Journal of Advances in Education and Philosophy

ISSN 2523-2665 (Print)
ISSN 2523-2223 (Online)

A Publication by "Scholars Middle East Publishers", Dubai, United Arab Emirates

Effects of Constituency Bursary Provision Timings on Internal Efficiency of Public Secondary Schools in Trans-Nzoia County, Kenya

Onsomu Ndemo Richard[1], Evans Ogoti Okendo[2*]

[1]PhD Candidate Kisii University, Kisii, Kenya

[2]Faculty of Education, Mwenge Catholic University, Tanzania

***Corresponding author**
Evans Ogoti Okendo

Article History
Received: 06.08.2018
Accepted: 18.08.2018
Published: 30.08.2018

Abstract: The purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of constituency bursary provision timings on internal efficiency of public secondary schools in Trans-Nzoia County Trans-Nzoia County, Kenya. The study was underpinned on Human Capital Theory developed by Schultz in 1971. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design with a target population of 77,337 persons. 78 (30% of 261) schools were randomly selected 16 from each sub-county with the exception of Endebes with 14 schools. A sample of 399 respondents was selected using Fischer formula. These included 306 form three students, 78 principals and 5 DEO, 5AEO and 5 CBF. A maximum of 4 form three students were randomly selected from the sampled schools. Data was collected data using questionnaires, documentary analysis and interview schedules. The instruments were validated by the three experts. Reliability of the instruments was determined through a pilot study where the Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.73 was obtained, hence the instruments were considered reliable. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, and presented in tables, while qualitative data from interviews was organized into themes and sub-themes. The study established that, there was a significant ($p = .001$; $\alpha = 0.05$) relationship between constituency bursary provisions and internal efficiency in public secondary in Kenya. It was therefore recommended that for enhanced internal efficiency in public secondary schools, there should be greater stakeholders' involvement during the bursary provision time.

Keywords: Bursary provision, bursary provision criteria, internal efficiency and timings.

INTRODUCTION

Education is a profitable private investment yet many students cannot afford to finance it out of their own family resources [1]. Governments therefore need to provide funds to support a broad based equitable expansion of secondary education with incentives for private provision and subsidies to disadvantaged students to ensure equality of opportunity and eventually eradicate poverty. The provision of education to a population is found to increase the economic growth of a nation. Allocation of government bursaries to deserving students enables them to: access education, transit smoothly through the levels of education and keep them in school without dropping out. Bursary allocation can only be conducted well using equity and efficiency principles. Equity demands that resources can fairly be distributed if more is provided for those regions that are disadvantaged in terms of low allocation or no resource allocation to disadvantaged members of the society and the poor who live in extreme poverty [2].

In the United Kingdom (UK), according to Veerspoor [2], students apply for a discretionary bursary from their school, college, academy or other provider. Bursaries are intended for students who are in most need of financial support and the eligibility criteria needs to reflect this. For example in Astley Cooper school, Hertfordshire Secondary School, two levels of eligibility are applied, that is, "medium priority" which includes any student who is in receipt of Free School Meals and "low priority" which includes students whose household is in receipt of means tested benefits. In addition any student, regardless of their personal or family circumstances can apply for a low priority award if they have an identifiable financial need. This financial assistance to students has greatly influenced the transition rates of students in both primary and secondary schools.

In Singapore the government through the Ministry of Education has a bursary scheme in place that is meant for students whose household income is less than $ 4000 a month. They provide $300 for

Copyright @ 2017: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution license which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium for non commercial use (NonCommercial, or CC-BY-NC) provided the original author and source are credited.

secondary 1 to 5. Eligibility is for students who are already in secondary school and whose performances are good [3]. This helps to retain the students who could have otherwise dropped due to lack of school fees. The government of Mexico directs bursaries to help indigenous students pay for textbooks and other learning materials.

Studies show that close to 70% of secondary school students in Malawi are entitled to bursary schemes which are supposed to cover 75% tuition fees for most beneficiaries and up to 100% for vulnerable groups such as double orphans and girls [4]. The expected beneficiary should be genuinely needy and already selected to a secondary school. These are the policy guidelines that guide the provision of bursary schemes [5]. In Botswana the bursary award scheme is administered by allocating bursaries/ scholarships as follows: ensuring equitable distribution of training places among critical area of manpower needs in the economy, applicants' choice of course in higher education and academic achievement at the senior secondary school [6]. The administration of the bursary scheme is decentralized. At the beginning of each financial year Head teachers of various secondary schools are supposed to provide the Education Division with number of needy children to benefit based on completed and verified bursary application forms collected. The Education Division managers who manage secondary schools directly then forward their requests of budgets to the MOEST Headquarters. MOEST then makes all arrangements to make sure that bursaries are remitted to the schools within the academic term. Investment in education in Zimbabwe (or any other developing country) occurs against a backdrop of scarce resources, and thus an insight into the internal efficiency of the school system helps employ resources to the best benefit of both the students and the nation. Despite this huge investment to assist the poor access secondary education, a large number of children do not access secondary education on completion of primary education. And even larger numbers of students are not sustained in the schools once they are enrolled. Most of them drop out of schools in their second or third year. It has been noted that class repetition and drop outs are high in developing countries [7].

