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ABSTRACT

The government has identified centralized planning as a serious development bottleneck and devised strategies for gradual devolution of decision-making power to the local level. Among other development blueprints is the Constituency Development Fund (CDF), which aims at decentralizing development planning to enable grassroots communities maximize their welfare in line with their needs. The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of constituency development fund on the provision of quality educational infrastructure in public secondary schools in Rongo District under the following objectives; to determine the extent to which constituency development fund influence the provision of quality curriculum infrastructure, to assess the extent to which constituency development fund influence the provision of quality curriculum support infrastructure, to examine the extent to which constituency development fund influence the provision of quality school sanitation facilities and to establish the influence of constituency development fund in the provision of quality co-curricular infrastructure in public secondary schools of Rongo District. The study adopted descriptive survey design as a blue print to guide the study. The sample size of the study was 129 respondents comprising of: 19 principals, 95 Heads of Departments and 15 CDF committee officials. Purposive sampling technique was applied in identifying the appropriate respondents used in the study. A structured questionnaire was used to collect data from the sampled respondents. Qualitative data was collected using an interview schedule directed to CDF committee officials. Quantitative data collected from the closed-ended sections of the structured questionnaire was analyzed using descriptive statistics in the form of frequencies and percentage tables with the aid of SPSS (Statistical Packages for Social Scientists). Qualitative data collected from the open ended sections of the structured questionnaire was organized into themes guided by the objectives of the study/research questions and reported narratively. Findings of the study revealed that: 10(66.7%) of principals and 63(70%) of HODs acknowledged that CDF funded teaching and learning infrastructures in their schools. Majority of principals 8(53%) and 54(60%) of HODs consented that CDF funded curriculum support infrastructures in schools. However, 7(46.7%) of principals and 41(45.6%) of HODs were discontented with the quality of school kitchen sponsored by CDF. 12(80%) of principals and 57(63.3%) of HODs confirmed that CDF did not participate in the construction of quality toiletry facilities in schools. Majority of principals 9(60%) and HODs 47(522%) confessed that CDF did not participate in the provision of co-curricular infrastructures in most public secondary schools of Rongo District. Majority of principals 8(53.3%) and HODs 55(61.1%) rated the quality of co-curricular infrastructures provided by CDF as fair. Based on findings of the study, the study made the following recommendations: CDF officials should increase the allocation of funds meant to facilitate the construction of curriculum infrastructures in schools in order to hasten and improve the completion of initiated projects; regular inspection
should be initiated and sustained by CDF committee officials to check on the quality of projects sponsored by CDF in schools; more toiletry facilities should be built in schools to off-load the pressure exerted by students on the already existing toiletry facilities using CDF funds; CDF officials to allocate more funds to facilitate the construction of quality co-curricular infrastructure
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

School infrastructure is the platform on which most learning takes place. For example, it is in the classrooms where teaching takes place; it is in the library where most of personal learning takes place. For this reason, quality of school infrastructure is a very important component in ensuring quality education. Education on the other hand is widely recognized as a fundamental tool to national development. Psacharopoulos & Patrinos, (2002) noted that investment in education and also investment in the factors that affect education positively increases future productivity of a nation since the foundation of a productive workforce is laid in formal education. An increase in access and quality of education relative to the national population is critical to socio-economic growth and productivity. UNICEF (1998) notes that since education is a development tool and a fundamental human right as enshrined in the UN charter of 1948, the issue of increasing access and maintaining quality remains a compelling necessity worldwide.

According to World Bank (2005), if the world is to achieve education for all (EFA) and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015, there is need for individual nations to develop holistic education sector plans and allocate sufficient national budgetary resources to develop the quality of related school infrastructure. Each nation should initiate modalities of providing and sustaining schools with the much needed quality infrastructure. Kenya as a nation has developed a proactive response by initiating devolved funds (CDF) channeled to the grassroots from the central government. These funds are motivated by the fact that people at the grassroots are better placed to set their priority needs. Such priority needs revolves around education, health etc.
UNICEF (2005) observes that quality of school infrastructure affects quantitative growth and the provision of quality education through provision of adequate science rooms, well equipped library, recreational facilities and boarding facilities as prerequisite conditions in providing quality education and promoting access to secondary education. Quality of school infrastructure is not only a problem in Africa but also in the whole world.

In America, schools are suffering from incidences of peeling paint, crumbling plaster, leaking roofs, poor lighting, inadequate ventilation and inoperative heating and cooling systems among other problems limiting access and provision of quality education (Atherton, 2008). According to the United States government (US, 1999) the physical condition of the Nation’s public schools especially, had been an important topic of discussion among policy makers, educators and parents in recent years. There were reports of broken plumbing; poor ventilation and overcrowding that had raised concerns about the effects of quality of school facilities on teaching and learning as well as the enrolment in the schools. There was also apprehension that older schools with out-dated electrical wiring would be left behind newer schools in the effort to connect schools to the internet. The US government further reported that over the past decade, a number of lawsuits challenging school funding for facilities had drawn attention to the poor conditions that many students encountered at school. For example, according to the Arizona Supreme Court, some districts had school houses that were unsafe, unhealthy and in violation of building, fire and safety codes. There were schools without libraries, science laboratories, computer rooms, art programs, gymnasiums and auditoriums (US, 1999). Paxson and Shady (2002) observed a similar situation in Peru and Indonesia. In Peru for instance, the government spent in excess of US $ 100 million in building and renovating the school infrastructure with the objective of improving enrolment and performance in secondary education.
In Germany, Becker and Siebern (2007) conducted a study and discovered that educational attainment differs considerably by whether place of childhood was in an urban or in a rural area. In urban, more densely populated counties, quality of schooling infrastructure is generally better than in rural, less densely populated counties. In particular, the supply of high schools (Gymnasien), the only secondary school track allowing university entry, is higher in urban counties. As a consequence, in urban counties, average distance to high school is relatively small and therefore the direct (commuting) and indirect (time) costs of going to high school are relatively small. In the countryside, average distance to high school is substantially higher and therefore the costs of taking further schooling beyond compulsory schooling are higher. Becker and Siebern (2007) found out that educational attainment was higher in counties with better schooling infrastructure. Schooling infrastructure was correlated with the degree of urbanization, providing a better schooling infrastructure especially in rural areas could thus considerably increase the incentives for individuals from disadvantaged family background to acquire quality education and thus improve their long-run prospects in the labour market.

Education in Northern Ireland (and perhaps in the United Kingdom as a whole) for many years, according to a general consensus, had been an area of under-investment. The Northern Ireland executive prioritized this area and planned capital expenditure of 108.9 million in 2002/2003 financial year. However, it is accepted that even these substantial sums will not bring Northern Ireland’s ageing educational infrastructure up to modern standards (Northern Ireland Yearbook, 2005). The problem is particularly acute in terms of outdated school buildings, many in a poor state of repair. A high percentage of Northern Ireland’s classrooms are temporary or mobile buildings. The government thus came up with a possible solution to the infrastructural deficit in the form of Public Private Partnerships (PPP) whereby private sector capital can create
the necessary infrastructure and effectively lease it to the Department on Education and Library board (Northern Ireland Yearbook, 2005). KPMG (1997) did a survey on behalf of the department of Education for Northern Ireland and the Education Technology Strategy Management Group and discovered that more than 70% of computers in schools were old and the vast majority of computing systems could not support modern multimedia. In order to bring about curriculum change and to obtain the real benefits in teaching and learning which ICT can deliver, a pupil-computer ratio of 8:1 was considered a necessary minimum, particularly for the secondary sector.

In Egypt, surveys found that there were practical factors that affected the enrolment of girls in Primary Education and their school attainment. Some of these causes were the long distance between school and family residence, the lack of safe and convenient school facilities for girls, the poor quality of education and the low training of teachers (Adel, 2010). Adel however, notes that the Egyptian government since the 1990s engaged in efforts to improve the school enrolment of girls and to bridge the gender gap in education. One of the initiatives was the community schools built by the Ministry of Education with the support from UNICEF. The other was the Education Enhancement Programme (EEP) that the government launched with support from the World Bank and the European Union. Community schools were first introduced in 1992 to address the educational needs of girls in the poor and isolated hamlets and villages in the country. The schools had high quality child-centred curriculum that enhanced academic competence and life skills of the students. Consequently, Adel, 2010 noted that the national enrolment rates of girls increased to 95% in 2004 in Primary, 92% in preparatory schools and 99% in Secondary schools.
In Ghana, secondary schools that have been established in rural communities are faced with the problems of poor infrastructure, lack of material input, inadequate logistics and lack of qualified personnel. Many of the schools do not have standard resources or well-equipped facilities for example, basic scientific instruments such as beakers, test tubes and burners. This has led to poor academic performance and in some cases low enrolment of learners as most learners end up dropping out of school. The government of Ghana however has committed to solving this problem as well as the promotion of information and communications technology (ICT) in a bid to improve on access to quality education. However, the first challenge is the provision of electricity to the rural areas for the dream of ICT to be realized (George, 2004).

In South Africa, while there has been significant strides in equalizing some education inputs for the poor (specifically in terms of personnel spending and non-personnel spending), both the 1996 and 2000 Register of needs identified significant infrastructure backlogs, unevenness in access to quality school infrastructure (including buildings and accommodation and basic services such as sanitation, water, telecommunications and electricity) and unacceptable conditions at some schools. According to OECD (2008), the update of the schools Register of needs survey, the 2006 National Education Infrastructure Management System (NEIMS) study confirmed significant progress in key infrastructure areas since 2000 and more so from 1996. Yet, provision of school infrastructure remains a serious challenge in terms of inequality in access to quality infrastructure, a significant proportion of learners being subjected to unacceptable conditions (overcrowded classrooms, absence or inadequate basic services, lack of security, dangerous structures) and a majority of schools not having key inputs for a modern Education (libraries, laboratories and computers). This has impacted on the quality of Education provided and the enrolment as well.
Kenya has no doubt achieved an impressive increase in quantitative indices in education at all levels since independence. For instance, in 1960, the primary gross enrolment rate (GER) was 47% while the secondary GER was 2% as compared to 107.6% and 42.5% in 2008 respectively. Further, transition rates to secondary education have increased from 27% in 2003 to 60% in 2008 (Republic of Kenya, 2008). Several policies introduced by the Government account for this rise, for example the introduction of free primary education (FPE) in 2003 increased enrolment and completion rates in primary education, increasing demand for secondary education. The introduction of subsidized secondary education (FSE) in 2008 lowered the cost of secondary education, making it affordable. The introduction of devolved funds (CDF) in 2003 channeled to various constituencies within the country to facilitate the provision of essential services to local people. CDF has been very instrumental in enhancing infrastructural development in most schools. Kenyan Government has heavily invested in various interventions geared towards expanding infrastructure which include, the laboratory equipment fund in 2004, and school infrastructure development fund in 2008 (Republic of Kenya, 2008).

