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ABSTRACT

Despite the fact that the Kenyan government offers Free Primary Education, there are still families that are not able to enroll and retain their children in school due to direct costs of education such as payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers, school uniforms, textbooks, money for school activities, and hidden costs such as opportunity costs. These costs brought about serious exclusions of less fortunate learners and may bring about drop out of pupils or non-attendance. This study aimed at gaining an in-depth understanding on the influence of direct and hidden costs of education on access and retention of learners in public primary schools in Garissa County. This study was guided by the following objectives; to determine the impact of payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents, cost of school uniforms, opportunity costs and cost of textbooks on access and retention in school. The study of literature review revealed the concept of cost of education. Now that primary education is free in the public primary schools in Kenya, direct and hidden costs in education hinder access and retention of many pupils. The direct costs of education includes school levies (PTA/BOM and support staff salaries), activity and examination fees, development funds, books and school uniform costs while the hidden costs includes opportunity cost. These direct and hidden costs of education are a major concern in almost all our public primary schools since majority of the parents cannot afford to meet them and hence access and retention are affected to a large extent. This study adopted the descriptive survey design. The researcher used questionnaires for headteachers, interview schedules for parents and FGDs for learners as research instruments to collect data. A sample of 10% of the schools and 10% of the headteachers was used for this study. Krejice and Morgan’s table was used to sample the 380 parents and 381 pupils grouped in 100 FGDs. The study found that on average, the cost of school uniform met by parents (70%), opportunity costs (76%), cost of textbooks met by parents (71%) and payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents (72%) very greatly affected access to primary school education. On average, the cost of school uniform met by parents (77%), opportunity costs (80%), cost of textbooks met by parents (73%) and payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents (76%) very greatly affected retention in school. The study recommended that findings of this study will help the government and other educational partners such as the NGOs and the private sector to come up with interventions that go beyond the mere assumption that access and retention rates can be increased by reducing the direct costs of education without giving a considerable look at the impact of hidden costs as well. The study will also help the government with the help of its development partners to increase the level of subsidies and provide enough learning resources to primary schools.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

The future of many countries depends on how well their citizens are educated, the type of education offered and how well it is developed (Todaro, 1997). The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted in 1948, declared that everyone has a right to education. The World Conference on Education for All (EFA), held in Jomtien, Thailand in 1990, sparked off a new impetus towards basic education especially with its so-called vision and renewed commitment. The Amman Mid-Decade Review of Education for All (1996) reaffirmed the commitment to the Jomtien resolutions. This was further bolstered by the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), which among other things, set targets to ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, would be able to complete a full course of primary schooling (UNESCO 2000). It observed that the provision of basic education, especially for girls, has remained elusive in many less industrialized countries. This was said to be particularly so in Africa, where ethnic tensions and conflicts have displaced many households, thus denying children opportunities of going to school.

The Dakar Conference of 2000 reviewed developments in achieving UPE in the African continent. In the case of Sub-Saharan Africa, Hyde (1989) has suggested that poverty arising from marginalization of these countries in the global economy, as well as the countries' low levels of economic development, may be important factors in how much stakeholders can avail for the purposes of education. Over the past decade several countries in sub Saharan Africa have abolished primary tuition
fees and introduced FPE. Studies on access and retention in primary and lower secondary education in Ghana shows that although the FCUBE made an overall enrolments increase, children from poor households continue to be underrepresented in enrolments (Akyeampong, 2009; Rolleston, 2009). Akyeampong (2009) and Rolleston (2009) made it explicit that not only direct costs of education such as payment of BOM/PTA Salaries, money for School activities, text books and school uniform hinder access of the poor but also hidden costs such as opportunity costs substantially affect the chances of poor children to enroll in and complete basic education. A study of access patterns in Malawi also concludes that access to education in the country continues to reflect household wealth (Chimombo, 2009). Thus, despite direct fees being abolished, these studies clarify that the abolition of fees has not been enough to ensure access to education for the poor. In Malawi, Free primary education was introduced in October 1994 following its announcement in June by the newly elected Government brought into power through the first multi-party elections since Independence. Just prior to that time, the Banda Government had brought in tuition waivers, in phases, from Standard 1, but parents still had been expected to pay book fees and to contribute to school funds. From 1994, however, Government was supposed to be responsible for all costs, though in practice it continued to expect communities to contribute to school construction.

Uganda introduced UPE in 1997. Education was seen as an important foundation of the poverty eradication Action plan. In Tanzania FPE was introduced in 2001 largely as part of the PRSP process, having been incorporated into the Education Sector Development programme. This led to arise in gross enrolment ratios. There was severe shortage of classrooms, desks, instructional materials as well as teachers.
Within this broad policy framework, and in tandem with EFA and MDGs, Lesotho implemented the Free Primary Education policy in most of its primary schools in 2000 (Ministry of Education and Training, Lesotho 2001). The Free Primary Education policy’s main objectives were to make basic education accessible to all pupils; to make education equitable in order to eliminate inequalities; and to ensure that every Lesotho child completes the primary cycle of education and ensure that education is affordable to the majority of Basotho (Ministry of Education and Training, Lesotho 2000). However, statistics show that out of the 180,000 pupils who enrolled in grade one in 2000, when Free Primary Education was first incepted, only 48,000 managed to write grade seven examinations by the end of 2006 (Chiombe 2007).

1.1.1 Primary Education in Kenya

At independence, Kenya had three major problems to solve; poverty, ignorance and disease. Kenya decided to lay more emphasis on education as the key to economic, social and political development (Republic of Kenya, 1964). The education system has expanded rapidly since independence, but the sector has had many challenges. Notable challenges that have been experienced include the sharing of costs between the government and parents from 1980s to 2002. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s public schools were managed through a parent-teacher association cost sharing system. Coupled with rapid education expansion, the policy has led to escalation of costs of schooling and increased pressure on the government budget over time (GoK, 2003).
This cost sharing plan cut off many children whose parents could not afford to pay fees in primary schools and make other contributions required to run the schools. Due to the cost sharing system, government expenditure on school supplies and equipment was minimal. The responsibilities for the construction and maintenance of schools and staff housing were left to the parent. This continued till 2002 when there was a changeover in the political leadership in the country. During the 2002 general elections in Kenya, the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) made the provision of free primary education part of its election manifesto (KANU Manifesto, 2002). Following its victory, on January 6, 2003 the Minister for Education, Science and Technology (MOEST) launched the Free Primary Education (FPE) to fulfill NARC's election pledge. Fees and levies for tuition in primary education were abolished as the Kenya government and development partners were to meet the cost of basic teaching and learning materials as well as wages for crucial non-teaching staff and co-curricular activities. The Kenya government and development partners were to pay Kshs. 1,020 for each primary child the year 2003. The FPE did not require parents and communities to build new schools, but they were to refurbish and use existing facilities such as community and religious buildings (Republic of Kenya). Under the free primary education law, families that had lost hope of ever sending their children to school got excited, turning up in large numbers to enroll them.

The outcome was that FPE was seen as a better strategy towards attaining Education for All. Recent policy initiatives have focused on the attainment of Education for All (EFA) and in particular Universal Primary Education (UPE). According to Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005, the key concerns are: Access, Retention, Equity, Quality and
Relevance. According to Education Sector Report of 2006 through the FPE initiative, there has been an increase in enrolment at primary school level. This has put a lot of pressure on demands for textbooks, other instructional materials as well as the school infrastructure. To remedy the situation the school authorities ask parents to pay fees to bridge the gap or threaten to close schools (Standard, 2010, Sept. 16th p.18).

Contribution by parents has been emphasized in the review as an important means of raising additional costs, but the nature, the extent and the implication of parents’ contribution to FPE has not been shown. Olembo (1982) observes that the contribution of parents to financing primary education is significant but it has never been quantified and added to the total budget for education thus it remains a hidden cost, a miscellaneous cost which is exclusive of the government’s annual budget for education. This is worsened by the fact that more than a decade after the introduction of FPE the capitation grant of FPE per child annually has not changed from Kshs.1020 despite the rise of the inflation. For example, since FPE was introduced in January, 2003, the cost of textbooks and exercise books increased exponentially, a scenario that only worsened in 2014 with the introduction of VAT on a range of manufacturing inputs and consumer goods. The Treasury introduced a 16% tax on books, and book publishers have since increased the retail price by 14% (Business Daily, October 2014). Making primary education free was a step in the right direction, yet many challenges remain and many families cannot afford the rest of the expenses associated with schooling. These includes books, school uniform, stationary and transport. With Free Primary Education, it was hoped that every Kenyan child would have access to basic education and that access and retention
rates would improve. However, research has shown that even with introduction of Free Primary Education, primary education is characterized by declining enrolment and low completion rates.

1.1.2 The State of Primary Education in Garissa County

Garissa County is one of the counties in Kenya with schools registering low retention rates and reduced access to education. According to the Kenya Census report (2009) there were 74,760 (58%) of school going age children who were out of school in Garissa County. Most of the out-of-school children look after animals and help parents in domestic chores thereby contributing to the economy of the family. Children in NEP are breadwinners in most families. Enrolling the child in school will therefore deprive the family from its economic benefit. This is an opportunity cost of educating the child.

In a 2010 study, it was found that of children aged 5-16 who had never attended school, 64% were from the poorest quintile, while 18% were from the second poorest quintile and only 3% from the wealthiest quintile (UWEZO, 2010). Compared to the national primary school Net Enrolment Ratio (NER) of 95.3% (2012), the NER for Garissa County was 50.6% (57.4% for boys and 44.5% for girls) (KIHBS, 2006). Of children aged 6-17 years in Garissa, 40.5% have never attended school. Compared to the national literacy rate of 81% and the rural rate of 77.9%, literacy in Garissa stands at a mere 42.1%.

