

## INFLUENCE OF CONSTITUENCY DEVELOPMENT FUND BURSARIES ON LEARNERS' CLASS ATTENDANCE IN PUBLIC BOARDING SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN KENYENYA SUB-COUNTY, KENYA

*Beth Syanda<sup>1</sup>, Mount Kenya University*

*George Ogochi<sup>2</sup>, Mount Kenya University*

### Abstract

Education is a profitable private investment yet many students cannot afford to finance it out of their own family resources. Awarding of bursaries to the poor and vulnerable enables such groups to access and complete school. The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of Constituency Development Fund (CDF) bursaries on Learners' class attendance in public boarding secondary schools in Kenyenyia Sub-County, Kenya. This study was inclined to the Human Capital Theory. Descriptive research design was adopted for the study. Krejcie and Morgan table was used to select a sample of 380 respondents from a target population of 25,279 individuals. Purposive and random sampling techniques were used to select the respondents. The researcher utilized questionnaires for teachers and students while an interview schedule. From the data obtained in Kenyenyia sub-county, it was important for the CDF to ensure that public boarding secondary schools had an allocation of these funds even before the students enrolled in school to ensure sustenance. On assessing the extent to which provision of learning resources by CDF influence learners' class attendance in public boarding secondary schools, it was important for schools to ensure that distribution of learning resources was be based on students' population and not performance.

*Key words: Learners, attendance, performance, retention*

### Background to the Study

Education is an important tool of empowering people for prosperity (Obare, 2004) and for making women and men productive in the labor market and also in the households. Education is a profitable private investment yet many students cannot afford to finance it out of their own family resources (Psacharopolous and Woodhall, 1985). 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 (Veerspoor, 2007). Education is human capital which is essential for one to be socially productive in the society (Schultz, 1982). A person with education benefits not only himself but also the society. 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. 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 such as orphans and the poor who live in extreme poverty.

In the United Kingdom (UK) all students may 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. A student awarded a medium priority bursary is not precluded from also applying for a low priority bursary where extra support is required. The school operates a 16-19 bursary fund committee which is made up of key stakeholders. It sits as and when required throughout the academic year and approves all awards. For low priority awards, it discusses every individual case based on the documentary evidence available and all the personal circumstances of the student and decides on an appropriate amount. The award is paid in kind such as provision of necessary course equipment, travel tickets and free meals. This helps to ensure the bursary awarded genuinely is sufficient to meet students’ needs. Communicating details about the bursaries is the responsibility of individual providers or groups of providers since the information is posted on their websites.

The government of Kenya recognizes the fact that education is the main pillar in the overall development process of the country (GoK, 2005). Consequently, it has developed an education policy that is geared towards education for all. It is aimed at eliminating disparity in all levels of education by 2015, a step that is in conformity with the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) (UNESCO, 2000). However, in most developing countries, the disadvantaged members of the society such as orphans and the poor are not enabled to access education. This is more specifically pronounced in marginalized communities as well as low income households.

In these countries, few disadvantaged members of the society such as orphans and the poor enroll in schools and the few who enroll, drop out early due to socio cultural and economic factors which include poverty (Towett, 2004). Consequently, these orphans and the poor lack their basic right of meaningful education. The lagging behind in education of vulnerable learners in these communities leads to diminished life chances in various areas such as employment, health and participation in political processes that affect their lives. This is consistent with the observation that restricted opportunity is one of the most powerful mechanisms for transmitting poverty across generations among the marginalized (Flora, 2008)

