

# Influence of Cost Sharing Policy on Provision of Physical Facilities in Public Day Secondary Schools: A Comparative Study of Trans-Nzoia and West Pokot Counties, Kenya

Tiluk Samuel, Kennedy Oirere Onchiri, Ronald Werunga Kikechi

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i4/4002>

DOI:10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i4/4002

*Received: 24 Jan 2018, Revised: 07 Mar 2018, Accepted: 10 April 2018*

Published Online: 19 April 2018

**In-Text Citation:** (Samuel, Onchiri, & Kikechi, 2018)

**To Cite this Article:** Samuel, T., Onchiri, K. O., & Kikechi, R. W. (2018). Influence of Cost Sharing Policy on Provision of Physical Facilities in Public Day Secondary Schools: A Comparative Study of Trans-Nzoia and West Pokot Counties, Kenya. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8(4), 153–165.

**Copyright:** © 2018 The Author(s)

Published by Human Resource Management Academic Research Society ([www.hrmars.com](http://www.hrmars.com))

This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this license may be seen

at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

**Vol. 8, No. 4, April 2018, Pg. 153 - 165**

<http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/IJARBSS>

JOURNAL HOMEPAGE

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at  
<http://hrmars.com/index.php/pages/detail/publication-ethics>

## **Influence of Cost Sharing Policy on Provision of Physical Facilities in Public Day Secondary Schools: A Comparative Study of Trans-Nzoia and West Pokot Counties, Kenya**

**Tiluk Samuel**

Master of Education in Comparative and International Education, Kisii University  
Email: iombaso@gmail.com

**Dr. Kennedy Oirere Onchiri, Dr. Ronald Werunga Kikechi**  
Lecturer, Kisii University Kitale Campus

### **Abstract**

The purpose of the study was to analyze cost sharing policy on provision of physical facilities in public day secondary schools: a case of Trans Nzoia and West Pokot Counties Kenya. The study was guided by the following objectives: to identify the effect of community on physical facilities development, role of government in physical facility development, role of partners and the removal of Parents Teachers Association support in physical facility development in Trans Nzoia and West Pokot Counties. The study was based on classical liberal theory. Descriptive survey was used by the researcher and research was employed in research design. Simple and stratified techniques of sampling were employed during the study. Target population for the study took into account all government-aided day secondary schools within Trans Nzoia and West Pokot Counties, out of which 86 schools were sampled. Observation schedules and questionnaires were the tools used to collect data which is quantitative in nature and the presented in frequencies of tables and analysis done by use of SPSS. The major findings indicated that majority of the schools were majorly supported by the communities, physical facilities and materials were lacking, majority schools charged the recommended ministry fees, majority of the schools relied on parents contributions to develop physical infrastructure, that government did not support physical infrastructural development, there is little support of the non state actors in physical development and there is a lacuna on physical infrastructure development. In the recommendations, the government needs to budget for and dispatch the finances directly to such schools on time; the government needs to initiate a strategy of building additional; sports facility, classrooms, toilets as well as science labs, transport infrastructure for schools, government should set aside resources to clear the debts owed by schools to avoid the

skyrocketing interest accrued to this debts now that the Parents Association fund stands disqualified and the researcher also recommends that schools and stakeholders should rally donors and well wishers to support school facility development. Further research should be conducted on relationship between boards of management capacity in resource utilization in secondary schools and out the alternative and sustainable vehicle to school infrastructure funding.

