International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)

ISSN 2307-4531
(Print & Online)

http://gssrr.org/index.php?journal=JournalOfBasicAndApplied

Assessment of the Constituency Development Fund in Enhancing KCPE Performance of Public Primary Schools in Kenya: A Case of Mwala Constituency

Kyiengo C. Maweu[a], Andrew Riechi[b], Gatimu Kiranga[c], Muondwe Samuel[d*]

[a,b,c] *Kenyatta University, P.O Box438044, Nairobi,00100,kenya*

[d]*Dedan Kimathi University of Technology, P.O Box 657,Nyeri-10100,Kenya*

[a]*Email: kyengocosmas@yahoo.com*

[d]*Email: kanyi.samuel02@gmail.com*

Abstract

Public primary schools are faced with many challenges related to the provision of adequate and appropriate learning facilities and poor financial management skills which have had a negative effect on KCPE performance. This study therefore investigated the efficiency of the CDF in enhancing KCPE performance in public primary schools in Mwala Constituency. Data were collected using questionnaires and an observation schedule. Responses were received from 119 respondents (21 head teachers and 98 teachers). Statistical analysis was used to analyse closed-ended items and descriptive statistics used to analyse open-ended items using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). The findings were presented in frequency percentage tables, histograms and pie-charts. The study also revealed that as much as most schools have a number of physical facilities as well as teaching and learning resources, the facilities are largely inadequate. Study findings also show that most public primary schools in Mwala Constituency are experiencing a shortage of teachers and non-teaching staff. It was however revealed that CDF has not been adequately channeled towards this situation hence impacting negatively on KCPE performance.

---

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: kanyi.samuel02@gmail.com

The study further established that challenges facing schools in regard to CDF funds range from the process of application for the funds by schools which is prone to manipulation, poor implementation of CDF projects in schools and lack of minimal support from stakeholders. It was concluded that there is a general feeling among head teachers that CDF has had a positive impact on KCPE performance to some extent. It was however of concern that the CDF funds have not been adequately utilised in areas that are crucial towards enhancing KCPE performance. More emphasis is being placed on constructing more classrooms and forgetting provision of teaching and learning resources and more teachers. Recommendations have therefore been made to streamline the CDF management in schools so as to boost KCPE performance.

Keywords: Constituency Development Fund; Enhancing KCPE Performance; Public Primary Schools in Kenya; Mwala Constituency.

1. Introduction

Universal Primary Education (UPE) is an international development goal which all countries are expected to achieve by the year 2015 [1]. At the World Conference on Education for All (EFA) held in 1990 the importance of 'basic education' was recognized. Article I of the World Declaration on Education for All adopted at the conference clearly states that "Every person– child, youth and adult– shall be able to benefit from educational opportunities designed to meet their basic learning needs", focusing on value, significance, and effects of education for individuals. The Dakar Framework for Action of 2000 set the goal with the statement "Ensuring that by 2015, all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to and complete free and compulsory primary education of good quality." This was further reflected in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) [1].

The aspect of 'Investment in Primary Education' has been a key element in the development process worldwide. In United States of America (USA) elementary schooling is free and compulsory to all children [3]. In India central government provide 80% of the financing of Free Primary Education (FPE), while the local states implement and provide the rest of the financing [2]. African countries like Malawi, Uganda and Lesotho have implemented FPE [4]. Implementation of FPE in Kenya on its part started laying down strategies of achieving FPE as was first articulated in Sessional Paper Number Ten of 1965 on African Socialism to eradicate ignorance, poverty and disease [4]. The first ever giant step towards granting FPE in Kenya was in 1974 [5]. A presidential decree led to provision of Free Primary Education to pupils in lower classes. As a result, the total enrolment, which stood at 2.1 million at that time, rose rapidly such that in 1978 it had reached 3.2 million [6]. This number weighed down on institutional growth such that in 1974, there were 3,700 primary schools and by 1980 the number had risen to 13,200 [1]. With enlarged enrolment, a countrywide building program launched to cope with the required classes, charged school committees with the task of imposing building fund for each child.

Re-introduction of FPE sought to address the limited progress towards the attainment of Universal Primary Education witnessed in the last decade (UNESCO, 2003). A new approach to the provision of Free Primary Education in Kenya was deemed necessary and in January 2003, it was declared in recognition of education as a

basic right for all Kenyan children as articulated in the Children's Act of 2001. According to the [7], the government would continue to pay teachers wage bill, support staff, pay for electricity, water and conservancy. The government would specifically provide to all public primary schools the required basic learning/teaching materials such as text books, exercise books, pieces of chalk and dusters.

The Ministry of Education through the government of Kenya has also made tremendous efforts to raise funds from donors such as World Bank, UNICEF, European Union, USAID and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) like Plan International and CARE Kenya to finance FPE [8]. In Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2004 on education and Training [9], the Government of Kenya demonstrates its commitment to the development of education and training through sustained allocation of resources. Financing education, in general, and especially in the context of the six goals of EFA has emerged as a key area, which needs urgent attention. At the sub-regional meeting in Kathmandu in April 2001, the South Asia Forum, all Ministers/Secretaries expressed an urgent need to have a comprehensive grasp of "financing", ensuring that it reflects strategic policy shifts vis-à-vis education, both for advocacy within countries and better use of resources for EFA [10].

The government of Kenya in addition to national budgetary allocation encouraged financing of primary education through devolved funds such as CDF. According to [11]; the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) is an additional means of financing (sourced from domestic revenue) for community-driven development including education that is managed at the constituency level by Members of Parliament (MPs) as such it supplements, or operates parallel to existing funding mechanisms for local government [12].

There has been a steady increase in budgetary allocations towards the CDF fund by the government since its inception in 2003/2004 financial year.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

Files According to [13]; as the results for the pioneers of the FPE were released, questions emerged on whether FPE was a 'curse' to public schools. Since 2003, the KCPE mean score in public schools has stagnated at about 240 points compared to 300 points for private schools. Some teachers interviewed by the East African Standard argued non-completion of the syllabus and congestion of pupils in classes hinders effective learning in public schools [13]. Education expert Peter Odhengo concedes that congested and overstretched classrooms have created unhealthy and uncomfortable conditions in most public schools. The PS said that while teachers in public schools handle big classes, their counterparts in private schools usually teach not more than 40 pupils in a class [13].

During the Mwala District Education Day, the District Education Officer observed that public schools that used to be trailblazers now perform below expectation. Some of the former top performing public schools have nose-dived in KCPE results since. The head teacher of one of such schools in her speech said parents used to be fully involved in daily running of the school before the introduction of FPE. She said, "In 1980s and 90s, public schools used to perform well as parents were buying books and library facilities. Since the introduction of FPE, most of the parents have relaxed. They say Government has provided everything for their children," she

explained. This comes against the much held belief that public primary schools are expected to have overcome these constrains through public funding by the government through FPE funds, the CDF as well as the Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF) putting public primary schools at par with private primary schools. This raises questions on the efficient utilization of these funds especially in the identification of areas of funding. The researcher therefore found it necessary to carry out this study with an aim of establishing the efficiency of the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) in enhancing KCPE performance in public primary schools in Mwala Constituency.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The study sought to achieve the following objectives:

1. To assess the extent to which CDF has been used to provide school physical facilities in Mwala Constituency.
2. To assess the extent to which CDF has been used to provide teaching and learning resources in public primary schools in Mwala Constituency.
3. To assess the extent to which CDF has been used to provide school personnel in public primary schools in Mwala Constituency.
4. To establish challenges facing utilization on CDF funds in public primary schools in Mwala Constituency.

1.3 Significance of the Study

This study may go a long way in highlighting to the government and members of the public on the way CDF funds are being utilized in public primary schools through presenting information on areas being given priority for funding and how this has influenced KCPE performance. The study may also provide literature for future research through the information it will gather from the respondents. The study may further provide the government and other policy makers with an objective assessment of the challenges facing utilization of the CDF funds in provision of school inputs and therefore planners may be guided when allocating funds through making more accurate estimates and allocations for the various requirements in the implementation of the Universal Primary Education policy.

