

THE IMPACT OF THE POLICY OF SECONDARY EDUCATION COST SHARING.

A CASE OF CHILESHE CHEPELA SPECIAL AND CHIBA SECONDARY SCHOOLS A CASE OF CHILESHE CHEPELA SPECIAL SECONDARY SCHOOL KASAMA: NORTHERN PROVINCE (Conference ID: CFP/654/2018)

AUTHOR: KAIMBO DICKSON, SUPERVISOR: DR. MUPALA C. JOHN.
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INFORMATION & COMMUNICATION UNIVERSITY,
LUSAKA, ZAMBIA
Email: ¹kaimbodickson@gmail.com

Abstract

This article is concerned with the role of education in promoting and accelerating economic and social development, the Government of Zambia devoted the early years of independence to the expansion of the education sector. The Government, however, could not shoulder the whole burden of financing education for long and, therefore, introduced the cost sharing policy in 1996. Demand for education has considerably increased in Zambia, yet, the sources of education finances are experiencing constraints even with the cost sharing strategy. With increased poverty levels, many parents are not able to meet the cost requirements under the cost sharing policy. This study, therefore, intended to investigate the impact of the cost sharing policy in secondary education in Kasama District of Zambia. In particular, the study sought to find out the views of teachers, parents and students on the cost sharing policy, the costs of secondary education, the main participants of the cost sharing policy and the proportion of dropouts and absenteeism attributed to the costs of education. This study established that there was an escalation of school fees at secondary school level as a result of the introduction of cost sharing policy in Zambia as well as in the other countries cited in this study. Most parents viewed cost sharing as a burden because not all of them were able to educate their children beyond the primary school level. The study recommends that the Government should introduce better methods of financing secondary education that would enable poor but bright students to join secondary schools of their choice, establish policies of identifying needy students among others.

Keywords: Cost sharing, Education Financing, Cost Effectiveness, Financing education, Needy Pupils, Secondary School, Pupils, Policy makers, Schools. .

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In Zambia, one of the documents that were instrumental in the launching of cost sharing through the education policy known as Educating Our Future MOE (1996) as noted by Elimu Yetu Coalition (2002:23). The introduction of cost sharing in 1996 officially marked the government's abandonment of 'free' and highly subsidized education. Like in most African countries, for example Nigeria, Rwanda and Tanzania, higher education in Zambia was historically offered free, with the public purse covering both tuition and living expenses (Weidman, 1993:56)

Education needs for secondary education in Zambia are on the increase since the introduction of Free Primary Education (FPE). Financing of education continues to be a challenge to the government, parents, and communities at large Muthaka, (2007:15-24). Identifying sustainable financing options that maximize on cost effectiveness in resource utilization is, therefore, critical. Education financing also encompasses all financial outlays to educational institutions and sections, as well as the Ministry, made by central and local governments, the private sector, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), households, communities and external donors, towards investment in the education sector MOE (1996). It includes resources from parents, families and communities in form of tuition fees, "harambees" (voluntary community fundraising) and other levies. Over the last decade, the Ministry General Education recurrent expenditure constituted more than a third and between 3-6% of Government of Zambia GRZ (2015). In 2003, Zambia introduced the Free Primary Education Policy with a view to meeting the goal of Universal Primary Education (UPE). Having successfully initiated this policy, the country is now gearing to widening access to and improving the quality of secondary and tertiary education. However, the country faces constraints in mobilizing additional public and private resources to meet the high cost of expanding access to quality secondary education Siantotola (2004)

As noted by Carmody (2004), the ever-growing demand for education and the resultant expansion of education because of the world-wide inflation have led to massive increases in spending on education

all over the world. To address the issue of high costs of secondary education, the Government of Zambia introduced the concept of cost sharing MOE (1996). Through this policy, the community has shared costs with the government in the provision of a variety of basic human services and needs, education being one of them. Siatontola (2004), commenting on the impact of cost sharing in Zambia, noted that too high fees have been charged to a level prohibitively costly for the poor, causing enrolment rate to fall due to rising drops. The decline in secondary school enrolment over the last decade has been caused by the following factors: high cost of education (the average annual unit cost of education is 5 times higher than primary education) and poverty, with an estimated 30 per cent dropout rate due to this factor alone. Other factors include; high cost of learning and teaching materials, school uniforms, transport and development levies. In addition, the cost of secondary education in boarding schools is higher than that of day schools by more than 50 percent Kelly (2005).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Cost sharing, which was introduced in 1996, has led to an increase in school fees in secondary school level. In 1996, the Education policy emphasized the need for cost sharing in education between the Government, parents and communities due to the decline in government funding. The implementation of cost sharing in education, against of rising poverty, led to adverse effects on access, retention and quality of education Kelly (2005). Cost sharing officially marked the Government abandonment of 'free' and highly subsidized education. The Government was to carry on with the task of paying teachers and education administrators as well as fund some limited school facilities. It has not been clear, even to the policy makers, how the increasing demand for the limited number of secondary school places could be increased to enhance access to, and participation in secondary schools against the background of the cost sharing strategy in education Siatontola (2004). Therefore, this study attempts to investigate the impact of the policy of cost sharing on education in selected secondary schools in Kasama District.

1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS The 1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

problem investigated in this study was the impact of the policy of cost sharing in Kasama District secondary schools. *The main research question which guided this study was: how has the policy of cost sharing affected secondary education in Kasama District of Northern Province?*

The following sub-questions were formulated based on the main research question:

1. What does the policy of cost sharing in Kenyan schools entail?
2. What is the impact of this policy on the enrolment of students?
3. What is your opinion on cost sharing policy in terms of completion rates of students in secondary schools?

1.3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Based on the research problem and sub-problems stated above, the purpose of this study was to analyze the trends of learners' enrolment, participation and completion rates in secondary education in public schools in Kasama District of Northern Province. The study focused on the following objectives.

1. To identify the main participants in cost sharing in secondary education.
2. To find out the impact of the cost sharing policy on the enrolment of students.
3. To analyze completion rates of students enrolled into public secondary schools with regard to cost sharing.
4. To suggest strategies in the context of cost sharing that ensure that all students have access to secondary education. The study aimed at providing information on the impact of the cost-sharing policy with regard to allocation of education resources. It is hoped that the findings of this study could enlighten planners and educators on possible strategies to help improve enrolment and retention rates in secondary schools. It could also rekindle further research in financing secondary education in general and cost sharing in education in particular?
5. What can the Government, community and parents do to ensure that all students have access to secondary education?

