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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors influencing management of Constituency Development Fund (CDF) projects in public secondary schools. Imenti South Sub-county was selected for the study. The objectives of the study were, to assess the influence of project identification by BOM on management of CDF projects in public secondary schools, to determine how adequacy of funding influences management of CDF projects by BOM in public secondary schools, to assess the influence of project implementation by BOM on management of CDF projects in public secondary schools and to determine the influence of Monitoring and Evaluation by BOM on management of CDF projects in public secondary schools. The study may be of significance to the Ministry of Education in formulating policies related to Management of CDF projects. The study adopted descriptive survey design. The researcher used questionnaire, Interview guide and observational checklist to collect data. The respondents of the study were 32 school principals, 32 BOM chairpersons, 165 BOM members, 12 CDFC members, 1 DEO and 3 AEOS. Validity of the instrument was established through sharing the information in the questionnaires with the supervisor and colleague students to establish whether the questions were relevant. Reliability of the instrument was established through test retest method. Quantitative data was analyzed through descriptive statistics using SPSS package and presented using percentages and Tables. Qualitative data was analyzed through content analysis which in turn was analyzed by organizing data into themes. The findings of the study showed that majority of BOM committee were usually involved in identification of projects through participation in need assessment, tendering of project, budget preparation and implementation. Findings also indicated that BOM committee lacks a developed monitoring and evaluation system for schools though a majority agreed that adhering to monitoring and evaluation schedule would improve management of CDF projects in schools. The recommendations of the study are that the CDF committee should disburse funds in time to schools and also allocate enough funds to facilitate completion of the intended projects. This would minimize stalled CDF projects in schools.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Most countries in the world have realized the importance of decentralization in order to bring about development at the local level. Decentralization as a means of transforming the society aims at mobilization of resources for Nation building. Uganda for instance started decentralization on political front since 1986 in order to meet the needs and interests of its citizens. According to Odhiambo, (2006) through decentralization effort the Ugandan Government was able to achieve transfer of power to lower levels of Government, improving resource accountability and responsibility by linking taxes to service delivery and improving capacity at local level to plan finance, manage and implement projects and programs.

India has a programme called Member of Parliament Constituency Development Fund (MPCDF) in which every Constituency is allocated funds according to poverty index (Sashiyan, 2007). Indian schools are managed by School Based Management Committee (SBMC) who have autonomy over budgeting, project identification, monitoring and implementation of the funded projects. The school committee requests for grants from the local constituency office with a plan, budget and project proposal which encourages transparency and accountability. The School Based Management Committees (SBMC) is accountable to the local CDF office which then accounts to the Central Government of India and they are legally mandated and trained in both financial and general school management. However, the school projects in India are not completed in time due to inefficiency of SBMC, and inadequacy of funds which forces government intervention to complete school projects (Muraya, 2009).

African countries like Zambia, Ghana and Senegal have programmes similar to Kenya, Zambian government have mandated School Management Committees (SMC) and School Governing Boards (SGB) to manage funds from the Central Government. (Board man, 2001). The two project fund management teams in Zambian schools often create conflict for their roles are not clearly defined yet both management teams are accountable to the Government for they request grants from the Government as one school governing unit and the committee uses the disbursed
funds for intended school purpose according to plan and budget such as building of classes, toilets. However, the two groups’ battle for greater control of the funds which slows decision making and affects budgeting and project implementation processes. The disbursement of school project funds from Zambian Government aided schools is delayed due to conflict between SMC and SGB and school projects are not completed in time (Wilson, 2007).

Education is an important tool for imparting knowledge, skills and values from one generation to another (Oluoch, 1982) and in Kenya education is recognized as an important sector which contributes to socio-economic, political and cultural development. Management of Secondary School Education is crucial for achievement of predetermined goals hence, Secondary Schools are managed by Board of Management (BOM) which aims at giving each school its own personality and identity. With decentralization of authority and for effectiveness, the Board of Management (BOM) are involved in sourcing and utilization of resources by ensuring that school funds are prudently managed (Eshiwan, 1990). Education act Cap. 211 and sessional paper No. 1 of 2005 state that the Board of Management should manage human and other resources in schools so as to facilitate smooth operations, infrastructural development and provision of teaching and learning materials (MOEST, 2005). The BOM is also responsible for the management of the projects sponsored by Constituency Development Fund (CDF) kitty (Mburugu, 2006).

The CDF was designed to support constituency level; grassroots development projects and its aim is to achieve equitable distribution of development resources across regions and control imbalances in regional development brought about by Partisan Politics (Oyugi, 2007). It targets all constituency development projects particularly those aimed to combat poverty at the grassroots (Kimenyi 2005). The CDF programme has facilitated the putting up of new water, health and education facilities in all parts of the country, including remote areas that were usually overlooked during funds allocation in National budgets (Wilson 2007).

The CDF was among the innovations of the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) Government of Kenya. The CDF has an annual budgetary allocation by the Central Government to each of the
constituency in the country. The CDF is therefore a decentralization idea that provides communities with opportunities to decide on projects of interests for the social benefit of community members hence improvement of livelihoods. The CDF Act 2003 that brought CDF funds provides an amount equal to 2.5% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) for CDF. According to Odhiambo (2006), the CDF programs involve redistribution of decision making responsibilities for project identification, planning, and implementation and monitoring from the Central Government to the constituencies.

The CDF channeled to learning institutions has enabled putting up of facilities such as classrooms, dormitories, ablution blocks and other infrastructural projects (Ayako,2006).This aims at improving schools facilities, performance and enrollment hence achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and vision 2030 aspects of education. The public secondary schools in Kenya are under the management of Board of Management (BOM) and administrated by schools principals who are charged with the responsibility of ensuring public schools are run as per the guidelines of the Ministry of Education.

BOM in Imenti South sub-county face many challenges while managing CDF projects according to a seminar organized for Imenti South District in December, 2012. It was reported that school projects face numerous challenges in management and implementation of projects such as inadequate project funding, poor financial management skills by the BOM and poor standard workmanship (DEO’s report 2012).

Also a report by Government of Kenya (GOK, 2007) states that most BOM members cannot rank needs or quality and quantity and are composed of elites in the society who use their influence to undermine the views of the less educated members in the same BOM (Oyugi, 2007). The study sought to establish the factors that influence management of CDF projects and hope to generate new knowledge that would widen the horizon of existing knowledge concerning CDF project management by Board of Management as stipulated in the CDF Act and Education Act (Cap, 2011). Mburugu (2006), states that the noble concept of CDF initiating school funded projects and the BOM in the management of these funds has received insignificant attention from
a few researchers. Therefore the study filled the gap by researching on factors influencing management of the CDF projects in public Secondary Schools in Imenti South Sub-county.

1.2 Statement of the problem.
In Kenya many development projects are funded by CDF which was established by Constituency Development Fund Act 2003 published in Kenya Gazzette supplement No., 107 (act No., 11) 9th January 2004. The Act compels the Central Government of Kenya to remit 2.5 percent of its annual ordinary revenue budget every year to constituency development fund. Subsequently; the local constituency is compelled by the same act to allocate 46.2 percent to Education sector (GOK, 2003). Kimenyi,(2005) argues that CDF management faces varied challenges some of which include the organization structure in managing CDF projects and project identification criteria. The CDF in Kenya has had impressive results in some constituencies while others have performed poorly in the utilization of funds in various projects (Mulwa, 2008).

