

**A CASE OF STUDY OF THE INDIRECT COSTS OF FREE PRIMARY EDUCATION
AND ITS IMPACT TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF UNIVERSAL FREE PRIMARY
EDUCATION IN MATUNGULU DIVISION, MACHAKOS DISTRICT.**

**BY
JULIA MWELU WAMBUA**

**A project report submitted for registration in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the award of degree of Master of Education in Educational Planning, University of Nairobi**

2008

University of NAIROBI Library



0370696 7

11F2

LB

1564

• 24 W36

C.2

DECLARATION

This project report is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university.

JULIA MWELU WAMBUA

Signed 

Date 14/10/2008


This project report has been submitted for examination with my approval as the university supervisor.

DR. GENEVIEVE WANJALA

SENIOR LECTURER

Department of Educational Administration and Planning

University of Nairobi

Signature 

Date 14 - 10 - 2008

DEDICATION

This research is dedicated to my parents, Willy Wambua Muema and Mrs. Phyllis Wambua Muema who so much inspired me to go for further studies and served as a pillar of strength; to my beloved son, Denzel Wambua and my house-help, Ndanu, for their patience, encouragement and endurance through the difficult times we went through until the completion of the study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Great thanks to the almighty God who kept me focused on the promise that faith can move mountains and that hard work coupled with patience pays hence was able to complete the project successfully.

Special thanks to the University of Nairobi and specifically to Dr. Genevieve Wanjala, the then Head of Department of Education, Administration and Planning, for the innumerable and priceless tips, positive consideration for the University's award for my scholarship, constructive criticism, patience and guidance that saw me through the entire study period.

Special gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Obae Mosoti and Dr. Genevieve Wanjala for their motherly approach in guiding me in this project and may God bless them in their endeavours.

My sincere appreciation goes to all the head teachers, deputy head teachers, teachers, parents and all those persons who directly or indirectly contributed towards the preparation and compiling of this project. Thanks to Anne Waeni of Mubena Computers who typed my work tirelessly and Mrs. Ruphine of the Computer Lab, University of Geography, Geography department House who edited my work. May God bless them abundantly.

I cannot forget my son, Denzel and the house help Ndanu, who sat late in the night as I wrote my work and continually encouraged me throughout the entire course. May the Almighty God shower them with His bountiful blessing.

ABSTRACT

The thrust of this research project was an investigation into the hidden costs embedded in the current Free Primary Education and their implication in the implementation process of this programme in public primary schools; a case study of Matungulu Division in Machakos District. In the reviewed literature, it has been that education is a human right; therefore elementary education should be free and compulsory.

However, in the developing countries, it has been a hurdle to meet these basic requirements. In the Kenya, Free Primary Education Policy was enacted in January 2003 and its implementation was a landmark policy decision by the government of the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC). The country's budget increased by 17.4 % to a soaring 79.4 billion with 5.6 billion being allocated to the Free Primary (FPE). Despite this budgetary allocation to FPE programme, there still exists financial loophole, which the parents of the primary school going children have to seal for efficient and effective educational system.

The objectives of the study were to:-

1. To establish the indirect costs embedded in the FPE programme to parents.
2. To investigate the availability and adequacy of physical facilities in the face of increased enrolment.
3. To find out the hidden costs parents incurred in the FPE Programme.
4. Examine the effect of the hidden costs on pupils' performance.
5. Investigate whether the rate of pupil attendance to school can be attributed to the effect of the hidden costs of FPE.

The study used the descriptive survey research design. To find out the hidden costs of FPE and their implication in the implementation of the FPE, a guided questionnaire for head teachers was used. An interview schedule for the parents was used to complement and compare data solicited through the questionnaire and to probe for in-depth information from those directly affected by the hidden costs of Free Primary Education; the parents. The observation schedule was used to check the physical infrastructure and the amenities in the school. Out of the seventy five public primary schools in Matungulu Division, fifteen of them were sampled out using the simple random sampling technique.

This is well above the ten percent minimum that constitutes a sample in a descriptive study (Gay, 1987). The same technique was used to select sixty parents from the fifteen school, two parents of standard eight and two parents of standard one of every school who are members of P.T.A in each of the selected schools. All these sixty parents of the fifteen schools sampled out were interviewed.

The descriptive statistics involving frequencies, percentages pie charts and histograms were used to analyze the data. The result helped the researcher to come up with conclusions and percentages.

The study established that the FPE programme has not catered for educational essentials such as school uniform, desks and school furniture, construction of additional classrooms, transport fees for the commuting pupils and has not catered fully for the feeding programme- the lunch programme. These were some of the hidden costs of FPE, which the parents had to cater for

financially. The study established that there was inadequate teaching and learning facilities such as exercise books, textbooks, stationery(writing materials) and thus there is an overwhelming need for physical facilities, learning resources and land for extension of additional classrooms since enrolment is a continuous phenomena. The study concluded and recommended that:-

- i) More money should be disbursed by the government to enhance free primary education
- ii) The government should ensure that the funds are disbursed to cater for all pupils' educational needs.
- iii) The spirit of Harambee should be revived with the politicians being in the steering committee in mobilizing the school community in raising funds to supplement the already inadequate FPE funds.

The study also identified the following areas for further research:-

- i) A similar study could be replicated to a large sample to establish if similar results could be attained.
- ii) Investigate the future of FPE in Kenya.
- iii) Investigate the gap in quality of education in private and public schools in the endeavour to joining higher institutions of learning.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Content	Page
Title page.....	i
Declaration.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Abstract.....	v
Table of contents.....	viii
List of tables and figures.....	xi
Abbreviations and Acronyms used.....	xv

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background to the problem.....	1
1.1 Statement of the problem.....	13
1.2 Purpose of the study.....	14
1.3 Objectives of the study.....	14
1.4 Research questions.....	15
1.5 Significance of the study.....	15
1.6 Limitations of the study.....	16
1.7 Delimitations of the study.....	16
1.8 Basic assumptions.....	16
1.9 Definition of significant terms.....	17
1.10 Organization of the study.....	18

CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction.....	20
2.1 The concept of free primary education programme, 2003.....	20
2.2 Free Primary Education (FPE) Programme, 2003.....	23

2.3 The Indirect costs of Free Primary Education.....	23
2.4 Effects of Indirect Costs of Pupil Performance	26
2.5 Availability and Adequacy of Physical Facilities and Materials in Schools.....	26
2.6 Community Participation in Programme Implementation in Schools	28
2.7 Conceptual Framework	29

CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction	31
3.1 Research Design.....	31
3.2 Target Population.....	31
3.3 Sample of the Study and Sampling Procedure	32
3.4 Research Instruments	33
3.4.1 Instrument Validity.....	35
3.4.2 Instrument Reliability.....	35
3.5 Data Collection Procedures	36
3.6 Data Analysis Techniques	36

CHAPTER FOUR
DATA INTERPRETATION

4.0 Introduction	37
4.1 Questionnaire return rate.....	37
4.2 Demographic Data of the Respondents.....	37
4.3 Demographic information of the Head teachers.....	43
4.4 Analysis of Parents' Demographic Data	51
4.5 Demographic Information on Adequacy of Physical Facilities.....	76

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction	87
5.1 Summary of the Study	87
5.2 Summary of the Research Finding.....	87
5.3 Head teachers' ability and remarks on the attainment and adequacy of the FPE fund.....	88
5.4 Parents responsibility in supplementing for the uncatered for costs and expenses by the FPE Programme	90
5.5 General Observation of the Physical Facilities and Infrastructure by the Teaching Staff.....	91
5.6 Conclusions of the Study.....	92
5.7 Recommendations of the study.....	93
5.8 Suggestions for Further Research	95

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	96
--------------------------	-----------

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Introductory Letter to Head Teacher	104
Appendix 2 Introductory Letter to Parents	105
Appendix 3: Questionnaire for the Head Teachers	106
Appendix 4: Interview Schedule for Parents.....	109
Appendix 5: School Observation Schedule.....	111

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Free primary education cost to the government 2003/2004-5	9
Table 1.2: Annual unit allocation per child.....	11
Table 3: Random sampled schools from four zones in Matungulu Division.....	33
Table 4: Gender Distribution of Head Teachers.....	38
Table 5: Head Teacher categorized by experience in headship	39
Table 6: Academic Qualification.....	40
Table 7: Other Academic Qualifications.....	40
Table 8: Professional Qualifications of the Head Teachers	41
Table 9: Other Professional Qualification of the Head Teachers.....	41
Table 10: Receipt of FPE Funds by the Head Teachers of the Fifteen Schools.....	42
Table 11: Amount of FPE Funds Allocated to the Schools	42
Table 12: Sufficiency of the FPE Funds as Viewed by Head Teachers	43
Table 13: Head Teachers Comment on the Increase on Pupil Enrolment After FPE Programme.....	44
Table 14: Pupil Enrolment Rates Following the Introduction of FPE 2003-2006.....	45
Table 15: Enrolment Rates in the Fifteen Public Primary School's in the Division	46
Table 16: School Performance in KCPE 2001-2005	48
Table 17: Drop out Rate Between 2003-2006.....	49
Table 18: Cost Met by Parents	51
Table 19: Development Cost Met and Unmet by Parents.....	52
Table 20: Purchase Of Teaching and Learning Material (Stationery Material, Uniform etc).....	52
Table 21: Support funds met by parents	52
Table 22: Attendance of Pupils	53
Table 23 indicates the opinions on solving problems posed by hidden costs.....	54
Table 24: Gender Distribution of Parents	55
Table 25: Age Distribution of Parent Respondent.....	56
Table 26: Name of Location.....	56
Table 27: Name of Sub-Location	57
Table 28: Number of Male Children in Public Primary School.....	58

Table 29: Number of Female Children in Public Primary School	58
Table 30: Name of Schools Where the Parent Respondents' Children's Go.....	59
Table 31: Distance of the schools from residence in kilometers.....	60
Table 32: Type of Transport Means Used by the Children.....	61
Table 33: Availability of Lunch	61
Table 34: Provision of School Lunch Programme as given by Parent Respondents.....	62
Table 35: Amount on Money Spent on Lunch Daily.....	63
Table 36: Amount on Money Spent on Textbooks Annually	64
Table 37: Amount Spend on Exercise Books Annually	65
Table 38: Amount Spend on Writing Materials per Year	66
Table 39: Amount spent on Practical subjects	67
Table 40: Amount Spend on Desks and Furniture.....	68
Table 41: Amounts Spend on Activity Fees.....	69
Table 42: Amount Spend on Watchman's Wages.....	69
Table 43: Amount Spend on School Examination Fees Annually	70
Table 44: Amount of Money Spend in Uniform Purchase Annually	71
Table 45: Failure to Attend School by Pupils Annually	73
Table 46: Reasons for Missing School	73
Table 47: Comments of How Free is Free Primary Education	74
Table 48: Pupil Drop Out Rate Annually.....	75
Table 49: Reasons for Pupil School Drop Out Rate.....	75
Table 50: Adequacy of Classrooms	77
Table 51: Permanency of classrooms	78
Table 52: Temporary Classrooms.....	78
Table 53: Classrooms with Ventilation of Doors and Windows.....	78
Table 54: Open Air-Teaching Areas.....	79
Table 55: Availability of Adequate Desks and Chairs.....	79
Table 56: Availability of Special Rooms e.g. Workshops, Libraries, and Laboratories	80
Table 57: Existence of a Computer Room	80
Table 58: Availability of a School Hall	81
Table 59: Existence of a School Kitchen	82

Table 60: Adequate Sanitations Facilities.....	82
Table 61: Condition of the Sanitation Facilities.....	83
Table 62: Good State of School Uniform by the Pupils	83
Table 63: Reasons for the Poor State of the School Uniform	84
Table 64: Availability of Income Generating Activities e.g. a School Farm.....	85
Table 65: Availability of a School Canteen or Dining Hall Providing Breakfast and Lunch to the Pupils.....	85
Table 66: Means of Feeding of the Pupils	86

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Conceptual framework	29
Figure 2 Number of pupils are there per class from the year 2003-2006	47
Figure 3 Number of pupils are there per class from the year 2003-2006	48
Figure 4 School KCPE performance for the last 5 years	49
Figure 5 A Pie-Chart on Physical Facilities and Amenities Extra Cost Borne by Parents	
Physical facilities and amenities extra cost borne by parents	72

LIST OF ABBREVIATION AND ACRONYMS USED

ATS	:	Approved Teachers Status
B.Ed	:	Bachelor of Education
CPE	:	Certificate of Primary Education
EFA	:	Education for All
FPE	:	Free Primary Education
GOK	:	Government of Kenya
IIEP	:	International Institute for Educational Planning
KACE	:	Kenya Advanced Certificate of Education
KANU	:	Kenya African National Union
KCE	:	Kenya Certificate of Education
KCPE	:	Kenya Certificate of Primary Education
KJSE	:	Kenya Junior Secondary education
MOE	:	Ministry of Education
MOEHRD	:	Ministry of Education Human Resource Development
MOEST	:	Ministry of Education, Science and Technology
NARC	:	National Rainbow Coalition
NGO	:	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD	:	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PTA	:	Parents-Teachers Association
SAPS	:	Structural Adjustment Programmes
T.S.C	:	Teachers Service Commission
U.N	:	United Nations
UNESCO	:	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	:	United Nations Children's Fund
UoN	:	University of Nairobi
UPE	:	Universal Primary Education

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background to the Problem

Education being the cornerstone of economic and social development; it will be futile disguise for a country to pretend to advance in the very absence of basic literacy and numeracy skills among its populace. Instead the country is bound to wallow in perpetual ignorance, poverty and incapacitation of its political, economic and scientific institutions as regards productivity and development. Education was viewed as a tool for progression and development; an antidote for the colonial malaise which ailed the country at the advent of independence. The founder president of the republic of Kenya, Mzee Jomo Kenyatta made a presidential call for all the citizens of Kenya to heed the call of Harambee and work together to eradicate at then the social maladies which had adversely affected the society. Ignorance (illiteracy), poverty and diseases, Education seemed then a panacea for the above maladies. To recall his words on that day, "...as we participate in pomp and circumstance, and as we make merry at this time, remember this; we are relaxing before the toil that is to come. We must work harder to fight our enemies- ignorance, sickness and poverty. I therefore give you the call; HARAMBEE! Let us all work hard together for our country, Kenya" (Albren, 1982:12).

Primary education being the basic foundation for education, the provision of quality basic education to a country's population is crucial to the attainment of rapid and sustained national development. Basic education in the majority of the developing countries including Kenya has largely been used to refer to the primary sub-sector of education. Thus this level of education should receive the biggest share of available resources (Woodhall 1970 and Blaug 1974).

