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ABSTRACT

Education is a key component of human quality essential for generating high incomes and sustainable socio-economic development. It is characterized as an essential ingredient in poverty eradication, free primary education has increased participation, and it has at the same time created considerable problems. It has exacerbated the problem of teaching and learning facilities. The study sought to investigate factors influencing learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in Public Primary Schools in Kenya. A case of Cheptais Sub County. Specifically the objectives of the study were to determine how teacher factors influence learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary schools, to assess how school funding influence learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary school, to determine how school attendance influence learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary schools and how school physical environment influence learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary schools. The study will add more information on the already available empirical knowledge on performance of Public Primary schools. The study employed a descriptive research design. The study targeted a population of 1500 respondents representing the total number of teachers from Cheptais Sub County. A sample size of 306 respondents was used in the study. Systematic random sampling technique was used to select the desired representation from the various teachers in the sample from different schools. Questionnaires were used to collect data. A pilot study was done in the neighboring Bungoma West Sub County. To ascertain the reliability of the instruments, test-retest method was employed. Frequency tables and percentages were used to analyze the data collected and the information in tables was explained to enhance interpretation of the data. Results were interpreted and required recommendations made at the end of the study. It was found out that training of teachers was an important factor for performance because it equipped him or her with skills necessary to handle pupils and eventually perform well, enough facilities like classrooms, libraries and books ensured no congestion in classes. Teacher pupil ratio was found to be the most important factor as small classes enabled individual attention by the teacher, truancy from school was found to be the major factor contributing to poor academic performance since most of the children engaged in farming through the Shamba system practiced in Mt Elgon forest. Negative attitude of the surrounding community towards the school promote bad performance. The socio-economic status of the community was found to promote performance as children from rich parents performed better compared to children from poor parents. Recommendations for the study were first, the government should train and employ more teachers to improve learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education, funding of Public institutions should be increased to improve learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education, Institutions should put on strict measures to curb truancy. School physical environment and its surroundings should be learner friendly and finally shamba system practiced in Mt. Elgon should be banned by the government to arrest the involvement of learners in farmin
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Education is a key component of human quality essential for generating high incomes and sustainable socio-economic development. It is characterized as an essential ingredient in poverty eradication (Ogawa, 2010: 1). According to UNESCO (2007), education was formally recognized as a human right since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 (UDHR). The Dakar Framework for Action (2000) declared that access to quality education was the right of every child. It affirmed that quality was at the heart of education. According to Smaoff (2007, cited in Ogawa, 2010) the mastery of curriculum is measured by national examination and the best indicator of high quality education is a high score on the national examination.

In the United States of America, Performance of public primary schools has always been of special interest to educators, parents and society at large. This is due to several factors that contribute to this poor performance, excessive absenteeism is listed as the number one factor that affects performance in public primary school. As students’ progress from the primary grades excessive absenteeism drains community resources impacting human services such as truancy officers, social workers, probation officers, school counselors, the courts and retail merchants (Us Department of Justice 2001). It is critical to identify strategies early in a child’s school life that will intervene effectively with youths who are chronically truant and interrupt their progress to delinquency and other negative behaviors by addressing the underlying reasons behind their absence from school.

In Ghana a study by Opare (1981) compared academic performance of day and boarding students in a research conducted. His study found that most of those who performed well came from homes of higher socio-economic factors and this counted in the performance of the schools. He recounted that public schools performed poorly because of middle class background of parents. In spite of the evidence to suggest parental support can help to improve performance in public primary schools, many are skeptical of parental support programmes. Michelle Fine (1993) “home advantage” raise concerns about the wide spread implementation of parental support policy and practices. Their concern about effects of parental support programmes stems from their observations that many schools and teachers use only one –size-fits-all approach. The
result is that schools reinforce white, upper and middle class values and disadvantage students from other backgrounds.

In Nigeria, a study by Oni (1992) analyzed facilities as a strategic factor in organizational functioning. This is so because they determine to a very large extent the smooth functioning of any social organization or system including education. He further stated that their availability, adequacy and relevance influence efficiency and high Productivity. Library is an essential in teaching-learning process. It forms one of the most important educational services. The educational process functions in a world of books. The chief purpose of a institution library is to make available to the students, at his easy convenience, all books, periodicals and other reproduced materials which are of interest and value to him but which are not provided or assigned to him as basic or supplementary textbooks. The importance of library has been demonstrated by the Government when she expressed in the National Policy on Education (NPE) that every state Ministry needs to provide funds for the establishment of libraries in all her educational institutions and to train librarians and library assistants. As a resource, it occupies a central and primary place in any school system. It supports all functions of school-teaching and provides service and guidance to its readers.

Kenya recognizes that the education and training of all Kenyans is fundamental to the success of the Vision 2030 (Ministry of state for planning national development and vision 2030, 2010). Education equips citizens with understanding and knowledge that enables them to make informed choices about their lives and those facing Kenyan society. The education sector will therefore, provide the skills that will be required to steer Kenyans to the economic and social goals of Vision 2030. The first immediate challenge facing the sector in Kenya’s transformation to 2030 is how to meet the human resource requirements for a rapidly changing and more diverse economy. The next challenge is to ensure that the education provided meets high quality standards, and that its contents are relevant to the needs of the economy and society (Kenya vision 2030, 2007)

The Government introduced Free Primary Education (FPE) in 2003 in an effort to realize the Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS) and MDG goals. The FPE programme has resulted in increased access to primary education by reducing the cost burden on households and providing learning and teaching materials to all public primary schools. FPE interventions have increased enrolments in formal primary schools from 5.9 million in 2002 to 7.63 million in 2006 (Education sector report, 2008).
However, while free primary education has increased participation, it has at the same time created considerable problems. It has exacerbated the problem of teaching and learning facilities. As a result of the high influx of new pupils, classrooms are congested. Many of the preliminary surveys seem to show that the existing facilities make a mockery of the free education program. Many school management committees feel that they are seriously constrained to improve the state of learning facilities due to the government’s ban on school levies. At the same time, conditions laid down to request for concessions to institute levies are so cumbersome that they hesitate to embark on the process (Sifuna, 2003).

In Kenya several challenges have been noticed to impact on the universalization of primary education. Poverty is one of the leading challenges facing the implementation and eventual realization of Universal Primary Education (UPE). An offshoot of the poverty problem is child labor. According to the Child Labor Survey, Kenya had 1.3 million children classified as child laborers (GoK, 1999). Poor staffing and provisioning have also adversely affected the attainment of UPE in Kenya. Many schools are grossly understaffed. The situation is grimmer for schools in the arid and semi-arid areas, as well as those in the slums of urban areas, where the ratio could be as high as 1:100 (UNICEF, 2005). For the majority of children in Kenya, as in other African countries (Ki-Zerbo, 1990), primary school education is terminal. As such, primary educations should equip them with adequate life and career skills to lead meaningful lives after school. In reality, however, the education offered in primary schools predominantly aims at preparing the pupils for secondary school (Sifuna & Sawamura, 2008). Consequently, many children terminate their formal schooling with very little in the way of gainful life skills.

Low academic achievement has been defined as failing to meet the average academic performance in test or examination scores, as determined by a set cut-off point. Pupil achievement in Kenya’s primary schools can be compared using the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) examination which is standardized. Studies have indicated that in informal settlements of Nairobi pupils perform below average compared to those outside informal settlements. However, the performance is also affected by such factors as gender, school type and location and socio-economic status (APHRC, 2008). In some regions of Kenya performance in the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education has been attributed to such factors; absenteeism of pupils from school, lack of facilities, lack of motivation, understaffing and lack of role models.
In Magarini (Katana, 2010) several factors have been attributed to the poor performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education. The factors include understaffing of teachers, teacher and pupil demotivation, poor time management, poor discipline standards, negative impacts of the community and lack of adequate teaching and learning materials. However, these factors differ depending on the region under study as well as school. There is therefore need to carry out studies in every region to ascertain the individual factors that affect Kenya Certificate of Primary Education performance in the region (Morumbwa, 2006).

In Meru central District, Thuranira (2000) cited such factors as poor remuneration for teachers, transfers being effected at the middle of the term, inadequate supervision and inspection. The study reported other factors which were similar to those reported in other areas. These factors include understaffing, lack of learning and teaching materials, lack of motivation and lack of enough support from the local community. The government has committed itself to education sector especially with the introduction of free primary education though with many challenges impacting on performance of public schools in Kenya. Cheptais Sub-county is in Bungoma County, Kenya.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Provision of quality education for all the children is one of the objectives of the Kenyan government. Because of this, the government of Kenya is currently putting on measures to improve quality of education in public primary schools. Despite the government’s effort to introduce free primary education, increase teacher’s pay to boost their morale, learners performance in public primary schools in Cheptais Sub County has been persistently low. This is evident as shown in the table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1 School’s KCPE mean scores from 2013 to 2016 in Cheptais Sub County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamarang’ D.E.B</td>
<td>241.69</td>
<td>214.04</td>
<td>244.65</td>
<td>212.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaptoboi R.C</td>
<td>267.18</td>
<td>261.00</td>
<td>236.05</td>
<td>226.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapkoto A.C.K</td>
<td>215.93</td>
<td>224.84</td>
<td>253.86</td>
<td>277.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peresten A.C.K</td>
<td>269.38</td>
<td>280.95</td>
<td>286.38</td>
<td>285.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marigo S.D.A</td>
<td>263.72</td>
<td>223.65</td>
<td>209.03</td>
<td>266.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.1 above shows that learners in Kenya certificate of primary education in Cheptais Sub County is consistently low. With this continued dismal performance, there is need to investigate the reasons for this low performance. This is why this study sought to investigate factors influencing learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools in Kenya: A case of Cheptais Sub County

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to investigate factors influencing learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary schools, a case of Cheptais sub-county.

