

**IMPACT OF CONSTITUENCY DEVELOPMENT FUND IN FINANCING
SECONDARY SCHOOL EDUCATION IN NDARAGWA CONSTITUENCY, KENYA**

Joseph Gicheru Ndei

Department of Curriculum and Education Management, Laikipia University, Kenya

***Dr. Peter Githae Kaboro (PhD)**

Department of Curriculum and Education Management, Laikipia University, Kenya

Prof. John Kanjogu Kiumi (PhD)

Department of Curriculum and Education Management, Laikipia University, Kenya

ABSTRACT

Secondary school education aims at preparing the youth to play their roles in future as responsible citizens. Access to secondary education in public secondary schools in Kenya has not been fully achieved due to rising costs in education. The Kenya Government has therefore devised policies to help address issues of education access and retention through establishment of cost subsidies. The constituency development fund (CDF) was established in 2003 through an Act of Parliament. The principal aim of the fund is to mitigate the imbalance in regional development and provide people at the grassroots an opportunity to make expenditure choices that maximize their welfare in line with their needs and preferences. A key focus of CDF was to provide a devolved system of funding education. However, the extent to which CDF has succeeded in achieving this noble aim has not been investigated from the secondary school principals' perspective. The focus of the study therefore was to determine the extent to which CDF as a means of financing secondary school education has succeeded in improving physical facilities, enhancing enrolment and reducing the dropout rate as perceived by the secondary school principals in public secondary schools in Ndaragwa Constituency. The study adopted an Ex-post facto research design where data were collected using self-administered questionnaires to 25 principals. Data were analyzed through descriptive statistics. The study found that CDF has not significantly impacted on improving the status of secondary school education in Ndaragwa Constituency in terms of improving physical facilities, enhancing enrolment and reducing dropout rates. The study recommends that CDF framework be revised in order to assist schools to address pertinent issues facing them and to improve the quality of education in all secondary schools in Kenya.

Key Words: Constituency Development Fund (CDF); Dropout rate; Enrolment; Financing education; Physical facilities.

1. INTRODUCTION

Most governments of the world and individual citizens attach a lot of importance to the provision of education. This is because of the realization that education plays a great role in the entire development process of a country. Olaniyan and Okemakunde (2008) observed that most

economists agree that it is the human resources of a nation and not its material resources that ultimately determine the character and pace of economic and social development. According to Olaniyan and Okemakunde, education is seen as an intentional effort to increase the resources needed for creating new ideas. In this regard it can be argued that increase in education provision will translate to accelerated technological progress.

According to Kenya's National Report on the Development of Education of 2008, the main objective of the Government of Kenya since independence in 1963 has been to provide quality education and training for all its citizens. The Kenya Government considers education as critical in the promotion of social, economic and political development in the country. According to UNESCO (2002) education outcomes extend beyond individual and national income: it is a force that develops well-rounded and engaged citizens and builds a cohesive society. However, despite the immense benefits of education, Chiuri and Kiumi (2005) noted that it is an expensive venture. It therefore cannot be left either to individuals or the government to shoulder the full financial burden, but must be a shared venture among individuals, private and public companies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as well as the government itself.

Ever since the introduction of formal education in Kenya, various strategies have been initiated for financing it. According to Mutua (2009), public financing of education in Kenya started in 1909. Following the recommendations of Professor J. Nelson Fraser, experimental financial grants were made to mission schools. Prior to that period, education was mainly provided and financed by missionaries through private and public funds. For example, Mutua observed that the Holy Ghost missionaries relied on local resources and gifts from abroad to finance education. Africans started their own secular schools outside mission controlled schools through the Local Native Councils (LNCs) which were established in 1925. These councils according to Abreu (1982) were empowered to levy taxes which were used for the development of education including other social service sectors in the country.