1.4 Delimitation of the Study

Delimitation is a process of reducing the study population and areas to be surveyed to manageable size. The study was delimitated by the fact that it was only conducted in public primary school in Mwala Constituency and did not involve public primary schools from other constituencies in Kenya which are also benefiting from the CDF funds. Therefore generalisation of the findings to the rest of the country should be done with a lot of caution.

1.5 Limitation of the Study

The study was limited by the fact that given the sensitivity of issues related to utilisation of the CDF funds,

some respondents might have withheld some information for fear of victimisation. The study was also limited by time constraints given that the researcher was not on study leave and therefore found it difficult to find spare time within his work schedule to focus on the study. There were also constraints arising from the high costs of conducting this study.

1.6 Assumptions of the Study

The study was based on the assumption that:

1. Public primary schools in Mwala Constituency are beneficiaries of the constituency Development Fund (CDF).
2. Respondents are aware of key priority areas that require funding from the CDF funds.
3. All public primary schools in Mwala constituency have an operational school committee.

1.7 Literature Review

The following are discussed under literature review, dynamics of quality of education, public funding of education, then impact of basic education financing on pupil performance, economics of financing education and the concept of devolved state revenue allocations.

1.7.1 The Dynamics of Quality of Education

The question of the quality of education and its main determinants remains controversial amongst scholars, policy makers and practitioners. Traditionally, teaching and learning inputs and examination scores have been used as proxies for quality. However, we should remember the extent that factors shaping educational experience are school-based, while others relate to the child's family, community, social and cultural aspects of the child's environment, educational quality needs to be examined in relation to the social, political, cultural and economic contexts in which it takes place [5].

Among the most important instructional materials that have been shown to have a significant influence in the teaching-learning process are textbooks and other reading materials. Studies have pointed to evidence, particularly in developing countries, that the availability of such materials has a positive effect on school effectiveness [14,15,16]. Availability of textbooks has been shown to have a direct and positive correlation with pupil achievement in developing countries. The Kenyan government began providing textbooks in schools immediately after independence as one of the measures to support children from poor families. Under the Kenya School Equipment Scheme (KSES), 20 Kenya shillings per child were provided at the primary school level for the provision of learning materials. Increased enrolment in subsequent years, however, constrained the government's ability to fully meet the needs of schools and pupils. Subsequently, the cost-sharing programme shifted the entire burden of book provision to the parents, and KSES was abolished in 1989. However, the procurement and supply of textbooks to poor schools under an adjustment credit was re-introduced in the 1990/91 financial year. The importance of textbooks in the FPE programme is underscored by the fact that out of the FPE funds of KES 1,020 per pupil, about two thirds (KES 650 or 64 percent) is earmarked for the

purchase of textbooks, supplementary readers and reference materials, among other items [14,15,16].

It is generally agreed that the most important manifestations of schooling quality (however defined) are literacy, greater cognitive abilities and better student performance in examinations [5,17]. Internationally, pupil scores have been accepted and used as a proxy of achievement. Traditionally, the Kenyan education system has performed better than that of its neighbors as measured by the relevance and the quality of test items and overall outcomes. As early as 1982, a comparison of the educational development in Kenya and Tanzania [18] noted the higher educational attainment of Kenyans compared to Tanzania. They attributed the difference partly to the more relaxed attitudes taken by the Kenya towards the growth of private schools contrary to the situation in Tanzania. [17] Further noted that whereas many questions in the Kenyan examination system (KCPE) are knowledge, there is still a strong emphasis on problem solving and application of knowledge and that as a result, these examinations may be valid measures of students' cognitive achievements.

1.7.2 Public Funding of Education

Reference [19] states in the United States of America use different methods to fund public education. State aid to school districts can be classified in six categories: flat grants, foundation programs, guaranteed tax base programs, percentage equalization programs, full state funding, and pupil weights. The flat grant is one of the oldest types of state education aid. It is a straightforward mathematical calculation dividing the available funds by a simple unit of measure. The state selects the funding unit, such as students or teachers, and distributes an equal amount of funding per unit to school districts. Flat grants do not take into account the levels of local funding or special needs of students [19].

According to [20]; Botswana has consistently devoted a greater share of government spending and gross domestic product (GDP) to education than the other countries. According to [21]; the share of the government budget going to education has increased in Uganda and is now similar to the share devoted in Botswana and hence higher than the Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) average. In Malawi, however, education expenditure has been slow to grow and education spending as a proportion of government expenditure and GDP is low by SSA standards. In Malawi and Uganda UPE was associated with a significant increase in spending on education as would be expected. There is evidence that specific sectors lost out because of this prioritisation of education [21].

According to [22] in the implementation of free primary education the Kenyan Ministry of Education established a system in which all 18,000 public primary schools can receive capitation grants straight from the Ministry through bank accounts. The annual amount is 1,020 Kenyan shillings (14 US dollars) per pupil, which is earmarked for purchasing educational materials, such as textbooks and notebooks, as well as for the repairing of school facilities and to ensure quality assurance. The total grant amount is determined by the number of pupils enrolled, whereby, large-scale schools enjoy advantages over schools with fewer pupils [22]. The government also allocated an additional 300 million shillings for the administration and monitoring of its progress [23].

In the national budget for fiscal year 2005/06 (360,087 million shillings), expenditure for the Ministry of Education (94,927 million shillings) accounted for 26.4% of the total budget and much of it was provided by donor agencies [24]. The agencies were therefore becoming the primary funders for the education sector rather than supplementing government efforts. According to [24] the government is fully aware of the high public expenditure on education and the support it receives from international partners. It is in this regard that serious consideration is being given to the need for the diversification of funding which has led to devolved funding of education through CDF and the Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF) [24].

1.7.3 Economics of Financing Education

According to [25] the first fundamental input for decisions in education is the unit cost per student or graduate by level of schooling (primary, secondary, university or postgraduate), by curriculum type (general vs vocational track in secondary education) or by type of faculty in higher education. Such cost must be decomposed by the many inputs that enter into the production function of education, e.g. teachers' salaries, rental cost equivalent of school buildings, textbooks, materials and supplies. Unit costs of private schools should be juxtaposed to those for public schools. Costs must be broken down into public and private, the latter referring to what the student actually bears. Public costs are the total resource cost of schooling, regardless of who pays them. A significant part of the cost of schooling, especially in post-compulsory education levels, is the opportunity cost of student time [25].

According to [27]; it is important to know the unit social (resource) cost of education. Equally, one must know that the unit cost is of different types of curricula in secondary education, and also the per student cost of university faculties. Actually, it is astonishing how many decisions on investment in certain levels (beyond primary) and types of education are being made without explicit consideration of the cost of such provision, let alone the expected benefits.

According to [27]. we can distinguish two broad classes of educational benefits. One refers to the immediate educational outcome, or student learning. The other is the eventual labour market outcome, referring, of course, only to those who will enter the labour market, often measured by the graduate's earnings. Student achievement can be measured by any of the standard ways, e.g. by asking the student to take a test both at the beginning and end of the schooling period in order to record the achievement value added, which in turn can be compared to the pedagogical inputs that went into the learning process [27].

Assessing student achievement as the end product is very important for two reasons. First, many students will never enter the labor market, or at least the formal modern wage sector. Hence, for them this is practically the only educational outcome one can measure. But among non-formal labour market participants, market outcomes can be measured by imputing shadow wages [27]. Second, even among those who will engage solely in "household production", literacy can contribute to a long series of beneficial outcomes, such as better sanitation conditions for all family members, awareness of family planning methods and reduced fertility.

