



Full Length Research Article

CHALLENGES IN FINANCING DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS IN PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN IJARA DISTRICT IN GARISSA COUNTY, KENYA

Paul Kigaya Karogo and *John Aluko Orodho

Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies, School of Education,
Kenyatta University, Kenya

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 21st March, 2014
Received in revised form
03rd April, 2014
Accepted 11th May, 2014
Published online 25th June, 2014

Key words:

*Financing, Development project,
Facilities,
Low -cost boarding School,
Non-Governmental Organizations,
Mobile school,
Ijara District,
Garissa County,
Kenya.*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the challenges in financing development projects in public primary schools in Ijara district, Garissa County. The objectives of the study were to find out the major financiers of development projects and the challenges and possible solutions to challenges faced in financing development projects in public primary schools in Ijara District, Garissa County, Kenya. The study was premised on Getzel Systems theory (1968) which states that schools are social systems bound by set of elements, subsystems and activities that interact and constitute a social entity. The study adopted a multi-case study approach for the aim of obtaining an in-depth description of experiences of particular cases(in this case, schools) in the financing challenges for development projects. Purposive sampling was used to select 12 out of 42 primary schools to constitute the cases of interest. The respondents were twelve (12) headteachers and twelve (12) PTA chairpersons from the selected schools. Interview schedules and observation guides were used to collect data. The study found out that there were many sources of financing for school development projects. The Government of Kenya through the Ministry of Education and the Ministry for the Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands were the major financiers of school projects. The constituency development fund (CDF) had been used to put up major school facilities. There were many non- governmental organizations operating in Ijara district that assisted to put up educational facilities. Parents contributions was minimal due to various factors key among them poverty among households. The study recommended that the parents, communities, pupils and stakeholders be actively involved in the development and implementation of school development plans. Income generating activities suited to arid areas like irrigation farming were proposed as an additional source of funds.[295 words]

Copyright © 2014 Paul Kigaya Karogo and John Aluko Orodho. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Background to the study

Recent statistics indicates that education sector budget in Kenya has generally been increasing over the years particularly after the introduction of Free Primary Education (FPE) in 2003 and Free Day Secondary Education (FDSE) in 2008 (Orodho, 2014; Republic of Kenya, 2012a,12b). The public spending in education sector was allocated colossal funding which increased from Ksh.92.2 billion (equivalent to US\$ 1.08 billion) in 2005/2006 to Ksh.169 billion (US \$1.88 billion) in 2009/2010 fiscal year to meet the new demands of the policies (Republic of Kenya, 2012).

***Corresponding author: John Aluko Orodho**

Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies, School of Education, Kenyatta University, Kenya

On average, the education sector accounted for 28 percent of the aggregate public expenditure in 2005/2006 and dropped marginally to 26 percent in 2009/2010 fiscal years (Republic of Kenya, 2013). The country's education expenditure as a percentage of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has remained fairly constant ranging from 6.1 percent in 2005/2006 to 6.2 during the 2009/2010 financial year (Republic of Kenya, 2012a). These efforts to devote meaningful funding to education is justified against the backdrop that available evidence from literature review suggests a positive and significant correlation between indicators of quality education and financial allocation (Brookings Institution, 2013; Oketch & Ngware, 2012 ; World Bank, 2008, 2012). Orodho (2014) supporting the UNESCO (2012) document has aptly argued that educational institutions should not only be adequately financed, but these finances ought to be available in ways that neither exclude any learner

by gender or region of residence nor leave any deserving learner behind. This contention is in tandem with the Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda under the auspices of the United Nations (2013) who aver that it is important to target learning outcomes, and to make sure that every child performs up to global minimum standard upon completing primary education (United Nations, 2013). It is against this backdrop that this paper attempted to investigate the challenges in financing development projects in public primary schools in Ijara District, Garissa District, Kenya.

State of the Art Review

At independence in 1963, the government of Kenya allocated 15% of the recurrent expenditure to education. After independence, the government committed itself to offer a minimum of seven years of free primary education (FPE) (Bogonko, 1992). The local communities took the initiative of building schools which were later taken over by the government once they became viable. The government took the responsibility of paying teachers' salaries and providing instructional materials and equipment. In order to expand enrolment, the government initiated a policy of free primary education (FPE) in 1974 (Republic of Kenya, 1999). The FPE policy benefited from good economic growth. The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) grew by an average of 6.6% between 1964-1973. The situation however changed between 1974-1979 when the GDP growth rate declined to 5.2% plunging further to 4.1% between 1980-1989. In 1986, the government issued Sessional paper No.1 on Economic Management for Renewed Growth which saw the introduction of cost-sharing in all sectors of the economy. The aim was to reduce government support sectors that should otherwise be self-sustaining (Republic of Kenya, 1986).