The socio-economic status of Rongo District population may likely challenge the provision of quality educational infrastructure. A study of influence of Constituency Development Fund in the provision of quality educational infrastructure in public secondary schools of Rongo District can reveal parameters upon which the achievements of CDF can be measured. This is what has motivated the researcher to initiate this study at this point in time.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

In Kenya, development has all along faced numerous challenges to the government, development partners and the general public. The gap between the rich and the poor has not only widened but the poverty situation has worsened (GoK, 2004; 2003c). This worsening poverty has had different effects on the economy with the result of escalating cost of living amidst diminishing means of livelihood. In particular, ownership of development initiatives especially at the grassroots level has been unimpressive in as far as participation of the local community is concerned. This is mainly because centralized planning has worked to isolate beneficiaries. As a result, decision-making power has ended up being concentrated on the national government, leaving beneficiaries more or less as mere onlookers.

In order to redeem this trend, the government has initiated development blueprints channeled to the grassroots which responds to the immediate needs of the locals. The most profound development blueprint is the Constituency Development Fund (CDF), which aims at decentralizing development planning to enable grassroots communities maximize their welfare in line with their needs. Nevertheless, there are increasing concerns about the utilization of CDF which suggest that the funds are not being utilized optimally. Issues about favoritism in the allocation of funds from CDF informed by political loyalty have been raised. An empirical study conducted by Owuor (2009) on factors influencing management of constituency development fund in Ainamoi constituency, Kericho District revealed that corruption was bleeding the CDF by citing cases of allegation of corruption especially by MPs. Owuor pointed out that MPs manipulate the CDF act to achieve their own selfish ends. Owuor narrated complaints from the public that MPs appoint their relatives, close friends and political cronies to head CDF committees thus facilitating lack of transparency in the CDF kitty. Assessment conducted on
Constituency Development Fund (CDF) by National Taxpayers Association (NTA) in 145 constituencies of which Rongo constituency was amongst, not only reflected poor project implementation but also revealed a worrying trend where leaders concentrated resources in areas that overwhelmingly voted for them during the elections. This move has facilitated uneven educational development in most constituencies, an aspect which is contrary to the principle of public finance (Article 201) which stipulates that the public finance system “shall promote an equitable society”.

According to National Taxpayers Association (NTA), schools in Rongo District still lack essential requirements like quality school sanitation facilities. Poor sanitation acts as fertile ground for outbreak of diseases making absenteeism amongst students the order of the day when students seek medication. Unless something is done to redeem the quality of educational infrastructures particularly sanitation facilities in most public secondary schools in Rongo District, the learning situation may degenerate from worse to deplorable and eventually go out of hand. This is what has motivated the researcher to initiate this study at this point in time.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of constituency development fund on provision of quality educational infrastructure in public secondary schools of Rongo District, Kenya.
1.4 Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following objectives:

1) To determine the influence of constituency development fund on provision of quality teaching and learning infrastructure in public secondary schools of Rongo District.

2) To assess the influence of constituency development fund on provision of quality curriculum support infrastructure in public secondary schools of Rongo District.

3) To examine the influence of constituency development fund on provision of quality school sanitation facilities in public secondary schools of Rongo District.

4) To establish the influence of constituency development fund on provision of quality co-curricular infrastructure in public secondary schools of Rongo District.

1.5 Research Questions

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

1) What is the influence of constituency development fund on provision of quality teaching and learning infrastructure in public secondary schools of Rongo District?

2) What is the influence of constituency development fund on provision of quality curriculum support infrastructure in public secondary schools of Rongo District?

3) What is the influence of constituency development fund on provision of quality school sanitation facilities in public secondary schools of Rongo District?

4) What is the influence of constituency development fund on provision of quality co-curricular infrastructure in public secondary schools of Rongo District?
1.6 Significance of the Study

Findings of this study may be useful in providing policy makers with useful information necessary in planning the expansion of Secondary School physical infrastructure through constituency development fund. Findings may guide policy makers in evaluating whether constituency development fund dispersed to various schools is efficiently utilized. The study may also be useful in providing a mirror for the role of the Government in enhancing the provision of quality educational development through constituency development fund. Lastly the study may provide literature on the influence of Constituency Development Fund in the provision of quality educational infrastructure.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

The study experienced the following limitations: some schools were out of session at the time of conducting the study due to midterm break. The researcher sought to overcome this challenge by doing a background check of schools to know their calendar so as to conduct the study when learners were on session. Some schools were inaccessible due to poor roads. The researcher overcame this limitation by starting out the research process early in order to have adequate time to reach all the targeted schools. The researcher also used flexible means of transport such as bicycles, motor bikes which could easily penetrate the dilapidated roads. Some respondents were uncooperative in completing the research questionnaires as required. This was dealt with by explaining to respondents the importance of the study before collecting data and seeking respondents consent for voluntary participation.
1.8 Delimitations of the Study

The study was delimited to public secondary schools within Rongo District. A closer scrutiny of secondary schools within Rongo District revealed that most secondary schools were underdeveloped in terms of educational infrastructure compared to neighbouring Districts. Districts neighbouring Rongo District such as Awendo District, Nyatike District, Migori District, Uriri District, Kuria District reflected better development in terms of quality classrooms, computer rooms, libraries, laboratories, toiletry facilities etc. For this reason, the study was confined to public secondary schools within Rongo District in order to establish the intrigues behind the provision of quality educational infrastructure.

1.9 Basic Assumptions of the Study

The study was conducted based on the following assumptions; Respondents provided accurate information while filling in the questionnaire. The sample selected for the study was a fair representation of the entire targeted population. Constituency development fund is uniformly provided across all schools in Rongo District. Constituency development fund influence the provision of quality teaching and learning infrastructure. Constituency development fund influence the provision of quality curriculum support infrastructure. Constituency development fund influence the provision of quality school sanitation facilities. Finally, constituency development fund influence the provision of quality co-curricular infrastructures.
1.10 Definition of Significant Terms used in the Study

Constituency Development Fund: These are funds that filter from the central Government through larger and more layers of administrative organs and bureaucracies and go directly to local levels and thus provide people at the grassroots the opportunity to make expenditure decisions that maximize their welfare consistent with their immediate priorities.

Curriculum Support Infrastructure: Structures within schools which aid in curriculum implementation.

Educational Infrastructure Development - Includes all the facilities/ equipment necessary in implementing the curriculum effectively, for example buildings, water, power supply and play grounds.

Sanitation The equipment and systems that keep schools clean, for example, the number of toilets, solid waste disposal facilities, adequate water supply etc.

Public School According to Kenyan Education Act (1968) Cap 311, a school is an institution, centre or place where not less than ten students receive regular instruction.

Quality of Education Is the degree of meeting set standards in terms of teaching/learning i.e. access, good performance and talent development for the learners.
1.11 Organization of the Study

The study was organized into five chapters; chapter one basically gave the introduction and described the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, 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 provided a review of literature related to the study thematically as per the research objectives, the theoretical framework, the conceptual framework as well as the summary of literature reviewed. Chapter three focused on the research methodology discussed under the following sub-headings; research design, target population, sample size, sample selection, research instrument, pilot testing of instrument, validity of research instrument, reliability of research instrument, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques and ethical issues in research. Chapter four entails data presentation, analysis, interpretation and discussion where as chapter five consists of summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviewed literature related to the study based on the following thematic areas: the concept of constituency development fund, constituency development fund and provision of quality teaching/learning infrastructure, constituency development fund and provision of quality curriculum support infrastructure, constituency development fund and provision of quality school sanitation facilities, theoretical framework, conceptual framework and summary of literature reviewed.

2.2 The Concept of Constituency Development Fund

Constituency Development Fund (CDF) was established through the Constituency Development Fund Act of 2003. It is one of the ingenious innovations of the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) Government of Kenya. CDF is an annual budgetary allocation by the Central Government to each of the country’s parliamentary jurisdictions. Reasons that motivated the government to initiate CDF include; decentralization of funds from the central government to the local communities to enable the local communities prioritize their needs because different communities have different needs. Un-even regional development, as some regions were more developed than others because of political favoritism.

While there are several rules that govern the utilization of the Fund to ensure transparency and accountability, decisions over the utilization of the funds are primarily by the constituents. Unlike other development funds that filter from the central government through larger and more layers of administrative organs and bureaucracies, the funds under this program go directly to
CDF provides individuals at the grassroots the opportunity to make expenditure choices that maximize their welfare in line with their needs and preferences. To the extent that the local population is better informed about their priorities, the choices made can be expected to be more aligned to their problems and circumstances. CDF can therefore be considered a decentralization scheme that provides communities with the opportunity to make spending decisions that maximize social welfare. CDF is an example of what is generally referred to as Community Driven Development (CDD) initiatives that empower local communities by providing fungible funds (often from the central government but sometimes from donor sources, GoK, 2010).

Although CDF takes a relatively small amount of national resources—2.5 percent of government’s ordinary revenue collected every year, its impact can be significant if the funds are efficiently utilized. Because the Fund benefits communities directly, it stimulates local involvement in development projects and as a result constituents have more information about projects funded under this program. This is evidenced by regular commentaries in the media and reports by members of parliament on the status of the CDF projects. As a result of the involvement of communities in decision making and monitoring resource use, theory predicts that programs such as CDF would result in high levels of efficiency and that the selection of the projects would vary across jurisdictions in line with development priorities. These efficiency outcomes largely arise from the role that communities play in decision making and monitoring the use of funds (Gravenir, 1991).

Constituencies vary widely in various aspects that may impact on the efficiency of CDF. Some of these aspects include size of the jurisdictions, population size, density and diversity,
scope of economic activities, degree of urbanization, levels of education, poverty, etc. These dimensions are expected to impact on the project choices. Funding per constituency is fairly uniform but some allowance is made for poverty levels so that higher poverty areas receive slightly more resources. There are also some restrictions such as limits on the share of funds that go to a particular type of project. Under Constituency Development Fund, local communities are involved in decision making and in monitoring expenditures. In essence, constituencies provide a natural laboratory to test functional theories of community driven development and decentralization. There are indications that CDF is helping provide services to communities that for many years did not benefit substantially from government services. In particular, the poor have in the past experienced serious problems accessing basic services that are now made available through CDF (Khaemba and Okemo, 2007).

