



**Article History**  
 Received: 2024-09-18  
 Accepted: 2025-10-19  
 Published: 2025-11-19

Issue no: 1 | Vol no: 6 | November 2025: 11-24

## Relationship between Donor Funding and School Operations in Public Secondary Schools in Nakuru County, Kenya

Faith Adhola <sup>(1)</sup>   
 John Ochola <sup>(2)</sup>   
 Betty Tikoko <sup>(3)</sup> 

(1,2,3.) Kabarak University, Kenya.  
 Main Author's Email: [fadhola@kabarak.ac.ke](mailto:fadhola@kabarak.ac.ke)

### Cite this article in APA

Adhola, F., Ochola, J., & Tikoko, B. (2025). Relationship between donor funding and school operations in public secondary schools in Nakuru County, Kenya. *Editon consortium journal of curriculum and educational studies*, 6(1), 11-24. <https://doi.org/10.51317/ecjces.v6i1.653>

### ABSTRACT

This paper investigated the relationship between donor funding and operations of public secondary schools in Nakuru County. The study was anchored on the Resource-Based Theory and adopted the correlational research design. The target population was 365 public secondary school principals and the same number of bursars in Nakuru County. The accessible population comprised 102 principals and 102 bursars from Bahati, Gilgil and Nakuru Town East sub-counties. A sample of 51 principals and 51 bursars, selected using the census method in National, Extra County and county schools and simple random sampling for the sub-county schools, participated in the study. A bursar's questionnaire and principal's interview guide were used to collect data. The face and content validity of the bursars' questionnaire and principals' interview guide were checked through expert judgement. The reliability of the bursars' questionnaire was estimated using the Cronbach Alpha method. The instrument was reliable as its coefficient was 0.762. Qualitative data were analysed thematically through the inductive method. Hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance using Pearson's Correlation. The financial support by donors was low, as it was rated at 2.34 out of 5. The findings further showed that the relationship between donor funding and school operations was positive but not statistically significant,  $r(29) = .152, p = .415$ . The study concluded that financial support by donors does not affect school operations. This finding may assist school managers in coming up with alternative measures that help schools reduce disruptions to their calendars due to financial challenges.

**Key words:** Donor funding, financial support, school operations, public secondary schools.



This article is distributed under the license of a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/). It is permitted to be used, reproduced and distributed in line with Editon Consortium Publishing guidelines.



## INTRODUCTION

Financing of education is a major problem in many third-world countries, including Kenya. The policy of provision of Free Day Secondary Education, therefore, implies that the government would sufficiently cater for the costs of education. However, there have been complaints by school principals that the capitation is not sufficient for them to run the schools. This is due to the skyrocketing prices of commodities and inflation. Recent studies on the financing of education in Kenya indicate that there are serious finance-related constraints affecting secondary school education. Most of the time, principals also complain of delayed disbursement of funds, which in turn affects the operation of the schools to the point where schools must look for funds outside the government sources to cover the deficient funding. However, not much is known about the relationship between these funding strategies and school operations since limited studies have been done on the topic. This study sought to investigate the relationship between Donor funding as an income diversification strategy being adopted by school principals and school operations in public secondary schools in Nakuru County, Kenya.

School operation aspects include: school administration, curriculum and instruction, student services, teaching and learning, parents and community engagement, safety and security, and continuous improvement. Effective school operations require sufficient funding in order for the school to run appropriately. Ayodele (2021) argues that no organisation could carry out its functions effectively without adequate financial resources at its disposal. Money is needed to pay staff, maintain the plant and keep the services going. Hence, there is a need for secondary school administrators to be adept at financial management practices to utilise the funds appropriately. Cherotich et al. (2020) observe that the principals who are in charge of school management are expected to play an important role in ensuring the smooth functioning of schools and proper and efficient use of available financial resources. The school management has to undertake tasks that are aimed at ensuring that education is equitable, efficient and accessible to all students (Cherotich et al., 2020). They are also charged with the responsibility of ensuring proper utilisation of the school finances.

Obiakor (2023) notes that one of the biggest challenges of secondary school operation management is poor funding. As a result, the secondary school principal has to adopt innovative income diversification strategies to spread the limited resources available. The extent to which adequate educational programmes are achieved depends largely on the economic provisions supporting the programme. Lack of finance is a global problem bedevilling education institutions the world over (Obiakor, 2023). These differences in opportunities are posited to relate to differences in student achievement and other outcomes and require court intervention (Hanushek & Joyce-Wirtz, 2023). In the United Kingdom, Miller and Smith (2022) noted that schools were facing an unprecedented funding crisis, threatening staff redundancies, larger class sizes, restrictions to the curriculum and the elimination of support services.

In developing countries, underfunding of secondary education is widespread. Amaechina et al. (2020) reported that in Nigeria, inadequate funding has been the bane of educational growth and development at all levels of education. The impact of these challenges has included: dilapidated structures, inadequate facilities and equipment for teaching and learning, as well as the welfare of staff in terms of remuneration and working environment. Muhangi (2019) adds that adequate resources have not been mobilised to allow secondary schools in Uganda to fully realise the government's existing plans for secondary education.