Under the CDF kitty several funded projects have been initiated in schools where some of the projects stall along the way and others are fully implemented. Complains have been raised on BOM capability on management of funds on funded projects by CDF Kitty in Kenya and also in Imenti South Sub-county (DEO’s report 2013). Since the inception of the CDF programme in schools, there are limited studies which have been carried out to establish the factors influencing management of CDF projects in Public Secondary Schools. This study therefore established the factors influencing management of CDF projects in Public Secondary School in Imenti South sub-county.

1.3 Purpose of the study
The purpose of this study was to assess the factors influencing Management of CDF projects in Public Secondary Schools in Imenti South Sub-county of Meru County.
1.4 Objectives of the study
This study was guided by the following objectives.

i. To assess the influence of project identification in managing CDF projects in Public Secondary Schools in Imenti South Sub-county.

ii. To determine how adequacy of funding influences management of CDF projects in Public Secondary Schools in Imenti South Sub-county.

iii. To assess the influence of project implementation in managing CDF projects in Public Secondary Schools in Imenti South Sub-county.

iv. To determine the influence of Monitoring and Evaluation in managing CDF projects in Public Secondary Schools in Imenti South Sub-county.

1.5 Research questions
The study was guided by the following research questions.

i. How does project identification influence the management of CDF projects in Public Secondary Schools in Imenti South Sub-county?

ii. How does adequacy of funding influence the management of CDF projects in Public Secondary Schools in Imenti South Sub-county?

iii. How does project implementation influence the management of CDF projects in Public Secondary Schools in Imenti South Sub-county?

iv. How does Monitoring and Evaluation influence the management of CDF projects in Public Secondary Schools in Imenti South Sub-county?

1.6 Significance of the study
It is hoped that the study findings may be used by the Ministry of Education (MOE), to formulate Policies and financial issues related to CDF funds management by the Secondary Schools . The research findings would also be used to develop policy interventions that would improve BOM management skills.

It is hopeful that the CDF Board and CDF Committee in Imenti South Constituency would also use the research findings in strengthening the management of CDF funds. This would ensure
more schools benefit from the CDF funds hence improving the education standards in the country.

The study findings may provide literature which would be used by scholars in the area of development funds especially CDF. This would broaden the existing knowledge on decentralization.

1.7 Delimitation of the study
There are many factors that influence management of CDF projects, but this study assessed the factors influencing BOM in managing CDF projects. The scope of the study was delimited to 32 CDF funded out of the possible 65 Public Secondary Schools in Imenti South Sub-County, Meru County.

1.8 Limitations of the study
The study was limited by:-

- The BOM may not provide confidential or sensitive information which may interfere with results.
- The distance between the schools limited the study due to financial implications.
- Lack of proper documentation by the project management committees made it difficult to track funds disbursed to projects over time.

1.9 Assumptions of the study.
The study was based on the following assumptions

i. Respondents would be co-operative and honest in their responses.

ii. Secondary schools with CDF projects have Board of Management (BOM) who understand their roles as managers.

iii. The respondents are conversant with MOE and CDF policy guidelines on financial management.
1.10 Definition of significant terms used in the study.

**Board of Management Committee** - refers to a legally mandated committee appointed by the Minister for Education and charged with responsibility of management of secondary schools resources and funds.  

**Management of CDF projects in public Secondary schools** – A unique activity with a beginning and an end funded through the Constituency Development Fund. The activity aims at organizing the use of these CDF resources in a specific way to achieve particular results within a given time period.  

**Evaluation** – Determining the value, significance, or worth of CDF projects through careful appraisal and study by the BOM.  

**Imenti South sub-county** – Refers to an administrative unit within Meru County.  

**Influence** - refers to the power to change or effect change in a person or institution, the power to determine needs to approve budgets of projects through a process that involves planning, budgeting, implementing and management of funds in a school.  

**Monitoring** – The art of collecting necessary information by the BOM in order to make a steering decision concerning CDF projects at the right time.  

**Project Identification** – The process of checking if the candidate projects should be undertaken by the school through the BOM.  

**Project Implementation** – It’s the actual execution of the project design which involves what is required to successfully complete the project along the dimensions of time, budget / cost and quality.

1.11 Organization of the study

The study was organized into Five chapters. Chapter One covered background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research objectives and research questions. It also covered the significance of the study, basic assumptions of the study, limitations of the study, delimitations of the study and definition of significant terms used in the study. Chapter Two reviewed literature of the study on the factors influencing management of CDF projects in Public Secondary Schools. The chapter covered management of CDF projects in secondary schools and the project life cycle. It also focused on BOM involvement in project Identification,
Project Implementation, and Monitoring and Evaluation of CDF projects and how adequacy of funding influences the management of CDF projects. The chapter also covered theoretical and conceptual Frameworks. Chapter Three covered the methodology used during data collection. It covered the research design, the target population, sample size and sampling procedures. It also covered the data collection instruments, the instruments’ validity and reliability, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques. Chapter Four covered data analysis, interpretation and presentation while Chapter Five covered summary of the study findings, discussions, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW.

2.1 Introduction
This chapter reviewed literature related to the study on the factors influencing management of CDF projects in public secondary schools. The chapter elaborated on management of CDF projects in public secondary schools and the project life cycle. It also focused on BOM involvement in project Identification, BOM involvement in Project Implementation, BOM involvement in Monitoring and Evaluation of CDF projects and how adequacy of funding influences the management of CDF projects.

2.2 Management of CDF projects in public secondary schools
Management of Secondary School Education is crucial for achievement of predetermined goals hence, Secondary Schools are managed by Board of Management (BOM) which aims at giving each school its own personality and identity. With decentralization of authority and for effectiveness, the Board of Management (BOM) are involved in sourcing and utilization of resources by ensuring that school funds are prudently managed (Pakia, 2006).

Education act Cap. 211 and sessional paper No. 1 of 2005 state that the Board of Management should manage human and other resources in schools so as to facilitate smooth operations, infrastructural development and provision of teaching and learning materials (MOEST, 2005). The BOM is also responsible for the management of the projects sponsored by Constituency Development Fund (CDF) kitty (Nowrojee, 2008).

A project is a complex, non-routine, one-time effort limited by time, budget, resources, and performance specifications to meet customer needs (Gray and Larson, 2008). All projects evolve through a similar life cycle sequence during which there should be recognized start and finish points. In addition the project objectives may be defined in a number of ways, e.g. Financial, social and economic, the important point being that the goals are defined and the project is finite (Mantel, 2003). According to the Constituencies Development Fund (Amendment) Act 2007, a project means an eligible development as described by the Act. The projects which are funded by
the constituencies development fund (CDF) are identified and formulated by the community representatives and they should have a lasting and significant social economic impact on the community (GOK, 2003).

The project life cycle goes through four stages such as defining the project, project planning, implementation stage and handing over/ which involves delivering the project to the intended stakeholders. According to Mulwa, (2008) there is no life cycle that applies to all the projects and in school funded projects, the project are identified by the school management and build up to the peak. Gall,(2007) identified four phased model stages that a project goes through such as defining stage, during this stage, the project specification are defined, project objective are established and implementation teams are formed.