According to [8] the Studies done in the United States, it revealed the availability of bursary provision. Pell grants are subsidies provided to students attending high school and university education on the basis of need as determined by their own parent's income and assets. It is given entitlement without regard to ability, achievement, the particular institution attended or the programme of study. The actual bursary provision depend on the amount appropriated by the congress each year and the number of needs of potential recipients [9]. The writer feels that this could be the rue form of bursary since its main focus is financial need of the applicant. Developing countries and Kenya in particular may borrow a leaf from this, so that bursaries are effectively distributed. Another form of subsidy is called Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants. This is a form of bursary that is awarded to university students and other institutions of higher education. The financial aid is at discretion of the college's financial aid office. Supplemental grants together with subsidies represent the principle contribution of the federal government towards bringing higher education into reach of young people from low-income families [9]. In developed countries, education beyond basic education is partly financed by the state. In some countries such as Japan, secondary school education is free while in some African countries such as Uganda, affordable secondary education has been tried. In Britain education is totally and fully financed by the state up to the secondary level. Parents are required to ensure that children attend school with, the central government through education authority entrusted by section 7 of 1994 act to avail education facilities to ensure smooth running of education. In Canada, education is not free with school fees being part and parcel of the education system. Parents are required to contribute towards education development and provision. However, the government recognizes that some parents are sincerely not in a position to pay hence provisions are made to ensure that a child is not denied access to education because of inability to pay fees In the federal republic of Germany, Bursary takes the form of "Bafog" (sic). This is subsidized loan to students [10]. The government supports the students at both upper secondary and higher education levels. The government must provide funds for all who meet the award criteria. The loan carry enormous subsidy for all borrowers who have its use for more than 20 years at zero interest as opposed to true loan. Johnson [11] further analyzed subsidies in the United Kingdom. He observed that this was characterized by:- 1. Generous grants for fulltime students from low and middle income families. 2. There is very little assistance to students whose courses are deemed not to be advanced and 3. Cost sharing by students themselves through work or loans. The subsidies in the United Kingdom target mostly university education and other institutions of higher learning. The focus is unique in its own way as it does not focus only on students from low income families but also middle income families. This is the point of departure with this study as it intended to identify those students from low social economic backgrounds and pursuing secondary school education in public schools for the purpose of bursary awards. There is no regard of the type of courses as the curriculum is the same. In Argentina, universal access to primary education and partly subsidized secondary and higher education does not seem to ensure that the poor students gain access to education. Children from poor families enter primary school at a later age and suffer from high drop-out rates. The poor also tend to receive an education of lower quality than that received

by the non-poor. Lower tuition subsidies reduce the chances of students from poor families finishing secondary school. Given these circumstances, an inter-generational poverty cycle may be difficult to break.

Studies conducted by some scholars indicate the availability of bursary subsidies in developing countries. The bursaries take different forms. A survey by the government in Argentina in 1975 revealed that government subsidy range from 45 to 92 percent of total costly per pupil in primary schools and between 31 to 96 percent in private secondary schools [12]. In Ecuador government subsidies are in form of fees and takes only 3 percent. Other sources of subsidies are donations or endowment in Bolivia for instance (Latin America) this source provides for 11 percent of the income of private schools [13]. In South Africa, user charges are identified as a barrier to education [14]. The South Africa Schools Act provides that majority of parents at a public school may determine whether or not school fees are charged and amount to be paid. However, exemption exists for those who cannot afford to pay; exemption is extended to parents whose incomes are less than 30 times but not more than 10 times the amount of fees.

A study by Jallade [15] analyzed the pattern of financing for a private and public education and the incidence of taxation and distribution of public subsidies for education in Colombia. The study found out that equity implications of public subsidies depend on whether the taxes that are used to finance public subsidies are progressive, proportional or regressive. A tax is progressive if it takes a larger proportion of the income of the rich than that of the poor taxpayers; it is regressive if the reverse is the case and proportional if it takes the same percentage of income from all income groups. The general conclusion is that taxation as a whole is roughly proportional of most taxpayers in Colombia. In Kenya the situation is worse since some high income earners especially the legislators are exempted from income tax on their allowances [16]. Jallade [15] went ahead to analyze educational subsidies between the income groups and to compute subsidies received as a proportion of taxes paid. It was found that in total, education subsidies in Colombia redistribute income from the rich to the poor since the poorest families receive more education subsidies than they pay in taxes whereas the richest receive only 2 percent of their taxes in form of education subsidies this implied that public subsidies in Colombia depended on the income bracket and the taxes paid. Those whose income was low were allocated more public subsidies for education in relation to the taxes they paid. Studies done in Malaysia [17] and Indonesia [18] on the redistribution effects of public expenditure found out that the levels of subsidy at post-secondary and higher levels of education benefit the wealthy and suggested that governments should have a policy of shifting more of the financial burden to private rather than public funds on grounds of social equity and economic efficiency. They reasoned that the existence of a private relatively unsubsidized education sector might contribute towards a more equitable distribution of subsidized in Colombia, since the rich will be more likely to enrol their children in private schools and therefore public subsidies can be concentrated on the poorer households whose children will attend public schools. This argument may not be entirely convincing since it is not automatic that the rich will enroll their children in private school rather than public schools. In many developing countries, the rich have tended to enroll their children in public schools because of the quality of education provide there. Studies by Meerman [17] and Meesook [18] should have informed us about the difference in the quality of education provided in private and public schools in the countries studied.