In Kenya, the government directs funds to schools through Free Secondary Funds, Constituency Development Funds (CDF) and the County Development Funds in devolved units. Parents also meet direct costs, including boarding fees, activity fees, uniforms, transportation and lunches (Bosire et al., 2019; Onesmus, 2020). Other sources of funds are the private sector, religious organisations, communities, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), and development partners, largely the donor community (Rotich et al., 2021). Many studies have decried the inadequacy of these sources of funds (Nyangaresi et al., 2020). Moreover, Cherotich et al. (2020) posited that in Kenya, an analysis of the Kenyan government funding reveals that the

education sector, specifically in the secondary school category, still has large financial gaps which have not been met through government funding. Chemweno et al. (2019) noted that despite the introduction of Free Secondary Education (FSE), students are being excluded for non-payment of other levies. Coupled with the inadequacy of resources, the schools also grapple with delayed disbursement of funds from the national government (Njeri et al., 2023). The delay in finances has inhibited various operations in secondary schools (Nyamwega, 2016). As a result, the principals have to rely on their income diversification strategies, such as donor funding, to mobilise funds and manage reserves till the funds are available. Cherotich et al. (2020) say that school principals have to be proactive and design financial resource mobilisation strategies that would assist them in covering the deficits needed to ensure that the school operations continue.

In Nakuru County, public secondary schools are particularly affected by inadequate funding. This is due to increased enrolment after the implementation of the 100 per cent transition policy from primary schools to secondary schools, which has led to increased enrollment in these schools (Otieno & Ochieng, 2020). Kiarie et al. (2019) observed that in order to ensure that schools operate, the parents and the school board have to come up with ways to ensure that they have the resources needed to ensure effective and efficient operation of the schools. Mwangi (2019) also found that due to the large number of students enrolled in secondary schools, there was a big strain on the available teaching/learning resources, and this has led to the danger of poor-quality learning provision.

The objective of the study is to investigate the relationship between Donor Funding and school operations in public secondary schools in Nakuru County, Kenya. The research hypothesis:  $H_{01}$ : There is no statistically significant relationship between donor funding and school operations.

The study's findings may be beneficial to policymakers at the Ministry of Education in financial management and planning so that secondary schools can be self-sustaining. School managements may also adopt the findings of the study to avoid disruptions to the school calendar due

to financial challenges. The findings provide a basis for more research in other counties in Kenya and the world at large. School communities may also benefit from this study on how they can acquire resources to help their secondary schools surmount the financial deficits.

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The government of Kenya subsidise education in the form of Free Secondary Education (FSE). In 2021, the capitation for FSE was capped at KShs 22,240 per student in response to heightened agitation for more funds to promote the quality of education (Ministry of Education, 2017). The government of Kenya has also rolled out the supply of books to all public secondary schools, hence utilising part of what was meant for the tuition voucher head. Apart from the government capitation sent directly to schools, the government, through the initiative of parliament, introduced the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) as a kitty to support constituency grassroots development, of which education is one of them. It provides financing for the building of more schools, constructing and improving existing classrooms and facilities and providing bursaries to learners. (Rukwaro et al., 2017).

The Kenyan government, through the Basic Education Act (2023), assures Kenyan children free basic education (Republic of Kenya, 2022, 2023). The launch of Free Day Secondary Education (FDSE) in 2008 was a strategy to make education accessible and affordable to many households in the country (Adan & Orodho, 2021).

AJa-Okorie (2021) observes that despite the importance of quality education, financing of education has been at a crossroads as the financial requirements of education have affected universal access to basic education. Due to poverty, many households are not able to meet the indirect costs of schooling, resulting in many school-age children having limited or no access to schooling. Adan & Orodho (2021) noted that while the government has waived tuition fees and provides textbooks, other classroom materials such as exercise books, writing materials, and other stationery are still parents' responsibility. This is because the government is facing budgetary constraints as it tries to strike a

balance between funding the all-important education sector without compromising on other sectors, which also need investment. Mashala (2019) adds that abolition of secondary school fees does not mean free education as parents still pay significant amounts of money for their children's education, such as school uniforms, school bags, shoes, food and medical care. As a result, dropout, absenteeism and lower grade progression are still evident at all levels.

Government funding of public secondary schools has been the subject of many studies in Kenya. Nyanga and Orodho (2021) established that despite the introduction of free secondary education (FSE), the latent cost of secondary education was still high and beyond the reach of poor households. The study recommended that the Government of Kenya, through the Ministry of Education, should increase the amount of capitation and encourage schools to intensify income-generating and cost-saving measures geared towards making education affordable to all.

AJa-Okorie (2021), Adan and Orodho (2021), Mashala (2019), and Nyanga and Orodho (2021) provided a comprehensive overview of the funding challenges and implications of the Free Secondary Education (FSE) model in Kenya, drawing on multiple sources to highlight the financial burdens still borne by families despite the abolition of tuition fees.