Primary education therefore becomes a fundamental base for further formal education, training and life-long learning.

The pivotal role of education has made it to be declared an essential human right, which every child is entitled to, and whose provision should therefore be the responsibility of governments. Abagi (1998) notes that provision of educational opportunities especially basic education, has been an objective of many countries all over the world. Basic education has been considered as a right which nations have an indisputable responsibility to guarantee their citizens. The evidence is clear that education improves the quality of life, improves the health and economic productivity. In the early sixties, the developing countries many of which consisted of massive illiteracy, priority was given to universal illiteracy; priority was given to universal free primary education (UPE) following the historic model of the developed countries whose developmental pyramids had been built from the ground up. Thus the educational ministers of Asia, Africa and Latin America adopted the uniform goal to complete UPE within twenty years. By the close of 1970's, developing countries had broadened educational opportunities. However, their educational pyramids bore little semblance to what their ministers had envisaged at the regional educational conferences held in Karachi, Addis Ababa, Santiago-de-Chile and Tripoli in 1966 (Coombs, 1985:69).

UN General Assembly declared 1979 the international year of the child. It bore in mind that the year would offer an opportunity for further action to promote the application of the declaration of the rights of the child, adopted twenty years earlier (Gaston 1979:9) UNESCO similarly to other

UN agencies attached particular importance to the following passage from the declaration on the rights of a child.

“ The child is entitled to receive education which shall be compulsory at least in the elementary stages. He shall be given an education, which will promote his general culture and enable him to, on a daily basis of equal opportunity, to develop his abilities, his individual judgement, and his sense of moral and social responsibility and to become useful member of society” (Gaston, 1979:9).

In pursuit of free basic education as an essential right of the child, the Government of Kenya (GOK) in 1974 under the Kenya African National Union (KANU) government declared the first four years of primary education free of tuition fees. This was extended to the whole primary school system in 1979 with a view to introducing universal primary education in the country by the year 2000 (Republic of Kenya 1998). The policy however did not withstand the test of time!

By 1980, third world countries were still groping in darkness of how universal primary education goal shall be achieved, and it was doubtful if many countries would reach it by the year 2000 (Coombs, 1986:70). Dakar Framework for Action (2000), notes that the drawbacks towards the achievement of UPE notwithstanding the international community made commitments to basic education through out the 1990 notably at the world summit for children (1990), the world conference on Human Rights (1993), the world conference on population and development (1995), the mid-term meeting of the international consultative forum on Education for All (1996), and the International Conference on Child Labour (1996). Participants in the world education Forum committed themselves to achieve education for all (EFA) goals and targets.

They also reaffirmed the vision of the world declaration on EFA (Jomteim, 1996) supported by the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the convention on the rights of the child that;

“ All children, young people and adults have the human right to benefit from an education that will meet their basic learning needs in the best and fullest sense of the term. An education geared to tapping each individual’s talents and potential, and developing learners’ personalities, so that they can improve their lives and transform their societies” (Dakar Framework for Action, 2000).

Since 1990, primary school enrolment increased by some 82 million worldwide (Dakar Framework for Action, 2000). The figures illustrate serious devotion by many countries to progress in the face of chronic economic constraints and continued rapid population explosion. At the end of 1990’s, developing countries had achieved net enrolment rates in the excess of 80%. There was a remarked improvement in primary school enrolment in many regions with the critical exception of Sub-Saharan Africa

Despite battling out with many natural and human-made catastrophes that have hindered development and sometimes, even dragged back the achievements already won, many developing countries have struggled with absurd economic adjustment programmes, and increased debt burden, a skewed (Lopsized) global system, poor governance and sometimes misappropriation of resources as well as drought and floods. However education has remained a top agenda in their development programmes, between 1990 and 1998, the net enrolment for boys increased by 9% to 56% and that of girls by 7% to 48% in sub-Saharan Africa (Elimu Yetu Coalition, 2003).

Enrolment figures hence marked considerable regional variations. The most remarkable progress was in East Africa with enrolment of 70% for both boys and girls. In Southern Africa, girls were 76% and boys 56%. By 1999, 40% of girls and 50% of boys were enrolled in West Africa and 50% of girls and 60% of boys in Central Africa.

In view of the above, the president of South Africa, Thabo Mbeki made the following remarks while opening the conference on education for Africa renaissance on the 20th Century,

“If the next century is going to be characterized as a truly African century, for durable peace and sustained development, in Africa, then the success of this project is dependent on the success of our education systems. For nowhere in the world has sustained development been attained without a well-functioning system of education, without an effective higher education and research sector, and without equality of education opportunity (Dakar Framework for Action, Commentary, 1999).

Earlier in 1961, African education ministers held the first conference in Addis Ababa under the aegis (auspices) of UNESCO to chart out the way forward for development of education for their countries, which were just coming out of colonial rule. The key resolution was that All African countries would strive to provide Universal Primary Education (UPE) by 1980.

Initially, the enactment into law of the Children’s Act 2001 (Act No. 8 of 2001) in November 2001 injected new impetus towards ensuring available, free and compulsory primary education to all citizens without discrimination. Section 7 of the act reads: ‘7 (1) Every child shall be entitled to education provision of which shall be the responsibility of the government and the parents (2) every child shall be entitled to free basic education which shall be compulsory in

accordance with articles 28 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child". The convention provides articles 28 so far as is material as follows.

"ARTICLE 28"

- 1) States parties recognize the right of the child to education and with a view to achieving the right to progress, and on the basis of equal opportunity, they shall in particular: make primary education compulsory available and free to all (Lee Muthoga in Sunday Nation, December 15,2002, p 18, col 3-5).

Consequently, with effect from March 3rd 2002, it is a criminal offence for a teacher to demand money from a child or chase him or her away for lack of payment of fees. The law provides that such a teacher shall be arrested and prosecuted, and if found guilty is liable to pay Kshs. 50,000 fine (Gillard, East African Standard, December 4th, 2001: 32 Col II-3).

Saitoti (2003), the then Minister of Education noted that to address the existing social cultural, economic and political needs, the government appointed the Kenya Education Commission in 1964, under the chairmanship of Ominde to advise the government on formulation and implementation of national education policy. The commission emphasized the need to provide universal primary education. This was however not implemented until 1974; covering the first four classes of primary education and extended from five to seven in 1979. High enrolment in primary school reflected the initial influx of students in standard one in 1974 when primary school fees at that level was eliminated. By 1989, the gross enrolment had soared to 100%. In 1988, the presidential working party on education emphasized the need for cost-sharing in

education between the government, parents and communities due to the decline in government funding. The implementation of cost sharing in education in the plight of rising poverty led to adverse effects on access, retention and quality of education (Daily Nation, January 11th 2003).

Cost sharing officially marked the government's abandonment of "free" and highly subsidized education. The government was to carry on with the task of paying salaries to teachers, education administration and fund some limited school facilities. Parents were to provide for tuition, books and examination fee while communities were to be responsible for putting up physical structures and ensure their maintenance (Elimu yetu coalition, 2003). Cost sharing in education coincided with the introduction of a new system of education (8-4-4) which put more financial burden on the parents and communities whose ability to finance other basic social needs had already been greatly compromised by a contracting national economy (Deolaliker, 1999). As a result, many children especially from economically marginalized groups could not access primary education. Gross enrolment rates declined from 105.4% in 1989, to 87.6% in 2000 (Saitoti, 2003).

Another significant development towards free primary education was the auspicious December 27th, 2002 general election victory of a new government, whose key pre-election campaign pledge was to abolish fees and other user charges at the primary level and make schooling compulsory for all children. In this regard, the new National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) government re-launched free primary education (Daily Nation, January 7th, 2003, p1 col 3). The government has since increased public financing on free primary education programme. This renewed commitment by the government of Kenya was greatly welcomed by pledge of support by development partners. Three years ago at the World Education Forum in Dakar, Senegal, 180

governments, United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organizations (UNESCO), the World Bank among other organizations committed themselves to work together to get all the World's children into primary school by 2015, a goal known as Education for All (EFA). It was declared that no country with organized plans on EFA would be hindered in its achievement of this goal for lack of funds (UNESCO, 2002).

According to the ministerial task force formed on January 10th 2003 by the Minister of Education, Science and Technology on the implementation of free primary education spearheaded by Mrs. Edda Gachukia, over 1.5 million eligible children were out of school mainly because of the numerous levies charged (Ministry of education, 2003). Hence the rationale behind free and compulsory education is to increase enrolment in schools and curb dropouts.

However, the government in its endeavour to offer free primary education, has continued to be orchestrated by enormous challenges as pertains the financial realities which characterize the free primary school programme. According to the ministerial task force on implementation of free primary education programme, the government required Kshs. 22.4 billion for the 2003/2004 fiscal year to fully implement its policy of free primary school education (Ministry of education, 2003).

Table 1.1 shows the breakdown of the cost of free primary education to the government between 2003 and 2004.

Table 1.1: Free primary education cost to the government 2003-2004.

Area	In Kshs. (Up to June 2002/2003)	In Kshs. (2003/2004)
Curriculum	5,562,245,825	3,064,902,900
Physical facilities	5,000,000	2,498,979,500
Needs of disadvantaged	1,249,489,750	149,489,750
Media desks	2,882,000	2,957,000
Human resources	Nil	Nil
PTA	589,000,000	Nil
TSC teachers	671,000,000	6,100,000,000
In-service training	500,000,000	1,500,000,000
Inspect vehicle, motor cycles	256,500,000	256,000,000
Total	8,836,117,575	13,572,329,150
Grand total		22,408,446,725

Source: Ministry of Education, 2003

The current 2004/2005 national budget indicates that out of the MoEST allocation of Kshs. 59.5 billion for recurrent expenditure Kshs. 50.1 billion will be spent on salaries leaving only Kshs. 9.4 billion for operations and maintenance. Kshs. 870 million is earmarked for development (Kisero, 2003). This scenario indicates that the government has to look elsewhere for additional

funds. In 2004, the government raised Kshs. 11 billion for free primary education from donors. The funds included contributions from the World Bank (Kshs. 3.7 billion), United Kingdom (Kshs. 1.6 billion) and UNICEF (Kshs. 190 million). Other donors were Organization of Oil and Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC- Kshs. 1.1 billion) World Food Programme (WFP- Kshs. 1 billion) and Sweden (Kshs. 430 million) (Daily Nation, July 29, 2003 p4 col. 1-4)

The government in support of FPE through the MoEST, has disbursed per capita grants direct to all schools to cater for instructional materials and operational costs. As at mid September 2003, the Ministry had handed out Kshs. 8.7 billion to primary schools, each receiving in proportions to the number of children registered with them. By the end of financial year, each child was entitled to a total of Kshs. 1,020. The MoEST had put across guidelines on how the annual units allocation per child of Kshs. 1,020 is to be spent in primary schools (MOEST, 2003a).

The table below depicts the annual unit allocation per child by MOEST.

Table 1.2: Annual unit allocation per child.

VOTE HEAD	COST PER PUPIL (KSHS)
School Instructional Material Account	
Textbooks per pupil (1 ½)	360
Exercise books per pupil (21)	210
Supplementary Readers & Reference Materials per pupil	55
Pencils per pupil (3)	15
Dusters, Chalk, Registers	5
Charts and Wall maps	5
Total for School Instructional Material Account	650
General Purpose Account (GPA)	
Support Staff Wages	112
Repairs, Maintenance and Improvements (RMI)	127
Activity	43
Quality Assurance	29
Local Traveling and Transport (LTT)	21
Electricity, Water & Conservancy (EWC)	10
Postage/Box Rental/Telephone	22
Contingency	6
Total for General Purpose Account	370
GRAND TOTAL	1,020

Source: MOEST (2003a) Free Primary Education Funds- breakdown to public primary schools of 24th September 2003 (Ref: PE 14/42/1/Vol.11/21)

Concurrently, the implementation of FPE has led to the influx in the number of school going children; the total enrolment has swollen to about 7.2 million children-25% of population (Daily Nation, September 12th, 2003, p 7 col. 5). In spite of this impressive result owing to FPE, issues about shortage of physical facilities, and equipment, inadequate number of teachers, financial and quality implications, the new role of parents among others have been raised. Parents and communities are still expected to contribute in financing primary education. The Permanent Secretary, MoEST, Prof. Karega Mutahi in his launch of the primary school Instructional Materials Management Handbook (April, 2003) appeals thus:

“I call upon parents, communities and other stakeholders to continue supplementing government efforts in order to provide quality education for all the children in the Republic of Kenya”.

This plea of support was reiterated by the Minister of Education Science and Technology, Prof. George Saitoti on September 17th 2003 when he said;

“ I appeal to parents and communities to support this initiative by being fully involved in school activities and ensuring transparency. If parents feel they have certain facilities that should be upgraded, we should not stop them”.

This means that government primary schools, in agreement with parents, may levy fees such as building, and maintenance of classrooms, toilets etc. the Directors of Education, Mrs. Naomi W. Wangai in her circular to public primary schools of May 30th 2003, sums up stating that: “Education is a partnership which requires parents/guardians to play a complementary role in the

provision of services and materials other than the ones provided by the government”. (MoEST, 2003 b).

In essence, this cursory impression suggests that primary education is not completely free as such. Paradoxically, parents have to supplement the costs for which the government funds has not allocated funds or where the funds are inadequate. A need therefore arises for an in-depth qualitative study on these indirect costs to parents.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The financial implications that accompany the implementation of the FPE programme posed a new challenge to the school administration especially the head teachers. According to Elimu Yetu Coalition Report (2003), the government implemented the plan without carrying out a cost analysis to determine how much each child needs. The decision to award Kshs. 1,020 per child is therefore arbitrary. It disregarded previous estimates (Republic of Kenya, 1998; Abagi 1997, Mithar, 1995) on the actual cost of primary education. Secondly and closely linked to the first one, it does not fully compensate schools, which charged more than Kshs. 1,020 per child to meet their operational expenditures (UNESCO, 2003). A void is consequently left, which the parents are naturally supposed to fill in for the sake of meaningful education for their children.

The responsibility of parents in financing primary education in Kenya is still a factor of consideration. Though the essence of the launch of the free primary education is to ensure that all children of school going age are offered basic education without charging of any levies, the parents ironically have to supplement the costs for which the government has not allocated funds or in cases where the funds are inadequate. On January 6th, 2003, the GoK re-launched FPE (Free

Primary Education) issuing a directive that all levies in public primary schools have been abolished (Daily Nation, January 6th, 2003).

