THE ROLE OF SPONSORS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE IN PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN KENYA

Julia Jepkemboi Ronno

Moi University, P. O. Box 3900-30100

ABSTRACT: *Sponsors have a great influence in the management of public schools in Kenya. This is why they were given the mandate in the Education Act prior to the free primary education of 2003 to oversee the general management of the schools they sponsored. The study sought to establish the influence of sponsors on the management of public primary schools in Wareng Sub-County in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya. Informed by the study, this paper examines the influence of sponsors in the development of infrastructure in public primary schools in Kenya. The study adopted a descriptive survey design and was guided by the Systems theoretical approach. The target population comprised all schools, head teachers, all chairpersons, sponsors' representatives and one District Quality Assurance Standards Officer in the Sub-County. A sample size of 115 respondents was selected, which comprised 38 head teachers, 38 chairpersons, 38 sponsor representatives and one officer from the District Education Officer's office. The participants were sampled using quota, purposive and simple random sampling techniques. Since the research was both quantitative and qualitative questionnaires, interviews and observation schedules were used to collect data. Data was analysed using descriptive statistical techniques, specifically frequencies and percentages. The results of the study revealed that sponsors no longer participate in their initial role of developing and funding public primary schools. It emerged the introduction of free primary education has brought confusion over the role of sponsors with those of the head teacher. It was, therefore, recommended that the Ministry of Education needs to review the policy on sponsoring of schools, especially on the rules and rights of sponsors.*

KEYWORDS: Role, Sponsors, Development, Infrastructure, Public Primary Schools, Kenya

INTRODUCTION

School sponsorship is conceived as an aspect of shared leadership, with the idea of involving teachers, head teachers, school committee and all stakeholders in the management of schools. It can also be described as an image of participatory leadership of full participation by management, teaching staff and non-teaching staff in developing a shared vision, planning and implanting instructional development, working with the community and participating in school management. A more narrowly defined concept of sponsorship is shared governance, which refers to head teachers sharing their governing roles with teachers and other non-teaching staff, including the Board of Governors in the management of schools (Blasé & Blasé, 2000). It is similar to participative school management in which other members apart from the head teachers are allowed to participate in decision-making.

Mahoney (1998), in a study on the emergence of school governors, reports that during the late 1960s and early 1970s there was growing demand for more accountability in the education systems and for more public participation in the running of schools. The 1967 Ploden report, whose principal focus was primary education, highlighted the importance of parents'

involvement in children's education and looked to local authorities to encourage more parents as managers.

Passi (1988), in a study on the management of schools in Uganda, notes that the government's development expenditure on education has not kept pace with the expansion of the education system. Consequently, shortage of teaching materials and equipment is experienced at all levels of education. These difficult economic conditions in the country have resulted in increased demand for community support through parents-teachers associations (PTAs). PTAs have, therefore, become the major funding bodies of schools and assumed a pivotal role in the development of the education systems. The 1969 Education Act gave the government of Uganda the legal right to plan, control and develop education. The Act spelt out a policy meant to ensure strict control of school funds. Thus powers of levying school fees and general management of the schools was vested in the hands of the management committees. However, despite this contribution, PTAs still do not have any legal status within the school system. Over the years, the government policy of not levying extra charges was withdrawn and a provision was made for schools to charge extra money, called 'development funds', provided that it was accepted by a certain percentage of parents in their annual general meetings and approved by the Ministry of Education and Sports.

Sponsor's Influence in the Development of Infrastructure.

Kogan (1984), in his research on school governors in England and Wales, observes that the 1980 Education Act shifted the balance of power in the management of schools in favour of school governing bodies. Kogan also found that the instrument of government establishes the composition of a governing body and it is the article of government which specifies its powers. However, the study revealed that the model article had not followed the 1980 Education Act and hence the existing power of most school governors looked back to the model article issued in 1945. In the research, Kogan concludes that governors have failed to use these powers systematically and so they have fallen into disuse. The study comments that governing bodies of schools form part of a complex social and political system which can be described in several forms of language and analysis. They are part of the system of educational government and zone of political activity and movement. They may be part of the wider governing managerial structure and yet are a means through which there can be participation and representation of the community, client groups and any action taken professionals.