The government appointed the presidential working party on education and manpower development for the next decade and beyond. The report avers that the government will continue to finance provision of education administration and professional services while communities, parents and sponsors provide physical facilities, books and supplementary readers, stationary and consumables (Republic of Kenya, 1988). In 1988, the cost-sharing policy was introduced in schools. The 8-4-4 education system was implemented in 1985. The 8-4-4 education system was leaning towards science and technology. This raised the burden for acquiring new textbooks, workshop tools and equipments, classrooms and toilets all of which were few or non-existent. In most schools, students slept in classrooms for lack of dormitories. In yet other schools, there were incomplete classrooms, unequipped science rooms and faulty water system (MacKay, 1981). In March 1990, a world conference on Education for All (EFA) in Jomtien, Thailand established a global programme committed to reducing the number of illiterate adults by half. Later in April 2000, a follow up conference was held in Dakar, Senegal that came up with a framework of action to realize Education for All (EFA) targets by 2015. In addition, the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) have accelerated the demand for primary education, costs notwithstanding. Education and training contribute to economic growth, social returns and increased demand for more equitable education attainment. Education is a welfare indicator and a key determinant of

earnings. It is an important exit route from poverty. There is need for an increased investment in human capital through education (Republic of Kenya, 2005). It is for this reason that the researcher decided to investigate the challenges in financing development projects in public primary schools in Ijara district. According to the Australian national commission for UNESCO on compulsory education in Australian states, those who got interested in local schools formed parents and citizens organizations which raised funds locally for school projects.

They mobilized and sought local opinion regarding education and administration. The same Australian commission on UNESCO also pointed out that unless citizens feel that the school in the community belonged to them, they would not be prepared to contribute towards its development. Moehlman (1982) finds in his studies that all money for schools should come from a single source; the people by a method of levying and assessment taxation. This is because the schools serve the community. According to Listockin (1974), funding of schools in New Jersey heavily relied on local sources like local property tax. America had believed for a long time that education was a responsibility of the local Government. However, failure by the local government to provide sufficient funds to support education in America led to a nation-wide taxation. Local authorities, the state, educational establishments, churches, various associations and movements, private institutions, commercial and industrial firms were involved in education financing.

From a case study in France, Garcia (1964) pointed out that from the middle 19th century onwards, state interventions became necessary to ease the financial burden of local authorities. Grants were made to municipal authorities to build schools and for payment of teacher salaries. Scholarships were offered to help the less prosperous families. Getao (1996) observes that the surprise recovery of Japan after the Second World War is credited to its education system. In connection to financing, there was provision of education for everyone without discrimination as to sex, race, class, social status or family origin. Compulsory education was provided with no tuition fees charged in state and local authority schools. Schools are public but the law will permit qualified persons to operate private schools.

Thinh (1991) also maintains that in Vietnam, parents' associations have come to play an important role in construction and maintenance of school buildings and facilities. In association with the local education council, parents associations persuade and encourage local production and trading firms to build educational/school facilities. Education in India was financed by the central and state governments (Varghese & Tilak 1991). Besides public sources there are also private sources. Public sources included fees. This indicates that cost-sharing strategy is also embraced by the education system in India. In Uganda, households have sought to bridge the gaps left by government by meeting 65-90% of the costs of schooling (World Bank, 2000). Bogonko (1992) maintains that in Uganda, much of the development expenditure is met by the collective efforts of parents and local communities who in the 1960s put up the schools themselves. He adds that between 1983-1988, parents and communities continued building schools and meeting all non-salary costs.

Free primary education is not a new phenomenon in Africa following the Dakar Accord of (2000) which advocated for universal primary education for all (EFA), the goals aimed to eliminate gender disparities in primary and secondary education by year 2005. This was set as one of the main objectives and which advocated for universal primary education. Some of the African countries which initiated the Free Primary Education Programme included Malawi, Botswana and Uganda (UNESCO, 1990). In the case of Lesotho, Malawi and Uganda the three countries represent different stages of the process over time, using different scales and different approaches under differing political, social and economical contexts (UNESCO, 1990). Relevant contextual similarities among the three countries included the fact that all are emergent multiparty democracies. In Malawi and Lesotho free primary education was the key election issue on which the new government came to power. All countries have or have had recently high poverty and illiteracy rates and low primary enrolment and completion rates. All three countries were highly centralized and lacked fiscal discipline. Differences among the countries include divergent scales such as population size, density, gross domestic product, per capital income, foreign debts, foreign aids and the FPE starting point (organization structures, national enrolment rate, Institutional capacity and school ownership) (UNESCO, 1990).

