, catering and accommodation in boarding schools and post school institutions, school/college amenities (transport, water, energy and immunization), students' personal expenses and remuneration of non-teaching staff. This was still a huge responsibility for the parents and communities, especially the poor.

The escalation of school fees at secondary level had been the immediate consequence of the cost sharing policy in Kenya as well as in other countries. Access to public secondary schools and universities by the poor had remained elusive despite the government efforts to ensure equity in provisions of education. As earlier indicated, Martim (2008) had argued that children from poor backgrounds had continued to be marginalized as some national schools charges were in excess of Kshs 60,000 annually.

From the findings of the study, it was revealed that enrolment had been increasing and the schools tried as much as possible to retain their students in school as they had sought different measures of assisting them.

One school operated a bursary fund for needy students and looked for individuals to sponsor some of the needy students. However, the study also established from principals, teachers and parents that drop-out affected the poor in most cases and that

high rates of absenteeism were associated with school fees as students were regularly sent home for school fees.

School administrators did not follow the fees guidelines provided by the Ministry of Education and they regarded them as unrealistic hence charged what they felt was realistic. Parents viewed cost sharing as a burden. The costs of education were too high, especially for the poor parents and they called for a reduction of education costs. Some parents and students were not aware of the cost sharing policy or their role as far as the policy is concerned.

5.4 LIMITATIONS

This study was carried out in only two public schools, a national and a district day school. Provincial and private schools were left out. The study also did not include the candidate class as they were sitting the Kenya National Examinations at the time of the study.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher makes the following recommendations:

- The government should sensitize the public on the need of the cost sharing policy so as to bring many players aboard.
- The government should establish the unit cost of secondary education and come up with fee guidelines that are acceptable to all and put in place policies to ensure that school administrators adhere to these fee guidelines.
- The government should introduce effective policies in identifying the bright and poor students so that they are not left out of secondary education due to lack of school fees.

- The government should also come up with effective policies of identifying committed school managers (Board of Governors) to assist in the administration of the bursary fund to reach the poor who are supposed to be the only beneficiaries.
- There is need for schools to start income generating projects and encourage both parents and students to participate in order to subsidize the cost of education.
- Schools should make a follow up on students who stayed out of school for more than one week and assist them to catch up on what they have lost while at home. This will make the students not to feel marginalized because they are poor.
- There is need for the introduction of a better method of financing education that would enable the poor to join schools of their choice and those they qualify to join.
- That the Government institutes better management and controls to minimize misappropriation of available financial resources.

5.6 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY.

As this research was done in only two secondary schools in Limuru District, the results cannot be generalized. There is, therefore, need to carry out further research in more learning institutions on the topic, to determine the influence and impact on this policy in the whole country as this would go a long way in assisting the policy makers adopt measures that will enable all students in secondary schools access the much desired education that would make them better scholars and citizens.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Best W.J and Kahn V. James, 2009. *Research in Education*: New Delhi, Pearl offset press private limited.

Citifonline.com/Ghana.

Common Wealth Education Fund, 2003. *Reform Agenda for Education Sector in Kenya*. Setting Beacons for Policy and Legislative Framework. Nairobi :Elimu Yetu Coalition.

Country studies. us/carribbean islands

Daily Nation, January 11th 2002, May 8th 2008 (14:5).

De Vos, A.S, 1998(a). *Conceptualization and operationalisation*. In De Vos, A.S(Ed). *Research at grassroots. A primer for the caring professions*. Pretoria: Van Schaik publishers.

Eshiwani G.S,1993. *Education in Kenya since Independence Nairobi*: East African Publishers Ltd.

Government of Kenya 2005a. *Sessional paper No.1 of 2005 on policy Frameworks for Education Training and Research*, Nairobi Government Printer.

Government of Kenya, 1988. *Report of the Presidential working party of Education and Manpower Training for the next Decade and beyond*. Nairobi, Government Printer.

Government of Kenya, 2003, 2004, 2005 *Appropriations Accounts*, Nairobi. Government Printer.

Government of Kenya 2005. *Kenya Education sector support programme*. Nairobi Government Printer

Graham-Brown S, 1988. *Education in the developing world: conflict crisis*: New York: Addison Wesley Longman Inc,

[Http://www.kensap.org](http://www.kensap.org)

[Http://www.devdata.worldbank.org](http://www.devdata.worldbank.org)

Institute of Policy Analysis and Research; policy brief Volume 9, issue 23, 2003

John W Creswell, 2009. *Research Design*, SAGE Publications; Singapore.