There have been three types of secondary schools in Kasama; Government, Private and Grant aided schools. The Grant aided schools are more selective and only one out of four learners are accepted into one. The Government schools are less selective and make up to 75% of all secondary schools in the country CSO (2010). Facilities in these schools are not as good as those in the Grant-aided ones and often lack books, teachers and infrastructure to name but a few challenges. A report by UNESCO reveals that several developing countries will face acute problems in financing their secondary education expansion if present conditions and cost structures continue to prevail. As pupils leave primary schools, it is always their hope that they will join one of the Grant-aided secondary schools. While the Grant-aided schools cannot accommodate everyone who applies, great concern is of those who qualify but end up in the Government schools simply because they cannot afford the fees charged in the schools of their choice. As much as the Government of Zambia wants to push on with the policy of cost sharing, and given the massive continued poverty amongst the majority of Zambian families, it should ensure all the children of Zambia get equal chances in the available schools regardless of their social backgrounds. The findings of this study will have several implications for the future of secondary education in Kenya such as: i. helping the government through the Ministry of Education to re-evaluate the policy of cost sharing and possibly come up with better methods of financing secondary education;

- ii. Revealing the role played by parents in financing education and challenge the government to review the Education Act and give the Parents Teachers Association (PTA) legal status, thus more powers to manage the schools especially in financial management.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The classical Liberal Theory of Equal opportunity and the Social Darwinism assert that each person is born with a given amount of capacity which to a large extent is inherited and cannot be substantially changed. Thus, educational systems should be designed so as to remove barriers of any nature (economic, gender, geographic) that prevents bright students from lower economic backgrounds from taking advantage of inborn talents, which accelerate

them to social promotion. The classical Liberal Theory states that social mobility will be promoted by equal opportunity of education. The roots of this theory can be traced to writers such as Rousseau (1712-1778), who claimed that the “natural” statesmen were born equal and personal qualities should not jeopardize social equity so long as society rewards people according to their status. Social institutions such as education should in some sense attempt to treat people equally. American educator Horace Mann (1796-1889) could call education the great equalizer. In Zambia, the government made primary education free and highly subsidized secondary education in a bid to enhance access to education. However, with the introduction of cost-sharing in education against the background of poverty levels in the country, many parents may not be able to enroll and sustain their children in primary and secondary schools, given the rising hidden and actual cost of education. Therefore, for equity consideration, it practically becomes impossible to ignore the fact that unequal participation in education will in the long run worsen the status of the poor and the vulnerable groups. Njeru (2003). The classical liberal theory was found to be relevant for this study because cost sharing discriminates poor families who cannot afford to keep their children in school hence withdrawing them prematurely. This impacts on education negatively.

LITERATURE

REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION This chapter does not only provide a background to financing secondary education in Kenya per-se, it also focuses on other countries such as Jamaica, Ghana and Eritrea. Such a study is necessary for one to understand the challenges, if there are any, faced by these countries. Secondary education provides a vital link between basic education and the world of work, on one hand, and further training on the other. It is, therefore, an important sub-sector of education in the preparation of human capital for development and provision of life opportunities. However, despite its importance in the process of development, the costs of provision and expansion of quality secondary education have been escalating while resources for secondary education have been dwindling. The current status of education in Kenya suggests that the scenario is likely to remain the

same, if not worse, unless urgent interventions are put in place to address the problems (Onsomu, Muthaka, Ngware & Kosimbei, 2006:2). Various countries that are on track in achieving UPE (Universal Primary Education) are now looking for innovative strategies and financing options for expanding secondary education, consistent with national human capital development goals. However, fiscal constraints prevent many, especially low-income countries, from relying solely on government revenue for financing desired education expansion. The World Bank (1994) urged African countries to consider the idea of cost sharing instead of fully relying on public expenditures. Research carried out by Kiveu and Maiyo (2009:1) indicates that the adoption of the cost sharing policy in education has witnessed the return, to communities and parents, a substantial proportion of financial responsibility for schooling. With increased poverty levels, many parents and communities have not been able to meet the requirements under this policy.

2.2 DEFINITION OF COST SHARING. Cost sharing can be defined as an arrangement under which costs of the programme or project are shared by the involved parties, according to an agreed upon formula (Businessdictionary.com). Johnson (2003:35) defines cost sharing in education as a shift in the burden of higher education costs from being borne exclusively or predominantly by the government or tax payers to being shared with parents and students. Cost sharing or matching can also be defined as that portion of project or programme costs not borne by the funding agency. It includes all contributions, including cash and in kind, that a recipient makes to an award (accounting.ucdavis.edu). Kiveu and Mayio (2009:273) have defined the cost sharing policy as a situation where the government on one hand, and the households and communities on the other hand, share the responsibilities of financing education.

2.3 COST SHARING POLICY IN ZAMBIA A report by Education Coalition (2003) notes that cost sharing in education and other sectors had always been a feature of educational development in

Zambia even before independence. This continued even in the post-independence period. The decision to introduce cost sharing was occasioned by the shift in the national economic policy which had so far seen visible government contribution in financing social services. In Zambia, education financing is based on the cost sharing policy introduced in 1996, which requires most costs in education to be met through partnerships between public sector (government), non-governmental organizations (NGO's) and religious organizations MOE(1996). Within this funding policy framework, overall government role includes financing professional development, teachers' remuneration in public institutions, and provision of infrastructure, administration and management of bursary and scholarships for needy students. Responsibilities for other players include physical infrastructure development and maintenance, payment of fees for tuition, public examinations, catering and accommodation in boarding schools and post-schools institutions, school/college amenities (transport, water, energy and communication), students' personal expenses and remuneration of school/college non-teaching staff MOE (1996).

Njeru and Orodho (2008:5) have also noted that, having accepted the rationality of cost sharing, the Ministry General Education Bursary scheme was introduced as one of the safety measures to cushion the poor and the vulnerable groups against the adverse effects of cost sharing. The bursary scheme, however, remains inefficient and ineffective. Other characteristics that contribute to bottlenecks in the implementation of the bursary scheme at the secondary school education level include poor access and participation due to poor quality of service, bad governance and management weaknesses. It is, therefore, arguable that against this background of more than half of Zambian population living below the poverty line, and rising cost of education, majority of households especially among the poor and vulnerable groups in the rural settings would not be able to invest in the development of quality education at the secondary school level Njeru (2008)

The main aim of the cost sharing policy was to reduce education cost burden on the government while ensuring cost effectiveness in the utilization of education facilities, equipment, materials and

personnel, hopefully with a view to maintaining growth, quality and relevance of education and training. Thus, the government and other stake holders have been having specific financing responsibilities as dictated by the cost sharing policy.