1.4 Objectives of the study

The study was guided by the following objectives.

1. To determine how Teacher factors, influence learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary schools.
2. To assess how school funding influence learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary schools.
3. To determine how school attendance influence learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary schools.
4. To examine how school physical environment influence learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary schools.

1.5 Research questions

The study sought to answer the following questions.

1. How do Teacher factors influence learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary schools?
2. To what extent do school funding influence learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary schools?
3. How does school attendance influence learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of primary Education in public primary schools?
4. How do school physical environment influence learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary schools?

1.6 Significance of study

Education is regarded as instrumental in the development of an individual be it morally, socially or intellectual. The basic primary education that one acquires at the lower levels of education actually determines the subsequent progress of a child in his or her entire life in education line. It is in the light of the above consideration that this study aimed to give some insight on factors that influence learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary schools. Hence the study intended to make a contribution to the existing knowledge on ways of improving learner’s performance in K.C.P.E in public primary schools. The study will also enable government design; intervention polices in addressing performance in public primary schools. Parents will also benefit from the study because this will help them support their children fully as they go through the education system.

1.7 Limitation of the study

The study would have been carried out in the entire Bungoma County to increase its external validity but it was not possible due to vastness of the study and the limited time span in conducting the study. The researcher reduced this limitation by confining the study to public primary schools in Cheptais Sub-County. The other limitation was that the respondent could give biased information and this false information might affect the whole study, the researcher was friendly to the respondents so that the respondents could be confident in him when disclosing their information. There was financial problem for example: traveling to collect data, telephone calls printing of questioners some of which were not returned and others spoiled. The researcher ensured that he had adequate finance necessary for carrying out the research fully to avoid shortcoming in the process of writing proposal.

1.8 Delimitation of the study

This study was carried out in public primary schools in cheptais sub county of Bungoma county. This place was chosen simply because schools under study were found there.
1.9 Assumption of the study

The study was based on the following assumptions.

1. It was assumed that the selected sample represented the population in all variables of interest.
2. It was assumed all the respondents would honestly give information required freely without fear.
3. It was assumed the questionnaire would be returned on time.
4. It was assumed the researcher would have adequate time to complete the study.

1.10 Definition of significant terms as used in the study

Learner’s performance in public primary schools – attainment of good grades by learners

Teacher factors – They refer to the skills that teachers should have to enhance learner’s performance

School funding – The funded education by the Government

School attendance – Consistence of student in schools

School Physical environment – refers to the factors in and out of the school that may promote or hinder learning to take place

1.11 Organization of the study

This research project was divided into five chapters: Introduction, Literature Review, Research Methodology, analysis and presentations and finally recommendations. Chapter one (Introduction) was divided into the following sections: Background information, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives, research questions, significance of the study, basic assumptions of the study, limitation and delimitations of the study and definition of significance terms. Chapter two (Literature Review) included; teacher factors, funding, school attendance and school environment, theoretical framework, Summary of Literature and conceptual framework. Chapter three (Research Methodology) which included; research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedure, data collection instrument, data collection procedure, validity of instruments, reliability of the instruments, data analysis techniques, ethical considerations and operational definition of variables. Chapter four deals with data analysis, presentation, interpretation and discussions. Chapter five has summary of findings, discussions,
conclusions and recommendations. This research ended with references and appendices including questionnaires.

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This Chapter discussed the literature related to the factors influencing performance of KCPE in public primary schools. It particularly focused on how teacher factors influence performance in KCPE, how funding influence performance in KCPE in public primary schools, to determine how schools’ attendance influence performance in primary schools and to examine how school environment influence performance in KCPE in public primary schools.

2.2 The concept of learner’s performance.
Academic achievement or academic performance is the outcome of education. It is the extent to which a learner, teacher or institution has achieved their educational goals. Academic achievement is commonly measured by examinations or continuous assessment but there is no general agreement on how it is best tested or which aspects are most important-procedural knowledge such as skills or declarative. Humans are capable of extra-ordinary accomplishment. Wonderful accomplishments also occur in day to day practice in institutions. An advisor inspires students to follow their dream, a teacher magically connects with pupils. WISKE (1998) says when people learn and grow, they are empowered to create results that make a difference.

2.3 Teacher factors and learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools
Training is practical instruction in and task requirements and methods. It may be provided in classroom or workplace, and its objective is to enable workers to some minimum initial performance standards, to maintain their proficiency.

According to Reynolds (2004) training is one of several responses an organization can undertake learning. It involves the application of formal process to impact knowledge and help people to acquire the skills necessary for them to perform their jobs satisfactorily. Training programs are so important in our society since they provide formal opportunities to acquire knowledge. As a result of the increased powers acquired as a result of training and education, the person has potential to perform better than he could before the training.
Public primary schools in Kenya have since the introduction of free primary education been performing poorly as compared to the private schools (ministry of education, Kenya 2013) yet many public primary schools’ teachers have enrolled for different training programs with an aim of improving knowledge for their own personal development which boosts their commitment. Any employer seeks to use the employee’s skills in attainment of his goals and so the employers focus is on the end results, that is, how the performance will be affected by the training.

Primary school teachers in the government in Kenya acquire different trainings, which the teachers expect to be recognized and appreciated by the employer. These teachers attend different trainings in different set ups which gives them advanced skills and knowledge in handling the pupils they prepare for the national examinations and even their curriculum based activities. The teachers service commission has also come up with additional training modules in partnership with various players in the education sector with an aim of equipping the teacher even more for them to improve in their performance.

According to Koech report (1999), he recommended that the admission criteria for teacher training colleges be reviewed to ensure, that only qualified candidates were admitted. Lambo (1961), noted that, the teacher-pupil ratio should be one to forty (1:40) in primary schools with at least one teacher per class. Ngaroga (2008), supported by stating that the pupils are overcrowded with a poor pupil teacher ratio. The girls shy off because they cannot be attended by the teacher. Thompson (1987), noted that the way in which teachers are recruited and trained may adversely affect pupils' performance. Their experience tends to be largely confined to the society of the school, they may teach about urban living without having lived in a town, manufacturing process without having seen a factory. Livingstone’s (1954), asserted that despite the assumption that women are naturally good teachers their training gets less attention than it deserves.

Kwesiga (2002) emphasized that female teachers are not so well regarded and respected as males and their potential as positive role models is weakened by the generally lower status of women. According to Moumouni (1968), a good training is very necessary to help a teacher develop his interest and ability for teaching girls. Grant (1972), emphasized that no one should enter teaching profession unless he is determined to do his best for the children. Hyde (1989), notes that incalculable harm can be done by lazy or careless teachers on girl’s performance.
Eshwani (1993), noted that most schools faced a lot of problems in terms of finance and qualified teachers as a result of which pupils performed poorly in national examination. Harish and Dale (1957), emphasized that management skills of head teachers should be upgraded. Their role as teachers in the inspection and supervision of teachers should be widened. Lewis (1984), asserted that teacher morale, professional support and awareness of educational possibilities through adequate pre- and in-service training are critical determinants of curricular quality. According to Kamunge report (1988), teachers of primary schools should be assigned to teach the subjects they are best qualified in. Mills (1974), noted that sound training imparts not only a way of doing but also a way of training, so that a trained teacher confronted with a situation acts wisely and quickly. Prescott (1938) emphasized that in recent years, it has been found that good supervision increases productive efficiency and supervision can be improved with training.

Teachers are the facilitators who are to impact into the students the concepts expected to be learnt. However, Olarewaju (1986) and Nwagbo (1995) were of the opinion that ignorant of the teachers or neglect of activity- oriented methods by the teachers grossly contributes to students’ low performance. When considering growth in technology, the development of human capital is paramount (Fajonyomi, 2007). This was in line with the view of Ogbazi (1987) who noted that problem of industrial development in Nigeria is that of inadequacy of sufficiently trained human resources and this has been a major constraint on the rate of technological and economic development of the country.

According to Kamunge report (1988), on education and manpower in the next decade and beyond, proposed increase in the salaries of teacher’s so as to retain qualified staff. Wandira (1971), noted that the incentive for the teacher to work well is limited since conventionally promotions are made on the basis of the level of qualification of the teacher and his length of service, the actual quality of his work may be less significant. Abagi and Okwach (2005) asserted that inappropriate and/or inadequate policy and legal frameworks and statements have negatively affected the development of quality education. Okwach and Abagi (2005) further notes that this has led to overloaded inappropriate and gender insensitive curricular. Tomkins and Izard (1965), asserted that the influence of female teachers is an important motivating factor. Kwesiga (2002), emphasized that as role models, female teachers motivate girls to enroll and to increase their attendance and performance. Wandira (1970), support this idea by saying that the teacher is not intrinsically motivated hence cannot make improvements on academic performance. Thompson (1987), further noted that many young people enter teachers training
because they have failed to achieve selection for further stage of formal education. Majority of the head teachers (66.7%) said that teachers were not motivated, while 33.3% indicated they are. World Bank Report (1986) acknowledges that teacher satisfaction is generally related to achievement satisfied teachers would concentrate hence enhancing academic performance of their pupils.