After independence in 1963, the Kenya Government fully financed some of the secondary schools. However, due to the overwhelming demand for secondary education, the government allowed communities and religious bodies to set up their own schools. Some of these schools were partially funded by the government while others (referred to as *Harambee* schools) were financed by the parents and were not funded at all by the government. By 1968, these *Harambee* schools constituted 70 percent of all unaided secondary schools, according to Bogonko (1994). The finances directed to secondary school education diminished with the shift of the government's policy towards primary education in the early 1970s and early 1980s. For example, in spite of the enrolment increasing by 22 percent in secondary schools in 1981, government grants for recurrent expenditure increased by only six percent. On the other hand the trend in *harambee* contributions to education increased considerably, (Sifuna & Otiende, 1992).

The government's implementation of the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) package from the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in 1986 saw a major shift in funding of education in Kenya. The Kenya's National Development Plan of 1989-1993 spelt out cost sharing arrangements in various public sectors including provision of education

(Otiende, Wamahiu & Karugu, 1992). From 1988 to 2007, secondary education in Kenya was financed mainly through the cost sharing policy between the government, parents and communities. The government provided for teachers' salaries, curriculum development, bursaries and supervision services. Parents on the other hand provided teaching-learning materials, textbooks, physical infrastructure and other necessary direct costs to education such as uniforms, activity fees, private tuition charges and examination fees. At the same time, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the private sector contributed towards education through donations of funds and facilities, payment of school levies, especially in poor and marginal areas, scholarships and bursaries (Abagi, 1997).

According to the National Report of 2001 on Development of Education in Kenya, inadequate public resources for education have made the government and its key partners to depend on bilateral and multilateral donors to support educational projects. One of the major drawbacks in this approach however, has been sustainability. The report avers that this scenario is linked not only to inadequate funding but also to the tendency to plan and implement the programmes without inbuilt structures that can allow continuity. To cushion the poor and vulnerable groups against the adverse effects of cost sharing in education, the bursary scheme was introduced by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST) in 2003. However, according to a study carried out by Njeru and Orodho (2003), the bursary fund was insufficient to meet the objectives of enhancing access to secondary education and reducing dropout rate among the poor. This was because of the fact that the bursary kitty constituted only 6.4 per cent of the total outstanding educational costs.

In 2008 the government introduced Free Day Secondary Education (FDSE) with a view to enhancing access to secondary education. Though there was a substantial increase in enrolment after implementation of FDSE programme, the Economic Survey of 2009 noted that the cost of secondary education still remained prohibitively high due to boarding expenses which were not catered for by the grants allocated to the programme. This has led to more than half of the school age population not accessing secondary education (GOK, 2009).

From the foregoing, it is clear that the government has made efforts to make secondary education affordable. However parents continue to experience various challenges in meeting the costs that are not catered for by the government. In Ndaragwa constituency, these challenges may be due to factors related to its physical and social environment. For example Ndaragwa is a rural constituency and agriculture is the main economic activity. The 2005-2010 Nyandarua County Strategic Plan noted that the county had a secondary school dropout rate of 10 percent. This was attributed to high cost of education and limited number of schools. A study conducted by Kenya National bureau of statistics (KNBS) in 2013 found that Ndaragwa constituency had 58.8 percent of residents with primary school education only and 25.9 percent with secondary school education and above. This implies that the transition rate from primary school to secondary school education is low. It suggests that the number of dropouts had not reduced after the strategic plan period. It was also observed that Ndaragwa constituency lagged behind the neighbouring constituencies in Nyandarua County in terms of access to improved sources of water. However, it was ranked highly in the use of improved sanitation. These are infrastructural

facilities that could affect learning in secondary schools. They therefore constitute some of the concerns of the secondary school principals as they strive to improve learning conditions in their schools.

To develop the infrastructure of the schools, principals rely on fees paid by parents, CDF and grants from the government among other sources. Most of the parents get their finances from agriculture, being the main economic activity in Ndaragwa Constituency. Most of the agriculture is rain fed as implied by the low level of access to improved sources of water outlined by the KNBS. The constituency has diverse climatic conditions with areas near the Aberdare ranges which are to the west of the constituency receiving higher rainfall than the plateau which is to the east as noted by Halima (2014). The low rainfall in some areas affects agricultural production which in turn affects the individual family's income. The capacity to finance education by these families is therefore negatively affected by the low agricultural productivity. The school principals are then forced to turn to other alternative sources of funds like CDF to develop their schools.