Each child is entitled to a sum of Kshs. 1,020 per year (Daily Nation, January 6th, 2003). Despite this, parents have to go an extra mile in supplementing the costs of primary education especially where the government has not catered for in terms of allocation of funds. Therefore, the issue of absolutely free education has been depicted as ironical. The question as whether primary education in public schools is purely free or if there are indirect costs to parents has been raised. This study therefore aims at establishing the actual indirect costs to parents embedded in the current free primary education programme.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the indirect costs embedded in the current free primary education and their implication (influence) in the implementation process of this programme in public primary schools in Matungulu Division, Machakos District in Kenya.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The following were the objectives of this study:

1. To establish the indirect costs embedded in the FPE programme to parents.
2. To investigate the availability and adequacy of physical facilities in the face of increased enrolment.
3. To find out the role parents play in the FPE programme.
4. To examine whether the indirect costs affect pupils' performance.
5. To find out whether the indirect costs were connected to pupil drop-out rate from school.

1.4 Research Questions

In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the following research questions will be answered;

1. What aspects of the school expenditure are not catered for by the FPE funds in Matungulu Division?
2. How has increased enrollment affected the physical facilities in primary schools?
3. What are the indirect costs parents incur under the FPE programme?
4. How do the indirect costs affect pupil's performance?
5. What is the effect of the indirect costs to drop out rates?

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study will be useful in the following ways:

1. It has depicted the aspects of the school expenditure not catered for by the government's FPE funds.
2. It has enabled parents to know on average the indirect costs they will shoulder for their children's education in public primary schools.
3. The study has provided vital information on the effect of the indirect costs to pupils' attendance in school and their performance.
4. The study illuminated the attributes if any to the indirect costs on pupils' dropout rate(s).
5. The study has contributed research knowledge on the indirect costs of FPE programme to academicians and educational researchers.

1.6 Limitation to the Study

This study was limited to Matungulu Division, Machakos District, Eastern Province, Kenya; therefore the findings obtained may not be generalized to reflect indirect costs of free primary education in other parts of the country. Moreover, findings of this study therefore may not tally similar research conducted in a purely urban setting. Notwithstanding these limitations, the study was no doubt a good starting point for future and more generalized investigations.

1.7 Delimitations to the Study

This study investigated the indirect costs of FPE to parents of pupils in public primary schools in Matungulu Division of Machakos District, Eastern Province, Kenya. The researcher felt that this would be manageable in terms of time, effort and finances. This concurs with Gay (1992) who advises that a researcher should select an area convenient to him/her considering the available time, manpower and funds. The main respondents are parents and head teachers of public schools in Matungulu division.

Additionally the study focused mainly on two sources of financing public primary schools viz; the government and the parents. Only public primary schools will be studied through the implementation may have had an impact on the private primary schools.

1.8 Basic Assumptions

1. That the responses from the respondents were truthful, sincere (honest) and objective.
2. That every public primary school had received guidelines on the implementation of the FPE.

3. That every public primary school had received adequate FPE funds to cater for the instructional materials.
4. That every public primary/day school expects the parents to supplement certain costs in purchase of instructional materials and recurrent costs.
5. That the indirect costs of the FPE had a degree of contribution to pupils' school attendance and performance.
6. That school dropout could be attributed to the indirect costs of the FPE program.

1.9 Definition of Significant Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions of key terms have been adopted:

- **Basic education:** refers to the minimum educational attainment in the first of open cycle, where access is not (constrained) restricted by examination-based selection.
- **Community:** refers to all people living within the geographical catchment area of a school, whether or not they have children in that school.
- **Cost sharing:** is a policy introduced by the Kenya government in 1986, in which there is a partnership of shared financial responsibility between the government and consumers of public services.
- **Enrolment:** refers to the number of pupils who register as members of different grades at the beginning of the year.
- **Free primary education:** An education that involved no financial burden to the parents of the pupils. This means no fees or levies are charged, there should be no indirect costs to hinder any pupil from benefiting.

- **Harambee:** is a fund-raising exercise through voluntary contributions by members of the public for communal development. The word “harambee” with origins from Kiswahili is used as a rallying call for “pulling together” resources.
- **Head teacher:** refers to a primary school manager or executive, male or female with overall administrative responsibility over a school.
- **Indirect costs:** refer to indirect expenditures incurred by parents in the provision of education to their children. These costs, though significant, are usually not quantified and do not appear in the official annual reports of education by the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MoEST).
- **Parent:** refers to the mother or father of a pupil and includes a person who has assumed the responsibility of looking after and providing for the needs, and is generally concerned with the welfare of that pupil.
- **PTA- Parents Teachers Association:** refers to a body comprising of parents and teachers of a particular primary school. According to the presidential directive of 1979, every school in Kenya must have a PTA to be responsible for the provision of physical facilities such as classrooms, workshops, teachers’ houses, equipments.

1.10 Organization of the Study

This project was organized into five sections. Section one comprises of the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations and delimitations, basic assumptions and definition of significant terms. Section two reviews literature that is related to the field of study. It has been

divided into: introduction which entails indirect costs of free primary education and the parents role to financing primary education, the concept of basic (primary) education, the concept of free primary education (FPE) programme, 2003, availability and adequacy of physical facilities in schools, attributes of indirect costs to pupil school attendance and performance rate and community support in programme implementation, summary of the literature review and the conceptual or theoretical framework. Section three on the other hand describes the research methodology employed in carrying out the study. It entails the research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedure, research instruments: instruments validity and reliability, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques. Section four consists of presentations of data collected and interpretation of the findings while section five entails summary of the findings, conclusions, policy recommendation and suggestion for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This section is organized into the following sub areas; the concept of basic primary education, the concept of free primary education (FPE) programme 2003, availability and adequacy of physical facilities, attributes of indirect costs to pupil school attendance and performance rate(s) and community support in programme implementation, summary of the literature review and conceptual or theoretical framework.

2.1 Concept of Basic Primary Education

The provision of quality basic education to a country's population has been considered of crucial importance and it has been unanimously agreed that the provision of the former serves as a basis for achievement of rapid and sustained national development, emanating from Adam Smith the famed father of classical economics, education has been viewed as an important input in the development process through the human capital that is embodied in (and embedded on) its beneficiaries (Smith, 1952). Several other scholars among them Schultz (1961), Denison (1962), Becker (1964), Blaug (1967,1969), Psachoropoulos (1973,1975), underscored the vital role of education in individual improvement and national development. In a nutshell, education contributes to moulding the person as a whole, improving people's lives, and in poverty reduction by: helping people become more productive and earn more in terms of financial capability (because education is an investment, strengthening their skills and abilities-their human capital; improving health and nutrition, enriching one's rational ability and boosting his ego (e.g. the pleasure of intelligent thought and sense of empowerment it gives); and promoting

social development through strengthening social cohesion and giving more people better opportunities (and thus greater equity through opportunity) (World Bank, 1999). Indeed, research findings have portrayed returns on investment in primary education as much higher than in secondary and higher education. This renders this level of education in dire need of the biggest share of available resources (Woodhall, 1970 and Blaug, 1974).

It is this fact, which has prompted many countries to invest heavily in primary education. In Kenya, the government's policy on primary education like in most African countries, has oscillated between free education and cost sharing. The enormous contribution in financing in education by both parents and community as early as 1949, has received a commendation. In this regard, the government of Kenya was urged to be more supportive (Republic of Kenya, 1949). In most African countries, the rapid quantitative expansion of education in the post independence period had to contend with the existing demand for more educational facilities (opportunities) as it became evident that there were a significant number of children not enrolled in school (Nkinyangi, 1980).

In reference to Olembo (1982) research paper "The cost of primary education to Kenyan parent" the indirect costs are building fund, development, activities fee, watchman wages, harambee contribution, school uniform, stationery, school equipment, desks, examination fees, lunch and boarding fees. It is worth noting that Olembo (1982) paper did not cater for extra costs incurred by parents arising from the introduction of 8.4.4 system's practical subjects, viz: Agriculture, Home science and Art and Craft. This is because his work was done before the introduction of 8.4.4 system of education in Kenya in 1984.

A World Bank sponsored study on education in Sub-Saharan Africa in 1988 observed that in many African countries; public budgets have already been over-stretched. A big share of the money allocated to primary education, in these countries, is spent on teachers' salaries with little consideration towards equipment, maintenance of physical facilities and development (World Bank, 1988).

Anderson, (1973:46), noted the significance of parental contribution in financing primary education in Kenya. He stated that;

“Only 7% of the costs of capital development to first level schools come from sources outside the local community. In most areas these parents take the form of materials (corrugated iron sheets or cement) given to support self-help groups in their efforts... It can be seen, therefore, that capital development and maintenance in first level (primary school) education are based almost entirely on community self help effort”.

UNICEF (1989), stated that parents in Kenya are already shouldering a heavy burden in educating their children at the primary level despite the fact that education at this level is meant to be free. This depicted a contradiction to what is supposed to be free basic education. According to Nkinyangi (1977), the government did not consider how they would make up the revenues lost from fees used for upkeep of the schools. Eventually schools began levying fees to cover various costs. Odada (1988), argues that the overall costs to the parents of schooling children increased; quadrupling in certain districts and the non-schooling gaps began widening to substantial disparities of access to schooling between the rich and the poor.

Elimu Yetu Coalition (2003), commenting on the reform agenda for education in Kenya argues that the introduction of 8-4-4 system of education with its diverse subjects, including practical

ones and the implementation of cost-sharing mechanism in education sector in 1988 has dealt the parents a great blow in terms of increasing financial expenditure in educating their children. This, with the escalating poverty levels that characterized most of the population and the institution of levies by schools aggravated the situation.

2.2 Free Primary Education (FPE) Programme, 2003

Free primary education (FPE), in reference to the Kenya education commission report (Ominde report 1964 part 2) is that education which transfers the burden of fees from the parents spreading it to the entire community. Its main intention is to allow all children to access education indiscriminately. Education is regarded as a basic human right and therefore free primary education initiative is a major stride by the government to fulfilling this human right to its citizens.

Gastro (1990), notes that the child is entitled to receive education, which shall be free and compulsory especially at the elementary stages of development. This education will promote his general culture and enable him on the basis of equal opportunity to develop his abilities. His individual judgement and his sense of moral and social responsibility and to become a useful member of the society.

In accordance to the UN Charter, every child has a right to education. In reference to the declaration of human rights article 28 of 1979, education should be at least free in the elementary and fundamental stage. As a result of this, the UN has initiated concerted effort towards the achievement of this endeavour by its member states through various world conferences. This

initiative saw two conferences being launched: in 1990 the world conference on Education for All (EFA) was held in Jomtein, Thailand followed by another in 2000, the World education Forum which was held in Dakar, Senegal. The recommendations of these two meetings considered the attainment of UPE (Universal Primary Education) as a development strategy and consider a literate population as key to the overall development of any nation (Republic of Kenya, 2003).

The re-launching of the free primary education programme (FPE) in January 2003 was a bold policy decision by the NARC government in Kenya. The budgetary allocation to education rose from 17.4% to Kshs. 79.4 billion, with Kshs. 5.6 billion specifically allocated to the FPE programme. The government estimated that, expenditure of Kshs. 1,020 per child will enable schools meet all their budgetary requirements with an additional Kshs. 2000 for the disabled children (Daily Nation, September 17, 2003, p1).

2.3 The Indirect Costs of Free Primary Education

The provision of free primary education is viewed by the government as a strategy towards poverty eradication and the implementation of FPE is a spirit of partnership where everybody has a role to play. Though tagged the acronym “free”, the FPE programme still needs the support of the parents. Ironically, the parents are still required to meet the cost of examination fees for class eight, provide school uniforms, provide meals, transport to and from school, boarding facilities as well as health care. The government on the other hand will continue to supplement the parents’ effort in managing low cost schools and feeding programmes in ASAL areas (UNESCO, 2003).

On implementation, the free primary education programme certainly relieved parents of a significant proportion of financial outlays in education. The government has estimated that since the programme was launched, an additional 1.3 million children have enrolled in school, against an estimated three million that have been officially recognized as being out of school. However, there are some challenges facing the programme.

Primary schools were required to operate two bank accounts, the school instructional materials account (SIMBA) and the general purpose account in order to receive and account fully the funds for the implementation of FPE. The parents are supposed to also participate in monitoring the use of the Kshs. 1,020 set aside for every pupil by the government (Republic of Kenya, 2003). However, sometimes the government takes too long to disburse the funds to some primary schools. This hampers learning and parents are required to chip in to meet the school expenses for the normal running of the school. This inefficiency therefore renders free primary education not 'free' as such.

Cases of misappropriation of the free education funds were also evident, while some schools took long to receive their allocations. Most recently, an alarm was sent out by the minister of Education that publishers were fleeing schools in terms of the purchase of textbooks. This prompted parents to take on the initiative of buying books for their children (Elimu Yetu Coalition, 2003).

2.4 Effects of Indirect Costs to Pupil Performance

Another serious concern has been quality considerations, with regard to the high enrolment, which has put a strain on the resources available including classrooms and the number of teachers required to implement the programme. Reviewing 2003 Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) examinations results, some public schools which performed well in 2002 before the implementation of FPE programme, did very poorly prompting critics to say the programme could be compromising standards (Daily Nation on the web, January 5, 2004, file:11 editorial, htm).

2.5 Availability and Adequacy of Physical Facilities and Materials in Schools

The appearance of the school plant as well as the school compound is a very important source of inspiration and motivation to members of the school, the community and the stakeholders (Okumbe, 1998). Physical resources owned by the school include school land, buildings, equipment, furniture, vehicles and their spare parts, animals, garden produce, books and other teaching-learning materials and stationary. The head teachers should set up and follow proper management and administrative procedures so that all physical resources in the school can be utilized properly, maintained regularly and disposed off lawfully (Republic of Kenya, 2001).

Crowding within classrooms is another factor that hinders effective learning and consequently implementation of the new programme. Nguru (1986), cites that if children are crowded in their sitting position, they find it difficult to write. Teachers also find it difficult to move around a crowded class. Inability to move within a class means that the teacher cannot efficiently assist a needy child or mark the pupil work as an evaluation procedure. Maengwe (1985), concurs with

this fact that when the class is large, the teacher tends to use lecture method dominating the situation and reducing contact with pupils.