While barriers to accessing quality education are a reality for all poor children in most counties, children in Garissa County consistently lag behind in enrolment, attendance and learning outcomes due to the direct costs of education such as
payment of BOM/PTA Salaries, money for School activities, text books, school uniform and hidden costs such as opportunity costs. According to Nguru (1997), many children from poor homes are persistently absent from school and subsequently dropout. He adds that many pupils come to school hungry because of lack of food at home. The government has tried to assist through the financing of certain targeted programmes.

Apart from the FPE there are a number of other interventions such Cash transfer programs, Hunger Safety Net Programs (HSNP), CT-OVC (Cash Transfer for orphans and vulnerable children) programs and enrollment drives by NGOs in collaboration with MOE that are geared towards increasing access and retention rates in primary schools in all parts of the county. Thus far, impact evaluations of the HSNP and CT-OVC have not shown a significant impact on primary education indicators. This is because the transfer value of HSNP and CT-OVC is not sufficient for poor households to meet both essential daily needs and education-related costs. Hence the government’s initial objective of every child attaining primary education remains unattained. It is due to this contradicting scenario that with the implementation of free primary education, access and retention rates in Garissa County are low; the researcher found the necessity to conduct a study on the impact of hidden costs of education on access and retention of learners in Primary schools in Garissa County.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In an attempt to create access to Education For All (EFA) by the year 2015 as provided for in the Dakar Framework of April 2000, Kenya Government with
support from its development partners has come up with policies such as Free Primary Education (2000), Conditional Cash Transfer Programs and enrolment drives. High enrolment of children in schools in the country, has some questions about access and retention of primary school pupils in Garissa County which remain unanswered. Based on the background of this study it is evident that more than half of the children in Garissa County are still out of school and that some are still dropping out of school. Given that FPE is in place, one would expect high access rates, participation, retention and graduation. This trend contradicts the national initiatives where by enrolment has been gradually increasing. Though the low enrollment and retention rates are of great concern in Garissa County, there is no evidence that a systematic research study has so far been conducted in Garissa County to analyze the influence of direct and hidden costs of primary education on the low access and retention of pupils in primary schools. The study therefore attempts to identify and analyze the influence of these direct and hidden costs of education on low access and retention in primary schools, in Garissa County for the purpose of sensitizing primary education stakeholders in the County on the impact of these direct and hidden costs of education on access and retention of learners in primary schools and measures to curb the prevailing situation of low access and retention.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

This study sought to investigate the direct and hidden costs of primary education and their impact on access and retention among the learners in primary schools in Garissa County.
1.4 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were:

i) To determine the impact of payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents on access and retention in primary schools in Garissa county

ii) To find out the impact of cost of school uniforms met by parents on access and retention in primary schools in Garissa county

iii) To establish the impact of opportunity costs on access and retention in primary schools in Garissa county

iv) To explore the impact of cost of textbooks met by parents on access and retention in primary schools in Garissa county

1.5 Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

i) How does payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents influence access and retention of pupils in primary schools in Garissa County?

ii) What is the impact of cost of school uniform met by parents on access and retention of pupils in Primary schools in Garissa County?

iii) How does opportunity cost influence access and retention of pupils in primary schools in Garissa County?

iv) What is the impact of cost of textbooks met by parents on access and retention of pupils in Primary schools in Garissa County?
1.6 **Significance of the Study**

Since this study was based on the fact that even though the government of Kenya was providing Free Primary Education, there are direct and hidden costs that are not catered for by the government. This study will be useful in that the findings of the study will add to the growth of existing knowledge on direct and hidden costs of education and its impact on access and retention public primary school. The study provides information that could form a basis for recommendation of any relevant adjustment towards achieving the objectives of education for all (EFA) by the year 2015. The findings makes it possible for the education stakeholders and policy makers to come up with strategy for easing the parents cost-burden such as mobilizing funds from the international donor agencies and development partners.

1.7 **Scope of the Study**

The study was confined to a sample of public primary schools in the county due to the vastness of the county which may pose logistical and financial challenges. Sample was drawn from the 173 public primary schools in the county. Private schools were not included in the study since they do not benefit from Free Primary Education funds. The study further confined itself to headteachers, parents and pupils.

1.8 **Limitations of the Study**

Because of time and financial constraints the study was limited to only a few selected direct costs of school uniform, textbooks, money for payment of PTA/BOM teachers and Support staff and hidden cost such as opportunity cost.
1.9 Assumptions of the Study

The study was carried out under the following assumptions; the respondents will cooperate and provide accurate, truthful and honest responses to the items in the questionnaire and interview schedules. The parents understand their role in the provision of primary education. Education officials and schools keep proper records of enrolment, finances and attendance.

1.10 Theoretical Framework

The researcher adopted the classical liberal theory of opportunity and social Darwinism. The theory asserts that each person is born with a given amount of capacity, which to a large extent is inherited and cannot be substantially changed. It also states that social mobility is promoted by equal opportunity of education. The roots of this theory can be traced to writers such as Rousseau (1712-1778) who claimed that in the “natural” statesmen were born equal and personal qualities should not jeopardize social equality as long as society rewards people according to their status/merits (Njeru and Orodho, 2003; Kiveu, 2004). Thus, education system should be designed so as to remove barriers of any nature be it economic, gender or geographic that prevents bright students from lower economic background from taking advantage of inborn talents, which accelerates them to a social promotion. The theory demands for further going through education at primary and secondary levels to which access would be determined on the basis of individual’s merit and not social, economic or geographical background.

By removing economic barriers and making more places available in primary, ideal conditions could be treated to implement the vision of equal opportunity, where
everybody has access to the kind and amount of education that suited his/her
inherited capacity. In the past a great deal has been attached to education as a
vehicle of equalization and it has generally been assumed that increased public
spending on education which contributes to this end reduces dropout, repetition and
absenteeism of the poor (OECD, 1975). Social Darwinism emphasizes that every
citizen should be given, through education the social status which entitles him or her
to inherit aptitude. For example, the Government of Kenya in 2003 had made
primary education free to enhance access to basic education. However, with the
presence of direct costs like school uniform, PTA/BOM salaries, development fund
and activity fees and hidden costs such as opportunity cost against the background
of high poverty levels in the country, many parents may not be able to enroll and
sustain their children in primary schools given the rising hidden and actual costs of
education. Therefore for the equity consideration, it practically becomes impossible
to ignore that fact that unequal participation in education will, in the long run,
worsen the status of the poor and vulnerable groups (Njeru and Orodho, 2003).

The theory was found appropriate for the study because of equity consideration; it
becomes practically impossible to ignore the fact that unequal participation in
education will in the long run affect the status of the poor and the vulnerable groups
like the girl- child from ASAL areas. For example, if the government fails to provide
mitigating factors to arrest the issue of low enrolment in ASAL areas, then education
for all will not be effectively realized.
1.11 Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework is a hypothesized model identifying the conceptual or variables under study and showing their relationships. Orodho (2004) defines it as being a model of presentation where a researcher conceptualizes or represents the relationship graphically. This study was based on a conceptual model developed by the researcher so as to help identify the answers to the questions in the study. The dependent variables for the study were, access and retention while the independent variables were the direct costs of primary education such as Payment of PTA/BOM salaries, School Uniform, Books, School development funds, Activity fee and hidden costs such as Opportunity cost. The total cost of the resources that the society contributes to an education system includes both the direct cost such as the cost of School uniforms, Salary for PTA/BOM/Support staff, development funds, school activities and hidden costs such as Opportunity cost.

**Figure 1.1: Conceptual framework on the impacts of direct and hidden costs of education on access and retention of learners in public primary schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct costs of education</th>
<th>Access to primary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Payment of PTA/BOM salaries</td>
<td>• Low Enrolment rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Uniform</td>
<td>• Increased number of out of school children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Books</td>
<td>• Low literacy rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hidden costs of education</th>
<th>Retention of learners in schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity cost</td>
<td>• High drop-out rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High rates of absenteeism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low completion rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High repetition rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent variables | Dependent variables
The Figure 1.1 shows the conceptual framework which encompasses the independent variables and their possible influence on the dependent variables. The model shows various direct and hidden costs that are met by parents. These direct and hidden costs influenced an individual learner's level of motivation to attend and progress smoothly through primary education. Repetition increased the chance of school dropout hence low retention rate. Those pupils who dropped out of school end up in activities like house chores, waged labour or end up idling (Theuri, 2004). Most of the times children from poor households were in and out of school due to lack of ability to meet the school levies such as payment of salaries for PTA teachers, activity and development fees. This increased the rate of absenteeism and eventually led to school drop-out. Parents who cannot afford to buy uniform for their children were forced to keep their children at home and involve them in child labour. This led to an increase in the number of school age going children who are out of school and hence low enrolment rates.
1.12 Operational definition of terms

Access: Address the open nature of education that is organized as a basic right of every child, youth and adult, it embraces the concept of inclusiveness of all potential learners horizontally and vertically.

Direct costs: refers to the expenditure incurred by parents in the provision of education and in this study the direct costs include payment of salaries to BOM teachers, school uniforms and text books.

Enrolment: Refers to the act or state of making someone officially a member of a group or society.

Educational cost: These are direct and hidden/indirect expenses incurred by parents in sending their children to school.

Hidden costs: refers to indirect expenditure incurred by parents in the provision of education and in this study the hidden costs include Opportunity cost.

Opportunity cost: refers to the alternative available to primary school pupils, which compete for their own attention as opposed to going to school.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter contains a review of literature related to the study. It focuses on the empirical studies on the types of hidden costs affecting access and retention of learners in public primary schools.

2.2 Free Primary Education in Schools

Countries are making encouraging progress toward reducing the number of out-of-school children. Some 72 Million children were not enrolled in school in 2005 (57% of them girls), down from 96 million in 1999 (59% girls) (UNESCO 2007). Nevertheless, projections on the average annual rate of increase in enrollment suggest that most low-income countries will need almost three times the current growth rate to achieve the 2015 goals (ADEA, 2009). Moreover, increased enrollment does not always translate into similar gains in attendance and completion, as witnessed by the fact that more than 90 million children did not attend school in 2005 (UNICEF, 2007).