In 2003, the government of Kenya introduced Constituency Development Fund (CDF) bursary with an aim of assisting the poor and the vulnerable groups in the community to meet their basic needs such as health and education. The government of Kenya has put in place several interventions to provide schooling opportunities for the poor and vulnerable. It is not confirmed whether all poor and the vulnerable groups are aware of these interventions. Among these interventions include free primary education, subsidized secondary education, education bursaries and Constituency Development Fund bursary (CDF). The CDF bursary as one of the interventions aimed at achieving four objectives: increasing access to secondary schools, ensuring retention of students in secondary schools, promoting transition and

completion rates and reducing disparities and inequalities in the provision of secondary education. The bursary scheme targets to assist orphans, children from arid and semi-arid lands, children in difficult circumstances and other vulnerable groups, children from poor households especially those without income and generally the girl child (GoK, 2017). The learners of Kenya Sub-County are eligible to this fund. This study therefore sought; to establish how the CDF has assisted the learners in the provision of education in Kenya Sub-County.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Various constituencies through the CDF operate a bursary fund for secondary schools as part of Social Dimension of Development program initiative targeting poor and vulnerable students. The scheme is intended to enhance retention and completion rates and ensure high quality secondary school education for all eligible Kenyans with special attention to the poor and vulnerable groups (Gesora, 2017). Issues such as corruption, political patronage, nepotism and tribalism have plagued the CDF award process to schools. Worse still is the little regard for defined bursary eligibility criteria. There is inadequate information to facilitate re-orientation of the CDF to make it a needs-based initiative. For example, students from high socio-economic backgrounds received more bursary support than their counterparts from the humble backgrounds as a result of political pressure exerted on the CDF committee (Gesora, 2017). Thus, equity in the allocation of the CDF to schools and students has not been achieved fully. The money allocated to the students is not enough to sustain them in secondary schools. Every citizen should have inalienable right to social services which include education irrespective of their socio-economic, gender and political background. Although funds are disbursed by government for onward awarding to needy students, such students have had to transfer from public boarding to public day secondary schools which are cheaper. Students absenteeism due to lack of school fees has also been experienced. It is on such background that the researcher will seek to establish the influence of CDF on Learners' class attendance in public boarding secondary schools in Kenya Sub-County, Kenya

### **Literature Review**

With the introduction of cost sharing policy, the burden of secondary education shifted to the parents entirely. This fee-paying secondary education impacts negatively on the poor households as they cannot afford to educate their children. These cost of education leads to poor participation of children from marginalized and disadvantaged groups in secondary education (RoK, 1999). It is in this regard that the government introduced three types of bursaries at constituency level.

The first was Secondary Education Bursary Fund (SEBF) in 1993/1994 financial year which is money channeled by the government to help needy students in secondary schools. The second was the CDF in 2003 for generalized development with emphasis on health, education and social amenities. The third is bursaries from local authorities. There is a kitty for poor students in Local Authorities Transfer Funds (LATF) which was introduced in 1999. The CDF Policy had a special place for education; it allocated 10% of the total constituency allocation to education. This allocation has been used to build additional classrooms, construct libraries and laboratories, construct dormitories and equip schools. More specifically, the educational allocation has been used to award bursaries for secondary schools and different types of post school educational programs including teacher training, technical training, other types of vocational training and university education. In particular

through this policy many students have benefited from CDF bursary fund which has enabled them to access education and eventually complete school and become self-reliant.

In UK, Edusave bursary scheme which is initiated by the government through Ministry of Education states categorically that for a student to qualify for bursary the gross monthly household income should be below \$4000. Set rules are put in place to ensure that this is adhered to. The scheme ensures that the beneficiaries are retained in school. Any student who discontinues does so under his/her own will (MOE, 2012). Still in UK, there is what is called 16-19 Bursary fund. The bursary fund guidance for 2012/2013 re-emphasizes the importance of ensuring available funds are targeted at those students experiencing the greatest financial disadvantages, that the amounts allocated are sufficient to enable those students to participate in education and that the availability of funding is effectively communicated to prospective and actual students both before and when they enroll.

Different bursary providers have set out to achieve this. For example, in Brandford academy eligibility to the funds is based on the household income being below 16,100 pounds or the students' parents being in receipt of jobseekers Allowance income support or an equivalent benefit. According to Open (2007) in China and Philippines bursaries eligibility was pegged on official poverty line. However, the eligibility ceiling is an income level above the official poverty line which gave eligibility to many students who were not drawn from the ranks of the very poor. In Thailand, eligibility based on family income fails to take into account a number of factors such as the number of other dependents in a given household. In Rwanda the chances of being in school are higher among children with both parents alive than among those who have lost at least one parent.