According to the World Bank [19], educational subsidies in Vietnam are such that provision is made for fees to be waived or even halved for certain groups that are considered to be in need of such fee waiver. These include handicapped students, children from minority ethnic groups, orphans, children of killed or seriously wounded soldiers, and children in mountainous or remote areas. Those can obtain exemptions from fee payment.

However, the discretion still lies with the government to either waive the fees completely or just half the fees in some cases; therefore, children of slightly wounded or seriously wounded soldiers, children of government employees disabled by work injuries, ethnic minorities and children of families who are poor pay half the fees. In 1993 for example, 14 percent of lower secondary students and 10 percent of upper secondary were fully exempted.

Nhundu [20], focusing on Zimbabwe, concluded that the Zimbabwean government introduced equal government subsidy for all secondary education in order to equalize education opportunities and reduce disparities between former white and black education systems. This resulted in massive expenditure on education accounting for at least 10 percent of total national outlay on education. Subsidies varied from 8.90 dollars per pupil in grade one and 19.15 dollars for grade seven [21]. The subsidies differed from high cost schools getting 337 dollars in 1982 for each pupil compared to 83 dollars for their counterparts in low cost schools. In many developing countries, higher education is highly subsidized and absorbs more spending. Thus, in Cape Verde, introduction of basic education and training projects provide for a minimum of six years of compulsory basic education so as to benefit the poor since the correct structural problems in education tend to disadvantage them [22].

Some developing countries have used student loans as a way of equalizing education opportunities for

those who cannot afford to finance for it. After graduating from high school or universities, students are made to repay the loan with or without interest. In Latin America and the Caribbean, for example, it has been proved that student loans work. Students are willing to borrow and that the existence of loans has helped to increase private demand for university education and has enabled many poor students to finance their own education [13]. In South Africa, user charges are identified as a barrier to education [14]. The South Africa Schools Act provides that majority of parents at a public school may determine whether or not school fees are charged and amount to be paid. However, exemption exists for those who cannot afford to pay; exemption is extended to parents whose incomes are less than 30 times but not more than 10 times the amount of fees.

According to Wangila [23] and Obonyo [24], bursaries are used in financing secondary school education which enhances some economic status for secondary school leavers in their various locations in Cherangany district. Despite the findings the two did not come out clearly with the criteria of identifying the bursary beneficiaries and how bursary awards have benefited needy students' participation in secondary school education among various vulnerable groups in the country. Therefore this study seeks to investigate on the multiplier effect of constituency bursary provision on internal efficiency practices and participation of needy students in public secondary schools in Trans-Nzoia County

Statement of the problem

Despite the efforts by the government to improve access and retention of students in secondary schools, evidence shows that access to secondary education is still highly skewed in favour of the rich [25] and debate still rages among the various interested parties on the bursary disbursement and its efficiency [26]. Moreover, a large number of children who are supposed to be in school are not enrolled and 30% of the students who enrol in secondary education drop out before they complete the secondary cycle [27]. Okoth [28] also shows that thousands of poor students in the country do not benefit from CBF leading to dropout. A number of factors have been cited as being responsible for high drop-outs, and hence low completion rates among students in public secondary school in most African countries.

This cost is prohibitive and raises equity issues in secondary education in terms of access and participation as the financially poor are unable to meet this cost yet, secondary education is an integral component of basic education and hence a fundamental right for all children. This has led to disruption of teaching and learning in the schools, students are sent home to collect school fees and other resources. Some students have dropped out of school due to lack of the required resources. Those that absent themselves from school for many days have repeated classes for not completing the school syllabus [29]. There were increased reported cases of students not being access to secondary school education in Trans-Nzoia County [30]. Moreover, Cherangany Sub- county in the former Rift valley province is characterized by endemic poverty and surging orphanage and hence, has a large proportion of needy children among it's secondary school going population (KESSP Trans-Nzoia County situation analysis and action plan, 2005-2010). The frustrations that these students go through affect their academic performance; they lose interest in education and eventually drop out of school. Based on the policy recommendation for revised plans on equitable and efficient distribution of bursary provision [31] and recommendation from the studies such as; Boru [32] to investigate the influence of government funding on education on school internal efficiency, there was need to carry out a study. This prompted the need for the study to assess the multiplier effects of constituency bursary provision on internal efficiency of public secondary schools in Trans-Nzoia County, Kenya.

Research questions

- What are the effects of constituency bursary provision timings on internal efficiency of public secondary schools in Trans-Nzoia County, Kenya?