Graduate earnings can be decomposed along the same lines as educational costs, i.e. they can correspond to the

graduates of different educational levels, to alternative curriculum types, public or private education, and to people working in either the public or private sectors of the economy [25]. The latter two distinctions are very important to make in order to approximate the productivity of graduates, as measured by the earnings of those working in the private sector. Recording the earnings of graduates in the public sector is also useful, as this sector can set the signals to which prospective students respond. It is also important to know the absolute (and therefore, relative) salaries of graduates of the educational system, for studying issues of equity and the factors determining income distribution [25].

Once the above primary analysis ingredients are available, there is a small step towards assessing the efficiency with which resources are being used in education. For example, the coefficients of an educational production function can be related to the cost of providing the respective educational inputs. This analysis can lead to policy conclusions that one could not have imagined before, such as determining what inputs are more effective in raising student achievement [26]. Similarly, the information of the costs and earnings/productivity differentials can easily be combined to produce rates of return to investment in education, along all the dimensions according to which the costs and benefits have been disaggregated, e.g. by level of schooling or curriculum type [25].

According to [25]; if we axiomatically accept basic education and literacy as a *sine qua non* right of every person on this earth – a very tall order to be achieved in a short time period then, other than for academic reasons, one need not waste time in estimating further returns to primary education. Whatever these monetary returns are and they have proved to be very high in empirical estimations they are irrelevant when the population's literacy is at stake [25]. Every child should graduate from basic education knowing the three Rs (reading, writing and arithmetic), regardless of what a mechanical rate of return estimation to primary education may show. Information on the above costs and relative salaries can also lead to a reverse rate of return calculation, i.e. instead of inserting into the rate of return formula the stream of costs and benefits associated with the investment in question, one can insert just the education costs and solve for the required productivity benefits that would make the investment break even at a given discount rate. Often, by just inserting the cost of the investment, it becomes extremely unlikely that the graduates of target educational level X will be 10 times more productive than the control group to justify the investment [26].

1.7.4 The Concept of Devolved State Revenue Allocations

In making funding allocations to local governments we can think of state education financeinstitutions as a central authority optimizing a social welfare function containing weighted values of equity, efficiency, and distributive politics [28]. The state legislature is usually the dominant actor in these. The social welfare function analogy is merely used as an organizing framework for theoretical discussion and later hypotheses testing. However, we could easily formalize this approach with state central decision makers optimizing total state welfare by allocating between school districts on the basis of equity, efficiency, and politics, [28,29].

Revenue allocations are based on a formula developed and approved by the state legislature, but with assistance from the state education agency. The basis for state formulas varies widely, but usually considers such factors as local revenue, local tax capacity, economies of scale, as well as other special needs [30]. While state allocations

are usually formula based, the political nature of developing and approving the formulas leaves substantial leeway for allocation systems to respond to each of these values.

1.7.4.1 Equity

In the USA according to [31]; state decision-makers could assign all the weight in the social welfare function to equity, by "leveling-out" revenues across districts in an absolute sense. However, this absolutist approach would ignore the classic moral hazard problem associated with state revenue equalization efforts. If local school districts recognize that state revenues are forthcoming up to the point of equalization, then there is no incentive for local taxing authorities to tax their own residents. Therefore, full equalization is never guaranteed, and the state allocation formula always depends on both local revenue effort and the tax capacity of the local district. Tax capacity is the ability of citizens of the district to pay for education [31,31]. also report that in USA twenty-four states use assessed property valuation in evaluating tax capacity. Nine additional states consider property valuation along with a range of other revenue sources such as user fees, investments, and bonds. An additional fourteen states consider property valuation and personal income in measuring tax capacity. The formulas whereby local revenues combine with tax capacity to determine the rate of revenue equalization vary widely [30].

Another reason why absolute equalization might not be an appropriate standard is that it would ignore the special circumstances that differentiate local districts. For example, rural districts have higher transportation costs and often suffer diseconomies of scale from smaller student populations [30]. An argument can be made that absolute equalization would penalize rural districts by not allowing for these differences. On the other hand, urban taxpayers have higher total tax bills due to higher service levels and a larger number of taxing authorities. An argument can be made that urban should therefore receive more state funding to compensate taxpayers for these disadvantages. There are also wide variations in the number of "special need" students across districts. Absolute revenue equalization ignores the higher costs of educating gifted, disabled, or disadvantaged students, thereby penalizing other students within a district. Thus, absolute revenue equalization would not actually bring parity of inputs. It is on this point that this study seeks to determine if revenue equalization is adopted when allocating funds to public primary schools in Mwala Constituency.

1.7.4.2 *Efficiency*

State education finance institutions may also consider the positive externalities associated with education in their allocation decisions. An externality occurs whenever the activities of one economic agent affect the activities of another economic agent in ways that are not reflected in normal transactions [29]. In other words, a higher gain to society results if state allocation decisions take into account potential gains beyond the benefit to the local residents. Reallocation based on positive externalities is generally recognized to result in greater allocative efficiency. Allocative efficiency means arranging inputs so as to produce the greatest gains for society [29]. The state produces the greatest allocative efficiency by redistributing funds toward regions with higher marginal returns [29].

Notes that, generally, educated workers have higher long-term earnings potential, and also provide a more

attractive environment for business investment. By subsidizing local education the state gains the long-term benefits of a stronger economy and higher tax revenues. Since the potential for improvement is greater in regions with less well-educated citizens, the state should target these regions to produce higher marginal returns. Additionally, an educated workforce is important to minimizing such problems as illiteracy, unemployment, poverty, and crime. Therefore, the state will spend less future money on unemployment compensation, welfare payments, law enforcement, prisons, and other effects related to low education. Accordingly, states should also target regions with high unemployment and poverty to maximize marginal gains and minimize future payments for these problems [29].

Allocation efficiency is a concept that is theoretically distinct from equity and distributive politics. If an allocation produces higher marginal gains for the state, relative to other possible allocations, then it should be considered allocationally efficient [29]. Of course, illiteracy, unemployment, poverty, and related anomalies are typically higher in the same regions where schools are poorly funded. Therefore, it may be difficult to distinguish between state allocations based on these more specific problems versus a thrust for revenue equalization [32].

1.7.4.3 *Distributive Politics*

States may also reallocate resources between regions based purely on political considerations. The weight given to distributive politics in the social welfare function may be due to a genuine belief by decision-makers that reallocation is somehow socially beneficial. For example, a social benefit may derive from reallocating toward regions with heavy concentrations of certain racial or ethnic groups. However, democratic decision-makers need not have such normative rationale, and may allocate politically on the basis of self-interest and the re-election incentive [33, 34].

The state politics literature suggests that state decision makers respond to citizen preferences across a variety of policy arenas. For example, [35]. found that state welfare payments respond to the cultural conservatism of a state's citizens. Likewise, [36]. showed that the relative progressiveness of a state's tax system depends on state liberalism. [37]. Found that state indebtedness responds democratically to the relative liberalism of a state's citizens. More generally, [38]. found congruence between citizen and government liberalism and state allocations across a range of policy areas. There is also need to control for political responsiveness to various group effects in the process of evaluating the importance of equity in the social welfare function [38].

According to [39]; over the period 2003-2007, the NARC government expanded fiscal decentralisation efforts by introducing several constituency level funds that are popularly referred to as devolved funds. These funds are transferred from central government to constituencies, and the authority to identify and manage projects legally rests with the residents of the constituencies. They include one block grant—the Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF) - introduced in 1999 and financed mainly by 5% of national income tax and targeted grants such as the Free Primary Education Programme, the Constituency Development Fund (CDF), the Secondary Education Bursary Scheme (SEBS), the Constituency Aids Fund, the Youth Enterprise Fund, the Rural Electrification Programme and most recently, the secondary school tuition fee waiver. Most of these funds were implemented

within the last two years of the NARC government. Despite the introduction of these funds, calls for more political decentralisation remain. Indeed in 2007, one of the key issues on the election platform was whether Kenya should go into a regional form of government thereby indicating that fiscal decentralisation efforts may not be addressing pertinent issues of political and economic development adequately [39].