The second stage is planning which entails developing a structure to determine project achievement, the project schedule and the intended beneficiaries. During the third stage major project work implementation takes place and products such as classrooms, toilets, dining halls, and administration blocks among others are produced. The fourth and final stage is about handing over or delivering the project to the stakeholders such as BOM, PTA, students and local community leaders for the intended use (Howard &Snetro 2002). During the handing over of the project stakeholders may be trained on project management, handing over documents are handed over to the board for safe keeping and future reference hence CDF projects undergo a project life cycle like other projects such as depicted in Figure 1.
Once a project has been handed over to the school management the focus switches to the school project management team (SPMT) that sets the stage for project monitoring. Safety measures and provision of security by school management and local community leaders is developed early in the project life cycle and any project crises after handing over may be averted by pre-planning and setting project funds by the organization for future renovation which should be included in the initial budget (Mental and, Meredith 2003).

2.3 Project identification and Management of CDF Projects

According to Gall,(2007) a project is a complex non-routine, one life time effort limited by time, budget and resources to meet customers’ needs. The constituency development fund amended Act (2007), defines a project as an eligible development in which the projects are identified by the school management committee (SMC) or Board of management (BOM) after community formulation (GOK, 2003). The BOM is a legal body constituted and mandated by the Minister

Figure 1: CDF Project life cycle

Source CDF implementation guide (GOK, 2006)
for Education to manage schools. Education Act, (Cap 211), sections 3 (1) vests the management of Education in Kenya with the Minister for Education who delegates the BOMs in all public schools to manage school resources including funds. The BOM is the legitimate manager of a public secondary school and exercises this authority through the principal who is the BOM secretary.

The CDF Act of 2003, sections, 23 (3) provides for community to come up with a list of projects to be funded by CDF. Section 38 of the act provides for the community representation in any project undertaken to be under a manager in the school. Project identification lays squarely with the Board and after identifying the project then the BOM cost the project by preparing Bill of Quantities (BQ) and forwarding the same to CDFC in accordance with CDF Act, (2007). The BOM then forwards minutes of certified documents for approval and ratification to local CDF office (MOEST, 2003).

According to Mburugu (2006) BOM face many challenges while managing project funds from CDF which is due to composition of BOMs, shortage of CDF funds and long bureaucratic process and disbursement. The CDF Act, 2003, provides the need for costing and evaluating projects in schools on continuous basis in which the BOM is mandated to cost all projects and avail financial records related to CDF projects, tender the project and provide all bank transactions and project implementation report, CDF Amended Act,(2013).

2.4 Adequacy of funding and management of CDF projects

Many schools are built and equipped through CDF funds according to Kimenyi , (2005) ,locally managed and controlled funds have great potential to bring about positive development outcome at local level especially if community participation is sufficiently enhanced. Effective funds management in schools is determined by parameters which govern funds control such as auditing, BOM training level and good financial governance (Mburugu 2006).

According to Oyugi (2007), effective management of funds has been in adequate in allowing for identification, implementation, project monitoring and evaluation. The CDF act 2003, section 25 (2) stipulates that funds for school projects should be adequate and be disbursed in time for
successful implementation of school projects, CDF allocates project fund as grants and is allocated through a thorough process every financial year and the BOM are mandated to prudently manage allocated project funds.

The government avails funds to National Management Committee which allocates the available funds to school projects which may not be as per BOM project budget, Ochieng (2005). The school management then cost the project with the available funds from CDF which may not be enough to complete the school project. Bennel and Sayid (2002), argues that countries in sub-Saharan Africa such as Zambia disburses funds to three categories of school; National, Provincial and District levels through Secondary School Educational Board (SSEB) although the funds are inadequate and don’t reach schools in time Cohen (2002).

2.5 Project implementation and management of CDF projects

Kimenyi (2005) argues that CDF is designed to fight poverty though implementation of development projects at local level especially those that provide basic needs such as education, and healthcare. According to Ochieng (2005), Project implementation is a very important part of the life cycle of a project. It’s the actual execution of the project design which involves what is required to successfully complete the project along the dimensions of time, budget/cost and quality (Gikonyo, 2008), and all school project implementation is handled by the Board of management with the principal as the secretary monitoring day-to-day project implementation.

Project implementation influences the BOM to stick to time frame allocated to the CDF project in the school in order to achieve predetermined managerial goals (CDF ACT, 2003). The Board of management proposes projects to CDFC according to resources allocated; the BOM selects a single school project from many project proposals that can contribute significantly to the school objectives which the BOM can implement according to Mburugu (2006).

The CDF amendment act 2004 and the public procurement and disposal act 2005 and the CDF implementation guidelines 2004 prepared by National Management Committee (Gikonyo, 2008) provides that CDF projects are implemented by the respective Government Departments in
which they fall. Members are expected to be active in the implementation phase to ensure objectives of the project are met, according to the National Management Committee (2004).

2.6 Project Monitoring and Evaluation and Management of CDF Projects

Gudda (2011), defines monitoring as the art of collecting the necessary information with minimum effort in order to make a steering decision at the right time. This information also constitutes an important and necessary database for analysis, discussion, evaluation (self) and reporting. According to Gebremedhin, Getachew & Amha (2010), Monitoring is a process of measuring, data collecting, processing and communicating to assist the beneficiaries and project staff in decision making. The purpose is to provide all concerned with information as whether project objectives are being achieved and whether the operations, performance and impact of a project is “on course”, according to Wanjiru,(2008).

The information should also indicate inadequate operations, shortfalls in performance and discrepancies between planned objectives or predicted impact and those achieved in order to modify inadequate objectives and rectify project deficiencies (Kerote 2007). The BOM involvement in monitoring is to be conceived from the beginning as part of the group formation and action process. Mulwa, (2008) defines evaluation as a process that involves systematic collection, analysis and interpretation of project related data. The importance of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) has to be impressed upon the implementing group at the very start of the project. According to Oaklet Peter (1988) effective recording is to be undertaken by BOM of inputs, outputs, work plans and progress made in CDF projects.

Monitoring could give much satisfaction to the beneficiaries and facilitate benchmark for other projects (Mulwa 2008). The CDF should have part of monitoring and evaluation components in its management (CDF Act 2003). Wanjiru (2008) indicated in her social audit of CDF that monitoring report be strengthened and deepened in all CDF projects. According to Mulwa (2008), any judgment emanating from evaluation largely depended on the value system from which evaluating party originates.
The revised CDF Act 2007 emphasizes that the identified projects when implemented should then be monitored and evaluated. The act gives the technical department and the Constituency Development Fund Committee (CDFC) authority to monitor the projects and allocates 2% of the CDFC fund be used for Monitoring and Evaluation exercise. A manager who fails to monitor a program to gather coverage and process information misses out on the opportunity to start desirable activities, change directions when necessary and stop doing unproductive activities (Holden, 2004). M&E seems to be highly valued in theory even if not widely taken in practice, some of the BOM and CDFC members are trained on M&E but they do not do it practically.

2.7 Theoretical Framework

The study employed the theory of Needs Achievement as postulated by David McLelland who had build on an earlier work by Henry Murray (1938). According to McLleland (1961) an individual’s motivation can result from three dominant needs namely, the need for achievement (N-achi), the need for affiliation (N-aff) and the need for power (N-p). On the need for achievement, the Board of Management can perform its duties by managing constituency development fund projects when provided with right financial management tools such as, planning, programming and budgeting systems (PPBS). In the PPBS process, the BOM while using needs achievement can be provided with rational information on programmes related to CDF management. The BOM would need power and authority as advocated by McLleland (1961) to be able to manage CDF projects as budgeted, planned and approved. The theory of needs would compel the BOM to have a single mind preoccupation in management of CDF projects. The BOM would feel affiliated when the school environment is conducive after project implementation and would be able to operate and manage CDF projects effectively. In this study, the BOM would feel frustrated and perform poorly in management of CDF projects if an enabling environment is not provided for them as CDF project managers.
2.8 Conceptual framework

The Figure 2 shows a conceptual framework that has major variables and their influence on each other.