Eshiwani (1993) notes that public financing of education has grown in importance as the concept of human capital has found a wider acceptance as a vital factor in economic growth and even more important, the idea that education is a human right. Olembo (1985:10) avers that missionary pioneers Ludwig krapf and John Riebman had to use their own resources to run elementary schools. At one point, the missionary teachers had to have sweets, clothes and other gifts in order to attract pupils. Later, Africans realized the benefits of western education and soon demanded for more chances in missionary schools. In 1963, the government of Kenya committed itself to offer a minimum of seven years of free primary education. Facilities had to be put in place to accommodate the rising number of primary school-goers. To achieve this, the government acquired loans from international donors like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to augment local sources (Bogonko 1992: 198). Since independence in 1963, the number of students enrolled at various levels of education has substantially increased. At the secondary level, enrolment grew from 30,000 students in 1963 to 862,908 students in 2003 (415,246 girls and 447,662 boys). However, despite increased enrolment, the sector is still faced with issues of equality, access and quality (Republic of Kenya 2005). Mutua (1975) notes that *public financing of education started in 1909 when financial grants were granted to mission schools conducting industrial training.*

In 1925, an inquiry was made into the grant-in-aid system leading to a considerable increase of allowances for building and equipment maintenance subject to a satisfactory report by the government inspector. Most primary schools developed on harambee basis mainly in central and Nyanza provinces of Kenya (Sifuna 1990). The 8-4-4 system of education was born out of the recommendations of the Mackay report of 1981. The system was science oriented. When it was implemented in 1985, schools shouldered a big burden. One of the ways used by Kenyans to finance the school development projects was self-help (Harambee) drives. Parents were required to donate a specific amount of money in the form of development funds, harambee funds or building funds. In the local communities, leaders arranged for systematic collections of donations from farmers, politicians, co-operative societies and fund raising meetings (Harambee) (Sifuna 1990). The government of Kenya policy on primary education follows the key strategy to achieve universal primary education (UPE) by 2015. According to the sessional paper no.1 of 2005; In pursuit of this, the government introduced free primary education (FPE) in January 2003 which resulted in an increased enrolment from 5.9 million in 2002 to 7.2 million children in public primary schools in 2004. This was an increase of 18%.

Under Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP) 2005-2010 it is envisaged that:

The government wishes to enhance the quality of education by providing textbooks and other instructional materials and rehabilitate schools in Arid and Semi Arid Areas (ASALS), urban slums and pockets of poverty (Republic of Kenya, 2005). In the sessional paper no.1 of 2005, the government of Kenya through MOE wishes to attain a transition rate of 70% from primary to secondary school level from the current rate of 47%, paying special attention to girls' education. To achieve this, the government plans to construct/renovate physical facilities/equipment in public learning institutions in disadvantaged areas, particularly in ASALS and urban slums by 2008. The Ministry of Education adopted a SWAP (sector wide approach) to finance development projects in Kenya. Through the SWAP, the government and development partners have developed the Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP). KESSP is based on the rationale of the overall policy goal of achieving education for all (EFA) and the government commitment to the attainment of millennium development goals (MDG) (Republic of Kenya, 2005). From table 1, the government spent KShs 6,622 million in infrastructure development i.e. building new schools and rehabilitation of existing structures over the period 2005-2010. New primary schools were not constructed during the first year (2005/06). Priority in the first year would be given to school improvement grants.

Table 1. Summary of yearly infrastructure costs: 2005/06 – 2009/10 (Kshs million)

Component	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/2010	Total
School improvement grants	475.00	100.00	1140.00	1000.0	1000.0	4715.0
New primary school construction	00.00	144.70	144.70	133.40	111.35	534.15
Management and capacity building	95.36	55.06	19.67	10.17	10.17	190.27
Monitoring and evaluation	52.36	100.	95.50	94.38	94.38	437.50
Sub total	622.83	1400.38	1399.9	1238	1215.9	5876.9
Existing infrastructure programmes (primary) – USAID/OPEC	235.00	255.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	745.00
Total	857.83	1655.38	1654.87	1237.95	1215.9	6621.9

Source: KESSP (2005-2010:8)

Development projects (rehabilitation and construction of primary schools) took 90.6% of the funds. Management, capacity building and monitoring and evaluation take Kshs 627.77 billion (9.4%) of the total budget. This study aimed at establishing to what extent the government has achieved this objective in Ijara district, Garissa County.

Statement of the problem

Primary school education has been faced by many challenges arising from increased enrolment of pupils. Among the challenges is the decline in the quality of education being offered. The introduction of Free Primary Education (FPE) saw an increase in enrolment by about 1.1 million pupils in public primary schools. According to the recently released 2013 KCPE results, public primary schools performed dismally compared to private schools. The poor performance was attributed to many factors key among them overcrowded classrooms and shortage of land for expansion. Attention has not been drawn that the basis of free primary education funds disbursement remain the same since 2003 to date, despite the fact that some schools exist in diverse environmental setting with diverse budgetary needs. For instance, Ijara District is one of the arid and semi-arid areas with schools located far apart. Still schools in the district are funded like schools in areas with high agro-ecological potential. Thus there exists a significant resource gap which this research intends to address areas such as analysis between policies, funds availability and management styles for sustainable free primary education implementation. Currently there are a number of challenges facing access and use of ICT in Kenyan schools which include; high capital costs, limited rural electrification, frequent power disruptions and high poverty levels among the communities. This study investigated sources of funding for major development projects in public primary schools.