1.7.4.4 The Constituency Development Fund

According to [40]; the State University of New York Center for International Development (SUNY/CID) kicked off a major project on "constituency development funds' with a workshop for 25 academicians and practitioners at the University at Albany's Rockefeller College on 8-9 December 2009. Constituency development fund (CDF) is the generic name for a policy tool that dedicates public money to benefit specific political subdivisions through allocations and/or spending decisions influenced by their representatives in the national parliament. According to [41]; as economies in the "developing world" grow and their political systems become increasingly stable, CDFs have become increasingly popular. They are found in a growing and diverse set of developing countries, such as Kenya, Bhutan, Jamaica and Papua New Guinea, as well as in the distributive politics (generally called "pork barrel") in US national and state level policy making. Operations of CDFs remain controversial in donor communities because they raise fundamental questions about democratic theory, the efficacy of government service delivery, the extent to which such service delivery can be made accountable, the role of legislators in selecting development priorities, and how public participation in policy making can be made more meaningful. It is a propitious time to launch a comprehensive program of exploratory and practical research on CDFs [41].

CDF is one of the many development initiatives being undertaken by the Government of Kenya to address poverty in the country. The main purpose of the fund is to ensure that a specific portion of the Annual Government Ordinary Revenue (AGOR) is devoted to the constituencies for purpose of development and in particular the fight against poverty at the constituency level. CDF fund projects are community based and benefit a widespread cross-section of inhabitants of particular area. CDF funds cannot be used for purpose of supporting political or religious bodies or activities [42].

According to [43]; the fund was established through the CDF Act (2003) and CDF (Amendment) Act 2007. The Act covers the legal and institutional framework through which the fund operates. It shifts planning/identification of projects to the local communities, hence a bottom-up planning approach to development. At least 2.5% of AGOR is allocated for CDF program. Three quarter of the amount is divided equitably between the 210 constituencies, while the remaining quarter is allocated to constituencies based on their poverty ranking [43]. CDF Act has created several official bodies to carry out specific functions to ensure smooth running of the program.

1.7.4.4.1 Assessment of Co-financing of CDF by Donor Agencies

According to [42]; CDF funding is complimentary to other development initiative of government. Therefore, the government has encouraged CDF beneficiaries to seek other donors to complement its effort. Section 26 & 36 of

the CDF Act allow for co-funding of projects. The Act requires that where co-funding is undertaken, the name of co-funder shall be acknowledged in the sign board and the amount involved specified. Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF) and Parents Teachers Association (PTA) are some of the major co-funders of the CDF projects. LATF has mainly co-funded in infrastructure and public utility projects like public toilets, roads, schools and market stalls, while different school PTAs have co-funded some of the school projects like classrooms, dormitories and laboratories. Some constituencies like Marakwet East and West have co-funded in projects like Marakwet Medical Training College. Some of the project's key donors include AIC Church, and Watt brothers who have contributed over KSh20 million while CDF has contributed over KSh6 million [42].

1.7.4.2 Transparency & Accountability

According to Constituencies Development Fund Act (Amendment) of 2007 there are mechanisms in place which allow co-funding while at the same time ensures transparency and accountability. Such mechanisms include the requirement that each co-funder in a joint project fund a specific phase or activity in a project. To enhance transparency each donor is acknowledged on a sign board which may indicate a specific activity done and if possible amount of fund contributed. Funds from CDF are banked in an account with suffix word *CDF*. These funds are not mixed with other donors or beneficiary's funds. This is to ensure more accountability and transparency. This also ensures that CDF funds are protected from any bank overdrafts in the respective beneficiary account. Separate donor bank account ensures that each donor can examine/query any expenditure and bank transaction relating to respective donor's amount [8].

1.8 Emerging issues in CDF utilisation

According to the Constituencies Development Fund Board Report to the Commissioners of Revenue Allocation Commission on CDF Resource Allocation Criteria, implementation of the CDF programme is facing a number of challenges. They include:

1. Low capacity of the committees leading to poor projects implementation.
2. Lack of community participation which leads to implementation of projects that are non-aligned to their needs.
3. Spreading of funds to too many projects – This is caused by lack of proper planning and giving consideration to political expedience rather than considering the benefits to the communities.
4. Lack of proper architectural designs and drawings make the most estimates too low with the effect that most projects are allocated insufficient funds.
5. Poor quality of work due to non-involvement of professionals.
6. Lack of proper Bill of Quanities which leads to difficulties in monitoring works in progress.
7. Lack of supervision by the technical departments which leads to poor quality of projects and misappropriation of funds.
8. Multiple roles by different government officials which makes it difficult to coordinate the results from the projects.
9. Lack of proper records at the grass root level such as PMC and CDFC.

10. Political interests and struggle for scarce resources results in skewed projects in one side of the constituency.
11. Abandonment of projects which results in wastage of resources.
12. Failure to differentiate between white elephant projects and key projects.
13. Lack of separation of powers between the MPs and CDF committees (conflict of interest) [44].

The CFD board has attempted to address these challenges in the following ways:

1. The Board partners with international organizations such as UNDP, ADB etc on periodic capacity-building and preparation of manuals of main CDF stakeholders especially grass roots management units.
2. Computerization of the CDF Board hopes to link the secretariat office to the constituencies in an attempt to improve data processing and access to information by all stakeholders.
3. The CDF Board has formulated a Strategic Plan for 2010 – 2014 aimed at guiding its operations.
4. To address mismanagement of the Fund, the Board has put in place key measures such as coming up with policy guidelines and the Taskforce Review whose recommendations will address the existing gaps within the CDF Act.
5. Strengthening of audit systems and collaboration with investigating agencies i.e. Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission and Criminal Investigation Department on cases touching on fraud.
6. To intensify Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, the Board is in the process of hiring registered Structural Engineers, Quality Surveyors and other staff on full-time basis. Their key role will be to monitor and evaluate CDF projects.
7. Public education campaigns to create awareness and to enhance community participation in project identification and implementation [44].

This study therefore sought to establish the extent to which these solutions to the challenges have enhanced CDF's efficiency in enhancing KCPE performance in public primary schools in Mwala Constituency.

According to [45]; construction of new schools and the freeze on teacher employment are the main factors behind the severe shortage of staff, which was declared a national crisis by principals at their conference in Mombasa. According to the Republic of Kenya in 2009 the number of classrooms in primary schools rose from 209,000 in 2008 to 220,000 in 2009. The pupil enrolment also went up from 8.6 million to 8.8 million, an increase of nearly three million from 2002 levels. But all the expansion has not been met by a corresponding increase in the number of teachers. Currently, there are only 219,387 teachers in public primary and secondary schools, down from an average of 240,000 in the last decade when enrolment was much lower [11].

A survey by [45]; established that at least 1,000 new schools have been established using the Constituency Development Fund at a time when the government has stopped hiring teachers. It is mostly these new schools that have led to the creation of 13,223 classrooms in primary and secondary schools over a one-year period between 2008 and 2009. It revealed that all regions in the country fear that the quality of learning is quickly deteriorating as a rise in the number of pupils remains unmatched by the supply of teachers. It is estimated that 65,000 more staff are required to ensure quality learning, according to TSC statistics for last year (2009) [45].

According to [13] in the East African Standard 30th December 2010, in the North Rift and Western, education officials and parents want construction of additional schools using CDF stopped with parents saying that they were being forced to employ teachers for the new schools. On average 10 schools have been built in each of the constituencies in the North Rift region using the CDF. "Teachers are being transferred from long established schools to those set up using CDF, causing serious imbalance of staff," Wareng district education officer Elizabeth Otieno said. She disclosed that the district was faced with a shortage of 301 primary school teachers [13]. "One teacher has to coach a stream of between 120 and 150 students which amounts to an over-load," MsOtieno said. The situation is similar in Eldoret East with the district education officer Jama Gama adding that at Kiptechmet Primary School, three teachers were handling an average of 300 pupils while at Chelelek in the same area, four teachers handle up to 400 pupils [45]. Parents called for planned use of the CDF money instead of duplication of projects as in the case of "unnecessary" schools. Eldoret parent William Koech proposed merging some of the schools to resolve the under-staffing problem (East African Standard 30th December (2010).

