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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of family income and the constraints it presents to primary school participation in Buuri district. The objectives of the study included; to determine the major sources of income among families: to establish the impact of family income on school participation, to determine the availability of teaching/learning material, to suggest ways of subsidizing parents effort in meeting educational costs. This research adopted a descriptive research design. The study sample size was 46 teachers, 46 parents, 23 head teachers and 642 students. Data collected was be analyzed using descriptive statistics. The study established that the provision of the basics not catered for by the Free Primary Education program but was catered for by parents was poor and that pupils’ school attendance was low. Among the major reasons that resulted in pupils’ absences which was reported to be on regular basis includes lack of school fees, helping parents/guardian at home, caring for their sick parents, diseases, pupils’ involvement in income generating activities and poor nutrition. The study also found out that parents paid extra tuition, bought uniforms, and bought books in support of their children’s education. However, the majority of the parents reported that they were facing constraints in financing pupils education. The study also concluded that the school parents’ major economic activity was small-scale farming. The study also concluded that there is a gradual decline in pupil’s enrollment, access and participation in education for the past five years despite the inception of free primary education by the government. The study also concluded that parents paid extra tuition, bought uniforms, and bought books in support of their children’s education. The study recommends that to avert the problem of declining pupil’s participation in primary education the government and other stakeholders should invent new policies and strategies to that ensure pupils from low-income families have access to education. The study further recommends that the school management and other policy makers in the education sector should come up with policies and strategies to ensure pupils from low-income families have access to education.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter highlights the background of the problem that was investigated, statement of the problem, and the purpose for the intended study. The researcher was guided by some research questions, which were derived from the objectives of the study. The researcher was bound to encounter certain limitations, which were likely to limit the effectiveness of the study, and these have been cited in this chapter. Theoretical and conceptual framework reflects the relationship between the various variables to be investigated and finally there is definition of various terms as used in the study.

1.1 Background of the study

Since the end of World War II in 1945, a world rise in peoples aspirations in education has culminated in demand for education as a human right and an investment for manpower development. The declaration of education as a basic human right in the world conference on education for all {EFA} Jomtien, Thailand 1990 and the world education forum Dakar, Senegal 2000 have seen people and governments state interest in improving access to education.

The UN Convention on the rights of the child states that, every child has a right to education that develops their personality, talents, mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential. Any nation’s children are its future workers, citizens and leaders. Education remains the major tool by which people become economically and socially empowered. However, this situation is grossly affected by the cost of Education. In
Kenya, through policy Evolution, cost of Education has been meet though public and private contribution. The report of the Presidential working party on Education and manpower training for the next decade and beyond popularly known as the (Kamunge report 1988) had many changes. This was at a time when the government scheme for the provision of instructional material through the national textbook was inefficient and therefore adversely affected the quality of teaching and learning. As a result, the government came up with a policy on cost sharing between government, parents and the community.

The cost sharing policy entails the cost incurred by the parents in provision of primary education. The parents are expected to meet the cost of school uniform, development of infrastructure, health, transport and boarding facilities (private cost) whereas the government finances teachers’ salaries, target support to vulnerable groups, laboratory equipments, building of new schools especially in arid areas and provision of teaching/ learning materials in all public school(public cost) (Sessional paper no. 1 of 2005 on a policy frameworks to educational training and research.)

When parents are not able to meet such cost, it results to high dropout rate that diminishes the pool of qualified people from diverse backgrounds who will enter the professional and political ranks that make important public policy decisions. Every school’s mission should be to educate students to become knowledgeable, socially skilled, healthy, caring, and responsible citizens.
The provision of widely spread education and training opportunities has been a long-standing objective of the Government of Kenya (GoK). Since Independence, the Government has sought to address the challenges facing the education sector through a range of policy initiatives, often with mixed results. Nevertheless, a major focus has been the attainment of Universal Primary Education (UPE) and the key concerns of achieving greater access, participation, equity, quality and relevance. However, at the outset of the 21st century, the country is faced with new challenges of educational policy, which marry both the right to universal access to education, and the need to enhance rapidly the development of skilled human resources (Otieno and Colclough, 2009).

National economic and social policies shape household life and the experiences of children. In Kenya, despite government efforts, poverty has continued to rise, especially in the last eighteen years. Most families live below the poverty line prompting children to drop out of school to look for alternative ways of looking for money. This may lead to child labor hence hinder school attendance (Moyi 2010). Socio-economic factors affect the nutritional levels, subsequently school attendance, and internal efficiency. The association between attendance rate and nutrition status is a function of socioeconomic status. The predictive effect of nutrition status on educational achievement is more evident for girls with poor socio-economic status (Mukudi, 2003).

Family income determines the poverty levels which subsequently affect the internal efficiency in primary schools. After Free Primary Education (FPE) policy was implemented in Kenya, enrollment in primary education rapidly increased. Indeed,
because of the FPE policy, Marginalized children could go to school. They do not have to pay for their tuition, and can receive free textbooks, pencils, and exercise books from the government. According to Orotho (2002) there were other adjustment programmes through the education sector adjustment credit (EDSAC) which emphasize the increased implementation of user charges and budget rationalization. This has resulted in escalating costs of primary education. Ayot 1980 notes that Kenya is probably the only country in East Africa with the highest proportion of cost borne by parent and students. This was deemed necessary because resources were scarce and also education does not only have social returns but also private returns. At primary level private rates of return exceed the social rates of return and thus the beneficiaries of secondary education ought to meet part of their education. Apart from the direct cost of education, there are the opportunity costs which are normally high to poor families. These high opportunity cost coupled with lower expected benefits of education lead to low investment in a child’s education among the poor families. Children from poor families perform poorly and this may not have anything to do with lack of cognitive abilities but it may reflect their disadvantaged economic circumstances. Tadoro (1997) refers to this high cost of education (both direct and indirect) charged at primary level as`` the financial process of eliminating the poor from participating in the vital processes of investing in human capital as education and poverty among others causes.
1.2 Statement of the problem

Education is both private and social investment, which contributes to the economic development and rises the incomes of the poor as much as investments in physical capital does. Education is seen as an investment because it entails cost in the present and because it increases productive capacity and income in the future. Families need to consider the private cost and benefit when choosing how to allocate scarce family resources. From a public policy perspective, government also needs to consider the social cost and benefits of education vis a vis the many alternatives uses of the same public funds. The introduction of FPE has helped to keep pupils from all backgrounds in school. However, other facts have affected the positive contributions of the FPE. The FPE provides support for only tuition but other items like uniform, food and other requirements are left for the parents to provide. Hence the financial status of the families affects the provision of this necessity and participate of children in most parts of the country. Children may end up dropping out of school to participate in income generating activities.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to investigate family income and the way it impacts negatively in school participation and provision of teaching/learning material.

1.4 Objectives of the study

i) To determine the major sources of income among families
ii) To establish the impact of family income on school participation

iii) To determine the availability of teaching/learning material.

iv) To suggest ways of subsidizing parents effort in meeting educational costs.

1.5 Research questions

The following research question guided the researcher to achieve the stated objectives

i) What are the major source of income of parents in Buuru district?

ii) How does the family income affect school participation?

iii) To what extent are the teaching/learning resources adequate

1.6 Significance of the study

The study provided information on the families’ income and how it influences participation of children in primary schools in Buuri district. The study brought out factors affecting internal efficiency such as enrollment, dropout, repetition and retention. This information may be helpful to the stakeholders in the ministry of education in planning policies that ensure maximum benefits from FPE and abolish all user charges. Information may also be helpful to NGOs which may wish to assist in financing primary education in terms of provision of necessities that are not included in the FPE. The findings might also give insight to the government to address the issue of poverty.

1.7 Assumptions of the study

In the proposed study the following assumptions were be made:

1. All respondents would be cooperative and provide reliable responses.
2. The researcher did not know the different levels of family income in the selected district.

3. The teachers and pupils to be involved in the study would be those in session.

4. The resources and constraints in Buuri are similar of those of any other rural setting.

1.8 Limitations of the study

The study was confined to parent’s representatives, head teachers; teachers and pupils in the sampled school. Private schools were not included as pupils who attend private schools mostly come from families in middle level income or above.

1.9 Delimitations of the study

The study was conducted in Buuri district and would not extend to other districts in the county. It also focused on primary school and did not extend to secondary schools due to financial, time and logical constraints.

1.10 Theoretical framework

The study derives a theoretical framework from the theory of classical liberal theory of equal opportunity and social dawisnism as propounded by liberal progresivists like Horace Mann-1976-1889(Education has a great equalizer).

