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ABSTRACT

Research in social inequality with regard to how it affects realization of human success, prosperity and contentment in life has been documented. In education, social inequality has been found to affect how children access and ultimately achieve their educational goals and ensure upward mobility in higher education and careers. Issues of poverty, lack quality housing lack, basic amenities and security among other factors have contributed to under achievement of education of millions of children in Kenya. The purpose of this study was to access how factors in social inequality impact of learning process among primary school in Athi river district the objectives of the study was to identify types of social inequality challenges, document access to education by primary school pupils, determine the state of retention in school and find out the rate of completion of education by pupils in public schools in Athi river districts. The study adopted descriptive survey research design. The research instruments were administered to 256 respondents. 12 out of 76 schools in district representing 15% of total school were sampled. The data was generated using questionnaires focus group discussion, interviews and observation guide. Data collected was analyzed using statistical program for social science (SPSS) and MS-excel. The finding were represented using frequencies and percentages distribution tables, histograms, pie chart and bar graphs the study found poverty, family back ground (orphans) poor infrastructure, poor pupil teacher ratio, level of parental education, and housing as the major social inequality factors in the community. The study also found accessibility to school as good. However the schools were not enough for all school-age going children. The study found the retention rate was high (80%) with a drop out of (20%) the rate of completion was also high. The impact of social inequality on education of pupil includes poor academic performance, lateness to school, dropping out to school, early employment, marriages and drug abuse. The study recommended employing of more teachers improving school feeding programs and infrastructure. The parents to provide a conducive environment for their children education encourage access and retention of their education. Further research is recommended to find out the impact of social inequality in access retention and completion in secondary and tertiary institutions.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Grusky (2001) defined social inequality as a situation in which individuals in a society do not have equal social status. The author points out areas of potential social inequality which include: voting rights, freedom of speech and assembly, the extent of property rights and access to education, health care, quality housing and other social goods. Walker (2009) states that social inequality refers to the ways in which socially-defined categories of persons (according to characteristics such as gender, age, class and ethnicity) are differentially positioned with regard to access to a variety of social ‘goods’ such as the labor market and other sources of income, education, healthcare services, and forms of political representation and participation. He further argues that factors of social inequality were shaped by a range of structural factors, such as geographical location or citizenship status, and were often underpinned by cultural discourses and identities defining, for example, whether the poor are ‘deserving’ or ‘undeserving.’ The common factor in both the definitions cited, points to situations where certain conditions inevitably lead to limited access to, or inadequate supply of essential needs to a section of human populations across the world.

Social inequality, therefore, anchors its understanding on a dual-layered existence of human beings predicated on the social principle of those who have and those who do not have. These factors point to the undesirability of social inequality for social progress in improving the quality of life for the vast majority of people. It appears prudent to make the general assumption that people who lack basic needs or even the practical opportunities to create wealth and hence elevate their social status are predisposed to myriad problems of acquisition, purchasing power provision and most importantly, insulation from economic
pressures. Various scholars have explored social inequality as and its effects on economic status, growth, politics, gender relations and education among others. For instance, Bottero (2007) while discussing the effects of social inequality explored the effects it has on social relationships. In particular, the writer brought forth the idea of ‘homophily’, which simply implies that people were more likely to associate with others who were socially similar to themselves. It therefore further implies that social inequality largely dictates human association with others around them constrained by social similarity and differential association. Research has shown that there is a social sorting process in the way we form social ties, so that the people we interact with tend to be similar to ourselves in education, social class, race/ethnicity, religion and attitudes. This has major consequences for our routes through life and worldviews, and for how inequality is reproduced.

In education, Murnane and Blank (2008) observe that social inequality manifests itself in terms of inter-individual variations in the different steps in transition dynamics during one’s educational career. To some, social inequality militates against their access, retention and transition in education. It places conditions in the path to progress due to the issues of lack of the basic essentials necessary for attainment of projected goals. It is from this standpoint that the study found ground to seek more information regarding social inequality and its effects in education in Athi-River District.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Achoka, Maiyo, and Odedero (2007) observe that basic education as the minimum education is a crucial factor every Kenyan must have for progressive existence in society. It is for that reason Kenya subscribes to the international protocols that established EFA in Jomtien, Thailand 1990 and the world education forum in Dakar, Senegal, 2000. Since then, the Kenya Government in her Education Sector Strategic Plan and Sessional paper No. 1 of 2005 has
articulated how to attain the goals for education for all. The Plan and Implementation Matrices for: 2003-2007, show her commitment to eliminate poverty as a hindrance to educational development, promote human rights through provision of education and attain sustainable development by the provision of quality basic education for all. Thus, like other developing nations in the world today, Kenya is making efforts to achieve access in education for all.

In 2003, when the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) government took over the reins of power, the provision of Free Primary education (FPE) for all was the policy that was implemented immediately in line with the 2nd Millennium Goal on Universal Education. Consequently, a large number of children who had hitherto been unable to attend school due to economic challenges found space in public education institutions. However, according to Gachuhi (1999), all the noble intentions the country holds towards provision of education for all its citizens has become a big challenge to the policy makers. Enrolment rates have declined due to what some see as the impact of poverty as a major component of social inequality on over 50% of Kenya’s population, making education an expensive social service. This study therefore, basing its foundation on these noble educational intention the government harbors for its children, sets out to examine aspects of social inequality in society and their influence on access to education, retention in learning institutions and completion rates of learners in primary schools in Athi River District, Machakos County.

1.3 Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to assess how factors of social inequality impacts on learning process among primary school children in Athi-River District.
1.4 Objectives of Study

The general objective of the study was to examine social inequality as a factor in access, retention and completion rates in education.

The specific objectives were to:
1. Identify types of social inequality challenges in Athi-River.
   Document access to education by primary school pupils in Athi-River.
2. Determine the state of retention in schools of pupils in Athi-River.
   Find out the rates of completion of education by primary school pupils in Athi-River

1.5 Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:
1. What is the state of social inequality among the populations in Athi-River?
2. How easily do pupils access education and educational institutions in Athi River?
3. How are the rates of retention in schools among primary school pupils in Athi-river?
   4. What are the rates of completion of the learning process among pupils in Athi-river?
   5. What is the impact of social inequality on the process of learning in Athi River?

1.6 Assumptions of Study

The study operated under the following assumptions:
1. That social inequality is a factor among the populations in Athi-River
2. That there are primary schools which provide education to pupils in Athi River
3. That there are pupils who attend primary schools in Athi-river
4. That social inequality has had an impact on’ access, retention and completion of education among primary schools in Athi-river
1.7 Limitations of the Study

Although social inequality has the potential of affecting education and learning across all levels from pre-primary to university, the study limited itself to examining social inequality as a factor in primary school level of education and specifically in public primary schools. This is due to the fact that since the introduction of Free Primary Education, the primary level public school provides an adequate population sample for study due to the large number of pupils taking advantage of the free education scheme.

1.8 Delimitations of the Study

The study anticipated a number of delimitations among them logistics of accessing some of the institutions. Due to distance between primary schools, the study found it difficult to visit all of them. However, a sample was selected from among schools that are easily accessible for study. Social inequality entails certain families significantly lacking in basic needs necessary for survival. Some families were not willing to discuss these inadequacies with people outside of their family unit or relations. The study however made attempts to explain to such families the importance of the study and provided assurances for privacy of any information given. The primary school pupils themselves arguably provided a very good source of information on accessibility, retention and completion of education. However, the study encountered problems where some pupils were not able to articulate the critical issues responsible for certain situations they find themselves in a situation where some of them might not be able to articulate the critical issues responsible for certain situations they find themselves in.
1.9 **Significance of Study**

Available literature on the effects of social inequalities has tended to address issues of HIV/AIDS, and housing in a generalized approach. While they are commendable sources of information on social inequalities and its impact on populations, they tend to lack detail on pertinent particulars that can help reinforce discourse on social inequality and its effects on educational goals and processes. This study is keen on making contribution to the wider literature of effects of social inequalities by addressing particulars as far as educational processes are concerned.