In addition to cost sharing in the financing of public sector, partners, especially NGO's, communities and the private sector are expected to continue providing private education services at all levels including pre-primary education, technical education and informal and tertiary education. On average, household funding of secondary education takes 60% while government financing constitutes 40% of the aggregate secondary financing. To a large extent, the implementation of the cost-sharing policy at secondary level gives a leeway for schools to charge higher fees compared to the fees guidelines provided by the Ministry of General Education. Thus, secondary education has continued to increase the cost burden for households in spite of the levels of public funding Kelly (1999). A study carried out by Siatontola (2008) reveals that the patterns and trends of education financing in Zambia incorporated a partnership between state, household and communities long before the formal introduction of the cost-sharing policy. The same study further notes that the government's financing of secondary education has largely been directed towards recurrent expenditure, mainly to meet teachers' salaries and allowances, at the expense of development expenditures, which would be essential to provide and improve the physical and instructional facilities. This has resulted in poor quality education as most schools are inadequately provided with basic learning resources. The financing of secondary education, i.e. cost sharing strategy, has, however, become problematic as parents have to shoulder an increasingly large portion of the costs thus creating a negative impact on the poor and vulnerable households Njeru (2008). Elimu (2003) had made the same observation by indicating that the implementation of the cost sharing policy was taunted with several problems. Understandably, the manner in which the program was introduced had a lot to do with the cajoling by the World Bank and IMF as part of the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs). While the poor performance of the economy put strains on government resources, the transfer of costs to

parents, at a time when they were still struggling to meet increased education costs brought about by the implementation of a new education system (7-2-3), was ill advised. Worse still, there were no clear guidelines as to the extent to which parents and communities were expected to cost share.

2.4 THE INFLUENCE OF COST SHARING POLICY ON ACCESS AND ENROLMENT IN SECONDARY EDUCATION IN ZAMBIA.

Njeru (2008) observed that the cost sharing policy has a negative impact on the poor and vulnerable households. This is because parents have to shoulder an increasingly large portion of the cost. Kombo (2009) seem to agree with this observation because a study they carried out found out that cost sharing has mainly affected the poor because they cannot afford the cost of the secondary education which is beyond the reach of not only the poor but also the middle-income families. Apparently, dropouts and repetition as a phenomenon in Zambian Secondary Schools as a whole has significantly contributed not only to unequal access to education, decreased quality of education but has also manifested an alarming aspect of wastage within the education. As noted elsewhere, household funding of secondary education takes, on average, 60 percent while government financing constitutes 40 percent of the aggregates financing. To a large extent, the implementation of the cost sharing policy at secondary school level gives a leeway for schools to charge higher fees compared to the fees guidelines provided by the Ministry of Education. Further various categories of schools charge different amounts of school fees which are unmanageable to some parents especially the poor. Odhiambo (2000) commenting on the impact of cost sharing in Zambia noted that fees charged were at a level prohibitively high for the poor, causing enrolment rates to fall as well as too many dropouts. As earlier noted, Zambian secondary schools fall into three categories: GRZ, Grant Aided and Private schools. Further, government schools are divided National Technical, Boarding and day schools. National Technical schools select student in order of scores achieved. Students with the highest scores gain admission into National Technical schools while those with average scores are selected into Boarding and day schools. Day schools accept students with lower scores. Pupils work hard in

primary schools with a hope of attaining high marks to get them a place in one of the National Technical and Boarding schools in the country. School fees charged in these national schools is sometimes two or three times that charged in day schools and, therefore, those pupils from poor backgrounds admitted into national schools are left out as they cannot afford the fees charged in these schools. As noted earlier, in the cost sharing strategy, the government finances education administration and professional services, while the communities, parents and sponsors, provide physical facilities, books and supplementary readers, stationery and other consumables through school fees. Poor students who are not identified by any sponsor end up losing their places in secondary schools, or would join and later on drop out of school due to lack of school fees. Students who fail examinations or those whose parents cannot afford secondary school fees either repeat the final school year or pursue technical training opportunities. A number of students also drop out of school by choice due to poor scores especially at grade 9 level. A study carried out by Mayo (2009:278) reveals that the fees and other related direct costs have become too high for parents to afford given their low average incomes. Therefore, some may not afford to keep their children in school especially at secondary level. According to Musonda (2016), five students from Kasama District who were admitted to Technical school could not report because of lack of school fees. Access to public secondary schools and universities by the poor has remained elusive despite government efforts to ensure equity in provision of education. Martin (2008) argues that despite tuition waiver in secondary school, children from poor backgrounds have continued to be marginalized. Many children from poor families perform well in primary and are admitted to Technical and Boarding schools but are locked out due to their inability to pay the high fees. Although cost sharing policy was introduced on the basis of economically genuine reasons, high poverty levels in the households are very pervasive. Therefore, financing education through cost sharing policy could be one of the major problems facing secondary education in Zambia Mayo (2009). This situation might be the root cause of increased dropouts, absenteeism and repetition in secondary schools. On the same study it was reported by some teachers that absenteeism leads to poor performance

which in turn leads to repetition that overburden the parents who are made to incur extra costs. These costs lead to inefficiency in the sense that the students take more than the required minimum number of years to graduate.

2.9 CONCLUSION

Educational investment has long been considered as a stimulant for economic development. It is one of the important economic activities that can play a major role in boosting a country's economy. According to EFA 2001, secondary education is a human right. Failure to provide basic education seriously compromises a country's effort in reducing poverty. A study carried out by Mayo (2009) found out that teachers and parents viewed cost sharing both positively and negatively. Positive in the sense that it had made parents actively participate in the running and management of schools. On the negative side, it was reported that cost sharing has discriminated the poor who could not afford the costs of education. Financing of secondary education will continue to face major challenges unless and until efficient resource utilization measures are put in place.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provided a description of the research design of this study. It also gave a detailed explanation of the research approach and the data collection strategies used. The study aimed at answering the following questions.

1. What does the policy of cost sharing in Kenyan Schools entail?
2. What is the impact of this policy on the enrolment of students?
3. Does this cost sharing policy affect completion rates of secondary school students?
4. What can the Government community and parents do to ensure that all students have access to secondary education?