**Keywords:** Community Participation, Partners, and Physical Faculties.

## Introduction

According to Oketch (2000) and Johnston (1986, 2003, 2004), the concept of cost sharing was introduced to the education sector as a measure to share the burden of service costs in schools to the students and parents which was wholly in the hands of the governments, after economic liberalization in 1980s. Kitogo (2010) defined cost sharing policy in education to mean; shifting portion of financial burden of higher learning from government to the students and their parents. The policy of cost sharing has been accepted and adopted by many countries both in developing and developed world. According to Tobyehatch, (2013) there is ever rising costs of education overtime to the extent that out paces the demands of the consumer. In the United States of America for instance, the state prioritisation of education has been decreasing whereas the school enrolments and expenditure had rapidly increased. In Mexico, his argument of cost sharing had given rise to adverse effects on the efficiency of schools such as; increased rate of repetition, failures and dropout rates. Gropello and marshall (2005) had a different opinion from that of Gertler and their argued on the policy of cost sharing had resulted to positive consequence on the efficiency of school as it reduces repetitions rates, failure rates as well as lowering the number of learners dropping out of schools. Fiske and Ladd (2002) argue that in the developing nations, cost sharing had adversely affected the efficiency of schools whereas the same phenomena had a positive influence in the developed world nations. There is an observation by Kyambalesa (2010) that great pressure has been realized on the existing school infrastructure due to the strategy initiated and introduced in 2003 regarding setting off any levies at primary level, making free in Kenya. The national commission on excellence in education capacity research practicum and policy makers (Ministry of education, 2006) recognized that building education capacity was a necessary precondition for sustained educational improvement. According to the commission, educational capacity includes: human, social, physical and fiscal resources needed in schools to achieve educational goals (Crampton et al, 2008). Onhiri (2015) asserts that each individual secondary school aims at providing quality education to learners. This is made possible through provision of sustainable physical infrastructure, committed personnel and teachers, modernized resources and learner friendly environment, visa vies: enough time between the learners and the teachers, accessibility of such school, healthy and good water source, houses for the instructors within the school compound, essential physical facilities for the learners such as; play ground, toilets, libraries, computer labs, dining halls and enough class rooms. What are the gaps and the limitations that may be faced during implementation of physical facilities development in Secondary Education funding in Kenya, given that the parental contribution component has been removed from the fees structure and yet government has only committed to support to the development of facilities through an insignificant vote-infrastructure, which only go to very few schools. This forms the basis for this research study.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Various approaches which are seen as likely to augment the resources and give the possible strategies for financing of education financing which are adopted to the social and economic set ups have been identified and attempted. The Coalition (2003) argues that; one of the most known frameworks of cost sharing is where government is tasked to be in-charge of teacher's salaries and the cost of administering education and the parents were to provide for their children's tuition fees as well as purchasing of textbooks. The Community is tasked with the responsibility of constructing and maintaining of physical facilities. Despite government subsidy in free secondary education and a paltry infrastructure fund for schools, there is great concern on how secondary schools will implement the financing of physical infrastructures in Trans Nzoia and West Pokot Counties. Secondary schools in the two counties have deficit in terms of physical infrastructure development according to the respective county directors of education. To compound the problem further, the government through the gazette notice No. 1555 (2015), has now banned parental participation in raising funds for infrastructure. Therefore there is a glaring gap on how schools are would meet their financial obligation given the ban on the PTA fund which usually meets the cost. It is from this perspective that the researcher wanted to find out the influence of cost sharing policy on provision of physical facilities in government aided day secondary schools: a comparative study of Trans Nzoia and West Pokot Counties, Kenya.

### **Research Questions**

1. To establish the influence of community participation on provision of physical facilities in government aided day secondary schools: a comparative study of Trans Nzoia and West Pokot Counties.
2. To investigate the influence of government on provision of physical facilities in government aided day secondary schools: a comparative study of Trans Nzoia and West Pokot Counties,
3. To find out the influence of partners on provision of physical facility in public Day schools a comparative study of Trans Nzoia and West Pokot Counties.

### **Research Objectives**

1. Does community participation influence provision of physical facilities in government aided day secondary schools?
2. Does government influence provision of physical facilities in government aided day secondary schools?
3. Do partners influence provision of physical facility in public in government aided Day schools?