2.3 Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality Teaching and Learning Infrastructure

Odeyinka and Aibinu (2006) as cited by Konya (2011) revealed that seven out of ten classroom projects surveyed in Nigeria suffered delays in their execution. This delay was attributed to insufficient funds allocated to the projects. This scenario is similar in Kenya where CDF committee-members charged with the mandate of allocating funds to various projects within the constituency by the constitution (CDF Act, 2003), fund projects partially thus making projects stall before their completion. This makes the partially funded projects costly as they fail to live up-to the intended purpose. Konya(2011), in his study on determinants of delay on completion of CDF financed classrooms in public secondary schools in Butere constituency underscored the significance of community participation in development projects by reinforcing
that community participation ensures sustainability of projects as it fosters community ownership thereby guaranteeing project continuity. Konya’s study was inclined towards establishing the determinants of delay on completion of CDF financed classrooms. Konya did not reveal how CDF facilitate the completion of quality Teaching/Learning Infrastructure, an omission that this study tends to address.

Fisher (2006), conducted a study on the impact of school infrastructure on students outcomes and behaviour. Fisher established a correlation between building design and student outcomes. His study established that academic achievement improves with improved building conditions, lighting levels, air quality and temperature. He further established a correlation between class size and students achievements. Having large classes can affect the quality of teaching since the teacher cannot provide individual attention as well as frequently evaluate learning. Lackney (2001) in his study about evaluation in classroom design also echoed the same sentiments. Lackney discovered that students who came from well designed classrooms on average performed better than students who came from not well designed classrooms if all other factors are held constant. These empirical studies reveal that physical infrastructure plays pivotal role in educational development. The Government has in the recent past provided devolved funds to various constituencies through Constituency Development Fund (CDF). These funds are devolved to various constituencies to assist in building new physical infrastructures such as classrooms, laboratories, office blocks, libraries etc or improve the quality of existing ones.

An empirical study conducted by Luvega (2007) on the role of physical infrastructures on educational development established that lack of physical infrastructure like classrooms, libraries, laboratories, office blocks, toilets etc reflected a negative impact on the quality of
teaching/learning. Schools where students were congested/overcrowded in classes reported poor performance. Schools without established libraries where students carry out self-study reflected same patterns of poor performance in national examination. The same trend of performance was witnessed in schools without laboratories where students carry out science practicals. These findings revealed that physical infrastructures play pivotal role in enhancing the quality of students’ performance. It is on this premise that the government initiated Constituency Development Fund (CDF) to provide funds to improve the quality of existing physical infrastructures in schools or build new ones. A study conducted by OECD (2006a), Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE, 2006 and DFES and CABE, 2005) on the importance of physical infrastructures to schools also echoed similar results that quality physical infrastructures are paramount for any institution in initiating and sustaining good performance.

Adequacy of quality physical infrastructures may influence access to education at any level (UNICEF, 1998). This has been the guiding principle to policy making in education in Kenya. An empirical study conducted by Mabula (2006) on effects of quality school physical infrastructures on access to primary education in Kenya established that inadequate school infrastructure can hinder the achievement of Subsidized Secondary Education (SSE) targets. The study further observed that massive investment in the provision of quality school physical infrastructures by the government through CDF was among the strategies employed to attract rapid enrolment in secondary education. Through CDF, the government put up more quality classrooms, teachers’ houses, and adequate separate toilets for boys and girls. This helped in boosting the quality of results in schools.
The World Bank (2003) report emphasized the need to teach small classes. The report revealed that small classes enable teachers to maintain class control and diversify their lessons according to the diverse capacities of their students. Sanoff (2001) in his research on school building assessment methods also made the same conclusion. Sanoff asserted that school buildings had an impact on the mental development of a student. He emphasizes that schools that were properly build and attractive motivated learners to stay in school and learn as well. A study conducted by Gogo (2002) in Rachuonyo District on the impact of cost sharing on access to secondary education established that, a class size of between 30-60 students is relatively modest in enhancing learning in secondary schools.

Republic of Kenya (2008) observes that, primary school enrolments in Kenya has continued to increase from 47% Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) in 1960s to 107.6% in 2007. Various interventions by the government and other stakeholders have facilitated this increase, for instance, the expansion of new quality school physical infrastructure and rehabilitation of existing ones through utilization of CDFs. Further, the introduction of FPE initiative in 2003 increased enrolment from 5.9 million in 2002 to 8.2 million in 2007 (Republic of Kenya, 2007a) despite this positive development, primary education is characterized by overcrowded classrooms and over-stretched physical facilities threatening access and the provision of quality education (Luvega, 2007).

According to a study on improving access to secondary education in Kenya by Ngware et al., (2006), access to secondary education in Kenya is usually pegged on the number of available spaces in secondary schools. Due to the limited number of schools, about half of pupils completing primary school lack opportunities to enroll in secondary schools. CDF can be used to
facilitate the provision of the much needed quality physical infrastructures to cater for the increased number of pupils’ moving from primary to secondary schools. A study conducted by Republic of Kenya, 2008 on impact of CDF on students enrolment shows that the number of students enrolled in secondary schools has continued to increase, for instance from 778,601 in 2002 to 1.4 million in 2008 courtesy of the support provided to needy and bright students through Constituency Bursaries Fund(CBF).

According to a study by Ngware et al., (2006) among the factors constraining growth in secondary school education is lack of adequate secondary schools to match that of primary schools. In 2003, there were 3,661 public secondary schools compared to 18,081 public primary schools. This imbalance worsened, following the introduction of Free Primary Education (FPE) in 2003 which increased access and completion rates at the primary education increasing the demand for secondary education (ElimuYetu Coalition, 2003). The introduction of Subsidized Secondary Education (SSE) in 2008 made the situation more acute since it opened access to secondary education to the poor, increasing secondary education enrolment from 725,480 in 2007 to 1.4 million in 2008 (Wangari, 2008). Though there has been marked improvement in secondary education enrolment over the years, special attention should be paid to improvement and expansion of school physical infrastructure to make Subsidized Secondary Education (SSE) policy a worthwhile investment. In lieu of this, CDF can be used as a vehicle towards the destination of improving the quality of physical infrastructures in schools.
2.4 Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality Curriculum Support Infrastructure

An empirical study conducted by Adede (2012) on impact of school infrastructure on provision of quality education in public secondary schools of Nyakach District, found out that one cannot expect high level of students’ academic performance where school buildings such as technical workshops and laboratories are substandard. Curriculum support infrastructure include: assembly halls, school kitchen, teachers’ houses and technical workshops are essential in teaching-learning process. The extent to which these infrastructures enhance quality education depends on their location within the school premises, their structure and facilities available in them. Well planned curriculum support infrastructures in terms of location, structure and facilities facilitates effective teaching and learning process thereby enhancing the quality of educational outcomes (Ajayi, 2007).

While emphasizing on the importance of quality curriculum support infrastructures to students’ academic performance, Mark (2002), in a study on factors affecting learners’ performance in schools in Canada, maintained that one cannot expect high level of students’ academic performance where school buildings such as technical workshops and laboratories are substandard. Mark emphasized that clean, quiet, safe, comfortable and healthy environment are important components of successful teaching and learning. He opined that in these infrastructures, it is possible for students to get injuries if they are not safe or properly watched over by their teachers or technicians. Similarly, In Nigeria Ajayi (2007) maintained that high level of students’ academic performance may not be guaranteed where curriculum support infrastructure such as technical workshops and laboratories are structurally defective, not properly ventilated and not spacious enough for use. He further emphasized that the quality of
curriculum support infrastructures in terms of structural effectiveness and proper ventilation may lead to successful teaching and learning process.

In some of the secondary schools in Nigeria, Ajayi (2007) points out that technical workshops and laboratories were not spacious enough, there were no adequate lighting and ventilation in the libraries, there were instances where classrooms were located very close to the technical workshops, while adequate furniture and fittings were not provided in some of the workshops. All these may not make such workshops conducive for learning and hence good academic performance of students may not be guaranteed. Stressing on the importance of adequate technical workshops and laboratories, Philip (1997) maintained that laboratories and technical workshops with adequate lighting, ventilation and proper location within the school, play vital role in students’ academic performance. Funds from CDF support the construction of the much needed quality curriculum support infrastructure such as laboratories, science rooms, workshops etc in almost all schools.

A study conducted by Fuller (2006) and Popoola (2009) on curriculum support infrastructure found out that school laboratories significantly influence students’ academic performance. According to Bajah (2009), laboratories are essential in the teaching and learning of science subjects. It has been observed that the quality of laboratories have been compromised in some schools. Apart from the fact that the required facilities are not in the laboratories, some of the laboratories are not spacious, not properly located while some do not have cross ventilation and adequate lighting. Such laboratories may not enhance effective teaching and learning thereby impeding students’ academic performance. The planning of technical workshops in some of the secondary schools seems to be defective.
Students’ academic performance in the Kenyan secondary schools had been affected since the introduction of free primary education and subsequently the introduction of free secondary tuition. This, according to Kangethe (2010) led to most schools, more so small schools, not being able to finance the construction of laboratories or improving the quality of existing laboratories. Kangethe (2010) discovered that the levels of curriculum support infrastructure planning and students’ academic performance were directly related. In Rongo District, Ngunzo (2011) in his study on the impact of school infrastructure on access to secondary education, concluded that schools that had modern laboratories, adequate quality class rooms and spacious libraries significantly attracted and enrolled more students than schools that had inadequate laboratories, sub-standard class rooms and libraries at 5% level of significance.

2.5 Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality School Sanitation Facilities

Sanitation facilities include: solid waste disposal (containers, waste pits, latrines) drainage (soak pits, drainage channels) and adequate water for personal hygiene and to clean latrines/toilets. According to Gogo (2002) and Wilken, White and Kinder (2003), materials used in construction of the school building and type of buildings determine the level of cleanliness. Maeke (2009) did a study on school shape up in Marsabit and established that water and sanitation is critical particularly among girls in school. Maeke observed that more than 50% of primary school pupils drop out of school due to inadequate sanitation. She established that availing water supply to a school improves sanitation and more so attendance; the study further established that schools shape up project which provided water in most primary schools improved attendance by 35% and completion rates by 45% within two years.
A study conducted by Moughon and Campbell (2009) on water, sanitation and hygiene found out that basic hygiene cannot be effective without appropriate facilities. Improving public health in a sustainable manner needs to go hand in hand with improving the quality of sanitation infrastructure in school in order to give students the opportunity to practice good hygiene. They further observed that providing sanitation infrastructure without effective operation and maintenance systems and plans will result in unsuitable facilities being built. Inter-Agency Network for Education and Emergencies (INEE, 2009)) conducted a survey on gender responsiveness to school sanitation among secondary schools in Ethiopia and established that inadequate sanitation facilities affects adolescents more and more so the girls in emergencies of menstruation. Girls need adequate latrines and water supply to comfortably change sanitary pads or other materials and wash themselves in privacy. Poor sanitation may affect women teachers and may lead them to fail to attend school during menstruation or restrict them in doing their professional duties which may eventually impact negatively on the performance of students.