The Education Act (RoK, 1980) gave a mandate to the sponsors to participate in school management. Paragraph 61(34) of the Act says that it is appropriate that sponsors should share in the administrative management of the schools they sponsor. The *Kamunge Report* (RoK, 1988) observed that an institution's governance is clearly defined in the law so there should be no problem in determining the participation and contribution of the sponsors towards the development of those institutions. The working educational institutions should be encouraged to increase their contributions towards the development and improvement of their school.

Sponsors are people who represent the outer community. They are nominated to the SMC through support from people they represent. It is their duty to fund all development projects in the school. Such projects include construction of physical facilities and other infrastructure in schools. For any development to take place, parents have to be relied upon. The changes brought parents to the mainstream of the school management and began to demand an active involvement in identifying, designing and implementing development projects through their representatives.

With the introduction of the free primary education (FPE) (2003) in Kenya, parents were relieved of the heavy burden of payment of school fees and levies. The government funded education and it was clearly stated that there should be no other levies charged for institutional learning. Parents were left with only the development of infrastructure. By the year 2003, many schools were already established. Those which had no facilities remained with the burden of starting from the grassroots. This is because the introduction of FPE came with a lot of implications, the major one being over enrolment in all public schools which overstretched the existing facilities. Tindall (1988) says that large class sizes contribute to declining test scores. Educational standards in Kenya require that twenty-five students should use one latrine. The large influx to schools, after 2003, made the facility congested. This automatically forces the management to increase their efforts. Parents need clear explanations for them to understand why they should fund such facilities. Various studies on the level of implementation of FPE programmes acknowledge the government's efforts in provision of instructional materials to public primary schools. The studies, however, note that the FPE policy was rushed into without preparing the implementers and re-defining roles of specific stakeholders (UNESCO, 2005).

School sponsors are expected to use financial resources to put up all physical aspects of the school development. A sponsor is expected to be able to pinpoint at least one structure it has put up in their school. The *Koech Report* (Republic of Kenya, 1999) observes that some sponsors hardly make any financial contributions to the schools they claim to sponsor yet they become very vocal when it comes to issues of management. Since the sponsors represent the community of the sponsored schools, they are able to source funds from other well-wishers. The CDF is available and tactful planners will be able to access it. There are also other funds such as the LATF which is offered to boost educational institutions by the local governments.

Statement of the Problem

Management is said to entail the activities of planning, controlling, organizing, appraising and leading the procurement and utilization of both human and physical resources at the disposal of an organization in order to achieve the organization's defined ends (Republic of Kenya, 1976; MOE 1999). In the Education Act, cap 211 (RoK, 1968), section (i) a, b and section (b) 4, states the roles and rights of school sponsors. Among these roles is the sponsors' participation in school management. Paragraph 61(34) of the Act says that it is appropriate that sponsors share in the administrative management of their schools. This means that the main function of sponsors is to contribute towards the development of the institutions that they sponsor. The *Kamunge Report* (Republic of Kenya, 1988) adds that sponsors of educational institutions should be encouraged to increase their contribution towards the development and improvement of their schools.

However, most sponsors have not lived to the Education Act standards concerning development and improvement of schools. Many school projects have stalled due to poor prioritization and inadequate allocation of funds. Most schools lack adequate basic physical facilities such as classrooms, libraries, latrines and playgrounds among others. There are also cases of constant wrangles among sponsors over the appointment of school head teachers (Cheruiyot, 2001). This is common in areas where the appointed head teacher does not belong to the same religious denomination as the sponsors. Financial management practices are wanting in most schools. Majority of the sponsors have little or no knowledge on financial matters. This leads to poor management and utilization of school funds and poor returns on invested funds (Ogada, 2009).

Since its introduction, various studies on the levels of implementation of FPE programmes have acknowledged the government's effort to provide instructional materials to public primary schools, leaving development to parents and communities. These studies, however, note that the FPE policy was rushed through without preparing implementers and re-defining roles of specific stakeholders (UNESCO, 2005). Sifuna (2005) adds that the rushed programme resulted in confusion among education stakeholders due to lack of clear guidelines on various matters, including how the management should develop their schools. These could be some of the causes of the poor management of primary schools.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted in Wareng Sub-County of Uasin Gishu County in North Rift Kenya. The sub-county was chosen for the study because it was originally part of the white-highlands. The settlers who lived there had established schools on the basis of their religious denominations. It was, therefore, assumed that religious traditions got into the education system and influenced current leadership styles. The district is also a cosmopolitan area with different types of people from all over Kenya. The research adopted a descriptive survey design, which is used to acquire a lot of information through frequency based observations of actual target population.