Mutua and Chui (2023) define a donor fund as charitable giving administered by a public, church or private charity and created for the purpose of managing an organisation, family, or individual. Give Round Inc. (2023) defines a donation as an altruistic gift, either with a general charitable purpose or for the support of a particular project. They add that donations may come in the form of cash or in-kind gifts such as gift vouchers from a local retail store, food from a supermarket, and office equipment from a small business and should be considered as a goodwill contribution, without the need for anything in exchange from the non-profit organisation.

Secondary education resources are obtainable from the government, parents and donors (Baghdady &

Zaki, 2019). In Kenya, the funding model for education that the government has adopted is based on Sessional Paper No.6 on Education and Training for the Next Decade and Beyond, which officially ushered in the policy of cost-sharing since the government could not shoulder the whole burden of funding education. Simiyu (2021) points out that under this policy, the financing of education was to be undertaken through a partnership of the public sector, NGOs, communities, individuals and the private sector. Prior to cost-sharing, the government shouldered the whole burden of funding education. This policy, therefore, allowed for private-public partnership in which communities and private individuals could contribute towards the education needs of schools. Ndulu et al. (2021) add that the government adopted a cost-sharing program in which parents and other stakeholders are responsible for paying the other costs, such as the provision of infrastructure and other services for boarding schools, while the government, through free secondary education, covers tuition fees.

Depending on the nature of the school, resources are mobilised from any or a combination of the mentioned sources. Secondary education schools may be funded through donor funds generated from local NGOs and religious bodies or even philanthropic individuals (Hedger et al., 2022). Also, community-based organisations (CBOs) which are non-profit entities working at a local level to improve the lives of residents in social fields and have often been involved in providing and/or funding educational services at local level (Muhangi, 2019) These entities fund secondary education through school fees payment and /or other charges especially in form of scholarships or bursaries (Alcott et al., 2024). Thus, the local community (such as local NGO and the church) funds secondary education by supporting poor students or their households to enable students who would have otherwise not been able to access secondary education.

Financial support from donors has been investigated through various studies in Kenya. A study conducted by Getange et al. (2021) on alternative sources of funding for free day secondary education in Kisii Central District, Kisii, Kenya showed that partners in the form of donors contributed 2.8 per cent of the funds for school operations. This reflects that donor

funding and sponsors' contributions are quite low in Kisii County. Mutua and Chui (2023) also investigated the influence of donor support practices on girls' retention in public secondary schools in Mwingi East Sub-County schools, which had donor support. They recorded a high number of girls' retention compared to those who were not supported by donors.

Moreover, Chumba (2023) did a study titled 'Financial Resource Mobilisation Strategies and Financial Sustainability of Universities in Kenya, and found that (94.73%) of the participants reported that to no extent at all do NGOs frequently fund development in the school. However, 2.6 per cent of the participants reported that to a very large extent NGOS frequently fund development in the school. The finding meant that even though the NGOS fund schools, to a small extent, their contribution is not significant in most schools.

Simiyu (2021) conducted a study on Funding in Public Secondary Schools and their influence on academic achievement in Bungoma County, Kenya and established that 76.9 per cent of the respondents indicated that non-governmental organisations (NGO)/community-based organisations (CBOS) had not funded them at all. The mean score of the responses was 1.819 with a standard deviation of 0.797. The low deviation shows that the responses were very consistent, given that respondents generally did not consider NGOs/CBOs as one of the main sources of funding in secondary schools in the county. In the same vein, Oranga et al. (2020) reported that other alternative sources of financing secondary education in Kisii County, other than income-generating projects, include funding from the following: Individual sponsors and donors, Government bursaries, Harambees / Fundraising, Non-Governmental organisations (NGOs), Religious organisations, e.g. Churches, Constituency Development Fund (CDF), Banks, e.g. Equity, Cooperative, and Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF).

This study used the resource-based theory proposed by El Nemar et al. (2022). It notes that for an organisation to strengthen its position in the market, it needs to capitalise on its strategic resources, which not only generate value for the organisation but also

help it establish and maintain competitive advantages over time. The underpinning theory of RBV is that it puts forward the concept that several organisational resources can impact on improving strategic organisational performance (Barney, 2021). The acquisition of the resources is thus critical to the adequate performance of the organisation, and this details why the theory is used for this study. This pertains to the relationship between school financial management manifested in the performance of management actions (regulatory tasks) and the financial aspects of schools for an authority to achieve the set goals. Resource-Based theory has been criticised for ignoring the broader social context in which organisations are embedded and the contextual factors that underpin any decisions pertaining to resource selection and utilisation. For this reason, the study included the school category and location of the schools as intervening variables.

### METHODOLOGY

This study employed the correlational research design. This is a non-experimental investigation that examines the strength and direction of association among constructs, utilising appropriate statistical techniques (Mishra & Alok, 2022). The relationship between these constructs can be positive, negative or not related. The correlational design was chosen because the purpose of this study was to explore the relations between income donor funding and school operations without the manipulation of variables. Further, Pearson's correlation coefficient statistics were used to determine the strength and direction of association between the study variables.