Experience in many countries shows that the household costs of schooling are a major barrier that prevent children from accessing and completing quality education. The private costs of education are especially burdensome in countries in which poverty and vulnerability impose tough choices on families and households about how many and which children to send to school (ADEA, 2009). In Pakistan, the government has partnered with the private sector to ensure success of the FPE Program. In 1979, the government sought to encourage the establishment of private
institutions, which now constitute 14 percent of all schools, to expand the availability of school places. The goals of the policy included among others to eliminate dropout and fulfilling the basic learning needs by the year 2002; improve the quality of education, by reasserting the role of teacher in the teaching-learning process, modernizing curricula and textbooks, improving physical facilities, and introducing activity-oriented new sciences at all levels of school education (Oketch and Rolleston, 2007).

In 2003, the Kenyan Government implemented the FPE policy which was a campaign pledge to voters. The FPE initiative focused on attaining education for all (EFA) and in particular Universal Primary Education (UPE). Key concerns were access, equity, relevance, internal and external efficiencies within the education system (MOEST, 2005). Through the FPE policy the Kenyan government scrutinized the 8.4.4 system which had previously been coupled with retention and reduced enrolment before it came to power. The government focus was also on ‘quality education and training as a human right issue in accordance to Kenya Law and International Conventions’. The study sought to find out the impact of direct costs of education such as payment of salaries to BOM teachers, school uniforms, textbooks and hidden costs such as Opportunity costs on access and retention of learners in public primary schools.

2.3 The Concept of Cost in Education

Education and training can be reviewed as investment where individuals and society make deliberate decisions to meet the total costs (direct and indirect) of education as a mechanism or tragedy of harvesting a wide range of direct and indirect benefits in
the future. These are classified into private and social costs respectively (Woodhall, 1970). Education can be viewed as a private investment where individuals and their families make efforts and commitment to purchase education for the purpose of increasing benefits in return in the future. Educational costs are further categorized into direct costs such as salaries for PTA teachers, school uniform, text books, school activities and hidden/indirect costs such as Opportunity cost which refers to the productivity/earning forgone. The assumption is that the pupil would have been productive and hence contributes to the family sustenance had he/she been out of school.

It is estimated that at least 45% of the costs of education are borne by parents although the primary education in Kenya is free. They include direct costs where parents are expected to buy school uniforms and text books, pay PTA/BOM teachers and hidden costs such as Opportunity cost in order for their children to attend school (RoK, 1976). According to UNICEF (2003) costs still remain a major constraint to primary education despite the fact that it is nominally free. This study aimed at finding the impact of direct costs of education such as payment of salaries to BOM teachers, school uniforms and text books, and hidden costs such as Opportunity cost on access and retention in primary schools in Garissa County.

2.4 Educational Costs Affecting Access and Retention in Public Primary Schools

The problem of direct costs of education such as payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers, costs of school uniforms and text books occurs all over the world. In Bangladesh, Ardt et al. (2005) found that there are hidden costs in the educational
system that abolishing tuition fees do not address. Annual testing and activity fees exist in many schools and families employ private tutors outside of school. If a family cannot afford a tutor, children often fail because of the limited time they have with the teacher, others may drop out of school. Many schools also require uniform. In Latin America and parts of Australia direct costs of education such as school supplies, uniforms and transportation, make it difficult to send every child in a family to school. In India, although education is purportedly free, Dorleans (2006) noted that household expenditures are significant and the greatest direct costs appear to be uniforms and textbooks (approximately 80% of all spending). Despite Nepal’s policy of providing free education, households spent a mean of 660 rupees on a primary school child, which amounts to 20% of the income of the poorest households (Glewwe and Kremer, 2005).

World Bank (2005) observed that even with fee abolition, Ethiopian parents collectively spend over 57.5 million Birr on primary school hidden fees, 56.7 million Birr on books, 30.3 million Birr on school supplies, and 47.1 million Birr on unspecified school related expenses. Despite fee abolition in 2001, Sierra Leone, the share of financing by households was 50.4% in 2003/4. Aggregated parents were contributing Le 50,330 million with the government contributing Le 49,542 million (World Bank, 2005). Stasavage (2005) noted that in Uganda, parents whose children attend public school spent an average of Ushs. 33, 460 on transport, 17, 810 on private tutoring, 15, 480 on food, 9,710 on tuition fees, and 6,470 on uniforms. Around Ushs. 3,000 were spent on each PTA fees, development funds and exam fees.
Oywa (2010) on a survey of direct costs of education in Kisumu Municipality reported that the survey was necessitated by frequent complaints by parents that schools were introducing too many levies. He said the school dropout was likely to rise because of the direct costs of education. According to the report, all public schools in Kisumu charge admission fees ranging between Kshs. 200 to Kshs. 2,000 for new pupils. New entrants also buy their own desks and books. In some schools, new pupils pay Kshs. 200 for an interview. The report said that nearly all the schools sampled charged between Kshs. 50 and Kshs. 150 tuition fees per term and between Kshs. 20 and Kshs. 50 for mock examinations per term (Oywa, 2010). These studies show that despite the fact that primary education is free in most countries in the world, parents still have to pay for what the government does not cater for. This makes it cost-sharing and not free primary education. The researcher sought to find out how direct costs of primary education such as payment of salaries to BOM teachers, school uniforms, text books and hidden costs such as opportunity costs affect access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County.

2.5 Influence of Educational Costs on Access and Retention in Public Primary Schools

The direct cost in education which may influence access and retention of learners in public primary schools includes school levies (examination fee, activity fee and PTA fund), expenditure on school uniform and textbooks while the hidden cost include Opportunity cost.
2.5.1 Influence of Direct Costs on Access and Retention

School levies includes examination, activity and PTA funds. Many children are unable to enroll in school because the parents are required to cater for these expenses. Among those enrolled, many of them are forced to miss classes because they are at home now and then collecting money. This tendency if repeated severally in a school system makes the syllabus coverage difficult with only a few in class most of the time. Other pupils will opt to remain at home when the examination is done and hence find it difficult in getting the entire image of the class and eventually opt to drop-out of school. Olembo (1982) attributes high non-retention rates to the burden of high levies that replaced school fees in primary education. Wako (1980) argues that it is quite possible that the new costs of education at primary level disillusioned some parents who had taken the government universal primary education literally and withdrew their children from primary schools. He says that the difficulty of finding money to pay for the education of their sons and daughters is the main cause of premature withdrawal of pupils from schools. He noted that majority of those unable to be retained in school came from the poor families. These families were unable to buy their children school uniform and textbooks. Repeated and prolonged expulsions adversely affect the pupil's progress and frequently cause them to drop out.

According to the Human Development Report in (2003) the standards of living in Kenya have generally decreased with the poor becoming poorer (UNDP, 2003). Some of the poor parents cannot afford to provide the additional inputs required to sustain the children in school. This will therefore lead to many children remaining out of school hindering access to basic education which is a human right. Many
others will also drop-out of school as a result of repeated absence from school due to school levies. This study attempted to address the issue of direct costs of education such as payment of salaries to BOM teachers, school uniforms and money for school activities in relation to enrollment and retention in public primary schools in Garissa County.

2.5.2 Influence of Hidden Costs on Access and Retention

Investment in a child’s education is not just out-of-pocket costs but also the foregone productive contribution the child would have made to the family. The United Nations International Labour Organization (ILO) estimates that 250 million children between the ages of 5 and 14 years are toiling in the workforce of developing nations. About half of those children work full time, while the rest combine work with schooling or other non-economic activities. Children between five and six years make important contribution to households through housework and childcare as productive work. In this case, the private cost of opportunity cost take roots in such places at the expense of schooling. This means that the value of earning foregone or unpaid work in the household accounts for education among the poor.

In Kenya, due to the high level of poverty, children are employed as house girls, herders, coffee pickers and hawkers so as to augment family income. Abagi (1997) notes that as poverty level rises, child labour becomes crucial for family survival. Poor families sometimes withdraw their children from school to work on the family farm or to look after cattle as majority of families in Kenya are dependent on agriculture. It can also be observed that school attendance fluctuates with the
farming calendar and that habitual absentees are found a high propensity for dropping out (Abagi, 1997). Child labor is increasingly employed in domestic activities, agriculture, and petty trade in rural and urban Kenya. Poor households, and in some cases children themselves, have to carefully analyze the opportunity costs of education. As a result, parents have continued their children, particularly daughters, into the labor market mainly as domestic workers in urban centres. In North Eastern region, boys are sent to look after the animals in order to save money for the family that would have been paid to an employed herder. These families may feel that is a waste of time and loss of income from potential wage earning labor to attend school. Opportunity cost as a hidden cost is therefore a major impediment to access and retention among learners in public primary schools with an emphasis on those from poor households. This study sought to find out the influence of hidden cost such as opportunity cost on access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County.

2.5.3 Relationship between Cost of School Uniform and Textbooks, and Access and Retention

In many places in Kenya, it is a policy that all pupils should be in school uniform. Some families are forced to withdraw their children from school due to lack of school uniform. This has mainly affected pupils who come from poor backgrounds (World Bank, 2004). Some NGOs working on education has called for the abolition of school uniform in certain areas in Kenya arguing that they add an unnecessary burden to parents. Pupils with no uniform will develop inferiority complex and hence drop-out of school. Some children remain out of school because their parents cannot buy them proper school uniform. In some circumstances, pupils are forced to
borrow school uniform because they cannot afford resulting to low self-esteem. There are other pupils whose uniforms are completely worn out and they fail to concentrate in class work and therefore weaken their academic performance and eventually drop-out of school (Mason and Rozelle, 1998).