According to findings of World Bank (2007) children who had lost their mothers even if they had not lost their fathers were most at risk of not attending school. Social-economic disparities widen substantially at post primary level. The government set up the Rwanda Genocide Fund (RGF) which targets this level of Education. The orphaned children are the beneficiaries of such funds and funding continues for as long as such students are present in the system. Orphans are therefore relatively well represented in secondary Education. According to Conseil protestant du Rwanda (CPR) which is an umbrella organization of schools run by various churches, their data on participation of children in secondary level revealed that participation in secondary education of orphans rose to 41% owing to the fact that these children have been specifically targeted for assistance under Rwanda Genocide Fund (RGF).

Oyugi (2010) in a study of Public Expenditure Tracking of Bursary schemes in Kenya observes that the major objective of the bursary scheme is to enable children from poor families' access education. According to him there is no consistency in supporting children from poor families. Such students are not guaranteed continuous funding to completion of high school education. Student who need funding have to apply and reapply for funding. When they re-apply, they are re-evaluated along with other applicants. A substantial percentage of continuing students qualify for subsequent funding but this is based on re-application. Transition and completion rates in secondary schools remained below 50% essentially due to worsening poverty and increasing costs of education (Republic of Kenya, 2003).

According to Wachiye and Nasongo (2010) in a study on access to Secondary School Education through the constituency bursary fund in Kandunyi constituency, in an effort to enhance transition from the primary schools to secondary schools, the government of Kenya introduced the bursary scheme for secondary schools during 1993/1994 financial year. The

bursary targeted 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 method of 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.

In a study carried out by IPAR (2003) on education financing in Kenya, results indicated that the Ministry of Education had not given adequate guidelines to schools on how to identify needy students for the bursary awards. The general guidelines from the Ministry simply instructed the schools to allocate the money to the poor, bright and well-disciplined students, failing to give specific guidelines regarding the amounts of bursary funding to be allocated per student, in order to have meaningful impact. Without clear guidelines, schools used various criteria and methods to allocate the bursaries. As a result, most head teachers abused the facility by awarding the bursaries to their kin, some from less deserving backgrounds. In other cases, the DEOs and politicians are said to have put undue pressure on head teachers to allocate bursaries to their relatives, thereby denying needy students access to the facility.

Njeru and Orodho (2003) investigated the impact of the bursary scheme in four districts namely: Kiambu, Kisumu, Bungoma and Garissa. The study results showed that the needy students in the study districts had varying amounts of outstanding fees, indicative of the bursary fund being insufficient to cushion their education needs. The study also showed that while the bursary scheme was meant to cushion the poor and vulnerable against the vagaries of falling economic indicators, it appeared not to have made any overwhelming impact on students' access to secondary education and had achieved little in maintaining increased retention and participation rates in secondary school education. Kiragu (2002) says that the Bursary introduced by the government in secondary schools did not necessarily benefit the most deserving students because of reasons such as nepotism, corruption and poor selection criteria.

Prior to 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 as follows: Firstly, it was noted that undeserving students benefiting from the bursary fund. The managers and the head teachers allocated bursary funds to those students from rich families and hence denying the funds to the deserving students.

Secondly, as a result of proper communication to parents or guardians and the beneficiaries, very few beneficiaries are reached. Thirdly, due to the rampant corruption in the management of bursary funds, ghost students and children of well-connected individuals being allocated bursaries. Fourthly, it was also observed that too small amounts were being allocated. As a result, the bursary fund does not adequately assist needy student because it is quite insufficient. Fifthly, it was observed that there is lack of clear criteria for bursary allocation. As a result of the absence of well-defined criteria, there was no transparency and accountability by MOE and schools (MOE bursary section data, 2003). Finally, it was observed that the bursary funds were not disbursed in a timely manner and a result, the funds it 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 programs and projects should support national development and reduces poverty.