This study was conducted in Nakuru County, Kenya. The county is a cosmopolitan area occupied by almost every ethnic group found in Kenya. This brings out a mixed social and cultural influence. This eliminates the social-cultural factor as a main intervening variable. Nakuru County has both rural and urban setups. This aspect gave the study diversity regarding the status of public secondary schools.

There were 365 public secondary schools in Nakuru County at the time of this study (Nakuru County Director of Education office, 2024). The target population was 365 principals and 365 public secondary school bursars in Nakuru County. The

accessible population comprised 102 principals and the same number of bursars from all public schools in 3 selected sub-counties. The three sub-counties were Gilgil, Nakuru Town East and Bahati. The three sub-counties were selected because they had all the categories of school (national, extra county, county and sub-county) and were located in urban and rural settings. The principals were chosen because they are the chief executive officers and accounting officers of schools. Similarly, the bursars were selected because they are in charge of school finances.

The number of principals and bursars from public schools in the three sub-counties who participated in the study was determined using the formula developed by Nassiuma (2000). The formula was chosen because it is recommended for determining a sample size of a finite population. The formula is:

$$n = NC^2 \div C^2 + (N-1) e^2$$

Where:

- n is Sample size
- N is Population Size
- C is Coefficient of Variation
- e is Margin of Error.

Nassiuma (2000) recommends a 30 per cent variation of the coefficient and a 5 per cent margin of error for surveys. However, during the study, the sample sizes of the principal and bursars were calculated at a 20 per cent coefficient of variation and a 2 per cent margin of error in order to yield a larger sample, as

this ensures low variability and sampling error. The sample size of the principals and bursars was:

$$n = (102 \times 0.2^2) \div (0.2^2 + [102 - 1] 0.02^2)$$

$$n = 51 \text{ (rounded to whole number)}$$

The samples of the bursars and principals were 51. The census was used to select all the principals and bursars of national schools (6), extra county schools (4), and county schools (5). At the sub-county level, simple random sampling techniques were used to choose the participants.

The research used questionnaires and interview schedules as the main data collection tools. Questionnaires were used to collect data from school bursars. This is because they have pertinent information concerning the income diversification strategies of the schools due to their roles in the schools. An interview schedule was used to elicit in-depth data from secondary school principals on donor funding as they have adapted to manage school operations.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Response Rate

Data for this study were gathered using a bursar's questionnaire and a principal's interview schedule. It targeted 51 principals and the same number of bursars. The number of questionnaires administered was 51, and the same number of requests for interviews were also sent. The return rates of these two instruments are given in Table 1.

**Table 1: The Return Rates of the Instruments Used To Collect Data**

Instrument	Number administered/invited for interview	Number filled/interviewed	Return rate (%)
Bursars' questionnaire	51	31	60.9
Principals' interview schedule	51	31	60.9

These results indicate that the return rates of both the bursars' questionnaire and the principals' interview schedule were 60.9 per cent. The return rates were rather low despite the researcher employing several strategies to increase them. The strategies were repeat visits, using the Drop Off, Pick Later (DOPL) technique and assuring respondents of utmost

confidentiality. DOPL was expected to boost questionnaire return rates given that it provides respondents with sufficient time to fill out questionnaires (Gathii et al., 2019). The return rates were, however, considered adequate for analysis as they were above Sharma's (2022) 60 per cent "good" mark.

## School Characteristics

School characteristics were analysed with regard to category, type and location.

The results of the analysis are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: School Characteristics**

Scale	Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
School category (n = 29)	National	4	12.9
	Extra county	4	12.9
	County	4	12.9
	Sub County	19	61.3
School type (n = 26)	Girl boarding	7	25.0
	Mixed boarding	4	14.3
	Boys boarding	5	17.9
	Day	10	35.7
	Mixed boarding and day	2	7.1
Location of school (n = 28)	Rural	20	71.4
	Urban	8	28.6

The results reveal that the majority of the institutions were sub-county schools (61.3%), while the rest were national (12.9%), extra-county (12.9%) and county (12.9%). These findings show that all school categories were involved in the study; the sample was thus representative of the population. The results also reveal that day schools (35.7%) posted the highest percentage and were followed by girls' boarding (25.0%). The rest of the school types were boys boarding (17.9%), mixed boarding (14.3%), and mixed boarding and day (7.1%). With regard to

school location, the majority were situated in rural areas (71.4%) while the rest (28.6%) were in urban centres. These findings are consistent with those of a study by Kitur et al. (2020), which established that the majority of schools in the country were based in rural areas.

## Schools' Sources of Funds

Analysis of data provided by the principals indicated that schools receive funds from various sources. The sources are given in Table 3.

**Table 3: Sources of School Funds (n = 31)**

Source	Frequency	Percentage
School fees/levies	25	80.6
Capitation from the government	22	71.0
Income-generating activities	3	9.7
Grants	2	6.5
Donors (CDF, County, LAFT, etc.)	11	35.5
Corporate sponsors (e.g. Equity Bank)	3	9.7

The principals reported that the main sources of funds were from school fees/levies (80.6%), capitation from the government (71.0%) and donors

(35.5%). The other sources of funds were income-generating activities (9.7%), corporate sponsors (9.7%) and grants (6.5%) from which they get funds.