The Constituency Development Fund (CDF) was established in 2003 through the CDF Act in the Kenya Gazette supplements No. 107 (GoK, 2004). The main aim of the fund was to control imbalance in regional development and provide people at the grassroots with the opportunity to make expenditure choices that maximize their welfare in line with their needs and preferences (GOK 2003). The projects that are funded through CDF are community based. This arrangement aims at ensuring that the prospective benefits are available to a widespread cross-section of the inhabitants of a particular area (CDF Act, 2004). A minimum of 10 per cent of the constituency CDF allocation is used for education bursary scheme. The CDF Act establishes four committees to manage the fund. These include the National Management Committee (NMC) and the National Constituency Development Fund Committee (NCDFC) which are national committees and the District Project Committees (DPC) and Constituency Development Committees which are grassroots committees. Beneficiaries of the CDF funding are community based development projects that ensure the benefits are enjoyed by all people at the constituency level. Local communities identify projects according to their needs in such sectors as education, water, healthcare and infrastructure among others.

After Kenya promulgated the new constitution in 2010, some of the projects that were previously financed by CDF were transferred to the county governments that were established by the new constitution. Secondary education however remained a function of the national government. To avoid conflicts with the county government, the CDF Act of 2004 was amended in 2015. In the amendment, CDF was renamed the National Government CDF (NG- CDF) and all the national government functions were to be financed by the NG-CDF. Due to the rising cost of secondary education, the government in 2012 appointed a task force to look into the cost of secondary education in Kenya. This task force recommended that the responsibility of developing school infrastructure be transferred from the parents to CDF and county governments. Consequently, the Ministry of Education developed secondary schools' fees guidelines which transferred the responsibility of financing school infrastructural projects from parents to CDF and other government financing mechanisms (GOK 2015). As a result of this mandate, it therefore means

that secondary school principals have to interact more with CDF in an effort to develop their schools.

A secondary school principal is the chief executive officer of the school and is expected to ensure the provision of adequate physical facilities of the school as outlined in the Education Act of 2013. This was echoed by the Bungoma County Director of Education (CDE) during a principals' workshop, as reported by Kenya News Agency (KNA) on 29th May 2014. The County Director expressed that the image of the school is reflected by the way the school principal presents and handles issues related to development of the school both physically and academically. Uko (2015) observed that there is a significant relationship between the principal's proficiency, creativity and the overall objectives in the management of school facilities. Effective management and provision of school facilities is necessary in creating an enabling conducive academic environment thereby enhancing a corresponding achievement and performance in teaching and learning process. Taking this into account, the finances from CDF come in handy as the principal makes an effort to improve the school both academically and physically. The principals are therefore the key officials in determining the impact of CDF on provision of education in secondary schools. It is therefore important to establish their perception on the role of CDF in financing secondary school education. The purpose of the study was therefore to investigate the secondary school principals' perception of the impact of CDF in financing secondary school education in Ndaragwa Constituency, specifically in improving physical facilities, enhancing enrolment and reducing dropout rates.

2. METHODOLOGY

The study adopted *ex-post facto* research design. *Ex-post facto* design is used to determine the cause or consequence that exist between variables by observing an existing condition or state of affairs and search back in time for plausible causal factors (Kasomo,2006). This design is useful in determining retrospectively the relationship between independent and the dependent variables (Kerlinger 1986). The design was adopted in view of the fact that CDF had been in place for several years before the study. Consequently the principals' perception on the impact of CDF in financing education was determined in situ as it had occurred without manipulating or controlling it.