Johnstone, D.B, 2003a. *Cost-sharing in higher education: Tuition, Finance assistance: and accessibility* Czech Sociological Review, 39(3), 351-374.

Kiveu N and Maiyo J, 2009. *The impact of cost-sharing on internal efficiency of public secondary schools in Ndivisi division of Bungoma district, Kenya*; Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology.

Kombo D & Tromp , 2006. *Proposal and Thesis Writing: An introduction, Kenya*: Paulines Publications Africa.

Lewin K & Cailloids F, 2001. *Financing Secondary Education in Developing Countries*. UNESCO, International Institute for Education Planning.

Lewin K & Cailloids F, 2002. *Financing Secondary Education in Developing Countries*. UNESCO Publishing .

Macmillan H & Schumacher S, 2006. *Research in Education. Evidence-based Inquiry 6th Edition*. Boston: Pearson Education. Inc.

Manda D K, Mwabu G and Kimenyi M S, 2004. *Human Capital externalities and returns to education in Kenya*. KIPPRA Discussion paper No. 13, Nairobi: Kenya Institute Public Policy Research and Analysis.

Marcucci P, Johnson B, and Ngolovoi M ,2008. Higher educational cost-sharing, Dual-Track Tuition fees and Higher education access: The East African experience.

Martim, E 2008, '*Inequalities in Education: Poor Still Marginalized.*' Daily Nation 8th May, 2008, 14:5

Matt Henn, Mark Weinstein and Nick Foard, 2009. *A critical introduction to social research*. SAGE Publications; London.

Ministry of Education Science and Technology, 2005.*Ministerial Public Expenditure Review*, Nairobi Government Printer.

World Bank 1999, Ministry or Education; Elimu News; Issue No.2 December 2007 Nairobi. Elimu News.

MOEST (Draft). *Education Sector Strategic Plan*, 2003:007; September 2003

Ngware, NN, Onsomu, EN & Muthaka, DI, 2007. *Financing Secondary Education in Kenya: Cost reduction and Financing options*. Education Policy Analysis Archives 15(24).

Njeru E and Orodho J, 2003. *Education Financing in Kenya Secondary School - Bursary scheme implementation and challenges*. Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (IPAR DP/035/2003), Nairobi.

Norusis, M, 2004. SPSS. *Guide to data analysis*, Upper Saddle River, N.J- Prentice Hall.

Odada, J.E.O & Odhiambo, LO (Eds), 1989. *Cost sharing in Kenya*. Nairobi UNICEF, Planning section.

Onsomu EN, Muthaka D, Ngware M and Kosimbei G, 2006. *Financing of Secondary Education in Kenya: Costs and Options*. Nairobi: Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA)

Onsomu EN, Muthaka D and Manda DK, 2005. *Draft Paper on access, determinants and strategies for expanding secondary education in Kenya*, Nairobi. Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis.

Orodho J A, 2002. *Enhancing Access and Participation in Secondary education among the poor and vulnerable through bursary in Kenya*. A consultancy paper submitted to the Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (IPAR) for publication.

Orodho, J. A, 2009. *Elements of Education and Social Science Research Methods*; Maseno; Kanezja.

Orodho, J.A and Njeru, E, 2003. *Education Financing in Kenya; Secondary bursary scheme implementation and challenges*, IPAR, DP/035/2003. Nairobi; Institute of Policy Analysis and Research.

Psacharopoulos G, Woodhall M, 1985. *Education for Development. An analysis of Investment Choices*, Washington D. C Oxford University Press.

Penrose Penran, 1998. *Cost sharing in Education; Public Finance School and Household perspectives*. Education Research Serial No. 27.

Pontefract C and Hardman F, 2005. 'The Discourse of Classroom Interaction in Kenyan Primary Schools'; in the *Journal of Comparative Education*. Oxfordshire: Routledge Journals, Taylor and Francis Group Ltd. 41:1.87 – 106

Ravinder Rena, 2004 *Financing of Education in Eritrea – A case stud of Zoba Mackel*: Asmara. Eritrea Institute of Technology SAGE Publications; London.

UNESCO, 2002. *Financing Education – Investment and Return*: Paris, UNESCO Publishing

Vanus, James and Colin William, 2002 *Impact of cost sharing on Education. Reform of Secondary Education (Rose 11)* Washington DC: The World Bank.