1.9 Impact of Basic Education Financing on Pupil Performance

As the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005pointed out, lack of textbooks and other teaching materials (vital for better learning) are also causes for concern in the education sectors. While there is no general theory as to what determines the quality of education, studies conducted in developing countries point to significant relationships between cognitive achievement and school expenditure. Evidence from a growing body of experimental studies suggests that school performance (as measured by test scores) is significantly improved by textbook provision, smaller class sizes, adequate instructional time, teacher qualifications and training, and teaching practices. These findings are particularly true for children belonging to disadvantaged social backgrounds [46].

Reference [47] noted that the cross-country studies of quality outcomes show consistent effect of resources on education outcomes. Studies using internationally comparable test scores tend to show that resources have a significant impact, but the direction of this impact differs across studies. In [47]; the pupil-teacher ratio has a negative and significant impact on achievement. Using similar data, the [48] study reports a positive but insignificant result, while the [49] study, using class size as the resource variable, reports a positive and significant impact. These last two results suggest that smaller class sizes are associated with better achievement and, that the greater the level of resources available, the better the performance. Other measures of resources used in these studies also show inconclusive or counter-intuitive results. The two studies that explore the impact of per pupil expenditures on test scores, for instance, find that higher levels of expenditure are associated with higher levels of achievement, although in only one of these studies is this effect significant [47,48].

No low-income countries were represented, and only South Africa from the African continent. It is unclear, therefore, whether the absence of a consistent link between public expenditure and education resources would also be found in low-income developing countries, and in particular in Sub- Saharan Africa which forms a basis of the current study.

In a study by [47]. the pupil-teacher ratio is positively and significantly associated with these measures of

quality outcomes. These results, coupled with the results from the test score studies, suggest that larger pupil-teacher ratios are associated with poorer internal efficiency and therefore poorer test scores. In addition to these results, Reference [50] looks at the impact of resources on Grade 5 survival rates. This study shows that per pupil expenditure is a significant determinant of primary school survival rates: higher levels of per pupil expenditure tend to increase the persistence of primary school pupils.

Reference [51] argues, however, that there may be a slightly stronger link between resources and achievement in developing countries, because education systems in developing countries tend to be so severely under-resourced compared to developed countries that marginal increases in resourcing are likely to have much larger impacts on education outcomes than in developed countries. A study of Tanzania documents clearly shows how different values of the same education expenditure measure are reported in different documents for the same year [52].

In some countries, a large proportion of education expenditure is not allocated to specific education sub-sectors and, in some cases, this unallocated category includes expenditure that is in fact sub-sector specific. For example, textbook provision for all levels of the education system, in many SSA countries, is centrally controlled, and this expenditure falls into the unallocated category as it is not always disaggregated by education level [52]. While UNESCO attempts to ensure the resource measures it reports are comparable, it is likely that there is some variation in the definition of these resource variables across countries. Further inaccuracies in the education expenditure data may occur because expenditure recorded as being spent on education may in fact be diverted for other uses. For example, in Uganda a public expenditure tracking survey found that only 30 per cent of capitation grants intended for schools actually reached them [53].

According to [54] the effectiveness of the public expenditure management system is also an important area in which the link between resources and outcomes is mediated. Unfortunately, no data are available to measure the effectiveness of public education expenditure. The budgetary process and the relationship between planning and budgeting are key to understanding the relationship between public expenditure and education outcomes, and it has been argued that a major reason why education reforms have failed in the past is because they have neglected the budgeting process [54,54]. further notes that in many developing countries, decisions regarding the composition of education expenditure are partly determined by budgetary outturns. When available resources fall short of planned expenditure it is easier to cut back on textbook provision than on teachers' salaries, which leads to inefficient resource allocations.

Reference [55] argues that current allocations of resources across different input categories (e.g. teachers, textbooks) are inconsistent with an output maximizing model of input choice. They argue that if this composition were altered by, for example, spending additional resources in a different way, this spending would lead to better education outcomes. Evidence from studies suggests that the cost-effectiveness of teacher salaries is low in comparison with other inputs such as textbooks and other instructional materials. This implies that additional resources concentrated towards non-salary inputs may have larger impacts on education out comes [55].

In a study by Kennedy Omondi Otieno [13] on teaching and learning resources and academic performance in

mathematics in secondary schools in Bondo District of Kenya, the results show that classroom/laboratories and stationeries/teaching aids are significant. These findings are in consonance with the findings of [56] and the report by [57]. which opined that teaching/learning materials such as textbooks, class rooms, teaching aids (chalk, board, ruler and protractor), stationeries and laboratories affect academic performance of the learners. Also the result of the findings agreed with that of [58] who asserted that learning is strengthened when there are enough reference materials such as textbooks, exercise books, teaching aids and class rooms. He further asserted that academic achievement illustrates per excellence the correct use of these materials. The implication of this result is that provision of conducive classrooms and laboratories and other teaching/learning resources can positively change teachers' attitude to the teaching of mathematics and make the subject to be very interesting, meaningful and exciting to the students and hence will encourage mathematical exploration and manipulation by students which will keep them alive and thinking and will also help them to realize the applications of mathematics [58].

The implication of this finding is that without government financial support to the schools, most of the infrastructures like classroom buildings and other learning materials may not be available for use by the students. It is therefore necessary that the government should increase its support both financially and materially towards support of teaching/learning of mathematics in all schools in Kenya. Lack of trained teachers was found to be significant [58]. This is in agreement with that of [59] who asserted that experience and qualification is the best asset for handling a task. In his findings, teaching is one of the duties that require both qualification and experience for better delivery. Recruitment of competent teachers to improve teacher-student ratio is a necessary measure in improving performance.

2. Research Methodology

The study adopted the descriptive survey design. Survey research design can be defined as a technique where detailed information concerning social phenomena is collected by posing questions to respondents such that it becomes possible to find explanation of social phenomena in question. Survey design concerns with gathering of facts or pertinent and precise information concerning the correct status of phenomena and when possible conclusions from the facts discovered. The design was used to investigate the efficiency of the CDF funds on enhancing KCPE performance in public primary schools in Mwala Constituency.

Table 2.1: Impact of CDF funds on performance

	Head teachers		**Teachers**	
Response	**Frequency**	**Percentage**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Very positive	7	33.3	9	9.1
Positive	11	52.5	64	65.3
No impact	2	9.5	12	12.2
Negative impact	1	4.7	13	13.4
Total	**21**	**100.0**	**98**	**100.0**

Table 2.2: Use of CDF on provision of physical facilities

		Head teachers		Teachers	
Solution	**Response**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**
CDF has been used to ease overcrowding in classes by being used to build extra classes.	Yes	15	71.4	74	75.5
	No	6	28.6	24	24.5
	Total	**21**	**100.0**	**98**	**100.0**
CDF has been used to acquire more land for the inadequate playground.	Yes	2	9.5	12	12.2
	No	19	90.5	86	87.8
	Total	**21**	**100.0**	**98**	**100.0**
CDF has been used to build extra toilets and renovate existing ones.	Yes	16	76.1	55	56.1
	No	5	23.9	43	43.9
	Total	**21**	**100.0**	**98**	**100.0**
CDF has been used to purchase more desks	Yes	1	4.7	10	11.3
	No	20	95.3	88	88.7
	Total	**21**	**100.0**	**98**	**100.0**
CDF has been used to provide clean drinking water to the school.	Yes	1	4.7	14	14.2
	No	20	95.3	84	85.8
	Total	**21**	**100.0**	**98**	**100.0**