Theoretical frame work

Theoretical framework in this study was derived from The Human Capital Theory developed by Schultz in 1971. Traditionally, economic growth was mainly attributed to three factors of production namely: land, labour and capital (money and machines). Schultz in 1971 after extensive study of economic growth in the USA came up with the theory of Human capital investments. He argued that the growth in output could only be adequately explained by the investment in human capital that had taken place in form of formal education, on-the-job training, and improved health adult education and the mobility and migration of workers so that they are able to respond to changing job opportunities [33]. According to this theory, people should invest in education for future gain in form of economic development. Investment in education is done by the individual and by the society/government for future expected benefits. This theory forms an important theoretical base of this study because it explains the high government investment in education in form of bursaries and the communities contribute by foregoing other projects to promote education in Kenya. Investment in education will be realized through high enrolments, high transition rates from primary to secondary school, and provision of facilities and resources of secondary schools. Since bursaries are an investment, this study will analyse the extent to which this investment is realized. It will find out how much of the bursaries have been invested in human capital by

funding secondary and education and impact it has had on accessibility to secondary education.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design with a target population of 77,337 persons.78 (30% of 261) schools were randomly selected 16 from each sub-county with the exception of Endebes with 14 schools. A sample of 399 respondents were selected using Fischer formula. These included 306form three students, 78 principals and 5 DEO, 5AEO and 5 CBF. A maximum of 4 form three students were randomly selected from the sampled schools. Data was collected data using questionnaires, documentary analysis and interview schedules. The instruments were validated by the three experts. Reliability of the instruments was determined through a pilot study where the Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.73 was obtained for the questionnaire. qualitative reliability was regarded as a fit between what researcher recorded as data and what actually occurs in the natural setting that is being researched [34] which expressed the a degree of accuracy and comprehensiveness of coverage. Reliability in qualitative approach construed as dependability which involved member checks through respondent validation of responses and triangulation of responses from different sources. In member check, the researchers took back the findings to the respondents and recorded their reactions to the report as one of the mechanisms of accessing dependability. Though a researcher assessed reliability using respondents' validation by going back to respondents to check whether their findings are dependable, caution was taken because sometimes respondents are not in a privileged position to be solely commentators on their actions. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, and presented in tables, while qualitative data from interviews was organized into themes and sub-themes.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Effect of bursary timing on internal efficiency of public secondary schools in Kenya

The study established the effect of timing of bursary allocation on internal efficiency in public secondary in Kenya. To achieve this, the researcher adopted, Cross tabulation, percentages and frequencies as the most preferred statistical techniques. The analysis, therefore, began with the descriptive statistics of the variable first bursary allocation.

Table-1: First bursary allocation in the year 2015

Category	Frequency	Percent
Yes	207	53.4
No	181	46.6
Total	388	100

Source (Researcher, 2017)

As shown in Table-1, 207 (53.4%) of the respondents benefited from the first bursary allocation while 181 (46.6%) of the respondents indicated that they never benefited from the first bursary allocation. This implies that most of the respondents benefited from the first bursary allocation.

Table-2: The month of first bursary allocation in the year 2005

Month	Frequency	Percent
January	31	15.0
February	26	12.6
March	20	9.7
May	2	1.0
June	16	7.7
July	8	3.9
September	93	44.9
October	6	2.9
November	5	2.4
Total	207	100

Source (Researcher, 2017)

As shown in Table-2, of those who benefited from the first bursary allocation, most 93(44.9%) of them were allocated in the month of September followed by January and February at 31 (15.0%) and 26(12.6%) respectively. May was the least 2 (1.0%) month when students received bursary allocation. This implies that most of the respondents benefited from the first bursary allocation in the third term when the government have already budgeted.

Table-3: First bursary allocation in the year 2015 and school internal efficiency

Did you receive first bursary allocation * School internal efficiency Crosstabulation					
			School internal efficiency		Total
			Yes	No	
Did you receive first bursary allocation	Yes	Count	52	155	207
		% within Did you receive first bursary allocation	25.1%	74.9%	100.0%
	No	Count	24	157	181
		% within Did you receive first bursary allocation	13.3%	86.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	76	312	388
		% within Did you receive first bursary allocation	19.6%	80.4%	100.0%

Source (Researcher, 2017)

As shown in Table-3 most (25.1%) of the respondents who experienced enhanced internal efficiency received the first bursary allocation while those who never received first bursary allocation were the majority (86.7%) who opined that, there were no internal efficiency in schools. This implies that first bursary allocation is a good determinant for enhanced school internal efficiency as most of the students who receive the firs bursary allocation talk of improved school internal efficiency compared to those who never. This finding was supported by an interviewee who had the following to say:

*…In most cases, students who receive first bursary allocation are less likely to be sent home for school fees and are always present in school. Therefore, the government should ensure that more students benefit from the first bursary allocation …*Male informant, 47 years, School principal.

Table-4: Time of use in the year 2015 for the first bursary allocation

Month	Frequency	Percent
January	21	10.1
February	30	14.5
March	13	6.3
May	10	4.8
June	21	10.1
July	7	3.4
September	8	3.9
October	72	34.8
November	2	1
Not aware	23	11.1
Total	207	100

Source (Researcher, 2017)

As shown in Table-4, of those who benefited from the first bursary allocation, most 72(34.8%) had their bursary allocation used to pay their school fees in the month of October followed by February and those who were not aware when the bursary allocation was used to pay fee at 30 (14.5%) and 23(11.1%) respectively. November was the least 2 (1.0%) month when students the first bursary allocation was used to pay fees. This implies that most of the first bursary allocation were used to pay fees at the beginning and end of the year when the administration needed funds for the start of the academic year and clear the students' arrears at the end of the year respectively.