Purpose and Objective of the Study

The aim of the study was to determine challenges in financing development projects in public primary schools in Ijara district, Garissa County. The Objectives of the study were:

1. To find out the level of financing of the projects by each financier.
2. To find out the challenges and possible solutions to challenges faced in financing development projects.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In order to address the objectives of the study, a multiple case study approach was adopted for the aim of obtaining an in-depth description of the experiences of particular cases (in our case, schools) in the challenges related to financing development projects. The case study design can also, according to Orodho (2009) integrates a variety of sources, research methods, and data in the investigation. The cases for the study were 12 primary schools purposively selected from among 47 in the study locale of Ijara District, Garissa County, Kenya. Ijara District is situated to the extreme south of North Eastern region. It borders Tana River District to the west, Garissa to the North and Lamu to the east. It also borders the Republic of Somalia to the North East. The District covers approximately 11,330 square Kilometers. The district is arid. The vegetation in the district is generally acacia species of shrubs and long grass. The predominant economic activity is

pastoral-nomadism where residents move from one place to another in search of water and pasture for their animals. The major respondents were the

The research was done for about six months to meet the requirements for the award of a degree of Master of Education of Kenyatta University. The headteachers and Parents Teachers Association (PTA) chairpersons were the major respondents. All the respondents were interviewed in a quiet place and lasted approximately 45 minutes. With the participants consent, each interview was tape recorded and notes were taken during and after interviews in order to capture the non-verbal messages (Orodho, 2009, 2012; Brooks, 2013). The data gathered through these semi-structured interviews related to the challenges experienced in financing development projects in their respective schools. In the analysis of data, the interview transcriptions and the notes that were taken during the interviews were used. The credibility as well as the description and interpretive validity was established by summarizing the interview notes to the participants in order to check whether the results reflect what they had said (Orodho, 2009). Deductive and inductive approaches were employed in data analysis. Relating to the objectives of the study, some codes were obtained from the reviewed literature while others arose while reading the transcriptions.

The Theoretical Framework

This study was based on Getzel et al (1968) systems theory which state that schools are social systems bound by a set of elements, sub-systems and activities that interact and constitute a social entity. The social system consists of interdependent parts, characteristics and activities that contribute to and receive from the whole. Each social system has goals, structure and is open (it interacts with the environment). From this theory the school is a system of social interactions with certain assumptions. In a school, the students, teachers, parents/communities, the government and stakeholders play a critical role in raising funds for development projects. There is interdependence between parents and the schools their children attend. The goal of a school is to instruct students to gain knowledge, skills, positive attitudes and values that will contribute to political, social and economic development of both the individual and the society. This forms the basis on which individuals and the society contribute towards meeting the costs of school development projects. A school is structured with different components (players). Headteachers, teachers, parents/guardians, school communities and other stakeholders each have a role to play in funding school development projects. All open systems have inputs from the environment which include energy, information, money, people and raw materials. These inputs are transformed into outputs. A school is an open system. It receives funding from within its catchment area and produce graduates into the society. The systems theory of organization was modified to suit this study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sources of Finances for School Development Projects

To effectively address objective one on sources of funding, the researcher commenced by finding out which development

projects had been undertaken by schools in the last five years (2008-2013). Majority of the sampled schools had acquired basic infrastructure such as classrooms and toilets. Approximately 41.0 % of these schools had initiated construction of administration blocks, teachers housing and fencing. Half of the sampled schools had dining halls/kitchens. Boarding facilities had been built in at least 25% of the sampled schools. However, none of the schools had bought computers. One third of the respondents rated the amount of land as very adequate while the rest of the respondents rated the land as adequate. Land scarcity is not an issue in Ijara district since the facility is communally owned. When the community wishes to set up a school, the community elders demarcate a sizeable portion for this purpose. The common feature in most of the sampled schools was that none had an operational school development plan to guide and/or prioritize development.

To summarize, the following responses were got when respondents were asked to state the sources of finances for school development projects:

Table 2. Responses on sources of financing

Source Of Funds	No. Of Headteachers	Total Percentage (%)
GOK/MOE	12	100
PTA	6	50
County Council	0	0
Self Help (Harambee)	0	0
Donations(NGOs)	12	100
Others(CDF,ARID LANDS)	12	100

Source: researcher

Most of the PTA chairpersons concurred with the headteachers that the Government of Kenya (through MOE and MDONKALS), the constituency development fund (CDF) and donors (NGOs) contributed in financing development projects in the schools. The PTA chairpersons felt that the parents and/or guardians contributed 41.67 % of the financing of education facilities. Parents contributed to school development in kind; clearing the school compound, carrying building blocks and erecting temporary fences around the schools. The parents in Ijara adapted a communal approach to contribute to the school. Under the leadership of village elders, they would gather in the school on an appointed day and build a temporary kitchen or carry building materials to the required site. They demarcated school land by erecting a temporary fence. Parents also contributed by serving as committee members.