Table 2.3: Use of CDF in providing teaching and learning resources

		Head teachers		Teachers	
Solution	**Response**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**
CDF has solved the issue of lack of textbooks by being used to buy more textbooks.	Yes	2	9.5	12	12.2
	No	19	90.5	86	87.8
	Total	**21**	**100.0**	**98**	**100.0**
CDF has eased inadequacy of exercise books by being used to buy new exercise books.	Yes	3	14.2	11	52.3
	No	18	85.8	87	47.7
	Total	**21**	**100.0**	**98**	**100.0**
CDF has been used to purchase more resource books	Yes	0	0.0	12	12.2
	No	21	100.0	86	87.8
	Total	**21**	**100.0**	**98**	**100.0**
CDF has been used to purchase teaching aids e.g. maps, charts, class reader and science facilities.	Yes	1	4.7	8	8.1
	No	20	95.3	90	91.9
	Total	**21**	**100.0**	**98**	**100.0**
CDF has been used to purchase more playing facilities such as balls and nets.	Yes	0	0.0	5	5.1
	No	21	100.0	93	94.9
	Total	**21**	**100.0**	**98**	**100.0**

2.1 Data Analysis and Discussion of Results

This study assessed the efficiency of the CDF in enhancing KCPE performance in public primary schools in Mwala Constituency. It looked into the efficiency of CDF in the provision of school physical facilities, teaching and learning resources and school personnel. The study also examined CDF-related challenges experienced by schools.

Table 2.4: CDF's impact on provision of school personnel

		Head teachers		Teachers	
Solution	**Response**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**
CDF has been used to hire more teachers to ease the issue of teacher shortage.	Yes	2	9.5	3	3.0
	No	19	90.5	95	97.0
	Total	**21**	**100.0**	**98**	**100.0**
CDF has been used to employ more non-teaching staff	Yes	0	0.0	2	2.0
	No	21	100.0	96	98.0
	Total	**21**	**100.0**	**98**	**100.0**

Table 2.5: Allocation of CDF funds to schools

Response	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Have received CDF funds	21	100.0
Have not received CDF funds	0	0.0
Total	**21**	**100.0**

Table 2.6: Amount allocated to schools

Years	**Amount allocated**	**No. Of schools**
2008	Nil	16
	100,000	2
	300,000	2
	200,000	1
Total	**600,000**	**21**
2009	Nil	11
	90,000	1
	93,000	1
	200,000	2
	300,000	4
	400,000	2
Total	**1,083,000**	**21**
2010	Nil	8
	100,000	1
	150,000	1
	250,000	1
	300,000	7
	350,000	1
	400,000	2
Total	**1,550,000**	**21**

Table 2.7: Attendance of CDF in-service training by head teachers

Response	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Have attended	2	9.5
Have not attended	19	90.5
Total	**21**	**100.0**

Table 2.8: Teachers' involvement in CDF application

Response	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Are involved	30	30.6
Are not involved	68	69.4
Total	**98**	**100.0**

Table 2.9: Role of teachers during CDF application. **N = 30.**

Response	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Giving opinion about the projects to be undertaken.	23	76.6
Presenting views on the problems in the school such as shortage of instructional materials.	21	70.0
Participate in the preparation of the Bill of Quantity.	19	63.3
Participating in the school development committee.	18	60.0
Planning and management of CDF funds.	17	56.6
Calculating the sum required for the projects.	16	53.3
Taking the bill of quantity to CDF offices	3	10.0

Table 2.10: Priority areas for CDF funding. **N = 21.**

Area	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Construction of classrooms	18	85.7
Construction of workshops and offices	13	61.9
Purchasing desks	6	28.5
Hiring of guards	6	28.5
Hiring of school cooks,	3	14.2
Hiring of grounds men	2	9.5
Hiring of teachers,	2	9.5
Purchasing of textbooks	2	9.5
Purchasing of exercise books,	1	4.7
Construction of laboratories	0	0.0
Purchasing of chalk,	0	0.0
Purchasing of pens and pencils,	0	0.0
Purchasing of wall maps,	0	0.0
Purchasing of rulers	0	0.0
Purchasing of markers	0	0.0
Hiring of laboratory technicians,	0	0.0

Table 2.11: Identification of funding areas. **N = 98.**

Response	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Recommendations from the school committee	72	73.4
Recommendation from departments	31	31.6
Recommendations on the CDF committee	20	20.4
Headteachers' discretion	8	8.1
Area member of parliaments discretion	5	5.1

Table 2.1: Factors considered when allocating funds

Response	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
School needs	14	66.8
Specific projects in the schools	4	19.0
Poverty levels of parents	3	14.2
School total population	0	0.0
Total	**21**	**100.0**

Table 2.13: Challenges facing utilisation of CDF according to head teachers. **N = 21.**

Challenge	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Inadequate CDF allocated to schools.	20	95.2
High expectations from the community while not taking into account the amount allocated.	18	85.7
Interference from politicians/provincial administration through inciting parents against head teachers.	18	85.7
Lack of support from line ministries during implementation of projects.	17	80.9
Lack of skilled masons (fundis) to undertake school projects.	17	80.9
Frequency fluctuation of materials' prices.	17	80.9
Some suppliers hiking materials' prices to schools.	16	76.1
Difficult to get approval from the Ministry of Works.	15	71.4
Monitoring of utilization of CDF being done by unprofessional who tend to incite parents.	14	66.6
Conflicting advice from various stakeholders.	14	66.6
Lack of proper utilization of CDF due to inadequate training in CDF management.	13	61.9
Lack of support from parents in terms of supplying materials and labor.	12	57.1
Mistrust of head teachers by CDF officials.	12	57.1
Demand for bribes by Ministry of works officers before they approve school building plans.	11	52.3

Table 2.14: Solutions to Challenges facing utilisation of CDF according to head teachers. **N = 21.**

Challenge	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Adequate funds should be allocated as per project needs.	20	95.2
Money should be allocated when needed without delay.	18	85.7
CDF committees should carry out a needs assessment in all schools in the constituency.	17	80.9
.		
The CDF application process should be reformed to make it less tedious.	16	76.1
CDF should come up with clear requirements on how to allocate the funds instead of schools having to use influential people.	16	76.1
Fairness should be exercised when allocating CDF funds to schools.	15	71.4
Teachers should be included in the CDF committees for they know better the needs of schools.	15	71.4
CDF should be channeled through NGOs and non-partisan (political) individuals.	12	57.1

The results of this study revealed that:

1. There is a general feeling among head teachers and teachers of public primary schools in Mwala Constituency that the introduction of CDF for schools has had a positive impact on KCPE performance.
2. That as much as most schools have a number of physical facilities, the facilities are largely inadequate and therefore have had a negative impact on KCPE performance. It was established that most schools in the constituency lack adequate water for use in schools, desks and playgrounds, an indication that CDF funds are not adequately being channeled towards providing these facilities. It was further revealed that CDF funds have mostly been channeled towards construction of classrooms and offices.
3. The study also revealed that as much as all schools have teaching and learning resources, most of these resources are largely inadequate and that CDF has not largely been channeled towards providing these resources.
4. Study findings also show that most public primary schools in Mwala Constituency are experiencing a shortage of teachers as shown by the fact that most of the schools have one teacher per class. Further, the CDF has not been widely used to employ more teachers in most schools as seen by very few teachers having been employed by school committees. The findings also show that teachers are teaching many or all subjects which may affect their lesson planning as well as content delivery thus affecting KCPE performance. It was also revealed that schools are faced with a problem of shortage of school non-teaching personnel and that CDF has not been adequately channeled to these school personnel.
5. Inequitable allocation of CDF funds was found to be one of the challenges facing public primary schools in Mwala Constituency. Schools also have to go through challenges associated to application for funds through terms which involve having to present strong cases to the CDF committees so as to qualify for allocation of these funds. A substantial number of head teachers found the CDF application process not convenient and therefore a challenge to them. Some schools are also faced with a challenge of having to lobby for CDF funds which exposes them to acts of extortion from unscrupulous CDF officials.
6. The study also established that head teachers are experiencing a challenge of lack of training on CDF funds and therefore lack adequate knowledge on issues pertaining to the CDF fund and may therefore experience problems when applying for the funds as well as when utilising the funds. Another challenge was that most teachers are never involved in the CDF application process and therefore being the implementers of the school programmers, their views are not incorporated leading to a situation where priorities for funds are not very beneficial to pupils thus affecting their performance. Other major challenges include:

    (a) Inadequate CDF funds allocated to schools.
    (b) High expectations from the community while not taking into account the amount allocated.
    (c) Interference by politicians/provincial administration through inciting parents against the head teachers.
    (d) Lack of support from line ministries during implementation of projects,
    (e) Lack of skilled masons (fundis) to undertake school projects,
    (f) Frequent fluctuations of prices of materials,
    (g) Some suppliers hiking materials' prices for schools,
    (h) Lack of teachers' involvement in budgeting and procurement processes,

(i) Poor management of CDF funds,
(j) Embezzlement of CDF funds meant for the school projects,
(k) Long application process before allocation is approved.