Rauniyar (2009) observed that improved hygiene and sanitation reduces the possibility of outbreak of water borne diseases, for instance diarrhea and parasitic infections. According to a survey report by Jeffery (2008) on cleanliness and learning in higher education, there is a high correlation between levels of cleanliness and academic achievement. Susana (2007) observed that students particularly girls miss school or even drop out due to lack of sanitary facilities or the absence of separation of girls and boys toilets. In these situations, girls even stay away from school when menstruating.
2.6 Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality Co-curricular Infrastructure

School co-curricular infrastructure build by CDFs in most schools in Kenya help in developing the learner physically, socially, mentally and emotionally through providing opportunities for exercises (Ngaroga, 2003). The availability of adequate playing fields and necessary equipment are necessary for talent development. Learning institutions should provide the appropriate forum for nurturing talent in athletics, music, drama, games and other related arts (Khaemba, 2007).

Hunt and Lasley (2010) noted that educational benefits of co-curricular activities include: promotion of cognitive, affective and psychomotor growth and development, improved self concept, positive attitude and overall academic achievement. Hunt and Lasley (2010) further stresses that an educationally sound co-curriculum programme promote students’ physical, mental, social, emotional and moral well-being. Thus, it is clear that co-curricular programmes have historically been endorsed in school board policy in many school districts in the United States of America. In addition to the school board policy statements, independent organizations such as the National Federation of State High School Associations (NFSHS), argue that co-curricular activities can, among other things, help promote citizenship, a sense of teamwork, and self discipline in students who participate in them. Students who participate in co-curriculum activities typically do better academically, have fewer attendance and discipline problems and have a higher graduation rate than fellow students who do not participate in co-curricular activities (Hunt and Lasley, 2010).

According to a study by Luvega (2007) on the success of FPE in Kakamega District, co-curricular activities ensure the harmonious growth of personality. The provision of school
infrastructure related to games, sports and clubs equips the learner with strength for streamlining the talents of the child. It helps to improve the child’s analytical thrust for knowledge, promote competitive spirit, communication skills, value orientation, leadership skills and career development. Indeed Musumba (2010) notes that Kenyans have always shown their prowess in road races and defended their titles at the world’s Marathon while Kitula (2010) identify Kenyans who have built a career from the co-curricular activities in schools, for instance Oliech and Mariga who are not only local but international footballers.

Beeri (2005) established that co-curricular activities equip the learner with team spirit particularly games and club activities. She found that inter-house competition in games, sports and art helps the student to groom themselves into competent and self confident individuals. According to a study by Ewing (2009) on incubators of entrepreneurial talents in US universities, it was established that student’s who took part in co-curricular activities were more innovative and were more likely to start or take a job in a start up. Further, this study found that co-curricular programs enable students to connect ideas and build relationships that will help them launch new ideas and firms. However, learners can only explore those talents when the necessary infrastructure is provided. Unlike Ewing (2009) study which looked at the impact of school infrastructure on the development of talents of students at the university level in America, this study address the influence of constituency development fund in the provision of quality co-curricular infrastructure in public secondary schools of Rongo District.
2.7 Theoretical Framework

This study is inclined to participation theory propounded by Kimenyi, 2006. Participation theory stipulates that, target beneficiaries develop a sense of ownership and commitment for the initiated projects, to ensure their sustainability. Indeed, one of the central principles behind participation is the involvement of people in decision-making regarding their welfare. For this reason, the local people should not be seen as passive development objects; rather they should be treated as principle stakeholders to be actively engaged in decision-making regarding local development. Recent approach to development in Kenya has tended to identify development initiatives through broad-based consultation between both experts and lay persons with intended beneficiaries playing a key role. A good example in this regard is the development of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers at both district and national levels (Kimenyi, 2006). To ensure efficiency in the allocation of resources for maximum benefit to citizens, community participation is indispensable as it enhances local capacity to hold leaders and public officials accountable. The driving principle behind participation is sustainable development that requires people to have hands-on experience concerning projects that benefit them. This way, withdrawal of technical staff does not spell doom to the projects.

The foregoing is based on the observation that local people are best placed to make decision concerning their needs. This makes the people active partners in development thus instilling a sense of ownership. Failure to be inclusive may make the community get alienated and this can be enough fuel to ignite passivity and possible resistance to the development initiatives. Indeed, Chitere (1994) and Mulwa & Nguluu (2003) cite cases where communities have been left out only to develop resistance towards initiated projects. In other cases local communities have been alienated by technology used in project implementation, making project sustainability out of question. In relation to this study, Kenya’s Constituencies Development Fund (CDF) was established by the Constituencies Development Fund Act of 2003 (GoK,
2003a) as an annual budgetary allocation by the government to each of the country’s 210 parliamentary constituencies. This allocation is aimed at alleviating poverty at the local level while empowering the communities to have an input in development that directly concerns them. The aim of the fund is basically to decentralize development planning and operations to the grassroots so that communities can maximize their welfare in line with their identified needs and preferences. This makes the fund a classic example of decentralization in development planning and implementation.

The assumption behind the decentralization paradigm is that it speeds up development and gives priority to the beneficiaries to make decisions regarding their welfare. The existence of CDF Act is a clear indication that the Government of Kenya is slowly embracing the idea of decentralization and therefore devolution of management and planning from the central government to the grassroots (Ongoya & Lumallas, 2005). This Act provides the governance framework for a transparent and accountable utilization of the funds by giving the beneficiary communities a voice in planning and implementing their own development initiatives (Kimenyi, 2006). The fund is arguably one of the best innovations of the government, besides other initiatives. Starting from July 2006, CDF constitutes 7.5% of government annual revenue, up from the previous proportion of 2.5%. According to CDF’s official website, the current allocation formula is such that three quarters of the total allocation is divided equally among all the constituencies, while the remaining quarter is allocated according to constituencies’ poverty levels such that the poorer areas get more funding. The standard formula is such that the quarter is divided by the National Poverty Index multiplied by the Constituencies Poverty Index. CDF constitute significant efforts towards localized, participatory and sustainable development, which, regardless of the amount of money involved, should not be misused.
2.8 Conceptual Framework

Conceptual Framework is a diagrammatic explanation of the research problem hence an explanation of the relationship among several factors that have been identified as important to the study (Ngechu, 2006).

Figure 2.1: Perceived Conceptual Framework showing the interplay among variables
Dependent Variables

Quality Teaching and Learning Infrastructure
- Availability of CDF funded T/L infrastructure
- CDF and provision of quality classes
- CDF and provision of quality administration block

Quality Curriculum Support Infrastructure
- Availability of CDF funded curriculum support infrastructure
- CDF and provision of quality laboratories
- CDF and provision of school kitchen

Quality School Sanitation Facilities
- Role of CDF in the provision of quality school sanitation facilities
- CDF and the provision of quality school toiletry facilities

Quality Co-curricular Infrastructure
- Games and sports pitches
- Games and sports equipment
- Games and sports stores
- Clubs equipment

Source: Self-conceptualized framework (2014)
Figured 2.1, verbalizes the interplay among various variables used in the study. Constituency Development Fund (CDF) stands out as an independent variable. Dependent variables of the study include: Quality teaching and learning infrastructure; Constituency Development Fund (CDF) has been instrumental in improving the quality of teaching and learning infrastructures such as classrooms, staffrooms, libraries, home science rooms, office blocks etc in most schools since its inception. The existence of these quality teaching and learning infrastructures in schools facilitate steady enrolment of students. Quality curriculum support infrastructures such as laboratories, workshops, assembly halls etc interact with teaching and learning infrastructure to yield quality educational outcomes. Constituency Development Fund (CDF) also facilitate the construction of quality school sanitation facilities such as toiletry, abolition bocks, rubbish pit, urinal pit etc. Quality school sanitation facilities enable the girl-child to attend school regularly even during menstruation period. Consistency of students in school attendance provides an enabling environment suitable producing quality results. Quality co-curricular infrastructure like games and sports pitches, games and sports equipment and stores and clubs equipment enhance talent development if they are adequate or underdevelopment of talents if they are absent or inadequate. The interaction of the independent variable (CDF) with dependent variables is facilitated by Government policies and programmes (intervening variable). The free interplay between the independent variable (CDF), intervening variable-Government policies and programmes put in place to assist in equitable allocation of CDF facilitate the provision of quality educational infrastructure in schools (dependent variable).
2.9 Summary of Literature Review

From the literature review, it has been established that inadequate quality school infrastructure like classrooms can be a major hindrance to quality teaching/learning. Academic achievement improves with improved building conditions, lighting levels, air quality and temperature. Quality school infrastructures can be made available to schools through the support of CDF. Further, there is a correlation between school class size and students achievements; having large classes can affect the quality of teaching since the teacher cannot provide individual attention as well as frequently evaluate learning. Similarly the design of a classroom may have an effect on the performance of students. Quality of school infrastructure may affect access to education at any level. In most cases, enrolment or admission of students to a particular level is pegged on the available spaces. There have been interventions by the government of Kenya for example, to increase access in both primary and secondary schools through the introduction of FPE and FSE. This has led to overcrowded classes thus necessitating urgent expansion of existing educational facilities to accommodate the spiraling numbers of students. This can be done through devolved funds (CDF) channeled to various constituencies.

Quality school sanitation is instrumental in the provision of quality education as there is a high correlation between levels of cleanliness and academic achievement; an equipped classroom, clean and orderly, creates a favourable learning environment. It has been established that many primary school pupils drop out of school due to inadequate sanitation. Thus, availing water supply to a school improves sanitation and more so attendance. Improved hygiene and sanitation reduces the possibility of outbreak of water borne diseases for instance diarrhea and parasitic infections. All these can be achieved through the support of funds from CDF. Quality school co-
curricular infrastructure helps in developing the learner physically, socially, mentally and emotionally. The availability of adequate playing fields and necessary equipment are necessary for talent development. Co-curricular activities help to improve the learner’s analytical thrust for knowledge, promote competitive spirit, improves communication skills, value orientation, leadership skills and career development. Learning institutions should therefore provide the appropriate forum for nurturing talent in athletics, music, drama, games and other related arts. This can be realized through funds generated from CDF.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology used in conducting the study. These include; the research design, target population, sample size and sample selection, the research instruments to be used, their reliability and validity, procedures for data collection, techniques for data analysis and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research Design

The study adopted descriptive survey research design. Descriptive design was appropriate for this study because it enabled the researcher to collect and analyze both qualitative and quantitative data. Descriptive survey design is a method of collecting information by interviewing or administering questionnaires to a sample of individuals hence suitable for extensive research. It is an excellent vehicle for the measurement of characteristics of large population (Orodho, 2003). It maintains a high level of confidentiality, it is convenient and enables data to be collected faster, enables questions to be asked personally in an interview or impersonal through a questionnaire about things which cannot be observed easily. It also gives the study an opportunity to get an accurate view of responses to issues usually derived from the objectives at both the individual and group level (Kothari, 2003).
3.3. Target population

The study was conducted in Rongo District. The study targeted 19 Principals, 95 Heads of Departments (HODs) and 15 CDF committee members. The total target population was 129 respondents.