Weidman J, 1995. *Diversifying Finance Education Systems in the Third world: The Case of Kenya and Mongolia*.

World Bank ,2005. *Expanding opportunities and building competences for young people*. A new Agenda for Secondary Education.

World Bank ,2003. Life long learning in the global knowledge economy: Challenges for developing countries, Washington DC: World Bank.

www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/intHigherEdu.Finance. www.unesco.org.

APPENDIX 1

LETTER SEEKING PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN LIMURU DISTRICT.

Jedidah Wanjiru Wambugu
P.O. Box 340, 00217
LIMURU

District Education Officer
Limuru District

Dear Sir,

REF: PERMISSION TO CARRY OUT RESEARCH IN THE DISTRICT.

I am writing to request for permission to carry out a research project on “The Impact of the Policy of Cost Sharing in Secondary Schools in Kenya”.

The research is part of my Master of Education: Education Management degree and I am undertaking at the University of South Africa (UNISA).

The research will be carried out in six schools in your district, two Nationals, two Provincial schools and two District schools. It will strictly adhere to the UNISA Research Ethics regulations.

Yours faithfully,

JEDIDAH WAMBUGU

APPENDIX 2

INTRODUCTION LETTER TO SCHOOL HEADS.

Jedidah Wanjiru Wambugu
P.O. Box 340, 00217
LIMURU

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

I am a student of the University of South Africa pursuing a Master of Education Management degree. I am conducting a research on the impact of the policy of cost sharing in Secondary Education and I have picked your school among others for this study.

I will be interviewing you, two of your teachers and with your help; I will administer questionnaires to some of your students. The interviews will be audio taped for verification of findings. I will be calling you in the next two weeks to answer any questions you might have and confirm your willingness to participate.

I will also be interviewing some of your parents and would therefore request you to kindly let me know when you have a parents meeting so that I can talk to them.

Thank you for your time. Looking forward to working with you.

Yours sincerely,

JEDIDAH WAMBUGU

APPENDIX 3

PARTICIPANTS' INFORMATION SHEET.

The following was used in the informational phase for each interview.

1. Thank you so much for agreeing to talk with me today.
2. As I told you in the letter and on phone, this research is for a Master Thesis on the impact of the cost sharing policy in Secondary School.
3. Should we veer off into any area that makes you uncomfortable, please let me know and we will move on to something else.
4. Kindly correct me, if you think I have missed a point or misread your answer.
5. Your participation is strictly voluntary and you don't have to respond to every question.
6. I want to assure you that complete confidentiality will be maintained.
7. The interview will last 45-60 minutes and will be audio taped for verification of findings.
8. Please feel free to ask any questions at any time.

APPENDIX 4

CONSENT FORM

I..... (Please print your name)
have read and understood the nature of the research project and agree to participate as requested. I understand the regulations governing this research and grant consent for my interview to be tape-recorded.

I understand that my identity and that of my school will be kept anonymous and that any information provided by me will be treated confidential.

I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am not obliged to share information that I am not comfortable revealing.

Signed: _____ Date _____

APPENDIX 5

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PRINCIPALS

1. Can you share with me your understanding of the policy of cost sharing?
2. Can you tell me how it affects your school in terms of (i) enrolment (ii) completion rate.
3. What do you think the Government should do to ensure that all students have access to secondary education?
4. Are there some projects that have stalled as a result of this policy?
5. Apart from the parents and the government, who are the other contributors/donor?
6. How do you maintain needy students in school?
7. What changes can be made to the policy to overcome the challenges?
8. Is there a standing bursary fund in your school?
9. How do you raise money to replenish the fund after drawing from it to pay fees?

APPENDIX 6

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS: TEACHERS

1. For how long have you taught in this school?
2. What do you understand by the cost sharing policy?
3. From your own perspective how does cost sharing affect the students in this school?
4. Do you have any students who drop out due to lack of school fees?
5. About how many; per class /year?
6. Do you send students home for school fees?
7. How long do they take before they come back to school?
8. If they are completely unable, do you make a follow up?
9. Who are the benefactors and sponsors?
10. How do they make up for the lost time?
11. What do you think should be done to ensure that all students have access to secondary education?
12. How do you identify the needy students in your school?
13. Other than school fees, do they lack other basic commodities.
14. How does the school assist them?