The study aimed at providing information on the impact of the cost sharing policy with regard to allocation of education resources in selected schools in Kenya. Interviews were conducted with the relevant stakeholders, i.e. school principals, parents, teachers and the students and were recorded and

transcribed. Relevant documents such as admission registers, class registers and progression reports were analyzed in order to get objective view of the problem.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

Best and Kahn (2009) and Creswell (2009) define research designs as the plans and procedures for research that span the decisions from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection and analysis. De Vos (1998) on the other hand, claims that research design is the overall plan of conducting the whole research study in the world. De Vos argues that a research design is the blue print according to which data are collected to investigate the research hypothesis or question in the most economical way. The researcher in this case selected the qualitative approach to collect data. The rationale for selecting qualitative approach is discussed in the following section.

2. METHODOLOGY/RESEARCH DESIGN

2.1 Project Design / Approach

Introduction

This chapter presents the research methods which were employed in this study. It constituted the following: research design, target population, sample size, sampling procedure, research instruments, and data collection procedure and data analysis.

Research Design

The study used a descriptive survey design in conducting this research. The study mainly used qualitative methods of data collection; however, quantitative methods of data were also employed to yield pragmatic data to substantiate the qualitative data. Since the researcher sought to collect data about people's opinions, habits or any other social issue, descriptive research design was ultimate. This is in line with Kombo and Tromp (2006) who explained that, descriptive design could be used when collecting information about people's opinions, habits or any social issue. This design was selected because it follows a method of collecting data by interviewing or administering of questionnaire to a sample of individuals Smith (2003).

Population

The target population comprised of some Head teachers, teachers, pupils and parents/guardians in Kasama District of Northern Province.

Sample

The sample size constituted 85 respondents, which comprised of 2 Head teachers, 10 teachers, 58 pupils and 25 parents. The Head teachers and learners were selected purposively. Purposive selection of the teachers and learners was ideal because the decision depended on the schools which were closer to the researcher.

2.2 Sampling procedure

In selecting the respondents, purposive sampling technique was used. Thus, purposive sampling technique was used to determine who participated in the study.

Purposive sampling allowed the researcher to select those who were to provide the richest information, those who were the most interesting and manifest the characteristics of interest to the researcher Best and Khan (2006). The sampling technique was utilized because the selected sample was restricted to units considered by the researcher to be especially typical of the population Sidhu (2000).

Data Collection Methods and Instruments

In collecting data for this research, the following instruments were used: Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). Individual interviews were administered to the head and teachers, while FGDs was held for pupils and parents in order to get in-depth information from learners.

Interviews

Best and Kahn (2009:268) describe interviews as oral questionnaires. The purpose of interviewing is to find out what is in or on someone else's mind. Qualitative research uses interviews as one of the data collection techniques. The interviewer must understand his/her own role. She/he should not express any opinions and should advise the participants that he/she is not going to be judgmental in any way. In this study, the interviewer used the interview guide approach.

Focus Group Discussion

FGD (Appendix II) was employed to generate in-depth information from the learners. The data from interviews or focus group discussions consisted of direct quotations from people about their experiences, opinions, feelings and knowledge, Patton (1990) in (Best and Khan, 2006).

2.6 Ethical Considerations

Ethical issues were taken into consideration as permission to visit the schools was taken from the DEBS office, school administrators and teachers of children. Additionally, identity of respondents was kept private and confidential.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Results / Research findings

This chapter discusses the presentation and interpretation of the findings of the study. The study aimed at providing information on the impact of the cost-sharing policy with regard to allocation of education resources.

The study also sought to analyze the trends of learners' enrolment, participation and completion rates in secondary education in public schools in Kasama. Data analysis technique adopted in analyzing qualitative data was through content analysis and presented in prose forms. It was also presented in frequency table and in percentages. Data for the study was collected by conducting individual interviews with school Head teachers and focus groups interviews from the teachers and parents and a questionnaire for the students and analyzing documents relevant for this study. The qualitative data checklist was developed and the checklist clustered along main themes of the research to ease consolidation of information and interpretation and then analyzed through content analysis. Content analysis is the process of analyzing verbal or written communications in a systematic way to measure variables qualitatively (Norusis, 2007). Analysis was done according to the following sub-questions;

- i. What does the policy of cost sharing in Zambian schools entail?
- ii. What is the impact of this policy on the enrolment of students?

- iii. Does this cost sharing policy affect completion rates of secondary school students?
- iv. What can the Government, community and parents do to ensure that all students have access to secondary education?

The study also sought to achieve the following objectives:

- i. To identify the main participants in cost sharing in secondary education.
- ii. To find out the impact of the cost sharing policy on the enrolment of students.
- iii. To analyze completion rates of students enrolled into public secondary schools with regard to cost sharing.
- iv. To find out the patterns and trends in financing secondary school education in Zambia.

4.2 RESPONDENT RATES

Data was collected using interview guides. The respondents who participated in the study were two principals, 58 students, 10 teachers and 25 parents. These are the only ones who were contacted after filling the consent forms out of 80 students, 10 teachers and 40 parents. A total of 93 respondents equate to 72 percent.

4.3 THE PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS.

Several questions were asked in order to understand the profile of the respondents as follows.

4.3.1 How long teachers had taught in the same school?

The teachers were requested to indicate the period of time they had taught in the school they were stationed. From the findings, majority (51%) of the respondents indicated that they had taught for three years, 21 % indicated that they had taught for five years, 15% indicated that they had taught for two years, 8% indicated that they had taught for one year, while 5% indicated that they had taught for thirteen years. It was clear that most teachers had taught in the school for more than two years. This implied that they were aware of the issues concerning their students and were in a position to offer valid information on the subject under investigation.

4.3.2 Parents- How many other children they had in school?

Fifteen of the parents indicated that they had three children in school; seventeen had two while two others said they had one and one parent said that hers had dropped out due to lack of school fees which she could not afford.

4.3.3 Pupil respondents:

The respondents were requested to indicate the class they were in. From the findings, majority 24 (41.5%) were in Form three, 18 (31.0%) were in Form two while 16 (27.5%) were student in Form one. The Form four students were sitting for their final exam Kenya Certificate of Secondary Examinations (KCSE) and could not participate in the study.

4.4 THE MEANING OF THE COST SHARING POLICY

4.4.1 The Principals

The principals indicated that the policy of cost sharing in education was a situation where the government catered for part of education cost such as paying of teachers and professional development of workforce in education while the other share of Class Frequency Percentage (%) Form 1 16 27.5 Form 2 18 31.0 Form 3 24 41.5 Total 58 100 51 education costs was catered for by government partners in education such as parents, church organizations, NGOs and the communities. The principals explained that cost sharing policy was adopted due to the high cost the government was experiencing in provision of education, due to the burden of misappropriation and funding of other social services in the economy. *“The government was having difficulties and there was a lot of education funds misappropriation leading to high cost of education and the government could only meet part of the education cost.”* stated one of the principals.