**Figure 2: Conceptual Framework**

A Conceptual framework clarifies relationship among independent and dependent variables. It provides a clear concept of the areas in which meaningful relationships are likely to exist (Cargan, 2007). In this research, the researcher intends to find out the influence that project identification, adequacy of funding, project implementation and Monitoring and Evaluation by BOM have on Management of CDF projects in public secondary schools. It shows that effective CDF project management depends on independent variables. Though the variables have a direct influence on management of CDF projects, there are moderating variables such as Government policy that impact on CDF project management by BOM. The dependent variable influence BOM to be effective in managing CDF projects which will lead to improved school infrastructure hence improvement in academic Performance in schools.
2.9 Summary of the chapter and research gaps

The literature review focused on factors influencing Management of Constituency Development Fund projects in Public Secondary Schools in Imenti South Sub-county which included, Board of management involvement in project identification, Project Implementation, adequacy of funding and Monitoring and Evaluation of school projects. This chapter related the above issues on the management of Constituency Development Fund Projects by Board of Management.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter focused on research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, data collection instruments, ethical considerations and operational definition of variables.

3.2 Research design

The study employed a descriptive survey design. The design was used in collecting data to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject under study. A survey collects information from a sample by asking questions in order to describe such aspects or characteristics of the population of which the sample is part of (Fraenkel & Wallen 2009). According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a descriptive survey is the best method for social scientist interested in collecting original data so as to describe a population which is too large to observe directly.

3.3 Target population

The target population of the study was the 32 Public Secondary Schools within the three Divisions of Imenti South Sub-county which have been funded by CDF. The 32 BOM Chairpersons, 32 School Principals, 165 BOM members, 1 DEO, 3 AEOs and 12 Constituency Development Fund Committee (CDFC) members formed the target population. The total respondents who participated in the study was therefore 245.

3.4 Sample size and Sampling procedure

This section describes the sample size and sampling procedure

3.4.1 Sample size

A sample in a research study is the part of a population (group) from which information is obtained while sampling refers to the process of selecting individuals who will take part in a research study. Samples were used instead of the entire population in order to reduce costs, time used in research, quality control and also because accessibility of the entire population is sometimes difficult (Kasomo, 2006)
The study used a sample size derived from table developed by Krejcie and Morgan, (1970) Sample Size Determination Table in appendix IX. According to the table, the sample size was 245 respondents as shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Sampling frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>NO. TO BE INTERVIEWED. SAMPLED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOM Chairpersons</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOM Members</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Principals</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEOs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFC Members</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>368</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2 Sampling procedure

Purposive sampling was used where public schools that have been funded with CDF funds in Imenti South sub-county were investigated and all the CDFC committee, AEOs and DEO members were selected for interview. Simple random sampling was applied to select samples of BOM members to be included in the study from the 32 CDF funded Public schools. Purposive sampling enabled the researcher to use the respondent as required based on the objectives of the study and the respondents were clearly predetermined and their inclusion justified. Simple random sampling ensured that each BOM member had an equal chance of being selected.

3.5 Data Collection Instruments.

The instruments of data collection included the use of questionnaire, interview guide/schedule and observation checklist.

3.5.1 Questionnaire

A questionnaire is most appropriate when addressing sensitive issues especially on survey that deal with anonymity to avoid reluctance or deviation by respondents according to Babbie (1989). Data was collected from the BOM members and school principals using a questionnaire. The questionnaire was formulated in a manner that it addressed each objective under study. Close
ended questions were used for easy coding and analysis while open ended questions were used to enable respondents give their independent opinion.

3.5.2 Observation Checklist.
According to Mcmillan & Schumacher (2001), an observation checklist is used to collect data regardless of other techniques used. Observation as a method of data collection was also used to collect data. The researcher while administering the questionnaires observed the CDF project existence in schools such as dormitory, classrooms, work quality, implementation process and was able to record such observations.

3.5.3 Interview guide/schedule
According to Mcmillan & Schumacher (2001), interview guide is flexible and adaptable as it involves direct interaction between individuals. Face to face interview was used to collect information from the CDFC members, DEO and AEOS as they are effective and appropriate and had questions related to objectives.

3.6 Validity of Instruments
Validity refers to appropriateness, meaningfulness, usefulness and correctness of inferences a researcher makes based on data collected through an instrument, (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Content validity of the instrument was determined by my supervisor, a lecturer from the University of Nairobi and my student colleagues. The corrections on the indentified questions were incorporated in the instrument hence fine tuning the items to increase its validity.

3.7 Reliability of Instrument
Reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trial. (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). In this study the test-retest method of estimating reliability was used. It involved administering the questionnaire twice with a break of one week to the same respondents from two selected schools at separate times. The scores of the first and second trials were computed using Pearson’s product moment Correlation Coefficient.

\[
    r = \frac{N\sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{N\sum x^2 -(\sum x)^2} \sqrt{N\sum y^2 -(\sum y)^2}}
\]

Where
A Pearson product moment correlation coefficient (PPMCC) of 0.83 for the BOM questionnaire were obtained indicating that the two sets of scores were correlated hence the instrument had high degree of reliability.

To check the reliability of the interview schedule, test and retest formula was applied by administering the instrument on one identified respondent and repeating it on the same respondent after a week’s interval. A correlation coefficient of 0.82 was obtained hence according to Mugenda and Mugenda, (2003) a coefficient of 0.80 or more implies that there is a high degree of reliability of the data. Therefore, both instruments were deemed to be highly reliable.

3.8 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher obtained a permit from the National Council for Science and Technology. A copy of the permit was submitted to the DEOs office Imenti South Sub County and CDF offices were contacted to give a letter that allowed the researcher to conduct research in the District. The selected schools were then visited to seek permission and administer questionnaire to respondents. The questionnaires were personally administered to the respondents by the researcher.

3.9 Data Analysis and presentation Techniques

According to Brymen & Crammer (2007), data analysis seeks to fulfill research objectives and provide answers to research questions. Data analysis refers to examining what has been collected in a survey or experiment and making deductions and inferences. Completed questionnaires were collected for data coding and analysis. Analysis then proceeded according to objective and research questions of the study. The quantitative data collected was assigned nominal, ordinal and interval values and analyzed using descriptive statistics of frequency tables and percentages.
as well as the mean. The findings from this kind of data was interpreted and analyzed further with the help of Statistical package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and then presented in form of frequency distribution tables, percentages, figures and words in order to make meaningful conclusions. This was deemed to be easy in interpretation and convenient in giving general overview of the problem under study. Qualitative data was analyzed through content analysis which in turn was analyzed by organizing data into themes, patterns and sub-topics.
### Table 3.2: Operationalization of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Variable/Indicator</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Tools of Analysis</th>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To assess the influence of project identification by BOM in managing CDF projects in public secondary schools in Imenti South Sub-county.</td>
<td>Independent • Project identification</td>
<td>Needs assessment • Tendering</td>
<td>Nominal Ordinal</td>
<td>Mean Percentages</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine how adequacy of funding influences management of CDF projects by BOM in public secondary schools in Imenti South Sub-county.</td>
<td>Adequacy of funding • Amount given • Disbursement</td>
<td>Nominal Ordinal</td>
<td>Mean Percentages</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To assess the influence of project implementation by BOM in managing CDF projects in public secondary schools in Imenti South Sub-county.