7. Solutions included:

(a) Adequate funds should be allocated as per project needs,
(b) CDF money should be allocated when needed without delay,
(c) CDF committees should carry out a needs assessment in all schools in the constituency.

2.2. Implications of the Study

The findings of the study have the following implications:

It was established that as much as most schools have a number of physical facilities, the facilities are largely inadequate. This means that most public primary schools in Mwala constituency have fallen short of providing an ideal learning environment for pupils. Most schools in the constituency also lack adequate water for use in schools which may expose pupils to discomfort caused by thirst or even to water borne diseases due to use of dirty water from streams. Lack of desks was also widely acknowledged which makes the learning process uncomfortable for pupils. Schools also lack playgrounds which deny pupils opportunities to play. It was also revealed that CDF funds have mostly been channeled towards construction of classrooms and offices. This has led to a situation where schools have adequate classrooms which cannot be fully utilised due to lack of teachers. It was therefore clear that inadequate school physical facilities has made teaching and learning in public primary schools in Mwala Constituency difficult and therefore impacted negatively on KCPE performance.

The study also revealed that as much as all schools have teaching and learning resources, most of these resources are largely inadequate. Lack of teaching and learning resources limits the effectiveness of any instructional processes and therefore leads to poor performance in KCPE. The fact that CDF has not largely been channeled towards providing these resources means that most schools are experiencing shortage of these facilities and therefore affecting KCPE performance negatively.

Study findings also show that CDF has not been widely used to employ school personnel in most public primary schools in Mwala Constituency. This means that schools are experiencing shortage of teachers and non-teaching staff forcing teachers to teach many subjects which interferes with their preparation for lessons thus affecting their content delivery. It also means that teachers have to deal with large classes of pupils which limit individual attention to the pupils, giving and marking of exercises and general control of classes during lessons. Shortage of non-teaching personnel means that schools lack personnel such as librarians, laboratory technicians and school cooks. This hampers school programmers leading to poor KCPE performance.

From the study findings, it was clear that schools are faced with challenges such as inequitable allocation of CDF funds, challenges associated with application for funds and utilisation of CDF funds. This means that many schools are denied a chance to have adequate funds at the right time and may not be able to properly implement

school projects due to lack of support and undue interference from stakeholders. This makes schools unable to acquire the much needed facilities thus impacting negatively on KCPE performance.

2.3 Conclusion

The findings of this study point to the following conclusions:

1. The introduction of CDF for schools has had a positive impact on KCPE performance.
2. That CDF funds are not adequately being channeled towards providing school physical facilities but are mostly being channeled towards construction of classrooms and offices leaving out other facilities such libraries, laboratories and workshops.
3. That CDF has not largely been channeled towards providing teaching and learning resources leading to inadequacy of such facilities in most public primary schools in Mwala Constituency.
4. That CDF has not been widely used to employ more teachers and non-teaching staff in most schools leading to shortage of these personnel in schools.
5. That CDF funds allocated to schools are inadequate to finance the provision of school facilities. The application process is also prone to abuse while the implementation process of school projects is also faced with challenges ranging from political interference, incompetent implementers and lack of accountability.

2.4. Recommendations

In view of the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. The government should increase budgetary allocation to the CDF so as to ensure that adequate funds are made available to schools and caution schools from inflationary tendencies. CDF committees should also carry out proper needs assessment in schools so as to allocate adequate funds to these schools.
2. The government, CDF committees and schools should carry out sensitization campaign to parents and school communities so as to ensure that there is enough support for school projects and also to avoid unfair criticism.
3. The government should carry out reforms on the CDF programme so as to make it free from political manipulation. This will go along in ensuring that the CDF programme is free of political interference by politicians and the provincial administration.
4. The line ministries which include the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Public Works should be more supportive to schools during the implementation of CDF projects so as to ensure that viable projects are identified and fully implemented.
5. School committees should ensure that skilled masons (fundis) are selected to undertake school projects so as to ensure that school projects are of good quality, less costly and completed on time.
6. The CDF and the relevant ministries should put in place proper CDF monitoring programmers so as to ensure that implementation of school projects in up to date.
7. The government and CDF committees should facilitate more capacity building programmers for CDF committees so as to ensure that the implementers are adequately knowledgeable.

8. Implementers of CDF projects should adhere to transparency accountability when implementing CDF projects so as to ensure proper implementation of the projects.
9. The government should put in place clear guidelines on the CDF fund so as to ensure that school committees are made more knowledgeable of the application processes thus limiting cases of some individuals taking advantage for extortion.
10. The process of implementation of CDF projects in schools should be all-inclusive to all stakeholders so that views of all the stakeholders are incorporated as a way of ensuring that projects identified are relevant and realistic.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost am grateful to the Almighty God for giving me courage and strength to pursue this academic enterprise to completion. May He be glorified and Honoured all the time.

My heartfelt appreciation and indebtedness goes to my supervisors Dr. Andrew Riechi and Mr. GatimuKiranga who gave me academic and professional guidance. Their commitment, patience, support and wise counsel made me feel academically enriched and inspired. In addition, I would wish to appreciate the Kenyatta University for giving me an opportunity to further my studies.

I wish to acknowledge with great thanks the support accorded to me by Joe and family members whose love, support and inspiration have seen me through this study. I am also indebted to several individuals for their contribution towards the success of this study. First of all to the D.E.O Mwala District for her support and assistance, all the Head teachers and teachers of the Public Primary Schools who showed me a lot of support through their co-operation during my fieldwork.

I thank all my class mates especially James Ndonga, Tom Ocholla, Jane Nyambura and Eunice Chepkemoi with whom we shared knowledge and experiences. Equally appreciated are members of the academic staff of Kenyatta University and my school staff who helped me during my years of study.

I owe my sincere gratitude to my wife for her continued moral support, encouragement and understanding throughout my study. Finally my friends and well-wishers, I thank you all.

References

[1.] Sifuna, D.N. (2005). "Partnership in Educational Assistance to African Countries: Rhetoric or Reality?" *Journal of International Cooperation in Education*, 3 (2), 3–21.

[2.] Government of India (1994). *The District Primary Education in India*. Available online: www.education.wic.in

[3.] World Education Forum, (2004). *The Dakar Framework for Action. Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments, World Education Forum 2000, Dakar, Senegal.* Paris: UNESCO.

[4.] World Bank. (2006). *Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP) Project Appraisal Document***.**Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

[5.] UNESCO (2004). *The Quality Imperative*.,EFA Global Monitorin Report 2005, Paris.

[6.] Republic of Kenya (2003a). *Free Primary Education: Every Child in School.* Nairobi: MoEST.

[7.] Republic of Kenya (2003b). *Constituencies Development Fund Act of 2003*. Nairobi: Government Printer.

[8.] Republic of Kenya (2007). *Ministry of Education Handbook on FPE in Kenya. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation*. Nairobi: Government Printer.