The implementation of FPE programme has been partly hampered by lack of adequate learning facilities. The programme initially depicted that the parents were not to incur costs of building new classrooms but to improve and refurbish the existing ones. While on a visit to Kihumbuini primary school in Kangemi, the UNICEF good will ambassador Harvey Belafonte praised those implementing the programme for the success as more children have enrolled in the school but he however pointed out that more classrooms, equipment and teachers are still needed (Daily Nation, 18th Feb. 2003 pp6). It is now the responsibility of the parents to meet the costs of building classrooms, which is an expense the government did not cater for in the implementation of the free primary education. This is an epitome of the indirect costs the parents or the community has to shoulder.

Master plan on education and training, MPET (1997-2010), it has been noted that physical facilities have a bearing on quantity and quality of education. More space and furniture are necessary if enrolments are raised. Nevertheless a certain minimum classroom space per pupil and other requirements such as furniture, sanitation facilities and recreation grounds are a prerequisite for quality education (Republic of Kenya, 1999). This leaves parents and the entire community with school going children with no choice but to provide these amenities to the schools.


2.6 Community Participation in Programme Implementation in Schools

A school being part and parcel of the community in which it is situated, its members have a common interest in the school because it provides education for their children. The head teacher has a role to play in ensuring that good relations are nurtured between the school, the community and the education authorities (Halliday, 1995).

The school needs to enlighten the community in contrasting its current sense of what schools do and ought to do with other concepts of education. The community should conceive the significant role the school plays in the process of education and what the schools are doing currently. At this wavelength, the school has the role of explaining to parents the concept of FPE and the parents' role in its implementation. This is of paramount importance considering the confusion that wrecked the launch of the programme in January 2003 where parents were hoodwinked to think that the government was to provide everything including school uniform!

For effective implementation of the free primary education programme, the local communities are expected to participate in school management through school committees and parents associations, to mobilize additional resources for use in school hence supplementing the ones the government provides, to participate in making decisions and implementing policies on provision of physical facilities and procurement of learning teaching materials (Republic of Kenya, 2003:18).

FIGURE 1: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK



The programmes and policies implemented in schools originate from the government through the Ministry of Education. All these policies and programmes are intended to benefit the recipients or subjects to which the policy applies as well as the entire society. Fundamentally all stakeholders should be involved not only 'in' its formulation but also in its implementation. These comprise of political leaders, the civil society, trade unions, sponsors and the community.

The success of the programme will only be realized when all stakeholders support the programme fully and offer both material and technical advice to the school administration. On the other hand, the school administrator is obliged to carry out the implementation diligently by mobilizing and utilizing all resources available. Inefficiency on any part of the chain will lead to constraint (the indirect costs being not catered for) in the implementation and subsequent failure of the programme. Constraints on public resources due to competing sectors and poor economic growth have limited the government's ability to make primary education completely free. Parents, consequently, are incurring some indirect costs in the provision of free primary education.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This section explains the methodology to be used in carrying out the research. It encompasses the research design, target population, sample and sampling procedure, research instruments, reliability and validity of the instruments, data collection and data analysis procedures.

3.1 Research Design

This study was conducted as a descriptive survey research destined to investigate the indirect costs of free primary education to parents. According to Lockesh (1984), descriptive research studies are designed to obtain pertinent and precise information concerning the current status of phenomena and whenever possible to draw valid general conclusions from the facts discovered.

The descriptive survey method was found relevant in the study in that the researcher wanted to find out the impact of indirect costs of FPE to the achievement of Free Primary Education in Matungulu Division. More specifically, the researcher wanted to find out how the Free primary Education Programme (Independent Variable) has been influenced by the indirect costs (Dependent Variable) in the District Public Schools.

3.2 Target Population

A population is any group of individuals who have one or more characteristics in common that are of interest to all researchers (Best and Kahn, 1998). Brinker (1988) defines a target population as a large population from which a sample population is to be selected. For the

purpose of this research, the target population was the parents and head teachers of the seventy six public primary schools in Matungulu division falling within four educational zones namely: Tala, Matungulu, Kyanzavi and Kiboko.

3.3 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

A sample is a sub set of the target population to which the researcher intends to generalize the results (Wiersma, 1986:263). Stephan and McCarthy (1958:22) in Singleton et al (1988:130) have defined sampling as the seeking of knowledge or information about a population by observing a part of this population (sample) in order to extend the findings to the entire population.

The study targeted 75 primary schools within four (4) administrative educational zones in Matungulu Division. Simple random sampling was used to select the participating schools. In each zone, the names of schools were written on pieces of paper, which were folded and placed in a box. The box was shaken and a paper was picked one at a time and the name of the school on the paper was recorded. The paper was then folded again each time and returned to the box. The process was repeated until 15 public primary schools were obtained. This method was chosen to ensure that all eligible schools got equal probability of being chosen. Table 3 below depicts the use of the simple random sampling technique used to sample the fifteen schools.

Table 3: Random Sampled Schools from Four Zones in Matungulu Division

Zone	Total number of public schools	Sample size
Matungulu	19	4
Tala	24	5
Kianzabe	16	3
Kiboko	16	3
Total	75	15

This is well above the 10 percent minimum that constitutes a sample in a descriptive study (Gay, 1987). The same technique was used to select 60 parents from the 15 schools, 2 parents of standard eight pupils and 2 parents of standard 1 pupils from every school who were members of the PTA in each of the selected schools. Head teachers of the selected schools formed part of the sample size of head teachers.

3.4 Research Instruments

To obtain the required data, three instruments namely the questionnaire, the interview schedule and the observation schedule was used.

(i) Head teachers' Questionnaire

Questionnaires was used for this study because they are much more efficient in that they require less time, they are less expensive and permits collection of data from a much larger sample as suggested by Gay (1992). The questionnaire was used in capturing data from on the impact of indirect costs to the achievement of free primary education in Matungulu division. The

questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section A was used to collect data from the teachers of the sampled schools about their academic background while section B is how to solicit information on the expenses which the government has not catered for and what the parents are indirectly expected to supplement. The questionnaire further solicited for information on pupils' performance, attendance and dropout from school after the introduction of the FPE.

(ii) Interview Schedule for Parents

The second instrument which was an interview schedule was developed to solicit information from parents. This instrument is advantageous because it can be applied even to illiterate respondents. Further, the method allows the interviewer to develop a rapport with the interviewee and to ask supplementary questions to clarify where the response are unclear. This interview schedule captured data from parents concerning their input to supplement free primary education. The interview schedule had structured and open ended items. This format is attached herewith as Appendix 4.

(iii) Observation Schedule

This is the last instrument, which captured data on sufficiency of facilities/infrastructure as pertains the achievement of FPE. It depicted whether there is sufficient infrastructure to meet the increased enrollment due to FPE, which is a good determinant of whether the FPE programme has been successful.

The main items to be observed in the sample schools comprised the following:-

- a. Classrooms
- b. Learning rooms such as libraries, workshops, homescience rooms and agriculture store.

- c. Social amenities such as telephone, electricity and computers.
- d. Sanitation facilities
- e. Furniture such as desks
- f. School uniforms
- g. School farm and other income generating activities.

School observation schedule checklist is attached herewith as Appendix 5.

3.4.1 Instrument Validity

The questionnaire, the interview schedule and the observation schedule were checked for validity. Given that the content validity according to Gay (1987) is established by expert judgement, the opinion of the supervisors and lecturers in the department will be relied upon. Mugenda (1999) defines validity as the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences based on research results. It is the ability of instruments to measure what they are intended to measure.

3.4.2 Instrument Reliability

Reliability on the other hand is a measure of the degree to which a research result yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. Besides, the instruments were piloted to determine reliability and validity, and to correct any weaknesses identified in the process. Piloting groups were drawn from the division, but will but will not be part of the sample. A pilot study was conducted in the eight primary schools in the Division, which constituted 10% of the seventy five public primary schools.

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

An introductory letter serving as a research permit was obtained from Jogoo House, Ministry of Education headquarters. The researcher visited the head teachers of the sample schools to inform them of the intended study. The researcher then administered the questionnaire to the head teachers. The parents selected as sample size were interviewed as scheduled. A date was set when the completed questionnaires could be ready for collection from the head teachers. The researcher liaised with the head teacher in making arrangements to interview the parents.

3.6 Data Analysis Techniques

Descriptive analysis techniques were utilized to run frequencies and percentages using Statistical Programme for Social Sciences (SPSS). Qualitative data from key informants was analyzed in themes and categories identifying similarities and differences that emerged. Qualitative analysis includes presentation of quotes from different respondents and recording verbatim from some respondents. The themes emerging from secondary data were identified and secondary data augmented the primary data.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.0. Introduction

This chapter focuses mainly on the data collected in the study. The first section contains the analysis of the data collected from the parents and the last section analyses the data collected from the observation of the physical infrastructure in the public primary schools.

4.1 Questionnaire Return Rate

There are seventy five public primary schools in Matungulu division .Fifteen schools were sampled out for research and there were three questionnaires issued to head teachers of the sampled schools, which were duly signed and returned hence 100% of the questionnaires was returned.

4.2 Demographic Data of the Respondents

The questionnaires were administered to head teachers of the fifteen public primary schools sampled out for study. They provided information concerning their gender, age, academic and professional qualifications. The questionnaire further gave a provision for the head teachers comment on the adequacy and amount of the Free Primary Education funds allocated to each public primary school in the division, pupil enrolment rates, drop-out rates and pupil performance since the enactment of the free primary education.

The return of the questionnaires administered to fifteen public primary schools was realized as a result of hand picking of the answered questionnaires coupled with reminders through telephone calls. All the returned questionnaires were useful for the study.

4.3. Demographic Information of the Head Teachers

The head teachers' questionnaire was divided into two parts. Part 1 was out to tackle the following details: gender, age, academic qualifications, other qualifications, professional qualification of the head teachers. The second part dealt with adequacy of the FPE funds on the view of the head teachers, the amount of FPE funds allocated to each school, the trend of the following since the enactment of the free primary education: public enrolment rates for the years 2003-2006, the performance levels for the past five years 2001-2005, the pupil drop out rates for the years 2003-2006 in each of the sampled out schools.

PART I

Table 4: Gender Distribution of Head Teachers

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	14	93.3
Female	1	6.7
	15	100.0

According to Table 4, there is no gender balance in the distribution of head teachers. Only one head is a woman.

Table 5: Head Teacher Categorized by Experience in Headship.

Years	Frequency	Percentage
5 and above	4	26.7
6-10	4	26.7
11-15	3	20.0
16-20	4	26.7
Total	15	100.0

Table 5 portrays the experience in headship of the head teachers. 26.7% of them have five years and above in headship, six to ten years in headship and sixteen to twenty in the same. To determine their academic and professional qualification, the respondents were asked to indicate their highest level of academic qualification. The findings are as shown in Table 6 showing academic qualification.

Table 6 shows professional qualifications of the head teacher while Table 7 shows the respondent head teachers' other professional qualifications.

Table 6: Academic Qualification

Qualification	Frequency	Percentage
KACE	6	40.0
KCSE/KCE	8	53.3
OTHER	1	6.7
TOTAL	15	100.0

53.3% of the head teachers' respondents had K.C.S.E/K.C.E. academic qualifications while 40% had K.A.C.E academic qualifications.

The findings of the head teachers other academic qualifications are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Other Academic Qualifications

Other qualification	Frequency	Percentage
School certificate (EACE)	1	6.7
NONE	14	93.3
TOTAL	15	100.0

93.3% of the respondents had EACE school certificates as the other academic qualification.

Table 8: Professional Qualifications of the Head Teachers

Professional qualification	Frequency	Percentage
B.ED	1	6.7
ATS	13	86.7
P1	1	6.7
TOTAL	15	100.0

86.7% of the head teachers' respondents had A.T.S. professional qualification while 6.7% had B.ED and P1 professional qualifications.

Table 9: Other Professional Qualification of the Head Teachers

Other professional qualification	Frequency	Percentage
Undergraduate Studies	1	6.7
ATS IV	1	6.7
None	13	86.7
Total	15	100.0

86.7% of the head teachers' respondents had no other professional qualifications while 6.7 % had A.T.S. IV and were undertaking their undergraduate studies.

PART II

This part dealt with the adequacy of FPE funds, the amount allocated to each individual school, whether each school received FPE funds, the pupil enrolment rates, the performance level, the pupil drop-out rate since the enactment of the FPE programme in the year 2003. Some of the indirect costs as mentioned by the respondent head teachers and the school/pupil attendance rate in the individual schools are also highlighted as shown in table 10 and 11.

Table 10: Receipt of FPE Funds by the Head Teachers of the Fifteen Schools

Comment	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	14	93.3
No response	1	6.7
TOTAL	15	100.0

Table 10 shows that majority 93.3.% of the fifteen sampled out schools received FPE funds thus majority or almost all schools received the FPE funds from the Government of Kenya.

Table 11: Amount of FPE Funds Allocated to the Schools

Amount	Frequency	Percentage
1020 Ksh	13	86.7
720 Ksh	1	6.7
350 Ksh	1	6.7
TOTAL	15	100.0

Table 11 indicates that the valid amount of FPE funds to each public primary school is 1,020 Kshs as majority of the schools prescribed this amount as the actual amount received annually. 1% of the schools indicated as being in receipt of different amount (s). As mentioned earlier in chapter one of this research project, 1,020 Kshs was the legal annual unit allocation per child by the Ministry of Education (MOEST) and therefore this is the amount supposed to be received by all public primary schools as the annual unit allocation per child by the ministry of education (MOEST) and therefore this is the amount supposed to be received by all public primary schools as the annual allocation per child.

The aspect of adequacy or sufficiency of the FPE funds as viewed by the respondent head teachers is given in Table 12.

Table 12: Sufficiency of the FPE Funds as Viewed by Head Teachers

Sufficiency	Frequency	Percentage
No	15	100
Yes	0	0

Majority of the head teachers and actually almost of them felt that the 1,020 Kshs annual unit allocation of the FPE funds per child was not adequate to cater for the pupil's educational expenses. They reiterated that the government should increase the FPE annual unit allocation per child if a successful educational output is to be realized out of the free primary education.

The question to whether there was an increase in pupil enrolment after the introduction of the FPE in the year 2003 is given in Table 13

Table 13: Head Teachers Comment on the Increase on Pupil Enrolment after FPE Programme

Comment	Frequency	Percentage
Increase in pupil enrolment	13	86.7
No increase in pupil enrolment	2	13.3
Total	15	100

86.7% of the head teacher respondent remarked that there was an increment in pupil enrolment after the enactment of the FPE programme.

The pupil enrolment rates following the enactment of the FPE in the year 2003 up to the current year 2006 is given in Table 14.