Books can also be said to be related to non-retention and out-of-school. In the past, both the exercise books and textbooks were the responsibility of the Kenya School Equipment Scheme (K.S.E.S). They budgeted for three exercise books per child while the requirement was six such books per child in lower primary and fifteen in upper primary where textbooks were issued. The supply was too little. Teachers had to ask parents to buy these facilities. Until recently the burden of books was entirely on the parent. But with the introduction of FPE in 2003, the government was to provide learning materials such as books, pens, chalks and dusters, but the question is whether the supply is sufficient to keep the pupils in school. The burden of textbooks still remains on the parent and those who cannot afford are forced to keep their children out-of school or dropped out in the middle. This study sought to find out the influence direct costs on access and retention of learners in public primary schools in Garissa County.

2.6 Summary of Literature Review

According to the World Bank (1992), primary education in all developing countries yields more in both social and private rate of returns. Many developing countries sacrifice funding of other sectors in order to finance education. According to UNICEF (2003) increasing level of poverty, rising costs and rapid increase in primary school age population, financing education has been a problem in
developing countries. This has continued to hinder the realization of education for all (EFA) as many children are still out of school and some more are dropping out since parents are required to meet other education costs (direct and hidden costs).

The study of literature review revealed the concept of cost of education. Now that primary education is free in the public primary schools in Kenya, direct and hidden costs in education hinder access and retention of many pupils. The direct costs of education covered in this section includes school levies (PTA/BOM and support staff salaries), activity and examination fees, development funds, books and school uniform costs while the hidden costs includes opportunity cost. These direct and hidden costs of education are a major concern in almost all our public primary schools since majority of the parents cannot afford to meet them and hence access and retention are affected to a large extent. Now that primary education is free in public primary schools in Kenya, this study was carried out to determine the extent the direct costs of education such as school levies (PTA/BOM and support staff salaries), activity and examination fees, development funds, text books, school uniform costs and hidden costs such as opportunity costs influence access and retention of learners in public primary schools in Garissa County.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter outlines the methodology used in the study. It highlights the research design, study area, target population, study sample and sampling procedures, research instruments, validity and reliability, data collection procedures and data analysis and presentation techniques.

3.2 Research Design
The study adapted the descriptive survey design. The descriptive survey design is intended to produce statistical information about aspects of education that interest policy makers and educators (Orodho, 2005). A survey is an attempt to collect data from members of a population in order to determine the current status of that population with respect to one or more variables (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). The design was suitable for this study because it enabled the researcher to contextually interpret and understand how the independent variables of school uniform, textbooks, money for payment of PTA/BOM teachers and opportunity costs affected the dependent variables of access and retention of learners in primary schools.

3.3 Location of the Study
This study was conducted in Garissa County located in mid-North Eastern Province of Kenya. Garissa town is the county headquarters and remains a critical administrative and commercial hub that links the counties of Isiolo, Wajir, Tana River as well as neighboring Republic of Somalia to the East. The county was
determined to have a population of 623,060 people in the 2009 population and housing census (RoK, 2009). The male:female ratio is tilted in favour of the men who account for approximately 53.7% of the population whilst women account for 46.3%. The county is made up of 7 administrative sub-counties each with functional and strong education team headed by sub-county education officers and supported by technical staff. The county has 173 public primary schools, 46 private primary school schools, 25 public secondary schools and 11 private secondary schools.

Garissa Town is an urban commercial centre. Most of its population depends on business and farming. Dadaab and Fafi Sub-Counties host the largest refugee camps and are considered as host communities and received support from NGOs. Balambala and Ijara Sub-counties are neighboring River Tana and largely depend on farming and pastrolism. Ijara Sub-county is prone to heavy floods and receives higher amounts of rainfall as compared to other Sub-counties. Lagdera Sub-county depends solely on pastoralism. Hulugho Sub-county borders Somalia and is prone to insecurity. Trading activities exist between the borders.

There has been a low enrolment rate of pupils across the county despite the Free Primary Education (FPE) initiative by the government. Apart from the FPE, other interventions aimed at increasing enrolment and retention rates exist in the county. UNICEF in conjunction with the Government of Kenya runs an enrolment drive program across all the sub-counties. Save the Children International is implementing a Cash Transfer Project in the County that benefits 3000 households distributed in 5 sub-counties. The project is aimed at reducing the financial barriers of education and increasing access and retention in primary schools. Despite all these interventions,
the enrolment and retention rates are still low. The dropout rate for primary school stands at 43% for females and 31% for male. This prompted the researcher to traverse the county to find out the causes of these low enrolment and retention rates and how to deal with the situation.

3.4 Target Population

Orodho (2003), points out that target population is any group of individuals who have one or more characteristics in common that are of interest to the researcher. Target population in this study consisted of all the parents, head teachers and pupils from Garissa County which has seven sub-counties, namely; Garissa Town, Balambala, Lagdera, Dadaab, Fafi, Hulugo and Ijara.

3.4.1 Population of Schools

There were 173 public primary schools in Garissa County distributed across all the seven sub-counties as shown in the Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-county</th>
<th>Number of public primary schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garissa</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balambala</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fafi</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagdera</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dadaab</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ijara</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulugho</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.2 Subjects

The researcher used the following groups of people as respondents in this research;

3.4.2.1 Headteachers

The headteachers were selected to be part of this research because they were the managers of the institutions in which this research was conducted. They were also the custodians of the key data such as enrolment and completion rates of pupils in public primary schools. The head teachers also had information on the impact of payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by the parents on access and retention of pupils in school. There were 173 public primary school headteachers in Garissa County.

3.4.2.2 Pupils

The researcher also used the pupils as key informants in this research because the pupils are the ones that make the school. They were the main population in the school. They also had firsthand information on the impact of opportunity cost on access and retention of pupils in school since they are the one who engaged in opportunities such as house girls, herders, coffee pickers and hawkers to supplement family income. There were 54,136 pupils in the 173 public primary schools in Garissa County.

3.4.2.3 Parents

The researcher interviewed parents since who had the responsibility of providing for the schooling needs of their children. They were the ones who met the hidden costs of educating their children. Parents were therefore in a position provide reliable information on the impact of the cost of school uniform and textbooks on access and
retention of pupils in school. The parents were also stakeholders of education in the county and formed part of the school management committee such as PTAs. There were about 40,800 parents for the 54,136 pupils in the 173 public primary schools in Garissa County, (CDE Office Garissa County, 2014).

3.5 Sampling Design

Sampling is the process of selecting a number of individuals for a study in such a way that the individuals represent the larger group from which they were selected. The individuals selected comprise a sample and the larger group is referred to as population (Gay, 1996).

3.5.1 Sampling of Schools

Nwana (1979) recommends 5% to 20% sample for populations that run in thousands, however, he asserts that there is no hard and fast rule on sample size. The researcher used cluster sampling technique to select the schools from each of the seven sub-counties in Garissa County as representative sample. Since the study was carried out in 173 public primary schools, a sample of 10% of the 173 schools was used which resulted into 18 public primary schools. The eighteen schools were then clustered into sub-counties and a sample of 10% drawn from each of the sub-counties. Simple random sampling was used to select the schools from each sub-county. In each sub-county, the names of all the schools were written on pieces of paper of the same size, shape and colour, which were then folded and placed inside a box. The box was shuffled and a paper drawn at random, one at a time, the name of the school on the paper constituted the sample. The process was repeated until the required sample of public primary schools was obtained. The sample of schools was as shown in Table 3.2.
Table 3.2: Sample of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-county</th>
<th>Population of public primary schools</th>
<th>Sample of school (10% of the population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garissa</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balambala</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fafi</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagdera</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dadaab</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ijara</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulugho</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.2 Sampling of Subjects

The respondents in this study were sampled as follows;

3.5.2.1 Headteachers

The researcher used purposive sampling technique to sample all the headteachers using a sample of 10% of the 173 schools, which resulted to 18 headteachers. The 18 headteachers were chosen purposively from the sampled schools.

3.5.2.2 Pupils and Parents

The sample size for this study was determined using the following formula, developed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970):

\[ S = \frac{X^2NP(1-P)}{d^2(N-1) + X^2P(1-P)} \]
Where;

S is the required sample size

$X^2$ is the value of Chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level (3.841)

N is given population size.

P is population proportion (assumed to be at point 0.50 since this would provide the maximum sample size).

d is degree of accuracy as reflected by amount of error that can be tolerated in fluctuation of p.

For parents;

\[
S = 3.841 \times 40,800 \times 0.5 \times (1 - 0.5) / \sqrt{0.05^2(40,800 - 1) + 3.841 \times 0.5(1 - 0.5)}
\]

S = 380

From the above calculations, 380 parents were sampled from the sample of schools. Stratified random sampling was used to select the parents in the 18 public primary schools. In each school a sample was drawn in proportion to its population.

For pupils;

\[
S = 3.841 \times 54,136 \times 0.5 \times (1 - 0.5) / \sqrt{0.05^2(54,136 - 1) + 3.841 \times 0.5(1 - 0.5)}
\]

S = 381

From the above calculations, 381 pupils were sampled from the 18 public primary schools sampled. Stratified random sampling was used to select the 381 pupils and
grouped into 100 Focused Group Discussions comprising of 3-5 pupils drawn in proportion to the population. The FGDs comprised of seven items meant to gather data on the influence of opportunity costs on access and retention. The ratio of male to female pupils in the FGDs was 1:1. The sample of respondents was as shown in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Sample of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Research Instruments

This study used the following instruments to collect data from the key informants;

3.6.1 Questionnaires

The questionnaires consisting of both closed and open ended questions were administered to the headteachers. Questionnaires minimize bias on the side of the researcher and the respondent (Kombo and Tromp, 2005). The closed ended questions were accompanied by a list of all possible alternatives from which the respondents selected the answer that best described their opinions. The open ended questions gave the respondents complete freedom of response. Each item of the questionnaire addressed a specific research question of the study.
3.6.2 **Interview Schedules**

Interview schedules were preferred for parents because they can obtain detailed information about personal feelings, perceptions and opinions and they will achieve a high response rate (Connaway and Powell, 2010). In addition interviews enabled data collection from parents who cannot read.