The target population for the study was all principals in public day secondary schools in Ndaragwa Constituency. School principals were identified as the respondents of the study because they are the chief executive officers of their schools and they are expected to ensure and assure provision of adequate physical facilities of the schools as outlined in the Education Act of 2013. According to Kothari (2004), sampling is the selection of part of the respondents who should be as representative of the total population as possible in order to provide a miniature cross-section. When the universe is a small one there is no need of sampling according to Kothari. In this study therefore, all the 25 public secondary schools' principals in the constituency formed the study sample. The purpose of research is also to learn about a population and the larger the sample the more likely it is to be representative of the population as observed by Piel (1995). Kasomo (2006) also recommended that researchers use the largest

sample possible because statistics calculated from large samples are more accurate estimates of the population characteristics.

The study used a questionnaire to collect data. The questionnaire contained 30 Likert type items which were categorized into three sub-sections. Sub-section one collected data on principals' perceptions of CDF in financing physical facilities, section two focused on the role of CDF in improving enrolment while section three collected data on the extent to which CDF had contributed to the reduction of dropout rate. The items had five response categories namely strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. The responses categories were allocated scores of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively. However, the scoring chart was reversed for negative statements. The questionnaire was systematically assessed for validity and reliability using data from a pilot study that involved 12 schools in the neighbouring Ol-joro-orok constituency. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics specifically means, frequency counts and percentages.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The research sought to establish the principals' perceptions of the impact of CDF in financing key areas in secondary school education. These areas formed the bases of the Likert scale type items and covered three crucial areas namely improvement of physical facilities, enhancing enrolment and reduction of the dropout rate in schools. The principals were asked to indicate their rating of CDF in various areas on the Likert scale. The ratings of the principals were analyzed and the means scaled into four categories as illustrated in Figure 1:



Figure 1: Distribution chart of principals' rating of CDF based on scores of Likert scale items

According to figure 1, a mean of less than 2 was categorized as very low between 2 and 3 as low, between 3 and 4 as moderate and above 4 as high.

Mean Rating of Principals on the Key Education Themes Achieved through CDF

The principals were asked to rate the extent to which CDF had contributed to the improvement of physical facilities, enrolment and reduction of dropout rate in their respective schools. The findings are presented in Table 1:

Table 1: Mean Rating of the Principals Based on Key Areas in Secondary Education

| Theme | Index |
|---|--------------|
| Improvement of physical facilities | 2.22 |
| Improvement of enrolment in secondary schools | 3.18 |
| Impact in reduction of dropout rate | 2.41 |
| Average | 2.60 |

Table 1 indicates that the rating index of the three key themes in secondary school education had an average of 2.60. According to the rating chart illustrated in figure 1, this rating was low. This implies that according to the principals’ view, CDF has not significantly impacted on improving the status of secondary school education in Ndaragwa Constituency, Kenya. The sub-sections that follow discuss the principals’ opinion on the impact of CDF on each of the themes covered, namely improvement of physical facilities, enrolment and reduction of dropout rate in their respective schools.

Impact of CDF on the Improvement of School Physical Facilities

Table 1 indicates that the impact of CDF on the development of physical facilities had a mean of 2.22 which is low as per the scale used. It is worth noting that, physical facilities play an important role in the overall performance of students in both academics and co-curricular activities. In a study conducted by Uko (2015) it was found that the condition, adequacy and effective management of educational facilities had a stronger effect on the overall performance of students than the combined influence of family background and school attendance. The study further observed that in order to fulfil educational objectives, education facilities are required and should be central to the extent that teachers, students and other personnel will enjoy their stay and perform their duties effectively.

The study further sought to find out the rating of the principals on specific physical facilities that are financed by CDF. They were asked to indicate their rating with regard to the extent to which CDF had contributed to the improvement of specific physical facilities. The findings are presented in table 2.