Table 14: Pupil Enrolment Rates Following the Introduction of FPE 2003-2006

Pupils per class	Frequency	Frequency
1-20	1	6.7
21-40	7	46.7
61-80	3	20.0
101-120	1	6.7
121-140	2	13.0
None	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

Tables 13 and 14 on enrolment portray the fact that there was a tremendous increment of pupils immediately after the enactment of the FPE. This explains the fact that parents experience a feeling of alleviation or relief of the educational burden which has been bestowed on them before the enactment of the FPE and wanted to make maximum use of the FPE programme by enrolling their children who were then not in school into school as the new programme of education posed as a panacea for their financial incapacitation to meet the children's school fees. The statistical information or analysis given in Table 15 is a reflection of the pupil enrolment rates for the fifteen sampled schools from the division. They are as follows: -

Table 15: Enrolment Rates in the Fifteen Public Primary School's in the Division

Pupil population (School population in the start of each indicated year) after the implementation of FPE in 2003

SCHOOL (PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL)	YEAR			
	2003	2004	2005	2006
MUKALWA	553	522	501	504
KIKAATINI	357	352	334	366
KWATOMBE	593	625	626	645
KIANZABE	118	97	109	135
KISUKIONI	621	601	606	79
MATUU ESTATE	642	671	710	748
KWA KISANGA	362	396	420	421
KITHUIANI	707	735	738	741
NGALALYA	332	351	354	329
TALA TOWNSHIP	799	873	972	1089
TALA BOYS'	-	1023	1025	1045
TALA GIRLS'	325	382	387	388
TALA S.A	341	347	336	303
NGULUNI	406	419	393	366
SENGANI	291	270	274	299

Table 15 indicates pupil enrolment rates for the years 2003-2006 portray a general increase in the pupil school population since the enactment of the Free Primary Education programme coupled up with a sudden influx of pupils into public primary schools immediately after the FPE introduction to the education system. There is a depiction of this sudden influx in the following school: Mukaiwa, Kisukioni and Nguluni to mention a few. This enormous sudden influx of the school population was later brought down by some factors which can be attributed to the indirect costs parents have to shoulder which the government of Kenya did not cater for in the annual unit cost allocation of the FPE funds to each child and which posed a heavy burden to parents making them to withdraw their children after the first year of the FPE programme.

Figure 2 and 3 in form of histograms depict a sudden influx of the pupil school population or enrolment rate in the initial years since the birth of the FPE programme but the trend suddenly changes with a drastic drop in the number being enrolled in the last two years following the enactment of FPE in year 2003.

Figure 2

How Many Pupils are there per Class from the Year 2003-2006




Figure 3

How Many Pupils are there per Class from the Year 2003-2005 Class 8




Table 16: School Performance in KCPE 2001-2005

46.7% of the schools attained a mean score of 201-250 in the last five years from 2001-2005.

This was realized by pupils in class eight from the years 2003-2006, a cross section of the fifteen sampled public primary schools in Matungulu division.

Mean Score	Frequency	Percentage
151-200	4	26.7
201-250	7	46.7
251-300	3	20.0
301-350	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

The following is a histogram depicting the performance of class eight pupils in the fifteen sampled out schools in the past five years after the introduction of FPE, 2001-2005.

Figure 4

State the Performance of the School in KCPE for the Last Five Years 2001 - 2005




Table 17 shows the number of pupils who dropped out of school since the enactment of the FPE programme in the year 2003 up to the year 2006.

Table 17: Drop out Rate Between 2003-2006

Rate	Frequency	Percentage
0	10	66.66
0-10	2	13.33
11-20	1	6.66
21 and above	2	13.33
Total	15	100.0

Table 17 shows that there was a remarkable drop in the number of pupils in the sampled fifteen public primary schools after duration of one or two years after the introduction of the FPE. 13.33% of the pupils dropped out of school at a rate of 21 and above. 6.66% of the pupils dropped at a rate of 11-20. However, majority of the pupils remained a steady school population after the FPE Programme. This significant drop by pupils from school is attributed to certain indirect costs such as uniform, transport fees to and from school, lunch costs and supplement textbooks or stationary costs/expenses. These unmet costs by the GOK which are being termed as indirect costs in this study contributed to pupil drop out from school as they posed a heavy burden to the already financially incapacitated Kenyan population; poverty being one of the social maladies the government has to struggle to minimize or eradicate!

The respondent head teachers' were asked to indicate some of the indirect costs; the educational expenses that the GOK has not catered for through its FPE funds allocation through the MOEST. The following table 18 is a representation of some of the indirect costs as stipulated by the respondent head teachers.

4.4 Analysis of Parents' Demographic Data

Table 18: Cost Met by Parents

Rate	Frequency	Percentage
Uniform	12	30.76
Food	7	17.94
New structures	6	15.38
Others (transport, supplementary text books, etc)	14	35.89
Total	42	100.0

Table 18 is a summary or reflection of the entire expense being borne by the parents of the children in the public primary schools even with the incalculation of the FPE programme in the existing education system.

The major expense borne by parents appears to be that of the purchase of school uniform with it taking 30.76% of the uncatered for costs by the GOK, the referred to indirect costs. The other expense second in the list is that of the lunch programme which the government has catered for partially by donating food for lunch to some schools and others not even receiving any.

Table 19, 20 and 21 below portray the individual indirect costs which the GOK. has not catered for or has partially done so and the percentage cost (s) the parents have to meet for a successful education system to be achieved.

Table 19: Development Cost Met and Unmet by Parents

Met or unmet	Frequency	Percentage
YES:MET COSTS	10	66.7
NO:UNMET COSTS	5	33.3
TOTAL	15	100

66.7% of the respondents remarked that the development costs was met by parents while 33.3% of the respondents said that the development costs was not met by parents.

Table 20: Purchase of Teaching and Learning Material (Stationery Material, Uniform etc)

Unmet	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	15	100.00

100 % of the respondents indicated that the purchase of learning materials was the sole responsibility of the parents.

Table 21: Support Funds Met by Parents

Met	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	15	100.00

100% of the respondents indicated that support funds were the responsibility of the parents.

The respondent head teachers were asked to indicate the rate of pupil attendance to school in general in order to establish whether there has been a regular or irregular school attendance rate

and if whether irregular or regular it can be attributed to the indirect costs of FPE programme.

Table 22 below shows whether the attendance was regular or irregular.

Table 22: Attendance of Pupils

Attendance	Frequency	Percentage
Regular	8	53.3
Irregular	7	46.7
Total	15	100.0

46.7% of the pupils attended school irregularly after the enactment of the FPE programme. This can be attributed to some of the indirect costs being borne by the parents and which the GOK has not catered for in its FPE funds scheme.

The respondent head teachers gave the following as solutions to minimise or solve the problem of indirect costs.

They are: -

- i) Parents to share in the responsibility of building school structures (classrooms) that is parents' contribution.
- ii) The government to increase FPE funds or its support
- iii) The gap between private and public primary school to be checked or to review the educational output in public primary school vs private primary schools and make the necessary adjustments as regards FPE programme.

Table 23 Indicates the Opinions on Solving Problems Posed by Indirect Costs.

Opinion/Suggestion	Frequency	Percentage
Parents contribution	1	6.7
Gap between private and public primary school to be checked	1	6.7
More government support	13	86.7
Total	15	100.0

86.7% of the respondent head teachers felt that the government should increase the free primary education funds allocation to the public primary schools to help solve the problem of the indirect costs which have negatively impacted to the educational output of the free primary education programme. 6.7% of the respondent head teachers had the opinion of the parents being fully involved to meeting the costs the FPE has not catered for fully like building of classrooms and purchase of uniform which the FPE has solely left to the parents to bear. 6.7% of the respondent head teachers shared in the idea of reviewing the gap between the public primary schools and the private primary schools in order to make major re-adjustments to the FPE programme for it to produce the desired educational standards.

PART III

This part dealt with the interview schedule return rate. The main respondents in this research instrument were the parents of the primary school going children of the sampled out schools. Admission of this interview schedule was carried out by selecting sixty parents form the fifteen schools, two parents of standard eight pupils and two parents of standard one pupils from every school who are members of the P.T.A. in each of the selected schools which added up to the well

above 10% minimum that constitutes a sample in a descriptive study (Gay, 1987). This is depicted in chapter three (Research and Methodology) of this research project. A day was set to interview the selected parents from every school. The respondent parents gave answers to questions posted to them by the researcher. The researcher went ahead to compile the given information. Table 24 below portrays gender distribution of the parents.

Table 24: Gender Distribution of Parents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	10	66.67
Female	5	33.33
Total	15	100.0

There is no gender balance in the distribution of parents. Majority, 66.67 % of the parents are male while 33.3% are female.

The parent respondents were categorized according to age and the results were tabulated as in Table 25.

Table 25: Age Distribution of Parent Respondent

Year-bracket	Frequency	Percentage
26-30 Years	2	13.3
31-35 Years	6	40.0
36-40 Years	5	33.3
41-45 Years	2	13.3
Total	15	100.0

Nearly half of the respondent parents were in the 31-35 years age bracket.

To determine their area of residence or their area of origin, the parent's respondents were asked to indicate. The findings are shown in Table 26 and table 27 showing name of location and sub-location.

Table 26: Name of Location

Name of Location	Frequency	Percentage
Koma-rock	3	20.0
Tala	5	33.3
Kalandini	3	20.0
Nguluni	1	6.7
Kangundo	1	6.7
Kianzabe	2	13.3
Total	15	100.0

Table 27: Name of Sub-Location

Name of Location	Frequency	Percentage
Matuu	2	13.33
Sengani	3	20.0
Mbuni	1	6.7
Muisyani	1	6.7
Katine	3	20.0
Muisuni	1	6.7
Kayatta	1	6.7
Kumbu	1	6.7
Kalandini	2	13.3
Total	15	100.0

33.3% of the parents hailed from Tala location as its educational zone with many public primary schools totaling to five from the sample size. Kangundo and Nguluni had the least of the parent respondents this being an indication that they have the least number of public schools and only one public primary school represented each location respectively. As pertains the sub-location, most parent respondents came from Sengani and Katine sub-locations.

The parent respondents were asked to indicate the number of children in primary school male vs female. The tables below indicate the number of children either male or female enrolled in the public primary schools by the respondent parents as their children.

Table 28: Number of Male Children in Public Primary School

No. of Children	Frequency	Percentage
0.00	1	6.7
1.00	9	60.0
2.00	5	33.3
Total	15	100.0

Table 29: Number of Female Children in Public Primary School

No. of Children	Frequency	Percentage
0.00	8	53.3
1.00	5	33.3
2.00	2	13.3
Total	15	100.0

60% of the parent respondents had only one male child in public primary school followed by 33.3% of the parent respondent having two male children in public primary school. This portrays a high number of the male primary school going children as compared to the females (the girls). This can be attributed to the traditional stereotype preference of having the male or boy child attend school as compared to the girl-child. This is a clear depiction of why the government through the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST) has waged war against such perpetrators of this ill-fated traditional belief and has currently been trying to protect and enhance a greater opportunity to the girl child as pertains the provision of basic education.

The parent respondents were asked to mention the name of school where their children attend.

The table below depicts by name the schools (public primary schools) where their children go.

Table 30: Name of Schools where the Parent Respondents' Children's Go

Name of school	Frequency	Percentage
Ngalalya primary school	1	6.7
Kikaatini primary school	1	6.7
Mukalwa primary school	1	6.7
Sengani primary school	1	6.7
Nguluni primary school	2	13.7
Tala girls primary school	1	6.7
Tala boys primary school	1	6.7
Kwa Kisinga primary school	1	6.7
Kianzabe primary school	1	6.7
Kithuiani primary school	1	6.7
Kisukioni primary school	1	6.7
Kwatombe primary school	1	6.7
Matuu Estate primary school	1	6.7
Tala Township primary school	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

13.3% of the parent respondents indicated/mentioned Nguluni primary school as the popular public primary school where their children go. Similarly it might have been the school where one of the respondent children go.

When one of the respondents were asked to indicate in kilometers the proximity oif the primary school their children go from their area of residence, the following information was represented in the table below: -

Table 31: Distance of the Schools from Residence in Kilometers

Distance	Frequency	Percentage
1 - 2	12	80.0
3 - 4	3	20.0
Total	15	100.00

80% of the primary school going children had access to their primary school from their homes or residence. 20% of them had to go further from their residence, 3 – 4 km from their homes.

Parent respondent were told to indicate the means their children use tom access the school. The table below indicates the means of transport the children (child) use to access their educational centers.

Table 32: Type of Transport Means Used by the Children

Means	Frequency	Percentage
Foot	15	100.00

Shockingly, 100% of the parent respondents indicated footing was the popular means of transport used by their children to access school. This can be a clear indication that most parents have sought a nearby public primary school as the best educational center for their children to avoid further costs brought forth by the indirect costs phenomenon. This also indicates a good distribution of the public primary schools for all the children to access basic education which is an educational goal by the government and the other stakeholders.

About the lunch programme, the parent respondents were asked to mention whether their children came back for lunch or were provided with lunch at school. Table 32 below shows the response given by the respondents.

Table 33: Availability of Lunch

Comment	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	5	33.3
No	10	66.7
Total	15	100.0

66.7% of the parent respondents had their children provided for lunch at the public primary school as indicated by Table 32. Nevertheless, 33.3% of the children in public primary school had to go back home for lunch. This shows that there is a lapse in the provision of the lunch

programme as stipulated by the free primary education programme which was out to provide lunch to the public primary school going children. This portrays its effectiveness has been surpassed by time and the programme might be slowly ebbing away. This now leaves the parent with no other alternative other than provide adequate lunch to his or her school going child/children! This becomes an indirect cost borne by the FPE programme which might not have been catered for and which will have to be shouldered by the parents.

The tables below further depict the aspect of the lunch programme as given by parent respondents.

Table 34: Provision of School Lunch Programme as Given by Parent Respondents.

Comment	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	7	46.7
No	8	53.3
Total	15	100.0

Table 34 indicates that 53.3% of the parent respondents mentioned that their children were not receiving lunch at their primary schools while 46.7% of them indicate that their children received lunch at school. Therefore majority of the parents had to supplement in the lunch programme or in other words provide lunch fully to their primary school going children.

Further asked about the amount of money they had to spent on their children's lunch, the parent respondents gave the following information tabulated in Table 35 below.

Table 35: Amount of Money Spent on Lunch Daily

Amount in Ksh	Frequency	Percentage
0.00	5	33.3
1.0	1	6.7
20.0	1	6.7
35.0	1	6.7
40.0	3	20.0
50.0	1	6.7
80.0	2	13.3
90.0	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

According to table 35, inadequate food and other necessities like uniform, and transport fee as depicted in other tables are some of the drawbacks of the Free Primary Education programme. These findings concur with earlier studies conducted by Amunga (1997), Kibogy (2001) and Wanjohi (2002).