3.6.3 **Focus Group Discussions**

For pupils, FGD was preferred because detailed information was obtained about personal and group feelings, perceptions and opinions, and also saved time and money compared to individual interviews.

3.7 **Piloting**

Baker (1994:182-183) noted that a pilot study is often used to pre-test or try out a research instrument. Baker found that a sample size of 10-20% of the sample size for the actual study is a reasonable number of participants to consider enrolling in a pilot. Piloting was done using test-retest method after writing the questionnaires and before starting the actual data collection. Two schools were selected through stratified random sampling procedure. A total of 40 pupils, 20 from each school, 40 parents and 2 headteachers were used for piloting. Pre-testing was conducted to enable the researcher modify, restructure and eliminate any ambiguous items in the questionnaire. Piloting was done with the sole purpose of detecting any weakness and find out if the questionnaires were clear to the respondents. Problems and any unclear questions that arose during the pre-testing were sorted out by reframing the questions. This helped the researcher establish the validity and the reliability of research instrument.
3.8 Validity of Research Instruments

Validity is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represents the phenomenon under investigation (Orodho, 2009). It is concerned with the accuracy or truthfulness of a measurement. To ensure content validity, the instruments were scrutinized and approved by the supervisors in the Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies, Kenyatta University. The comments of the supervisors were considered by the researcher and the necessary revision of the instruments done. Pilot study for head teachers, parents and pupils was carried out to improve on the face and content validity of the instruments by modifying any item found to be ambiguous.

3.9 Reliability of Research Instruments

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. The test-retest technique was used to assess reliability. The same instrument was administered twice to the same group of subjects after two weeks and then the scores correlated to obtain a coefficient of reliability. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient formula was used to determine how the scores correlate.

The formula is:

\[
r_{xy} = \frac{n\Sigma xy - \Sigma x \Sigma y}{\sqrt{n\Sigma x^2 - (\Sigma x)^2} \sqrt{n\Sigma y^2 - (\Sigma y)^2}}
\]

Where,

\[X=\text{scores of the first test}\]
\[Y=\text{the scores of the second test}\]
\[\Sigma x^2=\text{summation of the square of the first test score}\]
\[\Sigma y^2 = \text{summation of the square of the second test score}\]

\[\Sigma x\Sigma y = \text{A product of the summation of the first and second test scores}\]

\[n\Sigma x = \text{Product of number of scores and summation of first test}\]

\[n\Sigma y = \text{Product of number of scores and summation of second test}\]

### 3.10 Data Collection Procedure

Before collecting data, the researcher sought for an introductory letter from the School of Education, Kenyatta University addressed to National Council for Science and Technology seeking for permit to conduct research in the area of study. Thereafter, a permit and an authorization letter to carry out research were issued by National council for Science and Technology. The researcher proceeded to inform the District Education Officer about the intended research. Their authorization letters were picked by the researcher. The parents and students consent was sought before the data collection. During data collection the research purpose and objectives were explained to the headteachers. Data collection was confidential and anonymous. The questionnaires for the 18 headteachers were administered by the researcher in person so as to give room for further clarification of the items in the questionnaire that were not clear. Interview schedules for parents were conducted at their households to avoid inconveniencing them. FGDs for pupils were conducted in the school during breaks and after classes to avoid interruption of lessons and normal school programs or activities.
3.11 Data Analysis and Presentation

This refers to the examination of the coded data critically and making inferences (Kombo and Tromp, 2006). Data collected was subjected to qualitative and quantitative analysis where qualitative analysis comprised of answers to open ended questions. Quantitative data comprised of close ended questions and categorized data. Quantitative data was analyzed by coding the data using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Scientists) software and generate descriptive statistics such as percentages and frequency tables. This enabled data to be presented in an organized and meaningful fashion, and simplified to see the general while qualitative data was analyzed thematically. This qualitative method was chosen because data was categorized according to themes and objectives in relation to the opinion, views and perception of the respondents. This method is also faster when applied in analyzing transcripts of oral interviews and interview schedules as well as questionnaires which are the major instruments in data collections for the study (Orodho, 2005). Recorded interviews were transcribed with consent of the interviewees; interview conducted in mother tongue was translated into English and interpretation done according to emerging patterns from the respondents. Data was analyzed objectively to ensure that there were no biases or subjectivity.

3.12 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

The researcher engaged with a cash transfer project that is implemented by Save the Children International in the county. As a coordinator of the project, the researcher had a strong link with all the administrative and educational officials in the county. This eased approvals required at each levels of the research. The researcher had
travelled in all the parts of the county to supervise monthly data collection for the cash transfer project, this eased the logistics of traversing the county.

On research ethics, the researcher assured all the respondents of confidentiality and anonymity. The researcher took an individual responsibility for the conduct and consequences of the research by adhering to the time schedule agreed upon with the officers and school administration. The researcher was honest and transparent when dealing with respondents. The respondents were assured of getting feedback from the research if they need it after the study. This is aimed at securing cooperation from the respondents.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the study based on the data collected from the respondents in relation to the objectives of the study. The purpose of the study was to investigate the impact of the direct and hidden costs of primary school education on access and retention among the learners in public primary schools in Garissa County. The study addressed the following objectives: to

- Determine the impact of payment of salaries to PTO/BOM teachers by parents on access and retention in primary schools.
- Find out the impact of cost of school uniforms met by parents on access and retention in primary schools.
- Establish the impact of opportunity costs on access and retention in primary schools
- Explore the impact of cost of textbooks met by parents on access and retention in primary schools.

The findings of this study are presented focusing on the following:

- Profile of respondents.
- Impact of payment of salaries to PTA/BOM by parents on access and retention.
- Impact of cost of school uniforms met by parents on access and retention.
- Impact of opportunity costs on access and retention.
- Impact of cost of textbooks met by parents on access and retention.
The findings in this study are based on the perceptions of the respondents and not on tabulated data nor on calculations. The study focused on a cohort of students in each of the sampled schools from 2004 when they joined standard one to 2011 when they finished class eight. This trend of pupils was used to measure the influence of direct and hidden costs on retention of the learners since the difference between those who joined class one in 2004 and those who successfully completed the eight year cycle informs the research on the transition and drop-out. Whether this difference was due to the direct and hidden costs of education or other factors too influenced was not cross measured but based on the perception of the majority of the respondents it was influenced largely by the direct and hidden costs of education.  

At the same time the impact of these direct and hidden costs of education on access was measured also based on the perception of the respondents who were asked to mention if there were any school age children in their locality who was out of school due to these direct and hidden costs. At the same the gross enrolment rate and the net enrolment rate of the County in comparison with the national rates indicates that there are still significant number of school age children who are out of school and especially those from poor households. Since poverty and access are correlated then it is as a result of those direct and hidden costs that these children are locked out of school.  

4.2 Profile of Respondents  

It was important to have some background information about the respondents who gave the information that was analyzed. The background information collected in the study included: Gender, marital status, age and professional qualification.
4.2.1 Gender

The study sought to find out the gender of the head teachers and parents. The results obtained are summarized in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Gender of Head Teachers and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 67</td>
<td>199 53</td>
<td>211 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6 33</td>
<td>176 47</td>
<td>183 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 100</td>
<td>375 100</td>
<td>393 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that majority (67%) of the head teachers were male while 33% were female. This shows that male teachers were more educated and professionally qualified as head teachers in the County as compared to female. This agrees with Njeru (2003) who observes that there is no gender equity in the Kenyan education system with male preference to education given a priority than female. Fifty three percent of the parents were male while 47% were female. The ratio of male to female students was 1:1 in the focused group discussions. In total, 54% of the respondents were males while female respondents were 46%.

4.2.2 Age

The researcher determined the age of head teachers and parents and the findings are reported in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2: Age of Head Teachers and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 indicates that 22% of the head teachers and only 6% of the parents were aged below 30 years, 39% of the head teachers and 36% of the parents were between 30 – 40 years, 28% of the head teachers and 25% of the parents were between 41 – 50 years, while 11% of the head teachers and 36% of the parents had more than 50 years. This implies that majority of the parents and head teachers had sufficient information with regard to impacts of direct and hidden costs of education on access and retention in public primary schools.

4.2.3 Marital Status

The researcher sought to know the marital status of the head teachers and parents. The information obtained from the study is presented in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3: Marital status of Head teachers and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information in Table 4.3 showed that 67% of the head teachers and 56% of the parents were married. Majority (55%) of the total respondents were also married.

4.2.4 Professional Qualifications

Information was also obtained about the professional qualifications of the head teachers. The findings are summarized in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Professional Qualification of the Head Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional qualification</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 1 Certificate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1 Certificate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KACE (A Level)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 revealed that 33% of the head teachers were university graduates, 28% had Diploma in Education, 22% had P 1 Certificate, 11% had S 1 Certificate while only 6% had KACE as their highest level of academic qualification. This shows that the majority of the head teachers were qualified to administer the schools effectively.

4.2.5 Experience

The study sought to establish the experience of the head teachers. The findings obtained from the study are summarized in Table 4.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.5 revealed that majority (63%) of the head teachers had at least 20 years of experience as school managers. This shows that the head teachers have a wealth of experience required to answer the research questions.
4.3 Impact of Cost of School Uniforms met by Parents on Access and Retention

The study sought to establish the extent to which the cost of school uniforms met by parents affected access and retention of learners to public primary schools in Garissa County. Data analyzed was obtained from three hundred and seventy five (375) parents out of the three hundred and eighty (380) sampled because they directly incurred the cost of school uniforms they bought for their school going children.