Table 1: Principals’ Rating of Effectiveness of CDF in Improvement of Physical Facilities

| Item | Index |
|--|--------------|
| 1 Construction of additional classrooms | 3.00 |
| 2 Acquiring computers | 2.41 |
| 3 Construction an administration block | 2.27 |
| 4 Improvement of sports equipment and facilities | 1.73 |
| 5 Construction or Improvement of sanitary facilities | 2.23 |
| 6 Power Connection | 2.23 |
| 7 Improvement of Security | 1.91 |
| 8 Facilitation of power supply | 1.90 |
| 9 Acquiring of chairs | 1.75 |
| 10 Improvement of teaching of science | 2.77 |

As clearly illustrated in table 2, the principals rated the construction of additional classrooms highly. This could suggest that CDF responded to high demand of secondary education occasioned by the introduction of subsidized secondary education in 2008. This finding is consistent with findings of a study carried out by Mbaya and Maende (2014) in Sabatia Sub-county that found that CDF was one of the institutions that assisted schools in response to serious congestion in classrooms witnessed after the introduction of subsidized secondary education. This could also point to a deliberate effort by the government to improve transition rate from primary to secondary education.

Integrating ICT in teaching and learning is one of the strategies that the government is using to enhance quality of teaching and learning in schools. This requires that schools have reliable source of power and computers including other ICT equipment. Towards this end, CDF seems to fair poorly in both provision of computers and assisting schools to connect to the power grid. On electric power connection, the low rating could be attributed to the fact that the government is collaborating with rural electrification authority (REA) which has seen 73.7 per cent of secondary schools being connected to the power grid as reported in the Basic Education statistical booklet of 2014. After being connected to the national grid, schools were expected to look for funds to finance the wiring and other necessary equipments within the school. From the rating in table 2, CDF appears not to have assisted schools in this area. Physical facilities such as administration block, chairs and sports facilities are crucial in making students and other school personnel comfortable and enjoy their stay in the school. Towards this end, the principals appear not to be satisfied with what CDF has achieved in this area, hence the low rating.

According to Session Paper Number 10 of 2012 on Kenya Vision 2030, Science Technology and Innovation (STI) are regarded as critical to the socio-economic transformation of the country. In this regard, improving the teaching of science subjects in schools will go a long way in equipping learners with basic skills that will enable them to pursue science based courses at the university. The principals' low rating of CDF in this area appears to suggest that CDF has not played a significant role in assisting schools in improving teaching of sciences. The principals' rating of CDF on improvement of security of their schools was low. It is worth noting that the safety of the learners is central in the achievement of quality education in any country. This has been emphasized by the safety standards manual for schools of 2008. The low rating of the principals in this area could be due to the fact that the nature of security challenges faced by schools includes cases that are mostly related to students' indiscipline as noted by Kirui, Mbugua and Sang (2008). CDF therefore has played minimal role in the maintenance of students' discipline.

Impact of CDF in the Improvement of School Enrolment

The mean rating of the role of CDF in the improvement of enrolment was 3.18 as shown in table 1. This rating was high as per the rating scale and also the highest among the three categories. This high rating could be due to the fact that the CDF Act has set a limit of not more than 10 percent for CDF bursary scheme. The funds could be reaching more students because the 10

percent share has always been set aside for that specific purpose while physical facilities have to compete for funding with other community based projects.

Table 3 shows the distribution of principals' perception of the role of CDF in improvement of enrolment in schools

Table 2: Contribution of CDF in the Improvement of Enrolment as Perceived by Principal

| Item | Index | |
|------|--|--------------|
| 1 | Increased capacity to admit more students | 3.82 |
| 2 | Bursary has helped students join Form 1 | 3.86 |
| 3 | School was able to admit students who had missed places in other schools through political conflicts | 2.91 3.27 |
| 4 | Paid fees for students who would otherwise not have joined school | 3.18 |
| 5 | Students who had not joined school in other years joined form one | 2.91 |
| 6 | Offers financial assistance to students who are IDPs | |
| 7 | Used to pay fees for orphaned students through HIV/AIDs | 3.38 |
| 8 | Students from physically/mentally challenged parents assured of CDF | 2.95 |
| 9 | Students from families affected by natural calamities receive financial assistance | 2.95 |
| 10 | Students rescued from various forms of abuse are assisted | 2.55 |