Table 35 indicates that 33.3% of the respondents do not spend any amount of money for lunch. In other words they do not incur any lunch expenses. However, 20% indicated that they spend as much as twenty shillings for lunch on their children. Others 13.3% spent up to eighty shillings on lunch for their children. 67% of the parent respondents also indicated that they have to part with ninety shillings in form of lunch for their children. This is a clear epitome that the parents are still required to shoulder the lunch expenditure for their children while still in the primary school.

On the aspect of textbooks, the parent respondents were required to mention how much money they spend annually on supplementing for the already existing inadequate textbooks availed by the Ministry of Education (MOEST) for the free primary education programme. The following information was tabulated.

Table 36: Amount Spend on Textbooks Annually

Amount in Ksh	Frequency	Percentage
0.00	7	46.7
150.00	1	6.7
1000.0	1	6.7
1200.00	2	13.3
1800.00	1	6.7
1830.00	1	6.7
3000.00	2	13.3
Total	15	100.0

Although 46.7% of the parent respondents indicated that they were not incurring any expense as pertains textbook purchase, 13.3% had a big burden to bear having to purchase books worth Kshs. 1,200 and Kshs. 3,000 respectively. This leaves a slob of a burden on the side of textbooks to be shouldered by the parents. Despite the fact that the FPE programme is providing textbooks they seem insufficient for adequate syllabus coverage by the primary school-going children and hence the parents are required to chip in enormously to ensure effective syllabus coverage for all taken subjects.

Table 37: Amount Spend on Exercise Books Annually

Amount in Ksh	Frequency	Percentage
0.00	3	20.0
1.00	1	6.7
40.00	1	6.7
100.00	1	6.7
150.00	1	6.7
175.00	1	6.7
200.00	1	6.7
240.00	1	6.7
300.00	2	13.3
460.00	1	6.7
500.00	2	13.3
Total	15	100.0

Table 37 is a pointer to the fact that despite 20% of the parent respondents attesting to the fact that they do not have to spend any coin in purchase of textbooks, 13.3% of the parent respondents have to incur as much as Kshs. 500 in purchase of writing on materials such as exercise books. This becomes an indirect cost the parents have to cater for as a supplement cost due to the inadequate exercise books provided by the free primary education programme. Due to the enormous work load characteristic of the present subject syllabus/curriculum, the primary school going children are subjected to a lot of writing which requires a greater quantity of exercise books.

Table 38: Amount Spend on Writing Materials per Year

Amount in Ksh	Frequency	Percentage
0.00	2	13.3
1.00	1	6.7
80.00	2	13.3
100.00	2	23.3
120.00	3	20.0
250.00	2	13.3
288.00	1	6.7
340.00	1	6.7
500.00	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

Table 38 indicates that 20% of the parent respondents spend as much as Kshs 120 annually in purchasing writing materials for their children in public primary school. In addition 13.3% of the respondents spend Kshs. 80, Kshs. 100 and Kshs 250 respectively. This depicts a financial burden to the parents as pertains the provision of writing materials such as pens and pencils

Table 39: Amount Spent on Practical Subjects

Amount	Frequency	Percentage
0.00	10	66.7
1.00	1	6.7
60.00	1	6.7
100.00	1	6.7
300.00	1	6.7
420.00	1	6.7
Total	15	100.00

Table 39 shows that 67.7 of the parents respondents do not spend any amount of money in purchase of materials for practical subjects for their children while 6.7% of the parent respondent spent money ranging from Kshs. 1.00 to as much as Kshs. 420 in purchase of the entire package of practical material annually.

Table 39 indicates that practical subject materials are a big burden in the primary education curriculum due to the inculcation of practical subjects such as home crafts (science) and art craft which, require a great deal of practical materials and which are also expensive, in the same note, majority of parents opt for their children not to take practical subjects for they cannot meet this added expenditure on purchase of materials for practical subjects.

Asked on how much they spend on physical infrastructure and learning facilities such as desks and furniture, the parent respondents gave the following information shown by the Table 40.

Table 40: Amount Spend on Desks and Furniture

Amount in Ksh	Frequency	Percentage
0.00	4	26.7
1.00	1	6.7
400.00	1	6.7
500.00	3	20.0
700.00	1	6.7
750.00	1	6.7
800.00	2	13.3
1500.00	1	6.7
2400.00	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

20% of the parent respondents claimed that they spend as much as Kshs. 500 in purchase of desks and furniture annually. 6.7% of them went as far as spending Kshs. 2400 in purchase of desks and furniture. This is a clear depiction that the purchase of desks and furniture still remains a burden borne by the parents and that the FPE funds have catered minimal or even have not catered for the purchase of desks and furniture which the pupils cannot do without.

Table 41: Amounts Spend on Activity Fees.

Amount in Ksh	Frequency	Percentage
0.00	13	86.7
200.00	1	6.7
550.00	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

86.7% of the parent respondents spend nil in activity fees for their children annually while 6.7% of them spend amount of money ranging from Kshs. 200 to Kshs. 550 in supplementing the minimal figure of money allocated to activity fees vote head every year.

Table 42: Amount Spend on Watchman's Wages

Amount in Ksh	Frequency	Percentage
0.00	13	86.7
550.00	1	6.7
1800.00	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

Table 42 is a pointer that 6.7% of the parent respondents spend money ranging from Kshs. 550 to Kshs. 1800 annually in payment of watchman wages. This is a vote head or an expense lingering in a public primary school which the government has not allocated any amount of money for and which the parent has to supplement or solely provide for it as it's a paramount security consideration for the school. This leaves the parent with a heavy financial burden to shoulder

during this time of financial hardships brought forth by an unstable economy or inflation and the looming unemployment in the country. It also beats the essence of free primary education as advocated by the education planners for the education programme.

Table 43: Amount Spend on School Examination Fees Annually

Amount in Ksh	Frequency	Percentage
0.00	4	26.7
20.00	1	6.7
30.00	1	6.7
75.00	1	6.7
150.00	1	6.7
160.00	1	6.7
200.00	1	6.7
300.00	1	6.7
400.00	1	6.7
500.00	1	6.7
600.00	2	13.3
Total	15	100.0

26.7% of the parent respondents pointed out that they spend nothing or nil as pertains payment of examination fees for their primary school going children in public schools annually. However 6.7% spend money ranging from Kshs. 20 to Kshs. 500 annually in payment of examination fees.

13.3% spend as much as Kshs. 600 in the same payment. This depicts that to an extend the parents are supposed to chip in, in meeting the examination fees.

Table 44: Amount of Money Spend in Uniform Purchase Annually


Amount in Ksh	Frequency	Percentage
0.00	1	26.7
350.00	1	6.7
400.00	1	6.7
450.00	1	6.7
600.00	2	13.3
1000.00	2	13.3
1050.00	1	6.7
1200.00	1	6.7
1400.00	1	6.7
1500.00	1	6.7
1600.00	1	6.7
4000.00	2	13.3
Total	15	100.0

13.3% of the parent respondents spend money ranging from Kshs. 600, Kshs. 1000 and as much as Kshs. 4000 in purchase of school uniform for their primary school going children in public schools annually. Surprisingly, 6.7% of them do not spend anything on purchase of school uniform and one is left to wonder who caters for the school uniform for their children as the

government in its allocation of the FPE funds has not allocated any amount of money towards school uniform purchase. 6.7%, however spend money ranging from Kshs. 350 to Kshs. 1600 in purchase of school uniform. This epitomizes the fact that the purchase of school uniform is a big burden to the parents who already are living below the poverty line being in the third world countries and faced by the harsh economic conditions and overwhelming unemployment. It would be a great relief if the government through the MOEST allocated some money towards meeting this extra school uniform cost. This would have made the FPE programme meaningful in its sense of being 'free'.

The following pie-chart is a depiction of the physical facilities and amenities extra cost borne by parents in public primary schools.

Figure 5: A Pie-Chart on Physical Facilities and Amenities Extra Cost Borne by Parents
Physical Facilities and Amenities Extra Cost by Parents



The parent respondents were asked to point out how often their children failed to attend school annually. The information given is tabulated in the table below.

Table 45: Failure to Attend School by Pupils Annually

Comment	Frequency	Percentage
Yes (irregular)	7	46.7
No (regular)	8	53.3
Total	15	100.0

Table 45 above indicates that 53.3% of the parent respondents pointed out that their children in primary public schools have never failed to attend school throughout the year hence emphasizing the fact that their children attended school regularly. However 46.7% of the parent respondents admitted that their children did (do) not attend school regularly or in other words attended school irregularly in a year. They admitted that some of the reasons for missing school could be attributed to the financial burden extended to parents which the FPE programme has not allocated any funds towards and if it has, they have not been sufficient and the parents have to supplement financially towards meeting them. Majority, nevertheless gave the reason of sickness as the major cause of school absenteeism by their children. This latter aspect is depicted in the Table below.

Table 46: Reasons for Missing School

Reasons	Frequency	Percentage
None	4	26.7
Sickness	11	73.3
Total	15	100.0

13.3% of the parent respondents claimed that sickness was the major cause of their children's absenteeism from school while 26.7% of the parents could not point out the exact causes of their children's absenteeism from school and this, the researcher attributed to the existence of the indirect costs which have been a big burden to majority of the parents who are not financially stable. Although they did not admit openly to the fact, some of the reasons leading to school absenteeism could be attributed to lack of money to purchase school uniform, purchase meals, buy supplement teaching and writing materials and even pay watchman wages among many.

The respondents were further asked to comment how 'free' was the Free Primary Education: whether the Free Primary Education programme was actually free or not. The following comments tabulated in Table 47 below were given by the respondents.

Table 47: Comments of How Free is Free Primary Education

Comment	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	6	40.0
No	9	60.0
Total	15	100.0

60% of the parent respondents admitted that the free primary education was not free as such or was not free at all as they still had to cater for some of the education expenses such as purchase of uniform and teaching and writing materials.

Table 48: Pupil Drop Out Rate Annually

Rate in number(s)	Frequency	Percentage
None	13	86.7
1-2	2	13.3
Total	15	100.0

Table 48 indicates that 86.7% of the parent respondents pointed out that their primary school going children in public primary school did not drop out of school at any level and completed their primary education course successfully. However, 13.3% of the parent respondents claimed that their children dropped out of primary school at the rate of one to two children annually.

Table 49: Reasons for Pupil School Drop Out Rate

Reason	Frequency	Percentage
None	14	93.3
Poverty	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

93% of the parent respondents could not tell the reason for their children drop-out from school. However, the pupil drop out rate could be attributed to poverty which has been a looming social

malady in the country for years due to the problem of overwhelming unemployment, retrenchment from work places and the economic instability which has gripped the country for quite a considerable period.

4.5 Demographic Information on Adequacy of Physical Facilities

PART IV

This part dealt with the observation schedule return rate. The main respondents in this research instrument were senior teachers assisted by the deputy head teachers. Admission of this observation schedule was done by the researcher himself by observing the environs of the selected public primary schools, the physical condition or state of their physical infrastructure and amenities and also soliciting information of the same from the teachers especially the deputy head teacher and the senior teacher. This was to establish whether the free primary education has fully catered for the physical infrastructure construction, development and maintenance. This focused on the state of classrooms, whether permanent, semi-permanent or temporary in structure, availability of special rooms such as laboratories, library rooms, home science rooms, art and craft work shops, computer rooms, kitchen and school dining hall. The following information tabulated in the tables below depicts the state of classrooms and their adequacy.

Table 50: Adequacy of Classrooms

Comments 'Yes or No'	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	6	40.0
No	9	60.0
Total	15	100.0

60% of the teacher respondents pointed out that the classrooms were not adequate as the FPE programme did not cater for that vote head or construction of classrooms. This was an aspect left for the parents to cater for and therefore due to the financial incapitation of majority of the parents in rural areas, the aspect of construction of classrooms as long stagnated. After the introduction of FPE programme, classes got swollen up with pupils and the swelling number gas not been balanced with enough classrooms, hi one of the stations in Matungulu division, Kiboko zone named Matuu Estate pupils has many pupils as one hundred clustered in one class! This poses an unhealthy condition of learning for both teacher and pupil. This congestion poses the problem of mobility and inadequate ventilation in each of the classrooms. However, 40% of the respondents stated that the classrooms were adequate.

Asked about the aspect of permanency of the classrooms and the physical structures entirely, the teacher respondents and also from the researcher's observation point, indicated that majority of the classrooms were permanent while others were temporary.

Table 51: Permanency of Classrooms

Permanency (Comment)	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	14	93.3
No	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

93.3% of the respondents claimed that the classrooms were permanent structures while 6.7% of them refuted this fact claiming that they were temporal structures.

Table 52: Temporary Classrooms

Temporal (Comment)	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	2	20.0
No	12	80.0
Total	15	100.0

80% of the respondents (deputy head teachers and senior teachers) indicated that the classrooms were permanent structures while 20% claimed that they are temporal structures.

Table 53: Classrooms with Ventilation of Doors and Windows

Comment	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	10	66.7
No	5	33.3
Total	15	100.0

66.7% of the respondents observed that the classrooms were well ventilated with windows and doors while 33.3% of them observed that the classrooms lacked these ventilation facilities.

Table 54: Open Air-Teaching Areas

Comment	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	1	6.7
No	14	93.3
Total	15	100.0

6.7% of the respondents from the fifteen sampled out schools observed the class-rooms were make-shift open air teaching areas. They were not in form of physical structure but pupils learned under the tree shade or in an open-air space. However, 93.3% of them observed that there were classrooms meant for pupils to learn from.

Table 55: Availability of Adequate Desks and Chairs

Comment	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	2	20.0
No	13	80.0
Total	15	100.0

80% of the respondents observed that there are inadequate desks and chairs in the available classrooms. The FPE funds have not catered for the provision of chairs and desks in the

classrooms. However, 20% of the respondents observed that the desks and chairs in the classrooms were adequate.

Table 56: Availability of Special Rooms e.g. Workshops, Libraries, and Laboratories

Comment	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	2	20.0
No	13	80.0
Total	15	100.0

80% of the respondents observed that there were no special rooms such as workshops, libraries or laboratories in their schools while 20% of them indicated that there were special rooms in their schools. This is a pointer that the FPE funds are not adequate to cater for the construction of these special rooms, which are quite essential for the adequate achievement of desired educational standards (goals) in the educational system. In this, the parents are directly or indirectly forced to supplement in meeting the cost of the construction of these special rooms.