4.3.1 Impact of Cost of School Uniform on Access

Children in schools in Kenya just like in most other countries are required to put on school uniforms during school hours and days. Those without school uniform are either sent back home or feel inferior when they are in class. The uniform is seen as a sign of greatness by children in schools. These are uniforms are a cost to the parent and they are not provided by the government in the FPE grant. Information obtained from the respondents indicated that parents normally bought uniform for their children at least twice per year. This is because the children in rural areas especially walk to the school through the bushes and most of the times the uniforms get tattered and so it has to be changed. On the cost of the uniform the respondents indicated that though it differs from district to district it ranges between Kshs. 1000 - 2000 per pair for girls while for boys Kshs. 700 - 1500. This will mean that parents will be required to at least spend between Kshs. 1400 - 2000 on the minimum per year per child on school uniform. For parents with more than one child in school the burden will be more.
To determine the impact of the cost of uniform on access, information was obtained from the parents on the extent to which the cost of school uniform met by parents affected learners’ access to school is as shown in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Extent to which Cost of School Uniform met by Parents Affect Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>VL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low enrolment rates</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out-of-school children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low literacy rates</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

VG – Very great          G – Great           M – Moderate      L – Little
VL – Very little

Table 4.6 indicates that majority (79%) of the respondents reported that the cost of school uniform met by parents very greatly led to increased number of out-of-school children, 68% said that the cost of school uniform very greatly lowered literacy rates of learners while 63% noted that there were low enrolment rates due to the cost of school uniform met by parents. On average, 70% of the respondents reported that the cost of school uniform met by parents very greatly affected access to primary school education. Pupils are forced to borrow school uniform because they cannot afford resulting to low self- esteem. These findings are consistent with Oywa (2010)
who established that even after the introduction of the Free Primary Education in Kenya the burden of school uniforms still remains on the parent and those who cannot afford are forced to keep their children out-of school. Low enrolment rate is an indication of the impact of these direct costs on access to schooling.

4.3.2 Impact of cost of School Uniform on Retention

Children with no uniform are mostly sent home to look for uniform and this will increase the rate of absenteeism from school. Children with prolonged absence from school eventually drop-out hence impacting on the retention rate. To determine how the cost of school uniform met by parents influences the retention of learners in schools information was obtained from the parents and summarized in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Extent to which Cost of School Uniform Affect Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>VL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low completion rates</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High drop-out rates</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rates of absenteeism</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High repetition rates</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

VG – Very great G – Great M – Moderate L – Little VL – Very little
The findings in Table 4.7 revealed that majority (82%) of the respondents reported that the cost of school uniform met by parents very greatly led to low completion rates among learners while about 79% said that it resulted into high rates of absenteeism. There were 77% who reported a very great extent on high drop-out rates. On average, 77% of the respondents reported that the cost of school uniform met by parents very greatly affected retention in school. Some families were forced to withdraw their children from school due to lack of school uniform. There were other pupils whose uniforms were completely worn out and failed to concentrate in classroom which weakened their academic performance and eventually dropped out of school. These findings concur with Mason and Rozelle (1998) who noted that pupils whose school uniforms are completely worn out fail to concentrate in class work and therefore weaken their academic performance and eventually drop-out of school. However, 70% reported a very great extent on high repetition rates.

4.4 Impact of Opportunity Costs on Access and Retention

The study sought to establish the extent to which the opportunity costs affected access and retention of learners in public primary schools in Garissa County. Opportunity cost of education is a measure of the earnings lost by choosing to invest in education (and not on anything else). The fact that the needs always exceed the volume and dynamic resources and that therefore there are never enough resources to meet all the needs, determines any allocation of resources to have the character of a choice according to which the income of the option chosen is accompanied by loss (cost) resulting in giving up the best of the variants. In short, opportunity cost measures the gain by losses. The higher opportunity cost of labor to poor families means that even if the first few years of education are free, they are not without cost
to the family. Children of primary school age are typically needed to work on family farms, often at the same times as they are required to be at school. If a child cannot work because he or she is at school, the family will either suffer a loss of valuable subsistence output or be required to hire paid labor to replace the absent child. In either case, there is a real cost to a poor family of having an able-bodied child attend school when there is productive work to be done on the farm - a cost not related to tuition and of much less significance to higher-income families, many of whom may live in urban areas where child work is not needed. As a result of these higher opportunity costs, school attendance, and therefore school performance, tends to be much lower for children of poor families than for those from higher-income backgrounds.

Data analyzed was obtained from the one hundred (100) FGDs comprising of learners because they were the ones who were directly affected by opportunity costs.

4.4.1 Impact of Opportunity Costs on Access

The information obtained from the pupils on the extent to which the opportunity costs affected learners' access to school is summarized in Table 4.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>VL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low enrolment rates</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of out-of-school children</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low literacy rates</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings in Table 4.8 indicated that majority (83%) of the respondents reported that opportunity costs very greatly led to low enrolment rates of learners, 74% said that opportunity costs very greatly increased the number of out-of-school children, while 70% noted that there were low literacy rates as a result of opportunity costs. On average, 76% of the respondents reported that opportunity cost very greatly affected access to primary school education. The pupils did not access school because they were withdrawn out of school to work as house girls, herders, coffee pickers and hawkers to supplement family income. At the same time the parents the cost of taking the child to school in comparison with the foregone earning and/or expenses incurred as a result of taking the child to the school. Therefore most parents from poor households opt to have their children to look after animals or work in their small farms and hence locking them out of school.

4.4.2 Impact of Opportunity Costs on Retention

In spite of the existence of free and universal primary education in many, children of the poor, especially in rural areas, are seldom able to proceed beyond the first few years of schooling. The information obtained from the parents on the extent to which opportunity costs affected learners’ retention in school is summarized in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9: Extent to which Opportunity Costs Affect Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>VL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low completion rates</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High drop-out rates</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rates of absenteeism</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High repetition rates</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 80 80 10 10 5 5 4 4 1 1

Key

VG – Very great  G – Great  M – Moderate  L – Little
VL – Very little

Table 4.9 shows that majority (87%) of the respondents reported that opportunity costs very greatly led to low completion rates among learners while 83% said that it resulted into high rates of absenteeism. There were 79% who reported a very great extent on high drop-out rates. Those students who had school levy arrears stayed at home to help in various family activities such as looking after livestock, working in the farm, taking care of siblings, while girls were either married or employed as house helps. However, 70% reported a very great extent on high repetition rates. On average, 80% of the respondents reported that the opportunity costs very greatly affected retention in school. These findings agree with Abagi (1997) who found that as poverty level rises, child labour becomes crucial for family survival. Poor families sometimes withdraw their children from school to work on the family farm or to look after livestock since majority of families in Kenya are dependent on agriculture as a source of livelihood.
4.5 Impact of Cost of Textbooks met by Parents on Access and Retention

The study sought to establish the extent to which the cost of textbooks met by parents affected access and retention of learners to public primary schools in Garissa County. Data analyzed was obtained from three hundred and seventy five (375) parents because they had the responsibility of providing their children with learning materials including textbooks and other revision materials.

4.5.1 Impact of Cost of Textbooks on Access

Just like any other hidden cost met by parents children in primary schools are required to buy supplementary reading materials and revision textbooks since the materials provided through FPE is not sufficient for all the learners in the schools. Parents who cannot afford to buy these books and other learning materials for their children opt to have their school age children remain at home or those who are lucky to first join eventually drop-out.

The information obtained from the parents on the extent to which the cost of textbooks met by parents affected learners’ access to school is summarized in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10: Extent to which Cost of Textbooks met by parents affect access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>VL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low enrolment rates</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of out-of-school</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low literacy rates</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

VG – Very great

G – Great

M – Moderate

L – Little

VL – Very little

The information in Table 4.10 revealed that majority (73%) of the respondents reported that the cost of textbooks met by parents very greatly led to increased number of out-of-school children, other (70%) said that the cost of textbooks very greatly lowered literacy rates of learners while 69% noted that there were low enrolment rates due to the cost of textbooks by parents. On average, 71% of the respondents reported that the cost of textbooks met by parents very greatly affected access to primary school education. Teachers had to ask parents to buy textbooks in order to keep the pupils in school.

4.5.2 Impact of Cost of Textbooks on Retention

The information obtained from the parents on the extent to which cost of textbooks met by parents affected learners’ retention in school is summarized in Table 4.11.
Table 4.11: Extent to which Cost of Textbooks Affect Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>VL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low completion rates</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High drop-out rates</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rates of absenteeism</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High repetition rates</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

VG – Very great
G – Great
M – Moderate
L – Little
VL – Very little

Table 4.11 shows that majority (79%) of the respondents reported that the cost of textbooks met by parents very greatly led to low completion rates among learners while 75% said that it resulted into high drop-out rates. There were 72% who reported a very great extent on high rates of absenteeism. However, 68% reported a very great extent on high repetition rates. On average, 73% of the respondents reported that the cost of textbooks met by parents very greatly affected retention in school. The findings concur with Oywa (2010) who established that even after the introduction of the Free Primary Education in Kenya the burden of textbooks still remains on the parent and those who cannot afford are forced to keep their children out-of school or dropped out in the middle.
4.6 Impact of Payment of BOM/PTA Salaries by Parents on Access and Retention

The study sought to find out the extent to which payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents affected access and retention of learners to public primary schools in Garissa County. Data analyzed was obtained from eighteen (18) head teachers since they were school managers who paid PTA/BOM teachers from the money levied from parents. The head teachers were asked to indicate the number of pupils who enrolled in standard 1 in 2004 and the number at the 8th year in 2011.

The results obtained from the study are as shown in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Student enrolment and completion rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampled Schools</th>
<th>Total no. of pupils who enrolled in std 1 in 2004</th>
<th>Total no. of pupils in std. 8 in the year 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>41 to 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>21 to 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>51 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>51 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>31 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>More than 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>11 to 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>51 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>11 to 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>51 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>41 to 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>21 to 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>More than 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>51 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>31 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>51 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>11 to 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>51 to 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.12 shows that the number of pupils who enrolled in standard one in the year 2004 in majority of the public primary schools was slightly less than the number of pupils who the 8th year. This implies a high drop-out rate of pupils which was likely due to the school levies which was not manageable by the parents who opted for the pupils to engage in other home activities instead of going to school in order to supplement family income.