Parents' contribution was low (41.67%). One of the PTA chairpersons explained that:

Due to the pastoral/nomadic lifestyle of the people of Ijara, it is difficult to gather parents together at any one time. They follow their cattle to the grazing lands in the neighboring districts and may stay there for up to one month. Due to their pastoralist way of life, most parents are poor and cannot meet the hidden cost of education that requires them to contribute to development of school projects. The foregoing concern implies that there is minimal school-community relationship and teamwork when it comes to financing school development projects. As much as parents were rated as key contributors to the school kitty, headteachers agreed that most parents were often unable to pay the amount required from them by the

school. The parents and headteachers attributed this inability to various factors, among them poverty and parents being over-burdened with many responsibilities. The challenge of poverty and financing of education has been a long tradition of cost-sharing in education in Kenya, epitomized by the phenomenon of *harambee* (or self-help) schools (Orodho, 2014). During the 1970s, the nominal commitment to providing free education sat uncomfortably with the practice of *harambee* collections, but in 1988 this contradiction was resolved when cost-sharing was formally made the basis of education financing. It is arguable that if education financing is conditional on the payment of fees of various kinds, it ceases to be a right, an entitlement of citizenship, but becomes instead a commodity that is available only to those with the money to buy it. As aptly argued by Orodho (2014), even with the current FPE in Kenya, the latent cost of education in terms of buying uniforms, building fund and transport becomes a real burden. And in a region as poor as Garissa County, a policy that makes parents responsible for maintaining the nations primary schools infrastructure as well as meeting the other hidden cost of education is bound to lead to falling enrollments and low quality of educational attainment as has been observed in the un-packed enrollment and participation rates within the sub-counties of Garissa County. As a result, the PFE does not seem to be meeting the intended goals due to the high latent cost of education.

The study established that there was heavy NGO presence in the study locale. Majority of these Non-Governmental Organizations assisted to put up classrooms, dormitories and water storage facilities. The following were listed as some of the NGOs operating in Ijara district: UNICEF, World Food Programme (WFP), Womankind Kenya, Mikono international, World vision and Plumbers without frontiers. The above sources were mentioned to have contributed to financing school development projects as shown in table 3. From table 3, except for one NGO which focused on provision of classrooms, the rest of the NGOs supported schools by way of providing dormitories, beds, beddings, toilets and water storage facilities and school meals. Womankind Kenya reached 83.33% of the schools. Mikono international had reached one school where they put up four classrooms. UNICEF covered 33.33% of the schools under study. World Vision and Plumbers without Frontiers were promoting water, hygiene and sanitation in 16.67% of the schools. The CDF contribution to public primary schools was evident in every aspect. Donations were given as a form of assistance to the public primary schools by well-wishers. This assistance came in such forms as building of school facilities such as classrooms and dormitories and acquisition of water, sanitation and hygiene facilities. They built toilets and water storage tanks.

Despite these philanthropic contributions by the NGOs, some school headteachers and PTA chairpersons noted that:

Assistance was drawn from various NGOs and local well-wishers. The headteachers and PTA chairpersons agreed that since donations to schools were on voluntary terms, the schools could not budget on the basis of their availability. *The donor(s) determined the time to donate and could also terminate assistance in a short notice.* The implication of the foregoing quote is that the current donations by both local and

Table 3. NGOS Operating In Ijara District

NGO	Projects undertaken	Number of schools	Percentage (%)
Womankind Kenya(WOKIKE)	Dormitories, beds and beddings, toilets	7	58.33
Mikono	classrooms	1	8.33
UNICEF	Dormitories, beds and beddings	4	33.33
World food programme(WFP)	School meals	12	100
Plumbers without frontiers(PWF)	Toilets, piped water	2	16.67
World vision	Water trucking, water storage facilities	2	16.67

Source: Education offices and field data (2012)

international NGOs was not sustainable. In fact, the fact that most of these donors dictated what to contribute and the duration of the contribution was a worrying trend. It is arguable that more sustainable sources of funds need to be sought urgently.

The local authority/county council did not finance public primary school buildings/facilities. The Ijara county council was responsible for all school land. All the schools visited during the research had been built on land owned by the county council. All the primary schools in the study had completed building some classrooms. However, most of the schools had incomplete dining halls/kitchens, teacher's houses, dormitories and administration blocks.