To determine the influence of Monitoring and Evaluation by BOM in managing CDF projects in public secondary schools in Imenti South Sub-county.

Management of CDF projects **Dependent variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects implementation</th>
<th>Monitoring and Evaluation</th>
<th>Management of CDF projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation plan</td>
<td>Monitoring system</td>
<td>Improved school infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work schedule</td>
<td>Monitoring schedule</td>
<td>Completed School projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Project site visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Descriptive statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Descriptive statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Descriptive statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.10 Ethical issues

Research ethics refer to appropriateness of researcher’s behavior in relation to the rights of those who become the subjects (or informants) of the research work or are affected by it (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhills, 2000). The researcher ensured that participants participated voluntarily on their own consent. Confidentiality of data provided by individual was maintained and their anonymity maintained. Research respondents were treated with respect and courtesy.

3.11 Summary

This chapter discussed the design of the study which is descriptive design. The target population has also been discussed leading to sample size. Details of sampling procedures and methods of data collection, validity and reliability of instruments have also been discussed. Data analysis and presentation has been discussed as well as ethical issues and operational definition of variables.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents Data analysis, presentation and interpretation of the findings on data collected on factors influencing management of constituency development fund projects in public secondary schools in Imenti south Sub County. The findings were presented as follows; response rate, demographic information which captured gender of BOM Committee, age, academic qualification, work experience and position held by BOM committee. The chapter also presents and interprets data on project identification, adequacy of CDF project funds, project implementation and monitoring and evaluation of CDF projects.

4.2. Response Rate

A total of 229 questionnaires were given out to BOM committee for various schools. 3 AEO, DEO officer and 12 CDFC members were interviewed. Out of the issued questionnaire, 182 questionnaires were returned giving a response rate of 79.5%. Table 4.1 shows the response rate.

**Table 4.1: Response rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>Issued questionnaires</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOM Chairman</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOM Members</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFC members</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
<td><strong>196</strong></td>
<td><strong>79.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) a 50% response rate is adequate, 60% good and above 70% rated very good. Based on this assertion the response rate for this study can be said to be very good at 79.5%.
4.3. Demographic information

This section deals with demographic information of the respondents who constitute BOM committee. The demographic information captured data on age, gender, level of education and academic qualification of the respondent and position held in the BOM committee.

4.3.1 Gender distribution

The respondents were asked to indicate their gender. This aimed at establishing whether the study was gender sensitive while seeking the views of BOM committee, AEO, DEOs and CDFC members. The gender distribution was as indicated in Table 4.2

Table 4.2: Gender distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender distribution</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings as indicated in Table 4.2 majority 154 (78.6%) were male with 42 (21.4%) being female. This implies there were more males than female respondents. The dominance of males may mean that most of the duties and responsibilities in school management through Board of management committee attract more males than females.

4.3.2 Age of BOM Committee

The study sought to establish the age of BOM committee members and the results are as in Table 4.3

Table 4.3 Age of BOM committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of BOM committee</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-60</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 shows that majority 91(50.0%) of the BOM committee members ranged between 45-60 years, 70(38.5%) ranged between 35-45 years with only few of the respondents 20(11.0%) and 1(0.5%) ranging between 30-35 years and under 30 years respectively. This implies that majority of the BOM committee members are in their maturity age and well experienced with the school project management established under Constituency Development Projects Act.

4.3.3. **Academic qualification of the respondents**

The study sought to establish the level of education of the respondents. The results are indicated in the Table 4.4

**Table 4.4 Academic qualification of the BOM committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic qualification of the BOM committee</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O’ level</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the findings, 46% (90) of the respondents had attained O Level qualification, 33% (65) had attained Diploma, 12% (24) had Degree qualification and 8%(15) had attained masters with only a few1% (2) having attained PHD qualification. This means that the BOM members had the required qualification to manage CDF projects in schools professionally.

4.3.4. **Work experience of BOM committee**

The study sought to establish the number of years one has served as a BOM committee. The results are as indicated in Table 4.5.
From Table 4.5 above shows that majority of the BOM committee 127(70%) had served more than 3 years, 36(20%) had served 1-3 years while only 19(10%) had served less than one year.

**4.3.5 Position held**

The study sought to establish the position held by the respondents in the BOM committee. This was aimed at ensuring respondents are included as targeted in the study based on the position held in the BOM committee. The findings were as indicated in Table 4.6

**Table 4.6 Position held**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary/principal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chairpersons were 28(15.3%), Secretary/Principal 32(17.5%) and Members 122(67.2%).

**4.4. Project identification**

Project identification is an important stage in project management.

The study sought to determine the influence of project identification on management of CDF projects in secondary Schools.
4.4.1 Involvement in identification of CDF projects in schools.

Respondents were asked to indicate if they were involved in identifying constituency fund project in their school. The findings were as indicated in Table 4.7

**Table 4.7 Involvement in project identification in schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement in project identification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings in Table 4.7, majority 162 (89%) of the BOM committee indicated that they have ever been involved in identifying constituency fund projects in their schools with only few 20 (11%) stating they were not involved in identifying constituency fund projects in the schools.

4.4.2 Need assessment

The Respondents were asked to indicate if they carry out need assessment for projects in their schools. The findings were as indicated in Table 4.8.

**Table 4.8 Need assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need assessment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings majority of the respondents 101(55.5%) indicated that they carry out need assessment for school projects in schools, while 81(44.5%) said they do not carry out need assessment for school projects.
4.4.3 Commonly used tendering system

The BOM committees were asked to indicate the most commonly used tendering system for CDF projects in Schools. The findings were as indicated in Table 4.9

**Table 4.9 Commonly used tendering system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commonly used tendering</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open tendering</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted tendering</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for quotations</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct procurement</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings in Table 4.9, majority of the respondents 71 (38.5%) indicated that the most commonly used tendering system for CDF projects is request for quotations with 63 (34.6%) indicating restricted tendering the others, 32 (18.1%) and 16 (8.8%) indicated direct procurement and open tendering as the tendering system used for CDF projects in schools.

4.5 Adequacy of funds

The study also sought to determine if adequacy of funds affect CDF projects in schools. The amount of money that schools receive for CDF projects and when the funds are disbursed influences management of CDF projects.

4.5.1 Amount of money received from CDF

Respondents were asked to indicate the amount of money schools received for CDF projects. The findings were as indicated in Table 4.10
Table 4.10 Amount of money received from CDF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of money received</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 200,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000- 500,000</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,001-1,000,000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 1,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings in Table 4.10 majority of the respondents 51.1% (93) indicated they received between Kenya shillings 200,000 -500,000 ,15.4% (28) received less than 200,000Kshs,29.7% (54) received between 500,000 to 1,000,000Kshs and only 3.8%(7) had received over 1,000,000Kshs. From the observation schedule, it was observed that most of the CDF projects were at uncompleted stage an indication that the CDF funds received for school projects was not adequate to complete the projects.