3.4. Sample Size and Sample Selection

This section describes the sample size and sample selection used in the study.

3.4.1. Sample Size

A sample is a smaller group obtained from the whole population. It is a sub group carefully selected so as to be a representative of the whole population (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). According to Gay (1996), the larger the population size, the smaller the percentage of the population required to get a representative sample. For smaller populations, it may not be necessary to sample the population. Since the total number of principals, HODs and CDF committee members in Rongo District were only 129, the researcher included all of them in the study. This was because Gay (1996) recommended a complete enumeration (census) for studies targeting smaller populations.

3.4.2. Sample Selection

Sample selection is the process of selecting elements from a population in such a way that the elements selected represent the entire population (Orodho, 2005). It is a statistical practice concerned with the selection of individuals intended to yield some knowledge about a population of interest. Sampling is useful in research because one learns some information about a group by
studying a few of its members thus saving time and money. School Principals, HODs and CDF committee members were selected using purposive sampling technique. According to Oso and Onen (2008), purposive sampling is a technique whereby the researcher consciously decides who to include in the sample. Since the study adopted census (complete enumeration of the targeted respondents), 19 principals, 95 HODs i.e. 5 HODs of Sciences, Humanities, Languages, Technical and Games from all the 19 schools found in Rongo District together with all the 15 CDF committee members were included in the study.

3.5. Research Instruments

The research tool used for collecting data was a questionnaire. A Questionnaire is a research instrument that is used to gather data over a large sample and diverse regions. It upholds confidentiality, saves time and has no interviewer bias (Tromp and Kombo, 2006). Principals and HODs questionnaire had both open and closed ended questions. The questionnaire was organized into sections intended to extract specific information from principals and HODs. Section A sought to obtain information related to demographic characteristics of respondents; section B addressed questions related to influence of CDF on provision of quality teaching and learning infrastructure, Section C explored questions related to influence of CDF on provision of quality curriculum support infrastructure, Section D captured questions related to the influence of CDF on provision of quality school sanitation facilities. Finally, Section E contained questions related to influence of CDF in the provision of quality co-curricular infrastructure in schools. The researcher also collected information concerning influence of CDF on provision of quality educational infrastructure from CDF committee officials using an interview schedule.
3.5.1 Pilot Testing

Pilot testing is a trial run of procedures and instruments that one plans to use. Pilot testing may prevent costly mistakes. It is an important step in the research process. Principals of three schools from the neighbouring Dhiwa District were earmarked for pilot testing. The researcher selected these three schools for pilot testing with the assumption that the variables under investigation were also felt in these schools since they shared the same locality as the schools targeted for the study. The process of pilot testing commenced when the researcher defended her proposal successfully and thereafter got an introductory letter which enabled her to obtain a research permit from the National Council of Science and Technology. The researcher presented the permit to the relevant authorities within Rongo District i.e District Commissioner (DC) and District Education Officer (DEO). The researcher then recruited three research assistants whom she trained on how to administer the instruments. The researcher made formal arrangements with the selected school Principals on the most appropriate date of conducting the pilot testing. Information gathered during pilot testing assisted in improving the instruments.

3.5.2 Validity of Research Instruments

Validity of research instrument is a measure of the extent to which the instruments measure what they are intended to measure (Kathuri and Pasl, 1993). A research instrument is valid if it actually measures what it is supposed to measure and when the data collected through it accurately represents respondents’ opinions (Amin, 2002). Validity of the research instruments was ascertained by conducting a pilot study. This ensured that instructions were clear and all possible responses to a question were captured. Content validity of a measuring instrument is the extent to which it provides adequate coverage of the investigative questions guiding the study.
In this study, content validity was ascertained by consulting supervisors in research methods in the school of continuing and Distance learning of the University of Nairobi. These experts looked at every question in the questionnaire and did their own analysis to verify that the questions contained the content of the area under study. Recommendations from the experts assisted in improving the instruments.

3.5.3. Reliability of Research Instruments

Reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). The researcher adopted split half technique of assessing reliability because it required only one testing session. This technique was also preferred because it eliminated errors due to the respondents ease in remembering responses from the first test, a phenomenon common in test-re test technique. The split half technique overcame this problem by developing one scale for each variable and then divided the scale into two halves (even verses odd numbers) which were scored separately for each respondent. The scores were then correlated to check on the consistency of responses from respondents. Since split half procedure is based upon a correlation between scores obtained on only half the test, a correction is needed to determine the reliability of the entire test. The spearman Brown prophecy formula was used to make corrections as follows:

\[
R = \frac{2r}{1 + r}
\]

Where \(R\) is the corrected reliability coefficient

\(r\) is the correlation coefficient from original calculation
According to Dalen (1979), a co-efficient of 0.6-0.8 indicates that there is a high degree of reliability. In this study, the researcher calculated reliability co-efficient of 0.87. This proved that the instruments were reliable.

3.6. Data Collection Procedures

In order to collect data from the targeted respondents, the researcher obtained an introductory letter from the University of Nairobi and a permit from the National Council of Science and Technology. The researcher sought permission and letter of authority from the County Commissioner – Migori County before moving to the District Education Officer, Rongo District. Thereafter, the researcher visited each of the sampled schools and made appointment with the Principal on when to administer the questionnaires. Due to the expansive coverage area for the research, the researcher recruited four research assistants who assisted in data collection. The researcher trained the four research assistants on how to administer the instruments. This entailed training the research assistants on the best time to administer the questionnaires, how to develop good rapport while collecting data from respondents and to appear friendly to the respondents. Questionnaires were collected immediately after being filled by respondents. To ensure a high response rate, the researcher explained the purpose of the study to the respondents, made the questions precise and concise, clarified difficult questions and assured participants of total confidentiality. Before data entry, questionnaires were checked for completeness and data cleaning done to enhance data quality.
3.7. Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis is the process of systematically searching and arranging field findings for presentation (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992). It involves organizing the data, breaking it into categories and units and then searching for trends and patterns before deciding to report. It seeks to fulfill the research objectives and provides answers to research questions. The choice of analysis procedure depends on how well the technique is suited to the study objectives and scale of measurement of the variable in question. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentage counts and presented using frequency and percentage tables. Quantitative data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The number of respondents (frequency) who responded to a particular option were recorded in one column and percentages calculated and recorded in another column. The strength of percentages indicated preferred response. Qualitative data was transcribed, organized into various emerging themes guided by the objectives / research questions and reported in a narrative way.

3.8. Ethical Issues in Research

A permit and research authorization letter was obtained from the National Council for Science and Technology in the Ministry of Higher Education. Thereafter, the District Education Officer-Rongo District was notified of the research before the study was undertaken. An introductory letter seeking respondents’ permission to be part of the study was given to all potential participants. A copy of the permit approving the study together with the letter of transmittal was attached on the research instrument as a confirmation that the study was legitimate. Written informed consent for participation was obtained from all participants. For confidentiality purposes, respondents’ names were not required.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents findings of the study which have been discussed under thematic sub-sections in line with the study objectives. The thematic areas include: Questionnaire return rate; demographic characteristics of respondents, constituency development fund and provision of quality teaching/learning infrastructure, constituency development fund and provision of quality curriculum support infrastructure and finally, constituency development fund and provision of quality school sanitation facilities.

4.2 Questionnaire Return Rate

The study targeted 19 Principals, 95 Heads of Departments (HODs) and 15 Constituency Development Fund (CDF) officials. The researcher was unable to get 100% response rate from Principals, HODs and CDF officials. This is because, 4 Principals, 5 HODs and 6 CDF officials were not available in their respective work places at the time of conducting the research resulting into a combined response rate of 88.37%. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a response rate of 60% is good and that of 70% and above is very good. This implied that the combined response rate of 88.37% was adequate for reporting in this study. Table 4.1 shows the results.
Table 4.1: Questionnaire Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
<th>Obtained</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODs</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDF Officials</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Field Survey Data, 2014*

The study found the views of 15(78.94%) principals out of 19 principals, 90(94.74%) out of 95 HODs and 09(60.00%) out of 15 CDF officials. The study was able to get the views of 114 (88.37%) out of the targeted 129 respondents. This is in line with the findings of Cooper and Schindler (2010) who asserted that a response rate of at least 70% is adequate for a social scientific study.

4.3 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Three categories of respondents were identified, namely, Principals and HODs and CDF officials. The demographic characteristics that were considered in this section include: gender, age and the highest completed level of education of the participants. This gave a deeper insight on understanding the relationship between the variables under study.

4.3.1 Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Gender refers to socially constructed roles, behavior, activities and attributes that a particular society considers appropriate for men and women. It was necessary to determine the gender balance among Secondary school principals and HODs in Rongo District. For this reason,
principals and HODs were asked to indicate their gender. Their responses were as summarized in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Distribution of Respondents by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HODs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey Data, 2014

Out of 15 principals who participated in the study, 09(60%) were male while 06(40%) were female. On the contrary, out of 90 HODs who took part in the study, 53(58.89%) were male while 37(41.11%) were female. Findings of the study indicate that there were more male principals 9(60%) and HODs 53(58.89%) than female principals 6(40%) and HODs 37(41.11%). Thus affirmative action campaigns should be initiated in public secondary schools in Rongo District in order to break male dominance in leadership positions and increase the likelihood of females rising into leadership positions.