Secondly, this study will be useful to education policy makers in the areas of designing and implementing mitigation measures to challenges in access, retention and completion of educational processes. Findings will clearly indicate the correlation of all the variables under study and how they intersect to affect learning processes among pupils. These, the study believes, will be an invaluable resource for education planners towards improvement of accessibility conditions to education and educational institutions, design strategies to ensure high retention rates and completion rates for pupils.

Thirdly, the study will be useful in aiding primary schools managers to have a better understanding of social inequalities and its effects on specifically, retention and completion. Consequently, they will be able to draw roadmaps that can circumvent the effects of social inequality to be able to ensure sustained completion and retention rates of their pupils. It can be argued that without pupils, the manager and the institutions will be rendered ineffective and it is for that reason that the findings of this study will provide leadership necessary to avert such a situation.
1.9.1 Theoretical Framework

This study was based on the reference group theory according to matron (1936) “People identify with the social and cultural group to which they belong ‘normative reference group (NRG) or with another to which they aspire to belong - ‘comparative’ reference group (CRG). A number of studies point to the extent to which people’s total environment and group membership creates an orientation to involvement in educational projects and programmes. In the case of CRG, people have some sense of ‘missing out’ or being deprived’ and thus seek out opportunities to advance themselves. CRGs may be provided by the mass media, by colleagues and by relationships, for example, keeping pace with your partner. The current study finds this theory useful especially in determining issues of completion and retention. Some of the critical questions that accrue out of this theory and applied to the study include: Is the reference group of pupils compelling enough for them to want to stay in school? Is there any sense of deprivation they feel that can enhance retention or do they feel better when they quit school? Is there any reason explained to them as far as seeking opportunities is concerned? Are there role models around whom the pupils can form identities and hence remain in school to completion because they saw a purpose?

1.9.2 Conceptual Framework

To be able to understand further the relationships between variables in the study, The Learner-Education Factorial Relationships Model was used (Fig. 1)
The above figure provides a graphic illustration of the variables of the study. At the bottom are the factors in social inequality, which as indicated, affects two other variables; the learner and the resultant factors of access, retention and completion of education.

It is therefore an independent variable while the learner is dependent on it. The learner on their part does not affect any of the variables. Once factors of social inequality have had their effect, the learner is unable to access education, retain in the system and even complete. All the three other variables affect him as a result of missing out on others. Education becomes inaccessible if factors of social inequality are not resolved. That is why there is no direct connection whatsoever between the learner and education. Until factors in social inequality are removed or mitigated, there will continue to be a missing link between education opportunities and the learner.

1.10 Operational Definition of Terms

In this study, the following terms assumed the meaning defined:

Access: A learner being able to get to an educational institution to receive some form of learning.

Completion: A learner being able to reach the end of a stipulated educational process

Retention: a learner being able to sustain presence and activity in a given educational cycle.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction
This section will review related literature on access, retention, and completion of education in various scenarios both locally and internationally.

2.2 Issues of Access to Education
UNESCO partnering with International Institute for Education, and Planning (2009) raised issues with regard to access and inclusion in education with a focus on gender issues and emergencies. In their concern they observe that despite significant advocacy in this area, education remained marginalized in crisis response strategies and it was rarely seen as a priority by donors. Funding for education in crisis-affected fragile states was still woefully inadequate, volatile and unpredictable. Such persistent under-funding was likely due to the unfortunate misconception that education was not life-saving, and therefore not a priority during a rapid onset of emergency. The report further states that marginalized groups suffered even more from this belief that education was not a priority in emergencies. Humanitarian workers in the field of emergencies often believed that school provision alone was not problematic enough, and that greater stability was needed before attempting to reach excluded groups. Although the UNESCO report has raised pertinent issues specifically with regard to education access in war situations, the study found it a useful resource in engaging several other factors that cause social inequality and hence affects access to education by children in Athi-river.

Thorat (2006) writing on access to higher education in India contend that the second important issues, that confronts education in India relates to multiple disparities across State, rural-urban, male-female, inter-caste and inter-religious, poor-non poor and between
occupation group. The extent of enrolment was low in rural areas compared with urban areas and in some States. The enrolment was low among females compared to males. Among the religious groups, the enrolment was lower among the Muslim and Hindus compared with Jain, Sikh and Christian. The enrolment was also low among the poor and particularly low among person engaged in some economic activities such wage labor household as compared with those engaged in business as self employed. There had been huge increase in the demand for higher education since independence. However the increase in demand had not been matched by corresponding increase in the education infrastructure in term of educational institutions and other facilities. Due to the demand outstripping the capacity, a large number of aspirants are also denied access to higher education. Although the author’s focus was on access to higher education in India and the problems faced by those wishing to access education, the study found this an invaluable discourse that will enrich the discussion on factors that hinder access to education at the primary schools level in Athi-river.

Ardit K, Chas H, Robin K, Jun L and Woods R. (2005) observe that in Bangladesh the expansion of primary education has been crucial, just as it is in other developing; nations within South Asia and beyond. Bangladesh’s low literacy rate of 39% meant that Primary education became a priority in Bangladeshi politics since independence from Pakistan in 1971. Basic measures to implement universal primary education were taken from the outset. However up until recent times, enrollment, as well as government spending on the education sector, had remained very low; little progress was seen in the primary education sector throughout the 1970s and 80s. Additionally there had been problems of inequity and access. The 70s and the 80s saw a marked gender disparity in enrollment levels as well as attendance, completion, literacy rates and achievement levels. Marginalized and disadvantaged groups in general – particularly the rural and urban poor – have had significantly less access to education than other groups. Equity and access issues have included male/female success
rates, enrollment rates in rural versus urban areas, and poverty-related access restrictions. Large indigenous populations living largely in the Chittagong region as well as Sylhet and remote parts in the north of the country have not yet been reached by primary school expansion. The author has discussed issues that touch on poverty and the disadvantaged in the rural areas of Bangladesh. Though no direct mention has been made with regard to social inequality, the current study has gone further to examine issues of poverty as a factor of social inequality and hence a hindrance to completion, access and retention in education in Athi-river.

The UN Conference on Trade and Development (2002) states that universal access to primary education for all school age children had been a common goal in every country, and had been recognized as a human right in Article XXVI of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. On the experience in Malawi, the conference notes that families had been through various experiences with user fees for schools. Prior to the 1990s, user fees were a common policy. Besides the opportunity costs of sending kids to school, user fees were amongst the key reasons for the relatively low enrollment of students. During that period, less than half of eligible children were enrolled in school. The 1994 decision to completely abolish fees for primary education significantly increased enrollment. At the same time, however, the increase in the number of pupils placed pressures on the infrastructure and human resource capacities. Students suffered from a lack of facilities, shortages of qualified teachers, large class sizes and high student-to-teacher ratios. Moreover, the Government was not able to cover the loss in revenue from school fees, and in practice parents continued to contribute to provide basic school materials and maintenance. In short, while it was recognized that free primary education was the most important single policy measure in terms of its impact on enrollment; complementary policies were also needed so as to enhance access in a meaningful way. While the conference’s focus was on review of policies at government level
to increase access, the current study focused on policies that can aim at mitigating social inequality with regard to education in Athi-river, whether these policies are engendered from government or community levels.

Hepburn (2001) carried out research to find out national and community level initiatives, that had the potential to increase primary education access for children who had been orphaned (or made vulnerable) in areas heavily affected by AIDS in the eastern and southern Africa region (ESAR). He analyzed various initiatives that could be used more effectively to target resources to increase primary education access for orphans and other vulnerable children in this region. He found out that despite the many challenges HIV/AIDS posed to the educational systems, access to primary education remained a basic need and right of every child, as defined in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Primary education also had the ability to play a role in fighting the spread of HIV. Hepburn’s study focused on vulnerable children and those predisposed to HIV/AIDS challenges. The current study expanded this further and include all other critical factors of social inequality, disease included, that are an obstacle to access to education for children in Athi-river.