4.4.2 Parents.

Asked whether they had heard of the cost sharing policy, the study found that parents were aware of the cost sharing system as they indicated that it was a policy where the government provided part of education costs such as provision of teachers' remuneration while parents and guardians took part of the education cost such as provision of infrastructure in schools, maintenance cost and providing students with personal necessities. The findings concurred with Ngware (2006) who found that, through the cost sharing policy, the overall government role was to provide development of professionalism in education, teachers' remuneration, provision of infrastructure, administration and management as well as provision of bursary and scholarships for needy students. The parents, guardian, CDF, NGOs, the churches and the communities, as well as well-wishers, responsibilities included physical infrastructure development and maintenance, payment of tuition fees, public examinations, catering and accommodation in boarding schools and post-school institutions, school/college amenities (transport, water, energy and communication), students personal expenses and remuneration of school/college non-teaching staff.

4.4.3 Teachers

The study sought to investigate whether the respondents understood the cost sharing policy in education. From the findings after collection of information through focus interviews, all the teachers indicated that they were well aware of the policy in education. One respondent indicated that *"It was partial funding of the cost of education in school by parent and the government."* Another respondent indicated that *"It was a situation where the cost of education is shared between the government and the parents /guardians."* It was clear that the respondents understood the cost sharing policy in education. This agrees with Johnson's (2003:35) definition that cost sharing in education is a shift in the burden of education costs being borne exclusively or predominantly by the government or tax payers to being shared with parents and students.

4.4.4 Student view on cost sharing policy

On whether the students were aware of cost sharing policy, the study found that 55 (95%) of the student respondents were not aware of the cost sharing policy while 3 (5%) were aware of the cost sharing policy in education. This clearly indicated that students in secondary school are not aware of the cost sharing policy in funding education. The 5% who knew what it meant indicated that it was a system of funding adopted by the government in catering for education costs. One of the students wrote; *"This is the contribution of the government in funding of the education needs."*

4.5 EFFECTS OF COST SHARING POLICY

4.5.1 Principals/ Teachers' on effects of cost sharing on student in school.

The respondents indicated that the cost sharing policy in education had promoted community responsibility towards educating students to secondary school level and enabled many students' access and participation in secondary education. Some respondents indicated that implementation of cost sharing policy at secondary schools had promoted absenteeism among students; created room for corruption where some schools requested for more school fees than was indicated in the guidelines provided by the government, thereby increasing the cost of secondary education. Martim (2008) observed that the implementation of the cost sharing policy at secondary school level created a leeway for schools to charge higher fees compared to the fees guidelines provided by the Ministry of Education Science and Technology while various categories of schools charged different amounts of school fees which are unmanageable to some parents especially the poor. More specifically, the respondents indicated the various amounts of school fees charged, which could not be afforded by some parents, especially the poor. As indicated earlier by Mangoa (2015), five students from Kasama District who were admitted to Technical school could not report because of lack of school fees. Martim, (2008) further indicated that access to public secondary schools and universities by the poor had remained elusive despite government efforts to ensure equity in provision of education as an effect of cost sharing policy and

54 argued that, despite tuition waiver in secondary schools, children from poor backgrounds had continued being marginalized in education accessibility and equity.

4.5.2 Parents

Some parents indicated that cost sharing policy had effects of ensuring parents or guardians had to participate in meeting the cost of their children education. Others could not specifically identify the effects of the policy but they indicated that so long as they were able to pay for their children school fees, they were happy with the policy. Others felt that the policy had the effect of ensuring parents and other parties responsible for educating student had to work extra hard in order to educate their children. One of the parents indicated that, *"It affects me in the sense that I have to work extra hard to get more money to maintain my children in school"* The respondent also indicated that dropouts and repetition cases were reported in the schools and this significantly contributed to unequal access to education. Kiveu and Mayo (2009) had observed that cost sharing had mainly affected the poor because they could not afford the cost of the secondary education which is beyond the reach of not only the poor but also the middle-income families.

4.5.1 Students

The study found that most, 23 (39.7%), of the respondents join the school in the year 2016, 21 (36.2%) indicated that they joined the school in the year 2015 while 14 (24.2%) indicated that they joined the school in the year 2017. From this group of respondents, at least five of them had transferred from other schools.

4.5.2 Why the students left their former school?

From the findings, two students who left their former school to join their current one indicated that their parents could not afford the school fees charged in their former school, while one indicated that his parents brought him to a school near their home to cut on travel expenses since he was in a day school. The last two could not quite tell why the

parents decided to transfer them to their current school. This clearly indicated that the cost sharing policy influenced the placement of students in the type of school the learners were placed.

4.5.4 Whether the respondents had ever been sent home due to lack of school fees:

On whether the students had ever been sent home due to school fees problems, 30 (51%) indicated that they had been sent home due to lack of school fees while 28 (49%) indicated that they had never been sent home due to lack of school fee. This was clear that majority of the parent were burdened by the cost sharing policy in catering for their children education as not all parents were able to pay school fees for their children. This concurred with Njeru (2008). who indicated that cost sharing strategy had become problematic as parents had to shoulder an increasingly large portion of the costs thus creating a negative impact on the poor and vulnerable households.

4.5: Period students stayed at home

On the period the students stayed at home after being sent home for lack of fees, 12 (40%) of the respondents indicated that they had stayed at home for less than a week i.e. three or four days, 8 (27%) of the students indicated that they stayed at home for 1 week, 7 (23.0%) of the respondents indicated that they stayed at home for 1-2 week, whilst 3 (10%) of the student respondent indicated that they stayed at home for 2-3 weeks. It was clear from the findings that most students had been sent home which then implies that raising enough money to educate students is still a great problem.

4.5.6 How funds were raised for student to go back to school.

There were different ways through which money to take the students back to school was raised. From the findings, some of the methods employed include; contribution by the family members, others said that their parents paid from their salaries and were able to go back to school after one, two or three days. The study found that others went to help

their parent in picking tea to raise school fees while yet others indicated that they went back to school even though they were unable to get school fees. The School Headteacher for two of the respondents said the students had found some well-wishers to sponsor them. The findings concurred with Penrose (2010) who observed that children collect money from both parents as well as relatives to pay fees, and there appears to be less direct financial relationships between parents and schools. Penrose further noted those children also received money from several sources with 44% reported receiving money from parents, 28% from father only and 14% from mother only and 9% from other relatives. It was clear that fees charged in schools was at a level higher than could be afforded by many parents who were probably poor, causing enrolment rate to fall.