This agrees that the government plays a major role in financing public secondary school education in Kenya. Their statements are consistent with the findings (Nyamwega, 2016).

The principals were asked whether the funds mobilised by schools were enough to run their operations. The majority (92.3 %) of the principals complained that funds mobilised by schools were not enough. This is in agreement with the findings of Mutisya and Mwania (2018) in their study: The influence of principal-related factors on mobilisation of financial resources in day secondary schools in Kitui central sub-county, Kitui County, Kenya (Mutisya & Mwania, 2018). Only a few (7.7%) indicated that the funds they receive were enough to run school operations. With regard to the timely release of funds, most (73.1%) of the principals

indicated that free secondary school funds did not reach schools in time. The rest reported that they received capitation from the government on time (15.4%), and sometimes it was late (11.5%). These findings are consistent with those of Wanja (2014).

**School Operations**

School operation was measured using a set of 16 items in the principals’ interview guide. The principals rated their performance of school operations using a five-point scale. The scale was 1 = Poor (PO), 2 = Average (AV), 3 = Good (GO), 4 = Very Good (VG), and 5 = Excellent (EX). Their responses to the items were scored, summated and transformed into the school operations index (overall mean score). The responses to the items were summarised using percentages and mean scores as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4: Principals' Rating of School Operations (n = 31)**

Operation	PO	AV	GO	VG	EX	Mean	SD
Enrolling/registering students	-	22.6	41.9	25.8	9.7	3.23	0.92
Planning/organising for instruction	-	16.1	64.5	19.4	-	3.03	0.61
Timetables preparation	-	1	48.4	50.6	-	3.52	0.51
Content delivery	-	3.2	61.3	32.3	3.2	3.35	0.61
Assessing learners	-	-	58.1	41.9	-	3.42	0.50
Preparing students for examinations (revision)	-	-	64.5	35.5	-	3.35	0.49
Organising/engaging in co-curricular activities	-	38.7	29.0	32.3	-	2.94	0.85
Maintaining discipline	-	51.6	38.7	9.7	-	2.58	0.67
Providing support services to learners	-	41.9	45.2	12.9	-	2.71	0.69
Staffing (teaching and support recruitment and training)	-	64.5	35.5	-	-	2.35	0.49
Dealing with staff welfare issues	-	58.1	41.9	-	-	2.42	0.50
Development of physical infrastructure	-	71.0	29.0			2.29	0.46
Maintenance of school assets	-	80.6	16.2	3.2	-	2.23	0.50
Ensuring safety/security	-	22.6	77.4	-	-	2.77	0.43
Maintaining hygiene (water, sanitation, cleanliness, etc.)	-	19.3	71.0	9.7	-	2.90	0.54
Performance of administrative responsibilities	-	16.1	67.7	16.1	-	3.00	0.58
Schools' operations index						2.88	0.38

The results in Table 4 indicate that the item mean scores ranged from 2.23 to 3.52. The rating of items such as timetables preparation (M = 3.52, SD = 0.51), assessing learners (M = 3.42, SD = 0.50) and content delivery (M = 3.35, SD = 0.61) were relatively high. This is an indication that the performance of these school operations was good. The results also indicate that the rating of activities such as maintenance of school assets (M = 2.23, SD

= 0.50), development of physical infrastructure (M = 2.29, SD = 0.46) and staffing (teaching and support) (M = 2.35, SD = 0.49) were below average. This implies that schools had challenges carrying out these operations. The results further indicate that the overall rating, as measured by the school operations index, was M = 2.88 (SD = 0.38). Schools' performance of their operations was thus above average.



These results show that school managers do face challenges in carrying out a wide range of activities related to the day-to-day management, governance, and educational provision in their institutions. The findings support those of Bii et al. (2022), who observed that schools tend to do well in planning and organising for teaching, given that it is their main responsibility as curriculum implementers. However, most of them have challenges putting up and maintaining the necessary infrastructure due to financial constraints. A study by Ngetich and Ngeno (2020) in Ainamoi Sub-County, Kenya, also noted that schools had challenges carrying out some of their operations, such as the provision of instructional materials and employing the required number of staff, due to a shortage of funds and fluctuation in market prices. The challenges encountered seem to revolve around the inadequacy of funds. It means that principals and their management team must come up with strategies for mobilising funds in order to carry out the broad

range of activities and processes that support the core educational function of a school.

**Relationship between Donor Funding and School Operations**

Objective two explored the relationship between donor funding and school operations. Data used to explore the relationship was provided by the bursars and principals. The association between the two constructs was determined using Pearson's correlation test.

**Donor funding**

The bursars' opinions on donor funding were sought by asking them to respond to a set of five closed-ended items. They were requested to indicate the extent of agreement with the items based on a 4-category scale: Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Agree (A) and Strongly Agree (SA). The information provided was summarised using percentages as presented in Table 5.