2.3 Issues in Completion of Education

Nherera (2006) presenting findings on access to education in Zimbabwe made several observations with regard to education among school goers. For example, he observed that in spite of the impressive expansion of educational service provision after independence, issues of access, equity, and quality still remained problematic especially in remote areas, commercial settlement areas. He further pointed out that areas that had been left out during the period of rapid expansion of educational services continued to receive limited resources and were characterized by the highest percentage of children not in school, especially at higher levels such as secondary schools. Failure to attend school was due to inability to pay
school fees by parents and guardians. The SDF introduced to minimize negative effects of ESAP had not adequately met the needs of children from low socio-economic backgrounds. This in part had led to noticeable escalation of high dropout rates from school, particularly at secondary school level. The author further pointed out that research had proved that failure to meet school fees has been the main reason for withdrawal from school. Drought experienced during the 1990’s also contributed to the withdrawal of children from school. For younger children aged between 6 years and 8 years, long distance to schools had also been a deterrent. Furthermore, the girl-child was particularly disadvantaged in terms of access to secondary education. Currently, only 46.18% girls were in school, compared to 53.82% boys. The study found issues raised here namely; fees, drought and long distances as deterrents to both access and completion of school quite, applicable in the current research. The study tried to see if in Athi-river, the problem of completion has any similarity with regard to the factors discussed in the situation in Zimbabwe.

Maendeleo ya Wanawake together with The Academy for Educational Development and the Johns Hopkins University Center for Communication Programs (1005) stated that in most developing countries, girls did not receive the same educational opportunities as boys. Even when given the opportunity to be educated, the girls typically faced formidable barriers to the completion-of their studies. For example, while virtually all girls in Kenya were initially enrolled in primary school, approximately 65% of them dropped out before completing Standard 8. Many of the barriers that girls faced in striving to stay in school were either directly or indirectly related to reproductive health, sexual behavior, and maturation. Some of the causes of school dropout in Kenya included early marriage, pregnancy, lack of gender appropriate facilities in schools (such as latrines), low self-esteem, lack of money, harassment by male teachers and fellow students, and the low value placed on the education of girls by their parents and society in general. Although the study of the two organizations has focused
much on the girl-child and the challenges she faces in access and completion of education, this study investigated some of these factors alongside those endangered by social inequality in Athi-river to determine their impact on completion rates.

Kiugu (2000) releasing a report of the Kenya National Commission for UNESCO on EFA observed that the critical review of how well Kenya has done in achieving EFA goals, indicate that despite the above achievements, unfortunately, a wide disparity had emerged between the goals agreed upon at Jomtien and actual domestication of those goals in Kenya. The Report noted that major issues had emerged which had made the achievement of EFA goals difficult. Among these were increased poverty levels, the implementation of structural adjustment programs, and the servicing of both domestic and international debt. Despite the fact that more educational opportunities had been created in the last decade, many eligible school age children – aged 6-13 (about 11%) were still out of school. This was more pronounced in the ASAL and Coastal areas. Current statistical data shows that in the last two years national GER at primary school level did increase from 86.4% in 1996 to 88.8% in 1998. Of the many children who enrolled in primary school in Kenya, girls in particular did not stay long enough to complete the cycle. The completion rate in the last five years at this level had remained at 46% mark and out of those who joined form one, only about 84.5% completed secondary education in 1998. The current study found the statistics given by the author valuable in comparing trends of completion rates of primary school going children in Athi-river and tried to determine any other factors related to social inequality that militates against school completion.

Shaghai poverty conference (2004) observed that in many countries, ministries were trying to meet the concurrent challenges of increased access and demand for quality. The top priority was to extend continuation of FPE to the poorest, most marginalized populations, and to the
most remote areas. Domestic household surveys showed that school costs remained a problem - for the very poor. Planning and projections were improving. Gaps had been identified in legislation and regulations and were being managed. High dropout and poor completion rates needed to be addressed, and improving quality throughout remained a major challenge. Surveys had found a variety of reasons for high dropout rates including school costs, the need for labor, pregnancy or early marriage, disability or illness, or a lack of interest in attending school. Complementary or alternative basic education was needed to reach marginalized groups. The conference raised pertinent issues with regard to reasons children do not complete school. This study sought to determine whether, apart from social inequality, some of the reasons identified by the conference are at play in the completion problem in Athi-river.

Abagi and Odipo (1997) indicated that the operation of primary education system in Kenya faced the problem of inefficiency. Completion rates had remained very low (less than 50 per cent) for the last five years. Besides, national pupil-teacher ratio was also low, about 31:1. There was need to review 8-4-4 curriculum in a comprehensive and holistic manner. The curriculum had to be reduced and made relevant. Besides, viable and sustainable cost and financing mechanisms in education had to be instituted to stop drop-outs from the system, thus enhance completion rates. They observed that pupils dropped out at various stages of the education system, especially in Standards 6, 7 and 8. The situation was grave and worsening, a trend which contradicted the national goal of promoting literacy and fighting against ignorance. The authors outlined factors that were thought to be responsible for completion rate problems as; education policies and institutional processes; school-based factors; and household- and community based factors. As far as completion rates is concerned, the current study investigated some of the factors the researchers have raised especially those that tie with school and household to determine how they affect completion rates in Athi-river.
2.4 Issues of Retention in Education Processes

Crossling, Heagney, and Thomas (2009) argued that there was need to institute teaching and learning strategies to promote student ‘retention and success. These strategies were to consider the impact of mass higher education and increasing student diversity on student persistence and withdrawal. Further there was need to re-evaluate the curriculum to ensure student engagement in the learning process. This could be done through making the curriculum more responsive and relevant to students’ experiences while seeking to expand their skills and knowledge and making the assessments and evaluations more transparent so that the students could understand the learning process. One way to improve quality in regard to student retention was to identify influences and causes of student retention and attrition. Engaging students in their studies had been identified as important in retaining students and stemming attrition. The current study found the author’s suggestions aimed at increasing retention quite useful. They assisted in focusing-research towards identifying and suggesting solutions to the problem of retention ‘in schools in Athi-river.

Gachuhi (1999) argues that various teaching and learning approaches to encourage students to engage with their studies and their institution had been surveyed and found to work. They included; early engagement through pre- and post-entry induction activities, greater understanding of the diversity of students, including where they have come from, what they are interested in and their aspirations, this in turn could inform the organization of the programme and curricular contents, authentic and relevant curricula, building on students’ previous experiences, interests and future aspirations, and using inclusive language and relevant examples. Others were student-centered active learning designed to involve students in the learning process, integration of study skills to support the success of all students, and signing posting students to access other support services as necessary, formative feedback which is relevant and integrated into the learning experience in a timely and constructive
way. The current study used some of the factors raised as a guide to determine why there exists a problem of retention in schools in Athi-river.

Aikaman and Unterhalter (2005) wrote that although the Kenyan education system did not discriminate against girls and women, their participation was characterized by manifest disparities. There were serious regional disparities in regional enrolment particularly in the arid and semi-arid lands where pastoralism and nomadism dominate. There were also wide variations in drop-out rates between regions and in the last ten years completion rates in Kenya had never exceeded 50%. Low completion rates for girls meant that few of those who enrolled in school ever got to penetrate the job market. The challenges the girls faced include both in-school and out-of school; they spanned the economic, cultural, regional and policy realms. The current study investigated this problem of completion and retention in schools in Athi-river as a product of social inequality.