Despite the various sources of money in primary schools for development purposes, many facilities were yet to be built. Important educational facilities such as computers were completely lacking. For the last five years, no projects had stalled an indicator of proper planning and utilization of resources. Minor development projects such as renovations and construction of toilets were noticeable at the expense of major development projects.

Major challenges faced by schools in financing development projects

Although it was evident that the bulk of funding of development projects in the sampled schools was by the Government of Kenya through the Ministry of Education, all the respondents cited inadequate funding and the inconsistent flow of free primary schooling (FPE) funds as a major challenge to financing development projects. Additionally, they remarked that there were delays in releasing the FPE funds which hampered planning. Slightly less than 10 percent of the headteachers mentioned interference in the running of schools by School Management Committees (SMCs), politicians and other partisan groups.

One headteacher, reporting on political interference in financial management noted that:

School committee members (SMC) with vested interests in being awarded contracts held meetings outside the schools without involving the headteachers. The trend was even more prevalent among the SMC members who had been put into such committees through some political patronage.

Low value was attached to education as most parents were illiterate. The indifference of the local community was mentioned by 66.67% of the headteachers. They argued that the community did not actively participate in funding school facilities. They saw this as the responsibility of the parents whose children were attending school.

With regards to the impact of poverty on education, some headteachers and chairpersons of PTA averred that:

High poverty levels among the households contributed to parents' unwillingness to assist in putting up school facilities. The rising cost of equipment/ high prices of construction materials was another impediment to development of schools. Many headteachers (58.33%) noted that the prices kept rising by the day.

Explaining the above quotation, one headteacher noted that; We budget and the next time you visit a merchant, the price of commodities have gone up a number of times. This forces the headteachers to pass on the excess charges as a result of price increases to parents who are already too poor to pay.

Infrastructure in Ijara district was poor. The roads leading to the schools were seasonal, hence transport services were unreliable. Communication was difficult. Poor means of transport due to absence of all weather roads increased the costs of acquisition of educational facilities. Commencing of Agriculture related income generating activities was hampered by harsh climatic conditions. Most of the respondents cited breakages as one of the problems facing the schools. A huge sum of money was utilized to repair broken facilities.

One headteacher and four PTA chairpersons explained this state of affairs by stating that:

Most facilities like desks were broken by pupils during play or while being transported from one point to the next. Most of the mobile schools were made of temporary structures. Other respondents cited cowboy contractors as being the cause of structures that were sub-standard. The mobile schools changed location following the migratory pattern of the community served by the school.

Yet, the schools have to function despite these financial hardships. The source of financial support was noted to come from the NGOs. But these alternative sources in the name of NGOs have their own problems. Some headteachers and PTA chairpersons revealed that:

Donations as a source of financing are subject to the generosity of the donor. Whatever the donor decides to give and the project chosen are not very questionable. Donations are not reliable. They are not a constant source of funding. In fact, when the financial tap runs dry, this is the end of the project.

To reiterate, although the NGOs are currently perceived to be making very good effort in complementing Government funding for development projects, there is need to look for

more sustainable sources of income as suggested by Getange, Onkeo and Orodho (2014) in their study on Kisii Central District.

Possible Remedies to Challenges in Financing Development Projects

The interviewed headteachers and PTA chairpersons made various possible remedies to address the various challenges facing financing development projects in their respective schools. Some of these are reported as:

Both the headteachers and the PTA chairpersons concurred on possible methods of improving their school financial position. The four headteachers and two PTA chairpersons suggested that: These included soliciting for more funds from NGOs, FBOs, CBOs and well-wishers. They voiced the concern of Conducting fund raising (harambee). Self help (harambee) leads to ownership of the projects undertaken. Schools should request for increased funding from the government through the Ministry of Education, donors and other stakeholders. This can be done through the various education offices at the county and district levels. The schools should forward their budgets to the Ministry of Education at the start of each financial year. Similarly, they should forward proposals requesting for infrastructure funds.

Establishing income generating activities suited for arid areas like irrigated farming and bee-keeping would go a long way to supplement school income. Vegetable farming through irrigation was viewed as a possible venture by schools. Most of the schools had adequate land for income generating activities. School management committees should undertake labour contracts only as opposed to full contracts. The respondents observed that labour contracts would significantly reduce the total cost of projects and minimize vested interest. Use of high quality materials that could withstand poor soils and drainage was proposed, as was the case in the Kisii Central study (Getange, Onkeo & Orodho, 2014).

Community participation in school development should be encouraged. Parents/guardians, pupils and stakeholders should be actively involved in developing and implementing the school development plans. An elaborate school development plan fosters and guide future development. The local authorities (county council) should liaise with other government ministries to improve road network, power supply and water provision among other physical infrastructure in schools.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The government through the Ministry of Education and the Ministry for the Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands made great contributions towards major development projects in public primary schools over the last five years. The headteachers and PTA chairpersons however felt that alternative sources such as harambee (self help) and income generating projects should be explored to generate more funds. Essential structures such as dormitories, teachers' houses and administration blocks (staffrooms) were incomplete. No school had acquired computers. A lot of emphasis went towards the completion of classrooms.