### **Literature Review**

#### **Role of Community in Physical Facilities Development**

Community mobilization involves creation of awareness, sensitization and organizing for the action (Masube, 2008). Masube (2008), points out two factors that are key to community resource mobilization. First is the push results where the threat of the need felt acts as a unifying factor. In Tanzania, the success of secondary school emanates from the stakeholders role and contributions like providing land or space to build schools, contributing building materials for

schools or new classrooms, paying for school furniture and other equipment. The stakeholders have led to the increased number of schools and student enrolment every year (Nassium, 2000). Resource mobilization methods involves fund raising, local community service for resource mobilization, pooling work self help methods, grants, donations and technical assistance (Naidoo, 2005). Fund raising was thus officially recognized as one of the principal ways of taking development to the people (Kandajamy, 2004). This led local secondary schools stakeholders to organize development fund raising in schools (Luck, 2011). The project undertaken varied from one schools to another and included building schools and other basic facilities. Public Harambee were for projects of public nature in which government was involved. Wright and Dolores (2009) observes that within the nations in Europe, teachers unanimously recognize the price of parental participation due to various reasons that lead to student instructional fulfillment, garnering parent help in matters of field learning attendance and in stand of strengthening cooperation between the institutions of learning in the country.

### **Role of Government in Financing Physical Facilities**

Many agencies, after the World Education Forum in Jomtien in 1990 had a great emphasis on the increasing the primary level enrolments in most of the developing nations, whose focus was aimed at attaining and achieving the Education for All (EFA). The most important aspect is coming up with projected impacts of high enrolment in primary level to secondary level of education financially (Njeru & Orodho, 2003). The indication from case study which has been conducted in most of the third world nations on secondary education funding is that, a large number of third world nations will face a critical challenge in areas of; developing, expanding and lending of financial support to their secondary education if the prevailing situations and the cost of structures are still witnessed (Keith, 2006). In Vietnam for example, the government provided Free Education even in secondary up to 1989 when it was stopped due to economic constraints (Bray, 2002). Recently, Burma came up with innovative programs where the governments had to contribute about 41.5%, UNICEF 22.8% and the Community in the area to contribute about 35.6% of the costs of doing the repair of 434 newly established schools (Scandlern and Block, 1980). UNESCO (2000) observes that in reforming the financing of education, the governments, mostly from the third world nations are looking increasingly to the parents for additional funds for education. According to Ngware and Kiriga (2007), Kenya as a country in financing secondary education, rely on policy of cost sharing that was launched and officially introduced as a measure of Structural Adjustment Programs in 1988.

### **Role of Partners in Physical Facilities Development**

Some of the world global projects and organizations which were installed recently to aid public non-public partnerships, among which are; UN international compact workplace, Global Commercial Enterprise (GCE), Global Initiative on Education (GIE), the G-eight force, the partnering of non public and public initiative. Initiatives are as well extended and are currently in operational at regional levels of many nations of the developing part of the globe. Who are mostly financed by agencies dealing with developmental aspects (Draxler, 2008). The introduction of the public personal partnership for training was intended to spearheading realization of quality service pertaining education at all levels in education and societal set-ups (World Economic Forum, 2005), all of which are geared towards and aimed at promoting and building the



educational well-being of the child (Negroponte, 2007) as well as getting the readily acquainted with relevant knowledge and skills required in the world market demand (International Business Forum, 2007). Organizations and integrations like UNESCO and International Financial Boards are being recognized as facilitators of better achievements because they occupy a greater part of stakeholders in initiating and promoting development of related infrastructures in learning institutions and society as a whole. The primary purpose for Private Public Partnership's (PPP's) is identifying the common aspect amongst public and private enterprises as well as integrates experts and knowledge for the growth and development of both sectors. Partnerships centre and their concerns in various areas where the public institutions and the private sector can involve themselves in a "win-win" relationship, like; education, health, as well as development of the community (The United Nations Global Compact, 2007). Private Partnership Program's device gave recommendations; guidelines as well as ideologies which were to be followed by the developmental organizations in Germany. This initiated initiations which acted in providing directions, accelerated developments amongst integrated organizations and spearheaded pooling together of assets geared towards enhancing developmental duties (German Development Institute, 2003).