Thomas (2002) observes that globally, girls represent 60 percent of all out-of-school children. In some countries, girls’ initial enrollment rates were lower than those of boys, indicating barriers to access. In other countries, such as Kenya, initial enrollment rates were roughly equal, but as girls entered their adolescent years, they dropped out at faster rates than boys. Poverty was a primary reason girls, as well as boys, dropped out of school. However, girls also dropped out for other reasons directly or indirectly related to reproductive behaviors. Some of these other reasons included early marriage, sexual maturity (whereupon girls and/or their parents believe they no longer need to attend school because they are of marriageable age), pregnancy, low self-confidence (in that girls are unable to resist sexual pressures), and sexual harassment by male teachers and boys. Girls also dropped out of school because they felt uncomfortable if they were in their teenage years in primary school. Girls were often older than their male counterparts, because girls usually started school at a later age and could
repeat grades due to the difficult curriculum or having to perform household chores in lieu of schoolwork. The current study investigated the issue of not just girls’ retention in school, but also boys in Athi-river based on some of the factors identified by Thomas in his research.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology for the study. The chapter describes the research design, the target population, the sample and the sampling techniques, the research instruments, validity and reliability of the instruments data collection procedures and data analysis techniques.

3.1 Research Design

Orodho (2003) defines research design as the scheme, outline or plan that is used to generate answers to a research problem that is an arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance with the research purpose. This research adopted a descriptive research design. Descriptive survey is a method of collecting information by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals (Orodho, 2009). The purpose of the design is to study the relationships that exist, practices that prevail, beliefs and attitudes held, process that are going on, effect being felt or trends that are developing (Best and Khan, 2001). It utilized both the qualitative and quantitative approaches. The questionnaire was used to access qualitative data. In this way, verification, deeper explanation an appropriation of findings of the survey was sought for the sake of accuracy in interpretation of data (Kerlingler & Lee, 2000). The independent variables for this study were student access and retention while the dependent variable was social inequality factors.
3.2 Study locale

The study was carried out in Athi-river District located in Machakos County. It is a newly created district in Kenya. It was curved from larger Machakos District in August 2009. It borders Nairobi to the west, Machakos to the east and Kangundo to the north and Kajiado to the south. The area is located 12 kilo meters from Nairobi city and lies between Nairobi – Mombasa highway. Athi-river experiences semi-arid conditions. Most of the students in the schools depend on relief food donated by government and other non-government organizations. The district has 26 public primary schools and 50 private primary schools with a total population of 9465 pupils in primary schools. Singleton (1993) notes that the ideal setting for any study should be easily accessible to the researcher and should be that which permits instant rapport with the informants. Athi-river District is chosen because it is easily accessible to the researcher. The table below shows enrolment and staffing in educational institutions in the district.

Table 3.1: Enrolment and Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary public</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5560</td>
<td>5570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3994</td>
<td>3895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary public</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary private</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2338</td>
<td>2345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DEO’S Office Athi-river.
Figure 3.1 Map of Machakos County

Sound District Development Plan - Machakos District 1999-2001

NB: Some of the divisions such as Kangundo, Mwala, Yatta Masinga and Athi River have been elevated to districts.
3.3 Target Population

Borg & Gall (1989) have defined the target population as the universe of a study, that is, all the members of real or hypothetical set of people, events or objects to which an investigator wishes to generalize the result of the research study. The target population of this study included head teachers, parents, teachers and pupils of primary schools in Athi-river. They were chosen for the study because they are the stake holders and are knowledgeable-about access and retention in primary schools in Athi-river. All the 76 primary schools comprised the study population from which the sample was picked. Out of 76 schools, 26 are public while 50 are private schools with a total population of 18719 pupils and 958 teachers.

3.4 Sample and Sampling Techniques

A sample is a small portion of the target population. By observing the characteristics of a carefully selected and representative sample, one can make certain inferences about characteristics of a population from which it is drawn Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) suggest that 10% of the accessible population is adequate to serve as study sample.

Since there are two educational zones in the district, the schools were stratified into rural and urban zones where 3 schools were randomly sampled from each of the 2 zones. A total of 12 schools representing 15.8% of the total primary schools in the district were included in the study sample. This was well above the 10% for large samples and 20% for small samples in descriptive studies (Gay, 1976). The study also included 12 head teachers of the 12 randomly sampled schools; 3 male and 3 female teachers randomly sampled from each of the 12 schools. The 6 teachers were sampled to participate in the focus group discussion because 6 is the recommended minimum number of informants (Mwiria and Wamahi1995). The study also included 12 parents whose children were enrolled in the selected primary schools from each zone and also 12 parents who had no children in school, and 12 parents who had no
children in the school but are within reach from each zone. Simple random sampling was used to recruit 10 pupils in each of selected school. Purposive sampling was used to sample 2 education officers from each zone. A total of 256 respondents were included in the study.

Table 3.2: Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>H/Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Education Officers</th>
<th>Total No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Research Instruments

In social sciences research, the commonly used instruments questionnaires interview schedules, observational forms and standardized tests (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999). The focus group discussion were also used because it is best suited for obtaining data on group attitude and perceptions in order to bring to the fore the problem they encounter and suggest possible solutions (Mwiria and Wamahiu, 1995). This study used questionnaires, interview schedules, observation forms and focus group discussion. It also made use of secondary data such as district education records and student’s attendance registers from the school.

3.5.1 Questionnaires

The study used questionnaires with closed ended and open ended questions. The closed ended questions were included because they are easy to administer and analyze therefore they were economical in terms of time and money and allow collection of data from a large sample. The
open ended questions on the other hand are easy to formulate and helped to collect a more in-depth response from the respondents.

3.5.2 Interview Schedule

Interview was preferred as a device for data collection because it is a social encounter and respondents are more willing to respond in a socially acceptable or desirable way (Wiresswma, 1985). Interview is an effective method when the researcher’ understands the perceptions of the participants or learns the meaning they attach to certain phenomena or events (Borg and Gall 1989). Interview gave a higher response rate in a natural setting and researcher probed respondents to express their views freely and openly. The study also administered guided oral interviews especially to the primary school pupils due to technicalities of comprehension and response involved in questionnaires. Parents who it was established have a challenge in reading and writing also provided their data through oral interview.

3.5.3 Observation Guide

Observation was used mainly to determine issues of distance between, homes and institutions and inter-institutional distances. Including asking respondents to describe this distances the study determined this by observation, the researcher got the distance too.

3.5.4 Focus Group Discussion Guide

Focus group discussion was a guided discussion. This instrument was chosen because it is appropriate for soliciting information in the shortest time possible (Mikkelson, 1995).
3.5.5 Piloting

To test the effectiveness of the instruments developed for this study, a pilot exercise was undertaken on the sampled population. The study administered the questionnaires and interview schedules to pilot subjects in exactly the same way as they were administered in the main study. Respondents gave feedback to identify ambiguities and difficult questions. This assisted in discarding all unnecessary, difficult or ambiguous questions and assessed whether each question gave an adequate range of responses. Piloting also assisted in establishing that replies can be interpreted in terms of the information that was required re-wording or re-scaling any questions that are not answered as expected.

3.5.6 Validity

Validity refers to the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences which are based on the research results (Orodho, 2003) for the purpose of ensuring that the questionnaires measure what they are intended for. The study used Construct Validity in which it sought to find out if what is tested through the research instruments demonstrated an association between the test scores and the prediction of the theoretical and conceptual framework proposed in the study. The responses were analyzed to see if they concurred or disproved the proposed theoretical frameworks. Validity testing on the questionnaire was carried out to determine whether the questionnaire or survey measures what it intended to measure. The study tried to get a sample of all the respondents targeted for the questionnaire and not just those who are easy to reach. Validity tests were also carried out on the oral interview guide questions and aspects of observation elements to determine whether they have the ability to generate data relevant to the objectives of the study. The construct validity test for all the instruments selected legitimized the value of the tools, and checked whether the tools represented the intended content, appropriateness for the sample population and whether they developed measures for the phenomenon they are supposed to measure.
3.5.7 Reliability

Instrument reliability refers to the level of the internal consistency or the stability of the measuring device. Reliability focuses on whether the instruments used in research give the consistent results or data when used repeatedly on the same population (Wireshma, 1985).