4.3.2 Distribution of Respondents by Age

The study sought to establish the distribution of respondents by Age. This was because the researcher felt that ages of respondents could reveal their experience, commitment and level of responsibilities. In view of this, respondents were asked to state their ages and the results are presented in the table 4.3
Table 4.3: Distribution of Respondents by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>HODs</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 yrs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 yrs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 yrs &amp; Above</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey Data, 2014

Out of 15 principals who participated in the study, 3(20%) fell within the age category of 25-34 years, majority 8(53.33%) fell within the age category of 35-44 years while 4(26.7%) fell within the age bracket of 45-54 years. None of the principals fell within the age slab of 55 years and above. Looking at the age distribution of HODs, 16(17.8%) fell within the age group of 25-34 years, majority 42(46.7%) fell within the age category of 35-44 years where as 32(35.5%) fell within the age category of 45-54 years. Just like the principals, none of the HODs fell within the age bracket of 55 years and above. Findings of the study revealed that majority of principals 8(53.3%) and HODs 42(46.7%) fell within the age of 35-44years. This could be due to the fact that for one to be appointed as HOD or principal, he/she must have taught for sometimes and gained enough experience to be able to mentor/inspire other teachers.

4.3.3 Distribution of Respondents by Highest Completed Level of Education

The study sought to establish the distribution of respondents by highest completed level of education. This was necessary in order to fully understand respondents. For this reason,
respondents were asked to indicate their highest completed level of education. Findings were as tabulated in table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Distribution of Respondents by Highest Completed Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Education</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HODs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey Data, 2014

Out of 15 principals who participated in the study, none had Diploma and Doctorate level of education, majority 11(73.3%) had degree level of education, 4(26.7%) had masters level of education. Likewise, out of 90 HODs who participated in the study, 9(10%) had attained Diploma as their highest level of education, majority 61(67.8%) had degree level of education, 20(22.2%) had masters level of education. None of HODs had PhD level of education. Findings of the study revealed that, 11(73.3%) of principals and 61(67.8%) of HODs had degree levels of education. This showed that majority of principals and HODs embraced the modern way of life (culture) which lays emphasis on knowledge acquisition. Another possible reason why majority of principals and HODs had either degree or Masters academic qualifications was that the government pegged promotion of principals and HODs on academic and professional qualifications. This motivated most principals and HODs to develop double appetite for additional academic and professional papers (meritocracy) in order to package themselves for promotion.
4.4 Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality Teaching and Learning Infrastructure in Public Secondary Schools in Rongo District

The first objective of the study sought to determine the influence of constituency development fund (CDF) on provision of quality teaching and learning infrastructure in public secondary schools in Rongo District. This was necessary in order to assess whether the devolved fund was living up-to its expectation of providing quality teaching and learning infrastructure in public secondary schools. To achieve this objective, the researcher further sub-divided it into various sub-themes including; Availability of CDF funded teaching and learning infrastructure, CDF and provision of quality classrooms, CDF and provision of quality administration block.

4.4.1 Constituency Development Fund and Funding of Teaching and Learning Infrastructure

In order for the researcher to link the funding of teaching and learning infrastructure with CDF, the researcher enquired from principals and HODs whether CDF funded teaching and learning infrastructure in their schools. Their responses were as depicted in Table 4.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does CDF fund T/L</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>HODs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As reflected in Table 4.5, out of 15 principals who participated in the study, 10 (66.7%) acknowledged that CDF had funded teaching and learning infrastructure in their schools while 5 (33.3%) of the principals held a contrary opinion. On the other hand, 63 (70%) of HODs consented that CDF had funded teaching and learning infrastructure in their schools whereas 27 (30%) held a contrary opinion. Results of the study clearly showed that majority 10 (66.7%) of principals and 63 (70%) of HODs acknowledged that CDF funded teaching and learning infrastructure in their schools. CDF is an example of Community Driven Development (CDD) initiatives that empower local communities by providing fungible funds (often from the central government but sometimes from donor sources, GoK (2010). An empirical study conducted by Luvega (2007) on the role of physical infrastructures on educational development established that lack of physical infrastructure like classrooms, libraries, laboratories, office blocks, toilets etc reflected a negative impact on the quality of teaching/learning.

It is on this premise that the government initiated Constituency Development Fund (CDF) to provide funds to support refurbishing existing physical infrastructures in schools to improve on their quality or building new ones in order to make available the much needed physical infrastructures in schools. All the 9 (100%) CDF committee officials who participated in the study consented that they allocate funds to refurbish existing physical infrastructures in order to improve on their quality or support the construction of new ones particularly when prioritized by the schools’ BOGs. They mentioned classrooms, libraries, administration block, staffroom etc as some of the teaching and learning infrastructures they sponsored in schools.
4.4.2 Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality Classrooms

After establishing that CDF funded teaching and learning infrastructures in schools, the researcher was interested in ascertaining the quality of teaching and learning infrastructures constructed using CDF funds. Classrooms act as factories where students’ brains are processed. It is in the classroom where the actual teaching and learning takes place. It is on the basis of this crucial role played by classrooms in the learning process that the researcher enquired from principals and HODs whether CDF constructed quality classrooms in their various schools. Their responses were as depicted in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Classes</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HODs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey Data, 2014

Out of 15 principals who participated in the study, 6(40%) consented that the quality of classes constructed by CDF were very good, 4(26.7%) acknowledged that the quality of classes constructed by CDF funds were good while 5(33.3%) confessed that the quality of classes were fair. Likewise, 42(46.7%) of HODs consented that the quality of classes constructed by CDF were very good, 33(36.7%) confessed that the quality of classes were good where as 15(16.6%)
of HODs echoed that the quality of classes constructed by CDF were fair. Based on findings of the study, 10(66.7%) of principals and 75(83.4%) of HODs acknowledged that classes constructed by CDF were of good quality.

These findings concur with those of Fisher (2006) who observed that uncomfortable and unsuitable classrooms cause’ problems such as poor concentration span, writing difficulties, illness thus reducing the learning opportunities. Thus, the Government strives to provide quality classrooms in terms of adequate space, adequate ventilations, good lighting systems, good paintings of the walls etc. through CDF. Adequate classrooms in schools are directly related to improved enrolment as well as improved performance. The main aim of the government is to have more citizens enrolled and complete learning and in the end get good academic results so as to make successful transition to higher levels of learning. This will ensure that there is good quality of education due to little education wastage that comes from under enrolment and poor performance.

4.4.3 Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality Administration Block

The researcher examined the influence of CDF on the provision of quality administration blocks. An administration block is the centre of power in a school. An administration block houses offices of major departments found in the school together with the principal’s office. It is from the administration block that the principal evaluates, forecast, co-ordinates and plans all the activities of the school. These vital roles executed by the principal within the school in the administration block singles out the administration block as a unique structure which is indispensable in every school. It is on the basis of this that the researcher felt the need of
enquiring from principals and HODs whether administration blocks constructed by CDF were of good quality. Table 4.7 showed the results obtained from the study.

**Table 4.7: Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality Administration Block**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Adm Block</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HODs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey Data, 2014*

Out of 15 principals who participated in the study, 7(46.6%) opined that CDF funds supported the construction of administration blocks of very good quality in their schools. 4(26.7%) asserted that CDF funds supported the construction of administration blocks of good quality in their schools while 4(26.7%) consented that CDF supported the construction of administration blocks of fair quality. On the other hand, 45(50%) of HODs consented that CDF supported the construction of administration blocks of very good quality in their schools. 28(31.1%) confessed that CDF supported the construction of administration blocks of good quality where as 17(18.9%) of HODs acknowledged that CDF supported the construction of administration blocks of fair quality. Findings revealed that majority 11(73.3%) of principals and 73(81.1%) of HODs consented that CDF supported the construction of administration blocks of good quality in terms of adequate space, proper ventilations, paintings of the walls, lighting system etc. This observation was also herald by CDF officials while answering an open ended
question in the interview schedule requiring them to state some of the key teaching/learning infrastructures in school they sponsored using CDF funds. All the 9(100%) CDF officials mentioned classes, libraries and administration blocks as some of the key teaching/learning infrastructures they sponsored in most of the schools within their jurisdiction, a gesture that confirmed that CDF assisted in the development of administration blocks in schools within Rongo District.

4.5 Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality Curriculum Support Infrastructure in Public Secondary Schools of Rongo District

The second objective of the study sought to assess the influence of constituency development fund on the provision of quality curriculum support infrastructure in public secondary schools in Rongo District. Curriculum support infrastructures include laboratories, technical workshops, computer rooms, school kitchen etc. These were further discussed in details.

4.5.1 Constituency Development Fund and Funding of Curriculum Support Infrastructure

Curriculum support infrastructures are as important in the teaching/learning process as curriculum infrastructures. Curriculum support infrastructures complement curriculum infrastructures and both are indispensable in a school system. In view of this, the researcher was interested in establishing whether CDF funded curriculum support infrastructures in schools. The researcher sought respondents’ opinion to indicate whether CDF funded curriculum support infrastructures. Their responses were as shown in Table 4.8.
Table 4.8: Constituency Development Fund and Funding of Curriculum Support Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does CDF fund CSI</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HODs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 15 100 90 100 105

Source: Field Survey Data, 2014

Out of 15 principals who participated in the study, 8(53%) acknowledged that CDF funded curriculum support infrastructures in schools. 7(47%) held a contrary opinion. Likewise, 54(60%) of HODs consented that CDF funded curriculum support infrastructures in schools whereas 36(40%) of HODs held a contrary opinion. Based on the results of the study, majority of principals 8(53%) and 54(60%) of HODs consented that CDF funded curriculum support infrastructures in schools. This was further validated by majority of CDF officials 6(67%) who confessed that they funded the construction of laboratories, workshops, computer labs, libraries, schools kitchens etc in various schools.

An empirical study conducted by Adede (2012) on impact of school infrastructure on provision of quality education in public secondary schools of Nyakach District, found out that one cannot expect high level of students’ academic performance where school buildings such as technical workshops and laboratories are substandard. Similarly, In Nigeria Ajayi (2007) maintained that high level of students’ academic performance may not be guaranteed where curriculum support infrastructure such as technical workshops and laboratories are structurally
defective, not properly ventilated and not spacious enough for use. He further emphasized that structural effectiveness, proper ventilation and well located curriculum support infrastructure may lead to successful teaching and learning process.

4.5.2 Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality School Laboratories

School laboratories are very instrumental in the teaching / learning process more so for the science subjects. The researcher was interested in establishing whether CDF assisted in constructing quality laboratories in schools. For this reason, respondents were asked to rate the quality of laboratories funded by CDF. Results were as depicted in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality School Laboratory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Laboratory</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>HODs</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey Data, 2014

Results of the study reveal that 5(33.3%) of principals who participated in the study opined that school laboratories constructed through CDF funds were of very good quality, 4(26.7%) of principals confessed that school laboratories built using CDF funds were of good quality while 6(40%) said that they were of fair quality. On the side of HODs, 38(42.2%) consented that school laboratories built courtesy of CDF were of very good quality, 23(25.6%) confessed that
the school laboratories sponsored by CDF were of good quality while 29(32.2%) said that they were of fair quality. Results of the study revealed that, majority of principals 9(60%) and HODs 61(67.8%) acknowledged that school laboratories constructed using CDF funds were of good quality. Funds from CDF have made the dream of curriculum support infrastructure needed by schools a reality. CDF funds have enhanced the development of laboratories, science rooms, workshops, school kitchens, computer rooms etc in most public secondary schools in Rongo District.