**Table 5: Bursars' Views on Provision of Funds to Schools by Donors**

Item	N	SD	D	A	SA
Donors' funds are necessary to meet expenses in my school	30	6.7	20.0	43.3	30.0
The contribution from the donors is helpful in covering the expenses of the school	28	3.6	17.9	64.3	14.3
The money from the government is sufficient to cover all school expenses	30	63.3	33.3	3.3	-
We do not need money from a donor since the money from the government is enough to meet our school operations	30	80.0	16.7	-	3.3
The donors are willing to contribute their resources towards school operations	28	10.7	28.6	53.6	7.1

From Table 5 above, a majority of the bursars, at 43.3 per cent, agreed that donor funds are necessary to meet expenses in schools. 30 per cent strongly agreed, whereas 20 per cent disagreed. A minority, 6.7 per cent, strongly disagreed with the statement that Donors' funds are necessary to meet expenses in my school. A majority of the bursars, at 64.3 per cent, agreed that the contribution from the donors is helpful in covering the expenses of the school. 17.9 per cent disagreed with the statement, while 14.3 per cent strongly agreed with the statement. A minority of 3.6 per cent strongly disagreed with the statement that the contribution from the donors is helpful in covering the expenses of the school. 63.3 per cent of

the bursars strongly disagreed with the statement that the money from the government is sufficient to cover all school expenses, while a minority of 3.3 per cent agreed with the statement. A majority, 80.0 per cent, strongly disagreed with the statement that schools do not need money from donors since the money from the government is enough to meet our school operations. Minority 3.3 per cent strongly agreed with the statement. Bursars also agreed with the statement that the donors are willing to contribute their resources towards school operations at 53.6 per cent. 28.6 per cent agreed while 10.7 per cent strongly disagreed. A minority, 7.1 per cent, strongly agreed with the statement.

With regard to donor funding, 45.2 per cent of principals reported that they receive assistance from those entities. A similar percentage (45.2%) reported that their schools have not received any funding from donors. The donors which have funded schools in the study were Elimu, USAID, World Vision, CDF County government, NGOs and CBOs.

The bursars were requested to rate how frequently schools were given financial support by donors. The frequency of giving school funds was based on a 4-point rating, 1 = Never (NE), 2 = Rarely (RA), 3 = Occasionally (OC) and 4 = Often (OF). The responses to the items were scored, their means computed and converted into the donor funding index as shown in Table 6.

**Table 6: How Frequent Donors Provide Schools with Funds**

Donors/Sponsors	N	NE	RA	OC	OF	Mean	SD
Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)	30	6.7	63.3	30.0	-	2.23	0.57
Community-Based Organisations (CBOs)	31	3.2	83.9	12.9	-	2.10	0.40
Religious Organisations	31	-	64.5	35.5	-	2.35	0.49
Constituency Development Fund (CDF)	31	3.2	9.7	83.9	3.2	2.87	0.50
County Government Contribution	31	3.2	45.2	48.4	3.2	2.52	0.63
Grants	31	-	77.4	2.6	-	2.23	0.43
Local Authority Transfer Funds (LATF)	31	-	83.9	16.1	-	2.16	0.37
Donor Funding Index	31					2.34	0.26

From the results in Table 6 above, a majority, 63.3 per cent, of bursars said that they rarely received funds from NGOs. A majority of 83.9 per cent also said that they rarely receive funds from community-based organisations. The majority of 64.5 per cent of the bursars said the schools rarely received funds from religious organisations. On the other hand, the majority, 83.9 per cent of the bursars, agreed that they occasionally received funds from CDF, 45.2 per cent rarely received funds, and 48.4 per cent occasionally received funds from county governments. 77.4 per cent of the bursars said they rarely receive grants, while 83.9 per cent said their schools receive funds from L.A.F. Ts

The mean score ranges were between 2.10 and 2.87. The rating items such as NGOs (M=2.23, SD=0.57), CBOs (M=2.10, SD=0.40), Religious organizations (M=2.35, SD=0.49), Grants (M=2.23, SD=0.43), LAFTs (M=2.16, SD=0.37) were below average.

This implied that the schools were struggling with operations. CDF (M=2.87, SD=0.50), County government contributions (M=2.52, SD=0.63) were relatively high. This was an indication that the performance was good. The overall rating index (M=2.34, SD=0.26) shows that performance on operations was below average. These findings agree with the statement that NGOs, CBOs, Religious institutions, CDF and LATFs fund secondary education through school fees payment and /or other charges, especially in the form of scholarships or bursaries (Alcott et al., 2024).

**Hypothesis Testing**

The second hypothesis, which stated that the relationship between donor funding and school operations is not statistically significant, was tested using Pearson's correlation test. This involved relating the donor funding and school operations indices. The test results are given in Table 7.



**Table 7: Relationship Test Results between Donor Funding and School Operations**

Scale	School operations	
Donor Funding	Pearson Correlation (r)	.152
	p-value	.415
	N	31

The correlation test results indicate that the relationship ( $r = .152$ ) between donor funding and school operations was positive. However, the relationship between the two constructs was not statistically significant,  $r(29) = .152, p = .415$ . This means that donor funding does not affect school operations. These findings support hypothesis two, which stated that the relationship between donor funding and school operations is not statistically significant. It was accepted.