The study targeted all the public primary schools in the sub-county, all the head teachers (129), school chairpersons (129), the District Quality Assurance and Standards Officer (DQASO) (1), and sponsor representatives (387) in the school management committee. The sample size consisted of 38 schools, which was 30% of the targeted schools. A total of 38 head teachers, 38 sponsors' representatives, one DQASO and 38 chairpersons formed the study sample. The total sample, therefore, comprised 114 respondents. Quota random sampling was used to select the schools while purposive sampling technique was used to select the school head teachers, the district education representative (DQASO) and a chairperson representing each selected school.

In the study, questionnaires and interviews were used to collect data. The collected data was then analyzed using qualitative techniques. The data was tabulated and bar graphs, pie charts frequency, percentages, tables and charts were used to summarize and present findings. Information gathered was analyzed using descriptive statistics. This technique has been chosen because the data to be obtained was mainly nominal and ordinal. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software was used to assist in analyzing the data collected.

RESULTS

Analysis of Basic Physical Infrastructure

The study sought to find out the influence of sponsors on the development of basic physical infrastructure in schools. The participants were asked to respond to items and the research results were as shown on the table below.

Table 1: The Influence of Sponsors on the Development of Basic Physical Infrastructure

Items	Respondents	Frequencies & Percentages of Respondents		
		Agreed	**Disagreed**	**Undecided**
Class rooms	Head teachers	22(55.3%)	13(34.2%)	3(10.5%)
	Chairpersons	23(65.7%)	12(34.3%)	0%
	Sponsor Rep	30(78.9%)	8((21.1%)	0%
Latrines/toilets	Head teachers	13(34.2%)	23(60.5%)	2(5.3%)
	chairpersons	13(37.1%)	18(51.4%)	4(16.4%)
	Sponsor Rep	17(47.7%)	21(55.3%)	0%
Desks/chairs and tables	Head teachers	16(42.1%)	22(57.9%)	0%
	Chairpersons	6(17.1%)	27(77.1%)	2(5.7%)
	Sponsor Rep	18(47.4%)	20(52.6%)	0%

From Table 1

above, respondents generally agreed that sponsors influenced the construction of classrooms. The results show that 22(55.3%) of the head teachers, 23(65.7%) of the chairpersons and majority, 30(78.9%), of the sponsor representatives agreed that sponsors did have a hand in the construction of classrooms. On the other hand, 13(34.2%) head teachers, 12(34.3%) chairpersons and 8(21.1%) sponsor representatives disagreed on the same. It was observed from all the schools visited that there were neither classes being held outside nor under trees. This was a clear indication that sponsors and the community, as a whole, have kept to the initial responsibility of maintaining their schools as stated in the Education Act (RoK, 1980). Indeed, in majority of the schools visited there was at least a classroom that was constructed through the influence of sponsors. Most of the schools that were established before the cost-sharing era of the mid-1980s had classrooms built by sponsors. The other schools established later hardly had any constructions by sponsors.

The results in Table 1 further revealed that majority of the respondents disagreed that sponsors influenced the construction of latrines/toilets. The results showed that 23(60.5%) of the head teachers, 18(57.4%) chairpersons and 21(55.3%) sponsors' representatives disagreed. These results concurred with the DQASOs who said latrines are usually constructed by the school community and not necessarily sponsors alone. Apparently, 13(43.2%) of head teachers, 13(27.1%) chairpersons and 17(47.7%) sponsors' representatives agreed that sponsors influenced the construction of latrines/toilets. From the above, it is clear that sponsors never did such work on their own but with the help of all parents. As was seen earlier, the work of school sponsors continued smoothly before cost-sharing was introduced which forced parents to take part in the development of their schools.

Regarding to if sponsors provided desks, chairs and tables, majority of the respondents disagreed. Of the head teachers, 22(57.9%) disagreed and only 16(42.1%) agreed whereas of the chairpersons 27(77.1%) disagreed that desks, chairs and tables were bought by the sponsors while only 6(17.1%) agreed and 2(5.7%) were undecided. Responses from the sponsor representatives indicated that 20(52.6%) disagreed and 18(47.4%) agreed. This could be attributed to fact sponsors can distinguish between what is solely in their docket to do and the responsibilities of the community as a whole. The above results also concur with the views of the UNESCO (2005) report which says that before the inception of FPE, parents had to purchase desks for their children while the Ministry of Education funded the instructional materials.