A study conducted by Fuller (2006) and Popoola (2009) on curriculum support infrastructure found out that school laboratories significantly influence students’ academic performance. According to Bajah (2009), laboratories are essential in the teaching and learning of science subjects. Scott (2005) presented similar findings in the USA’ by summarizing that improved performance in science subjects was associated with improved science laboratories and technical workshops with up to date facilities. Such improvements saw many students pass in their high school examinations and consequently joined university.

4.5.3 Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality School Kitchen

Parents and by extension school administration must provide learners with basic human needs which include food, clothing and shelter for learners to be in a better position to consume the knowledge they learn in schools. The school kitchen plays an instrumental role in the school in as far as the provision of food is concerned. This is because; it is in the school kitchen where food is prepared. This pivotal role played by school kitchen motivated the researcher to enquire from principals and HODs whether CDF supported the construction of quality school kitchen in schools. They gave various sentiments as reflected in Table 4.10.
### Table 4.10: Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality School Kitchen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Kitchen</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>HODs</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** *Field Survey Data, 2014*

As reflected in Table 4.10, 3(20%) of the school principals opined that CDF sponsored the construction of kitchens of very good quality in most public secondary schools in Rongo District, 5(33.3%) of principals confessed that most school kitchens constructed using CDF funds were of good quality while 7(46.7%) asserted that the school kitchens built using CDF funds were of fair quality. Results of the study revealed that majority 8(53.3%) of principals consented that school kitchens sponsored by CDF funds were of good quality. Even though more principals said that the school kitchens constructed by CDF funds were of good quality, the 7(46.7%) that held a contrary opinion sent signals that discontentment was growing among principals on the quality of school kitchens sponsored using CDF funds.

Responses by HODs on the same question followed similar pattern. 21(23.3%) of HODs confessed that school kitchens sponsored by CDF in schools were of very good quality, 28(31.1%) of HODs said that they were of good quality while 41(45.6%) of HODs asserted that they were of fair quality. Based on the study, 49(54.4%) of HODs acknowledged that school kitchens sponsored by CDF were of good quality. However, 41(45.6%) of HODs said that the
school kitchens sponsored by CDF in schools were of fair quality. This big percentage of HODs who were discontented with the quality of kitchens sponsored by CDF in schools sent signals that besides providing funds to schools to support the construction of curriculum support services such as laboratories, workshops, computer rooms, school kitchens, inspection should be done by CDF committee officials to check on the quality of the sponsored curriculum support infrastructures in schools.

4.6 Constituency Development Fund and Provision of School Sanitation Facilities in Public Secondary Schools of Rongo District

The third objective of the study sought to examine the influence of CDF on the provision of quality school sanitation facilities in public secondary schools in Rongo District. School sanitation facilities include; toiletry facilities, water harvesting system, abolition block, urinal pit, waste pit etc. This theme was sub-divided into various sub-themes which include; role of CDF in the provision of school sanitation facilities, CDF and the provision of quality toiletry facilities in schools.

4.6.1 Role of Constituency Development Fund in the Provision of School Sanitation Facilities

Good sanitation facilities promote the health status of learners thus improving their attendance and level of concentration in class. In order for the researcher to appreciate the role of CDF in the provision of school sanitation facilities such as toilets, abolition block, water reservoirs, waste pits etc, the researcher inquired from principals and HODs whether CDF
participated in the construction of sanitation facilities in schools. Their responses were as shown in Table 4.11.

**Table 4.11: Role of Constituency Development Fund in the Provision of School Sanitation Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does CDF fund SSF</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HODs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 15 100 90 100 105

*Source: Field Survey Data, 2014*

Out of 15 principals who participated in the study, 5(33%) consented that CDF assisted in building school sanitation facilities. Majority 10(67%) held a contrary opinion. Likewise, 42(46.7%) of HODs acknowledged that CDF funds supported the construction of school sanitation facilities while 48(53.3%) of HODs held a contrary opinion. As reflected in Table 4.8, majority of principals 10(67%) and HODs 48(53.3%) confessed that CDF funds did not support the construction of school sanitation facilities. This confession implied that CDF funds supported the construction of teaching and learning infrastructures and curriculum support infrastructures as opposed to construction of school sanitation facilities. This confession was validated by 7(78%) CDF committee officials who opined that they prioritized the sponsorship of curriculum infrastructures such as classrooms, libraries, staffrooms, office blocks and curriculum support infrastructures such as teachers’ houses, laboratories, school kitchen as opposed to school
sanitation facilities etc. Only 2(22%) of CDF committee officials consented that they occasionally sponsored the construction of school sanitation facilities.

### 4.6.2 Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality Toiletry Facilities in Schools

Toiletry facilities include solid waste disposal (containers, waste pits, latrines) drainage (soak pits, drainage channels) and adequate water to clean latrines/toilets. The researcher was interested in establishing whether CDF assisted in the construction of quality toiletry facilities in schools. For this reason, principals and HODs were asked to rate the quality of toiletry facilities funded by CDF. Their responses were as depicted in Table 4.12.

**Table 4.12: Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality Toiletry Facilities in Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Kitchen</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HODs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** *Field Survey Data, 2014*
Out of 15 principals who participated in the study, none rated the quality of toiletry facilities sponsored by CDF as very good, 6(40%) rated the quality of toiletry facilities sponsored by CDF as good while majority of principals 9(60%) rated the quality of toiletry facilities sponsored by CDF as fair. Responses by HODs on the same question revealed similar pattern i.e none of the HODs said that the quality of toiletry facilities sponsored by CDF was very good, 30(33.3%) of HODs rated that the quality of toiletry facilities sponsored by CDF as good where as majority 60(66.7%) of HODs rated that the quality of toiletry facilities sponsored by CDF as fair. Based on the results of the study, majority of principals 9(60%) and HODs 60(66.7%) rated the quality of toiletry facilities sponsored by CDF as fair.

Results of this study concurs with the report of Susana (2007) on school attendance of the girl child which concluded that students particularly girls miss school or even drop out of school due to lack of sanitary facilities or the absence of separation of girls and boys toilets. In these situations, girls even stay away from school during menstruation period. This observation was further herald by 12(80%) of principals who confessed that most of the pit latrines in schools were being filled up rapidly due to congestion thus compromising on the quality of education as a result of long queues witnessed for students waiting for their turn. Based on these observations, most principals recommended that more toiletry facilities be built in schools to off-load the pressure exerted by students on the already existing toiletry facilities using CDF funds.
4.7 Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality School Co-curricular Infrastructures in Public Secondary Schools of Rongo District

The fourth and last objective of the study sought to establish the influence of constituency development fund in the provision of quality school co-curricular infrastructure in public secondary schools of Rongo District. In order to achieve this objective, Principals, HODs and CDF committee officials were subjected to several questions meant to establish how CDF participated in the provision of quality co-curricular infrastructure in schools. For better understanding of this theme, the researcher further sub-divided it into sub-themes which include: participation of CDF in the provision of school co-curricular infrastructures, role of CDF in the provision of quality school co-curricular infrastructures.

4.7.1 Participation of Constituency Development Fund in the Provision of School Co-curricular Infrastructures

The researcher was interested in ascertaining whether CDF participated in the provision of school co-curricular infrastructures in public secondary schools of Rongo District. For this reason, respondents were asked to indicate whether CDF participated in the provision of co-curricular infrastructure or not. Their responses were as summarized in Table 4.13.
Table 4.13: Participation of Constituency Development Fund in the Provision of School Co-curricular Infrastructures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does CDF fund CI</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HODs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 15 100 90 100 105

Source: Field Survey Data, 2014

As depicted in Table 4.13, out of 15 Principals who participated in the study, 6(40%) acknowledged that CDF participated in the provision of co-curricular infrastructures in schools while 9(60%) affirmed that CDF did not participate in the provision of co-curricular infrastructures in schools. Likewise, out of 90 HODs who took part in the study, 43(47.8%) confirmed that CDF participated in the provision of school co-curricular infrastructures whereas 47(52.2%) said that CDF did not participate in the provision of co-curricular infrastructures.

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher concluded that majority of principals 9(60%) and HODs 47(522%) confessed that CDF did not participate in the provision of co-curricular infrastructures in most public secondary schools in Rongo Districts. This observation was also echoed by all 9(100%) CDF committee officials while responding to a question in an interview schedule which required them to prioritize the order in which they sponsored school infrastructures. All the CDF officials ranked co-curricular infrastructures last after school sanitation facilities and teaching and learning infrastructures which was given top priority by the CDF officials. On further prompting of CDF officials on why they preferred sponsoring teaching
and learning infrastructures in schools, they responded by saying that teaching and learning
infrastructures are basic infrastructures required by all schools and that no meaningful
teaching/learning can take place without teaching and learning infrastructures put in place. This
reason disadvantaged co-curricular infrastructures which the CDF officials asserted that were
secondary infrastructures which schools could cope without.

4.7.2 Role of Constituency Development Fund in the Provision of Quality School Co-
curricular Infrastructures

School co-curricular infrastructures play a significant role in facilitating holistic
development of students which by extension enhance quality education through provision of
room for exercises. For this reason, the researcher felt that it was necessary to enquire from
respondents whether CDF participated in the provision of quality co-curricular infrastructures in
public secondary schools of Rongo District. Responses of respondents were as captured in Table

Table 4.14: Role of Constituency Development Fund in the Provision of Quality School Co-
curricular Infrastructures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of CI</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>HODs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.14 reveals that out of 15 principals who participated in the study, none rated the quality of co-curricular infrastructures provided by CDF as very good. 7(46.7%) rated the quality of co-curricular infrastructures provided by CDF as good while 8(53.3%) rated the quality of co-curricular infrastructures provided by CDF as fair. Looking at HODs, none rated the quality of co-curricular infrastructures provided by CDF as very good. 35(38.9%) rated the quality of co-curricular infrastructures provided by CDF as good while 55(61.1%) rated the quality of co-curricular infrastructures provided by CDF as fair. Results of the study reveal that majority of principals 8(53.3%) and HODs 55(61.1%) rated the quality of co-curricular infrastructures provided by CDF as fair. The researcher associated this fair quality of co-curricular infrastructures to a number of factors ranging from inadequate CDF to low prioritization of co-curricular infrastructures in schools. Based on the findings of this study, the researcher recommends that CDF officials should prioritize the sponsorship of co-curricular infrastructures in schools and allocate more funds in order to enable constructors boost on their quality. Results of this study further shows that co-curricular infrastructures are associated with improved participation of learners in the co-curricular activities and vice versa. These sentiments are validated by Vaidhyanathan (2009) study which revealed that student’s strength lies in co-curricular activities such as athletics, drama music, music and swimming and these talents can only be nurtured by schools through availing quality school co-curricular infrastructures.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on summary of findings, conclusion, recommendations and suggestions for further research based on the issues raised by this study.