Wayne (1998) asserts that a reward in form of pay has a strong impact on the employees’ performance. Bratton (2003), agree with Wayne when they state that pay is one of the most powerful motivating tools. Similarly, Armstrong (1996) emphasizes the value of extrinsic motivation when he says that money provides the means to achieve a number of different ends. Above all he asserts that money in form of pay is the most obvious extrinsic reward. Kiseesi (1998), in her study about job satisfaction of workers recommends that salaries of workers should be paid promptly and that promotion of workers should be accompanied by a corresponding increase in the salary they earn. She observes that salary was a strong force that kept teachers at their jobs. The researcher feels that this is recognition of the fact that salary is vital in causing satisfaction among workers and hence likely to influence performance.

A study on difference among levels of employees in terms of rewards was researched by Maicibi (2003) who observed that rewards such as sickness payment, contributory pension schemes, free life insurance and subsidized canteens are fairly evenly spread across all levels of employees. Maicibi (2003) in agreement with the above view noted that salary was a job satisfier for junior staff in universities in Uganda, while not a strong satisfier for senior non-teaching and academic staff. Therefore, all teachers in schools need the desire to be satisfied at work and once all teachers are motivated, their performance will definitely increase and they will see a point in what they are doing, which improves the work morale of teachers.

Complaints about the big teaching load of teachers have been reported by Ward, Penny & Read (2006). In Uganda, the Ministry of Education raised the teaching load of secondary school teachers to a minimum of 26 periods per week (out of a possible total of 40) in 2002. However, teachers protested to the President who reduced the number of periods to the original level of 18 per week. There are usually major differences in teacher workloads according to school size, type and location as well as subject areas. The most common reasons for low teaching loads are small schools, overcrowded curricula with too many specialized teachers, insufficient classrooms, and a predominance of single subject teachers. Private primary schools often have
strong incentives to expand classes in order to maximize fee income. If, however, the financial payoff to teachers for teaching extra classes is not increased sufficiently then this can result in lower motivation.

2.4 School funding and learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools

Free Primary Education (FPE) Refers to education that is funded through taxation or charitable organizations rather than tuition funding. Since its inception in Kenya, the policy has seen tremendous increase in enrolment of school going children from 5 million in January 2003 to 7.2 millions in May 2009 by World Bank Report 2009). This rapid increase in number of pupils has created constraints and challenges to successful implementation of FPE in Kenya thereby compromising the quality of education for most developing countries including Kenya, education takes the largest shares the national budget. In 2010, just over 17% of government expenditure went has prioritized education since independence significant recent policy shift was the introduction on the free primary education (FPE) program in 2003 following the election of the National Rainbow coalition (NACK) government. Thus the introduction of FPE in Kenya has contributed greatly towards the achievement of the goal of universal primary education. For most children from poor families, the only sure way to exit poverty and compete with others is by acquiring quality education. From this perspective, Kenya free primary education is an incredibly important policy. But there is great difference between attending school and learning. A number of studies and surveys have been conducted in Kenya and in fact other African countries reveal a sad story of public schools that are totally dysfunctional. The children are attending school but very little learning is taking place.

According to Uwezo Kenya (2011) only three out of ten children in a class three can read a class two story in (in English) while, while slightly more than half of them can read a paragraph. The findings are similar in numeracy, where 30 percent of class three children are unable to complete class two division, and 10 percent of class eight children cannot do class two division. Such outcomes reflect a system that has broken down as is not preparing children for the 21st century. The education may be free but there is very little value that is added in many of those schools.

Okwakol (2008) noted that a computer is increasingly becoming the major notebook, textbook, dictionary and storage facility for information for students in quality institutions of higher learning. She noted that universities that fail to utilize the benefits of the digital age-
computer assisted learning, web connectivity and networked learning – cannot offer quality education. Library facilities and information systems in almost all universities are antiquated. Books and scholarly journals are not only few but very old and are therefore irrelevant to current institutional needs and priorities. A study by Ndethiu (2007) at Kenyatta University found that lack of adequate reading resources posed a challenge to the promotion of students’ reading habits. Lack of current and relevant books, inadequate use of internet and general lack of reading space were important constraints to students reading

According to Oni (1992), facilities constitute a strategic factor in organizational functioning. This is so because they determine to a very large extent the smooth functioning of any social organization or system including education. He further stated that their availability, adequacy and relevance influence efficiency and high Productivity. Library is an essential factor in teaching-learning process. It forms one of the most important educational services. The educational process functions in a world of books. The chief purpose of an institution library is to make available to the students, at his easy convenience, all books, periodicals and other reproduced materials which are of interest and value to him but which are not provided or assigned to him as basic or supplementary textbooks. The importance of library has been demonstrated by the government when she expressed in the National Policy on Education (NPE) that every state Ministry needs to provide funds for the establishment of libraries in all her educational institutions and to train librarians and library assistants. As a resource, it occupies a central and primary place in any school system. It supports all functions of school-teaching and provides service and guidance to its readers. According to Fowowe (1988) a library must be up-to-date and at the same time allow access to older materials. It must be properly supported financially to fund materials and services among others.

While itemizing the types of libraries, Ola (1990) opined that institutions library in whatever form, has replaced the traditional method of ‘chalk and talk’ in imparting knowledge to students that its effect on academic performance need not to be over-emphasized. He concluded that a well-equipped library is a major facility which enhances good learning and achievement of high educational standard. In his words, Farombi (1998) reiterated that school libraries may not be effective if the books therein are not adequate and up-to-date as its impact may only be meaningful if the library could be opened to the students always for a considerable length of time in a school day. With all the above mentioned facts, it is sad to know that many schools operate without libraries (Shodimu, 1998) whereas Ogunseye (1986) had earlier noted that total absence
of an organized school library would continue to spell doom for thousands of secondary school students. This statement clearly implied that many schools operate without libraries and this had affected the academic performance of their students.

With increased enrolment rates in primary schools, teacher supply remains critical. The government has not been able to keep up with the pace of maintaining balance between teacher demand and supply. Teacher supply remains the most critical problem not only in Kenya but also in sub Saharan Africa where an estimated 3.8 million additional posts must be recruited and trained by the year 2015. Today, teacher pupil ratio is still too high and teacher demand and supply remain a major issue. There is also an issue associated with teaching learning materials (Okwach & George, 1997). Under the FPE program, every pupil is entitled to free writing materials e.g. pens, books. However, on the contrary books are shared in the ratio of one textbook to five pupils. Sharing of textbooks affects their accessibility to the books while at home and many have to do their homework early in the morning the next day when in school. This limits the amount of work teachers give to the pupils hence affecting performance of schools in the long run. Findings suggest that there is no adequate empirical study to support the views and assertions concerning teachers experience and motivation towards the implementation of free primary education policy in Kenya. There is need for empirical research to understand teacher’s experiences and challenges.

Alderman, Orazem & Paterno (2001) contributed to this discussion, their study concluded that higher student-teacher ratio had a consistent negative effect on student achievement particularly on language skills. However, Graddy and Stevens (2003) in their study concluded that student-teacher ratio was important determinant of fees and parents choose schools with lower student-teacher ratio. Levacic (2005) concluded a study on Grade KS3 and found that reduction in the student-teacher ratio had statistically significant positive effect on mathematics achievement.

Bayo (2005) opined that smaller classes benefit all pupils because of individual attention from teachers, but low-attaining pupils benefit more at the secondary school level. Pupils in large classes drift off task because of too much instruction from the teacher to the whole class instead of individual attention, and low-attaining students are most affected. Students benefit in later grades from being in small classes during early grades. Longer periods in small classes resulted in more increases in achievement in later grades for all students. In reading and science, low
achievers benefit more from being in small classes. The benefits of small class sizes reduce the
student achievement gap in reading and science in later grades. The ratio of students to teaching
staff compares the number of students (in full-time equivalent) to the number of teachers (in full-
time equivalent) at a given level of Education and similar types of institutions. However, this
ratio does not take into account the amount of instruction time for student compared to the length
of a teacher’s working day, nor how much time spend teaching. It therefore cannot be interpreted
in terms of class size. Pupil-teacher ratio, primary in Nigeria was 36.03 as of 2010. Its highest
value over the past 40 years was 46.09 in 2007, while its lowest value was 33.88 in 1975.
Primary school pupil-teacher ratio is the number of pupils enrolled in primary school divided by
the number of primary school teachers (regardless of their teaching assignment). Pupil-teacher
ratio, primary in Nigeria was 36.03 as of 2010. Its highest value over the past 40 years was 46.09
in 2007, while its lowest value was 33.88 in 1975.

Primary school pupil-teacher ratio is the number of pupils enrolled in primary school
divided by the number of primary school teachers (regardless of their teaching assignment).
Classes with too many students are often disrupting to education. Also, too many students in a
class results in a diverse field of students, with varying degrees of learning ability. Consequently,
the class will spend time for less academic students to assimilate the information, when that time
could be better spent progressing through the curriculum. In this way, student–teacher ratios are
compelling arguments for advanced or honors classes. Numerous sources argue that lower
student to teacher ratios are better at teaching leaners complex subjects such as physics,
mathematics and chemistry, than those with a higher ratio of students to teachers. Commonly the
schools with lower student to teacher ratios are more exclusive, have a higher attendance of
whites, and are in non-inner urban areas and/or fee-paying (non-government) institutions.