Analysis of other Essential Facilities

The study also sought to find out how the sponsors had influenced the construction of other essential facilities other than classrooms. The respondents were asked to respond to items that were also very important and necessary in a school set up. The results were as presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Assessment of other Essential Facilities

Items	Respondents	Frequencies & Percentages of Respondents		
		Agreed	**Disagreed**	**Undecided**
Library	Head Teachers	9(23.7%)	20(52.6%)	9(23.7%)
	Chairpersons	6(17.1%)	18(51.4%)	11(31.4%)
	Sponsor Rep	5(13.2%)	24(63.2%)	9(23.7%)
dining hall	Head Teachers	2(5.3%)	34(89.4%)	2(5.3%)
	Chairpersons	4(11.4%)	26(74.3%)	5(14.3%)
	Sponsor Rep	4(10.5%)	25(65.8%)	9(23.7%)
Borehole (water)	Head Teachers	7(18.4%)	23(60.5%)	8(21.1%)
	Chairpersons	15(42.7%)	20(57.1%)	0%
	Sponsor Rep	13(34.2%)	23(60.5%)	2(5.3%)
Teacher houses	Head Teachers	21(55.3%)	15(39.5%)	2(5.3%)
	Chairpersons	25(71.4%)	9(25.7%)	1(2.9%)
	Sponsor Rep	24(63.2%)	12(31.6%)	2(5.2%)
Staff room	Head Teachers	15(39.5%)	22(57.9%)	1(2.6%)
	Chairpersons	21(60%)	12(34.3%)	2(5.7%)
	Sponsor Rep	16(42.1%)	22(57.9%)	0%
Administration Block	Head Teachers	10(26.3%)	24(63.2%)	4(10.5%)
	Chairpersons	9(25.7%)	24(68.6%)	2(5.7%)
	Sponsor Rep	6(15.8%)	28(73.7%)	4(10.5%)

From the table above, it is clear that libraries in schools were not supported by the sponsors. From the outcomes, 20(52.6%) of the head teachers disagreed while 9(23.7%) agreed. Still, another 9(23.7%) were undecided. Majority of the chairpersons, 18(51.4%) likewise disagreed, 11(31.4%) were undecided while a small percentage of 6(17.1%) agreed.

Of the sponsor representatives 24(63.2%) disagreed, 9(23.7%) were undecided while only 5(13.2%) agreed. These results concurred with those of DQASOs who said that most schools put priority on infrastructure which, in their view, is most important. Since most schools do not have enough classrooms and the few available are congested, parents prefer to build the classrooms rather and subsequently other infrastructure such as the libraries are seen as a luxury. It was observed in some of the schools visited that text books were kept in cartoon boxes.

As to whether sponsors influenced the construction of dining halls, the results indicated that most the respondents disagreed. Frim the results, 34(89.4%) of head teachers, 26(74.3%) chairpersons and 23(60.5%) sponsors' representatives disagreed. One important explanation for this was that most of the schools were day-schools, meaning children commuted to school every morning, went home for lunch and back home in the evening. The results showed that sponsors did not work in isolation but in collusion with the other stakeholders. As regards provision of water to the schools, 23(60.5%) of the head teachers, 20(57.1%) of the

chairpersons and 23(60.5%) of the sponsor representatives generally concurred that water was a basic need to their schools. It was observed that there was no major need for schools which did not offer boarding to have dining halls.

The Ministry of Education requires every school to have sufficient water. The FPE policy makes a provision for water supply to schools and it was given a vote-head in the 2006 budgetary allocation to schools. This explains why there were water tanks and boreholes in majority of the schools visited. It also shows that sponsors never took part in the provision of water to schools. Nevertheless, 18% of the head teachers indicated that sponsors did not participate in the creation of water sources in their schools. Moreover, 15(42%) of the chairpersons and 13(43.2%) of the sponsor representatives agreed that sponsors influenced the construction of water sources and systems in schools. These findings show that majority disagreed which implies that the respondents were aware that the government provides water in schools.