However, despite having sources of funds for development of major projects in all schools, some buildings were incomplete or completely lacking. Apart from some complete classrooms in the schools, other key facilities such as dining halls/kitchens, dormitories, teacher's houses and staffrooms were inadequate, lacking or incomplete. No school had acquired computers. This shows that the schools in Ijara district were yet to adopt integration of ICT in teaching and learning. Most schools lacked a development plan (SDP). However, they had prioritized development projects. Structures such as toilets were in place and in some cases, renovations could be observed in classrooms. About 25% of the primary schools had incomplete buildings. Most of the buildings in place had been put in place over the last five years.

From the findings and discussion thus far, the following recommendations are made:

First, this study revealed that there is room and avenues that can ease the burden borne by parents and the government in financing of public primary schools. Public primary schools should seek diversified ways to raise money for their schools. In Ijara, public primary schools have adequate land for future expansion/development of schools. They can carry out income generating projects within their compounds. School halls can be hired out at a fee and the money should go to the school. Public primary schools should initiate projects such as bee-keeping and irrigated vegetable farming which does not require arable land.

Secondly, parents should be made aware of cost-sharing and the policy should be clearly spelt out to them. This could be done by more involvement of parents in school activities. Financing of primary level education should be viewed as a partnership between the local communities and the central government. The government should propagate its policy of cost-sharing in the community. The problem of community indifference to education financing is not very common in Kenya. The local administration should encourage the local communities to fully participate in supporting their schools. The support of the local communities currently is lukewarm. The schools themselves should engage more in communal activities so that they (parents) do not relent giving support to their schools. It is not enough for them to give only monetary support; they should also help in manual work since such activities contribute to the reduction of costs the schools incur.

Third, the demand for education facilities is projected to keep increasing if the current census figures are anything to go by. This will place a very heavy financial burden on the government and the people of Kenya. Assuming therefore that parents will continue to play an active role in construction of school facilities to meet the expected demand, every effort must be made to sustain the Harambee (self help) spirit that has been the backbone of school development during the past twenty-five years. Fourth, public primary schools in Ijara District should also seek ways of reducing costs so as to utilize the scarce resources. The schools could improvise on the building materials, for instance by using materials that are not easily affected by extreme weather conditions such as wood. Secondly the concept of preventive maintenance and the role of the headteachers in the day to day maintenance of school

property should be stressed. Workshops and seminars directed at school maintenance should be mounted nationally for education officials, parents, pupils and all stakeholders. Education officials should work with headteachers to ensure that major development projects are constructed in schools at least every five years as per the immediate needs of the schools. Development projects should not just end at the building of classrooms. Other essential facilities such as dormitories for low-cost boarding primary schools are prioritized. Boarding schools act as a safety net for children in arid areas where enrolment figures are low. Most children drop out of school to engage in child labour such as herding and early marriage of girls.

Fifth, the absence of computers was evident in all schools visited. Headteachers complained that establishing and equipping the computer workshops was very expensive and schools could not afford. A solution to this problem could be found in the government economic stimulus programme. This could boost to the 8-4-4 system of education as it is supposed to integrate Information Communication Technology (ICT) in the teaching and learning process.

Last but not least, Ijara district had relatively few primary schools situated in the arid areas of Kenya. It was populated by nomadic and pastoralist Kenyans. To address the imbalance in education between these and other districts in Kenya, the government should continue building low cost-boarding primary schools so that children can continue to attend schools. It is not possible for primary education in these areas to catch up with the rest of the country if they are not assisted by the government. Therefore, government support in marginal districts should continue with an aim of reducing inequity in primary school education.