Classical liberal theory asserts that each person is born with a given amount of capacity which to a large extent, is inherited and cannot be substantially changed. Thus educational systems should be designed so as to remove barriers of any nature (may they be economic, gender, religious or geographic) that prevent children from lower
backgrounds from active participation in school. The theory demands for further going through education at primary to which access would be determined on the basis of merit and not on economic or social backgrounds. It asserts that social mobility will be promoted by equal opportunity of education.

Inequality of participation means that the benefits of education are disproportionately enjoyed by the upper income families whose children are far more likely to complete primary and enroll for higher education whereas dropouts, absentism and repetition are occasioned by the financial inability of poor families which in turn affect internal efficiency of a system.

This theory is relevant to the proposed study because cost sharing/hidden cost discriminates poor families who cannot afford to keep their children in school hence resulting into high dropout rates, repetition and low completion rates.

1.11 Conceptual framework

The conceptual framework for this study will be based on the factors that impact on participation of pupils in primary schools in Buuri district. Home characteristic that encompasses family income, level of education attained by parents and parent’s attitude towards schooling will also be demonstrated. Parental educations grossly affect primary school participation. Parental occupations also influence school participation. According to Plowden (1967), the higher the social economic group, the more parents attend open day concerts and PTA meetings and the more they discuss with the teaching staff about
the progress of their children at school. As parents earn higher incomes and gain education, their aspirations for their children rise.
Figure 1.1 Conceptual framework of factors affecting school participation
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### 1.12 Definition of terms

**Access**  
Ability of all people to have equal opportunity in education regardless of their social, regional or political background.

**Activities of families**  
Families as well as other social affiliations such as religion

**Drop out**  
Refers to the pupils who leave schooling before completion of a particular level of education.

**Enrollment:**  
The total number of children in the education system at a given time

**House hold**  
This are families or homesteads of given areas

**Inputs**  
Resources or facilities which include qualified teachers, buildings, paying of school fees, tuition inclusive, science equipment and the pupils attendance and also their health status.

**Internal efficiency**  
This is the relationship between inputs and outputs of educational system or within individual.

**Output**  
This is the thereafter of the income. Like the number of pupils

**Participation**  
The retention and completion of education.
Retention

Refers to the ability of education system to sustain the pupils enrolled within the system.

Socio-economic

The income generating activities of the

Students flow rate

This refers to enrolment, repetition, dropout and graduation rates

Who participated successfully after their parents input, those that dropped out of school, pregnancies as a result of missing to attend classes.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The literature review sought to identify the impact of family income on school participation, cost of education in Kenya and other parts of the world, influence of poverty on school participation, parental income and its effects on school participation, and Kenya’s socio-economic profile.

2.2 World Overview on family income and school participation

In all societies, the family plays a crucial role in shaping the educational experiences and achievement of children and transmission of status from one generation to the next. Throughout the world, children of high-status parents are more likely to be enrolled in school than children from poor families (Buchmann 2002).

Household characteristics are important determinants of schooling decisions and outcomes. The household production function approach developed by Becker (1965) is often used by researchers in economics of education to show that household characteristics such as income and levels of parental education determine whether a child enrols in school, stays in school, learns and makes progress to higher levels of education (AL Samarrai & Peasgood, 1998). It is also used in economics of education to model other household schooling decisions, such as the type of school that a child attends (Kingdon, 2007; Beitfield, 2004). In Africa, studies that use the household production function approach
usually differentiate between urban and rural households. Rural households are often portrayed as disadvantaged in terms of having lower income and lower levels of education and therefore being associated with disadvantaged schooling decisions and outcomes when compared with urban areas (Ilion & Moock, 1991; Handa, Simler & Harrower, 2004; Johnnes, 2005; McMahon, 2005; Mugisha, 2006; Walque, 2005).

An important policy development which underlines the need for a better understanding of the interactions between household characteristics and rural schooling decisions is the implementation of free primary education (FPE) policy in many countries in the sub-Saharan Africa. FPE signals governments’ preferences to keep all or most of educational ‘production’ in the public domain for equity reasons (Kingdon, 2007) including the realization that direct and indirect costs of schooling may inhibit equitable human capital formation and lead to a more unequal society. These two phenomena – Rural household characteristics; and the FPE policy – a supply side – intervention that removes direct fees that would otherwise discourage schooling by poorer households. It provides us with an opportunity in the form of a ‘natural experiment’ with which to assess the relationship between household characteristics and school participation in Kenya. Accordingly, this study examines how household characteristics affect schooling decisions in Kenya in the context of the implementation of FPE.

A cross country national studies on school participation show that demand for schooling is an important factor in overall schooling outcomes (Colclough, 2003; McMahon, 2005). A study in rural Peru found that mothers’ education has a bearing on their children’s
school attendance, particularly in low-income households. This finding is replicated in Africa 2004; Onsomu, Kosimbei & Ngware, 2006; Walque, 2005). The study also reveals that school attendance of low income and female children is mostly affected by changes in school fees.

In South Africa, Sibanda (2004) found that individual and household-level attributes are important determinants of dropping out of primary. Sibanda’s study indicates that race, household size, female household headship and the head’s level of education are strong predictors of school withdrawal. The selection process for staying in primary school seemed to favor student from upper income groups Sibanda (2004). In Rwanda, following the genocide during which many children were orphaned, a study controlling for the schooling of biological parents and the child’s relationship to the head of an adoptive household found that education of the most educated adult male and female in the new household had a positive and significant effect on the schooling of the adopted child Walque (2005). The magnitude of the effect was similar to the effect in a biological mother-child relationship. For the most educated adult male in the adopting household, the effect was smaller than in a biological father-child relationship, but remained positive and significant. Walque (2005) concluded that the nurture component of the intergenerational transmission of human capital is important with respect to both parents.

Using multivariate regression techniques, Al-Samarrai and Peasgood (1998) show how household and individual characteristics affect whether or not a child goes to primary school, completes primary and attends secondary school in 15 villages of Tanzania. Their
study shows a sizable intra-household difference between the way in which household characteristics affect outcomes of mother’s and father’s influences over resource decisions. The study shows that, married mother’s education can increase the probability of girls enrolling in primary school by 9.7% for primary education and further 17.6% for secondary.

In the mid-1990s, Malawi replaced a system of user payments with free primary education. Although government spending on primary education rose sharply, quality declined as school enrollment surged by 60 percent (1 million new students), leading to overcrowding and a shortage of teachers. A delay in donor funding contributed to the country's failure to prepare adequately for increased enrollment. Teacher performance also appears to have deteriorated, because parents, relieved of the financial burden, felt less compelled to monitor the teachers. On the other hand, parents were still expected to contribute labor and materials to school construction and to buy school supplies and clothes; this, together with the opportunity cost of forgone child labor, left total costs high for some parents. The result was a rise in dropout rates. By 1999, the primary completion rate was only 50 percent. Gender biases persisted as well.

Uganda moved towards free universal primary education in 1997, when it waived tuition for up to four children per household. Families remained responsible for school supplies and contributions to construction, as in Malawi, and had to purchase uniforms and pay final examination fees as well. Uganda did better than Malawi, however, in preparing for the influx of new students. The government doubled the share of recurrent government
spending targeted to primary education and used external aid to train new teachers, build classrooms, and purchase teaching materials. Even so, educational quality has fallen, with high pupil-teacher and pupil-classroom ratios and inadequate materials, and net enrollment has declined, from 85 percent in 1997 to 77 percent in 2000. Gender biases are still reported, as in Malawi.

The experiences of these two countries demonstrate that simply abolishing fees and opening classroom doors cannot achieve universal public education. Obstacles arise on both the demand and the supply sides. Education can still be costly for the poor, thus discouraging enrollment, especially when maintaining quality is a problem. Maintaining quality, in turn, is not just a matter of increasing spending; good planning, implementation, and monitoring are also necessary. Achieving the goal of universal school attendance in both countries will require measures to relieve poor parents of all education-related costs, perhaps through a system of income transfers.

### 2.3 Cost of education

Education should not obscure its economic dimension since resources once devoted to education cannot be used for other purposes. Thus, the beneficiaries of education should meet part of the cost in education and especially at primary sub-sector where the private returns are more than the social returns. Apart from the direct costs of education there are opportunity costs which as Todro (1997) argues, are compounded by the extra levies charged in primary education. Tadro calls this “financial process” of eliminating the poor from participating in the vital processes on investing in education. Such direct costs
include tuition fee, purchase of textbooks, electing and maintaining physical facilities. Indirect costs include exam fee, uniform, activity fee and other school supplies.