As regards sponsors' influence on the construction of administration blocks, 10(26.3%) of head teachers agreed while the majority, 24(63.2%) disagreed. Only 4(10.5%) of the head teachers were undecided. The chairpersons shared similar views as the head teachers, so that 9(25.7%) of them agreed, 24(68.6%) disagreed and 2(5.7%) were undecided. Of the sponsor representatives, 28(73.7%) disagreed, 6(15.8%) agreed and 4(10.5%) were undecided. There are a least two factors that can explain these findings. One reason is the concept of prioritization. According to RoK (1999), prioritization is an important element in the management of schools. Things that are perceived to be of greater importance are done before those that are of less importance. In this case, managements in the schools that participated in the study constructed classrooms to accommodate pupils before putting up other support structures such as libraries or staff quarters. This is an appropriate management practice in such contexts. Secondly, there is often the misconception of the term "administration block'. It is a term in the field of education that is used to describe the managerial offices that are grouped together but away from the classroom blocks or buildings.

Some head teachers regard having an administrative block as a political issue because it isolates the head teacher as a greater authority in the school than the teachers and other staff and subsequently alienates the head teacher from the rest of the school. Administrative blocks also adds another dimension of prestige to a school. They shape the image of the institution. In an interview on of the DQASOs, reiterating this view, pointed out that administration blocks are a sign of prestige and schools that have them seek recognition and that teachers in those schools seek comfort. According to him, the mandate of constructing such buildings is not in the jurisdiction of sponsors but is usually done by chairpersons through the support of CDF donations.

Land Acquisition

Land is a requirement for any school to exist and operate. The Ministry of Education has set conditions on how schools should be erected. For a full primary school to operate, it is required that there be five acres of land located in a rural environment.

In line with the above, the study sought to establish if schools acquired the land they used from or with the help of sponsors. Sufficient land is important because it allow for school structures to be expanded to accommodate increased enrolment witnessed after the introduction of FPE (2003). Secondly, sizable land is also important as it can be used to generate income and food

for the school through agricultural activities such as dairy farming and crop husbandry. School land is also used as demonstration plots and to build staff houses which can be given or leased out to teachers at subsidized prices. Income from land-related activities can be used to subsidize purchase of extra curriculum and learning materials, improvement of infrastructure such as classrooms or dining halls or any other projects that are deemed important in the furtherance of educational objectives.

Table 3: Assessment on Land Acquisition

Items	Respondents	Frequencies & Percentages of Respondents		
		Agreed	**Disagreed**	**Undecided**
School land	Head teachers	12(31.6%)	24(63.2%)	2(5.2%)
	Chairpersons	13(37.1%)	22(62.9%)	
	Sponsor Rep	14(36.8%)	24(63.2%)	
Play ground	Head teachers	7(18.4%)	29(76.3%)	2(5.3%)
	Chairpersons	10(28.6%)	25(71.4%)	
	Sponsor Rep	12(31.6%	24(63.1%)	2(5.3%)

The results in Table 3 above show that majority of the respondents disagreed that school land was provided by sponsors. Of the dead teachers, 24(63.2%) disagreed that their school land was contributed by sponsors while 12(31.6%) agreed and a small percentage of only 2(5.2%) were undecided. Of the chairpersons, 22(62.9%) disagreed while only 14(36.8%) agreed. In regard to whether or not school playgrounds were provided by the sponsors, the reaction reiterated those on land provision. On this issue 29(76.3%) of the head teachers, 25(71.4%) of the chairpersons and 24(63.1%) of the sponsor representatives disagreed. However, it is important to note that Wareng Sub-County was formally the white settlers' land until Kenya's independence. Therefore, most of the European settlers had set aside portions of land to be used for public facilities like schools, hospitals and churches.

From the results above, it clearly indicated that there was need for the government to redefine the concept of sponsorship in Education Act (cap 211 of 1968) because most respondents noted that there was little that sponsors did on physical development of the schools they sponsored. While it is true that indeed land is provided by the community the lands that schools occupy today were bought from the white settlers by individual groups from respective owners. Each farm had set aside some acreage for public utilities, schools included; therefore, it is possible that the new owners simply continued what the settlers began. The owners of those farms build their schools and got convenient church sponsor for it. The title deeds were kept by the sponsors until after independence when all sponsored schools were taken over by the government (Education Act, 1980). As observed from the findings, it is true to say that sponsors contribute little in construction of infrastructure in their schools.