The data presented in table 1 showed that the contribution of CDF in improving enrolment appears impressive at 3.18. A closer look at the data presented in table 3 shows some disparities in the various groups that have been assisted by CDF towards improvement of school enrolment. While the rating of assisting students by CDF to join Form One is high at 3.86, vulnerable children from parents who were physically or mentally challenged, those whose parents may have been affected by natural calamities and those who had been rescued from various forms of abuse may have been neglected by CDF. It is worth noting that the schools census conducted by the Ministry of Education found that approximately 12 percent of pupils in primary schools were orphaned and vulnerable children (OVC) and those in secondary schools constituted 2.9 percent. This shows that the transition rate to secondary school by OVC is very low compared to the national average. With mean ratings of 2.55, 2.91 and 2.95 respectively, it suggests that the awarding of CDF bursaries may not have been well distributed.

Impact of CDF on the Reduction of Dropout Rate

Dropout rate in secondary school is considered as the percentage of 16-24 year olds who are not enrolled in school. For the purposes of this study, a dropout was defined as any student who abandons school completely after being enrolled before sitting for Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) examination. The impact of CDF in the reduction of dropout rate was low at 2.41 as illustrated in table 1. However for the various areas that can lead to students dropping out of school as presented in table 4, the principals opined that CDF has assisted students who become needy in the course of their secondary school education more than all the others aspects. The reasons for dropping out of school are due to perceived future prospects or lack of them, schools failing to provide impetus for continued study, youngsters admiring the

lifestyles of contemporaries who had already left, youngsters being tired of study and schools being no fun (Liu, 2014). In this regard, dropping out of school can be mitigated through guidance and counselling and promoting co-curricular activities. This will accommodate students who are good in the co-curricular activities and thus they will enjoy their school life.

Table 3: Impact of CDF on Reduction in Dropout Rate

| | Item | Index |
|----|---|--------------|
| 1 | Maintains needy students joining form one until they finish form four | 2.95 |
| 2 | Emerging needy students are given CDF until they finish school | 2.68 |
| 3 | Amount of CDF given meets all fee requirements for needy students | 1.82 |
| 4 | Student who are given CDF are not sent home for fees | 2.59 |
| 5 | Timing of disbursement of CDF bursary enables students to remain in school Throughout the term | 1.95 |
| 6 | A significant number of needy students are maintained in school through CDF funding | |
| 7 | CDF bursary is a reliable source of fees for needy students in my school | 2.50 |
| 8 | Students from parents who are unable to raise the required fees in the course of the students studies in my school are assisted through CDF | 3.10 |
| 9 | Used to facilitate professional counselling of students in my school to Avoid dropping out of school | 1.86 |
| 10 | CDF funds are used to sponsor co-curricular activities to motivate Students who are not academically talented | 1.82 |

From the findings in table 4, it can be noted that the principals' rating of CDF's effectiveness in assisting the schools to promote co-curricular activities and guidance and counselling was very low. According to the findings, principals opined that CDF is not a reliable source of funds in instituting measures aimed at reducing the dropout rate in secondary schools in Ndaragwa Constituency.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study it can be concluded that CDF has not impacted satisfactorily in financing secondary school education. The study established that other than improving on enrolment, CDF fared poorly in improvement of school physical resources and reducing dropout rates. This indicates that there is need for policy makers and education planners to develop a more effective framework for implementing government and public resources set aside for education in the country.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the study findings, the following recommendations were made;

- i. The government could consider increasing the amount of funds directed to CDF bursary. This will enable CDF to pay school fees for the applicants throughout the four years of secondary education. This will reduce the number of those students who drop out from secondary schools due to fees problems. It will also improve the performance in national examinations since the level of absenteeism will be reduced
- ii. CDF could also consider assisting schools to improve co-curricular activities. This will act as a motivation for those students who are likely to drop out of schools due to poor academic performance. They will also find school exciting because of their good performance in co-curricular activities.
- iii. CDF should set aside funds to help the existing schools to increase their capacity to admit more students rather than set up new schools with few students. It could also consider assisting day schools to set up boarding sections so as to admit students from areas that are far from the school. This will increase their enrolment and also increase the number of boarding schools.