Although the ratio of enrollment in developing countries increased steadily during the 1970’s the number of students who were not enrolled in school increased. This was conducted in different parts of Africa, for instance Tan (1985) in Tanzania. Mingat, Tan, Lee (1984) in Malawi and Chernichovsky (1981) in Botswana, had one common observation, that schooling was perceived as a burden on the family both because of direct costs and the loss of the child’s contribution to household production and income. Many parents also failed to perceive and realize the benefits of education. Studies conducted in Indonesia indicated that enrollments vary by income and geographical location. These disparities are attributed to social-economic background which explains variations in the demand and ability to pay the cost of schooling. Several studies carried out in various parts of the world, for example: Egypt by Cochrane et al (1985), Nepal by Johnson and Lockheed (1985) and Malaysia by De Fray (1984) all concur on a common finding that parents naturally weigh the parental cost and benefits of children’s education against claims on the available resources and that it is more difficult for poor families to provide educational inputs for their children. This disparity in the ability of parents to pay has contributed to the disparity in school resources World Bank (2001:25).

World Bank (1994) survey in Peru (Lima) observed that there were disparities in school resources among very large, medium and small urban and rural urban schools. It was further observed that poor children attend school with little resources (2001:26). Studies
conducted in China concluded that because of poor funding more than 30% of eligible rural students could not enroll in primary school which in turn shut door for higher education (Lin 1992:42). Studies on access and participation in primary education, states, that the poor are disadvantaged concerning investment in the human capital. Otiende (1992) revealed that governments in Africa region cannot be expected to increase the resources they devote to education substantially. The report also cautioned that further increase of government expenditure towards education were other pressing demands of public funds. This increase expenditure on education were further aggravated by the attempts African states were making to implement the Addis Ababa plan and thus many African states are experiencing national deficits. This economic situation has been characterized by limited resources and several competing claims on the resources. This leaves greater cost sharing at primary level as the key to satisfying the high demand for primary education Wb (1989). In Zimbabwe, for example, the provision of Education is a co-operative effort involving local authorities, private agencies such as churches and related organizations (Olembo 1992).

Kenya is faced with new challenges as the 21st century approaches, that of meeting the greater demand for quality education and training, both as a human right and as an essential investment inorder to strive to attain the status of a newly industrialized nation(NIC). Looking at the trend of the educational system in Kenya since independence, it is clear that this sector has undergone changes resorting to various review commissions appointed by the government to look into various issues effecting the education system.
and advice the government accordingly. Issues of concern included access, relevance, quality and efficiency of the education system.

The commission concluded that the present structure of subsiding education is both inefficient and inequitable. This is what has been experienced in Kenya primary sub-sector with the introduction of cost sharing as from 1980’s. According to the policy, parents are supposed to meet the cost of erecting buildings, maintaining facilities like classrooms, laboratories in addition to providing text books, tuition fees and other development levies. In his research findings, Nafukho(1991) argued that there has been continued increase in recurrent expenditure on education. This he deducted from budgetary allocation to education for 1985/1986 which accounted for 35.9% 1986/1987(36%) and 1987/1988 (37.7%). His conclusion was that if the trend continued it would seriously reduce the resources available to meet the growth targets set out in the development plan.

Master plan (1997-2010) on school infrastructure emphasized the putting of affordable but functional school building with the use of cheap local materials and labor. According to Orotho (2002) there were other adjustment programmes through the education sector adjustment credit (EDSAC) which emphasize the increased implementation of user charges and budget rationalization. This has resulted in escalating costs of primary education. Ayot (1980) notes that Kenya is probably the only country in East Africa with the highest proportion of cost borne by parent and students. This was deemed necessary because resources were scarce and also education does not only have social returns but
also private returns. At primary level private rates of return exceed the social rates of return and thus the beneficiaries of secondary education ought to meet part of their education. Apart from the direct cost of education, there are the opportunity costs which are normally high to poor families. These high opportunity cost coupled with lower expected benefits of education lead to low investment in a child’s education among the poor families. Children from poor families performs poorly and this may not have anything to do with lack of cognitive abilities but it may reflect their disadvantaged economic circumstances. Tadoro (1997) refers to this high cost of education (both direct and indirect) charged at primary level as the financial process of eliminating the poor from participating in the vital processes of investing in human capital as education and poverty among others causes.

2.4 Influence of poverty on school participation

Studies conducted by UNESCO (1990) found out that 90% of the illiterates in the world are concentrated in developing countries especially in South East Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa. A number of studies conducted in some African countries by Tan (1985,1984) concluded that schooling was perceived as a burden on the family because of both the direct cost and the loss of the child’s contribution to household production and income. Tadoro (1997) findings complemented earlier studies on effect of poverty in schooling when he concluded that there were was low participation of the poor in investing in human capital due to the associated costs.
About 90% of the poor people in the developing countries are said to be located on Brazil, Central America, China, Asia and sub Saharan Africa. In Latin America and the Caribbean, the poorest 10-20% of the population are found in the rural areas which are remote with low agricultural productivity while in the urban areas the poor constitute the single mothers with little or no education and young people for whom there are no jobs. Findings on studies carried out in Argentina indicated that children from poor families enter primary an advanced age and thus suffer from high dropout rates which consequently lead to low quality of their education and restricts their ability to be gainfully employed World Bank(1986). Similar studies conducted in Peru concluded that majority of the children do not complete primary school and enrolment in primary school is a privilege confined largely to middle and upper income groups.

According to Nag (1997) many poor families cannot afford to buy school uniform, meet transport expenses for their children, pay tuition fee in addition to other direct costs of education and so must keep their children at home. This was because poor families need the additional income. It has been suggested that the economic efficiency of households in peasant societies increases with greater total work input from children. The poor families value the earnings forgone and unpaid work in household and this is manifested in less demand for education among the poor who have on average more school age going children than higher income families. As Briggs (1980) points out when more sacrifices are demanded a poor family contemplates bearing their child’s cost of education or might abandon the whole exercise.
In Kenya the ASAL districts had the highest incidence of poverty (69-84%) in 1984. The poor in these areas are physically isolated, have poor access to basic goods, education and other services. The urban poor countries constitute about 23% of the total poor in Kenya. One major characteristic of the poor in Kenya is that they are landless, lack education and literacy. Clark (1979) in her doctoral dissertation on school stipulates that there is an increase in work time and reduction in school attendance for children where there are one or more siblings aged 15-18 in the household. She attributes this to lower income associated with large families.

In a paper presented by Prof. Karega Mutahi (2005), PS in the Ministry of education in Kenya, the PS pointed out that the major challenge facing the government is that, over 50% of the Kenyans are absolutely poor and as such are unable to participate actively in educating their children at primary level which is a fee-paying sector. The proportion of Kenyans living below poverty line is on increase within the urban population accounting for the highest proportion of this increment. The proportion of poor families is projected to stand 65.9% by 2015 if the current trend continues. According to the education sector Review and Development (2003) the primary sub sector recorded a national dropout rate of 4.6% for boys and 5.1% for girls in 1999. The lowest completion rates for the years between 1990-2000, was recorded in 1990-1993 cohort when it was 68.9%. The repetition rates for the same cohort were calculated at 1.7% and 1.5% for boys and girls.
2.5 Parental income and its effect on school participation

Parental occupation influence school participation of their children and according to Plowen (1967), the higher the social economic group the more often they discussed with the teaching staff about progress of their children at school. Hyde (1995) conducted studies in Ghana and Cote d’voire and found that parental education especially that of mothers was strongly related to the educational attainment (completed tears). As parents earn higher incomes and gain education, their aspirations for their children rise. Shultz (1988) stipulates that as income rise the gap between boys and girls educational attainment tend to close, for the richer the household the greater the attainment of the children and parents who earn high income send their children to school. Psacharopoulos (1985) asserts that drop out and repetition appears to be most common among students from low social-economic background and is more prevalent in rural areas than urban areas and among female students than male students are. Todaro (1997:395) portrays this outcome as he cites John Sommons, an educational economist on the poverty view towards education, asserts that:

On schooling, the poor quickly learn, in most countries is an escape from poverty for a only a few. The poor are the first to drop out because they need to work, the first to be pushed out because they fall asleep in class as one result of malnourishment. The hope brought to the village parents by the construction of a school soon fades….And they could never afford to send their son for secondary schooling``
Studies conducted by the World Bank (2001) found that it is more difficult for poor families to provide educational inputs for their children and disparity in the ability of parents to meet the direct costs of education has contributed to the disparity in the school resources. In a similar study by the World Bank (1994) in Peru the poor children were found to attend schools with little resources. Parental income also influences the survival rates. Alouch (2002) findings in primary schools on causes of absenteeism found that lack of school fees led to absenteeism which resulted in poor performance in national examinations. Eshiwani (1985) concur with findings of earlier studies that the disadvantaged children from low-income families dropout of school much earlier.