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. The objectives of the bursary schemes include increasing access to Secondary Schools, enhancing transition and completion rates in Secondary Schools, and reducing disparities and inequalities in the provision of Secondary School education (GOK, 1995). The bursary program is intended to assist the following group of students: orphans, children from poor households (especially those with no incomes), children from ASAL areas and urban slums, the girl child and children in difficult circumstances, those with special needs and girls rescued from difficult circumstances including early marriages and pregnancies (MOE Circular Ref.No.G9/1/V11/101 dated 22nd April 2005). The bursary allocation to each constituency is calculated based on the number of students from the constituency enrolled in Secondary Schools in Kenya, the national Secondary School enrolment, the district poverty index and the national poverty index.

The formula used to allocate bursaries to the constituencies is: -

Constituency bursary =  $\frac{\text{Amount allocated} * \text{enrolment} * \text{district poverty index}}$

$\text{National enrolment} * \text{national poverty index}$

This formula promotes equity by allocating more funds to constituencies with higher poverty level, hence aims at facilitating access and retention of children from marginalized areas including ASAL and urban slums.

## Methodology

All the thirteen (13) schools in Kenyenyia sub-county were used in the study. Given that the study's target population was 4428, which comprised of the Principals, teachers, learners and CDF committee members, the researcher will use the Morgan and Krejcie (1970) Table for sample size determination to arrive at 380 respondents. Since the 13 Principals and 16 CDF committee members will be sampled purposively, the remaining 351 respondents will be distributed ratio wise among the teachers and students as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Sample Size**

No	Category	Sample Size (F)	Percentage (%)
1	Public boarding Secondary School principals	13	3.42
2	Secondary School Teachers	27	7.11
3	Secondary School Students	324	85.26
4	CDF Committee Members	16	4.21
Total		380	100.00

*Source: Kenya Sub-County Education Office, 2019*

The study had a sample size of 380 respondents. All were given the questionnaire and which they filled and the researcher picked them after one week. At the end of the said duration, only 317 respondents had filled in the questionnaire giving a response rate of 83.42%. The researcher made efforts to call other respondents to fill the questionnaires but was not successful. Due to the constraint of time, the researcher continued with the analysis since according to Best and Khan, (2006) a response rate of 50% is considered adequate, 60% good and above 70% very good. Therefore, in view of this, the response rate was considered very good and exceeded the threshold postulated by Best and Khan.

Qualitative analysis was carried out on the data collected and findings obtained were presented in the section below.

The bursary allocation was targeted to students that had the greatest financial disadvantages. The sought data on this aspect was presented in the table 2.

**Table 2: Bursary allocation was targeted towards students with the greatest financial disadvantages**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	64	20.2	20.2	20.2
	Disagree	127	40.1	40.1	60.3
	Undecided	48	15.1	15.1	75.4
	Agree	78	24.6	24.6	100.0
	Total	317	100.0	100.0	

Source: The researcher, 2019

From the findings above, 60.3% of the respondents disagreed (20.2% strongly disagreed, 40.1% disagreed) that bursary allocation was targeted towards students with the greatest financial disadvantages. 24.6% of the respondents agreed that bursary allocation was targeted towards students with the greatest financial disadvantages. 15.1% of the respondents were undecided on whether bursary allocation was targeted towards students with the greatest financial disadvantages. Majority of the respondents disagreed that bursary allocation was targeted towards students with the greatest financial disadvantages. According to the UK

Edusave bursary scheme for the 2012/2013 financial year, the scheme’s guidance re-emphasized that available funds should be targeted to the students with the greatest financial challenges giving priority accordingly. From the data obtained in Kenyena sub-county, it was important for the CDF to ensure that public boarding secondary schools had an allocation of this funds even before the students enrolled in school to ensure sustenance.

Data on whether the bursary amount allocated was sufficient to allow students to participate in education. The findings obtained were presented in the table 3.