4.5.7 How the students made for the lost time:

The students who had been sent home due to lack of school fees adopted different measures of recovering for the lost time. From the findings, 20 (67.0%) of the respondents indicated that they sought assistance from other students, 7 (23%) of the respondents indicated that they sought assistance from the teachers for extra tuition while 3 (10%) of the respondents indicated that they were unable to cover for the lost time they were out of school. The study revealed that school fees and other related direct costs had become too high for parents to afford given their low average incomes and hence some could not afford to keep their children in school especially at secondary level. The students who stayed out of school for a long period of time recorded a decline in performance and this resulted in despondency and low self-esteem.

4.5.3.6 Identification of needy students

The school headteachers and teachers were asked how they were able to identify the needy students in their schools and one principal indicated that the students, on joining the school, are made to fill a questionnaire that sought to collect as much background information about the learners as was possible. The teachers also made a follow-up as they interacted with the learners in and out of class. Individual parents also made personal visits to school where they disclosed a lot of information about themselves and their children. In Zambia,

bursary scheme was introduced to cater for needy students through the Ministry of Community Development under the department of social warfare to ensure they get access to secondary education but the project was wrought with inadequate finances, weak administrative systems and questionable bursary eligibility.

4.5.3.7 Whether the parents benefitted from any Bursary Fund.

The Government, through the Ministry of Community Development under the department of social warfare, introduced a bursary scheme as one of the safety measures to cushion the poor and the vulnerable groups against the adverse effects of cost sharing policy. From the findings, majority indicated that they had never benefitted from bursary schemes implying that the bursary schemes were neither adequate, efficient nor effective. This concurred with Njeru (2010) who indicated that the bursary scheme, however, remains inefficient and ineffective due to poor access and participation as a result of poor quality of service, bad governance and management weaknesses. One parent who indicated that she had benefitted from the bursary scheme said that the money she got was too little as it had to be shared by very many applicants. There was, however, one parent who was happy because the school where the daughter was operates a bursary scheme for the needy students and her daughter's school fees was paid in full from that fund.

4.6 THE IMPACT OF COST SHARING POLICY ON ENROLMENT OF STUDENTS

According to the two Headteachers interviewed, the cost sharing policy was found to have positive and negative effects on enrolment and student completion of education as most of the best students from needy families were sponsored by the Camfed, Zambia Scholarship Fund e.t.c. However, there were parents who chose to enroll their children in Day schools even if they qualified to go to Technical and Boarding schools because of the high school fees charged in the latter. Mayo (2010) had observed that the cost sharing policy might be the cause of increased dropouts,

60 absenteeism and repetition in secondary schools. The same study reported that some teachers had observed that absenteeism led to poor performance which in turn led to repetition that overburdened the parents who were made to incur extra costs.

4.7 EFFECTS ON COMPLETION

4.7.1 Headteachers/Teachers

One of the principals interviewed indicated that none of her students dropped out of school due to lack of school fees as the school operates a bursary scheme for the needy students. The other one who heads a district school confirmed that there were students who were completely unable to raise school fees and at least two of his students were unable to complete their secondary education. This was a clear indication that indeed the cost sharing policy did affect the completion rates of students in secondary schools.

4.7.2 Parents

The parents all seemed to agree that it was a great struggle for most of them to keep their children in schools and ensure that they completed their secondary education. One openly said "I have to struggle to ensure that at least this one gets to complete her studies as my first two children dropped in form one and two as I was completely unable to pay for their education". There were no documents in the two schools to show that any student had left school due to lack of school fees but there were indications of transfers from boarding to a day school which could be pegged on school fees.

4.8 REFLECTION

According to EFA (2001) secondary education is part of basic education. Failure to provide basic education seriously compromises a country's effort to reduce poverty. This also implies that the millennium development goal of providing basic education to all by the year 2015 will not be realized. Basic education of acceptable quality is crucial in equipping disadvantaged individuals with the means to contribute to and benefit from economic growth. Education is one of the most powerful instruments societies have for reducing deprivation and vulnerability. It helps lift health of parents and children, reduce fertility and child mortality and affords the disadvantaged a voice in

society and the political system Woodhull, (1999). Education investments are crucial for sustained economic growth, which low - income countries are seeking to stimulate and without which long - term poverty reduction is impossible. Education directly contributes to worker productivity and can promote better natural resources management and more rapid technological adaptation and innovation. It is fundamental to the creation of a competitive knowledge-based economy, not only for the direct production of the critical mass of scientists and skilled workers that every country requires but broad-based education is associated with faster diffusion of information within the economy, which is crucial for enabling workers and citizens in both traditional and modern sectors to increase productivity Woodhull, (1999). Research has shown that nations with most of the population literate and in which all children complete at least a basic education have higher quality institutions, stronger democratic process and as consequence, more equitable development policies. To achieve these in Zambia, the government should come up with financing policies that will enable a good % of Zambians to complete at least the basic level of education.

4.9 PARTICIPANTS OF THE COST SHARING POLICY

4.9.1 Headteachers /Teachers

On who were benefactors or sponsors, the respondents indicated that there were parties responsible in helping school fees payment and other needs which included the church, non-governmental organizations such as Camfed, Zambia scholarship Fund, parent and guardians. One of the schools operated a bursary fund for needy students that raised money through staging charity walks that were sponsored by several companies and individuals..

4.9.2 Findings from the students

On who paid student fees, 45 (77.6%) of the respondents indicated that it was their parents who paid the school fees, 10 (17.2%) indicated that some NGOs paid for their school fees, 2 (3.4%) indicated that the Social Warfare catered for their school fees while 1(1.8%) indicated that school fees was paid by their church. The findings were in line with Government of Zambia (1996) education policy

which indicated that cost sharing policy required most costs in education to be met through partnerships between public sector and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO's), religious organizations, development partners and communities. As regards any other parties that helped in paying of school fees, the respondents indicated that Camfed, through its scholarship schemes, helped in paying school fees for needy girl students from all over the country and there were also some individuals who identified needy students from their communities and offered to educate them.

4.10 WHAT CAN THE GOVERNMENT, COMMUNITY AND PARENTS DO TO ENSURE THAT ALL STUDENTS ACCESS TO SECONDARY EDUCATION?

4.10.1 Headteachers /Teachers

These respondents felt that the government still had a great role to play in ensuring that all students had access to secondary education. Some indicated that the government should increase the education budget to include boarding day scholars' fees for needy students, make secondary education free and compulsory for needy and bright students, and enhance the Bursary Scheme to be more effective in helping the needy and vulnerable students. One school Headteacher observed that the schools were managed by well-wishers who are not in touch with the day to day learning of the school and, since they are not paid for the services they offer to schools, may lack the commitment that is needed. They observed that if the government made secondary education free, this would be a better way of identifying the needy and vulnerable and it would be easier to help them while in school other than allowing them to get wasted at home which in most cases leads to child labor.