Table 57: Existence of a Computer Room

Comment	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	0	00.0
No	15	100.0
Total	15	100.0

100% of the respondents observed that there was no availability of a computer room in their schools. A computer room was a rare physical structure in all the fifteen sampled out schools. Therefore parents are required to chip in the construction of this very essential physical facility as the country and even the entire world is embracing this modern technology where every aspect of technology is computerized.

Table 58: Availability of a School Hall

Availability of school hall	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	1	6.7
No	14	93.3
Total	15	100.0

Table 58 indicates that 93.3% of the respondents pointed out that there wasn't a school dining hall in their institutions. Nevertheless 6.7% of them observed that there existed a school-dining hall in their institutions. Being an essential physical facility, lack of a school dining hall portrays lack of vital physical facilities in most schools, as the FPE funds have proved inadequate to cater for the construction of a school-dining hall. Hence the parents are supposed to shoulder this responsibility of constructing the school-dining hall. This becomes one of the indirect costs the parents have to shoulder.

Table 59: Existence of a School Kitchen

Existence of a kitchen	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	1	6.7
No	14	93.3
Total	15	100.0

Table 59 indicates that 93.3% of the respondents remarked that there wasn't a school kitchen in their schools while 6.7% of them pointed out that a school kitchen did exist in their schools. This is a clear depiction that the FPE funds have not adequately catered for the construction of a school kitchen and therefore the parents have to directly or indirectly meet the expense of its construction.

Table 60: Adequate Sanitations Facilities

Adequacy	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	6	40.0
No	9	60.0
Total	15	100.0

60% of the respondents pointed out inadequate sanitation facilities while 40% remarked the existence of adequate sanitation facilities. Sanitation facilities and enough of them are a crucial necessity in any institution and lack of adequate sanitation facilities can lead to health hazards among the occupants of these institutions. Therefore the aspect of inadequacy of the above is an added expense to the parents who have to supplement in their construction and ensure an

adequate number of sanitation facilities for the pupils. This is a pointer that the FPE funds are not sufficient for the construction of the facilities.

Table 61: Condition of the Sanitation Facilities

Condition	Frequency	Percentage
Good	12	80.0
Bad	3	20.0
Total	15	100.0

80% of the respondents observed that the sanitation facilities were in good condition. However, 20% of the respondents pointed out that the condition of the sanitation facilities was appalling.

This latter observation portrays that the parents are supposed to chip in, in the maintenance of these sanitation facilities to avoid health hazards befalling the pupils. This points out that the FPE funds are not adequate for effective maintenance of these facilities.

Table 62: Good State of School Uniform by the Pupils

Comment	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	12	80.0
No	3	20.0
Total	15	100.0

20% of the respondents observed that the pupils were not in full uniform and if they were, it was not in good state. Nevertheless 80% of them observed that the pupils were in full uniform and that it was in good state. The FPE funds have not catered for school uniform and the parents are supposed to purchase school uniform for their pupils and ensure that its in good state afterwards. This is a indirect cost, which the FPE has not addressed which goes directly to the parents.

Table 63: Reasons for the Poor State of the School Uniform

Reasons	Frequency	Percentage
Poverty	14	93.3
Ignorance	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

93.3% of the respondents indicated that poverty was the major cause of the poor state of the school uniform. Parents could not afford to renew the already worn-out school uniform consistently as its required to avoid their children wearing tatters. This is due to the prevailing social malady, poverty, which has been one of the malaise the first president of Kenya, Jomo Kenyatta pointed out that the new government should work to eradicate. Since then, it still rears as a major social malady, the country has to fight to curb, but due to the economic instability, it has made it difficult to eradicate. This is an aspect (the school uniform state) the parents have to shoulder financially despite their poverty nature and poor state of economy. 6.7% of the respondents pointed out ignorance among the parents as the cause of the poor state of the school uniform.

Table 64: Availability of Income Generating Activities e.g. a School Farm

Availability	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	5	33.3
No	10	66.7
Total	15	100.0

66.7% of the respondents observed that there wasn't any income generating activity in their schools while 33.3% of the respondents indicated that there existed income-generating activities in their schools. This depicts that majority of the school heads relied on FPE funds and the parents' supplementary fees to run their schools. Now that parents are not supposed to be charged any levies, it becomes a difficult task to run the schools financially and at long last the parents will have to supplement to the already allocated inadequate FPE funds.

Table 65: Availability of a School Canteen or Dining Hall Providing Breakfast and Lunch to the Pupils

Comment	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	0	0.0
No	15	100.0
Total	15	100.0

100% of the respondents pointed out that there wasn't a school canteen or dining hall providing breakfast or lunch to pupils. Despite the government giving out free lunch to pupils, it has not been consistent in most of the schools and the parents have been required to feed their children

which is a cost going to the parents due to the ineffective lunch programme of the FPE programme.

Table 66: Means of Feeding of the Pupils

Means	Frequency	Percentage
Carry food from home	11	73.3
Expanded school feeding programme	4	26.7
Total	15	100.0

73.3% of the respondents indicated that majority of the pupils carried food from home due to the lack of a school canteen and a dining hall providing lunch, the latter a clear depiction of inadequate physical facilities and inconsistent or lack of a school lunch programme. However, 26.7% of the respondents pointed out the existence of an expanded school-feeding programme in their schools. This depicts that the parents are required to prepare food for their children to carry to school and this poses an added expense to the parents to meet. In essence, there are numerous costs in the entire educational system, which the FPE programme has not catered for and are being borne squarely by the parents.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary, conclusion and recommendations from a study that sought to establish the impact of indirect costs to the achievement of Free Primary Education in Matungulu division, Machakos district, Kenya.

5.1 Summary of the Study

The research was guided by six research questions, which sought to establish the impact of indirect costs to the achievement of free primary education. The focused areas were: -

- a) Head teachers ability: Personal and professional background in addition to his comment on the adequacy of the FPE funds as allocated to each school.
- b) Costs and expenses met by the parents of the public primary school going children despite the enactment of the free primary education programme.
- c) The state and condition of the physical infrastructure and school amenities after the introduction of the FPE programme.

5.2 Summary of the Research Findings

- a) Head teachers' ability and his comment on the adequacy of the FPE funds as allocated to the school (s) in addition to the aspects of the school expenditure which the FPE funds have not adequately catered for in the Free Primary Education programme.

- b) Availability and adequacy of the physical infrastructure and the school amenities; the state and condition of the physical infrastructure and school amenities after the introduction of the FPE programme.
- c) Costs and expenses met by the parents of the public primary school-going children despite the enactment of the Free Primary Education programme.
- d) The financial responsibility the parents have to shoulder for wholesome and effective Free Primary Education programme aimed to achieve the required education goals.
- e) The impact of the indirect costs of FPE to school attendance rate.
- f) The impact of the indirect costs of FPE to pupil performance.

5.3 Head teachers' Ability and Remarks on the Attainment and Adequacy of the FPE Fund

The research established that all the head teachers who participated in the study had the required professional qualification (s) to be a head teacher. That is the P1 and above such as S1 and ATS. The research further established that there was a gender imbalance in the distribution of the head teachers. Being a division in the rural areas, the disparity in Matungulu division primary school was far much wider amongst the head teachers. This pointed out that 93.3% of the head teachers were male while 6.7% were female. This findings is in line with the official government records and could be an accumulate outcome of the problem of girl-child education in many developing countries, Kenya included (World Bank, I 990). It is important to note that all the head teachers had the qualifications required by T.S.C. to head a primary school and majority of them, in fact, 26.7% of them had sixteen to twenty years experience in teaching.

The study findings showed that nearly every public primary school in the division attained the stipulated amount of the FPE funds; Kshs. 1,020 per child. The research indicated that 93.3% of the primary public schools received the FPE funds. However, all the head teachers pointed out that the FPE funds were insufficient in catering for the financial needs in their respective schools. 100% of the head teachers claimed the FPE funds were inadequate in running the school financially.

The research further established that the introduction of the FPE led to an upsurge in the enrolment levels in all classes with high enrolment being noted in class one. However, very slight change was noted in class eight enrolment levels. This could be attributed to the coming tendencies among schools to sieve the best pupils for class eight to give the respective schools a good name. 46.7% of the head teachers indicated that their schools obtained 201-250 mean score range in the last five years from 2001-2005. Most public primary schools registered a drop in the level of performance from the year 2001 to the year 2005. This can be attributed to the swelling nature of the classes after the enactment of the FPE programme due to the high enrolment rates of pupils brought by parents in the imagination that the education for the children was going to be free. This upsurge of students in classes made it difficult for teachers to afford individual attention to each and every child. It curtailed teacher-pupil rapport.

The research findings showed that 13.3% of the head teachers indicated that at least two pupils dropped out of school in the years 2003-2006. This can be attributed to the burden of the indirect costs of FPE to parents and also natural causes such as sickness, death and pregnancy.

On the perceptions of head teachers on FPE, the findings showed that, a majority of teachers were opposed to the term 'free' as it was viewed differently in that, the stakeholders, majority of them the parents had to purchase school uniform, school furniture (desks), provide meals and transport, build new classrooms and pay K.C.P.E registration money. They also are required to supplement in teaching and writing materials and paying of the watchman wages. They further mentioned and explained that FPE was a problem (hurdle) to head teachers who found it difficult to manage curriculum and instruction particularly in selecting and acquiring instructional materials, planning and organizing the school programme.

The research further revealed that head teachers have problems in containing the already prevailing indirect costs brought forth by the FPE and also in trying to curb their existence for an effective FPE programme. These are in the following areas:

- i) Inadequate FPE funds.
- ii) Inadequate physical facilities and infrastructure.
- iii) Negative attitude or ignorance towards meeting or supplementing for the uncatered for costs in the primary education by parents.
- iv) Parental failure to play their role.

5.4 Parents Responsibility in Supplementing for the Uncatered for Costs and Expenses by the FPE Programme

Majority of the parents hailed from Tala Division, making a 33.3% of the parents being from Tala educational zone. This is the zone with the majority of the public primary schools.

There existed gender imbalance as pertains the male and female parents with primary school going children 66.7% of them were males while 33.3% of them were females. Most of the parents were aged between 31-35 years old as the research revealed. The research further showed that 33.3% of the parents had two male children in public primary school while 13.3% had two female children in public primary school.

On the perceptions of the parents on FPE, the findings depicted that, a majority of the parents were opposed to the term 'free; as it was viewed differently in that, they paid for supplementary teaching and learning materials, purchased school uniform, paid watchman wages, provided transport and lunch in most occasions, paid K.C.P.E registration money and build classrooms. They further mentioned and explained that FPE was a problem to them as they are required to supplement and meet the above costs despite their financial in capitation due to the prevailing social maladies such s unemployment, retrenchment, economic instability, disease and drought which have befallen the country currently.

5.5 General Observation of the Physical Facilities and Infrastructure by the Teaching Staff

On managing physical and material resources, the main problem area was constructing buildings, maintenance and repair of school physical and material resources. The budget provisions by the government on FPE did not cater for building. The vote head on repairs, maintenance and improvement was allocated very little money compared to the conditions of the physical facilities in schools especially in the rural schools, which witnessed a high influx of pupils immediately after the enactment of the FPE programme in 2003. Hence this

shortage of enough FPE funds has pressurized the parents indirectly to maintain the conditions of their physical infrastructure especially the sanitation facilities which pose a major health hazard to the school fraternity if they are left un-maintained and dilapidated. The construction of classrooms is also the burden of the parents who feel that it is an added expense which the FPE programme should have addressed. So the head teacher and the parents seem to be in a tangle as the latter imagines that the FPE has catered for this and the former knows that this vote head on Repair, Maintenance and Improvement was allocated very little money while the one for Building was not catered for at all.

5.6 Conclusions of the Study

Based on the findings of this study, a lot of information was revealed concerning the impact of the indirect costs to the achievement of FPE programme in Matungulu Division, Machakos District. This depicts the financial responsibility the parents of this division have to shoulder for the effectiveness achievement of the FPE programme and to ensure the desired goals of education has been achieved while still upholding high educational standards in the Division. This is because the government through the Ministry of Education Science and Technology has not fully catered for the entire financial cost of running a public primary educational institution. This poses a major problem to the head teachers in managing the meager financial provisions availed by Ministry of Education Science and Technology and to the parents, a financial burden to shoulder in provision of basic education to their children; as they are supposed to supplement to the extra costs which the Free Primary Education (FPE) has not catered for.

5.7 Recommendations of the Study

From the foregoing study, recommendations were made to various stakeholders in the education sector in an endeavour to make the Free Primary Education (FPE) programme a success. It was also established that the Free Primary Education programme is a joint responsibility and that the government should consider the provision of primary education as being central to poverty reduction therefore alleviating parents the financial responsibility being borne by them.

From the study findings, it is very evident that public primary school head teachers faced problem in the implementation and management of Free Primary Education (FPE). The predominant problems they encountered pertained to over-enrolment, poor state of physical facilities, resources and deficiencies in managing the meager Free Primary Education (FPE) finances effectively and efficiently.

The concept of Free Primary Education was strongly dismissed by a majority of teachers and parents as the results revealed that parents were still involved in buying uniform, providing transport and food, paying examination fees and those who had children in boarding schools paid for boarding facilities. They also argued that as tax-payers, the taxes collected were used to cater for the provision of FPE. From this conclusion, the following recommendations were derived for the study: -

Based on the data collected and analyzed, the researcher recommends the following:

- i) Disseminate correct and timely information and sensitize the public on FPE. It should ensure proper management and efficient use of existing school resources and support continuous capacity building of school committees and teachers in resource management.**
- ii) Encourage community income generating initiatives so that the community can own the programme such as sugarcane farming, vegetable and fruit farming, poultry keeping, diary keeping and others and engage in fund raising activities such as exhibitions, presentation of dances, drama as it would supplement funds from the government and reduce the shortfalls in financial management of the institutions.**
- iii) Continue with the school feeding programme and lower the costs of boarding schools in the arid and semi-arid lands to avoid indirect costs of FPE.**
- iv) Harambee motto was very instrumental in raising funds for school projects. It should be supported fully by the government and politicians at all levels.**
- v) The government should review the budgetary allocation to education and increase the unit cost of the FPE funds allocation per child to ensure adequacy of funds to run the public primary school effectively and efficiently as pertains the financial spectrum in management of these institutions.**
- vi) The school committees ought to ensure that schools have enough classrooms with lockable doors, windows and adequate furniture to facilitate safe storage of books and teaching aids.**
- vii) Public primary schools should purchase approved instructional materials and involve parents and communities in making decisions on school expenditure.**

- viii) Public primary schools should purchase approved instructional materials and involve parents and communities in decision making on expenditure.
- ix) School administration should maintain records of pupils, receipts for audit purposes and check MOEST approval for additional levies in schools.
- x) The gap between private and public primary schools to be checked or to review the educational output in public primary school versus private primary schools and make the necessary adjustments as regards FPE programme.