4.5.2 Adequacy of funds received

The study further sought to determine if CDF funds received for school projects was adequate. The results were as indicated in Table 4.11

Table 4.11 Adequacy of funds received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy of funds received</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study findings indicated that majority 171(94%) of the respondents said that secondary schools do not receive adequate funds for CDF projects with 11(6%) saying schools receive adequate CDF funds for school projects.
4.5.3 Disbursement

The BOM Committee were further asked to indicate if CDF funds for school projects are disbursed on time and findings were as indicated in the Table 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds disbursed on time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings in Table 4.12, majority 127 (70%) of the respondents indicated that secondary schools do not receive CDF funds on time and 55 (30%), said that adequate funds are received by schools for CDF projects.

Further the Constituency Development Fund committee members were asked whether the funds allocated for CDF projects were sufficient and disbursed in good time. The CDF committee members indicated that the funds allocated for projects were not sufficient and the disbursement in most cases was late due to delays in receiving the funds from the Constituency Development Fund Board. Further the researcher sought to know from the CDF Committee whether the CDF projects were completed in time. The members of the CDF Committee stated that most of the projects were not completed according to their time schedule.

4.6 Project implementation

The study also sought to determine the influence of project implementation in CDF project management in secondary schools.

4.6.1 BOM involvement in project implementation

The respondents were asked to indicate if they were involved in implementing CDF projects in schools. The findings were as indicated in Table 4.13
Table 4.13 BOM involvement in project implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOM involvement in project implementation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study findings in Table 4.13 indicated that majority 140 (77%) said that they are involved in project implementation while 42 (23%) said that they were not involved in implementation of projects in schools. From the observation schedule it was observed that most of the CDF projects in schools were at uncompleted state.

4.6.2 Implementation plan on place and Adherence to implementation plan

The respondents were asked to indicate if they have a project implementation plan in schools and if they adhere to the implementation plan. The findings were as indicated in Table 4.14

Table 4.14 Implementation plan in place and Adherence to implementation plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation plan in place</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Adherence to implementation plan</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings majority of the respondents 98 (53.8%) indicated that that they have a project implementation plan in place but only 39 (39.8%) adhere to the implementation plan. The other 84 (46.2%) indicated they do not have an implementation plan in place and 59 (60.2%) indicated they do not adhere to the implementation plan.
4.6.3 Projects completed on schedule

The respondents were asked if the CDF projects were completed on schedule and findings were as indicated in Table 4.15

**Table 4.15 Projects completed on schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects completed on schedule</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings in Table 4.15 majority of the respondents, 117(64%) indicated that CDF projects are not completed on Schedule and only 65(36%) of the respondents indicated that the CDF projects are completed on schedule.

4.6.4 Participation in planning and budgeting of CDF projects

The study sought to find out if the respondents play any role in planning and budgeting of CDF projects. The findings were as indicated in Table 4.16

**Table 4.16 Participation in planning and budgeting of CDF projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in planning and budgeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings in Table 4.16 majority of the respondents 109 (60%) of the BOM Committee agreed that they play a role in planning and budgeting of CDF funds projects with only a few 73 (40%) indicating that they do not take part in planning and budgeting of funds.

4.7 Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation of projects is important in project management as it ensures projects fulfill their intended objectives.
4.7.1 Monitoring and evaluation system

The study sought to determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation in CDF project management in secondary schools by first determining if BOM Committee have developed monitoring and evaluation system for school projects. The findings were tabulated in Table 4.17.

**Table 4.17 Monitoring and evaluation system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and evaluation system</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study findings indicated that majority of the BOM members 140 (77%) do not have a developed monitoring and evaluation system for projects with only 42 (23%) indicating that they have a monitoring and evaluation system for projects in place.

4.7.2 Monitoring and evaluation team

Further the researcher sought to know from the respondents if they have a project monitoring and evaluation team for school projects and findings were as indicated in Table 4.18.

**Table 4.18 Monitoring and evaluation team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and evaluation team</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings majority 126 (69.2%) of the respondents indicated that they do not have a project monitoring and evaluation team for projects with only 56 (30.8%) indicating that they have a monitoring and evaluation team for projects within the BOM committee.
4.7.3 Adherence to monitoring and evaluation schedule and its improvement on management of CDF projects.

Further the respondents were asked to rate if adherence to monitoring and evaluation schedule improves management of CDF projects. The findings are tabulated in Table 4.19

**Table 4.19 Adherence to monitoring and evaluation schedule and its improvement on management of CDF projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adherence to monitoring and evaluation schedule and its improvement on management of CDF projects.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings shown in Table 4.19, majority of the respondents 91(50%) indicated that they agreed with the statement, 86(47.3%) strongly agreed while 3(1.6%) and 2(1.1%) disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement respectively.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF STUDY FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the summary of the study findings, discussions, study conclusions and recommendations for further research.

5.2 Summary of the study findings

The study aimed at investigating factors influencing management of Constituency Development Fund projects in Public Secondary Schools in Imenti South Subcounty of Meru County. The study targeted 32 Public Secondary Schools which had received CDF funds for projects total of 196 respondents participated in the study.

5.2.1 Project identification and its influence on CDF project management in public secondary schools

Majority of the respondents at 89% indicated that they have been involved in identifying CDF projects in their schools with only 11% indicating they were not involved in project identification in schools. Relating to need assessment most of the respondent 55.5% agreed that they carry out need assessment for school projects with only 44.55% indicating that they do not carry out need assessment for school projects. Respondents gave the most commonly used tendering system for school projects as request for quotations at 38.5%, 34.6% gave restricted tendering as the most common while 18.1% and 8.8% gave direct procurement and open tendering as the most common system respectively.

5.2.2 Adequacy of funds and its influence in CDF project management in public secondary schools

Study findings indicated that most schools, 51.1% received between 200,000 and 500,000 Kshs for CDF projects, 15.4% received less than 200,000, 29.7% had received between 500,000 and 1,000,000 while 3.8% had received above 1,000,000. Majority that is 70% of the respondents indicated that secondary schools do not receive CDF funds on time while 30% indicated schools
had received funds on time. Asked if the funds received for school projects were adequate, 94% of the respondents indicated funds were not adequate with only 6% indicating the funds were adequate.

5.2.3 Project implementation and its influence in management of CDF funds in schools

The study findings indicated that majority of the respondents, 77% agreed that schools undertake CDF project implementation through involvement in project implementation while 23% indicated not involved in project implementation. Further 53.8% indicated that they have an implementation plan for projects in schools with only 46.2% stating that they do not have an implementation plan in place. Most of the respondents (60.2%) of those who had an implementation plan stated that the plan is not adhered to and only 39.8 said that the implementation plan is adhered to. Also, 64% of the respondents indicated that CDF projects are not completed on schedule with only 36% indicating that projects are completed on schedule. Most of the respondents, 60% indicated that they are involved in planning and budgeting of CDF projects with only 40% indicating not involved in planning and budgeting of CDF projects.

5.3.4 Project monitoring and evaluation and its influence in management of CDF projects in public secondary schools

The study findings indicated that majority of the respondents, 77% do not have a developed monitoring and evaluation system for CDF projects in place and only 23% said they have a developed monitoring and evaluation system for projects. Further majority of the respondents at 69.2% indicated that they do not have a monitoring and evaluation team within the BOM committee while 30.8% said they have monitoring team within the BOM. On adherence to monitoring and evaluation schedule and its improvement on management of CDF projects, 50% agreed to the statement, 47.3% strongly agreed while 1.6% and 1.1% disagreed and strongly disagreed to the statement respectively.