As shown in Table-5 most (47.6%) of the respondents who believed that, there was enhanced school internal efficiency, had their first bursary used to pay school fees in the month of June, and followed by the month of July at 28.6%. Those who had their bursary used to pay fees in the month of November never (0.0%) believed on the improved school internal efficiency. This implies that, when the first bursary allocation is used to pay fees in the month of November, the students is likely to drop out from school, sent for school fees regularly and even perform poorly. Therefore, the school administration and education stakeholders should ensure that the students/beneficiaries have their first bursary used to pay fees either in first tem or second term for enhanced school internal efficiency. This analysis was followed by the descriptive statistics on the second bursary allocation.

Table-5: Time of use in the year 2015 for the first bursary allocation and school internal efficiency

First bursary allocation * School internal efficiency Crosstabulation					
			School internal efficiency		Total
			Yes	No	
First bursary allocation	January	Count	5	16	21
		% within First bursary allocation	23.8%	76.2%	100.0%
	February	Count	5	25	30
		% within First bursary allocation	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
	March	Count	2	11	13
		% within First bursary allocation	15.4%	84.6%	100.0%
	May	Count	2	8	10
		% within First bursary allocation	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	June	Count	10	11	21
		% within First bursary allocation	47.6%	52.4%	100.0%
	July	Count	2	5	7
		% within First bursary allocation	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
	September	Count	0	8	8
		% within First bursary allocation	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	October	Count	19	53	72
		% within First bursary allocation	26.4%	73.6%	100.0%
	November	Count	0	2	2
		% within First bursary allocation	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Not aware	Count	6	17	23
		% within First bursary allocation	26.1%	73.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	51	156	207
		% within First bursary allocation	24.6%	75.4%	100.0%

Source (Researcher, 2017)

Table-6: Second bursary allocation in the year 2015

Category	Frequency	Percent
Yes	188	48.5
No	200	51.5
Total	388	100

Source (Researcher, 2017)

As shown in Table-6, 188 (48.5%) of the respondents benefited from the second bursary allocation while 200 (51.5%) of the respondents indicated that they never benefited from the second bursary allocation. This implies that most of the respondents did not benefit from the second bursary allocation.

Table-7: Second bursary allocation in the year 2015

Month	Frequency	Percent
January	13	6.9
February	7	3.7
March	1	0.5
May	6	3.2
June	6	3.2
July	8	4.3
September	15	8.0
October	16	8.5
November	116	61.7
Total	188	100

Source (Researcher, 2017)

As shown in Table-7, of those who benefited from the second bursary allocation, most 116(61.7%) of them received the second allocation in the month of November followed by October at 16 (8.5%) and September at 15(8.0%) with March being the least 1(0.5%) month when students benefited from the first bursary allocation. This implies that most of the second bursary allocation are in the third term when students

have paid most of the school fees and sometimes it finds when students are doing their end year examination.

Table-8: Second bursary allocation and school internal efficiency

Did you receive second bursary allocation * School internal efficiency Cross tabulation					
			School internal efficiency		Total
			Yes	No	
Did you receive second bursary allocation	Yes	Count	49	139	188
		% within Did you receive second bursary allocation	26.1%	73.9%	100.0%
	No	Count	27	173	200
		% within Did you receive second bursary allocation	13.5%	86.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	76	312	388
		% within Did you receive second bursary allocation	19.6%	80.4%	100.0%

Source (Researcher, 2017)

As shown in Table-8 most (26.1%) of the respondents who experienced enhanced internal efficiency received the second bursary allocation while those who never received the first bursary allocation were the majority (86.5%) who opined that, there were no internal efficiency in schools. This implies that second bursary allocation is a good determinant for enhanced school internal efficiency as most of the students who receive the second bursary allocation indicated improved school internal efficiency compared to those who never. This finding was supported by an interviewee who had the following to say:

…In most cases, students who receive second bursary allocation are more likely to sit for the final year examination that enable one to be promoted to the next class. Therefore, the government should ensure that more students benefit from the second bursary allocation …*Female informant, 39 years, School principal.*

Table-9: Time of use in the year 2015 for secondary bursary allocated

Month	Frequency	Percent
January	26	13.8
February	7	3.7
March	3	1.6
June	6	3.2
July	5	2.7
September	12	6.4
October	12	6.4
November	98	52.1
Not aware	19	10.1
Total	188	100

Source (Researcher, 2017)

As shown in Table-9, of those who benefited from the second bursary allocation, most 98(52.1%) had their bursary allocation used to pay their school fees in the month of November followed by January and those who were not aware when the bursary allocation was used to pay fee at 26 (13.8%) and 19(10.1%) respectively. March was the least 3 (1.6%) month when students the second bursary allocation was used to pay fees. This implies that most of the second bursary allocation were used to pay fees at the beginning and end of the year when the administration needed funds for the start of the academic year and clear the students' arrears at the end of the year respectively.