4.10.2 Parents

On what the government could do to help in reducing the burden of fees, parents felt that the government should allocate more funds to the education sector to enable schools to have adequate learning facilities and to prevent misuse of the policy as some schools may use the policy to ask for exorbitant school fees that is not affordable by needy and vulnerable students. Parents also indicated that they would wish the government to

subside the cost of education further by not only providing professional development, teachers' remuneration and provision of infrastructure, but also offering education free for needy students. One of the parents indicated "*The government should subsidize school fees as much as possible and provide schools with adequate facilities*" This was clear that the government was not doing enough but could undertake to improve the cost sharing funding system to improve accessibility to secondary education for all the students irrespective of their social economic background. Asked how they raise money to educate their children, some parents said that they use their family resources to ensure that their children remain in school, most of those who are salaried often have to take bank and cooperative loans to sustain their children in school. Others indicated that they had to operate more than one job to raise enough money to educate their children. They, therefore, felt that the government could approach more NGO's and Government agencies and persuade them to partner in ensuring that all Zambian pupils access secondary education since, as was noted earlier by EFA (2001), secondary education is part of basic education in Zambia and failure to provide basic education seriously compromises a country's effort in reducing poverty.

4.11 CONCLUSION

The chapter presents the analysis of the study giving findings and interpretations. The analysis was done as per given objective of the study. The information provided by the respondents enabled the study to answer the study research questions. The study established that cost sharing policy had negative effects on completion of education among the students and this was clearly demonstrated by the in-depth interview of the principal, parent and teacher respondents. The study also found that there are still more measures that could be adopted for improving the policy to make education more accessible. The next chapter gives the summary of the findings, conclusion and recommendations guided by the study objectives.

From the literature reviewed, it was clear that, in the cost sharing policy, the government's role included

professional development and remuneration of teachers in public institutions and provisions of infrastructure while the responsibilities of other key players included payment of tuition fees, public examinations, catering and accommodation in boarding schools and post school institutions, school/college amenities (transport, water, energy and immunization), students' personal expenses and remuneration of non-teaching staff. This was still a huge responsibility for the parents and communities, especially the poor. The escalation of school fees at secondary level had been the immediate consequence of the cost sharing policy in Zambia as well as in other countries. Access to public secondary schools and universities by the poor had remained elusive despite the government efforts to ensure equity in provisions of education. As earlier indicated, Martim (2008) had argued that children from poor backgrounds had continued to be marginalized. From the findings of the study, it was revealed that enrolment had been increasing and the schools tried as much as possible to retain their students in school as they had sought different measures of assisting them. One school operated a bursary fund for needy students and looked for individuals to sponsor some of the needy students. However, the study also established from headteachers, teachers and parents that drop-out affected the poor in most cases and that high rates of absenteeism were associated with school fees as students were regularly sent home for school fees. School administrators did not follow the fees guidelines provided by the Ministry of General Education and they regarded them as unrealistic hence charged what they felt was realistic. Parents viewed cost sharing as a burden. The costs of education were too high, especially for the poor parents and they called for a reduction of education costs. Some parents and students were not aware of the cost sharing policy or their role as far as the policy is concerned.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher makes the following recommendations:

- The government should sensitize the public on the need of the cost sharing policy so as to bring many players aboard.
- The government should establish the unit cost of secondary education and come up with fee

guidelines that are acceptable to all and put in place policies to ensure that school administrators adhere to these fee guidelines.

- The government should introduce effective policies in identifying the bright and poor students so that they are not left out of secondary education due to lack of school fees.
- The government should also come up with effective policies of identifying committed school managers (Board of Governors) to assist in the administration of the bursary fund to reach the poor who are supposed to be the only beneficiaries.
- There is need for schools to start income generating projects and encourage both parents and students to participate in order to subsidize the cost of education.
- Schools should make a follow up on students who stayed out of school for more than one week and assist them to catch up on what they have lost while at home. This will make the students not to feel marginalized because they are poor.
- There is need for the introduction of a better method of financing education that would enable the poor to join schools of their choice and those they qualify to join.
- That the Government institutes better management and controls to minimize misappropriation of available financial resources.

5.6 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

As this research was done in only two secondary schools in Kasama District, the results cannot be generalized. There is, therefore, need to carry out further research in more learning institutions on the topic, to determine the influence and impact on this policy in the whole country as this would go a long way in assisting the policy makers adopt measures that will enable all students in secondary schools access the much-desired education that would make them better scholars and citizens.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgement of the input and guidance made by lecturers, supervisors etc. May also acknowledge help received from institutions; Government Ministries, government departments and Households etc.)

REFERENCES

- [1] I Carmody, B. (2004), *The Evolution of Education in Zambia*. Lusaka: Bookworld Publishers.
- [2] Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000), *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- [3] Gearheart, B.R, Weishahn, M. W. and Gearheart, C. J., (1988) *The Exceptional Student in the Regular Classroom* (4th Ed). Melbourne: Merrill Publishing Company.
- [4] Kelly, M.J. (1999), *The Origins and Development of Education in Zambia from Pre-Colonial Times to 1996*. Lusaka: Image Publishers Ltd.
- [5] Kelly, M.J. (2005), *HIV/AIDS: A Justice Perspective*, Lusaka: Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflections.
- [6] Kirk, S.A., Gallagher J.J., Annastasiow, N.J. and Coleman, M. R. (1993), *Educating Exceptional Children*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- [7] Kombo, K. and Tromp, L. A. (2006), *Proposal and Thesis Writing*. Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa.
- [8] Ministry of Education (1992), *Focus on Learning: National Policy on Education*, Lusaka: Zambia Education Publishing House.
- [9] Ministry of Education (1996), *Educating Our Future: National Policy on Education*, Lusaka: Zambia Education Publishing House.
- [10] Monaghan, L. (2003) "Maryland 2003 HIV infection statistics for hearing and deaf populations: Analysis and Policy suggestions," In: *Deaf Worlds* 22 (1), Spring 2006.
- [11] Munachaka, J. (2006), 'Teachers Vulnerability to HIV/AIDS Infection: The Case of Lusaka District.' Med. Dissertation, Lusaka: Unpublished, University of Zambia.
- [12] Sidhu, K. S., (2000) *Methodology of Research in Education*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.
- [13] Smith, E., Murray. S.F., Yousafzai, A.K., and Kaseba, C. (2004). *Barriers to accessing safe motherhood and reproductive health services: the situation of women with disabilities in Lusaka,Zambia*. *Disability and Rehabilitation* 26:121-127.
- [14] UNAIDS (2009), *Disability and HIV policy Brief*.
- [15] UNICEF (1999), *The State of the World's Children's Education*. New York: United Nations Publication.
- [16] UNFPA (2005), *Rapid Socio-Cultural Research as a Methodology for informing Sexual and Reproductive Health and HIV/AIDS programming in North Western Province, Zambia*.
- [17] USAID (2003), *USAID Project Profiles: Children Affected by HIV/AIDS* (3rd Ed). Washington D.C.: USAID.
- [18] Siamwiza, R. (1999), 'A situational Analysis of Policy and Teaching HIV/AIDS Prevention in Educational Institutions in Zambia.' Lusaka: UNESCO, 22-25.
- [19] Siatontola, S.P. (2004), 'The Role of Teachers in HIV/AIDS education in Southern Zambia.' Unpublished Dissertation for Master of Education University of Zambia.
- [20] World Bank (2004) *Global Survey on HIV and AIDS and Disability*. World Bank. n-text citations are used when directly quoting or paraphrasing a source. Depending on the source type, some Harvard Reference in-text citations may look something like this:(Fitzgerald, 2004).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX. 1