To test the reliability of the instrument, the researcher used the test re-test technique. The researcher prepared instruments in form of questionnaires and administered them to the respective pilot groups. The instruments were administered again after one week to the same group. Responses emanating from the first and the second trials were correlated mathematically (Pearson product moment correlation) to establish the reliability of the instruments. The correlation was 0.8 which is high, thus, the instruments were accepted as reliable. According to Orodho (2009), a correlation of 0.7 or higher is good enough for judging instrument as reliable.

The formula for Karl Pearson’s correlation coefficient is:

\[ R = \frac{\sum xy}{\sqrt{(\sum X^2) (\sum y^2)}} \]

3.6 Data Collection Technique

The study sought approval from Kenyatta University Graduate School. A permit was got from the Ministry of Education Science and Technology before study was conducted. Consent was sought from individual respondents and the institutions that were included in the study. An advance letter was sent to the sample respondents explaining the purpose of the study. The respondents were guided through the instruments which were also translated where necessary. Relevant documents were then analyzed to give information on the compression and retention rate. Secondary data was assessed through analysis of relevant documents in the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology publications and other archival and documentary centers. Confidentiality and anonymity and informants’ consent was put in place as requirements conditions for the whole research process. In respect for the
informants and in order to protect them form abuse of data they gave for the research against their people, data was represented in such a way that it could not be linked to individuals who gave it except by the researcher who may need to seek clarification during analysis of data.

3.6.1 Library and Archive Studies

The study gathered relevant information from the following sources: Moi Library of Kenyatta University, Macmillan Library, the National Archives, United States International University (USIU) Library and a host of online links that had information related to the research topic. The study reviewed the documented and posted sources such as:

i. Books related to the research topic such as those with literature on access, retention and completion rates in education

ii. Thesis related to the research

iii. Newspapers and magazines

iv. Internet articles posted on various websites commenting: matters of participation in education

All these provided both the pre-field work preparation on the research topic as well as valuable comparative and authenticating analysis of the data the current study collected from the field.

3.7 Data Analysis

Kerlingler (1986) defines data analysis as categorizing, manipulating and summarizing of data in order to obtain answers to research questions. Data analysis in descriptive survey studies involves a variety of descriptive and inferential statistics. Data collected through the questionnaires was analyzed according emerging patterns or opinions derived through statistics using statistical package for social science (SPSS) and Ms Excel. Data was
organized in frequency distribution tables as well as measures of dispersion (range and variance). This study used frequencies and percentages because they easily communicate research findings to majority of leaders (Gay, 1992). Frequencies easily show the number of times a response occurred or the number of subjects in a given category. Percentages were used to compare the sub-groups that will differ in proportion and size. The data from interviews and focus group discussions was read carefully paying particular attention to comments, ideas and concerns from the participants. The field notes were edited corded and written based on content and then analyzed deductively Kane (1995) notes that one can use inductive approach to collect data that is through interviews and then analyzes them deductively when putting the results of the whole study together. Graphical presentation of data included histograms, pie charts and bar graphs.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents statistical analysis and results of the data collected from 256 respondents of Athi-River District, Machakos County. The findings are interpreted with regard to the stated research questions. Questionnaires, interviews and focused group discussions were used as the primary tools for data collection. The data were analyzed using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). The results of the findings are presented on the basis of the objectives.

4.2 Background Information

This section presents the respondents’ distribution by division, type of school.

Table 4.1: Respondents’ distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Urban Schools</th>
<th>Rural Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day schools</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, the sample was drawn from two divisions which were categorized into urban and rural schools. It can also be seen that the sample schools are day schools. The lack of boarding schools may be due to lack of sustainable cost and financing mechanisms that are needed to start, run and maintain boarding schools. In addition, a school based environment – a boarding school – will promote education more than a day school since the pupils will have more time to engage in educational activities rather than home activities such as taking care of siblings, fetching firewood and cooking.
4.3 Social Inequality among the Populations

One of the objectives of the study was to identify the types of social inequality. The respondents were asked their opinion on social inequality among the population of Athi-river District. The following presents the findings.

**Figure 4.1: Social Inequality**

According to the teachers, as presented in the figure above, the majority 40 (55%) considered the inequality high, 16 (22%) considered it low, 12 (17%) very low while 4 (6%) very high. These findings indicate that there is a high social inequality level among the population.

These findings are similar to findings from recent studies by UNICEF (1989) that found most regions in Kenya with low literacy and general education levels have rampant poverty and morbidity due to depressed standards of living.

When the parents were asked to indicate the challenges they encounter. The following table presents the findings.
Table 4.2: Challenges encountered by parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges encountered</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School fees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big family</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental cost</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate water</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cost of living</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, majority experienced high cost of living at 23 (48%), school fees 10 (21%) big family, 10 (21%) rental cost at 4 (8%) and inadequate water at 1 (2%). The findings shows high cost of living for the families as the major challenge. UNICEF (1995) found that the socio-economic characteristics of parents make it difficult for them to meet the basic household and school needs.

Figure 4.2: Categories of employment

The figure above shows that majority of the parents at 63% were unemployed while 37% were employed. The findings explain why the majority of the population considers the cost of living as high. With no source of income, they will also be unable to sustain the family needs.
These findings are supported by findings by Nkinyangi (1980) who showed that as both parental education attainment and economic status decline, children’s level of education participation and final levels of attainment tend to decline.

**Figure 4.3: Amount earned to sustains needs**

![Amount earned sustain needs](image)

When the parents were asked to indicate if the amount they earned sustained their needs, majority at 41 (85%) indicated no, while 7 (15%) indicated yes. This may be as a result of their unemployment status and thus lack of income to sustain family needs and may take education a luxury. Poverty has frequently been associated with primary school drop out because poor families cannot meet school expenses and because children must sometimes work to help support the family (Levy, 1971).

The following table presents the pupils’ perceptions.

**Table 4.3: Parents alive/dead (pupils’ perceptions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Parents</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alive</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table above, majority of the pupils and their father alive, 105 (88%), mother 112 (93%) however, 15 (12%) had their father dead and 8 (7%) had their mother dead. Lack of parents may make the family difficult to meet basic household and social needs. This may lead children help the family by engaging in child labour to earn extra income. Child labour is a predominant factor which hinders primary school enrolment, especially in poor families (UNICEF, 1989).

Table 4.4: Level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education of parents</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, the highest level of education among the mothers 69 (57%) and among the fathers 71 (59%) was secondary education. This was followed by the primary school education among the mothers 29 (24%), and university education 24 (20%) among the fathers. On their occupation, majority of the parents were farmers, in own businesses and as housewives. According to Juma (1994), parents’ education experience is transmitted to their offspring. Parents who are learned will encourage their children to seek success in education. In addition, most parents do not help their children with the homework because they are illiterate. From the research findings from the interview guide for educational officers, it was found that the parental level of education affected school enrolment and retention of students.
While most pupils have parents, some were orphans thus vulnerable. This affected their going to school on a regular basis, getting late and some even dropping out altogether.

### 4.4 Access to Education and Educational Institutions

Another research objective of the study was to document access to education by the primary school pupils in Athi-river District. The researcher sought to find out how easily pupils access education and educational institutions in Athi-river. The following figure presents the findings from the pupil respondents.