REFERENCES

Abagi O (1997). *Public and Private Investment in Primary Education in Kenya: An Agenda for Change*. Institute for Policy Analysis and Research, Nairobi.

Abreu E (1982). *The Role of Self Help in the Development of Education in Kenya 1900 – 1973* Nairobi: Kenya Literature Bureau

Bogonko. S. N (1992). *A History of Modern Education in Kenya 1895 – 1991*. Nairobi Oxford University Press

Kothari.C.R. (2004). *Research Methodology.Methods and Techniques*. Second revised edition.New Weley Eastern LTD 2009.

Chiuri.L.W & Kiumi J.K. (2005) *Planning and Economics of Education*; Pangolin Publishers Ltd.

Government of Kenya. (1988). *Presidential Working Party on Education and Manpower Training For The Next Decade and Beyond*. Nairobi: Government Printer.

Government of Kenya (1999).*Totally Integrated Quality Education and Training (TIQET) Koech Report*. Nairobi: Government Printers.

Government of Kenya (2003). *National Development Report 2002 – 2008*. Nairobi; Government Printer.

Government of Kenya (2004). *Economic Survey 1989*. Nairobi: Government Printer.

Government of Kenya. (2005). *Nyandarua District Strategic Plan 2005-2010*. National coordination Agency for Population and Development, Ministry of Planning and National Development. Chancery Tower Valley Road, Nairobi.

Government of Kenya (2008).*Economic Survey 2007*. Nairobi: Government Printer.

Government of Kenya (2010).*Economic Survey (2009)*: Nairobi Government Printer.

Government of Kenya. (2013).*The Basic Education Act (2013)*.Nairobi ; Government Printer.

Government of Kenya. (2015). *Fees guidelines for public secondary schools (2015)*. Nairobi: Government Printer.

- Government of Kenya (2015). *The National Government Constituencies Development Fund Act (2015)*. Nairobi; Government printer.
- Government of Kenya. (2015). Fees guidelines for secondary schools in Kenya (2015). Nairobi; Government printer.
- Halima N. A. (2014). World Bank Report. *The influence of Rural Longistics and Rural Transport Costs on Farm Income and Poverty in Kenya. The case of Kisumu and Nyandarua Districts in Kenya*.
- Kasomo.D.(2006) *Research Methods in Humanities and Education*. Egerton University Press, Egerton :Kenya.
- Kerlinger, F. N (1973) *Foundations of Behavioral research*, second edition, Holt Reinhrt and Wilson. New York
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). *Foundation of behavioral*. London Winston inc..
- Mbaya J.B and Maende J.T. *Impact of Subsidized School Funding on Infrastructure Development in Public Secondary Schools in Sabatia Sub County, Vihiga County, Kenya* MED Thesis, Mount Kenya university
- Ministry of Education (2003). *National Report on the Development of Education in Kenya 2001*. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Mutua R.W. (2009). *Development of Education in Kenya 1946 – 1963*. Nairobi: East African Literature Bureau
- Njeru, E.H. & Orodho, J. A. (2003). *Education Financing in Kenya. Secondary schools Bursary Scheme; Implementation and Challenges*. Nairobi: IPAR.
- Olaniyan.D.A and Okemakinde 2008 [Http://www.Eurojournals.com/Ejsr.24-201](http://www.Eurojournals.com/Ejsr.24-201).
- Human Capital Theory Implications For Educational Development.
- Otiende.J.E, S. P. Wamahiu and A. M. Karugu 1992 *Education and Development in Kenya: A Historical Perspective*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Sifuna.D.N and J. E. Otiende (1992). *An Introductory History of Education*. Nairobi; Nairobi University Press.
- Uko. E.S(2015) *Principalship and Effective Management of Facilities in Secondary Schools in Cross river State. Nigeria*. International journal of Academic Research and Reflection vol 3 No 1 2015.
- UNESCO-UIS. (2002). *Financing Education in Sub-Saharan Africa. Meeting the Challenges of Expansion, Equity and Quality*. Montreal Quebec, Canada: UNESCO Institute of Statistics