The results in Table 18 show that donor funding has a positive impact on school operations. These findings support those of a study by Gongera et al. (2021) in Kisii County, Kenya. The study established that donor funding contributed to 2.8 per cent of funds for school operations. This is a significantly low contribution in Kisii County.

**Summary of the Findings**

This study sought to establish whether donor funding was significantly related to school operations. The findings showed that schools were occasionally given funds by CDF and the County Government. However, other donors such as CBOs, NGOs and religious organisations rarely or never supported

schools financially. The financial support by donors was low, as it was rated at 2.34 out of 5. The findings further showed that the relationship between donor funding and school operations was positive but not statistically significant,  $r(29) = .152, p = .415$ .

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Conclusions:** The study concluded that the relationship between donor funding and school operations in public secondary schools in Nakuru County is a statistically insignificant positive correlation. The study concludes that the financial support given to schools by donors is low and does not affect their operations.

**Recommendations:** On the basis of the findings and conclusions of the study, it is recommended that School managers should create and strengthen linkages with donors for them to attract funding for their operations from such entities. The school managers can also adopt other income diversification strategies that have been proven to have a positive, statistically significant relationship with school operations, such as engaging in income-generating activities.

**REFERENCES**

Adan, M. A., & Orodho, J. A. (2021). The subsidised secondary education policy: What are the socio-economic and cultural implications on equitable and quality education in Mandera West District, Mandera County; Kenya. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Volume, 19*, 56-63.

AJa-Okorie, U. (2021). Appraisal of principals' alternative sources and utilisation of funds for secondary school administration in Afikpo Education Zone, Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *Journal of Arts and Humanities, 6*(1), 72-79.

Alcott, B., Rose, P., Sabates, R., & Torres, R. (2019). *Measuring equity for national education planning*. UNESCO Institute for National Education Planning. UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

Amaechina, U. U., Obioha, O. & Obioha, K. (2020). Alternative sources of funding secondary education in Enugu Education Zone. *African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies, 1*(1).

Ayodele, A. A. J. O. (2021). Resource allocation, weaponised poverty, and deviant economies in Nigeria. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 39*(2), 285–304.



- Baghdady, A., & Zaki, O. (2019). Secondary education governance in Sub-Saharan Africa. *World Innovation Summit for Education, Qatar*.
- Barney, J. (2021). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1)
- Bii, J., Muhoho, J., & Mwangi, J. (2022). Effect of revenue generation strategies on operation efficiency in public secondary schools in Londiani Sub-County. *African Multidisciplinary Journal of Research*, 421.
- Bosire, M., Owuor, G., Asienga, I., & Kalui, F. (2019). Personal financial management practices of secondary school teachers in Kisii County, Kenya. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 10(6), 70–81.
- Chemweno, P. (2019). *School-Community Support in Implementation of Day Secondary Education in Trans-Nzoia East Sub-County, Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Eldoret.
- Cherotich, M., Atoni, R., & Munyua, J. J. (2020). Exploring strategies for financial resource mobilization in public secondary schools in Kapenguria Constituency West Pokot County Kenya. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 10(10), 153-159.
- Chumba, J. A. (2023). *Financial Resource Mobilization Strategies and Financial Sustainability of Universities in Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation). JKUAT-COHRED.
- County Education office, Nakuru. (2024). *List of schools in Nakuru County* (Unpublished document). Kenya
- El Nemar, S., El-Chaarani, H., Dandachi, I., & Castellano, S. (2022). Resource-based view and sustainable advantage: A framework for SMEs. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 1-24.
- Gathii, K. J., Wamukuru, D. K., Karanja, D., Muriithi, W., & Maina, K. (2019). *Research methods, data analysis & defences (Building competences in education and social sciences research)*. Education and Social Sciences Research Association of Kenya (ESSRAK).
- Getange, K. N., Onkeo, J. M., & Orodho, A. J. (2014). Alternative sources of funding for free day secondary education (FDSE) in public schools in Kisii Central District, Kisii County, Kenya. *International Organization of Scientific Research (IOSR) Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS)*, 13(4), 14–23.
- GiveRound Services Inc (2023). *Saving time and money for business and non-profits*. Retrieved Sept 29, 2023, from <https://giveround.com/>
- Gongera, E., & Okoth, O. N. (2013). Alternative sources of financing secondary school education in the rural counties of Kenya: A case study of Kisii County, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(4), 107.
- Government of Kenya. (2023). *The Basic Education Act, No. 13 of 2023*. The Government Printer.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Joyce-Wirtz, M. (2023). *Incidence and Outcomes of School Finance Litigation: 1968-2021* (No. w31271). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Hedger, E., Williamson, T., Muzoora, T., & Stroh, J. (2022). *Sector budget support in practice: Education sector in Uganda*. Kenya Education Info. Retrieved from <https://www.kenyaeducation.info/education-funding/sponsorships>
- Kiarie, B., Gesimba, P., & Mwaura, P. (2019). Examining the effects of income-generating activities on physical infrastructural development among public high schools in Molo Sub-County of Gilgil Sub-County, Kenya. *East African Scholars Journal of Education, Humanities and Literature*, 2(8), 495–503.
- Kitur, K., Choge, J., & Tanui, E. (2020). *Relationship between principals' transformational leadership style and secondary school students' academic performance in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education in Bomet County, Kenya*.
- Mashala, Y. L. (2019). The impact of the implementation of free education policy on secondary education in Tanzania. *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research (IJAMR)*, 3(1), 6-14.
- Miller, M. & Smith, L. (2022). *UK schools face devastating funding crisis*. International Committee of the Fourth International (ICFI).
- Mishra, S. B., & Alok, S. (2022). *Handbook of research methodology*. Educreation Publishing.
- MoES&T. (2017). *Guidelines for the implementation of free day secondary education*. Government of Kenya.