**Table 3: The bursary amount allocated was sufficient to allow students to participate in education**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	95	30.0	30.0	30.0
	Disagree	96	30.3	30.3	60.3
	Undecided	48	15.1	15.1	75.4
	Agree	48	15.1	15.1	90.5
	Strongly Agree	30	9.5	9.5	100.0
	Total	317	100.0	100.0	

Source: The researcher, 2019

From the table above 60.3% of the respondents disagreed (30% strongly disagreed, 30.3% disagreed) that bursary funds were sufficient to allow students to participate in education. 24.6% of the respondents agreed (9.5% strongly agreed, 15.1% agreed) that bursary funds were sufficient to allow students to participate in education. 15.1% of the respondents were undecided on whether bursary funds were sufficient to allow students to participate in education. Majority of the population disagreed that bursary funds were sufficient to allow students to participate in education. Njeru and Orodho (2003) carried out an investigation to analyze the impact of bursary schemes in four different districts. The results of their study showed that needy students in the study districts had varying amounts of outstanding fees meaning that the bursary fund was insufficient to cushion their education needs. From the findings in the above table, it was important for CDF in Kenyena to critically the needy students and ensure sustainable funds were allocated to meet the education needs of these students by ensuring learning without interruption.

The study wanted to establish whether there existed a well-structured criterion for selecting bursary recipients. The findings obtained were shown in the section table 4.



**Table 4: There was a well-structured criterion for selecting bursary recipients**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	52	16.4	16.4	16.4
	Disagree	147	46.4	46.4	62.8
	Undecided	45	14.2	14.2	77.0
	Agree	28	8.8	8.8	85.8
	Strongly Agree	45	14.2	14.2	100.0
	Total	317	100.0	100.0	

Source: The researcher, 2019

From the findings above, 62.8% of the respondents disagreed (16.4% strongly disagreed, 46.4% disagreed) that there was a well-structured criterion for selecting bursary recipients. 23% of the respondents agreed (8.8% agreed, 14.2% strongly agreed) that there was a well-structured criterion for selecting bursary recipients. 14.2% of the respondents were undecided on whether there was a well-structured criterion for selecting bursary recipients. Majority of the respondents disagreed that there was a well-structured criterion for selecting bursary recipients. IPAR (2003) carried out a research on education financing in Kenya. The results indicated that the ministry of education did not give adequate guidelines to schools on how to identify needy students for the bursary awards. From the findings above, it is very essential for the CDF to create a well-documented procedure for issuing bursaries to the deserving students thus avoiding unwanted challenges in the management of the bursary fund.

Data on whether provision of bursaries was corruption free is presented in table 5.

**Table 5: Provision of bursary was corruption free**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	51	16.1	16.1	16.1
	Disagree	182	57.4	57.4	73.5
	Undecided	39	12.3	12.3	85.8
	Agree	45	14.2	14.2	100.0
	Total	317	100.0	100.0	

Source: The researcher, 2019

From the table above, 73.5% of the respondents disagreed (16.1% strongly disagreed, 57.4% disagreed) that provision of bursary was corruption free. 14.2% of the respondents agreed

that provision of bursary was corruption free. 12.3% of the respondents were undecided on whether provision of bursary was corruption free. Majority of the respondents disagreed that provision of bursary was corruption free. According to Kiragu (2003), rampant corruption in the management of bursary funds led to ghost students and allocation of bursaries to well-connected and undeserving individuals. From the findings above, it was very important to come up matrices identified the deserving individuals for bursary funds thus avoiding bureaucracies that led to corruption.

Furthermore, the study sought to establish whether bursary funds were disbursed in a timely manner. The findings obtained were presented in the table below 6.

**Table 6: Bursaries were disbursed in a timely manner**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	CumPercent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	125	39.4	39.4	39.4
	Disagree	141	44.5	44.5	83.9
	Undecided	6	1.9	1.9	85.8
	Agree	45	14.2	14.2	100.0
	Total	317	100.0	100.0	

Source: The Researcher, 2019

From the above table, 83.9% of the respondents disagreed (39.4% strongly disagreed, 44.5% disagreed) that bursary funds were disbursed in a timely manner. 14.2% of the respondents agreed that bursary funds were disbursed in a timely manner. 1.9% of the respondents were undecided on whether bursary funds were disbursed in a timely manner. Majority of the respondents disagreed that bursary funds were disbursed in a timely manner. According to the Ministry of education, Kenya (Bursary section, 2003), it was observed that bursary funds were not disbursed in a timely manner and as a result, it affected the school operations leading to needy students being sent away from school. From the findings above, it was important to ensure the bursary funds were disbursed in a timely fashion to ensure that there was continuity in learning continuity for the needy students and no interruption occurred during the learning process.