## **Methodology of research**

### **Research Design**

The researcher used descriptive survey research design. It is a method of collecting information by interviewing, observing or administering a questionnaire. According to Orodho (2009), sample survey considers selecting of sub-sets of a given population which is to be measured. The survey design was more suitable because it helped in description of the nature the prevailing situations, provided the best standards of comparing and determining the relationship which prevail and exists between those specific events.

### **Data Collection Instruments and Sampling Techniques**

The research instrument employed in this research study for data collection was the questionnaires and interview guides. Questionnaires were chosen because they were less expensive given the wide area of data collection and they did not consume a lot of time as opposed to interview schedules and observation guides. Again, this method was appropriate considering the busy schedule of most of the respondents, (the principals and the BOM members) hence the questionnaire allowed respondents to complete them at their convenient time (Orodho, 2004). The items in the questionnaires comprised of close-ended and open-ended questions. The interview guide administered questions to the Sub County and County directors of education.

### **Data Analysis**

According to Orodho (2004), data analysis is lifeline for study research and methods of analysis are the foundation pillars. Quantitative data which was collected using interview schedules and questionnaires was analysed using descriptive statistics. Thus, the data was coded and cleaned and categorized manually according to the questionnaire items using frequency distribution tables and percentages. The data coded was then transferred using the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) to the computer sheet.

## Results of the Study

### Role of the Community in Physical Facility Development

#### Fertilizer rate and variety on Leaf Area Index of Irish potatoes

The researcher wanted to find out the extent to which such physical facilities were available in the government-aided day secondary schools. By asking the heads of the selected schools to use likerts scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree between 1-5 respectively, to give their responses. (Table 8)

**Table 1 Community in Physical Facility Development**

State of facilities	Trans Nzoia County									
	1		2		3		4		5	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
instructional Material	1	11.1	5	55.55	3	33.33	0	0	0	0
Enough classrooms	0	0	2	44.88	6	66.66	1	11.11	0	0
Enough dormitories	0	0	4	44.88	5	55.55	0	0	0	0
Means of transport	0	0	2	22.22	7	77.77	0	0	0	0
	West Pokot County									
Instructional Material	2	22.22	5	55.55	2	22.22	0	0	0	0
Enough classrooms	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enough dormitories	1	11.11	1	11.11	5	55.66	3	33.33	0	0
Means of transport	0	0	2	22.22	6	66.66	1	11.11	0	0

It was observed that there lacked facilities in both schools in the two counties given that majority of the respondents in Trans Nzoia county, 77.77% disagreed transport means was sufficient, 66.66 % said that classrooms lacked while 33.33 said that there was lack of instructional materials in the county. A comparative view on the same in west Pokot County showed that majority 66.66% lacked mode of transport as 55.66 disagreed to their being enough dormitories in their schools. From these findings it was seen that there was lack of the basic physical facilities in the schools of the two counties.

### The Role of Government in Financing of Physical Facility Development

The question sought to find out the organisations or entities that support physical facilities development in schools. The responses were as below.

**Table 2 Government in Financing of Physical Facility Development**

Supporting entity	Trans Nzoia County									
	1		2		3		4		5	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
PTA	6	66.66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MOE/County government	0	0	3	22.22	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non state actors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	West Pokot County									
PTA	5	55.55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MOE/County government	0	0	2	2.22	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non state actors	2	44.44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

On physical facilities development, it was observed that majority of schools in both counties were strongly supported by parents funds to come up with these said facilities. 66.66% of Trans Nzoia county schools strongly agreed that it is parents' funds that make it necessary for school infrastructure development as opposed to 55.55% in West Pokot County who had the same feeling. In terms of ministry of education or county government support, more schools in west Pokot county got more support (44.44%) as opposed to schools in trans Nzoia county where such organisation does not support physical development. It also came out that government through ministry of education has minimal support in both counties with only 22.22% approvals rating of to a small extent in both counties. It was found from this finding that government has not invested as it should in physical infrastructure development as theorized by Njeru and Orodho, 2003. The study also agrees with Keith (2006) who argues that Case studies have been conducted which illustrate secondary school financing issues in a wide range of countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America and that the analysis shows that several developing countries will face acute problems in financing their secondary education expansion if current conditions and cost structures continue to prevail.