5.2 Summary of Findings

The study sought to establish the influence of constituency development fund on the provision of quality educational infrastructure in public secondary schools in Rongo District. Findings of the study indicate that there were more male principals 9(60%) and HODs 53(58.89%) than female principals 6(40%) and HODs 37(41.11%). On distribution of respondents by age, findings of the study revealed that majority of principals 8(53.3%) and HODs 42(46.7%) fell within the age of 35-44 years. While examining the distribution of respondents by highest completed level of education, results of the study indicated that, 11(73.3%) of principals and 61(67.8%) of HODs had degree levels of education.

The first objective of the study sought to determine the influence of constituency development fund on the provision of quality teaching and learning infrastructure in public secondary schools of Rongo District. Results of the study clearly showed that 10(66.7%) of principals and 63(70%) of HODs acknowledged that CDF funded teaching and learning infrastructure in their schools. While examining the quality of teaching and learning infrastructure constructed using CDF funds, 10(66.7%) of principals and 75(83.4%) of HODs
acknowledged that classes constructed by CDF were of good quality. All the 9(100%) CDF committee officials who participated in the study consented that they allocate funds to refurbish existing physical infrastructures in order to improve on their quality or support the construction of new ones particularly when prioritized by the schools’ BOGs.

The second objective of the study sought to assess the influence of constituency development fund in the provision of quality curriculum support infrastructures in public secondary schools of Rongo District. Based on the results of the study, majority of principals 8(53%) and 54(60%) of HODs consented that CDF funded curriculum support infrastructures in schools. This was further validated by majority of CDF officials 6(67%) who confessed that they funded the construction of laboratories, workshops, computer labs, libraries, schools kitchens in schools. Results of the study revealed that majority of principals 9(60%) and HODs 61(67.8%) acknowledged that school laboratories constructed using CDF funds were of good quality. However, 7(46.7%) of principals and 41(45.6%) of HODs were discontented with the quality of school kitchen sponsored by CDF.

The third objective the study sought to examine the influence of constituency development fund on the provision of quality school sanitation facilities in public secondary schools of Rongo District. Results of the study revealed that; 57(63.3%) of HODs confirmed that CDF did not participate in the construction of quality toiletry facilities in schools. This observation was further herald by 12(80%) of principals who confessed that most of the pit latrines in schools were being filled up rapidly due to congestion thus compromising on the quality of education as a result of long queues witnessed for students waiting for their turn.
The fourth and last objective of the study sought to establish the influence of constituency development fund in the provision of quality school co-curricular infrastructures in public secondary schools of Rongo District. Results of the study revealed that majority of principals 9(60%) and HODs 47(522%) confessed that CDF did not participate in the provision of co-curricular infrastructures in most public secondary schools of Rongo District. Majority of principals 8(53.3%) and HODs 55(61.1%) rated the quality of co-curricular infrastructures provided by CDF as fair. On further prompting, principals and HODs singled out inadequate funds and low prioritization of co-curricular infrastructures during funding as the most dominant factors contributing to fair rating of co-curricular infrastructures in most schools in Rongo District.

5.3 Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of constituency development fund on the provision of quality educational infrastructure in public secondary schools in Rongo District. In terms of the stated research objectives, the following findings emerged from the study:

Results of the study clearly showed that majority of principals and HODs asserted that the teaching and learning infrastructure constructed using CDF funds were of good quality. All CDF committee officials who participated in the study consented that they allocated funds to refurbish existing physical infrastructures in order to improve on their quality or support the construction of new ones particularly when prioritized by the schools’ BOGs.

Majority of majority of principals and HODs acknowledged that school laboratories constructed using CDF funds were of good quality. However, minority of principals and HODs
wer’e discontented with the quality of school kitchen sponsored by CDF. Finally, majority of
principals and HODs confirmed that CDF did not participate in the construction of quality
toilet facilities in schools.

Results of the study revealed that majority of principals and HODs confessed that CDF did
not participate in the provision of co-curricular infrastructures in most public secondary schools
of Rongo District. Majority of principals and HODs rated the quality of co-curricular
infrastructures provided by CDF as fair. Principals and HODs singled out inadequate funds and
low prioritization of co-curricular infrastructures during funding as the most dominant factors
contributing to fair rating of co-curricular infrastructures in most schools in Rongo District.

5.4 Recommendations

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

CDF officials should increase the allocation of funds meant to facilitate the construction of
curriculum infrastructures in schools in order to hasten the completion of initiated projects.

Regular inspection should be initiated and sustained by CDF committee officials to check on the
quality of projects sponsored by CDF in schools.

More toilet facilities should be built in schools to off-load the pressure exerted by students on
the already existing toilet facilities using CDF funds.
CDF officials should allocate more funds to facilitate the construction of quality co-curricular infrastructures. They should as well prioritize the sponsorship of co-curricular infrastructure in schools.

### 5.5 Contribution of the Study to the Body of Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Contribution to the body of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To determine the influence of CDF in the provision of quality teaching and learning infrastructures in public secondary schools of Rongo District.</td>
<td>More CDF funds be allocated to hasten the completion and to improve on the quality of initiated teaching and learning infrastructures in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To assess the influence of CDF in the provision of quality curriculum support infrastructures in public secondary schools of Rongo District.</td>
<td>Regular inspection be initiated and sustained by CDF committee officials to check on the quality of projects sponsored by CDF in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To examine the influence of CDF in the provision of quality school sanitation facilities in public secondary schools of Rongo District.</td>
<td>More toiletry facilities be built in schools to off-load the pressure exerted by students on the already existing toiletry facilities using CDF funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To establish the influence of CDF in the provision of quality co-curricular infrastructures in public secondary schools of Rongo District.</td>
<td>CDF officials to allocate more funds to facilitate the construction of quality co-curricular infrastructures. Sponsorship of co-curricular infrastructure by CDF officials to be prioritized in schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6 Suggestions for Further Research

This study did not explore certain areas that were equally important. Such areas were left out because the scope of this study warranted. In view of this, the study suggests the following areas for further research:

i. Role of school infrastructure development fund in promoting access and quality education in public secondary education.

ii. The role of laboratory equipment fund in developing adequate laboratories in public secondary schools.

iii. The study was conducted in Rongo District which is in a rural setup, there is need to replicate the study in an urban setup in order to validate its findings.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I:

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS AND HEAD OF DEPARTMENTS (HODs)

Introduction

The purpose of this questionnaire is to establish the influence of Constituency Development Fund on the provision of quality educational infrastructure in public secondary schools in Rongo District. Openness, objectivity and accuracy in answering questions will be greatly appreciated. All your responses and information obtained will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will only be used for research purposes only. Please read the instructions carefully before you give required responses.

SECTION A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Which age bracket do you belong?
   [  ] 25-34yrs          [  ] 35-44yrs          [  ] 45-54yrs          [  ] Above 55yrs

2. Sex orientation
   [  ] Male              [  ] Female

3. What is your highest completed level of education?
   [  ] Diploma          [  ] Degree          [  ] Masters        Doctorate [  ]
SECTION B

Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality Teaching and Learning Infrastructure in Public Secondary Schools of Rongo District

5. Do you have CDF funded teaching and learning infrastructure in your school?
   Yes [ ]                     No [ ]

6. If yes in Q. 4, what teaching and learning infrastructure has CDF funded in your school?
   Classrooms [ ]           Libraries [ ]   Administration block [ ]   Staffroom [ ]

7. In your opinion, how do you rate the quality of the following teaching and learning infrastructures funded by CDF in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Learning Infrastructures</th>
<th>RATINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION C

Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality Curriculum Support Infrastructure in Public Secondary Schools in Rongo District

8. Does CDF support the building of curriculum support infrastructure in your school?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

9. If yes in Q. 7, which curriculum support infrastructure does CDF fund in your school?
   Laboratories [ ]  Workshops [ ]  School kitchen [ ]  Computer rooms [ ]

10. In your opinion, how do you rate the quality of the following curriculum support infrastructure funded by CDF in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Support Infrastructures</th>
<th>RATINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Kitchens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION D**

Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality School Sanitation Facilities in Public Secondary Schools in Rongo District

11. Has CDF participated in the building of the following school sanitation facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Sanitation Facilities</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolution Block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Reservoirs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste pits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. In your opinion, how do you rate the quality of the following school sanitation facilities funded by CDF in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Sanitation Facilities</th>
<th>RATINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolition Blocks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water reservoirs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste pits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION E

Constituency Development Fund and Provision of Quality School Co-curricular Infrastructure in Public Secondary Schools of Rongo District

13. Has CDF participated in the provision of the following school co-curricular infrastructure in public secondary schools of Rongo District?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Co-curricular Infrastructures</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Games and Sports Pitches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games &amp; Sports Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games &amp; Sports Stores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. In your opinion, how do you rate the quality of the following school co-curricular infrastructure in your schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Co-curricular Infrastructures</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Games and Sports Pitches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games &amp; Sports Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games &amp; Sports Stores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II:

CDF COMMITTEE OFFICIALS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Introduction

The purpose of this interview schedule is to solicit information on influence of Constituency Development Fund on provision of quality Educational Infrastructure in Public Secondary Schools in Rongo District. Fill it with utmost confidentiality. Do not write your name on the interview schedule

1. Indicate some of the key teaching/learning infrastructures in schools sponsored by CDFs.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

2. a) Do you allocate CDFs for building new curriculum support infrastructures in schools?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

b) If Yes in Q.2a, explain

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
3. a) Do you sponsor the construction of curriculum support infrastructures such as laboratories, technical workshops, school kitchen etc?

Yes [ ]       No [ ]

b) If Yes in Q 3 a). Explain

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

4 a) Which projects do you prioritize in your CDF funding?

Teaching and Learning infrastructures [ ]

Co-curriculum infrastructures [ ]

School sanitation facilities [ ]

b) Explain your answer?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Thank you for taking your time to participate in this study