5.3 Discussions on Findings

This section deals with detailed discussions of findings of this study.
5.3.2 Project identification

Project identification is important in project management since it ensures need assessment is undertaken in order to come up with a viable project. BOM Committee are mandated with the role of identification CDF projects in schools which concurs with a high percentage at 89% of Bom committee involved in Project identification as it lays squarely with the BOM Committee. After identifying the project then the BOM cost the project by preparing Bill of Quantities (BQ) and forwarding the same to CDFC in accordance with CDF Act, (2007). According to this study, those involved in identification of the CDF projects indicated that they do that through participating in ground identification on where to install a project, approving the cost of the project and preparation of budget. The CDF Act, 2003, provides the need for costing and evaluating projects in schools on continuous basis in which the BOM is mandated to cost all projects and avail financial records related to CDF projects, tender the project and provide all bank transactions and project implementation report, CDF Amended Act, (2013). However those who disagreed indicated the reason being lack of commitment in project management by the school management.

5.3.3 Adequacy of funds

Study findings indicated that most schools, 51.1% receive between 200,000 and 500,000 Kshs for CDF projects. Based on information gathered from the observation schedule, the amount is not adequate as the projects were incomplete or lacked basic facilities. This concurs with a study done on factors influencing implementation of CDF projects by Kimathi C.K in Machakos District. The CDF act 2003, section 25 (2) stipulates that funds for school projects should be adequate and be disbursed in time for successful implementation of school projects, CDF allocates project fund as grants and is allocated through a thorough process every financial year and the BOM are mandated to prudently manage allocated project funds. From the study findings majority, 70% of the respondents indicated that schools do not receive CDF funds on time and that the funds they receive are not adequate. The respondents further indicated that BOM Committee addresses the inadequacy through organizing local community to support and complete the project through Harambees, topping up with PTA funds and sometimes abandoning the project till the next CDF budget allocation. This implies that CDF funds are not disbursed on time to schools and furthermore not enough therefore affecting management of CDF projects.
5.3.4 Project implementation

The study findings indicated that majority of the respondents, 77% agreed that BOM Committee undertake CDF project implementation by being involved in Project implementation. The BOM Committee is required to stick to time frame allocated to the CDF project in the school in order to achieve predetermined managerial goals (CDF ACT, 2003). The Board of management proposes projects to CDFC according to resources allocated; the BOM selects a single school project from many project proposals that can contribute significantly to the school objectives which it implements through checking project expenditure regularly and physical progress. Those who indicated otherwise gave reasons such as failure by school management to provide regular feedback to the stakeholders and failure to involve all the stakeholders in the implementation process. Further majority of the respondents indicated that they try their level best to ensure CDF projects are implemented. The findings concurs with a study on influence of community participation on successful implementation of CDF projects in Mwea constituency by Nyaguthii E, (2006) However, 64 % of the respondents indicated that CDF projects in schools are not completed in time due to inadequacy of the funds and late disbursements. Most of the respondents, 60% said they were involved in planning and budgeting of CDF projects in schools but 40% indicated they were not involved. Respondents indicated that most schools, 53.8% have an implementation plan in place but only 39.8% said they adhere to the plan.

5.3.5 Monitoring and Evaluation

The study findings indicated that majority, (77%) lack a developed monitoring and evaluation system for projects in schools. The revised CDF Act 2007 emphasizes that the indentified projects when implemented should then be monitored and evaluated. The act gives the technical department and the Constituency Development Fund Committee (CDFC) authority to monitor the projects. Majority of the BOM committee 69.2% indicated that they do not have a monitoring and evaluation team for school projects. This concurs with the revised CDF Act 2007 that mandates the CDFC to monitor CDF projects. Majority of the respondents, 50% agree and 47.3% strongly agree that adhering to monitoring and evaluation schedule would improve management of CDF projects in schools. The findings agree with a study done by Mulwa (2008), on monitoring and evaluation to give benchmark for other projects.
5.4 Conclusions.

The following were the conclusions of the study:-

1. From the study findings it can be concluded that BOM Committee were not fully involved in identifying, CDF projects in their school through carrying out need assessment and their involvement in tendering for CDF projects,. However those who disagreed indicated the reason being lack of commitment by the school management.

2. The study further concluded that CDF funds allocated for school projects were not adequate and also not disbursed on time which explains why many CDF projects in schools stall along the way and those complete lack basic facilities as observed from the observational checklist.

3. The study also concluded that schools undertake CDF project implementation through having an implementation plan and adhering to the implementation schedule and participation in planning and budgeting of CDF projects. Those who indicated otherwise the study concludes that they gave reasons such as failure by school management to provide regular feedback to the stakeholders and failure to involve all the stakeholders in the implementation process.

4. The study also concludes that CDFC undertake regular monitoring and evaluation of projects to ensure CDF projects are implemented and managed well by the BOM committee so as to complete as planned and budgeted.

5.5 Recommendations

As far as identifying ,CDF projects the study recommends that BOM Committee should fully involve themselves through participating in need assessment for CDF projects, approving the cost of the project through a competitive tendering system and involvement in preparation of budget and also submit their CDF project plans to the CDF committee for consideration.

The study also recommends that the CDF committee should disburse the funds in time to schools to enable the implementation process be successful. This should also include allocating enough funds to schools to facilitate completion of the intended projects. This would minimize stalled projects in schools.
The Government should also monitor and evaluate the utilization of CDF funds allocated to schools to ensure that they meet guidelines put in place to govern the CDF utilization. The study also recommends that BOM Committee should invoke government policy on financial management of secondary schools by allowing BOM committee only in funds management.

5.6 Suggestions for further research

The study proposes the following areas for further research

i. The factors that influence management of constituency development fund projects in public secondary schools in other Sub Counties in Kenya as there are limited studies done in this area.

ii. Research work on factors influencing management of projects in private schools in order to compare results.

iii. Challenges facing project management is schools.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Letter of transmittal

Faith Mukiri
P.O Box 135-60402
Igoji.

Dear Respondent,

REF: TRANSMITTAL LETTER

I am a Post graduate student at the University of Nairobi (Meru Extra Mural Centre) pursuing a Master of Arts Degree in Project Planning and Management. As part of my final year requirements I am required to carry out academic work in the form of a research study. My aim is to conduct a study on the factors influencing Management of CDF projects in public secondary schools in Imenti South sub county Meru County, Kenya. I hereby request you to assist me in completing this questionnaire. Your information will only be used for the purpose of this study and it will also be kept confidential, thus to uphold privacy, please do not write your name or even that of anywhere on the questionnaire.

I am very grateful for your participation and co-operation.

Yours faithfully,

L50/ 65723/2013
Faith Mukiri
Appendix II: Board of Management Committee Questionnaire

The researcher is a post graduate student at University of Nairobi and pursuing a Masters Degree in Project Planning and Management. The researcher is conducting a study on the factors influencing Management of Constituency Development Fund projects in Imenti South Sub-county. Please tick the appropriate answer and give your opinion where necessary in the question.