4.6.1 Impact of payment of BOM/PTA Salaries on access

The information obtained from the head teachers on the extent to which payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents affected learners’ access to school is summarized in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13: Extent to which payment of BOM/PTA Salaries affect access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>VL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low enrolment rates</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of out-of-school children</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low literacy rates</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

VG – Very great  
G – Great  
M – Moderate  
L – Little  
VL – Very little
Table 4.13 shows that majority (77%) of the respondents reported that payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents very greatly led to low literacy rates among learners. There were also 72% who reported increase in the number of out of school children. Also, 67% noted that there were low enrolment rates as a result of payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents. On average, 72% of the respondents reported that payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents very greatly affected access to primary school education. This agrees with Roble (2006) who noted that majority of the schools in Garissa County are taught by a few qualified teachers because fresh graduates are not willing to teach in remote areas of the county and the schools rely heavily on teachers employed by PTA/BOM.

However, 11% of the head teachers were of the view that payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents very little increased the number of out-of-school children. Some learners did not access school due to other reasons such as drug abuse especially khat (miraa) and religious radicalization even though they came from economically stable families.

4.6.2 Impact of Payment of BOM/PTA Salaries on Retention

The information obtained from the head teachers on the extent to which payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents affected learners’ retention in school is summarized in Table 4.14.
Table 4.14: Extent to which payment of BOM/PTA Salaries affect retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>VL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low completion rates</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High drop-out rates</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rates of absenteeism</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High repetition rates</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

VG – Very great  
G – Great  
M – Moderate  
L – Little  
VL – Very little

The findings in Table 4.14 revealed that majority (89%) of the respondents reported that payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents very greatly led to high rates of absenteeism among learners while 83% said that it resulted into high drop-out rates. However, 67% of the respondents reported that who reported payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents very greatly resulted to low completion rates and high repetition rates. On average, 76% of the respondents reported that payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents very greatly affected retention in school. From the focus group discussions, the pupils indicated that those who were not able to pay school levies in time were sent home frequently, and therefore most of the pupils opted to stay at home and eventually unable to complete primary school education. These findings agree with Oywa (2010) who found that high drop-out rate in schools in Kisumu Municipality was necessitated by rise in hidden costs of education such as payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers met by parents.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter entails the summary of the study, conclusion and recommendations based on the objective of the study. The study sought to investigate the impact of the direct and hidden costs of primary school education on access and retention among the learners in public primary schools in Garissa County. In addition this chapter provides a direction for further studies.

5.2 Summary of the Study

The study sought to find out the influence of direct and hidden costs of education on access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County. The purpose of the study was to investigate the direct and hidden costs of primary education and their impact on access and retention among the learners in primary schools in Garissa County. The objectives of the study were; to determine the impact of payment of PTA/BOM teachers by parents on access and retention; to find out the impact of cost of school uniforms met by parents on access and retention; to establish the impact of opportunity cost on access and retention and to explore the impact of cost of textbooks met by parents on access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County. Research questions were derived from the objectives of the study.

The significance of the study was well outlined. The scope of the study was well stated. Literature review was presented in chapter two based on objective of the study. The study was guided by the classical liberal theory of opportunity and social
Darwinism. The theory asserts that each person is born with a given amount of capacity, which to a large extent is inherited and cannot be substantially changed. The study adopted the descriptive survey design. The researcher used questionnaires for the 18 Headteachers, interview schedules for 375 parents and 100 FGDs for the learners.

5.3 Summary of the findings

5.3.1 Impact of Costs of Uniforms on Access and Retention of Learners
The study established that the costs of uniforms as indicated by the parents and headteachers were very high for the locals who only depend on herding for their living. Parents normally buy uniforms at least twice a year for their children. Most parents and headteachers have indicated the cost of a pair of uniform ranges from Kshs. 1000-2000. This implies that parents who have a challenge in meeting the basic needs of their families are required to at least spend Kshs.2000 per year on schools uniforms. This stipulates to high cost of uniform for the arid and semi-arid communities that rely on herding to raise money to educate their children. As a result there is exclusion of children from

5.3.2 Impact of Costs of Textbooks met by Parents on Access and Retention
The study established that text books and other writing materials are bought by the parents on term basis, acquiring this materials becomes very expensive for the parents who are forced to withdraw their children from schools in order to perform other family activities instead of paying someone else to do the work. This has continued to hinder the realization of education for all (EFA) as many children are
still out-of school and some more are dropping out since parents are required to meet other education costs (hidden costs).

5.3.3 Impact of Opportunity Cost on Access and Retention of Learners

Opportunity cost is the alternative available to primary school pupils which compete for their own attention as opposed to going to school. Investment in a child's education is not just out-of-pocket costs but also the foregone productive contribution the child would have made to the family. Based on the perception of the respondents, the study found out that opportunity costs has increased the rate of drop-outs and retention of learners in schools. Majority of the respondents (89%) reported that opportunity cost very greatly lowered enrolment rates. Those who were in school are drawn out of school to work as house girls, herders, farmers and hawkers to supplement family income.

5.3.4 Impact of Payment of PTA/BOM Teachers on Access and Retention of Learners

The study found that the payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers was being done by parents which make education expensive for the parents in this region. The salary of the support staff is also being paid by the parents and the two forms the highest expense amount for the parents. The study found that those pupils who are not able to pay the levies are sent home which has made their learning difficult. The pupils and parents indicated that frequency of them being sent home for fees is very high and therefore some of them opt to stay at home. When the pupils drop out of schools the parents assign them other roles in the family such as looking after the animals,
working in the firm, looking after siblings, getting married and others get employed as house wife or herder or shamba boy.

5.4 Conclusion

i) The existence of direct and hidden costs on FPE has affected the access and retention of learners in primary schools hence educational wastage. Such costs included: Development fee, School uniforms, activity fee, extra tuition, lunch, transport, supplementary textbooks, and exercise books for homework among others. Salaries for PTA/BOM teachers, Uniforms, text books and other levies presented a big challenge to many parents, where the study found that most of these items have variations in costs. Most of the respondents indicated that the cost of school uniforms ranges from Kshs. 1000-2000 depending on the district. Parents indicated that they buy at least two pairs per year for their children since most of them live in rural areas and the children walk long distances to the school hence passing through bushes that tear their uniforms. This costs are too high for parents who cannot afford their daily bread. As a result therefore, the study concludes that cost of school uniform met by parents locks children from poor households out of school and also causes others to drop-out of school hence reducing the enrolment rates in schools in the County and also increases the drop out and retention rates.

ii) The study has also established that children in rural areas and also in urban areas of Garissa County whose parents cannot afford to pay the school levies end up in child labour. Most of the children in poor household act as breadwinners for their families. They work as house helps, farmers, herders, PSV touts and conductors. Parents also weigh the private and social rate of return vis-à-vis the
foregone earning as a result of taking their children to school. As a result the children are locked out of school and therefore reducing the enrolments in schools and increasing drop-outs. The study therefore concludes that opportunity costs greatly influences access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County.

iii) The research established that parents are required to buy textbooks for their children in primary schools. Primary school children are taught six subjects and though the government provides textbooks through the FPE grants it is not sufficient. The textbook-student ratio is 1:4 in most schools in Garissa County. At the same time parents are required to buy additional textbooks to supplement the recommended books of the syllabus to enhance their children's performance. The average cost of a textbook is about Kshs. 300 and so most parents may spend about Kshs. 1800 on average per year on textbooks. This is too much for parents who depend on livestock herding as their only source of income. Due to the prolonged dry spells most parents have lost most of their herds ending up in villages with abject poverty just depending on relief food. Such parents who cannot provide for the daily subsistence of their households cannot meet such levies and as a result their children do not either enrol in schools or drop out. The study therefore concludes that the cost of textbooks met by parents influences the access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County.

iv) The study found out that in most schools in Garissa County there is acute shortage of teachers. As a result most of the school heads and the Board of Management have resorted to employment of PTA/BOM teachers who are mostly untrained. These teachers are paid by the parents. The parents also pay
for the support staff especially the cooks and watchmen. The research through perceptions of the respondents and not on tabulated data established that parents pay Kshs. 150-300 per month for payment of PTA/BOM teachers.

5.5 Recommendations for Policy Makers

Based on the results presented, the researcher recommends the following measures to ensure access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County:

i) The Ministry of Education and schools managers should mobilize and encourage greater participation from various stakeholders and development partners, including local and international communities, to support the FPE programme to ensure access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County. In particular the Ministry should work on reducing the deficit in the teaching force in the county. This will reduce the parents' burden on payment of PTA/BOM teachers hence increasing access and retention of learners.

ii) The CDF allocation should be increased to cater for the provision of various learning materials and infrastructural development in schools to reduce the burden on poor parents. This will reduce the parents burden in meeting the costs of textbooks and other learning materials.

iii) The National and County government should through its development partners and using Sector wide Approach to planning come up with programs that will increase enrolment of children in schools and also retain those in school. This programs should aim at also reducing the financial barriers of education by counteracting the influence of opportunity costs through programs such Cash transfer programs. This has been tried by Save the Children International in
Garissa county and it has really led to improvement in access and retention. The government should ensure such programs continue.

iv) The Ministry of Education should through a policy instruct headteachers in Primary schools in Garissa County to allow children from poor households who cannot afford to buy school uniform to remain or join school with their home clothes. The government in collaboration with other stakeholders should also come up with a modality of supporting children from poor households with school uniforms. This will reduce the inferiority complex in those children and also increase access and retention of pupils in schools.