School Observation Report

The observation report gives a general description of conditions and characteristics of schools visited. The areas aspects included physical structures, conditions of school compounds, state of classrooms in terms of infrastructure, classrooms and their state, congestions, walls, lighting, ventilation and furniture. The size of land, availability of water and the general state of the school environment were also observed. The findings on the items observed were as presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Observation Schedule

Facility	Available	%	Not available	%
Classrooms	38	100		
Latrine/toilet	38	100		
Libraries	12	31.58	26	68.42
Dining halls	5	13.16	33	86.84
Boreholes (water)	38	100		
Teachers' houses	10	26.32	28	73.68
Staff room	26	68.42	18	47.37
Administration block	6	15.79	32	84.21
School farm	30	78.95	8	21.05
Play ground	32	84.21	6	15.79

From the observations above, it is clear that at least all the schools visited had classrooms. Most of the classrooms were permanent but in some schools classrooms in the lower primary section were still semi-permanent. It was also observed that lessons in all the schools visited were held inside classrooms and none were held outside for lack classrooms. However, it was noted that most classes were congested, especially in lower primary sections where there were up to 50 children per class.

Generally, the schools visited had large compounds enough for pupils to engage in extra-curricular activities such as games and sports. Most of these compounds were neatly mowed and clean without litter, although some of the schools with small compounds left theirs tardy. The classrooms of the permanent buildings were also large enough, with lighting for pupils to read well, well ventilated and with doors and windows that had shutters.

Concerning the latrines/toilets, the facilities were available in every school visited. Some had permanent buildings while others were built of timber. In most schools, the latrines were up to standards set by the Republic of Kenya (2008) which states that 25 pupils should use one latrine. There should also be separate latrines for boys and girls. Most schools had only one latrine for the staff, both male and female.

Most of the observed schools visited did not have teachers' quarters. This was attributed to the fact that in Wareng Sub-County majority of the teachers live near their schools; they, therefore, commute to and from school. Of the total 38 schools visited, only 3(8%) had teachers' quarters. All the three schools had old structures built with timber, with rooms in them where several teachers lived in. The structures were initially homes to the white settlers who lived in the area during the colonial period. With house allowance, most teachers now prefer to rent houses at shopping centres near their schools.

All boarding schools had dining halls. Only 3(8%) of the observed schools were boarding schools. The rest of the schools had multi-purpose halls which served in part as dining halls. It was observed that these were in fact large classrooms separated by hardboards. The hardboards would be opened to enlarge the classes and provide temporary halls during functions like parents' days. The other schools had no dining halls. The same was observed with staffrooms. Only 26(74.29%) of schools had staffrooms while the others had classrooms that had been converted into staffrooms without shelves for putting books.

It was also observed that only 8(10.5%) schools had constructed libraries or resource centres. In the schools where the facility existed, there existed filing systems for sorting books into

various categories such as storybooks, reference books for teachers, course books for pupils and other supplementary books. The remaining 30(89.5%) schools had constructed structures within the staffrooms where shelves were placed and books were arranged accordingly. A library is a requirement of the FPE where the purchased instructional materials (IM) are to be kept in lockable rooms for safety (Ministry of Education [MOE], 2004).

Only 6(15.9%) of the schools visited had administration blocks. An administration block is a modern building that consists of all offices. Most of those buildings were constructed through CDF donations. Apart from 4(10%) whose construction was complete, the remaining 2(5.2%) had stalled since the initiator no longer served as a signatory to the CDF. Most schools had land of more than five acres in size. Availability of land is important as it facilities expansion of school infrastructure among other beneficial uses. All except one of the schools visited had a playground. The one school had an ongoing dispute with the local community over land issues. A playground in a school set-up enables children to nurture their talents outside academic work and hence develop holistically. Games and sports also enhance children's motor skills and body health.

All the schools visited had water supply. The available water was in most cases tapped; but other schools used water harvested from rain or drawn from drilled boreholes within the school compounds. The extent to which the available water was safe was not clear, although it was used for drinking, cooking and mopping classrooms. It is a requirement of the FPE policy to give water tanks to schools to help them harvest rain water or store piped water for consumption by the school. All public primary schools had been allocated some funds to help them buy water tanks in the year (2006). Water also had a vote-head in school budgetary allocation, just like the instructional and other resources.