### **Conclusions and Discussions**

It is concluded from the study findings that; equipping of secondary schools with enough of the required resources is an essential strategy because it sets foundation for the growth of the learning institution and accommodates the growing enrolment rates to access secondary level of education. The research study found out the need for more funding to facilitate schools physical infrastructure. The government should get an alternative funding to physical facility development to relieve the parents the burden fully as contained in their fee guidelines. It is ironical that the government has good intentions of making education affordable and accessible to many parents who are poor and yet the parents are charged this vote head through the backdoor. It was concluded from the data analysis that, the government has not put in place measures to ensure that there is sufficient allocation of resources to support this school sub sector.

### **Recommendations**

From the study objectives, the researcher made the following recommendations; the governments should budget and give more finances directly to the schools within a given time-frame for earlier and better procurement of the required facility by the Boards of Management.. This will ensure parents are fully relieved of the burden of the high cost of education as enshrined in the government fees guidelines. Further recommendation is given for the government to develop a strategy of constructing enough physical facilities such as; science labs, sports facility, extra classrooms, toilets and transport infrastructure. The government should set aside resources to clear the debts owed by schools to avoid the skyrocketing interest accrued to this debts now that the Parents Association fund stands disqualified. Finally, it was recommends that schools and stakeholders should rally donors and well wishers to support school facility development as this has worked favorably in west Pokot County. The Board of managements and the principals should involve the communities around the schools as friends of the institution so as to support in initiating, implementing and developing school projects like; school physical infrastructure.



### Suggestion for Further Research

Further study should be conducted to find out the boards of managements' capacity on resource utilization in secondary schools and more research needs to be conducted to find an alternative and sustainable vehicle to school infrastructure funding.

### References

- Alatore, S. (2009). *Redefining school and community Relations: Teachers Perception of Parents as Participants and Stakeholders in Education*. London. Penguin Publishers.
- Berger, E., (2007). *Parent as Partners in Education: The School and Home Working together*. New York. MacMillan Publishing Press.
- Bertsch, T., Bouchet, R., Godrecka, J., Karkkainen, K., Malzy, T., and Zuckerman, L. (2005). *Corporate sector involvement in Education for All*. Paris: UNESCO
- Best, W. J., and Kahn, V., James. (2009). *Research in Education: New Delhi*, Pearl offset press private limited. Citifonline.com/Ghana.
- Brannigan, N. (2009). *The Global e-Schools and Communities Initiative (GeSCI)*. New York. UNESCO.
- Brannon, D. (2008). *Character education: it's a joint responsibility*. Kappa Delta Pi Record, 44(2):62-65.
- Bray, M. (1992) *New Resources for Education; Community Management and Financing of Schools in Less Developed Countries*. London. Common Wealth Secretariat.
- Bridgemohan, R. R. (2002). *Parent involvement in early childhood development in Kwa-Zulu Natal*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Johannesburg: University of South Africa.
- Chadwick, K. G. (2006). *Improving Schools through Community Engagements: A Practical Guide for Educators in Developing Countries*. London. Donnell/Crawfordsville Publishers.
- Clifton, T. (2006). *Eight Habits of the Heart for Educators: Building Strong School Communities Through Timeless Values*. New York. Bell Howell Publishers.
- Comer, J. P. (2009). *School Reaching Out: Family School and Community Partnerships for Students Success of Children Education and Urban Society*. New York. Thomas Hoffer Basic Books Publishers.
- Common Wealth Education Fund. (2003). *Reform Agenda for Education Sector in Kenya. Setting Beacons for Policy and Legislative Framework*. Nairobi: Elimu Yetu Coalition. Country studies us/Caribbean islands
- Daily Nation. (1998). *Private School needs support too*. Daily Nation July 27th Nairobi: Nation Media Group Ltd. Daily Nation, January 11<sup>th</sup> 2002, May 8<sup>th</sup> 2008 (14:5).
- Davies, D. (2009). *Home-School Relationships as they affect the Academic Success of Children in Developing Countries*. Philadelphia. Delta Kappan Publishers.
- De Vos, A. S. (1998a). *Conceptualization and operationalisation*. In DeVos, A.S(Ed). *Research at grassroots. A primer for the caring professions*. Pretoria: Van Schaik publishers.
- Deslandes, R., & Bertrand, R. (2004). *Motivation des parents à participer au suivi scolaire de leurs enfants*. *Revue des Sciences de l'Education*, 30(2):411-433.