**Figure 4.4: Distance from home to school**

![Distance from home to school](image)

According to the findings, 45% and 44% of the pupils indicated the distance from home to school as 1 – 2km and less than 1km respectively. The pupils who indicated more than 3km were 3%. The findings indicate that most of the pupils live within a 2 kilometer radius of the school. This is generally a walking distance from the school to home. These findings are supported by Maleche (1972) who argues that long distances from school and heavy household duties result in physical and mental exhaustion which makes learning uninteresting and ineffectual. Some pupils may therefore end up dropping out of school hence decreasing retention in schools.
From the figure above, majority of the pupils at 110 (92%) walk to school, 6 (5%) take a Matatu, 2 (2%) used a bicycle while 1 (1%) used a family car. These findings are in agreement with the findings above that indicate that most of the pupils live within a 2 kilometer radius from the school and thus would walk to the school. Hertz (1991) argues that long distance poses a security risk during transport especially for girls thus may affect retention in school.

**Figure 4.6: Time taken to school**
From the figure above, 92 (77%) of the pupils, who are the majority, take 30 minutes or less. Those who take about 1 hour are 25 (21%) while 2 (2%) take more than an hour Maleche (1972) argues that heavy household duties, long distances from school result in physical and mental exhaustion which make learning uninteresting and ineffective and this can lead to pupils dropping out of school thus lack of completion.

Figure 4.7: Lateness to school

When asked to comment on how often they get late to school, the findings showed that 71 (59%) sometimes get late to school, 9 (8%) always get late to school. Those who never get late to school were 40 (33%). While the findings indicate most of the pupils live within a 2 kilometer radius from school, and take 30 minutes or less, majority get late to school. (Hertz, 1991) argues that long distance and difficult terrain as well as public transport may be a security risk thus may cause low access and detention.
### Table 4.5: Access to education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Education</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, according to 8 (79%) of the headteachers and 57 (67%) of the teachers, accessibility is good and 3 (11%) of headteachers and 8 (25%) of teachers considered accessibility to be very good. These findings are supported by findings from a UNICEF study carried out in six focus districts (Nairobi, Baringo, Mombasa, Garissa, Kwale and Kisumu) in 1998, that found that proximity and access to primary school is a predetermining factor in enrolment and retention. On the reasons for challenges to making accessibility a problem to the pupils, the table below presents the findings.
Table 4.6: Challenges to accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headteachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a challenge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance and transport problems</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ ignorance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents negligence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor teacher-student relationship</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate learning facilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, majority of the headteachers at 8 (67%) considered distance and transport problems as the major reasons followed by poverty. The teachers 45 63% rated poverty as the major reason followed by poor teacher-student relationship. These findings are supported by Tan (1985) who found that the high cost of living and low income may hinder the parents from supporting their children’s education. When parents and headteachers were asked if they are any school-going age children in the community who are not enrolled in school, the following figure presents the findings.
From the figure above, according to 26 (54%) of the parents and 8 (67%) of the headteachers there are school-going age children in the community who are not enrolled in school. However, 22 (46%) of the parents and 4 (33%) of the headteachers there were none. Thus the school authorities and the district education office should work together to ensure all school-going age children in the community go to school especially with the free primary education program. The highly dispersed primary schools as well as the difficult terrain that forces children to transverse through make access more difficult. These findings are similar to findings from studies in Ghana and Egypt that found that limited primary schools, long distance to primary schools and highly dispersed rural population deter girls’ enrolment but not boys (Hertz, 1991).
Figure 4.9: Enough schools in the community

From the figure above, majority of the parents 30 (63%) and the headteachers 9 (75%) considered the schools in the community not enough for all the school-going age children. According to the education officers of school going age within the community who are not enrolled in school. In addition, there are no enough schools in the district. The above findings agree with those of Thorat (2006) who found that in India, access to education was low in the rural areas compared to the urban areas. It was also lower for the female than for the male.

4.5 Rates of Retention in Primary Schools

One of the research objectives was to determine the rate of retention in schools of pupils in Athi-river District. The respondents were asked to indicate the retention rates among primary school pupils. The researcher took the class 8 of 2011 as a case example for studying the retention and completion rate. The headteachers were asked to provide the information on their class enrolment for the last three years – 2011, 2010, and 2009. The following table presents the findings.
Table 4.7: Class enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2009 – Std 6</th>
<th>2010 – Std 7</th>
<th>2011– Std 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, it is found that in 2009 there was an enrolment of 1067 which reduced to 1045 in 2010, thus 22 pupils dropped out, which reduced to 849 in 2011 thus a further 196 pupils dropped out. The retention rate for the class can be calculated as 849 (80%) with a dropout rate of 218 (20%) across the three years. The above findings are supported by the findings from all the educational officers who indicated that the retention levels of the pupils who manage to access education as low. They cited the reasons as drought that brought about poverty, thus, the pupils did not attend school regularly or at all as they embarked on ways of looking for money – through – sand harvesting. Others come from families where the parents
are not keen in their education. The girls may get married early. The above findings agree with those of Okwach and Odipo (1997) who indicated that completion rates were very low especially for pupils in standard 6, 7 and 8. The parents were asked to indicate if any of their children had dropped out of primary school. The following figure presents the findings.

Figure 4.10: Boy-child dropped out of school

![Bar chart showing number of parents indicating none, one, or two boy children dropped out of school.]

From the figure above, 45 (94%) parents indicated none, 2 (4%) indicated one child, while 1 (2%) indicated two children. They gave the major reason as poverty thus the children sought employment at an early age. Distance and transport problems to school were the other reason cited by the parents.

Figure 4.11: Girl-child dropped out of school

![Bar chart showing number of parents indicating none or one girl child dropped out of school.]

Among the girl pupils, majority of the parents at 47 (98%) indicated none had dropped out of school while 1 (2%) indicated one had dropped out of school. On the reasons, the parents
cited unwanted pregnancies and early marriages as the major reason. Research has shown that girls than boys are likely to drop out of school. While some parents will invest in the boys’ education rather than girls, girls may drop out due to unwanted pregnancies and early marriages (UNESCO, 1986). When the headteachers were asked to comment on the dropout situation in their school, half indicated the girl and boy drop out situation as moderate and the other half indicated not serious. The following table presents the pupils opinion.

**Table 4.8: Drop-out situation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brother/Sister</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brothers never went to school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sisters never went to school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brothers dropped school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sisters dropped school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the majority of the pupil respondents indicated that none of their brothers and sisters never went to school or dropped out of school, some did. For instance, 4 (3%) indicated one and two brothers never went to school, 8 (7%) indicated one of their sisters never went to school. 3 (2%) percent and 4 (3%) indicated that one of their brothers and sisters dropped out of school. On the reasons, the respondents indicated lack of money thus the pupils either looked for work or got married early, especially girls. Simmons (1994) suggests that wastage
rates are important dimensions of school inefficiency. Data from Latin America and Africa suggests that; more than 50% of pupils who begin primary school drop out before the end of the cycle.

The teachers were asked to indicate if there were dropouts in their schools. The following figure presents the findings.

**Figure 4.12: Dropout in schools**

![Dropout in Schools](image)

From the above 55 (77%) indicated Yes, while 17 (23%) indicated No. (Gakuru, 1977) observed that schools and school environment make a difference in Kenya as more and more parents are progressively surrender responsibilities for their children to support various education institutions. Levy (1971) argues that high birth rates are associated with large families and the need for school aged children especially in low income families to look after young siblings.
From the table above, the major reasons given were parents’ negligence and poverty. These were followed by early marriage and indiscipline; unwanted pregnancies, thinking too old for school, family mobility and early employment. The least considered reason was peer influence. (Levy, 1991) demonstrated that the only educational variable significantly related to drop-out rate was the average rate of repetition. Proportionally, the higher the repetition rate the higher the drop-out rate. When the teachers and headteachers were asked to indicate the retention levels of the pupils, the following presents the findings.
From the figure above, majority of the teachers at 48 (67%) indicated high, 24 (33%) of the teachers indicated low. The findings indicate high levels of dropout which are due to poverty, parents’ negligence and indiscipline. Grade retention has been shown to have a negative effects on school performance at least in some cases (Levy, 1971).