Extensive research done on repetition and wastage by UNESCO (1977, 1982) concluded that the problem of dropout and repetition is a serious one in the developing countries. Psacharopoulos(1985) attributed the problem of dropout and repetition to the low social-economic background and he further stressed that this problem is more prevalent in rural areas and among female students. Most of the girls who drop out were found to be aged between 17-19 years and are victims of early pregnancies. Worse still it was found that over ½ of the fathers are school boys of similar age. On effects of absenteeism Willgoose (1974) says that it creates serious problems to the learners both academically and socially and that a student who is always absent from school lags behind in his/her school work. Turner(1974) stresses that absenteeism culminates in dropout.

Tyerman (1968) came up with types of absenteeism and one of the types was parental withdrawal. This is where the parents keep away the child from school for their
(parents) own purposes. Most of these purposes are related to the opportunity costs of educating children. Chronic absenteeism and repetition lead to students being ill-equipped for living and for further studies. There is a positive correlation between parent’s socio-economic status and their children participation in school. In developing countries, it was twice as high compared to those of professional parents. Dropout was concluded to be the advanced stage of absenteeism families of low economic status have inadequate facilities for studying outside school from such families return from the farm after dark and have inadequate light to do their homework. This affects their performance, discourages them and may eventually dropout. Psacharopoulos (1985) strongly argues that non-school factors like family background can influence educational achievement to such a great extent that they may overshadow the effect of school inputs.

2.6 Parental attitude towards school participation

Enrolment in the education system is primarily a parental decision. could partly be influenced by factors like school quality, school availability, direct costs and the opportunity cost of sending children to school. Apart from influencing enrolment, parental attitude also influences dropouts where in determining or influencing the probability of dropout is strengthened by community norms such as; the preferred age of marriage. This is reflected by the pressure put by parents on their girls to marry early which in turn offers a powerful distraction to the girl child. As Psacharopoulos (1985:206) puts it.
Non-school factors like family or motivation can influence educational achievement to such a great extent that they may swamp the effect of school inputs.”

Such an input to the education system are the entering students while the characteristics of the entering students are largely influenced by their parents attitude towards education. This will to some extent determine not only enrolment but also survival and completion rates of their children through the primary education system. Jencks (1972) supports Pacharopoulos (1985) regarding the entering students by stating that the output will gravely be determined by the inputs. Muola (1990) pointed out that children whose parents encourage them to do well in school, have interest in their schooling, are actively involved in their school work and they perform better in national examinations. Miola’s argument comply with Coleman (1996) that the influence of the home is an important contributor to variation in academic achievement.

Studies carried out by Alexander and Simmons (1975) in nine developing countries, Kenya included, concluded that pupils achievement in school was strongly determined by home background and individual personality. Parents who portrayed a positive attitude towards their children are seen to have enthusiastic, responsible, optimistic children who feel accepted and thus perform well in national examinations. Such parents will provide learning resources, motivate and follow up the performance of their children and build confidence in their children which in turn cultivate self esteem, high degree of independence and encourage them to develop interest in schooling.
2.7 Kenyan’s socio-economic profile on households

Kenya is committed to ensuring quality provision of quality Education for All by 2015 and Universal Primary Education by 2005. Policy initiatives towards achieving this goal have included abolition of user charges in primary education in 2003. During this year, primary gross enrolment reached 7.2 million pupils (48.6% female) having risen from 5.4 million pupils in 1989 (48% female).

National economic and social policies shape household life and the experiences of children. In Kenya, despite government efforts, poverty has continued to rise, especially in the last 18 years. The government of Kenya estimates that the population living in poverty has risen from about 48.8% in 1990 to about 55.4% in 2001 (Republic of Kenya 2004). The 2004 Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) estimates that between 1997 and 2001, a further 2.5 million people were living below the poverty line. The PRSP presents dismal statistics, “Illiteracy rates increased as enrolment rates in primary school declined during the 1990s. Life expectancy declined from 57 to 47 years between 1986 and 2000, while the situation in infant and child mortality and HIV/AIDS worsened” Republic of Kenya, (2004).

The majority of the poor in Kenya live in rural areas or in urban slum settlements with limited access to productive resources and social services. Since independence, successive governments had laid great emphasis on education as a way to combat poverty resulting in a rapid expansion of education in Kenya. Enrollment rates have fluctuated in the last 20 years. In the 1980s, the gross primary school enrollment rate had reached
about 115%; however, the rate fell to about 90% in 1999, the decline was partly due to the formal cost-sharing system introduced in 1988. In 2003, enrollments once again surged with the introduction of free primary education policy. The government of Kenya has consistently allocated a significant proportion of its resources to education (Moyi 2011).

While the free primary education (FPE) program has increased access to primary education especially among poorer households, ancillary costs of primary education (such as school uniforms, transport, examinations and lunch) continue to hinder the educational attainment of many children. In addition, the provision of quality education remains a challenge. This was highlighted by a recent study by Uwezo (2010) which found disappointing levels of learning among primary school children. The continued and consistent dominance of private schools in the KCPE has further raised concerns about the rising disparity in quality between public and private schools. As students from richer households increasingly enroll in private primary schools, designing policies that address the achievement gaps in public primary schools will overwhelmingly benefit students from poorer households that are unable to access private schools (Glennerster 2011).

2.8 Influence of Socio-economic factors on Schooling

According to Epstein (2001), it is important for home and school to share responsibility to ensure performance and general participation of children. This means interaction between parents and teachers, and interaction requires knowledge about each other. Many teachers have an inadequate understanding of the students’ background, it is not possible
for them to develop practices that inform and involve all parents in their children’s development. When teachers do not understand the children’s background, they may form stereotypes of the families; “pushy upper middle-class parents, helpful middle-class parents and incapable lower-class parents”. In a school in which students have different socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds, many teachers will be able to reach some of the parents; the parents with the same social and cultural capital as the school. Lareau (2000) investigated the parents’ ideas about school and school-home relations. Working class families trusted teachers as being responsible for education and, for this reason, they did not seek information that they needed to help their children. On the other hand, upper middle-class parents assumed that they had to share responsibility for the children’s education and took an active part in their schooling. The study also indicated that mothers were more involved in children’s school achievements than fathers. Upper-middle-class mothers were most involved in children’s learning, while working class fathers were least involved. Azaola’s (2007, p.5) study from Mexico also shows that parental involvement in their children’s formal education is “basically a duty of mothers”. The main reason for the mothers’ responsibility was the expectations of the gender roles in the community.

Harris and Goodall (2008) conclude that parents are the most important influence on students’ learning, and the greatest impact on students’ achievement was parents’ involvement in homework.

Boadu (2000) observes that boys from wealthier households in Ghana had enrolment rates 34 percentage points higher than boys from poor households. The gap in favour of girls from rich background compared with girls from low-income background was 55.4
percentage points. Wealth gaps in enrolment greatly exceed gender gaps in enrolment. The allocation of scarce household resources affects girls more than boys. Early domestic responsibilities, especially among young girls, conflict with the pursuit of education. Retrogressive cultural practices such as female genital mutilation (FGM) and early marriages prevent the advancement of girls in education. The willingness of parents to educate girls is reduced by socio-economic and cultural effects such as their expected change of allegiance after marriage to the husband’s family. Poor health, which is a consequence of either malnutrition or of common diseases, was found to be a constraint on schooling. It is an impediment to enrolment because parents fear sending their children to school when the probability of contracting contagious diseases is high. Lack of proper water and sanitation facilities prompted pupils to go for safe drinking water from Neighborhood Rivers and streams.