It was found out most schools stored water. Other schools had drilled boreholes to draw water from the ground. Sadly, Wareng Sub-County is one of those areas in Kenya that are seriously affected by annual drought. Most of the boreholes, therefore, dried up during dry spells. Overall, the results of the study showed that sponsors still have influence in development of mainly classrooms. This was evident in all the observed schools that had been established before the cost-sharing era of 1986. Then, the sponsors had full mandate to run their schools while the government supplied schools with teachers and equipment. As regards the other two basic physical facilities, the sponsors indicated they do not provide support for construction. Both the head teachers and the chairpersons also disagreed that sponsors construct facilities solely. Reasons for such a response is attributed to the fact sponsors do not do work alone but it takes the responsibility of each parent in the school.

CONCLUSION

From the research findings discussed in this paper, it emerged that the role of sponsors in the development of infrastructure in public primary schools has not been clearly defined. Notably sponsors contribute very little towards the development and provision of educational resources in schools today. Although the inception of FPE did not take over the role of sponsors, the community at large has not understood exactly what they are required to do. It is clear that the government provides funds only for instructional materials, and the development of infrastructure has been left for the school sponsors and the community. It, however, seems that the introduction of the FPE has resulted in confusion over the roles of various stakeholder in

the education sector. Therefore, the roles of specific stakeholders needs to be re-defined since the initial role may have been surpassed by time.

The definition of the sponsors' roles in the current Education Act as being simply responsible for ensuring maintenance of religious traditions of schools is inadequate. The need for professionalism in educational leadership justifies this approach, but it also bypasses the previous one of the general management of schools. There seems to be a prevailing perception of sponsors among a section of parents and other educational stakeholders as obstacles whose functions should only be limited to religious concerns of education. In response to this, the Ministry of Education should review the policy on sponsors of schools and give clear, specified roles and obligations to the sponsors.

REFERENCES

Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (2004). The dark side of school leadership: Implications for administration for preparation leadership and policy in schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 3*(4), 245-273.

Cheruiyot, P. (2001, January 13). Sponsors Meddling affects schools special Report. *Daily Nation*. Nairobi: Nation Media Group.

Kogan, M., Johnson, D., Packwood, T., & Walker, T. (1984). *School governing bodies*. London: Heinemann Education Books Ltd.

Mahoney, T. (1998). *Governing Schools Powers, Issues and Practice.* London: Macmillan Education Ltd.

Ministry of Education (2004). *Primary Teacher Education Syllabus* (Vol. 2). Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education (KIE).

Ogada, O. (2009). Internationalization *vs* Regionalization of Higher Education in East Africa and the Challenges of Quality Assurance and Knowledge Production. *Higher Education Policy, 22*(3), 331-347.

Passi, F. O. (1990). Planning for the supply and demand of qualified teachers in Uganda. *International Review of Education, 36*(4), 441-452.

Republic of Kenya (1968). *Laws of Kenya: The Education Act*. Nairobi: Government Press.

Republic of Kenya (1980). *Laws of Kenya: The Education Act*. Nairobi: Government Printers.

Republic of Kenya (1998). *The Okumbe Education Commission Report.* Nairobi: Government Printers.

Republic of Kenya (2008). *The Safety Standards Manual for schools in Kenya* (1st ed.). Nairobi: Church World Service.

Republic of Kenya (1988). *Report on the Development of Education for the Next Decade and Beyond (Kamunge Report).* Nairobi: Government Printers.

Republic of Kenya (1999). *Report of the presidential commission on the Review of Education in Kenya (Koech Report).* Nairobi: Government Printers.

Republic of Kenya, (1976). *Report on the Education objectives and policies (Gachathi Report)*. Nairobi: Government Printers.

Sifuna, D. N. (2005). The Illusion of universal Free Primary Education in Kenya: East Africa, News from Africa: *CITIKENA*. Issue 20.

Tindall, L. M. (1988). *Retaining All Risk students: The Role of Career and Vocational Education Information.* Columbus ott, series No. 335.

UNESCO (2005). *Challenges of Implementing Free Primary Education in Kenya. Assessment Report*. Nairobi: UNESCO.