Further quantitative analysis was carried out the variables. Correlation and regression analysis were used to analyze the data obtained. The findings obtained were presented in the section below.

**Correlation**

The findings obtained were presented in the table7.

**Table 7: Correlation**

		Bursary allocation was targeted towards students with the greatest financial disadvantages	Bursary was sufficient to allow students to participate in education	There was a well-structured criterion for selecting bursary recipients	Provision of bursary was corruption free	Bursaries were disbursed in a timely manner
Bursary allocation was targeted towards students with the greatest financial disadvantages	Pearson Correlation	1	.916**	.835**	-.028	.101
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.619	.072
	N	317	317	317	317	317
Bursary was sufficient to allow students to participate in education	Pearson Correlation	.916**	1	.764**	.005	.014
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.931	.805
	N	317	317	317	317	317
There was a well-structured criterion for selecting bursary recipients	Pearson Correlation	.835**	.764**	1	.117*	.015
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.037	.794
	N	317	317	317	317	317
Provision of bursary was corruption free	Pearson Correlation	-.028	.005	.117*	1	-.244**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.619	.931	.037		.000
	N	317	317	317	317	317
Bursaries were disbursed in a timely manner	Pearson Correlation	.101	.014	.015	-.244**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.072	.805	.794	.000	
	N	317	317	317	317	317

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: The researcher, 2019

The following variable combinations had a strong positive effect of increasing learners' attendance in public secondary schools in Kenya sub-county:

- Bursary allocation to the students that have the greatest financial disadvantages and allocation of a bursary amount that is sufficient to allow students to participate in education. This had a correlation co-efficient of .916\*\*.
- Bursary allocation to the students that have the greatest financial disadvantages and coming up with a well-structured criterion for selecting bursary recipients. This had a correlation co-efficient of .835\*\*.
- Allocation of a bursary amount that is sufficient to allow students to participate in education and coming up with a well-structured criterion for selecting bursary recipients. This had a correlation co-efficient of .764\*\*.

**Linear regression**

The findings were presented in the table 8.

<b>Coefficients<sup>a</sup></b>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.474	.144		24.127	.000
	Bursary allocation was targeted towards students with the greatest financial disadvantages	-.432	.095	-.688	-4.563	.000
	Bursary was sufficient to allow students to participate in education	-.074	.064	-.145	-1.155	.249
	There was a well-structured criterion for selecting bursary recipients	.344	.049	.650	6.990	.000
	Provision of bursary was corruption free	-.222	.039	-.294	-5.615	.000
	Bursaries were disbursed in a timely manner	-.043	.035	-.063	-1.199	.231

a. Dependent Variable: Dependent variable allocation of CDF bursary

Source: The Researcher, 2019

From the findings above, targeting bursary allocation to students with the greatest financial disadvantages, having a well-structured criterion for selecting bursary recipients and eliminating corruption in the disbursement of bursaries were significant predictors of improving learners' class attendance in public boarding secondary schools in Kenya sub-county. Their significance level was below .0005 which meant there was at least a 95% confidence level. The constant variable was a significant predictor of improving learners' class attendance in public boarding secondary schools.

## Conclusion

In determining whether CDF bursaries influence learners' class attendance in public boarding secondary schools, it was important for the CDF to ensure that public boarding secondary schools had an allocation of this funds even before the students enrolled in school to ensure sustenance. It was important for CDF to critically assess the needy students and ensure sustainable funds were allocated to meet the education needs of these students by ensuring learning without interruption.