Letting (2011) explored the effect of socio-economic factors on the performance of children in primary schools. Factors considered are parental involvement, teacher's involvement, number of siblings within a family, parental level of education, parental taking of alcohol, gender of the pupil, parental type of marriage and class repetition. All this factors influence academic performance at primary school level. Parents and children, in low status families who are interested in the improvement of academic achievement need to learn to deal with obstacles in the family and school environment that stand in the way of academic success of children. It is recommended that there is need for the government to strengthen family, parents, teachers and schools resources in general to improve academic performance of the pupils.
2.9 Summary

The chapter has analyzed the factors that influence school participation such as family income worldwide, its impact on school participation, cost of education in Kenya and other parts of the world, influence of poverty on school participation and Kenya`s social-economic profile. This study want to fill this gap by investigating the family income verses the private cost of education and the way it affects participation.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter is organized under the following subsections, the research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, data collection procedures and data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

The 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). It can be used when collecting information about people’s attitudes, opinions, habits or any of the variety of social issues (Orodho and Kombo, 2002). It utilized both the quantitative and qualitative approaches. The questionnaires were used to access qualitative data. In this way, verification, deeper explanation an appropriation of findings of the survey was be sought for the sake of accuracy in interpretation of data (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000).

3.3 Variables

The independent variables of the study included the family income background of the family. This included the type of employment, economic activities such as type of farming and business. The social factors included the drinking status of the parents and
religious values. The independent variable included the indicators of internal efficiency that is enrollment, dropout, attendance and retention.

### 3.4 Study locale

The study was conducted in Buuri district. Buuri District is one of the ten districts in Meru County. The district lays to the east of Mt. Kenya whose peak cuts through the southwest border of the district. To the west it borders Laikipia District, to the south it borders Nyeri and Kirinyaga districts and Isiolo districts to the north. The district straddles the equator, lying within latitude $0^\circ 3'45''$ north about $0^\circ 2'30''$ south. It lies within longitudes 370 and 380 east. The district covers a total area of 2,982 Km$^2$ of which Mt. Kenya and Imenti forests cover 1,030 Km$^2$ leaving only 1,952 Km$^2$ for human settlement. Pockets of poverty in the district are found in slums areas, especially in Buuri Division and among squatters in Timau division. Families with small uneconomic parcels of land especially in ASAL areas are also poor. The number of those living in absolute poverty (rural & urban) is 41 per cent. Its contribution to national poverty is 1.32%. Inhabitants mainly from Buuri Division practice subsistence farming which is characterized by crop failure as a result of frequent droughts whereas those in Timau division are squatters driven from forests after the ban on ‘shamba system’. The families are casuals in rich farms owned by foreigners. They earn less than a dollar per day.
3.5 Target population

The study mainly targeted the teachers, head teachers, parent’s representatives and pupils of the primary schools in Buuri district. The district has 69 primary schools with approximately 21400 children. The District has 531 teachers serving in primary schools. Buuri is picked owing to its high dropout rates and low enrolment in schools.

3.6 Sampling techniques and sample size

Simple random sampling was used to select the schools that were included in the study. Simple random sampling was also used to include the students into the study. All the head teachers were included in the study to provide information on the enrollment, dropout and retention in the schools. According to Kothari (1978) a sample size of 10-30% is appropriate for any given study. Hence, the sample size for the schools was 23(10%) and teachers were 46(10%). The number of students who was included in the study was determined depending on the population of students in each school. According to Kothari (1978), a sample size between 10 – 30 % is appropriate in that it will give the researcher an easy time to conduct the interviews and to give the questionnaires to the targeted groups. Mobilizing the teachers and the learners with a high population was a tedious exercise hence the need to use a small percentage of the targeted group as Kothari suggests
Table 3.1 Sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study group</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Teachers</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Research instruments

Questionnaires and interview schedule was the main research instrument. Questionnaires were used to seek information from the teachers and the students whereas the interview schedule was used to get information from the head teachers. An observation schedule was used to assess the state of the facilities as well the levels of enrollment.

3.8 Piloting

Piloting was done on a small representative sample that was not included in the study. The sample was drawn from five schools that were not part of the sample. The
piloting was to ensure that the research instruments do not have potential misunderstanding.

3.9 Validity

Orodho (2009) define validity as the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences which are based on the research results. In other words validity is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represents the phenomena under study. Validity of the research instrument was done through expert judgment by the supervisors and colleagues to find out if everything works well and detect any potential misunderstanding or biasing effects of different questions. It would also help test the feasibility of the study techniques and to perfect the questionnaires concept and wording. Convergent and discriminatory validity was estimated in order to test if the questionnaire will measure what it is intended to measure.

3.10 Reliability

Orodho (2009) define reliability as a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. The stability of questions will be assessed in terms of test-retest reliability. The questionnaires were administered twice to the same group of respondents. The second administering was done after a two weeks lapse time to check whether the same results can be obtained. Spearman rank correlation was used to compute the correlation coefficient which will be used to determine the extent to which the contents of the questionnaire are consistent in
producing the same response every time the instrument is administered. A correlation coefficient \((r)\) of 0.75 will be considered as having high reliability.

### 3.11 Data Collection techniques

The study sought approval from the Kenyatta University graduate school. A permit was sought from the ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology before the study was conducted. Consent was sought from individual respondents and the institutions that was included in the study. Then an advance letter was sent to the sample respondents explaining the purpose of the study. The respondents were guided through the questionnaire which was also translated where necessary. Relevant documents were then analyzed to give information on the levels of enrollment in various courses. Confidentiality, anonymity and informants’ consent was put in place as requirement conditions for the whole research process. In respect for the informants and in order to protect them from abuse of data they give for the research against their people, data was presented in such a way that it cannot be linked to individuals who gave it except by the researcher who may need to seek clarification during analysis of data.

### 3.12 Data analysis and presentation

Data collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics methods, especially the measures of central tendency (mean, mode and median). Data collected through the questionnaires was analyzed according to emerging patterns or opinions derived through statistics using Statistical programme for social science (SPSS) and Ms excel. Data was organized in frequency distribution tables as well as measures of dispersion i.e. range and variance.
Qualitative data was analyzed through content analysis (It is used when one has sets of existing written or visual documentation, which require analysis (Carol Grbich 2007). Graphical presentation of data will include histograms, pie charts and bar graphs.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND PRESENTATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents analysis and findings of the study as set out in the research methodology. The results were presented on the impact of family income on school participation in primary schools in Buuri District. The study targeted 46 teachers, 46 parents, 23 head teachers and 642 students out of which 39 teachers, 39 parents, 23 head teachers and 500 students responded and returned their questionnaires contributing to the response rates of; teachers and parents 84.7%, 100% for head teachers and 77.8% for the pupils respectively. This response rate was excellent and representative and conforms to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) stipulates that a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a rate of 60% is good and a response rate of 70% and over is excellent. This commendable response rate was due to extra efforts were made via personal calls and visits to remind the respondent to fill-in and return the questionnaires.

The chapter covers the demographic information, socio-economic activities of families, sources of family income and impact of family income on school participation.

4.2 Demographic Information

The study initially sought to inquire information on various aspects of respondents’ background, i.e. gender, age, teaching experience, level of education, among other aspects. This information aimed at testing the appropriateness of the respondent in
answering the questions regarding impact of family income on school participation in primary school.

4.2.1 Teachers’, head teachers and parents’ gender

The study sought to establish the teachers’ head teachers and parents’ representation. The findings are presented in the table below.

Table 4.1 Gender distribution for the teachers’, head teachers and parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings, the study established that the majority of teachers were males as shown by 53.8%, while females were 46.2%. The study sought to establish the parents’ gender. From the findings, the study established that the majority of parents were males as shown by 64.1%, while females were 35.9%. The study sought to establish the head teachers’ gender. From the findings, the study established that the majority of head teachers were males as shown by 100%. The findings thus indicated that majority of the teachers and head teachers in Primary schools in Buuri District are male, and therefore implying that there is gender disparity in primary schools in Buuri District and that most
of the responses on impact of family income on school participation in primary school came from males. The findings also mean that most of the responses were obtained from the female parents.

**4.2.2 Pupils’ Gender**

The study sought to establish the pupils’ gender. This would help in establishing gender representation in the schools. The findings are presented in the figure below:

**Figure: 4.1 Pupils’ Gender**

From the findings, the study established that the majority of the sampled pupils were males as shown by 56%, while females were 44%.
4.2.3 Teachers, Head Teachers and parents Age

The teachers, head teachers and the parents were asked to state their age bracket. The findings are presented in the table below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>Teachers Frequency</th>
<th>Teachers Percentage</th>
<th>Head teachers Frequency</th>
<th>Head teachers Percentage</th>
<th>Parents Frequency</th>
<th>Parents Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the findings, majority of the teachers (53.8%) were between 41-50 years, 20.5% were aged between 31-40 years while a small proportion of teachers as indicated by 12.8% were either between 20-30 years or 51-60 years old.