Section A: Personal Information
1. Indicate your gender
   Male ( ) Female ( )
2. Give your age
   a) Below 30 years ( )   c) Between 30 -35 years ( )
   b) Between 35 -45 years ( )   d) Between 45- 60 years ( )
3. Highest level of Education
   ‘O’ level ( ) Diploma ( ) Graduate ( )   PHD ( )   Professor ( )
4. How long have you served as a BOM Committee member/school administrator in your school?
   a) 3 years ( )   b) 6 years ( )   c) 9 years ( )   b) 12 years ( )   e) Above 12 years ( )
5. What position do you hold in the BOM committee?
   a) Chairperson ( )   b) Principal/Secretary ( )   c) Member ( )

Section B: Project Identification
5. Have you ever been involved in identifying constituency fund projects in your school?
   Yes ( )   No ( )
6. If yes, explain-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
   -----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
7. Do you carry out need assessment for projects in your school?
   Yes ( )   No ( )
8. What is the most commonly used tendering system for CDF projects in your school?
   a) Open tendering ( )
   b) Restricted tendering ( )
c) Request for quotations ( )
d) Direct procurement ( )

Section C: Adequacy of Funds

10. How much did you receive for the proposed CDF project in your school?
   a) Less than 200,000 Kshs ( )
   b) 200,000-500,000 Kshs ( )
   c) 500,001-1,000,000 Kshs ( )
   d) Above 1,000,000 Kshs ( )

11. Were the CDF funds received for the school project adequate?
    Yes ( )  No ( )

12. If no, explain how the BOM Committee addresses the inadequacy-----------------------------
-----------

13. Are the CDF funds for school projects disbursed on time?  Yes ( )  No ( )

SECTION D: Project Implementation

14. Are you involved in implementation of CDF funded school projects?
    Yes ( )  No ( )

15. If yes in 14 above, explain..........................................................

16. Do you have a project implementation plan in your school?
    Yes ( )  No ( )

17. In your own opinion do you think the implementation plan is adhered to?
    Yes ( )  No ( )

18. Are the CDF projects completed on schedule?
    Yes ( )  No ( )

19. If no give reasons ..........................................................
20. Are you involved in planning and budgeting of CDF projects?
   Yes (   )                           No (   )

21. If no give reasons---

SECTION D: Monitoring and Evaluation of CDF projects

21. Do you have a developed Monitoring system for CDF projects in your school?
   Yes (   )   No (   )

22. Do you have within the BOM project monitoring and evaluation team?
   Yes (   )   No (   )

23. The following statement relates to monitoring and evaluation of CDF projects;
   Adhering to monitoring and evaluation schedule by BOM improves management of CDF projects in secondary schools?
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Neither
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly disagree
Appendix III: Interview Schedule For DEO And AEO Officers

The researcher is a post graduate student at University of Nairobi and pursuing a Masters Degree in Project Planning and Management. The researcher is conducting a study on the factors influencing Management of Constituency Development Fund projects in Imenti South Sub-county. Please tick the appropriate answer and give your opinion where necessary in the question.

Section A: Personal Information

1. Indicate your gender
   Male ( )   Female ( )
2. What is your age bracket
   Between 30 -40 years ( ) between 40-50 years ( ) above 50 years ( )
3. Academic qualification?
   ‘O’ Level ( ) Diploma ( ) Degree ( ) PHD ( )
   Others (specify)...........................................................
4. What is your work experience as an Education Officer?
   Less than 5 years ( ) 5-10 years ( ) 10 years and above ( )

Section B: Monitoring and Evaluation of projects

1. Have you ever been trained or any of your officer in the sub-county on Monitoring CDF projects?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
2. Are you directly involved in identifying of CDF projects in your sub-county?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
3. What challenges do you face as an Education Officer in Monitoring CDF projects in your sub-county?
   .................................................................
4. Suggest ways of solving Monitoring and Evaluation problems of CDF projects in your Sub-county
   .................................................................
Appendix IV: Interview Schedule For CDFC

The researcher is a post graduate student at University of Nairobi and pursuing a Masters Degree in Project Planning and Management. The researcher is conducting a study on the factors influencing Management of Constituency Development Fund projects in Imenti South Sub-county. Please tick the appropriate answer and give your opinion where necessary in the question.

Section A: Personal Information

1. Indicate your gender
   Male ( ) Female ( )

2. What is your age
   Under 30 years ( ) 30-39 years ( ) 40-49 years ( ) above 50 years ( )

3. Highest Academic qualification?
   Diploma ( ) Degree ( ) PHD ( ) Others ( ) Specify………………

Section B: CDF Project Management

4. Have you ever been trained on CDF project management since your appointment?
   Yes ( ) No ( )

5. If Yes, what type of training?
   a) Funds management
   b) Project monitoring
   c) Project implementation
   d) Others(Specify) ………

6. Do you train school BOM’s on CDF project management?
   Yes ( ) No ( )

7. To what extent do you involve BOM members in CDF project implementation?

8. Do you monitor the use of the amount of money allocated to schools for CDF projects?

9. Do you involve the BOM in project identification?
10. What method does CDFC use to determine the amount to be allocated to CDF projects in schools?

11. Are the funds you allocated for CDF projects adequate?

12. What measures do you take to make sure that the funds are utilized properly?

13. What criteria do you use to allocate funds for CDF projects?

14. How do you make sure the projects are completed?

15. State the challenges you face in CDF project implementation ..........
   a) Political Patronage
   b) Pilferage
   c) Misappropriation CDF projects money
   d) Selfish interests.

16. Please list possible remedies to the problem you face in CDF projects management in relation to funds disbursement, Monitoring and Evaluation ......................
## Appendix V: Observational Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Comment / Observations by researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing grounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your time.

1. Gakuuni Girls Sec School laboratory Kshs 500,000
2. Kinoro Day Sec School laboratory Kshs 300,000
3. Kionyo Day Sec School Classroom Kshs 400,000
4. Kiangua Sec School Dormitory Kshs 500,000
5. Kithangari Boys Dormitory Kshs 300,000
6. Karoe Sec School Laboratory hall Kshs 500,000
7. Kiune Day Sec School laboratory Kshs 400,000
8. Kithunguri Sec School Classroom Kshs 300,000
9. Kithakanaro Sec School laboratory Kshs 533,000
10. Kaubau Day School Kitchen Kshs 350,000
11. Kairaa Day Sec School Computer lab Kshs 300,000
12. Machikine Girls Sec School Multipurpose hall Kshs 300,000
13. Mbaine Day Sec School Classroom Kshs 335,000
14. Muutiokiama Day Sec School Classroom Kshs 450,000
15. Mweru Day Sec School Laboratory Kshs 600,000
16. Mworoga Day Sec School Laboratory Kshs 600,000
17. Nkubu Day Sec School Administration block Kshs 900,000
18. Ntharene Day Sec School Multipurpose hall Kshs 500,000
19. Nkubu High School Dining hall Kshs 500,000
20. Nkuene Boys Sec School Dormitory Kshs 900,000

21. Nyomba yaathi Day Sec School Laboratory Kshs 416,000

22. Rwombo Day Sec School Classroom 300,000

23. St Agnes girls Sec School Dining hall Kshs 450,000

24. St Eugene Sec School Toilets Kshs 200,000

25. St Joseph Day Sec School Laboratory Kshs 400,000

26. St Martins Ngongo Day sec School Laboratory kshs 500,000

27. St Lucy for Visuary Impaired School Classroom Kshs 400,000

28. St Pauls Gitine Sec School Classroom Kshs 400,000

29. Nkumari Day Sec School Classroom Khs 400,000

30. Murembu Day Sec School Laboratory Kshs 1,000,000

31. Yururu Day Sec School Computer lab Kshs 416,000

32. Gankondi Day Sec School Laboratory Kshs 500,000

Source: South Imenti Constituency CDF Office.

www.cdf.go.ke
## Appendix VII: Krejcie and Morgan Sample Size Determination Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “N” is population size  
“S” is sample size  
Source: Krejcie and Morgan sample size Determination Table (1970)