It is very essential for the CDF to create a well-documented procedure for issuing bursaries to the deserving students thus avoiding unwanted challenges in the management of the bursary fund. It was very important to come up matrices that identified the deserving individuals for bursary funds thus avoiding bureaucracies that led to corruption. It was important to ensure the bursary funds were disbursed in a timely fashion to ensure that there was continuity in learning continuity for the needy students and no interruption occurred during the learning process.

## Recommendations

1. The government should allocate enough money for CDF bursaries that will be disbursed to deserving students.
2. It's important for schools to have the adequate learning materials which should be part of MOE budget
3. The government should support co-curricular activities since they teach the students social skills and interactions which are equally important as education
4. Growth and development of infrastructure is very important because it makes schools become scalable to accommodate future growth.

## References

- Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D.(1989). *Education Research: An Introduction* 5th Edition New York: Longman
- Flora, F. (2008). "Effectiveness of Government Bursary Fund Program in Enhancing Girl-child Access to Secondary Education in Kajiado District", Kenya: Unpublished Thesis Kenyatta University.
- Fry, R. (2003). *Hispanic youth dropping out of US schools, measuring the challenges*.Pew.1 hispanicCentre.Online <http://pcwhispanic.org/reprots/repon.php> 4/8/2010.
- Gay, L.R. (1992). *Education Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*: London: Charles E. Milton Keynes Philadelphia Company.
- IPAR (2003). Education Financing in Kenya: Secondary School scheme implementation and challenge. IPAR Policy brief volume , 9, issue, 3, 2003.
- Katler, B. (1989). *Sociological analysis on the impact that divorce has on children*. New York: Witey and Sons Ltd.

- Kerlinger F N (1973). *Foundation of Behavioural Research*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Kimenyi SM (2005). *Efficiency and Efficacy of Kenya's Constituency Development Fund. Theory and Evidence*. Connecticut: University of Connecticut.
- KIPPRA (2005). *Accountability and Performance of Constituency Funds*. Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Public Policy Research Analysis.
- Krejcie and D. Morgan (1990), *determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological measurement*.
- Lewin, K. (2008). *Seeking secondary schooling in sub-Saharan Africa, Strategies for Sustainable Financing*. U.S.A : World Bank.
- Lewin K, Caillods F (2001). *Financing Secondary Education in Developing Countries: Strategies for Sustainable Growth*. Paris: IIEP
- Mwangi W (2006). *Resolve Row Over Bursary*. Daily Nation. Nairobi: October 7th 2006.
- Nduva V (2004). *The Constituency Bursary Fund*. The Link Magazine. Nairobi: Vol. 004.pp. 16-17.
- Odalo B (2000). "What makes Makueni District Tick?" Daily Nation: Jan 3rd 2000.
- Odebero SO (2002). *Bursary as a Method of Financing Secondary School Education in Busia District – Kenya*. Unpublished M.Ed Thesis Maseno University, Kenya
- Onyango D, Njue J (2004). *Rising Protests Over Constituency Fund*. The East African Standard. Nairobi: September 19th 2004.
- Republic of Kenya (1999). *National Poverty Eradication Plan 1999- 2015*. Nairobi, Government Printer
- Republic of Kenya (2002). *TransNzoia District Development Plan, 2002 –2008*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya (2003). *Economic Recovery .strategy for wealth and Employment creation*. : Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya (2007). *Governance of Schools (Module Two)*. Nairobi. Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.
- Republic of Kenya (2010). *School financial and bursary allocation*. Government of Kenya: Nairobi. Government Printers
- Republic of Kenya (2010). *Draft Manual for Secondary schools Bursary Scheme*. Nairobi. Government Printers
- Republic of Kenya (2012). *Secondary scheme Bursary Fund*. Nairobi. Republic of Kenya
- Republic of Kenya (2003). *Report of the National Conference on Education and Training*. Nairobi. Government Printers.
- Ministry of Education (2012). *Edusave Merit Bursary (2012)* Singapore Britain. [Http://www.moe.gov.sg/initiative/edusave/funds-grants-awards/](http://www.moe.gov.sg/initiative/edusave/funds-grants-awards/)
- Mugenda, A & Mugenda, O. (2003). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Acts Press. Nairobi, Kenya.
- Njeru, F. H. N, & Orodho. J.A (2003). *Education Financing in Kenya, Secondary Bursary scheme. Implementation and challenges*. Nairobi, Institute of policy Analysis and Research (KIPPRA).
- Nkinyangi, A. (1980). *Socio-Economic Determinant of repetition*. Nigeria: Ahmadu University Press.
- Obare, M.M. (2004). *The Role of Government Bursary Fund in enhancing the participation of girls in secondary Education in Nyamira District, Kenya*. Unpublished thesis Kenyatta University.
- Oyugi, L. N. (2010). *Public Expenditure Tracking of Secondary Education Bursary Scheme in Kenya*. Nairobi: IPAR. Oxfam GB (2005). *Gender – Responsive Budgeting in*