Age is another factor that often affects educational attainment and performance. A large
body of empirical evidence attests a ‘birth –date effect’ in education. That is, scholastic
attainment varies with the month of birth (Bell and Daniels, 1990) Gledhil, Ford and Goodman,
(2002) Russel and Startup (1986), such that in any age cohort the older pupils tend to outperform
the younger. Using chronological age as a criterion for entrance into first grade means that the
age difference between some pupils in the same class can almost be one year. There is
continuing controversy about the optimal or appropriate age at which children should start
school. Many studies have shown that all the children fair better academically than their younger
age appropriate peers (La Paro and Pianta 2000). Additionally, Uphoff and Gilmore 1985, using research evidence about the relationship between age and achievement argued that the older pupils in a class fair better than younger classmates.

On the contrary, some studies (Demeis and Stearns 1992), Dietz and Wilson 1985 found no significant relationship between age and achievement while others ((Langer, Kalk and Searls 1984) found significantly higher achievement of the oldest as compared to the youngest pupils at age nine but this difference disappeared by age seventeen. As a whole, while some studies found no age effect on academic performance of some graders, most of the relevant studies pointed out that younger pupils seemed to be less ready for school tasks than there older peers and the younger classmates were shown to be lower achievers in reading, arithmetic and language skills (Davis, Trimble & Vincent 1980).

2.5 School attendance and learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools.

Truancy reduces the amount of instructional time and this results in Syllabus not being completed (Estey 2005). According to this author, the completion of the syllabus for each subject in each class provides the foundation for the next class to be built upon. When the syllabus is not completed, content that should be taught in the next class which is based on the previous class could not be taught. As these continue, there would be a backlog of content not taught and this would affect the learner’s performance of the students. Moreover, since the subject matter syllabus tend to be spiral, the non-completion of syllabus tends to have cumulative effect on the pupils such that as they move from one grade to the next grade, they encounter materials they do not have the foundation to study. In the final analysis poor performance is the result.

The middle school program (2004) of West Orange Public School, America cited in Paaku (2008) noting the importance of the presence of a student’s responsibility to make up for the missed work as a result of being absent. It also adds that the student must speak to each teacher upon return from an absence of any duration to make up for missed work. According to Paaku (2008), the program continues to state that if a student is absent for two days and beyond, double those days should be provided to make up work missed. This indicates the need and importance of student’s regularity as a way of commitment in effective academic work before the student can succeed and hence the school. In many countries, educators, parents and politicians are continuously searching for solutions that will reform public primary schools. The success of the school is contingent on students attending schools regularly (Smith 1998) in his
study emphasizes that attendance is a priority for educators. The goal of the study was to identify early indicators of poor attendance at the public primary schools in order to provide intervention that could have an impact on middle and high school divisions with vital information about a student's attendance. Research conducted in this area was to provide school divisions with vital information about students’ attendance patterns at the primary level that could reveal or predict an influence on student attendance in the middle and high school level. Findings showed that students must be present in school in order to benefit from the academic program in its entirety (DeKalb 1999, Rothman, 2001). According to them, schools and law enforcement officials are getting tough by enforcing laws that mandate school attendance and by holding parents responsible for their student’s attendance. Student non-attendance is a problem that extends beyond the school. It affects the student, their families and the community (DeKalb, 1999 U.S Department of Education, 2000)

Also related to poor educational performance is the level of truancy or unexplained absence among students. Truancy can be modeled both as an educational outcome and as a causal factor in explaining educational performance. Truancy tends to be higher among students from low SES backgrounds. Truancy, even occasional, is associated with poorer academic performance at school (Sparkes, 1999). Having high levels of unexplained absence at school has also been found to be associated with poorer early adult outcomes in the labor market for instance higher probability of being unemployed and poorer adult health relative to non-truants (Sparkes, 1999).

Geographical location affects pupils’ performance as pupils’ from rural areas are more likely to have lower educational outcomes in terms of academic performance and retention rates than students from urban area. Despite an adequate number of educational facilities in rural and remote Kenya, school children from these areas remain disadvantaged by other factors. Issues affecting access to education in regional areas include: costs, the availability of transport and levels of family income supports (Cheers, 1990; HREOC, 2000). According to Sparkes, 1999 Lower educational attainment has also been found to be associated with children living in public housing compared to those in private housing. This may be due to the effects of overcrowding, poor access to resources and a lack of social networks, and in this sense, housing type may also be a measure of neighborhoods influence.
Lockheed and Vespoor (1990), noted that children who lived a long way from school are prone to absenteeism and fatigue. This particularly increased the constraints for girls. According to a research carried out by the research center for innovation and development in Nepal, for every kilometer of distance a child had the highest number than the boys.

2.6 School physical environment and learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools.

Learning environment refers to the diverse physical location, context and cultures in which students learn. The school environment is an important aspect that contributes to performance in public primary schools. Physical facilities in terms of adequacy and quality have been noted to have great impact on performance. Heyneman and Loxley (1993) in their study on effects of availability of physical facilities on performance found out that presence of school library related significantly to achievement in Brazil, China, Botswana and Uganda. The library is an essential factor in performance of schools. Fuller (1986) identified a library as an instructional resource which may significantly influence learning process and eventually performance of public primary school pupils. Ayoo (2002) and Eshiwani (1993) agree that school environment such as classrooms, desk and books have a direct impact on performance on schools in developing countries.

Wabuoba (2011) quoted in Chuma 2012 observed that overcrowding in classrooms make it difficult for pupils to write. The teacher is also unable to move around the class to assist needy pupils and this affects the teaching-learning process hence performance of schools. Crowded classroom conditions not only make it difficult for learners to concentrate but limit the amount of time teachers can spend on innovative teaching method i.e. group work.

Schools with equipped laboratory have their pupils performing better than their counterparts in schools without laboratories or those work stimulates pupils’ interests as they are made personally to engage in useful scientific activities and experimentation (Owoeye and Yara 2010). Schools location also has an impact on performance of public primary schools. This can be whether the school is located in the rural or urban area, economic status of the neighborhood and clanism. (Ahmen 2003). The extent to which pupils learning could be enhanced depends on the location of the school. When a school is located near the market place, the noise from the market will distract the learners from concentrating thus affecting the performance. Economic status of the school neighborhood also has an impact on performance of schools. Aikens and
Barbarin (2008) noted that schools located in low economic status communities are often under resourced and this affects performance. Parents from low economic status are unable to afford resources such as books, computers or tutors to create this positive literacy environment. Woolfolk (2007) noted that when the communities’ economic status is low, they may not be able support the school financially hence poor performance is depicted since the school may not be able to meet most of its monitory demand.

Even though previous research has linked students’ socio-economic factors that are associated with student’s absence that are beyond the control of the school. Educators can improve attendance by monitoring students’ attendance, encouraging personal development and building relationships with parents setting high expectations (Rothman 1993). Developing an effective attendance program is way for schools to combat absenteeism (U.S Department of Education 1996 b) basing on this, there is still a need for research to address student’s audience (Smith 1998). Testing program, accountability issues and student achievement.

Literature has indicated that academic performance is influenced by the income of parents. According to Marshall (1984:61), children from poor parents often have to do heavy chores in homes and farms or go out trading before attending school in the morning and after returning home in the afternoon. He states that the family may not be able to afford school uniform or adequate food. Marshall further points out that at 26 nights there may be no place where the learner can do his homework and insufficient light for him to work. Marshall also contends that poor parents or guardians often do not attend meetings at the school due to lack of suitable clothes and cannot communicate in English language. Marshall also observes that these parents would feel out of place and ashamed and would not know what to say to the teacher if they meet him/her. Basil (2007) concurring with Marshall’s observation laments that low income level of parents is a major impediment to academic success.

Ministry of Education (1994) contends that financial ability of parents may lead to absenteeism of learners thus threatening student achievement. Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (2001) notes that school drop-out; absenteeism and general truancy is rampant in coffee, khat and tea picking, cane and sand harvesting, and fishing regions in Kenya. It laments that although these activities appear to be supplementing family incomes, they disrupt the normal school routine hindering the syllabus coverage and consequently students are not well prepared for the evaluation tests.
Parents or family socio-economic status is determined by an individual. Achievements in: education; employment and occupational status; and income and Wealth. Several comprehensive reviews of the relationship between social factors and Educational outcomes exist (Ainley et al., 1995). These studies and reviews make it clear those children from low families are more likely to exhibit the following patterns in terms of educational Outcomes compared to children from high social factors: it is argued that families where the parents are advantaged socially, educationally and economically, foster a higher level of achievement in their children. They also may provide higher levels of psychological support for their children through environments that encourage the development of skills necessary for success at school (Williams et al., 1993). Socio-economic status may therefore also be linked to family structure. As sole parent families on average have lower levels of income, 16 are headed by parents with lower educational

Attainment and are less likely to be in the labour force, children from these families are likely to have lower educational performance (Rich, 2000). Research studies have established that academic performance is also influenced both negatively and positively by socio-economic status of the family. Basil (2007) points out that poor parental care with gross deprivation of school and economic needs of a child usually yield to poor academic performance. He also asserts that good parenting supported by strong economic background could enhance strong academic performance of the child. Similarly, Orodho (1996:180) and Atkinson and Feather (1966, cited in Muola, 2007), also contend that parental education influences student’s achievement. Gakuru (1977, cited in Kibera and Kikomoti, 2007) states that wealthier and better educated parents create conducive learning atmosphere for their children. UNICEF (2005:9), UNICEF (2000) and Marshall (1984:61) pointed that parents with little formal education may also be less familiar with the language used in school, limiting their ability to support learning and participate in school related activities. Muola (2007) and Kibera and Kikomoti (2007:114) have shown that occupation status 6 of the parent determines student achievement. Ministry of Education Science and Technology (2001) observed that some economic activities in some regions in Kenya disrupt normal school routine and the pupils are not able to cover the syllabus which may result to poor academic performance.