REFERENCES

- Black, T.K. & Scandleon, M.C. 1980. *Financing Education in Burma*. London: Hearth and Co.
- Bogonko, S.N. 1992. *A History of Modern Education (1895-1991)*. Nairobi: Evans Brothers Kenya Limited.
- Brooks, L. 2013. *Research methods and applications*. Arl Publishers, Brookings Institutions. 2013. *Towards universal learning: What every child should learn*. Brooks.
- Brunner, J.S. 1961. The Act of Discovery. *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. No. 31 1961.
- Eshiwani, G.S. 1993. *Education in Kenya since Independence*. Nairobi: East African Education Publishers.
- Garcia, R. I. 1964. *The Financing of Education under a Centralized System*. Paris: OECD.
- Getange, K.N., Onkeo, J.M & Orodho, A.J. 2014. Alternative sources of funding for free day secondary education (FDSE) in public schools in Kisii Central District, Kisii County, Kenya. *International Organization of Scientific Research (IOSR), Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS)*. Volume 13, Issue 4, Ver. VI (April 2014) www.iosrjournals.org. pp14-23.
- Getao, N.F. 1996. *A Textbook in Comparative Education; International Education System*. Nairobi: Lectern Publications Ltd.
- Getzel, J.W. et al. 1968. *Education Administration as a social process: Theory, Research and Practice*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- <http://www/impactalliance.org/ev-en.php?id=49224>
- Listockin, D. 1974. *Educational Financing Reform*. New Jersey: Ratger University.
- Ministry of Education, Japan. 1988. *Education in Japan*. Tokyo: Gyasei Publishers.
- Moehlman A. 1982. *Public Sector Finance*. Chicago: Chicago Monality And Co.
- Mutua, R.W. 1975. *Development of Education in Kenya*. Nairobi: East Africa Literature Bureau.
- Ngware, M., Ezeh, E., Nderu, E., & Epari, C. 2008. Policy and programme issues emerging from the APHRC *education research in urban informal settlements in Nairobi, Kenya* (Occasional Report No.2), Nairobi: African Population and Health Centre.
- Ngware, M., Ezeh, E., Oketch, M., Mudenge, N. 2009. Do household characteristics matter in schooling decisions in Kenya? *Equal Opportunities International* 28 (7) 591-608.
- Njeru, E.H. & Orodho, A.J. 2003. Access and participation in secondary education in Kenya: Policy options. *Institute of Policy analysis and Research (IPAR). Discussion Paper No.037/2003*. Nairobi. PAR.
- Oketch, M & Ngware, W.N. (Eds). 2012. *Urbanization and Education*. African Population and Health Research Centre. Nairobi. www.aphrc.org .
- Oketch, M. & Ngware, M.W (eds.) 2012. *Urbanization and Education in East n Africa: African Population and Health Research Center*. ISBN 978-9966-21-175-0
- Olembo, J.O. 1985. *Financing Primary School Building in Kenya*. Nairobi: Trans Africa.
- Ongeri, P. 2009. *Speech on the 2009 KCSE results*. Nairobi. Ministry of Education.
- Orodho, A.J, Waweru, P.N. & Getange, K.N. 2014. Progress towards attainment of education for all (EFA) among nomadic pastoralists: How do we dismantle the gender differential jinx in Mandera County, Kenya?. *International Organization of Scientific Research (IOSR), Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IOSR-JHSS)*. www.iosrjournals.org .
- Orodho, A.J. 2014. Attainment of education for all (EFA) by 2015: From rhetoric chimera to practice in Kenya. *International Journal of Current Research. Vol. 6. Issue 01*, pp4666-4674. January 2014. www.journalcra.com
- Orodho, J.A. 2009. *Element of Education and social science Research Methods*. Kanzejja Publisher.
- Orodho, J.A. 2009. *Elements of Education and Social Science Research Methods*. Maseno: Kanzejja Publisher.
- Orodho, J.A., Waweru, P.N., Ndichu, M., & Nthinguri, R. 2013. Basic education in Kenya: Focus on strategies applied to cope with school-based challenges inhibiting effective implementation of curriculum. *International Journal of Education and Research (IJER)*. www.ijern.com
- Peil, M. 1995. *Social Science Research Methods: A Handbook for Africa*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.
- Republic of Kenya 2001: *Children's Act*, Government Printer, Nairobi
- Republic of Kenya. 1988. *Report of the Presidential Working Party on Education And Manpower Training For The Next Decade And Beyond*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya. 2005a. *Economic Survey*. Government Printers Nairobi
- Republic of Kenya. 2005a. *Sessional Paper No. 1 on Policy Reforms for Education, Training and Research: Meeting the Challenges of Education Training and Research in the*

- 21st Century. Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST Nairobi: MOEST.
- Republic of Kenya. 2005b. *Kenya Education Sector Support Programme 2005 - 2010: Delivering Quality Education and Training to All Kenyans*. Nairobi: MOEST.
- Republic of Kenya. 2005b. *Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP)*. Government. Printers.
- Republic of Kenya. 2012a. Sessional Paper No.14 of 2012 on realigning education and training to the Constitution of Kenya 2010 and Vision 2030 and beyond. Ministry of Education Science and Technology. Nairobi. Kenya.
- Republic of Kenya. 2012b. A Policy Framework for realigning education to the Constitution 2010 and Vision 2030 and beyond.
- Sifuna, D.N. 1990. *Development of Education in Africa: The Kenya Experience*. Nairobi: Initiatives Printers.
- Thinh, G.B. (1991). *Role of Parents Associations (PAs) In Vietnam in Shaeffss School And Community Collaboration for Educational Change*. Cipana: IIEP.
- Varghese, D. A., & Tilak, B.K. 1991. *The Financing of Education in India*. Paris: IIEP.
- World Bank. 2000. *Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Research in Development Projects*. Washington D.C: World Bank