APPENDIX 7

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS: PARENTS

1. Have you ever heard of cost sharing policy? Can you share with me your understanding of this policy?
2. How does it affect you as a parent?
3. What would you want the Government do to help reduce the fee burden?
4. How many other children do you have in school?
5. How do you pay for their school fees?
6. Who pays for the balance?
7. What would you want the government to do to help reduce the fee burden?
8. Have you benefitted from any bursary funds?
9. What changes can be made to the process of identification of needy pupils and the disbursements thereof?
10. What do you think of the arrangement where students work in school to offset part of the fees?

APPENDIX 8

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS (Tick as appropriate)

1. In which class/Form are you?
F1 F2 F3 F4
2. When did you join this school?
2011, 2010, 2009, 2008
3. If you did not join in Form One, why did you leave your former school?
4. Have you ever heard of the cost sharing policy?
Yes/No
5. In your opinion, what does it mean?
6. How does it affect you?
7. Who finances your Education?
i) Parent ii) Guardian iii) Constituency Development Fund iv) Church
8. Is there any other financier other than the above? Specify.
9. Have you ever been sent home due to lack of school fees?
Yes /No.
10. If yes, for how long did you stay at home?
i) Less than 1 week ii) 1 week iii) 1-2 weeks iv) 2-3 weeks
11. State how the money was raised to take you back to school?
12. How did you make up for the lost time?
i) Extra Tuition by teachers
ii) Assistance by other students
iii) Never made up.

APPENDIX 9

PROPOSED FEE STRUCTURE FOR A NATIONAL SCHOOL

<u>PROPOSED SCHOOL FEES STRUCTURE FOR THE YEAR 2012</u>						
<u>MAIN (WHOLE SCHOOL)</u>						
<u>VOTE-HEAD</u>						
			TOTAL	1stTERM	2nd TERM	3rd TERM
			<u>KSHS</u>	<u>KSHS</u>	<u>KSHS</u>	<u>KSHS</u>
1	TUITION		3,300.00	1,300.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
2	BOARDING EQUIPMENT		21,300.00	7,300.00	7,000.00	7,000.00
3	REPAIRS, MAINTENANCE & IMPROVEMENT		5,100.00	1,800.00	1,700.00	1,600.00
4	ELECTRICITY. WATER & CONSERVANCIES		7,000.00	2,500.00	2,300.00	2,200.00
5	LOCAL TRAVELING & TRANSPORT		3,100.00	1,100.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
6	CONTINGENCIES		4,400.00	1,600.00	1,400.00	1,400.00
7	PERSONAL EMOLUMENTS		10,400.00	3,600.00	3,500.00	3,300.00
8	ACTIVITY		1,000.00	400.00	300.00	300.00
9	MEDICAL		400.00	150.00	150.00	100.00
10	GRATUITY		<u>1,000.00</u>	<u>400.00</u>	<u>300.00</u>	<u>300.00</u>
	SUB-TOTAL		57,000.00	20,150.00	18,650.00	18,200.00
				-		
	<u>OTHER SCHOOL CHARGES</u>					
11	DEVELOPMENT		4,000.00	2,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
12	DISTRICT SMASSE FUND		100.00	100.00	-	-
	<u>ALL STUDENTS</u>					

1	LABORATORIES COMPLEX	FORM 1	8,000.00	2,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00
		FORM 11	2,000.00	2,000.00	-	-
2	PARENTS TEACHERS ASSOCIATION	ALL	5,600.00	1,900.00	1,900.00	1,800.00
3	INSURANCE COVER	ALL	1,200.00	1,200.00	-	-
			-			
	<u>OTHER INDIVIDUAL CHARGES</u>					
1	CAUTION MONEY	FORM I	500.00	500.00	-	-
2	K. N. E. C. EXAMS (Advance)	FORM11	2,000.00	700.00	700.00	600.00
	K. N. E. C. EXAMS (Advance)	FORM111	2,200.00	800.00	800.00	600.00
	K. N. E. C. EXAMS (Balance)	FORM1V	-	-	-	-
3	UNIVERSITY APPLICATION FEES	FORM 1V	300.00	300.00	-	-
4	COMPUTER STUDIES ONLY WHO TAKE		2,500.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	500.00
5	HOME SCIENCE ONLY WHO TAKE	FORM 111	3,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
		FORM 1V	3,500.00	2,000.00	1,500.00	-
	STUDENTS ID	FORM 1	200.00	200.00		
			<u>FORM 1</u>	<u>FORM 2</u>	<u>FORM 3</u>	<u>FORM 4</u>
		TOTAL	79,100.00	74,400.00	70,100.00	68,200.00