- Di Gropello, E., and Marshall, J. (2005) Teacher effort and schooling outcomes in rural Honduras. In Vegas, E. (Ed) Incentives to improve teaching: Lessons from Latin America. Washington D.C : World Bank.
- Donbusch, L., and Glasgow, S. (2009). School and Home in Education: A Review of Development in School and Home relationships. New York. Penguin Publishing Press.
- Draxler, A. (2008). New Partnerships for Education for All. Building on experience.
- Eccle, L., and Harrold, K. (2009). The Impact of Parental Involvement, Parental Support Support and Family on Pupil Achievement and Adjustment: London. John Wiley and Sons Publishers.
- Elacqua, G. (2007). The effectiveness of franchises and independent private schools in Chile's National Voucher Program. Washington D.C. World Bank.
- Elimu Yetu Coalition (2003). Reform Agenda for Education Sector in Kenya: Setting Beacons for Policy and Legislative Framework. Nairobi: Elimu Yetu Coalition.
- Epstein, J. (2008). Perspective and Previews on Research and Policy for School, Family and Community Partnerships. New Jersey. Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers Associates.
- Muthaka, E. N. D., and Manda, D. K. (2005). Draft Paper on access, determinants and strategies for expanding secondary education in Kenya, Nairobi. Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis.
- Eshiwani G. S. (1993). Education in Kenya since Independence Nairobi: East African Publishers Ltd.
- Fiske, E., and Ladd, H. (2002). Financing Schools in Post Apartheid South Africa: Initial steps toward fiscal equity. Sanford Institute Working Paper Series. Durham, North Carolina: Sanford Institute of Public Policy, Duke University.
- Fiore, J. D. (2011). School-Community Relations and Education (Third Edition). Manchester. Eye on Eye Foundation. Inc. Larchmont, New York. Rick S. Print Production Ltd.
- Gertler, P., and Glewwe, P. (2006). The willingness to pay for education in developing countries: Evidence from rural Peru. *Journal of Public Economics*, 42(3), 251-275.
- Kgaffe, M. M. (2001). Barriers to parent involvement in rural communities in North West Province. Unpublished Masters Dissertation. Johannesburg: University of South Africa.
- Government of Kenya. (2005a). Sessional paper No.1 of 2005 on policy Frameworks for Education Training and Research, Nairobi Government Printer.
- Government of Kenya. (1988). Report of the Presidential working party of Education and Manpower Training for the next Decade and beyond. Nairobi, Government Printer.
- Government of Kenya. (2003, 2004, 2005). Appropriations Accounts, Nairobi. Government Printer.
- Government of Kenya. (2005). Kenya Education sector support programme. Nairobi Government Printer
- Graham-Brown, S. (1988). Education in the developing world: conflict crisis: New York: Addison Wesley Longman Inc,
- Grant, B. K. (2009). Home, School and Community Collaboration: Culturally Responsive Family Involvement. London. Pauline Publishing Company Limited.
- Guillaume, A., and Yee, I. (2009). Prospective teachers' use of Diversity issues in case study analysis. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*. Volume 21.