2.7 Theoretical framework

The study was based on Maslow hierarchy of needs. Maslow wanted to understand what motivates people. He believed that individuals possess a set of motivation systems unrelated to
rewards or motivated people to achieve certain needs. When one need is fulfilled a person seeks to fulfill the next one and so on. The deficiency or basic needs are said to motivate people when they are unmet. Also the need to fulfill such needs will become stronger the longer the duration they are derived. For example, the longer the person goes without food the hungrier they will become.

Maslow’s (1968) hierarchy of needs theory has made major contributions to teaching and classroom management in schools. Rather than reducing behavior to a response in the environment. Maslow (1970) adopts a holistic approach to education and learning.

Before a student’s cognitive needs can be met they must first fulfill their basic physiological needs. For example, a tired and hungry pupil will find it difficult to focus on learning. Pupils need to feel emotionally and physically safe and accepted within the classroom to progress and reach their full potential. Students must be shown that they are valued and respected in the classroom and the teacher should create a supportive environment. Equally so, the teachers should also be motivated so that they can perform better.
2.8 Conceptual Framework

This study was guided by a conceptual framework that defined the relationship between the independent variables and dependent variables.

**Independent Variable**

**Teacher factors**
- Training of teachers
- Qualification
- Motivation of Teachers

**School Funding**
- Facilities in school
- Teacher pupil ratio
- Pupils characteristics

**School attendance**
- Truancy
- Lateness to school
- Distance from home

**School physical environment**
- School location
- Socio -Economic status

**Moderating Variable**
- Government policies
- Cultural factors

**Dependent Variable**
- Learner’s Performance in Kenya certificate of primary education.
  - School rankings
  - Pupils progress marks

Figure: 1 Conceptual framework
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Learners performance in Kenya certificate of primary education is measured by examination scores as determined by a set cut off points. Introduction of free primary education increased the enrolments of pupils in public primary schools from 5.9 million in 2002 to 7.63 million in 2006 (the education sector report 2008). While this has increased participation, it has at the same time created the problems of teaching and learning. As a result of new pupils, classrooms are congested. Many schools are grossly and understaffed where by in some schools the ratio of teachers to pupils is 1:100 (UNICEFF 2005)

Another study done in Magarini (Katana 2010) indicated that several factors have been attributed to dismal learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education which included poor time management, poor discipline standards, understaffing of teachers and teacher pupil ratio. However, this factors differ depending on the region under study as well as schools.

There is therefore need to carry out studies in every region to ascertain the individual factors that affect leaners performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools in the region (Morumbwa 2006)

2.9 Summary of Literature Review

The literature covered in this section included the concept of learner’s performance, teacher factors and learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools, school funding and learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools, school attendance and learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools and school physical environment and learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools. It also explains why the study was based on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs and the diagram of the conceptual framework that shows both independent and dependent variables.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter involved a description of research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, instrument validity reliability, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research design

Research design describes the pattern that the research follows, the plan or strategy that research will be conducted. The study was conducted through descriptive survey. Survey is a design that presents oriented methodology that is used to investigate populations by selecting samples to analyze and discover occurrences. Survey design was ideally suitable for the study because it considered issues such as economy of the design, rapid data collection and ability to understand a population from a part of it. The researcher traced through school records for the past few years and then compared the performance of those schools.

3.3 Target populations

Target population referred to the total number of subjects or the total environment of interest to the researcher. Cheptais sub-county had 150 public primary schools. The target population of 1,500 teachers. Education office, Cheptais sub-county was also involved in making a total study population of 1,500. The study was be carried out in all the two divisions of Cheptais sub-county namely Cheptais and Kopsiro divisions. It gave an equal chance for participation to all public primary schools spread in the two divisions.

3.3.1 Sample size

A sample size is a smaller group of subjects obtained from the accessible population (Mugenda and Mugenda 1999). The researcher used Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table to determine the sample size which was suitable for the study (see appendix iii). From a population of 1500 the sample size is approximately 306.

3.3.2 Sampling procedure

Sampling is the process of selecting a number of individuals for a study in such a way that the individuals selected represent the large group from which they were selected (Mugenda
and Mugenda 1999). Proportionate sampling procedure was used to select teachers as shown in table 3- below.

**Table 3. - Population size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>target population</th>
<th>sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education officers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The census sampling was used to select education officers.

### 3.4 Research instruments.

Research instruments refer to the tools used for collecting data. Data was collected using closed ended questionnaires and interview that was developed by the researcher. Both techniques was used to collect data from head teachers, zonal education officers and teachers. Questionnaires were used to inquire from head teachers of selected schools to determine how school funding influenced learner’s performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education in public primary schools since the target population was largely literate and given the time constraints.

Interviews were used to obtain information from education officers. Interviews were person to person verbal communication in which one person or a group of person asked the other questions intended to elicit information or opinions. This was used because it assisted the researcher obtain historical information and also get information that could not be directly observed.

### 3.5 Instrument validity

Validity refers to the extent to which research instruments measure what they intend to measure (Kombo & Tromp 2006, Best & Kahn 2003). The research instruments was piloted in order to standardize them before the actual study. The pilot study was done in the neighbouring Bungoma West District to determine if the items in the research instruments yielded the required data for the final study. The instrument was also given to my supervisor who evaluated the relevance of each item in the instrument to the objectives. Validity was determined using content
validity. Items were indicated by a tick or a cross in the questionnaire to measure what it was supposed to measure or not. A coefficient of those to be measured was computed, a coefficient above 0.5 implied that the instrument was valid. This helped to ensure that the items in the questionnaire captured the intended information accurately according to the objectives.

3.6 Instrument reliability

According to Carmines and Zeller (1990) reliability of an instrument is defined as the extent to which any measuring instrument yields the same results on repeated trials. Crownbach’s coefficient alpha was used to test the internal consistency reliability of an instrument. A reliability coefficient of above 0.7 according to Frankel & Wallen (2000) and Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) implied that the questionnaire was reliable. To ensure the reliability of the research instruments, the researcher conducted a pilot study that was done in the neighboring Bungoma West Sub County before the actual research was done. The researcher administered thirty questionnaires to Education officers, Head teacher and teachers who were not be in the sample twice before commencement of data collection from the sample respondents. After two weeks the researcher administered the same questionnaires to Education officers, Head teacher and teachers. The reliability was ascertained by correlating the scores on the two questionnaires.

3.7 Data collection procedure.

Personal contact was made by the researcher in the collection of data. Nwana (1996) stipulates that pre arrangement should be made with respondents so that there would be precision in the information given. The researcher thus gave an advance notice. In strategizing the collection of data permission was sought from head teachers whose schools was used. Questionnaires were then distributed and explanation was given on how respondents were to answer individual items. This ensured that respondents understood the task required from them. After one week of filling the questionnaires, the researcher visited the schools to collect the questionnaires. The researcher then had an interview with the head teachers of the schools.

3.8 Data analysis techniques.

Analysis of data provides the researcher with facts and figures that enable him interpret results and make statements about the findings of the study. This research used descriptive statistical methods to analyze the data that was collected. The researcher checked all the details of the Questionnaires to make sure that all the items were responded well. The researcher coded
all the questions that were answered and organized all the information before the data was analyzed. Qualitative data was divided into different themes before analysis. Statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze data. Percentages and frequencies was used in analysis and presented in a tabular form.

3.9 Ethical considerations

Confidentiality was considered by the researcher. All the information that was given by the respondents and their names were concealed. Before the study, all the respondents were given enough information regarding the study which was actually for academic reasons. The researcher sought permission from relevant authorities before embarking on research and for example from the university itself and the National Council for Science Technology and Innovation. The purpose of the study was clearly explained to the respondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research objective</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measurement scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To determine how teacher factors influence learners performance in KCPE in public primary schools. | **Independent variable** Teacher factors | • Training of teachers  
• Qualification of teachers  
• Motivation of teachers | Ordinal |
| | **Dependent Variable** Learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools | | |
| To assess how school funding influence learners performance in KCPE in public primary schools. | **Independent variable** School funding | • Facilities  
• Teacher pupil ratio  
• Pupil’s characteristics. | Ordinal |
| | **Dependent Variable** Learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools | | |
| To determine how school attendance influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools | **Independent variable** School attendance | • Truancy  
• Lateness to school  
• Distance from home | Ordinal |
| | **Dependent Variable** Learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools | | |
| To examine how school physical environment influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools | **Independent variable** School environment | • School location  
• Socio economic status | |
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND PRESENTATION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter provided the researcher with the findings of the study in line with the study objectives. It also included questionnaire return rate, demographic characteristics of the respondents. The objectives were to determine how the teacher factors influence learner’s performance in K.C.P.E in public primary schools, how school funding influence learner’s performance in K.C.P.E in public primary schools, how school attendance influence learner’s performance in K.C.P.E in public primary schools and how school physical environment influence learner’s performance in K.C.P.E in public primary schools.