LETTER SEEKING PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN KASAMA DISTRICT.

Kaimbo Dickson
P.o Box 410360
Kasama.

The District Education Board Secretary

Dear Sir/ Madam,

REF: PERMISSION TO CARRY OUT RESEARCH IN THE DISTRICT. I am writing to request for permission to carry out a research project on “The Impact of the Policy of Cost Sharing in Secondary Schools in Kasama”. The research is part of my Master of Education with Special Education degree and I am undertaking at the Information and Communications University. The research will be carried out in two schools in your district. It will strictly adhere to the UNISA Research Ethics regulations.

Yours faithfully,

KAIMBO DICKSON

APPENDIX .2

INTRODCTION LETTER TO SCHOOL HEADS.

Kaimbo Dickson
P.O. Box 410360
Kasama.

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

I am a student of the Information and Communications University pursuing a Master of Education with Special Education degree. I am conducting a research on the impact of the policy of cost sharing in Secondary Education and I have picked your school among others for this study. I will be interviewing you, five of your teachers and with your help; I will administer questionnaires to some of you pupils. The interviews will be audio taped for verification of findings. I will be calling you in the next two weeks to answer any questions you might have and confirm your willingness to participate. I will also be interviewing some of your parents and would therefore request you to kindly let me know when you have a parents’ meeting so that I can talk to them. Thank you for your time. Looking forward to working with you.

Yours Sincerely

Kaimbo Dickson

APPENDIX. 3

PARTICIPANTS' INFORMATION SHEET.

The following was used in the informational phase for each interview.

1. Thank you so much for agreeing to talk with me today.
2. As I told you in the letter and on phone, this research is for a Master Thesis on the impact of the cost sharing policy in Secondary School.
3. Should we veer off into any area that makes you uncomfortable, please let me know and we will move on to something else.
4. Kindly correct me, if you think I have missed a point or misread your answer.
5. Your participation is strictly voluntary and you don't have to respond to every question.
6. I want to assure you that complete confidentiality will be maintained.
7. The interview will last 45-60 minutes and will be audio taped for verification of findings.
8. Please feel free to ask any questions at any time.

APPENDIX. 4

CONSENT

FORM

I.....
..... (Please print your name) have read and understood the nature of the research project and agree to participate as requested. I understand the regulations governing this research and grant consent for my interview to be tape-recorded. I understand that my identity and that of my school will be kept anonymous and that any information provided by me will be treated confidential. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am not obliged to share information that I am not comfortable revealing.
Signed:_____ Date_____

APPENDIX. 5

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PRINCIPALS

1. Can you share with me your understanding of the policy of cost sharing?
2. Can you tell me how it affects your school in terms of (i) enrolment (ii) completion rate.
3. What do you think the Government should do to ensure that all students have access to secondary education?
4. Are there some projects that have stalled as a result of this policy?
5. Apart from the parents and the government, who are the other contributors/donor?
6. How do you maintain needy students in school?
7. What changes can be made to the policy to overcome the challenges?
8. Is there a standing bursary fund in your school?
9. How do you raise money to replenish the fund after drawing from it to pay fees?

APPENDIX. 6

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS: TEACHERS

1. For how long have you taught in this school?
2. What do you understand by the cost sharing policy?
3. From your own perspective how does cost sharing affect the students in this school?
4. Do you have any students who drop out due to lack of school fees?
5. About how many; per class /year?
6. Do you send students home for school fees?
7. How long do they take before they come back to school?
8. If they are completely unable, do you make a follow up?
9. Who are the benefactors and sponsors?
10. How do they make up for the lost time?
11. What do you think should be done to ensure that all students have access to secondary education?
12. How do you identify the needy students in your school?
13. Other than school fees, do they lack other basic commodities.
14. How does the school assist them?

APPENDIX. 7

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS: PARENTS

1. Have you ever heard of cost sharing policy? Can you share with me your understanding of this policy?
2. How does it affect you as a parent?
3. What would you want the Government do to help reduce the fee burden?
4. How many other children do you have in school?
5. How do you pay for their school fees?
6. Who pays for the balance?
7. What would you want the government to do to help reduce the fee burden?
8. Have you benefitted from any bursary funds? 9. What changes can be made to the process of identification of needy pupils and the disbursements thereof?
10. What do you think of the arrangement where students work in school to offset part of the fees?

APPENDIX. 8

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS (Tick as appropriate)

1. In which class/Form are you? F1 F2 F3 F4
2. When did you join this school? 2011, 2010, 2009, 2008
3. If you did not join in Form One, why did you leave your former school?
4. Have you ever heard of the cost sharing policy? Yes/No
5. In your opinion, what does it mean?
6. How does it affect you?
7. Who finances your Education? i) Parent ii) Guardian iii) Constituency Development Fund iv) Church
8. Is there any other financier other than the above? Specify.
9. Have you ever been sent home due to lack of school fees? Yes /No.
10. If yes, for how long did you stay at home? i) Less than 1 week ii) 1 week iii) 1-2 weeks iv) 2-3 weeks
11. State how the money was raised to take you back to school?
12. How did you make up for the lost time? i) Extra Tuition by teachers ii) Assistance by other students iii) Never made up.