5.8 Suggestions for Further Research

From the research findings and the subsequent recommendations made, suggestions for further research have been made. The following research areas are suggested for further study:

- i) This was a case of Matungulu Division. There is need for research similar to this to be done to cover a larger scale in order to exhaustively diagnose all the factual indirect costs of FPE and their impact in the achievement of FPE.
- ii) There is need to investigate the future of FPE and the need to extend it to the secondary and tertiary institutions.
- iii) Further studies need to be undertaken to investigate the gaps between public and private secondary schools and the universities.
- iv) A more detailed research needs to be done to determine the extend to which the recommendations made by the task force have been implemented.
- v) A study to investigate the parents, school committee members and the pupils' perception on FPE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abagi , O. (1997), Public and Private Investment in Primary Education in Kenya. An Agenda for Action, Nairobi, IPAR.**
- Abagi, O. (1997), The impact of political Education Reforms on the Quality of Primary education. Experience from Kenya in Quality Education Vol. 4. Watson K. et al. cassel, London.**
- Aduda, O. (2003), "Record Shs. 71 Billion Allocated to Best Free Learning:", Daily Nation June 13, 2003, p3.**
- Albren, E. (1982), The Role of Self Help in The Development of Education and Kenya, Kenya Literature Bureau, Nairobi.**
- Alexander, R. (1992), Policy and Practice in Primary Education , Routledge, London.**
- Blaug, M (1967), A Cost Benefit Approach to Educational Planning in Developing Countries, Report No. EC 157, Washington, D.C., The World Bank.**
- Blaug, M (1969), Economic of Education 2, Middlesex, England, Penguin Books.**
- Blaug, M. (1974), Education and the Employment Problem in Developing Countries, International Labour Office, Washington, D.C., The World Bank**

Borg, W.R and Gall, M.D. (1989), **Educational Research: An Introduction**, Longman. London.

Bray, Mark. (1981), **Policies and Progress Towards Universal Primary Education (UPE)**, Journal of Modern African Studies vol. 19 no. 4 pp 457-563.

CESA Team, (1999), **Comprehensive Education Sector Analysis Report**, MOEST/UNICEF/ Kenya Country Office, Nairobi.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1989), **Research Methods in Education: An Introduction 6th Ed**, Allyn and Bacon. Boston.

Coombs, P.H. (1968), **The World Education Crisis System Analysis**. Oxford University Press, New York.

Csapo, Mary. (1983), **Universal Primary Education in Nigeria: Its problems and Implications: African Studies review**, vol 26 no. 1 pp 91-118.

Denison, E.F. (1962), **The Sources of Economic Growth in the United States**, New York; Committee for Economic Development.

Dennison, B. et al, (1987), **Challenges In Educational Management: Principles Into Practice**. Nichols Publishing Company, New York.

Elimu Yetu Coalition (2003), Reform Agenda for Education in Kenya, ets Beacons for Policy and Legislative Framework, Nairobi, Common Wealth Education Fund.

Eshiwani, G.S. (1990). Implementing Education Policies in Kenya, Washington D.C: World Bank discussion paper no. 85.

Eshiwani, G.S. (1993), Education in Kenya Since Independence, East African Publishers Nairobi.

Gakuru, O.N. (1982), Who Goes to Secondary School in Kenya: A Study of Pre-school Education and Socio-Economic Background of the Child, Institute of development studies Nairobi.

Gary, L.R. (1987), Educational Research; Competencies for Analysis and Application, Ohio; Merill Publishing co.

Halliday, G.I. (1995), Quality in Basic Education: Better Education Management. Turning the Tables on Teacher Management. Common Wealth Secretariat. London.

Krejcie, R.V and Morgan, D. (1970) Determining Sample Size for Research Activities: Education and Psychological Measurement vol. 30 no. 3 pp 608.

Lokesh, K. (1984), **Methodology of Educational Research**. Van educational books publishers, New Delhi.

Ministry of Education (2003b), **Primary school Instructional Materials Management Handbook**, Nairobi; MoE.

Ministry of Education (MoE) (2003a), **Report of the Task force on the Implementation of Free Primary education**, Nairobi; MoE.

Mithar, N.J. (1995), **Cost and Financing Education in Kenya Access, Quality and Equity in Primary Education**, World Bank/MoEST. Nairobi.

MOEST (2001), **Education For All (EFA) in Kenya; A National Handbook for 2000 and Beyond**; Nairobi; MOEST.

MOEST (2003a), **Free Primary Education Funds- Breakdown to Public Primary Schools, 24th September 2003**, (Ref: PE 14/42/1/vol. II/21).

MOEST (2003b), **Parental Commitment /Support Staff Establishment for Primary Schools in Kenya, 30th May, 2003** (Ref: MN/ED/GEN/P/17/vol. 1/29).

Mugenda, O.M, and Mugenda, A.G. (1999), **Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches**, Acts Press, Nairobi.

Mulusa, T. (1990), **Evaluation Research for Beginners: A Practical Study Guide**. Nairobi University Press, Nairobi.

Muthoga L. (2002), **“Free Education and Campaign rhetoric”**, Sunday Nation, December 15, 2002, p. 18.

Nguru, G.M (1986), **An Analysis of Factors that Influence the Achievement of Primary Education Objectives**, Kenyatta University bureau of education research, Nairobi.

Obanya, Pai, (1999), **The Dilemma of Education in Africa**, UNESCO, Dakar.

Odada, O. & A.B. Ayako (1988), **The Impact of Structural Adjustment Policies on the Well being of the Vulnerable Groups in Kenya**, Nairobi: Report of the proceedings of a workshop held on November 3-5, 1985, Nairobi; UNICEF- Kenya Country office.

Oleembo, J.O. (1985), **Financing Primary School Buildings in Kenya**, Nairobi; Kenya, Transafrica press.

Olembo, J.O. (1982), **The Cost of Primary Education to a Kenyan Parent**, Nairobi' Bureau of Educational research.

Psacharopoulous, G. (1973), **Returns to Education; An International Comparison**, San Francischo; Jessey- Bass, Inc.

Psacharopoulos, G. (1975), Earnings and Education in OECD Countries, Paris; Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

The World Bank, Report No. EC 157, Washington, D.C;

Republic of Kenya (1949), Report of the National Committee on the Scope, Content and Methods of the African Educational System, Nairobi, Government Printer.

Republic of Kenya (1976), Report of the National Committee on Education Objectives and Policies (Gachathi Report), Government Printer, Nairobi.

Republic of Kenya (1988), Report of the Presidential Working Party on Education and Training for the Next Decade and Beyond, Government Printer, Nairobi.

Republic of Kenya (1988), Sessional paper No. 6 on “ Education and Manpower Training for the Next Decade and Beyond”, Nairobi, Government Printer.

Republic of Kenya (1998), Master Plan on Education and Training 1997-2010, Nairobi, Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.

Republic of Kenya (1999), The Commission of Inquiry into The Education System in Kenya (Koech Report), Government Printer, Nairobi.

Republic of Kenya (2002), **MOEST: Report of The Sector Review and Development Direction.**

Republic of Kenya (2003), **MOEST: Education Sector Development Plan 2003-2007.**

Republic of Kenya (2003), **MOEST: Free Primary Education, Every Child in School**, Jomo Kenyatta Foundation, Nairobi.

Republic of Kenya (2003), **MOEST: Guidelines for Implementation of FPE.**

Republic of Kenya (2003), **MOEST: Report of The Task Force on the Implementation of Free Primary Education.**

Schultz T.W. (1961), “ **Investment in Human Capital**”, American economic Review 1:1-17.

Singleton, et al. (1988), **Social Science Research**. Oxford University Press: New York

Smith, A. (1952), “ **The wealth of Nations**”. Encyclopedia Britannica Inc.

UNESCO (2002), **EFA Global Monitoring Report: Education for All: Is the World on Track?** Paris, UNESCO.

UNESCO (2003), **Kenya and UNESCO Magazine: 2002/2003 Annual Report**, Nairobi.

UNICEF (1989), **Adjustment with a Human Face**, vol. 1, London, Clarendon Press.

Webster, T. (2000), **Universal Primary Education in Papua New Guinea**, Pan African Networking Papua.

Wiersma, M. (1995), **Research Methods in Education**, 3rd Ed. Routledge, London.

Woodhall, M. (1970), **“Cost-Benefit Analysis in Educational Planning”**, Fundamentals of education Planning No. 13, UNESCO/11EP.

World Bank (1990), **Policy paper on Primary Education**, Washington D.C.

World Bank (1999), **Education Strategy Paper**, Washington, D.C., The World Bank.

World Bank/MOEST, (1990), **Financial Implications of Programmatic Changes in Kenya's Education System, 1990-2000**, Government Printer, Nairobi.

APPENDIX 1: INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO HEAD TEACHERS

JULIA M. WAMBUA,
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING,
P.O BOX 92,
KIKUYU.

THE HEAD TEACHER,

PRIMARY SCHOOL,

Dear Sir/Madam,

**RE: THE INDIRECT COSTS OF FREE PRIMARY EDUCATION TO THE PARENTS
OF MATUNGULU DIVISION, MACHAKOS DISTRICT, KENYA**

I am a postgraduate student at the University of Nairobi pursuing a masters degree in Educational Administration and Planning. I am conducting research on the indirect costs of Free Primary Education and their implication on the implementation of Free Primary Education Programme in Matungulu Division, Machakos District. Your school has been chosen to participate in the study. The respondents are the head teacher and two parents of standard 1 pupils and standard eight pupils.

The questionnaire for the head teacher and the interview schedule are designed for the purpose of this research only and all the responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Your co-operation will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

JULIA M. WAMBUA.

APPENDIX 2: INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO RESPONDENTS

JULIA M. WAMBUA,
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING,
P.O BOX 92,
KIKUYU.

Dear respondent,

_____ Primary School,

RE: THE INDIRECT COSTS OF FREE PRIMARY EDUCATION TO THE PARENTS OF MATUNGULU DIVISION, MACHAKOS DISTRICT, KENYA

I am a postgraduate student at the University of Nairobi pursuing a master's degree in Education Administration and Planning. I am carrying out research on the indirect costs of free primary education and their influence on the implementation of the free primary education programme in Matungulu Division, Machakos District. Your school has been selected to participate in the research and as parents of this school cum the stakeholders, your participation is of paramount importance.

I intend to conduct an interview on you on a date, which will be communicated to you by the head teacher of your children's school. All responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality. Your presence and co-operation on the material day will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

JULIA M. WAMBUA.

APPENDIX 3

APPENDIX 3: HEAD TEACHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

You are kindly requested to complete this questionnaire indicating your honest response by placing a tick (✓) against your option and by filling in the blanks (---) by giving as many details as possible.

SECTION A: Background information.

1. Gender

a) Male ()

b) Female ()

2. Academic qualification.

a) CPE ()

b) KJSE ()

c) KCE ()

d) KCPE ()

e) KCSE ()

f) KACE ()

g) Graduate ()

h) Any other, specify _____

3. Please indicate below your professional qualification.

a) P3 ()

b) P2 ()

c) P1 ()

d) S1 ()

e) ATS ()

f) B.Ed ()

g) Any other, specify _____

4. For how long have you been a head teacher?

- a) Below 5 years () c) 11 to 15 years ()
b) 6 to 10 years () d) 16 to 20 years ()
e) over 20 years ()

SECTION B: GENERAL INFORMATION

5. Has your school received the FPE funds?

- a) Yes ()
b) No ()

6. If YES, how much per pupil? _____

7. Is the money sufficient?

- a) Yes ()
b) No ()

8. Did your school get an increase in enrolment following the FPE programme?

- a) Yes ()
b) No ()

9. State the performance of the school in KCPE for the last 5 years.

Year	Mean score
2001	
2002	
2003	
2004	
2005	

10. How many trained teachers do you have in your school? _____

Thank you for your time and co-operation.

JULIA MWELU WAMBUA.

APPENDIX 4: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARENTS

The purpose of this study is to find out the indirect costs of free primary education programme and their implication on the implementation of FPE in Matungulu Division, Machakos District. Your co-operation and sincerity in answering the questions given below will be highly appreciated, and will go along way in improving the standards of primary education.

All your responses and any information obtained from you will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will only be used for analytical purposes.

1. Name of location _____, sub location _____
2. Your sex _____, your age _____
3. Number of children in primary school.
 - a) Male _____
 - b) Female _____
4. Name of schools where you children go.
 - a) _____
 - b) _____
 - c) _____
 - d) _____
5. Distance of the schools from home in kilometers: _____
6. I) Which type of means does your child/children use to access the (s) ?

ii) How much do you spend on your child/children daily for transport? Kshs. _____

7. I) Do your child/children:
- a) Come back for lunch? ()
 - b) Carry pocket lunch? ()
 - c) Get lunch at school? ()
 - d) Do without lunch? ()
- (Tick where appropriate)

ii) How much do you spend on your child/children daily for lunch? Shs. _____

8. How much do you spend on the following per child per year?
- a) Textbooks _____ shillings.
 - b) Exercise books _____ shillings.
 - c) Writing materials e.g. pens, pencils _____ shillings.
 - d) Materials for practical subjects _____ shillings.

9. How much do you spend for the following:-
- a) Desks/furniture _____ shillings.
 - b) Development/building fund _____ shillings.
 - c) Activity fees _____ shillings.
 - d) Watchman's wages _____ shillings.
 - e) School uniform _____ shillings.
 - f) Examination fees _____ shillings.

10. I) Do you think that primary education for your child is 'free' as stated?
Yes () No ()
(Tick where appropriate)

APPENDIX 5: SCHOOL OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

1. Describe the following school facilities.

a) Classrooms

i) Are they adequate? _____

ii) Are they:-

- Permanent? ()

- Temporary? ()

- No doors/windows? ()

- Open-air teaching areas ()

- Classrooms in another venue away from school compound ()

NB: state Yes or No.

b) Are there enough desks, chairs, etc _____

c) Are there special rooms e.g. workshops, laboratories (specify)

d) Sanitation facilities.

a) Are they adequate? _____

b) In good condition? _____

2. Are pupils in school uniform? (Describe the situation) _____

3. Is there a school farm or any other income generating activities?