4.2 Questionnaire return rate
This study targeted teachers within Cheptais Sub County. The questionnaires were given to 306 teachers who were interviewed. Table 4.1 below shows return rates of respondents for this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Return rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire dispatches</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires returned</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>73.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires missing</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>26.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above out of the questionnaires and interviews given to the teachers, head teachers and education officers, 224 were responded returned the questionnaires indicating a return rate of 73.20%.while 82(26.80%) were not returned. The reason why some of the questionnaires were not returned was because some of the respondents were absent during the day of collection. Therefore, a response rate of 73.20% is sufficient for analysis.
4.3 Demographic characteristics of the respondents

The researcher wanted to establish the distribution of the respondents by age, sex and level of education. Participants in the research were therefore asked to provide the necessary demographic data as shown below.

4.3.1 Distribution of respondents by gender

The questionnaire included an item on gender of teachers who involved in the research. The researcher was interested in finding out how gender influence learner’s performance in K.C.P.E in public primary schools.

Table 4.2 Gender of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>58.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>41.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.2 above it shows that majority 130(58.04%) were male against 94(41.96%) who were female among the 224 selected. This implies that there was male domination among teachers above the female representation and this shows that more male than females were teachers in Cheptais Sub County.

4.3.2 Distribution of respondents by age

This section sought to find the age distribution of respondents. This was to help the researcher to establish which section of the population involves most in teaching sector. This is in the table below.

Table 4.3 Age of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and above</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table above, the ages between 21-30 gave 28.57%, 31-40 gave 48.21%, 41-50 gave 12.50% and 51 and above gave 10.71%. This showed that age distribution across the categories kept on varying. This finding revealed that most of the respondents were between the ages 31-40 at 48.21%.

4.3.3 Respondents by education level
The researcher also wanted to find out the level of education of teachers.

Table 4.4: Education level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above 112 representing 50% of the teachers had primary teacher certificates, 60 teachers representing 26.79% had diploma certificates, 45 teachers representing 20.09% had attained degree certificates and 7 teachers representing 3.13% had attained a Master’s degree in education. This study therefore revealed that majority of the teachers had primary teacher education certificate since it was the minimum qualification for one to teach in a primary school.

This was the first objective in this study which sought to find out how teacher factors influence learner’s performance in K.C.P.E in public primary schools in Cheptais Sub County. The items were therefore geared towards finding out how training influence learner’s performance in K.C.P.E in public primary schools.

4.4.1 Training and learners Performance in KCPE
The researcher sought to find out who between trained and untrained teachers teaches best. This was important to help identify some of the factors that influence learner’s performance in K.C.P.E in public primary schools. The questions were therefore asked to the respondents and the following responses came up as shown in the table below.
Table 4.5: Teacher training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>83.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above teachers who poses sound professional training are well equipped with the requisite competences that enable them to promote effective teaching and learning which is in agreement with the findings of the study which showed that 83.93% responded Yes while 16.07% responded No. this is in agreement with Reynolds (2004) who said that training is the application of formal processes to impact knowledge and help people to acquire skills necessary for them to perform their jobs satisfactorily.

4.4.2 Training influence learner’s performance in KCPE

The study sought to find out if teacher training influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools. The researcher was therefore keen in asking questions so as to elicit responses from the respondents. The respondents gave the following responses as shown in the table below

Table 4.6 Teacher training influence learner’s performance in KCPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>37.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, 83(37.05%) of the respondents strongly agreed that teacher training influence performance in public primary schools, 50(22.32%) agreed, 45(20.09%) disagreed with the researcher, 36(16.07%) of the respondents strongly disagreed while 10 (4.46%) were undecided. This shows that from the percentages above, the training that the teacher undergoes in colleges helps the teacher to handle pupils well which in turn impacts on the performance of the learners in KCPE. This study is therefore in agreement with Thompson (1987) who noted that
the way in which teachers are recruited and trained may adversely affect learner’s performance. Grant (1972) also emphasized that no one should enter teaching profession unless he or she is determined to do the best for the children.

4.4.3 Qualification and learner’s performance in KCPE

Table 4.7 Teacher qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>76.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

172 (76.79%) of the respondents agreed that the qualification of a teacher had an impact on performance of KCPE since they had the techniques of handling pupils while 52 (23.21%) disagreed with the qualification of a teacher since some of the unqualified people were teaching in schools which continue to post good marks in KCPE. The study therefore supports Eshiwani 1993 who noted that most schools faced a lot of problems including qualified teachers as a result of which learners performed poorly in national examinations. According to Koech report (1999) he recommended that the admission criteria for training colleges be reviewed to ensure that only qualified candidates were admitted. Kamunge report (1988) agrees with this study. He noted that teachers of primary schools should be assigned to teach the subjects they are best qualified in.

4.4.4 Qualification influence learner’s performance in KCPE

The study was interesting in finding out if qualification was influencing learner’s performance in KCPE. The respondents gave the following responses as shown in table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8 Qualification and learner’s performance in KCPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>41.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the responses 92 (41.07%) agreed that qualification influence performance of KCPE, 74 (33.04%) strongly agreed, 21 (9.38%) disagreed, 27 (12.05%) strongly disagreed while 10 (4.46%) were undecided. From the percentages above, one may easily tell that, most of the respondents agreed to a large extent that qualification indeed was impacting on learner’s performance in KCPE. This is in agreement with Maundu (1986) who concluded that learners performance go hand in hand with teachers qualification.

4.4.5 Motivation and learner’s performance in KCPE
The researcher was interested in finding out if motivation had influence on learner’s performance in KCPE. Motivation among the teachers was likely to influence learner’s performance. This section provides the respondent’s views about motivation being a factor influencing learner’s performance. They gave the following responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>82.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 4.9 above it can be revealed that majority of the respondents 185 (82.59%) agreed that motivation was influencing learner’s performance in KCPE while 39 (17.41%) of the respondents disagreed that motivation was not influencing learner’s performance in KCPE. These results are in agreement with World Bank Report (1986) which acknowledges that teacher’s satisfaction is generally related to achievement hence satisfied teachers would concentrate hence making academic performance of the learners. Another study by Wandira (1970) also supports this idea by saying that, the teacher who is not intrinsically motivated cannot make improvement in performance.

4.4.6 Motivation influence learner’s performance in KCPE
The study sought to find out if motivation influences learner’s performance in KCPE. The questions were asked to elicit responses from the respondents. The responses were as follows.
Table 4.10 Motivation and learner’s performance in KCPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>41.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above 93 (41.52%) strongly agreed that motivation was an important influence on learners performance, 67(29.91%) agreed, 14 (6.25%) disagreed, 46 (20.54%) strongly disagreed and 4 (1.79%) were undecided. This showed that one easily tells that motivation has greatest influence on performance of KCPE. When a teacher is motivated he or she is likely to perform better. This study agrees with Kamunge report (1988) on education and manpower in the next decade and beyond proposed increase in salaries of teachers so as to retain qualified staff. Wayne (1988) also agrees with this study. He asserts that pay has a strong impact on the employee’s performance. Bratton (2003) also agrees with Wayne when he stated that pay is one of the most powerful motivating tools.

**4.5 How school funding influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools.**

This was the second objective in the study. The researcher wanted to establish how funding influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools.

**4.5.1 Facilities and learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools.**

The researcher wanted to establish if facilities influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools. The researcher therefore asked questions concerning the facilities. The responses were as shown in table below.

Table 4.11 Facilities and learner’s performance in KCPE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>91.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table above, 205 (91.52%) accepted that facilities influence learner’s performance in KCPE while 19 (8.48) did not agree that facilities influence learner’s performance in KCPE. From this observation we can conclude that majority of the people agree that facilities influence learner’s performance. Books, libraries, play an important role in pupil’s performance. This study is in agreement with a study by Ndethiu (2009) at Kenyatta university who found that lack of adequate reading resources posed a challenge to the promotion of learner’s reading habit. Lack of current and relevant books, inadequate use of internet and general lack of reading space were important constraints to students reading. According to Fawowe (1988), a library must be up-to-date and at the same time allow access to order materials. It must be properly supported financially to fund materials and services among others.

4.5.2: Facilities influence learner’s performance in KCPE

The researcher sought to find out if facilities influence learner’s performance in KCPE. The questions therefore generated the following responses as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, 114 (50.89%) strongly agree that facilities influence learner’s performance in KCPE, 60 (26.79%) agreed, 25 (11.16%) disagreed, 19 (8.48%) strongly disagreed and 6(2.68%) were undecided on the responses they gave. From the percentages above, most agreed that facilities play a big role in performance of learners in public primary schools. The study is in agreement with Oni (1992) who said that facilities constitute a strategic factors in any
organization including education. He further stated that their availability, adequacy and relevance influence efficiency and productivity.

4.5.2: Teacher pupil ratio and performance in KCPE.
The study aimed to establish if teacher pupil ratio influence performance in public primary schools. The researcher asked questions which elicited the following responses from the respondents as shown below.