The parents were also asked to state their age bracket. On the age of the parents, the study found that the majority of the parents (53.8%) were between 41-50 years, 20.5% were aged between 31-40 years while a small proportion of respondents as indicated by 12.8% were between 20-30 years old. The head teachers were also asked to state their age bracket. The study found that the majority of the head teachers (66.7%) were between 51-60 years while 33.3% of the head teachers were aged 41-50. From these findings, it can be noted that both the parents and teachers’ ages were between 41-50 years. The teacher’s and the head teacher’s ages are indicative of their long working experience.

4.2.4 Pupils Distribution by Classes

The pupils were requested to indicate the class they were in.
From the results of the study, most of the pupils (45%) were in class 8, 30% were class 7 while 25% were in class 6. The findings illustrate that the pupils who participated in the study were in upper classes, thus they were old enough to understand the concept of family income. It is also at this level of education that the pupils understand the family’s income and the impact it has on their education.

4.2.5 Teachers’ and head teacher’s teaching experience

The teachers were asked to state the duration that they had been working as teachers. The response were tabulated and presented as shown below;
Figure 4.3: Teachers and head teachers level of experience in terms of years of service

From the findings, majority of the teachers (79.6%) had been teaching for more than 10 years while 12.8% had been teaching for 6-10 years. This shows that majority of the teachers had enough experience in teaching to give credible information with regard to the impact of family income on school participation.

The head teachers were asked to state the duration that they had served in the capacity of school heads. The response tabulated above show that majority of the head teachers (66.7%) had served in the capacity of school heads for more than 10 years while 17.3% had been head teachers for 6-10 years. This shows that majority of the head teachers were old in this capacity as they had served for more than 10 years and were well endowed with ideas to manage the school effectively. In addition, in terms of the impact of income on school participation, they had rich information as they had interacted with parents for
a much longer duration.

**4.2.6 Parents’/ guardian highest level of education**

The study also sought to establish the highest level of education of the parents.

**Figure: 4.4 Parents’ highest level of education**

According to the findings, 43.5% of parents had primary level of education, 35.8% had secondary education while 20.7% had tertiary level of education. This information shows that the parents were knowledgeable and could give valid and reliable information based on their level of understanding of various issues.

**4.2.7 Number of children in school**

The parents were required to indicate their number of the children in school. The findings are as presented in the figure below;
According to the findings, 46.2% of the parents indicated that they had 3-5 children in school, 38.5% had 1-2 children while 15.3% had 6-10 children in school. These findings imply that having a higher number of children in school would constrain fees paying capability of the parent.

4.2.8 Person who pays school fees

The study inquired the children to state the person who pays their school fees. The finding are presented by the figure below;
From the findings, 66% of the pupils posited that their school fees was paid by their parents, 24% said it was paid by guardians while 10% indicated that it was catered for by other people. The findings illustrates that the burden of paying school fees is carried by the parents.

4.2 Economic factors influencing pupil’s access and participation in education

4.2.1 Economic background of most of the pupils

The study also sought to establish the economic background of most of the children from the teachers.
From the findings, 87.2% of the teachers reported that most of the children came from low income family, while 12.8% of the children come from middle income family. Epstein (2001), stated that the economic hardship are caused by low socioeconomic status of the parents and can lead to disruption in parenting, increase amount of family conflicts and increase the likelihood of depression in single parent households. Socio-economic status, indicate the quality of home life for pupils.

The head teachers were also requested to describe the family background of the pupils. From the results of the study, the majority of the head teachers (100%) reported that most of the pupils come from low income families. This finding are collaborated by the studies of Todoro (1997) findings on the effect of poverty in schooling when he concluded that there were was low participation of the poor in investing in human capital due to the associated costs.
4.2.2 Type of family housing

The study asked the pupils to state the setting of their family housing. The findings are presented in the figure below;

Figure 4.8 Type of family housing

According to the findings most of pupils (42%) lived in mud walled houses, 23% lived in timber houses, 20% lived in grass thatched house with mud wall while only 15% lived in permanent house. This depicts that majority of the pupils comes from low income household whose poor economic background deprives them conducive environment for their studies including lack of good housing. Becker and Tomes (1976), stated that an increase in an individual's income relatively increase the quality of their children. Families with high socioeconomic status with appropriate housing facility; often succeed in preparing children for schooling because they have access to a wider range of
resources to promote, explore and support the children mental and physical development as well as providing educational security which can groom their life.

4.2.3 Major economic activities of the parents

The teachers were also requested to indicate the major economic activities of the parents of their pupils. According to Apple & Zenki (1996), children from low income families become victim to anger diseases, physical, mental disabilities and homelessness due to environmental factors than children from rich families. Family background is the key to pupil's life and outside school. From the results of the study, all the teachers (100%) reported that parents’ major economic activity was small scale farming.

4.2.4 Description of the provision of the basics

The study also inquired on the teachers’ description of the provision of the basics not included in the Free Primary Education. The findings are presented in the figure below;

Figure 4.9: Provision of the basics like uniforms
Ausubel (1973) stated that young children are capable of understanding abstract ideas if they are provided with sufficient materials and concrete experiences with the phenomenon that they are to understand. Provisions of teaching and learning resources remain the responsibility of parents. Desforges and Abouchaar (2003) on the impact of Parental involvement in education of children found that a poor relationship between parental involvement, parental support and family education results in poor pupil achievement and adjustment in schools. From the results of the study, the majority of teachers as shown by 59% felt that the provision of the basics not included in the Free Primary Education was poor, 33% as fair while 8% said it was good. There is an indication that there is poor participation of the parents in terms of provision of basic facilities to enhance pupil participation in primary education in Buuri District.

4.2.5 School attendance of pupils

The study aimed at establishing the school attendance of pupils. The findings from the teachers’ responses are presented in the figure below;
According to the findings, the majority of teachers (53.8%) described the attendance of children in school as fair, 38.5% as good while 7.7% described the attendance as poor. Hornby (2000) and Driessen (2004) asserted that parents can make a significant contribution to the development of their children’s literacy by providing a stimulating environment as well as encouraging the participation of their children, both during the early years as well as the foundation phase and senior phase years of schooling. The low participation of pupils in Primary schools in Buuri district is low despite the implementation of FPE by the government which implies that the low income families could not afford the additional costs not catered by the FPE.

4.2.6 School enrolment for the last five years

The study also inquired on the school enrolment for the last five years. The results are displayed in figure 4.11.
From the results of the study, there were 1695 pupils who enrolled in 2008, 1682 pupils in 2009, 1630 pupils in 2010, 1648 pupils in 2011 while 1629 pupils were enrolled in 2012. This illustrates that there is a gradual decline in the trend of the pupils enrollment for the past five years despite the inception of free primary education by the government. The findings imply that there has been decline in the enrolment of the pupils in schools despite the inception of FPE. According to Nag (1997) many poor families cannot afford to buy school uniform, meet transport expenses for their children, pay tuition fee in addition to other direct costs of education and so must keep their children at home. This is because poor families need the additional income.
4.3 Reasons for pupils’ absence

The study inquired from the teacher about the reasons for pupils’ absence in school and the findings are as presented in the figure below.

Figure 4.12 Teachers’ views on pupils’ absence

On the reasons the children failed to attend school, 46.2% of the teachers gave disease as the cause for pupils’ absenteeism, 33.3% cited involvement in money generating activities as the cause while 12.8% cited poor nutrition as the cause of absenteeism. Studies by (Allen & Daly, 2002; Desforges & Abouchaar, 2003) show that children whose parents are involved show greater social, emotional development and health support. These include more resilience to stress, greater life satisfaction, greater self-direction and self-control, greater social adjustment, greater mental health, more supportive relationships, greater social competence, more positive peer relations, more
tolerance, more successful marriages, and less delinquent behaviors because there is free interaction between learners and parents.

The study also inquired on the reasons for the pupils being absent from school. The findings are presented in the figure below:

Figure 4.1 Pupils ‘Reasons for absenteeism

From the results of the study, most of the pupils posited that they were absent from school due to lack of school fees, 24% were absent as they were helping mother/guardian at home, 22% were caring for their sick parent while 18% were looking after their younger siblings. The findings are collaborated by those of Hyde (1995) that as parents earn higher incomes and gain education, their aspirations for their children rise. Alouch (2002) findings in primary schools on causes of absenteeism found that lack of school fees led to absenteeism which resulted in poor performance in national examinations.
4.3.1 Abseentism to attend to the families’ economic activities

The study also inquired on whether pupils miss school to attend to the families’ economic activities. The findings are presented in the figure below;

**Figure 4.2 Whether pupils missed school to attend to the families’ economic activities**

From the results of the study, the majority of the pupils as shown by 68% posited that they missed school to attend to the families’ economic activities. On the other hand, 32% of the pupils posited that they never missed school to attend to the families’ economic activities. Powell (1998) found that the school costs have negative effects to the probability that the mother works full time. Connely and Kimmel (2000) indicated that the probability of pupils missing school increases with low employment rates of parents than those employed. High available wages encourage mothers to work outside their homes, while high cost school fee suppresses maternal employment. The findings from the current study imply that failure of pupils’ participation in primary school education is
attributed to low parental income where the children miss school to attend the families’ economic activities.