As shown in Table-10 most (38.5%) of the respondents who believed that, there was enhanced school internal efficiency, had their second bursary used to pay school fees in the month of January, and followed by the month of March and June at 33.3% each. Those who had their bursary used to pay fees in the month of February never (0.0%) believed on the improved school internal efficiency. This implies that, when the second bursary allocation is used to pay fees in the month of March and June, the students is likely to drop out from school, sent for school fees regularly and even perform poorly while the month of February finds when students have been sent home in the month of January to collect fees.

Table-10: Time of use in the year 2015 for secondary bursary allocated and school internal efficiency

Second bursary allocation * School internal efficiency Cross tabulation					
			School internal efficiency		Total
			Yes	No	
Second bursary allocation	January	Count	10	16	26
		% within Second bursary allocation	38.5%	61.5%	100.0%
	February	Count	0	7	7
		% within Second bursary allocation	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	March	Count	1	2	3
		% within Second bursary allocation	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	June	Count	2	4	6
		% within Second bursary allocation	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	July	Count	1	4	5
		% within Second bursary allocation	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	September	Count	1	11	12
		% within Second bursary allocation	8.3%	91.7%	100.0%
	October	Count	3	9	12
		% within Second bursary allocation	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	November	Count	29	69	98
		% within Second bursary allocation	29.6%	70.4%	100.0%
	Not aware	Count	2	17	19
		% within Second bursary allocation	10.5%	89.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	49	139	188
		% within Second bursary allocation	26.1%	73.9%	100.0%

Source (Researcher, 2017)

Table-11: Crosstabs for time and internal efficiency of schools

Internal efficiency of schools * timely disbursement Crosstabulation						
		Timely disbursement of funds				Total
		SA	A	D	SD	
The internal efficiency of schools due to CDF provision	6.00	77	0	0	0	77
	12.00	1	**247**	17	8	273
	24.00	0	0	38	0	38
Total		**78**	**247**	**55**	**8**	**388**

The cross tabulation in table-11 above between timely disbursement of funds and internal efficiency of schools show that the majority of the respondents (247) agreed that the bursary funds were not disbursed in a timely manner and as a result, the funds affected the school operations leading to needy students being sent away from school.

Table-12:Chi-Square Tests for timeliness and internal efficiency

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	633.002[a]	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	538.845	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	245.182	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	388		
a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .78.			

The chi-square results in the table-12 above show that the two variables are related at $p \leq 0.001$ significance level. This illustrates that there exist statistical significant relationship between timely allocation and disbursement of CDF funds and internal efficiency in public secondary in Kenya.

Table-13: Correlation between timelines and internal efficiency variables

		Timelines of CDF disbursement
Timelines of CDF disbursement	Pearson Correlation	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	N	388
Enhanced enrolment in school due to CDF	Pearson Correlation	.704**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	388
Reduced dropouts and repetitions rate of students in secondary due CDF	Pearson Correlation	.713**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	388
Enhanced access of the vulnerable students to education	Pearson Correlation	.684**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	388
Increased retention of students in school throughout the academic period	Pearson Correlation	.741**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	388
Increased equity in accessing education by the girl child	Pearson Correlation	.730**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	388
Enhanced completion and transmission rate to university of students	Pearson Correlation	.670**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	388
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).		

The correlation results in table-13 above between timeliness of CDF disbursement and internal efficiency variable reveals that, there is appositive and significant relationship between timeliness in disbursement of CDF funds and internal efficiency variable. The results show that timeliness in CDF disbursement has reduced dropouts and repetitions rate of students in secondary, enhanced access of the vulnerable students to education, increased retention of students in school throughout the academic period, increased equity in accessing education by the girl child and has enhanced completion and transmission rate to university of students at ($r=.704^{**}$, $p<.001$ significant level), ($r=.713^{**}$, $p<.001$ significant level), ($r=..684^{**}$, $p<.001$ significant level), ($r=.741^{**}$, $p<.001$ significant level), ($r=.730^{**}$, $p<.001$ significant level) and ($r=.670^{**}$, $p<.001$ significant level) respectively

The internal efficiency variables were merged through data transformation to form one variable and correlated with timely disbursement of CDF funds s shown in table-14 below.

Table-14: Correlation between internal efficiency and timeliness of CDF disbursement.

Correlations			
		Timeliness	**Internal efficiency**
Timeliness	Pearson Correlation	1	.796**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	388	388
Internal efficiency	Pearson Correlation	.796**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	388	388
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

The results in table-14 above show that there is a positive and significant relationship between internal efficiency and timeliness of bursary disbursement at r=.796**, p<.001 significant level. Calculating the coefficient of determinant R, reveals that timeliness in disbursement of bursary funds contribute 63.30% variability to the internal efficiency of secondary school when other factors are held constant.

These challenge is still similar to those that faced bursary disbursement before the year 2003. Prior to the year 2003, disbursement of bursaries to schools was centralized at the Ministry of Education (MOE) Headquarters at Jogoo House. During this period, head teachers and school managers disbursed the funds to needy students. However, a number of complaints arose among them poor timing in disbursement of funds.

It was observed that the bursary funds were not disbursed in a timely manner and a result, the funds affected the school operations leading to needy students being sent away from school. It was in response to these challenges and other challenges that MOE devolved these to the constituencies in 2003. The rationale for this devolvement was to improve education service delivery and accountability as well as expanding the number of beneficiaries. The new approach facilitates participation of the relevant stakeholders at the grassroots, thus improving governance and accountability. This is also in line with the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) of 2002, which stresses that programmes and projects should support national development and reduces poverty.