Table 4.12 Teacher pupil ratio and performance in public primary school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>88.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses above, 199 (88.84%) of the respondents agreed with the researcher while 25 (11.16%) said that the teacher pupil ratio did not influence performance of KCPE in public primary schools. From the study above, we can conclude that higher student teacher ratio impact negatively on learner’s performance. This study is in agreement with the study conducted by Bayo (2005) who said that smaller classes benefit all learners because of individual attention from teachers. Alderman, Orazem & Paterno (2001) in their study also agreed with my findings by saying that higher learner teacher ratio had a continuous negative effect on learner achievement.

4.5.2: Teacher pupil ratio and performance in public primary schools.
The researcher wanted to establish from the respondents if teacher pupil ratio influence learner performance in KCPE in public primary schools. The questions were asked and the following responses came up as follows in the table below.

Table 4.13 Teacher pupil ratio and performance in KCPE in public primary schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>50.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table above 113 (50.45%) strongly agreed that teacher pupil ratio influence performance of KCPE 44 (19.64%) agreed, 31 (13.84) disagreed, 16 (7.14%) strongly disagreed while 20 (8.93%) were undecided. Based on the findings from the table above, most agreed that indeed teacher pupil ratio influence performance. Looking at the percentages above one draws a conclusion that higher number of learners in a class impact on performance. This study is in agreement with Graddy & Stevens (2003) who in there study concluded that learner teacher ratio was an important determinant of fees and parents choose schools with lower learner ratio. Levacic (2005) concluded a study on Grade KS3 and found out that reduction in the student teacher ratio had statistically significant positive effect on mathematics achievement.

### 4.5.5 Pupil’s characteristics and performance in KCPE

The researcher wanted to establish pupil’s characteristics influence performance in KCPE in public primary school. The following were the responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>74.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above 167 (74.55%) agreed that pupil’s characteristics influence performance while 57 (25.45%) did not agree that pupil’s characteristics influence performance in KCPE. From the above performance, one easily conclude that individual characteristics is a factor that influence performance in KCPE in public primary schools. According to the study done by Russel & Startup (1986) says that in any age cohort, the older pupils tend to outperform the younger pupils. Uphoff and Gilmore (1985) also agrees with the study that older learners perform better than young ones.

### 4.5.6 Pupil’s characteristics and learner’s performance in KCPE.

The researcher looked into how pupil’s characteristics influence learner’s performance in KCPE. questions were asked and the following responses came up as shown below.
Table 4.15: Pupil’s characteristics and performance in KCPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>50.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above response 113 (50.45%) strongly agreed that pupil’s characteristics influence performance in KCPE while 48 (21.43%) agreed, 22 (9.82%) disagreed, 32 (14.73%) strongly disagreed and 8 (3.57%) were undecided. From this analysis therefore pupil’s characteristics is a factor that influence performance in KCPE.

4.6 School attendance and learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools

This was the third objective in research. The researcher was therefore interested in finding out if school attendance influenced learner’s performance in KCPE.

4.6.1 Truancy and performance in KCPE in public primary schools.

The researcher looked into the aspect of truancy and if it influences learner’s performance in KCPE. From the question asked, the following responses were generated as shown below.

Table 4.16: Truancy and learner’s performance in KCPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>83.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses above 188 (83.93%) agreed that truancy influence learner’s performance while 36 (16.07%) responded that truancy does not influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools. From the above findings we can conclude that student’s absence from school impacts negatively on performance. This study also agrees with Paaku (2008) who states
that if a student is absent for two days and beyond double those days should be provided to make up for missed work.

4.6.2 Truancy influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools.
The researcher wanted to establish if truancy influence learner’s performance in KCPE and the following responses come up.

Table 4.17: Truancy influence learner’s performance in KCPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>44.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the percentage above 92 (41.07%) strongly agreed that truancy influence learner’s performance while 75 (33.48%) agreed, 12 (5.36%) disagreed, 40 (17.86%) strongly disagreed, while 05 (2.28%) were undecided. From the finding above therefore, we can conclude that majority strongly agreed that truancy influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools. From the above findings, we can therefore conclude that truancy affect learner’s performance in K.C.P.E. This is in agreement with Smith (1998) who emphasized that attendance is a priority for educators. The middle school program me (2004) of West Orange Public School, cited in Paaku (2008) noted the importance of the presence of a student’s responsibility to make up for the missed work as a result of being absent.

4.6.3 Lateness to school and learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools.
The researcher sought to establish if lateness to school influence learner’s performance in KCPE. The following responses were elicited as shown below

Table 4.18: Lateness to school and performance in KCPE in public primary schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>91.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the responses, 206 (91.96%) responded yes while 18 (8.04%) did not agree with the question asked. This showed that majority of the people agreed that lateness to school lead to poor learner’s performance in KCPE. This is in agreement with Paaku (2008) which indicate the need and importance of learner’s regularity as a way of commitment in effective academic work before the learner can succeed.

4.6.4 Lateness to school and learner’s performance in KCPE

The researcher looked into an aspect of lateness and its influence on learner’s performance in KCPE. The researcher asked questions that aimed to elicit responses from the respondents and the following were the responses as shown in the table below.

Table 4.19: Lateness to school influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>39.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the response above 88 (39.92%) strongly agreed that lateness influence learner’s performance in KCPE, 67 (29.91%) agreed, 20 (8.93%) disagreed, 37 (16.52%) strongly disagreed while 12 (5.36%) were undecided from this finding therefore, majority agreed that, lateness to school influence learner’s performance. This study therefore is in agreement with (Dekalb 1999, Rothman 2001) whom in their findings showed that learners must be present in school in order to benefit from the academic program in its entirety.

4.6.5 Distance from home and learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary school

The researcher wanted to establish if distance from home influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools, the researcher got the following responses from the respondents.
Table 4.20: Distance from home and learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>83.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings above, 186 (83.04%) agreed that distance from home impact on learner’s performance while 38 (16.96%) did not agree. From the percentages above one can conclude that distance from home influence learner’s performance in KCPE. We can therefore draw conclusion from this that learner’s performance is affected by distance as learners from far rural areas are more likely to have lower educational outcomes compared to those from urban areas. Issues affecting access to education in regional areas include: costs, the availability of transport and levels of family income supports (Cheers, 1990; HREOC, 2000)

4.6.6 Distance from home influence learner’s performance in KCPE

The researcher asked questions to the respondents on distance from home and its influence on learner’s performance in KCPE and got the following responses.

Table 4.21 Distance from home influence learner’s performance in KCPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>41.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the responses above 76 (33.93%) strongly agreed, 93 (41.52%) agreed, 19 (8.48%) disagreed, 05(2.23%) strongly disagreed awhile 31 (13.84%) were undecided. This finding show that distance from home influenced learner’s performance in KCPE. This study is in agreement
with Lockheed and Vespoor (1990) who noted that children who lived a long way from school are prone to absenteeism and fatigue which in turn impact on performance in schools.

4.7 School physical environment and learner’s performance in KCPE
This was the fourth objective in the study it’s sought to find out if school physical environment influence learner’s performance in KCPE.

4.7.1 School location and learner’s performance in KCPE
The researcher wanted to establish if school location influence learner’s performance in KCPE.

The responses were as shown in the table below.

**Table 4.22: School location and learner’s performance in KCPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>69.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the response above 156 (69.64%) agreed while 68 (30.36%) did not agree that school location influence learner’s performance in KCPE, one can conclude from the percentages that school location affect learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools.

4.7.2 School location influence learner’s performance in KCPE
The study wanted to establish from the respondents if school location influence learner’s performance in KCPE. The following responses were generated as shown below.

**Table 4.23: School location and learner’s performance in KCPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table above 96 (42.86%) strongly agreed that school location influence learner’s performance in KCPE, 65(29.02%) agreed, 11 (4.91%) disagreed, 38(16.96%) strongly disagreed while 14(6.25%) were undecided. This research is in agreement with Ayoo (2002) and Eshiwani (1998) who agreed that school physical environment such as classrooms libraries have a direct influence in learner’s performance in KCPE.

4.7.3 Social economic status and learner’s performance in KCPE
The study wanted to establish if social economic status influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools. The responses that were given were as follows.

Table 4.24: Social economic status and learner’s performance in KCPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>78.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings above 175 (78.13%) agreed that socio economic status influence learner’s performance while 49(21.87%) did not agree. From the percentages above, one can agree that social economic status of one’s parents influence learner’s performance. These findings agree with (Ainley et al, 1995) who says that learners from low families are more likely to show low performance in terms of academic performance than those from high class families.

4.7.4 Social economic status influence learner’s performance in KCPE
The study sought to find out if social economic status influence learner’s performance in KCPE, the questions were asked and the following were responses.

Table 4.25: Social economic status and learner’s performance in KCPE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the findings above 81 (36.16%) strongly agreed that social economic status influence learner’s performance, 64 (28.57%) agreed, 22(9.82%) disagreed, 36(16.07%) strongly disagreed while 21 (9.38%) were undecided. We can therefore deduce that social economic status influence learner’s performance. This study agrees with Woolfolk (2007) who noted that when the communities’ economic status is low, they may not be able to support the school financially hence poor performance is the depicted. Marshall (1984.61) also concurs with this study. He says learners from poor parents often have to do heavy chores in homes and farms or go out trading before attending school in the morning. Basil (2007) also supports Marshall Observations that low income level of parents is a major impediment to academic success
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter covers the summary of the findings, conclusions drawn from the study as well as recommendations based on the study findings and suggestions for further studies.