- Education, Education and Gender Equality Series. Programme insights. London: Oxfam.
- Republic of Kenya (1965). Sessional Paper No, 10: African Socialism and its Planning Implication, Nairobi.
- Government printer Republic of Kenya (1988). Sessional Paper No. 6 secondary Education in Kenya. Nairobi: Government printer.
- Republic of Kenya (1999). Education for the 21st Century; position paper. Nairobi, Ministry of Education.
- Republic of Kenya (1999). National Poverty Eradication Plan 1999- 2015. Nairobi, Government Printer Republic of Kenya (2003). Economic Recovery .strategy for wealth and Employment creation. Nairobi: Government printer.
- Republic of Kenya (2005) .Sessional Paper No. 1. Nairobi: Government printer.
- Republic of Kenya (2007). Kenya Education Support Programme 2005-2010. Nairobi: Government printer.
- Republic of Kenya (2007). Secondary Education Strategy 2007-2010. Nairobi: Government printer.
- Republic of Kenya (2008). Secondary School bursary Scheme Survey Report. Nairobi: Government printer.
- Republic of Kenya (2009). Draft Policy on Secondary Schools Bursary Scheme. Nairobi: Government printer.
- Psacharopoulos G: & Woodhall M (1985). Education for Development, An Analysis of Investment Choices. Washington D.C., for University press.
- Resnik, D.B. (2005) . What is ethics in research and why it is important? National Institute of health Website. 4th February 2011. 5.00 p.m.
- Schultz. T.W. (1961). Education Growth in Social Forces Influencing America Education. Nb Henry Chicago. National Society for Study of Education. University of Chicago Press.
- Siringi, S (2006). Grand Plan to check high Dropout Rate of Poor students. Daily Nation, December 4th, 2006, Nairobi. Kenya.
- Sitati, M. (2015). *Effectiveness of constituency bursary funds in enhancing retention of students in secondary schools in Bungoma South Sub-County*, *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 21(5), 12-22.
- Selowsky M (1979). Who Benefits From Government Expenditure? A Case Study of Colombia New York: Oxford University Press.
- Todaro, M. P. (1997) Economic Development. Delhi, India: Pearson Education pte Ltd.
- Todaro, M. & Smith, S. (2003). Economic Development. Delhi, India; Pearson Education pte Ltd.
- Tuckman WB (1978). Conducting Educational Research. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- UNESCO, (2000). Gender and Education for all. The leap to Equality. Paris: United States.
- UNESCO Bangkok (2010). Gender Responsive Budgeting in Education- Advocacy Brief Bangkok: UNESCO.
- Veerspoor, A. (2007). At the Crossroads: Choices for Secondary Education and Training in sub-Saharan Africa. Retrieved from [www.iiiep.unesco.org](http://www.iiiep.unesco.org). On 14th January, 2009. <http://www.education.gov.uk/childrenandyoungpeople/youngpeople/students/support/funding/a00203061/16-19-bursaries>.
- World Bank (2007). African Region Human Development Department. Secondary Education in Africa. All the Crossroads. Choices for secondary Education and Training in sub-Saharan Africa. Retrieved from [www.iiiep.unesco.org](http://www.iiiep.unesco.org). On 14th January, 2009. [www.education.gov.uk](http://www.education.gov.uk).