5.6 Recommendations for Further Research

i) This study was conducted in only one County therefore findings cannot be generalized to other areas in the Republic. Future studies could be extended to other counties to enhance generalizability of the findings or to validate them.

ii) This study also focused on few selected direct and hidden costs of education due to time and vastness of the locale, further research could be done on other forms of hidden costs of primary education.

iii) This study was also for Primary schools only, further researchers can consider doing the same for secondary education.

iv) Further research should be conducted on the various initiatives the schools can invest in to reduce the burden of hidden costs for parents in these regions.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: INTRODUCTION LETTER

Mohamed Diyat Abdi
P.O Box 1520
Garissa
Cell Phone: 0724230529

To:
The Headteacher,
________________________ Primary School,
P. o Box ________________.

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CARRY OUT A STUDY IN YOUR SCHOOL

I am a final year Master of Education Degree student at Kenyatta University. My area of Specialization is Economics of Education. I am carrying out a study on the role of hidden costs of education on access and retention of learners in Primary Schools in Garissa County. I am kindly seeking for your permission to gather information from you and your pupils through questionnaires and Focal Group Discussions respectively.

The identity of the respondents will be treated with utmost confidentiality. Your assistance and timely response will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

Mohamed Diyat Abdi.
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APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HEAD TEACHERS

Introduction

My name is Mohamed Diyat Abdi, a student of Kenyatta University and am carrying out research on the role of hidden costs of education on access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County, Kenya.

The purpose of this interview guide will be to determine the influence of payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents on access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County. The information you give will be held confidentially.

Instructions

1. You are not required to write your name on the questionnaire.
2. Indicate your choice by putting a tick (✓) or filling in the empty spaces.
3. Please, answer all questions in the questionnaire.

Section A: Background Information

(Please tick or fill the spaces provided)

1. What is your gender? Male [ ] Female [ ]
2. What is your age (Tick as appropriate)
   Below 30 years [ ] 30-40 [ ]
   40-50 [ ] Above 50 [ ]
3. What is your marital status?
   Single [ ] Married [ ]
   Widow(er) [ ] Divorced [ ]
4. What is your highest academic/professional qualification? (Take as appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>[ ]</th>
<th></th>
<th>[ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KJSE</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>EACE/KCSE (O level)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KACE (A level)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>P 3</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 2</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Diploma (ATS)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. For how long have you been a Headteacher?...........................................years

Section B: Role of payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents on Access

6. What is the total number of pupils who enrolled in your school in standard one in 2004 and total number of pupils in standard eight in 2011?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total no. of pupils in std. 8 in the year 2011</th>
<th>Total no. of students who enrolled in 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than 10</td>
<td>1. Less than 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 11 to 20</td>
<td>2. 11 to 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 21 to 30</td>
<td>3. 21 to 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 31 to 40</td>
<td>4. 31 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 41 to 50</td>
<td>5. 41 to 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 51 to 60</td>
<td>6. 51 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. More than 60 pupils</td>
<td>7. More than 60 pupils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7. To what extent does payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents affect access of learners in your school?

**Key**

1 = 81% – 100%  
2 = 61% – 80%  
3 = 41% – 60%  
4 = 21% – 40%  
5 = Less than 21%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Index (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low enrolment rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of out-of-school children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low literacy rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others? (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C: Role of payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents on Retention

8. To what extent does payment of salaries to PTA/BOM teachers by parents affect retention of learners in your school?

**Key**

1 = 81% – 100%  
2 = 61% – 80%  
3 = 41% – 60%  
4 = 21% – 40%  
5 = Less than 21%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Index (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low completion rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High drop-out rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rates of absenteeism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High repetition rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others? (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PARENTS

Introduction

My name is Mohamed Diyat Abdi, a student of Kenyatta University and am carrying out research on the role of hidden costs of education on access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County, Kenya.

The purpose of this interview guide will be to determine the influence of the cost of school uniform and cost of textbooks on access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County. The information you give will be held confidentially.

Section A: Background information

1. What is your gender

   Male [ ]       Female [ ]

2. What is your age (in years)

   Below 30 years [ ]       30-40 years [ ]
   41-50 years [ ]       Above 50 years [ ]

3. What is your marital status?

   Single [ ]       Married [ ]
   Widow(er) [ ]       Divorced [ ]
Section B: Role of cost of school uniform and cost of textbooks on Access

4. To what extent does cost of school uniform and cost of textbooks met by parents affect access of learners in school?

Key
1 = 81% – 100%  
2 = 61% – 80%  
3 = 41% – 60%  
4 = 21% – 40%  
5 = Less than 21%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Cost of school uniform index (%)</th>
<th>Cost of textbooks index (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low enrolment rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of out-of-school children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low literacy rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others? (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C: Role of cost of school uniform and cost of textbooks on retention

5. To what extent does cost of school uniform and cost of textbooks met by parents affect retention of learners in school?

Key
1 = 81% – 100%,  
2 = 61% – 80%  
3 = 41% – 60%  
4 = 21% – 40%  
5 = Less than 21%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Cost of uniform index (%)</th>
<th>Cost of textbooks index (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low completion rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High drop-out rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rates of absenteeism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High repetition rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others? (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE FOR LEARNERS

Introduction

My name is Mohamed Diyat Abdi, a student of Kenyatta University and am carrying out research on the role of hidden costs of education on access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County, Kenya.

The purpose of this focus group discussion will be to determine the influence of opportunity costs on access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County. The information you give will be held confidentially.

Instructions

1. You are not required to write your name on the questionnaire.
2. Please, answer all questions in the questionnaire.

FGD Checklist

1. What is the name of your school? ........................................................................................................

2. (a) Do you pay any school levy in your school?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   (b) If yes, list ........................................................................................................................................

3. (a) In your opinions are all parents able to pay school levy?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   (b) If No, what happens to the pupils whose parents are not able to pay the school levies promptly?
4. (a) Are the children of your ages in this location/village who are not in school?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) If yes, what do you think are the reasons why they are not in school?

5. Are there some pupils who were your classmates but dropped out of school because of opportunity cost?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

6. In your own opinions, do you think opportunity costs have impact on access of learners in school?

   **Key**
   
   1 = 81% - 100%,
   2 = 61% - 80%
   3 = 41% - 60%
   4 = 21% - 40%
   5 = Less than 21%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Index (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low enrolment rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of out-of-school children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low literacy rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others? (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. In your own opinions, do you think opportunity costs have impact on retention of learners in school?

**Key**

1 = 81% – 100%

2 = 61% – 80%

3 = 41% – 60%

4 = 21% – 40%

5 = Less than 21%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Index (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low completion rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High drop-out rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rates of absenteeism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High repetition rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others? (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX V: WORKPLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of research instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data coding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data entry and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX VI: RESEARCH BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Stationary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Writing Materials</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Duplicating Papers</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Pens</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Transport Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Pre-testing Questionnaires</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Administering Questionnaires</td>
<td>8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Collecting Questionnaires</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Contacting Supervisors</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Telephone/fax and postage</strong></td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Binding Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Proposal</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Final Report</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Data Analysis</strong></td>
<td>15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>42700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VII: MAP OF GARISSA COUNTY

Greater Garissa District
APPENDIX VIII: NACOSTI RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Telephone: +254-20-2213471, 2241349, 310571, 2219420
Fax: +254-20-318245, 318249
Email: secretary@nacosti.go.ke
Website: www.nacosti.go.ke

Ref: No.

NACOSTI/P/15/9552/4819

Mohamed Diyat Abdi
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on "The role of hidden costs of education on access and retention of learners in primary schools in Garissa County, Kenya" I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Garissa County for a period ending 3rd April, 2015.

You are advised to report the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Garissa County before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are required to submit two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

DR. S. K. LANGAT, OGW
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:

The County Commissioner
Garissa County.

The County Director of Education
Garissa County.
APPENDIX IX: COUNTY COMMISSIONER RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

THE PRESIDENCY
MINISTRY OF INTERIOR & CO-ORDINATION OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

Telegrams: “COUNTY” GARISSA.
Telephone: Garissa
ccgscounty@gmail.com

OFFICE OF THE
COUNTY COMMISSIONER
P.O BOX 1-70100
GARISSA COUNTY

When replying please quote
REF.NO: CC/EDU/7/3/(5)

Mohamed Diyat Abdi
Kenyatta University
P. O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

This in reference to your letter Ref No. NACOSTI/P/15/9552/4819 dated 30th January, 2015 from the Director General/CEO National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation and application for authority to carry out research on “The role of Hidden costs of Education on access and retention of learners in Primary Schools in Garissa County”.

I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake your research in Garissa County.

D. M. KYENZA
FOR: COUNTY COMMISSIONER
GARISSA COUNTY.
APPENDIX X: RESEARCH PERMIT

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT:
MR. MХOHЕMЕD DIIAT АDII
of KЕНYАTТA UНIВЕRSITу, 0-70100
GARISSA, has been permitted to conduct
research in Garissa County

on the topic: THE ROLE OF HIDDEN
COSTS OF EDUCATION ON ACCESS AND
RETENTION OF LEARNERS IN PRIMARY
SCHOOLS IN GARISSA COUNTY, KENYA

for the period ending:
3rd April, 2015

Applicant's
Signature

Permit No : NACOSTI/P/15/9552/4819
Date Of Issue : 30th January, 2015
Fee Received : Ksh 1,000

CONDITIONS

1. You must report to the County Commissioner and
the County Education Officer of the area before
embarking on your research. Failure to do that
may lead to the cancellation of your permit
2. Government Officers will not be interviewed
without prior appointment.
3. No questionnaire will be used unless it has been
approved.
4. Excavation, filming and collection of biological
specimens are subject to further permission from
the relevant Government Minister.
5. You are required to submit at least two(2) hard
copies and one(1) soft copy of your final report.
6. The Government of Kenya reserves the right to
modify the conditions of this permit including
its cancellation without notice.

Secretary
National Commission for Science,
Technology & Innovation

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

National Commission for Science,
Technology and Innovation

RESEARCH CLEARANCE
PERMIT

Serial No. A 4145

CONDITIONS: see back page