5.2 Summary of the findings
The study sought to find out factors influencing learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools in Kenya a case of Cheptais Sub-County. Every year learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools has been an issue every time the results are released. Understanding factors that influence learner’s performance in KCPE public primary schools is actually an important section to study.

5.2.2 Teacher factors and learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools
From the study 83.93% of the respondents agreed that training influence learner’s performance since trained teacher’s possessed sound professional knowledge, requisite competencies that enabled them to promote effective teaching and learning while 16.07% of the respondents indicated that training did not contribute to learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools. 76.79% of the respondents acknowledged that qualification influenced learner’s performance since a qualified teacher had the techniques of handling learners while (23.29%) of the respondents indicated that qualification did not influence learner’s performance. (82.59%) of the respondents agreed that motivation influence learners performance since teacher motivation is generally related to achievement while (17.41%) of the respondents indicated that motivation did not influence learners performance.

5.2.3 School funding and learners performance in KCPE in public primary schools
The study showed that 91.52% of the respondents agreed that facilities promote performance of learners in KCPE since the facilities promote smooth functioning of the school. 8.48% of the respondents did not agree that facilities influence learner’s performance in KCPE. (88.84%) of the respondents acknowledged that teacher-pupil-ratio influence learners performance because
the ratio of a teacher to pupils promote individual attention by the teacher while 11.16% did not agree with the findings above. 74.55% agreed that learner’s characteristics affect performance in KCPE because younger learner’s tend to perform better compared to older ones. 25.45% of the respondents did not agree with that.

5.2.4 School attendance and learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools.
From the study (83.93%) of the respondents agreed that truancy influence learner’s performance in KCPE because most of the learners were engaged in farming shamba system that is practiced in Mt. Elgon. Their parents also kept on migrating from one place to another with them, while 16.07% did not agree on the matter. 91.96% agreed that distance from home influence learner’s performance since most of the learners came to school late after some lessons had been taught. 8.04% of the respondents did not agree that lateness lead to poor learner performance in KCPE. 83.04% of the respondents agreed that distance from home influenced learner’s performance because some of the learner’s came to school when already tired since they came from far while 16.96% of the respondents did not agree on that.

5.2.5 School physical environment and learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools.
The study looked at the influence of school physical environment and learner’s performance in KCPE. It came out that 78.13% of the respondents acknowledged that pupils from poor economic background performed poorly compared to those one from rich background, those from rich background had everything they wanted, everything provided promptly when required unlike those ones from poor background. 21.87% did not agree with the study.

5.3 Conclusion
The study sought to find out whether teacher factors, school funding, school attendance and school physical environment influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools.

In conclusion training of teachers was found to be an important factor as far as performance of learner’s is concerned. The training the teacher gets equips him or her with skills necessary to handle learners and eventually perform well in KCPE. The study also found that qualification of the teacher promoted good performance. Lastly it was also found that schools performed poorly because they were being handled by untrained personnel who did not possess required skills to teach.
Facilities played an important role in ensuring that pupils perform well in national examinations, enough facilities like classrooms, libraries and books ensures that there is no congestion in classes. Teacher pupil ratio was also found to be the most important factor as small classes could enable individual attention by the teacher. Pupil’s age was also found to influence learner’s performance because it was found that younger learner’s performed better than their older counterparts when they sat for the same exams.

Truancy from school was found to be the major factor contributing to poor academic performance since most of the learner’s engaged in farming through the shamba system practiced in Mt Elgon forest. Lateness to school was also found to influence learner’s performance since learners went to school after two or three lessons had been taught. Worse still, after lunch most learners went back to school as late as 4:00 pm after all the afternoon lessons had been taught. Distance from home was also another factor whereby some learners walked long distances to get to school.

School location was also found to be another major factor influencing learner’s performance in KCPE, the surrounding of the school determines how the school performs. Negative attitude of the surrounding community towards the school does not promote the spirit of good performance. Social economic status of the surrounding community was found to promote performance. Learners from rich parents perform better compared to learners from poor parents.

5.4 Recommendation of the study.

Based on the major findings, the following are recommended.

1. The government should train and employ more teachers to improve learner’s performance in KCPE.
2. Funding of Public institutions should be increased to improve learner’s performance in KCPE.
3. Institutions should put on strict measures to curb truancy.
4. Schools and it surroundings should be learner friendly.
5. Shamba system practiced in Mt Elgon forest should be banned by the government to arrest the involvement of children in farming.
6. Enough facilities should be provided in schools to improve learners performance
7. Shamba system should be discouraged
5.5 Suggestions for further study

The study was conducted in Cheptais Sub-County, in Bungoma County. The following observations were noted for further research

1. Future studies could include other factors that influence learner’s performance in KCPE in public primary schools.
2. The research was limited to public primary schools thus a comparative research should be done on the factors influencing learner’s performance in KCPE in private schools in Kenya.
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APPENDIX I:

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Omoit Duncan,
P.o Box 1414,
Bungoma.

To whom it may concern,

Dear sir/madam,

I am Omoit Duncan, a student of Masters of Arts in Project Planning and Management at the University of Nairobi. I am currently doing a research on factors influencing learner’s performance of Public Primary schools in Kenya: A case of Cheptais Sub County. You have been identified as a potential respondent in this research. The information provided will help the Government design intervention policies in addressing performance in Public Primary Schools. The information given will be treated as confidential. Kindly provide the information that is well known to you. DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THIS QUESTIONAIRE. Your support and cooperation will be appreciated.

Thank you.
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS OF PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN CHEPTAIS SUB-COUNTY.

The purpose of this questionnaire will be to collect data on factors influencing performance of public primary schools in Cheptais sub-county, Bungoma County. Your school has been sampled to take part in the survey.

Instructions

a) Do not write your name on the questionnaire.
b) The information you will give will be treated with confidentiality.
c) Kindly provide answers to the questions as honestly and as precisely as possible.
d) Indicate your choice by a tick
e) Kindly answer all the questions

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.

Please tick (✓) where appropriate in the boxes provided.

1. Gender:
   Male [ ]   Female [ ]

2. Age:
   Between 21-30 years [ ]
   Between 31-40 years [ ]
   Between 41-50 years [ ]
50 and above years [ ]

3. Level of study
   - Certificate [ ]
   - Diploma [ ]
   - Degree [ ]
   - Master [ ]
   - PhD [ ]

SECTION B: OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS

TEACHER FACTORS AND LEARNER’S PERFORMANCE IN KCPE

1. Does teacher training affect learner’s performance in KCPE?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
   Explain your answer
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Does the qualification of a teacher influence learner’s performance in KCPE?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
   Explain your answer
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Do motivation of a teacher influence learner’s performance in KCPE?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
   Explain your answer
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
SCHOOL FUNDING AND LEARNER'S PERFORMANCE IN KCPE

1. Do school facilities influence learner’s performance in KCPE?
   Yes [  ]    No [  ]
   Explain your answer
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Does pupil teacher ratio influence learner’s performance in KCPE?
   Yes [  ]    No [  ]
   Explain your answer
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Do the pupil’s characteristics influence learner’s performance in KCPE?
   Yes [  ]    No [  ]
   Explain your answer
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND LEARNER’S PERFORMANCE IN KCPE

1. Does truancy influence learner’s performance in KCPE?
   Yes [  ]    No [  ]
2. Does lateness to school influence learner’s performance in KCPE?
   Yes [    ]    No [    ]
   Explain your answer
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Does distance from home influence learner’s performance in KCPE?
   Yes [    ]    No [    ]
   Explain your answer
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

SCHOOL PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT AND LEARNERS PERFORMANCE IN KCPE

1. Does school location influence learner’s performance in KCPE?
   Yes [    ]    No [    ]
   Explain your answer
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Do socio economic status influence learner’s performance in KCPE?
   Yes [    ]    No [    ]
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR EDUCATION OFFICERS

Instructions:
The interview schedule is aimed at investigating factors influencing learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools in Kenya: A case study of cheptais Sub County. Answer all the questions honestly. Confidentiality will be guaranteed for all the responses to the questions.

1. What are some of the teacher factors that influence learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools?

2. How does the school funding by the government influence learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools?

3. Do school attendance influence learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools?

4. Does school environment influence learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools?
5. Does the motivation of a teacher influence learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools?

6. How do facilities influence learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools?

7. Do school location influence learner’s performance in Kenya certificate of primary education in public primary schools?
SECTION C: LIKERT QUESTIONS

To what extent do you agree with the following statement on performance of KCPE? You can rate them as follows on a scale of SA (strongly agree), A (agree) D (disagree), SD (strongly disagree), U (undecided).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers training affects learner’s performance in KCPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification of a teacher influence learner’s performance in KCPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of teachers influence learners performance in KCPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities influence learner’s performance in KCPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher pupil ratio influence learner’s performance in KCPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner’s characteristics influence performance in KCPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy influence learner’s performance in KCPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateness to school influence learner’s performance in KCPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home influence learner’s performance in KCPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School location influenced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX III:**

**DETERMINING SAMPLE SIZE FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>Source Size</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>75000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1000000</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “N” is population size
“S” is Sample size
Source: Krejcie & Morgan (1970)