- Hung, C-L. (2007). Family, schools and Taiwanese children's outcomes. *Educational Research*, 49(2):115-125.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2010). Parental Involvement and Encouraging That Involvement: Implications for School-Based Programs. *Teachers College Record*, 112(3):747-774.
- Karemesi, J. (2010) Universalising Primary Education in Kenya, Is it Sustainable?
- Karen, L., and Warren, M. (2011). *A Match on Dry Grass: Community organizing as a Catalyst for School Reform*. London. Oxford University Press.
- Katharine, B. (2010). *Impact of Welfare on Children, Parents, Teachers and Schools: Inter-professional Challenges and Opportunities*. London. Woburn Publishers Limited.
- Kiveu, N., and Maiyo, J. (2009). The impact of cost-sharing on internal efficiency of public secondary schools in Ndivisi division of Bungoma district, Kenya; Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology.
- Kothari, C. R. (2005) *Research methodology; Methods and techniques 2nd edition*. New age international limited publishers.
- Latham, M. (2002). *Partnerships in Education*. World Education Market. Lisbon: EdInvest
- Lareau, L. (2006). *Empowering Teachers and Parents in Schools in Sub-Saharan Africa Countries*. New York. Delta Kappan Publishers.
- Lawson, A. H. (2007). *Two Frameworks for Analyzing Relationships among School Communities, Teacher Education and Inter-professional Education and Training*. Paris. University of Notre-Dame Press.
- Lemmer, E. N. (2007). Parent involvement in teacher education in South Africa. *International Journal about Parents in Education*, 1(9):218-229.
- Lewin, K., and Cailloids, F. (2001). *Financing Secondary Education in Developing Countries*. UNESCO, International Institute for Education Planning.
- Lewin, K., and Cailloids, F. (2002). *Financing Secondary Education in Developing Countries*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Lima, C. M. F. (2011). The Applicability of the Principles of Activity Based Costing System in Higher Education. In *Economics and Management Research Projects: An International Journal Vol. 1. No. 1 pp. 57-63*.
- Machen, S. M., Wilson, J. D., & Notar, C. E. (2005). Parental involvement in the classroom. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 32(1):13-16.
- MacNeil, A., & Patin, M. (2000). The principal's role in improving and sustaining parental involvement. Available from: <http://cnx.org/content/m12925/latest/>. (Accessed 18 May 2008).
- Malik, A. B. (2010). *Public-Private Partnership in Education. A lesson learned from the Punjab Education Foundation*. Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- Mariam, S. (2008). *The Practical Relationship between Schools, Parents and Community in Nigerian Education Systems*. Lagos. Nditla Publishing Press.
- McKenna, M. & Willms, J. D. 1998. Cooperation between home and schools: 'What' works in Canada. *Research Papers in Education*, 13(1):19-41.
- Miron, J. M. (2004). La difficile reconnaissance de "l'expertise parentale". *Recherche et Formation*, (47):55-68.