[9.] Republic of Kenya (2005). *Kenya Education Sector Support Programme 2005 – 2010: Delivering Quality Equitable Education and Training to All Kenyans.* Nairobi: Government Printer.

[10.] Al-Samarrai, S. (2002b). 'Bilateral and multilateral support for education and the EFA goals', Background Paper for the *UNESCO EFA Global Monitoring Report.*

[11.] Republic of Kenya (2008). *CDF Board Secretariat, 2008. National CDFC Training Report, 2008*. Nairobi: Government Printer.

[12.] Al-Samarrai, S. and Zaman, H. (2002). 'The changing distribution of public education expenditure in Malawi', *World Bank Africa Region Working Paper 29*

[13.] Otieno, S. (2010). "KCPE: The 'curse' of free education" in The East African Standard 30th December (2010). Nairobi: The Standard Media Group.

[14.] Farrell, J. P. and Heyneman, S.P. (1989). *Textbooks in the Developing World: Economic and Educational Choices*, EDI Seminar Series, World Bank, Washington D.C.

[15.] Lockheed, N. and Verspoor, A. (1991). *Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries.* New York: Oxford University Press for the World Bank.

[16.] Psacharopoulos G, Woodhall M (1985). *Education for Development and Analysis of Investment Choices.* Washington D.C: Oxford University Press.

[17.] Deolalikar, A. (1999). *Primary and Secondary Education in Kenya: A Sector Review*, mimeo, Human Development Sector Unit, Eastern Africa Region, The World Bank, Washington DC.

[18.] Knight, J.B. and Sabot, R.H. (1990). *Education, Production and Inequality: the East African Natural Experiment.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, for the World Bank.

[19.] Schultz, T.P., (2005). 'Accounting for public expenditures on education: an international panel study', *Yale Economic Growth Center Working Paper*, New Haven: Yale University.

[20.] Government of Botswana, (2007). *Report of the National Commission on Education.* Gaborone: Government Printer.

[21.] Arenstrop R (2008***). Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi and Uganda: Impact of Universal Primary Education.*** Washington DC: World Bank.

[22.] Oxfam & ANCEFA (2008). *UPE-Myth of Reality: A Review of Experiences, Challenges and Lessons from East Africa.*Nairobi.

[23.] Mukudi, E. (2004). Education for all: a framework for addressing the persisting illusion for the Kenyan context. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24, 231-240.

[24.] Republic of Kenya (2006b). *2006/2007 Budget Analysis, Ministry of Education*. Nairobi: Government Printer.

[25.] Psacharopoulos, G. (1994). *Returns to investment in education: A global update*. *World Dev.* 22(9), 1325-1343.

[26.] Harbison, R. and Hanushek, E., (1992). *Educational Performance of the Poor: Lessons from Rural Northeast Brazil.*New York: Oxford University Press.

[27.] Jamlson, D.T. and Lau, L.J. (1982). *Farmer Education and Farm Efficiency*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

[28.] Scholz, John T. and B. Dan Wood. (1999). Democratic Controls Over Bureaucratic Discretion: Are IRS Audits Equitable? *American Journal of Political Science*. 43: 1166-1188. *Serrano v. Priest*. 1971. 96 California Reporter 601.

[29.] Nicholson, Walter. (1998). *Microeconomic Theory: Basic Principles and Extensions. Seventh Edition.* New York: The Dryden Press.

[30.] Swanson, Austin D. and Richard A. King. (1997). *School Finance : Its Economics and Politics. 2nd Edition***.**New York : Longman Publishers.

[31.] Gold, Steven D., David M. Smith and Stephen B. Lawton. (1995). *Public School Finance Programs of the United States and Canada 1993-94.* New York: American Education Finance Association.

[32.] Downs, G. W. and Larke, D. P (1986). *The Search for Government Efficiency*. New York: Random House.

[33.] Ferejohn, J. A. (1974). *Pork Barrel Politics: Rivers and Harbors Legislation, 1947-1968***.** Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

[34.] Fiorina, Morris P. (1977). *Congress: Keystone of the Washington Establishment.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

[35.] Hill, Kim Q. and Jan Leighley. (1992). The Policy Consequences of Class Bias in State Electorates. *American Journal of Political Science*. 36: 351-65.

[36.] Morgan, David R. (1994). Tax Equity in the American States. *Social Science Quarterly*. 75: 510-23.

[37.] Clingermayer, James C. and B. Dan Wood. (1995). Disentangling Patterns of State Debt Financing. *American Political Science Review*. 89: 108-20.

[38.] Erikson, Robert S., Gerald C. Wright, Jr., and John P. McIver. (1989). Political Parties, Public Opinion, and State Policy in the United States. *American Political Science Review*. 83:728-50.

[39.] Gikonyo,W. (2006). "Decentralised Funds in Kenya: Working Paper." Nairobi: Hanns Seidel Foundation. Institute of Economic Affairs and the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights.

[40.] Bruton, H. and C. Hill, Eds. (1997). **T***he Evaluation of Public Expenditure in Africa*. Washington DC: World Bank.

[41.] Obok, E (2008). Impact of Constituencies Development Fund In Socio Economic Structure in Kenya, http://www.scribd.com/doc/20116188 .

[42.] Barasa, R. M. (2010). "Review of Constituencies Development Fund Projects A North Rift Case Study 3rd Draft October 2010." Energy, Environment & Development Network For Africa (AFREPREN).

[43.] Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2008). *Economic Survey 2008*. Nairobi: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics.

[44.] Republic of Kenya (2011). *Constituencies Development Fund Board: Presentation to the Commissioners of Revenue Allocation on CDF Resource Allocation Criteria*. Nairobi: Government Printer.

[45.] Siringi, S, Muyanga, P., Bii, B., Amadala, B., Wanzala, O. and Nyagesiba, B. (2010).*CDF Schools, Freeze Hiring Causing Teacher Shortfall.* Daily Nation Online 23rd June 2010.

[46.] UNESCO (2005). *EFA Imperatives in the E9: EFA Global Monitoring Report - 2005*. Paris: 7 place de Fontenoy 75352 07 SP, France

[47.] Lee, J. W. and Barro, R.J., (1997). *Schooling Quality in a Cross Section of Countries.*Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.

[48.] Hanushek, E.A. and Kimko, D.D., (2000). 'Schooling, labor-force quality, and the growth of nations', *American Economic Review*, Vol 5: 1184–208.

[49.] Wössmann, L., (2000). 'New evidence on the missing resource–performance link in education', *Working Paper 1051*, Kiel Institute of World Economics.

[50.] McMahon, W., (1999). *Education and Development: Measuring the Social Benefits*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

[51.] Hanushek, E.A., (2006). 'School Resources and Student Performance', in G. Burtless (ed.), *Does Money Matter? The Effect of School Resources on Student Achievement and AdultSuccess***.** Washington, D.C., Brookings Institution Press.

[52.] Samoff, J., (1991). 'The facade of precision in education data and statistics: a troubling example from Tanzania', *Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol 29 No 4: 669–89.

[53.] Ablo, E. and Reinikka, R. (1998). 'Do budgets really matter? Evidence from public spending on education and health in Uganda.' *Policy Research Working Paper 1926,* Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

[54.] Penrose, P., (1993). 'Planning and financing sustainable education systems in sub-Saharan Africa', *Education Research Paper 39*, London: Department for International Development.

[55.] Pritchett, L. and Filmer, D., (1999). 'What education production functions really show: a positive theory of education expenditures', *Economics of Education Review Vol 18 No 2: 223–39.*

[56.] Yadar. K. (2007). *Teaching of Life Sciences*. New Delhi, Anmol Publication. Ltd. India.

[57.] UNESCO (2008). *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2009: Overcoming Inequality: Why Governance Matters*. Paris: UNESCO.

[58.] Mutai, B.K. (2006). *How to write quality research proposal: a complete and simplified recipe*. New York: Talley Publications.

[59.] Birgen, P. (2005). A teacher can Break or Make A child. *Education Insight.* Nairobi: Insight Publishers.