- Muhangi, G. T. (2019). Demographic Factors as antecedents towards turnover intentions among secondary school teachers in Mbarara District. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(20), 91–102.
- Muhangi, G. T. (2019). Secondary Education in Uganda: Resource Mobilisation and Efficiency. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(20) DOI: 10.7176/JEP
- Mutisya, A. M., & Mwanja, J. M. (2018). The influence of principal-related factors on the mobilisation of financial resources in day secondary schools in Kitui Central Sub-County, Kitui County, Kenya. *Education*, 9, 12.
- Mutua, D. M., & Chui, T. M. M. (2023). The influence of donor support practices on girls' retention in public secondary schools in Mwingi East Sub-County. *International Research Journal*, 10(8).
- Mwangi, J. W. (2019). *Free secondary school education policy and the quality of teaching and learning in public day secondary schools of Gilgil Sub-County* (Master of Education Thesis). KEMU University, Kenya.
- Ndulu, A., & Njoroge, M. (2021). Influence of Cost Sharing Policy on students academic performance in secondary schools in Kenya: A Case of Kitui County. *Strategic Journal of Business & Change*, 2(24), 465-484
- Ngetich, R., & Ngeno, G. (2020). *Strategies Used by Secondary Schools to Manage the Fluctuations in Market Prices in Ainamoi Sub-County, Kenya*.
- Njeri, M. S., Severina, M., & Paul, G. (2023). Principal's visionary leadership and financial management in secondary schools in Meru County, Kenya. *Journal of Education*, 3(1), 14–25.
- Nyamwega, H. N. (2016). An evaluation of income generating projects in public secondary schools in Nairobi County. *International Journal of African and Asian Studies*, 21(6).
- Nyangaresi, D. K., Onderi, H., & Mwebi, B. (2019). Influence of school-based income generating projects on students' retention rate in secondary education in Kenya. *Journal of Educational Policy and Entrepreneurial Research (JEPER)*, 3(1), 45–61.
- Obiakor, M. I. (2023). Perceived impact of poor funding of education on quality control in government secondary schools in Enugu North local government area of Enugu State. *Sk International Research And Development Journals*, 1(1), 12-12.
- Onesmus, G. (2020). Hindrance to technologically guided education in Kenya secondary schools: A case study of Embakasi Girls' School. *Journal of Learning for Development*, 7(3), 423–432.
- Oranga, J., Obuba, E., & Nyakundi, E. (2020). Education as an instrument of poverty eradication in Kenya: successes and challenges. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(09), 410.
- Orodho, J. A. (2021). The subsidised secondary education policy: What are the socio-economic and cultural implications on equitable and quality education in Madera West District, Mandera County, Kenya? *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 19(9 Ver. II), 53-63.
- Orodho, J. A., Waweru, P. N., Ndichu, M., & Nthinguri, R. (2023). Basic education in Kenya: Focus on strategies applied to cope with school-based challenges inhibiting effective implementation of curriculum. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(11), 1-20.
- Orodho, J. A., Waweru, P. N., Ndichu, M., & Nthinguri, R. (2023). Basic education in Kenya: Focus on strategies applied to cope with school-based challenges inhibiting effective implementation of curriculum. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(11), 1-20.
- Otieno, M. A., & Ochieng, J. A. (2020). Impact of 100 per cent transition policy on public secondary schools in Machakos sub-county: Focusing on coping strategies. *Journal of Education practice* 11(24), 69-77.
- Rotich, J. C., Keitany, P., & Sang, H. W. (2021). *Ethical Principles and Procurement*.
- Rukwaro, M., Olembo, J., & Ogeta, N. (2017). Ways constituency development fund promotes students' access to secondary school education in Githunguri Sub-County, Kenya. *African Journal of Education and Practice*, 2(2), 35–45.
- Sharma, N. K. (2022). Instruments used in the collection of data in research. *Ponan Shodh Rachna Multidisciplinary Research Journal with monthly Publication*, 1(1), 1–9.

- Simiyu, C. (2021). *Funding In Public Secondary Schools and Its Influence on Academic Achievement in Bungoma County, Kenya* (Unpublished Thesis). Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology.
- Wanja, H. N. (2014). An understanding of the trends in the free secondary education funding policy and transition rates from primary to secondary education in Kenya. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4(1), 133–142.