- Naidoo, J. P. (2005). Educational decentralization and school governance: From policy to practice. International Institute for Educational Planning 7-9 rue Eugene Delacroix, 75116, Paris: UNESCO. 1997
- National Middle School Association Research Summary, (NMSA). (2003b). School initiated family and community partnerships: NMSA research summary: Student achievement and the middle school concept.
- Oketch, M. O. (2000). Costing and financing higher education for development in sub-Saharan Africa: Kenya's case. *International Education Journal*.
- Olembo, J. O. (1985). Financing Primary School Building in Kenya, Nairobi. (1986). Practical Primary Administration, Education, Arnold Publications.
- Onchiri, O. K. (2015). Building Top Performing Schools: Pittsburgh. Dorrance Publishing CO.
- Oppenheim, M. (2008). Critical Place of Community Development in School Transformation: The Story of the Vaughn Family Centre and Pacime urban Village. Canberra. AGPS Publishing Company Limited.
- Orodho, J. A. (2002). Enhancing Access and Participation in Secondary education among the poor and vulnerable through bursary in Kenya. A consultancy paper submitted to the Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (IPAR) for publication.
- Orodho, J. A. (2009). Elements of Education and Social Science Research Methods; Maseno; Kanezja.
- Orodho, J. A., and Njeru, E. (2003). Education Financing in Kenya; Secondary bursary scheme implementation and challenges, IPAR, DP/035/2003.Nairobi; Institute of Policy Analysis and Research.
- Oyaro, K. (2008). Free secondary schooling policy faces testing times. Nairobi.IPS
- Onsomu, N. E., John, N. M., Dramane, O., James, S., and Jaddidah, M. (2004). Community Schools in Kenya Case, Study of Community Participation in Funding and Managing Schools. UNESCO. 7-9 Rue Eugene Delacroix, 75116 Paris France (II R.P).
- Perrone, F. (2008). Family Involvement in Children's' Education: Success Local Approaches office of Educational Research and Improvement. New York, US Department of Education.
- Psacharopoulos G, Woodhall M, 1985. Education for Development an analysis of Investment Choices, Washington D. C Oxford University Press.
- Sanders, M. G. (2007). Building School-Community Partnerships: Collaboration for Student Success. New York. Delta Kappan Publishers.
- Shakil, S. (2003). Public-Private Partnerships for the delivery of basic education services to the Poor. London: DFID/AKDN
- Symeou, L. (2003). Fostering children's learning: An investigation of the role of teacher parent briefings. Edinburgh: British Educational Research Association Annual Conference.
- Republic of Kenya. (2012). Kenya Facts and Figures. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- The Global Compact. (2007). After the Signature. A Guide to Engagement in the United Nations Global Compact. New York. Global Compact Office
- Tobyehatch, H. (2013). Mastery of the Cost of Education with Hyperion Profitability and Cost Management.
- Republic of Kenya. (1988) Report on the Development of Education for the Next Decade and Beyond (Kamunge Report). Nairobi. Government Printer.
- UNESCO. (2002). Financing Education – Investment and Return: Paris, UNESCO Publishing

- UNESCO/IIEP German Development Institute. (2003). German Development Co-operation: Abstract of the Synproposal Report on the Evaluation of "Public-Private Partnership Program of German Development Co-operation. Berlin Global Knowledge Partnerships (2007). Global Knowledge Partnerships. New York.
- Van Wyk, J. N. (2008). A comparative perspective on the theories, policies and practices of parent involvement in education. Lecture paper: University of South Africa. August 2008.
- Watsons, K. (1980). Community Education Prospectors for the 1980s. The New Era. *Incorporating World Studies Bulletin and Ideas*, Vol 61 No. 1.
- Wolfendale, S. (1999). "Parents as partners" in research and evaluation: Methodological and ethical issues and solutions. *British Journal of Special Education*, 26(3):164-169.
- World Bank. (2003). Lifelong learning in the global knowledge economy: Challenges for developing countries, Washington DC: World Bank. World Bank (2012). World Development Indicators.
- World Bank. (2010) *Education in Sub Sahara Africa: Policies for Adjustment Revitalization and Expansion*. Washington D.C. World Bank
- World Bank. (2012). World Development Indicators.
- World Bank. (2010). Institute for Statistics in EdStats. Washington D.C.
- World Bank/UNESCO. Negropte, N. (2007). One Laptop per Child Project. New York. UNESCO.
- Wright, K., and Dolores, S. (2009): Building School and community Partnerships through Parent Involvement (2nd Edition). London, Prentice Hall publishers.
- Zelman, G. L., & Waterman, J. M. (1998). Understanding the impact of parent school involvement on children's educational outcomes. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 91(6):370-380.