To enhance efficiency in timely disbursement of bursary funds to school, the Ministry of Education circular of 22nd April 2005 addressed to all District Education Officer, REF.NO.G9/1/V11/101, set in motion revised guidelines for the disbursements of Secondary School bursaries through constituencies. This policy was implemented from 2003/2004 financial year and was communicated to stakeholders vide circular Ref.No.G9/1/ (61) dated 22/9/2003 through all District Education Officers. In 2003, the Government of Kenya decided that, in line with the government policy on decentralization and empowerment of communities, from the 2003/2004 financial year, the Secondary Schools bursary funds would be administered at the constituency and district levels. Since then, all Secondary education bursary funds have been sent to the constituencies where it is disbursed through the constituency bursary committee in the understanding that communities are better placed to identify the poor among them. Despite these arrangements, the disbursement has been done late forcing the students from poor and orphaned families to stay out of class for most of the learning period thus performing poorly in their exams.

Therefore, the school administration and education stakeholders should ensure that the students/beneficiaries have their second bursary used to pay fees either in the beginning of term one for enhanced school internal efficiency.

Table-15: First bursary allocation and second bursary allocation

Did you receive first bursary allocation * Did you receive second bursary allocation Crosstabulation					
			Did you receive second bursary allocation		Total
			Yes	No	
Did you receive first bursary allocation	Yes	Count	178	29	207
		% within Did you receive first bursary allocation	86.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	No	Count	10	171	181
		% within Did you receive first bursary allocation	5.5%	94.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	188	200	388
		% within Did you receive first bursary allocation	48.5%	51.5%	100.0%

Source (Researcher, 2017)

As shown in Table-15, majority (86.0%) of those who received second bursary allocation, benefited from the first bursary, while majority (94.5%) of those who never received second bursary allocation also failed to benefit from the first bursary allocation. This implies that, if you fail to be a beneficiary of first bursary, then you are likely to miss the second allocation.

These findings are in agreement with a study by Oyugi [35] of Public Expenditure Tracking of Bursary schemes in Kenya observes that the main aim of the bursary scheme was to support children from poor and orphaned families access quality education. He argues that there is no consistency in supporting children from poor families as those with responsibility of a warding the bursar are corrupt. Many of the students are not guaranteed continuous funding to completion of high school education as they end up receiving bursary may be once. Student who need funding have to apply and reapply for funding. When they re-apply they are re-evaluated along with other applicants and may end up not receiving the award.

A substantial percentage of continuing students qualify for subsequent funding but this is based on re-application. This has significantly contributed to low transition and completion rates in secondary schools to below 50% essentially due to worsening poverty and increasing costs of education [36].

A study by Wachiye and Nasongo [37] on access to Secondary School Education through the constituency bursary fund in Kandunyi constituency argues that the purpose of the bursary was to support the vulnerable groups namely the orphans, girls, children from slums and the poor in high potential areas and in arid and semi-arid lands. However, the study found that the criteria for bursary allocation was highly faulted for inordinate bureaucracy and for perpetuating

unfairness by giving bursaries to the undeserving students and to those that were well connected. Recipients from high socio-economic backgrounds received more bursary support than their counterparts from the humble backgrounds. This anomaly was attributed to the flawed criteria of selecting the bursary recipients and therefore the transition rates remained low in the area.

CONCLUSIONS

The study established that when the first and second bursary allocation is used to pay fees earlier like in the month of June and January respectively, the internal efficiency is enhanced. Moreover, if you receive the first bursary allocation, the chances of benefiting from the second bursary allocation becomes high. Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that, the bursary provision criteria affects the school internal efficiency, as those who received the bursary based on the criteria followed experienced enhanced internal efficiency. However, the criteria given by the Ministry of Education, in some cases was not adhered to as those students whose parents work in the government and have higher education level have higher chances of receiving bursary as compared to their counterparts.

RECOMMENDATION

The constituency bursary fund allocation process has been known to be slow and cumbersome, so the government should ensure close monitoring of the bursary disbursement to improve on efficiency. Moreover, instead of the government sending the funds to constituent heads who then proceed to distribute the funds to schools, the funds should be sent directly to the schools so that school heads distribute the funds to students to avoid delays.