From the figure above, majority of the headteachers at 9 (75%) indicated high, 3 (22%) indicated low, while 0.3 (3%) indicated very low. Global statistics show that 77 million girls are out of school as compared to 55 million boys (World Bank, 1998). In addition, the low
enrolment and high drop-out of girls is the reason why there is real concern for the removal of obstacles hampering girls’ access and retention in education all over the world (UNESCO, 1996).

The following table presents the reasons given by the teachers.

Table 4.10: Problems to retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems to retention</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No school feeding program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor follow-up</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper influence</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of learning material</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiscipline</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family problems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the teachers at 20 (28%) and 14 (24%) indicated poverty and improper influence respectively as the main reasons. These were followed by poor follow-up at 7 (10%), distance at 7 (10%), indiscipline at 6 (8%) and family problems at 6 (8%). The least considered reasons were no school feeding program and lack of learning materials. The above findings agree with those of Kiugu (2000) found that about 11% of eligible school age children aged 6–13 years were still out of school especially in the ASAL and Coastal areas. He also found that about 84.5% of students who joined Form One completed secondary school education.
4.6 Rates of Completion of the Pupil’s Learning Process

A research objective of the study was to find out the rates of completion of education by primary school pupils in Athi-river. To answer this, the researcher sought to find out the rates of completion of the pupil’s learning process. The following table presents the findings from the headteachers and the teachers.

Table 4.11: Completion rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion rates</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, majority of the teachers at 54 (75%) and headteachers at 11 (92%) considered the completion rate high. About 14 (19%) of the teachers considered it low while 1 (8%) of the headteachers and 4 (6%) of the teachers considered it very high. According to Kamunge Report (1998), about 65% of primary school dropouts withdraw before they reach fifth grade. On the reasons, the following table presents the findings.
Table 4.5: Reasons for low completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for low completion</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer influence</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early marriage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-headed families</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the teachers at 6 (56%) considered poverty as the main reason, followed by peer influence at 15 (21%), housework at 8 (11%) and early marriage at 4 (6%). Those who considered child-headed families and lack of teachers were at 2 (3%) and 2 (3%) respectively. These findings are similar to findings from a study done by Thomas (2002) who found that girls drop out of school due to early marriages, practicing prostitution and early pregnancies. The researcher further sought to find out if there were any issues in retention and completion that were gender specific. The figures below present the findings.

**Figure 4.15: Gender specific reasons -1**
From the figure above, according to the teachers, 41 (56%) indicated no while 31 (44%) indicated yes. The above findings are similar to those of Aikman and Unterhalter (2005) who found that although the Kenyan education system did not discriminate against girls and women, there were wide variations in dropout rates since the girls faced more challenges. Thomas (2002) found that girls represent 60% of all the out-of-school children.

**Figure 4.16: Gender specific reasons – 2**
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From the figure above, majority of the headteachers at 8 (67%) considered it no while 4 (33%) considered it yes. The major reasons given for the boys were early employment – sand harvesting and poor peer influence. For the girls, it was early marriage, housework and taking care of younger children since some of the households are child-headed. In addition, studies on educational wastage show that rates of repetition and dropping out are related to educational, social, political and economic factors (Levy, 1971). Poverty has frequently been associated with primary school dropout because families cannot meet school expenses and because children must sometimes work to help support the family.
4.7 Impact of Social Inequality on the Learning Process

A research objective of the study was to find out the impact of social inequality on the learning process. According to the findings from the headteachers, due to poverty, Family background (orphans), poor infrastructure, poor pupil teacher ratio, most of the pupils will perform poorly. They Will Come to school late and moreover even drop out of School. In addition, there are school-age children in the community who have not enrolled in school. These children will thus embark in early employment to cater for their needs and those of their families. This was supported by findings from the educational officers who indicated that due to family mobility from place to place in search for employment; the pupils did not attend school on a regular basis. These resulted to the pupils’ poor academic performance and dropping out altogether. In addition, the pupils were asked to indicate what occupied them at home that kept them away from studying; the following table presents the findings.

**Table 4.13: Reasons for not studying**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupies home, keeps from studying</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic duties</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching movies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing with peers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise pollution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of proper lighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, the majority that is 51 (42%) did not have anything that occupied them preventing them from studying. Those who embarked on domestic duties were 31 (26%), watching moves 25 (21%), playing with peers 10 (8%), noise pollution 2 (2%) and lack of
proper lighting were 1 (1%) These findings are similar to those of a study in Wajir District that fund lack of proper lighting prevented the children to do homework or extra reading at home during their free time. In addition, the girls are faced with most constraints in the homestead as opposed to the boys. Girls are affected more than boys as they perform most of the household chores. (Ambia, 2003).

When parents were asked to cite the impact of social inequality on the learning process, they indicated that most pupils would drop out due to both school and home challenges. In school, the pupils were overpopulated with fewer resources and not enough teachers. At home, due to poverty, the pupils would engage in activities such as drug use, early employment especially due to peer influence. The findings are similar to those of Thomas (2002) who cited poverty as the primary reason for school dropout. In addition, parents ask their children to earn an income for the family in different activities such as selling water, being employed as maids, sand harvesting resulting in child labor. According to UNICEF (1989) child labor is a predominant factor which hinders primary school enrolment especially in poor families.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the summary, conclusion and recommendations based on the findings of this study.

5.2 State of Social Inequality
Majority of the teachers, 40 (55%) considered social inequality high, majority of the parents 23 (48%) experienced high cost of living, majority of the parents 33 (63%) were unemployed and what they earned does not sustain their needs. Majority of the parents were farmers, in own businesses and as housewives. In addition, though most of the pupils had both parents alive, some were orphans.

5.2.1 Access to Education and Educational Institutions
The study found that majority of the pupils stayed within 2km from the primary schools and they walked to school. It was also found that 71 (59%) sometimes got late to school, 10 (8%) always got late to school and 40 (33%) never got late to school. Majority of the teachers and head teachers considered accessibility as good.

5.2.2 Rates of Retention in Primary Schools
The found that in 2009 there was an enrolment of 1067 which reduced to 1045 in 2010, thus 22 pupils dropped out, which reduced to 849 (80%) thus a further 196 pupils dropped out. The retention rate for the class was 849 (80%) with a dropout rate of 218 (20%) across the three years. In addition according to the educational officers the retention levels of the pupils who manage to access education was low. According to (67%) of the teachers, the retention
rate was high while (33%) indicated low; while according to (75%) of the headteachers, the retention rate was high, (22%) low, while (3%) very low.

5.2.3 Rates of Completion of the Pupil’s Learning Process

Majority of the teachers at 54 (75%) and headteachers at 11 (92%) considered the completion rate high.

5.2.4 Impact of Social Inequality on the Learning Process

According to the respondents’ poverty, family background (orphans), poor infrastructure, poor pupil-teacher ratio was the main areas of social inequality. These resulted in the pupils’ poor academic performance, lateness to school and dropping out of school. The pupils embarked on early employment, early marriages and drug abuse.

5.3 Conclusion

From careful consideration of the data analysis and the consequent discussion, and summary of the findings, the following conclusions can be made:

1. The social inequality was high and most parents experienced high cost of living.
2. Majority of the parents were unemployed and the income they got was unable to sustain their needs.
3. While most pupils had both parents alive, some were orphans, consequently, vulnerable.
4. Majority of the pupils stayed within 2km from school, however, the majority sometimes got late to school.
5. Distance, transport problems and poverty were cited as the main reasons for the challenge in accessing educational institutions.
6. There were school-age children in the community who were not enrolled in the schools.
7. The schools were not enough for all the school-age going children.
8. The retention rate for the 2009 class 6 was 80% with a dropout rate of 20% across the three years.