4.3.2 Pupil’s absenteeism to attend to the families’ economic activities

The study asked the pupils to indicate the rate at which they miss school to attend to the families’ economic activities. The findings are presented in the figure below;

Figure 4.3 Pupil’s absenteeism to attend to the families’ economic activities

From the findings, 44% of the pupils indicated that they missed often, 32% said it happened more often while 24% indicated that they rarely missed school to attend to the families’ economic activities. Deutscher and Ibe (2002) observe that for children to be able to participate effectively in the education systems, it is indeed the role and sole responsibility of parents to monitor their learning processes. However he noted that some children may be disrupted form participation due to poor family income. The findings of the current study, concur with those of Deutscher and Ibe by indicating that the rate at
which pupils in primary schools in Buuri district miss school to attend the families’ economic activities is quite high, implying that

4.4 Parents/guardian support to pupils studies

The research further sought to establish the different ways that the parents/guardians supported pupils’ education. The parents are presented in the table below;

Table 4.3 Parents/guardian support to pupils studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buy uniform</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help me in my work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy books and other items</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay extra tuition</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the findings, 29% of the parents paid extra tuition, 26% bought uniforms, 24% bought books and other items while 21% bought uniforms. Abouchaar (2003) on the Impact of Parental Involvement in education of children found that there is a relationship between parental involvement, parental support and family education on pupil achievement and adjustment in schools. The findings of the review further revealed the following: That parental involvement takes many forms including good parenting in the home, provision of a secure and stable environment, intellectual stimulation, parent-child discussion, good models of constructive social and educational values and high
aspirations relating to personal fulfillment and good citizenship. The study also found that parental participation is strongly influenced by family social class, parental level of education, material deprivation, parental psycho-social health and single parent status and, to a lesser degree, by family ethnicity. Hornby (2000) and Driessen (2004) asserted that parents can make a significant contribution to the development of their children’s literacy by providing a stimulating environment around language, reading and writing as well as supporting at home the school’s literacy agenda, both during the early years as well as the foundation phase and senior phase years of schooling.

The findings of the current as depicted by low percentages indicated there is poor parental provision in buying uniform, help children in home work, buying books and other items as well as paying extra tuition in primary schools in Buuri District. This poor participation is attributed by low family income in the area.
4.4.1 Activities funded by the parent towards child education

The study also sought to establish the parents’ role in supporting the education of the pupils. The findings are presented in the figure below;

**Figure 4.4 Activities funded by the parent towards child education**

From the findings, 29% of the parents reported that they purchased books, 26% bought school uniform, 24% paid for the extra tuition while 21% catered for activity fee. The finding are in line with the Psacharopoulos (1985) who asserts that drop out and repetition appears to be most common among students from low social-economic background and is more prevalent in rural areas than urban areas and among female students than male students.
4.4.2 Parents’ Constraint in financing the pupil’s education

The parents were also requested to indicate whether they faced constraints in financing pupils’ education. The findings are presented in the figure below;

**Figure 4.5: Parents’ constraint in financing the pupils’ education**

From the results of the study, the majority of the parents (74.4%) reported that they were facing constraints in financing pupil’s education while 25.6% indicated that they never faced constraints in financing pupils education. As Briggs (1980) points out when more sacrifices are demanded a poor family contemplates bearing their child’s cost of education or might abandon the whole exercise. Parents also face difficulties in finding high quality health care and a safe environment for their children due to low income and others due to poverty hence making it becomes a struggle to afford the price for quality care and safe environment (Neas, Seals and Mezey, 2003). This also contributes in
lowering the level of participation for pupils in primary school. Sloper and Beresford (2006) pointed out that about 55 per cent of families with CLWD live in

4.4.3 Teachers’ response on Pupils’ dropping out of school to engage in income generating activities

The study also sought to establish the teachers’ opinion on whether the school drop outs engage in income generating activities. The findings are presented below;

**Figure 4.6 Teachers’ response on Pupils’ dropping out of school to engage in income generating activities**

From the findings, 66.7% of the teachers reported that the school drop outs never engaged in income generating activities while 33.3% argued that the school drop outs did not engaged in income generating activities. According to Plowen (1967), the higher the social economic group the more often they discussed with the teaching staff about progress of their children at school. In the current study it is noted that children dropping
out of school to engage in income generating activities is rampant due to weak family social economic setting

4.4.4 Parental assistance in pupils’ homework

The study in this section asked the pupils to state whether their parents help them with homework. The findings are presented below;

Table 4.4: Whether parent help pupils in homework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On whether the parents/guardians help the pupils in doing the homework 77% of the pupils attested that their parents/guardians never helped them in doing their homework. Ysseldyke and Algozzine (1995) stated that with appropriate assistance, children achieve academic success just like their neighbors and peers. Garwood (1983) noted that poor parents’ participation in guidance and home work is detrimental to academic achievement. From the findings, only 23% of the pupils indicated that their parents/guardians help them in doing their homework, implying poor parental participation in pupils’ academic participation in primary school.
4.4.5 Pupils’ involvement in activities

The study asked the pupils to indicate whether they spend time at home helping parents in their economic activities. The findings are presented in the figure below;
Paratore and McCormack (2005) studies tell us that children who achieve high levels of reading have the benefit of parental support and involvement (Taylor & Pearson, 2002; Jordan, Snow and Porche, 2000 as well as the old ones like Durkin, 1966; Clark, 1976). This view is further supported by Henderson (1988) who also found that learners learn more effectively and successfully when parents are involved in their education. The reading at home pre-supposes that parents have a great role to play in this regard. A clear role definition and its understanding on the part of parties are crucial for positive contribution to the child's reading activities and participation in school.

According to the findings, the majority of pupils (81%) indicated that they spent time at home helping their parents in their economic activities while 29% of the pupils never assisted their parents in their economic activities.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of findings, discussion, conclusion drawn from the findings and recommendations made. The conclusions and recommendations were based on the purpose of the study.

5.2 Summary of Findings

From the findings, majority of the teachers reported that most of the children came from low income family. Similarly the majority of the head teachers reported that most of the pupils come from low income families. The findings were confirmed by most of pupils who posited that they lived in mud walled houses, timber houses, and grass thatched houses and only a minority lived in permanent house.

The study, also established that the school parents’ major economic activity was small scale farming as attested by the majority of the teachers. The majority of teachers argued that the provision of the basics material not catered for by the Free Primary Education program but catered for by parents was poor. The majority of teachers described the attendance children in school as poor, while a good number also described it as fair.
The research further established that there is a gradual decline in pupils’ enrollment, access and participation in education for the past five years despite the inception of free primary education by the government.

On the reasons the children failed to attend school, most of the teachers cited parents failure to afford basic items for their children as the major cause for pupils’ absenteeism, while others cited pupils’ involvement in money generating activities and poor nutrition as the cause of absenteeism.

Most of the pupils posited that they were absent from school due to lack of school fees, helping mother/guardian at home and caring for their sick parent. The study further found that the majority of the pupils missed school to attend to the families’ economic activities. In addition, most of the pupils missed school often. The research also identified that parents paid extra tuition, bought uniforms, and bought books and other items to support their children’s education. The majority of the parents reported that they were facing constraints in financing pupils’ education. As reported by the teachers the majority of school drop outs engaged in income generating activities.

The majority of the pupils attested that their parents/guardians never helped them in doing their homework. However the majority of pupils spent time at home helping their parents in their economic activities.

5.3 Conclusion

Carneiro and Heckman (2002) succinctly, notes that children whose parents have higher income have better access to quality schools, and these same parents shape the tastes and
expectations of their children. They are also able to better nurture the intellect of their children by assisting and directing their studies. The study concluded that most of the children came from low-income family who lived in poor housing facilities like mud walled houses, timber houses, and grass thatched houses. The study also concluded that the school parents’ major economic activity was small-scale farming. Thus the parents exhibited traits of low income and consequently constraints in enhancing their children’s participation in school.