REFERENCES

1. World Bank Group. (2016). *The Little Data*. World Bank Publications.
2. Veerspoor, A. (2012). At the crossroads: Choices for secondary education and training in subsahara Africa.
3. MOE. (2010). School financial and bursary allocation. Government of Kenya: Nairobi.
4. Gilbert, C. L., & Vines, D. (Eds.). (2006). *The World Bank: structure and policies* (Vol. 3). Cambridge University Press.
5. Novo, M., Bigey, F., Beyne, E., Galeote, V., Gavory, F., Mallet, S., ... & Dequin, S. (2009). Eukaryote-to-eukaryote gene transfer events revealed by the genome sequence of the wine yeast Saccharomyces cerevisiae EC1118. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, pnas-0904673106.
6. World Bank. (2007). African Region Human Development Department, Secondary.
7. Glewwe, P., & Kremer, M. (2005). Schools, teachers, and education outcomes in developing countries. *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, *2*, 945-1017.
8. Shelton, C. J., & MacDonald, A. G. R. Johnstone. 1986. Induction of triploidy in rainbow trout using Nitrous Oxide. *Aquaculture*, *58*, 155-159.
9. Johnstone, R. A. (1996). Multiple displays in animal communication: 'backup signals' and 'multiple messages'. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B*, *351*(1337), 329-338.
10. Wojtyniak, A. C., & Stone, J. A. (1986). A high-pressure mass spectrometric study of the binding of trimethylsilylium to oxygen and aromatic bases. *International journal of mass spectrometry and ion processes*, *74*(1), 59-79.
11. Johnson, D., Lanahan, A., Buck, C. R., Sehgal, A., Morgan, C., Mercer, E., ... & Chao, M. (1986). Expression and structure of the human NGF receptor. *Cell*, *47*(4), 545-554.
12. Guerrero, A. Afifi. (2007). Close Encounters: Communication in Relationships.
13. Psacharopoulous, G. F., Woodhall, M. (1985). Education and Development: An analysis of investment choices.
14. Onkoba, B. (2012). *Impact of bursary award on the internal efficiency of secondary schools in Gucha District, Kisii County, Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation).
15. Jallade, J. P. (1974). Public Expenditures on Education and Income Distribution in Colombia. World Bank Staff Occasional Papers Number Eighteen.
16. Ng'ang'a, J. C. (2008). *Determinants of Inter-firm Networks* (No. 89). KIPPRA Discussion Paper, DP.
17. Meerman, J. P. (1974). The definition of income in studies of budget incidence and income distribution. *Review of Income and Wealth*, *20*(4), 515-522.
18. Meesook, O. A. (1984). Financing and equity in the social sectors in Indonesia: some policy options.
19. World Bank. (1995). Priorities and Strategies for Education: A World Bank Review. Washington DC: The World Bank.
20. Nhundu, T. J. (1992). A decade of educational expansion in Zimbabwe: Causes, consequences, and policy contradictions. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *61*(1), 78-98.
21. Ministry of Education. (1980). Report of the National Conference on Education and Training . Nairobi.
22. Unicef. (2003). World Bank. 2003. *Marginal Budgeting for Bottlenecks: How to reach the impact frontier of health and nutrition services and accelerate progress towards the Millennium Development Goals. A budgeting model and an application to low-income countries (forthcoming)*.
23. Wangila, D. S. (2016). *Resistance management of western corn rootworm, Diabrotica virgifera virgifera LeConte, to corn traits in Nebraska*. The University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

24. Obonyo, E., Anumba, C., & Thorpe, T. (2005). APRON: an agent-based specification and procurement system for construction products. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, *12*(4), 329-350.
25. Oyaro, K. (2008). Kenya: Offer of Free Secondary Education Overcrowds Schools, Interpress service. Retrieved from http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi_0199-7669002/KENYA-OFFER-OF-FREE-SECONDARY.html
26. Rietveld-van Wingerden, M., Sturm, J. C., & Miedema, S. (2003). Vrijheid van onderwijs en sociale cohesie in historisch perspectief. *Pedagogiek*, *23*(2), 97-108.
27. Republic of Kenya. (2006). Education statistics and indicators fact sheet (2002-2006) Ministry of Education. Nairobi: Government Press.
28. Ponnu, C. H., & Okoth, M. O. (2009). Corporate social responsibility disclosure in Kenya: The Nairobi stock exchange. *African Journal of Business Management*, *3*(10), 601-608.
29. Tan, B. H., Valdivia, C. R., Rok, B. A., Ye, B., Ruwaldt, K. M., Tester, D. J., ... & Makielski, J. C. (2005). Common human SCN5A polymorphisms have altered electrophysiology when expressed in Q1077 splice variants. *Heart Rhythm*, *2*(7), 741-747.
30. Sabarwal, S., Evans, D. K., & Marshak, A. (2014). *The permanent input hypothesis: the case of textbooks and (no) student learning in Sierra Leone*. The World Bank.
31. Otieno, D. J., Hubbard, L., & Ruto, E. (2012). Determinants of technical efficiency in beef cattle production in Kenya. In *International Association of Agricultural Economists (IAAE) Triennial Conference, Foz do Iguacu, Brazil, August*.
32. Boru, K. (2013). Factors influencing internal efficiency in public primary schools of Moyale District Marsabit County. Unpublished Thesis.
33. Schultz, T. W., (1971) Investment in Human Capital. The role of education and Research. New York: Free Press.
34. Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). Action research. *Research methods in education*, *5*, 226-244.
35. Oyugi, L. N. (2010). Public Expenditure Tracking of Secondary Education Bursary Scheme in Kenya. Nairobi: IPAR.
36. Republic of Kenya. (2003). A report on Economic Survey. Nairobi: Kenya Bureau of Statistics.
37. Wachiye, J. H., & Nasongo, W. J. (2010). Access to secondary school education through the constituency bursary fund in kanduyi constituency, Kenya. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *5*(5), 224-236.