9. The main reason cited was drought that brought about poverty, thus, the pupils will not attend school regularly or at all as they embarked on ways of looking for money.

10. While the completion rate was generally high, those who did not were because of poverty and improper influence.

11. Both school and home factors brought about social inequality and affected the learning process.

12. Introduction of boarding schools to facilitate the retention of pupils in schools.

5.4 Recommendations

From the discussion and conclusions derived from the data collected and analyzed, the researcher suggests the following recommendations:

1. The Ministry of Education should employ or deploy more teachers in the schools especially in the rural areas to improve on the content impartation and the teacher-student ratio.

2. The government, NGOs, social groups should introduce and sustain feeding programs to enhance the retention of pupils in the primary schools.

3. Guidance and counseling measures should be utilized to ensure that the pupils are empowered in counteracting negative and improper influence and embark on completion of their primary education.

4. The government should improve on the infrastructure to facilitate employment opportunities for the people of the area. It should further seek to improve the farming efforts of the community people through irrigation, greenhouse farming to reduce the effects of drought.
5. Interaction between pupils who study in the ASAL areas and pupils from other areas, for example, Nairobi, Central, Eastern, Western, among other areas, should be encouraged. Such interaction will motivate the students in importance of education.

6. The government and other stakeholders and well wishers to improve the infrastructure of schools. These include the roads, buildings, toilets and water provision.

5.5 Recommendations for Further Research

The researcher makes the following recommendations for further research:

1. This research was conducted in only one district. Future research can be done in other districts and in other counties.

2. Future research can also be done among students in secondary and tertiary institutions of learning such as colleges and university to find out if the challenges faced are similar.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR H/TEACHERS

Division

Type of school; Day ☐  Boarding ☐

1. What is the current teacher establishment in your school?

   (i) Male……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   (ii) Female………………………………………………………………………………………………

   Total……………………………………………………………………………………………………

What are their qualifications?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BED Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Does your school experience teacher shortages?

   Yes ☐  No ☐

   If yes, what are the reasons for this shortages?

   ........................................................................................................................................

   ........................................................................................................................................
3. What is the last 3 years pupil enrolment of class 8 in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Current enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std 6 – 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std 7 – 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std 8 – 2-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Are there children of school going age within the community who are not enrolled in the school?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, what are the reasons that keep boys out of school?

Girls out of school

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

Boys out of school

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. How are the retention levels of the pupils who manage to access education?

Very high ☐

High Low Very low ☐

6. What reasons would you attribute to any problem of retention levels in primary schools in your school?

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
7. How would you rate completion rates of pupils in primary schools in your school?

   Very high  □
   High  □
   Low  □
   Very low  □

8. What reasons would you attribute to any indications of low completion rates of primary school pupils in your school?

9. Are there any issues in access retention and completion that are gender specifically?

   Yes  □   No  □

   If yes, Explain…………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

10. Do you think there are enough schools for all the school going aged children into this community?

    Yes  □   No  □

11. Comment on the level of discipline in the school

    Very good  □
    Good  □
    Average  □
    Poor  □
12. Suggest programmes that the school should come up with in order to improve the general behaviour of pupils especially in attendance to schools.

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

13. What would you say has been the impact of social inequality on education processes in primary schools in your school?

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

Any other relevant information…………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

14. In your opinion what can be done to improve pupils’ enrolment, completion and retention rates of primary education in your school?

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

Thank you for your co-operation.
APPENDIX B

TEACHERS FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

Division

1. Type of school  Day    Boarding

2. What is the level of social inequality challenge in your school?
   - Very high
   - High
   - Low
   - Very low

3. How would you describe the state of access to education among primary schools pupils in your school?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

4. How are the retention levels of the pupils who manage to access education?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

5. What reasons would you attribute to any problems of retention levels in primary school pupils in your school?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
6. How would you rate completion rates of pupils in your school?

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

7. What reasons would you attribute to any indications of low completion rates of primary schools in your school?

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

8. Are there any issues in access retention and completion that are gender specific?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, what are the reasons for this?

Girls………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

Boys………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

9. What would you say has been the impact of social inequality on education processes in primary schools in your school?

………………………………………………………………………………………………

Thank you for your cooperation
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PUPILS

Division

1. How many children are there in your family?
   Boys ☐ Girls ☐

2. How many of your brothers and sisters started but later dropped out of primary school?
   Brothers ☐ Sisters ☐
   Please give reasons for this.
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. How often are you late getting to school? Tick
   Always ☐ Sometimes ☐ Never ☐

4. How far is your home from the school Tick (v) the most appropriate answers?
   Less than 1km ☐
   1 -2 Km ☐
   2-3 Km ☐
   More than 3 Km ☐

5. How do you travel to school each day?
   Walking ☐ Bicycle ☐ Matatu ☐
   Driven to school in family car ☐ I am a boarder ☐

6. How long does it take you to get to school?
   30 minutes or less ☐ about 1 hour ☐ More than 1 hour ☐
7. What are some of the domestic duties you perform at home?

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

8. What are the things that occupy you at home and keep you away from studying?

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

9. What is the highest level of education attained by your mother and father?

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

10. What is your parent’s main occupation?
    a) Mother............................................................................................................................

    b) Father ............................................................................................................................

11. What is the highest level of education attained by your mother and father?

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

12. Do your parents have a business?

    Yes ☐    No ☐

    If yes, state the source and approximate amount of income.

........................................................................................................................................................................

Thank you for your co-operation.
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS

Instruction:
Please answer all the questions with honesty.

All questions will be treated with confidence and will be used for the purpose of research only.

Put a tick where appropriate.

1. Division
   Gender (a) Male □
   (b) Female □

2. Challenges encountered by parents
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

3. Amount earned / salary / wages does it sustain your needs?
   Yes □ No □

4. Are there children of school age going in the community who are not enrolled in school?
   Yes □ No □

5. How many of your children dropped out of primary school?
   Boys.................................................................................................................................
   Girls...............................................................................................................................
   Total..............................................................................................................................
6. What were the reasons for dropping out for the school?
   Girls
   Boys

7. Do you think there are enough schools for all the school going age children into the community?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

8. What would you say has been the impact of social inequality on education processes in primary schools your schools?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

9. In your opinion what can be done to improve pupil’s enrolment completion and retention rates of primary education in this district?
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

Thank you for your cooperation.
APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR EDUCATIONAL OFFICERS

Division

1. How many schools are there in this division? .................................................................

2. Are there any boarding schools in the district? ............................................................

3. What is the enrolment of boys and girls in the primary schools in the district?
........................................................................................................................................

4. What is the teacher pupil – ration ..................................................................................

5. How does this ratio affect pupil’s enrolment and completion of primary schools?
........................................................................................................................................

6. Are there children of school going age within the community who are not enrolled in the school?

   Yes ☐ No ☐

7. Do you have enough schools in your district?

   Yes ☐ No ☐

8. What is the effect of parental level of education on school enrolment and retention in primary school in your district?

   ........................................................................................................................................

   ........................................................................................................................................

   ........................................................................................................................................

9. How are the retention levels of the pupils who manage to access education?

   Very high ☐

   High ☐

   Very Low ☐
10. What reasons would you attribute to problems of retention levels in primary schools in your district?

11. How would you rate completion rates of pupils in primary schools in your district?

12. Are there any issues in access, retention and completion that are gender specific?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

13. What would you say has been the impact of social inequality on education processes in primary schools in your district?

14. In your view what can be done to improve pupil’s enrolment, and completion rates in primary education.

Thank you.
APPENDIX F

OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

The study will observe the following factors

1. Distance from one school to another
2. Distance between schools and most homes
3. Number of students enrolled in school
4. Number of students no longer attending school
5. Number of schools
6. Living conditions of families
7. Any other inequality factors in Athi-river.