The study also concluded that provision of the basics material not catered for by the Free Primary Education program but catered for by parents was fair and that pupils’ school attendance is fair. The study also concluded that there is a gradual decline in pupils’ enrollment, access and participation in education for the past five years despite the inception of free primary education by the government. Among the major reasons that resulted in pupils’ absenteeism which was reported to be on regular basis includes lack of school fees, helping parents/guardian at home, caring for their sick parent, disease, pupils’ involvement in income generating activities and poor nutrition.

The family plays a crucial role in shaping the educational experiences and achievement of children and transmission of status from one generation to the next. Throughout the world, children of high- status parents are more likely to be enrolled in school than children from poor families (Claudia Buchmann 2002). The study concluded that parents paid extra tuition, bought uniforms, and bought books in support of their children’s education to enhance their participation. However, the majority of the parents reported
that they were facing constraints in financing pupils’ education. The study further concluded the majority pupils dropped out of school to engage in income generating activities to supplement their families’ economic stability.

5.4 Recommendations

The study recommends that to avert the problem of declining pupils’ participation in primary education; the school management and other policy makers in the education sector should sensitize the parents and pupils on modern ways of generating family income that do not interfere with school participation.

The study recommends that, to improve parental participation parents and teachers should give an orientation on roles to allow parents an opportunity to own the school. This orientation can be followed by workshops that may practical aspects that provide information in detail. Continuous monitoring and evaluation of understanding through assessment of assistance in children's homework and the positive effect on teacher and parent relations on roles should be conducted.

The schools should develop a policy on parental involvement. Such development should be inclusive of all stakeholders to ensure commitment and buy-in. Clear defined roles, responsibilities and strategies like frequency of meetings and establishment of committees should be in place. The school should also hold strategic workshops to develop vision and mission statement of the school. Development of strategies will
enforce unity and interdependence among the parties. Team building will strengthen working together among groups in terms of their areas of operation.

There is need for the government to improve proper mechanisms for financing Child education especially for in poverty stricken areas such as Buuri district. This should go along with effective monitoring of disbursed funds to avoid misappropriation and thus enhance proper utilization to facilitate participation of the children as well as easing burden of incurring costs by

The study recommends proper campaign geared towards public sensitization of education and information needs and to ensure that there is no one who prohibits children with from participating in mainstream education. This will also go along with sensitizing the parents on the need to providing the relevant materials such as books, school uniform, and fees thus raising the level of participation during the learning process. Policy development needs to be based on a thorough situation analysis outlining the region context, which identifies the prevailing needs and states clear policy requirements to achieve the inclusion of children with disabilities.

**5.5 Recommendations for Further Studies**

Since this study explored the impact of family income on school participation in primary schools in Buuri District, the study recommends that;
i. Similar study should be done in other districts in Kenya for comparison purposes and to allow for generalization on impact of family income on school participation in primary schools.

ii. More research is done to establish additional factors that contribute to the impact of family income on school participation in primary schools.
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**APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS**

Instructions: The information given in this questionnaire will be treated as very confidential, please give your opinion as honestly and accurately as possible. No answer will be considered wrong because that will be your honest opinion. The information given will be kept secret and will only be used for research purposes.

**Background information**

1. Gender ............................................

2. Age..............................................

3. Number of years you have served as a teacher....................

4. What is the economic background of most of your children in class

   Low income family
   Middle income family
   High income families

5. What are the major economic activities of the parents of your children in class?

   Small scale farming
   Lumbering
6. How can you describe the provision of the basics like uniforms that are not included in the FPE to the children?

- Fair
- Poor
- Good
- Excellent

7. How can you describe the attendance of your children in school?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

8. What are the reasons why the children fail to attend school?

- Lack of school uniform
- Poor nutrition
- Disease
- Involvement in money generating activities
- Any other (explain)
9. What are the backgrounds of the children who do not attend school regularly?

10. i) Are there students who have dropped out of school to engage in income generating activities.

   ii) Which activities do they engage in?

APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PUPILS

Instructions: The information given in this questionnaire will be treated as very confidential, please give your opinion as honestly and accurately as possible. No answer will be considered wrong because that will be your honest opinion. The information given will be kept secret and will only be used for research purposes.

Background information

1. Class………………

2. Gender………………

3. Parent’s Age …………………

4. Occupation………………

5. Average score last term………………

6. Who pays your school fees (levies)?
   Parent
   Guardian
   Others specify

7. What is the level of education of the parent/guardian? Tick against the level attained.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary level</th>
<th>Secondary level</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What are the sources of income of your parents/Guardians?
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 
   d) 

9. Give reasons for being absent from school?
   (a) School fees
   (b) Was looking after younger siblings.
   (c) Helping mother/guardian at home
   (d) Parent was unwell
   (e) Lack of uniform
   (f) Others. Specify.

10. What type of house does your family live in. Please tick one
    (a) Permanent house (stone)
    (b) Grass thatched house with mud wall?
11. How do your parents/guardian support you in your studies (more than one answer)

(a) They buy uniform
(b) They help me in my work.
(c) They buy books and other items.
(d) They pay extra tuition.

12. State the farming activities that you engage in at home?

Coffee farming
Cattle Keeping
Horticulture
Miraa growing

13. Do you engage in any of the following at home?

Lumbering
Shop keeping
Matatu business

14. Does your parent help you in your homework?

15. Do you spend time at home helping your parents in their economic activities?

16. i) Have you missed school to attend to the families’ economic activities?

ii) If yes how often

Rarely
Often
Most often
APPENDIX III: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HEAD TEACHERS

Instructions: The information given in this questionnaire will be treated as very confidential, please give your opinion as honestly and accurately as possible. No answer will be considered wrong because that will be your honest opinion. The information given will be kept secret and will only be used for research purposes.

Background information

1. Gender..................

2. Age......................

3. Number of years you have served as a head teacher in the school............

4. Number of children in the school........

5. How can you describe the family background of most of your pupils?
   - Low income families [ ]
   - Middle income families [ ]
   - High income families [ ]

   What is the trend in enrollment in your school?

6. What is the effect of the socio-activities of the families on the enrollment, attendance and retention of children

7. How many children drop out of school to engage in income generating activities in each year?

8. What is the socio-economic activity of the family of the children who mostly dropout?
9. What challenges face students of different socio-economic backgrounds?

10. Please indicate your school enrolment for the last five years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARENTS

Instructions: The information given in this questionnaire will be treated as very confidential, please give your opinion as honestly and accurately as possible. No answer will be considered wrong because that will be your honest opinion. The information given will be kept secret and will only be used for research purposes.

**Background information**

1. Gender…………………………

2. Age……………………………..

3. Number of children in school…………………………

4. What is your highest level of education standard 8 and below
   - Form two
   - Form four
   - Form six
   - First degree

5. Specify any other.

6. What is your occupation?

7. What are your sources of income
8. Tick below the activities that you fund where your child goes to school.

- School uniform
- Activity fee
- Extra tuition
- Purchase of books
- Classroom construction

9. Do you face constraint in financing the above activities? If yes

10. How does it affect your child’s learning?
# APPENDIX V: OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>AVAILABLE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desks &amp; chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapped water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income generating activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other facility available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY/MONTH</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July-August</td>
<td>Sept 2011-March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a research topic and literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing research proposal, developing tools for data collection and preparing for research proposal seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field framework / conducting interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data entry, interpretation and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiling of the final draft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of findings/ final draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX VII: THE BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) ITEMS (STATIONARY)</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Cost in ksh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pens</td>
<td>6 dozens @ 12</td>
<td>72/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pencils</td>
<td>3 @ 20</td>
<td>60/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td>40/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash disk</td>
<td>2 @ 1500</td>
<td>3000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>8 rims @ 500</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7,172/=</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B) TRAVELING EXPENSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administering questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch @ 400 per day for 60 days</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>44,000/=</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C) SECRETARIAL SERVICES**

| Research proposal research, typing, printing and binding | 10,000 |
| Researching, Typing, printing and binding the final report | 15,000 |
| Photocopying questionnaires              | 2,000/=           |
| **Sub-total**                            | 27,000/=          |

**d) COMMUNICATION SERVICES**

| Telephone services                    | 7,000/=           |
| **Sub-total**                         | 7,000/=           |

**e) Miscellaneous expenses**

| 10,000                               |
| **Sub-total**                        | 10,000/=          |

**GRAND TOTAL**

| 95,172/= |